The Scots in Ireland: Culture, Colonialism and Memory, 1315-1826

Christopher McMillan
BA, MLitt

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
School of Critical Studies
College of Arts
University of Glasgow

April, 2016

Abstract

This thesis examines three key moments in the intersecting histories of Scotland, Ireland and England, and their impact on literature.

Chapter one 'Robert Bruce and the Last King of Ireland: Writing the Irish Invasion, 1315-1826', is split into two parts. Part one, 'Barbour's (other) *Bruce'* focuses on John Barbour's *The Bruce* (1375) and its depiction of the Bruce's Irish campaign (1315-1318). It first examines the invasion material from the perspective of the existing Irish and Scottish relationship and their opposition to English authority. It highlights possible political and ideological motivations behind Barbour's negative portrait of Edward Bruce - whom Barbour presents as the catalyst for the invasion and the source of its carnage and ultimate failure - and his partisan comparison between Edward and his brother Robert I. It also probes the socio-polticial and ideological background to the *Bruce* and its depiction of the Irish campaign, in addition to Edward and Robert. It peers behind some of the *Bruce*'s most lauded themes such as chivalry, heroism, loyalty, and patriotism, and exposes its militaristic feudal ideology, its propaganda rich rhetoric, and its illusions of 'freedom'. Part one concludes with an examination of two of the Irish section's most marginalised figures, the Irish and a laundry woman.

Part two, 'Cultural Memories of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, 1375-1826', examines the cultural memory of the Bruce invasion in three literary works from the Medieval, Early Modern and Romantic periods. The first, and by far the most significant memorialisation of the invasion is Barbour's *Bruce*, which is positioned for the first time within the tradition of *ars memoriae* (art of memory) and present-day cultural memory theories. The *Bruce* is evaluated as a site of memory and Barbour's methods are compared with Icelandic literature of the same period. The recall of the invasion in late sixteenth century Anglo-Irish literature is then considered, specifically Edmund Spenser's *A View of the State of Ireland*, which is viewed in the context of contemporary Ulster politics. The final text to be considered is William Hamilton Drummond's *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland* (1826). It is argued that Drummond's poem offers an alternative Irish version of the invasion; a counter-memory that responds to nineteenth-century British politics, in addition to the controversy surrounding the publication of the Ossian fragments.

Chapter two, 'The Scots in Ulster: Policies, Proposals and Projects, 1551-1575', examines the struggle between Irish and Scottish Gaels and the English for dominance in north

Ulster, and its impact on England's wider colonial ideology, strategy, literature and life writing. Part one entitled 'Noisy neighbours, 1551-1567' covers the deputyships of Sir James Croft, Sir Thomas Radcliffe, and Sir Henry Sidney, and examines English colonial writing during a crucial period when the Scots provoked an increase in militarisation in the region.

Part two 'Devices, Advices, and Descriptions, 1567-1575', deals with the relationship between the Scots and Turlough O'Neill, the influence of the 5th Earl of Argyll, and the rise of Sorley Boy MacDonnell. It proposes that a renewed Gaelic alliance hindered England's conquest of Ireland and generated numerous plantation proposals and projects for Ulster. Many of which exhibit a 'blurring' between the documentary and the literary; while all attest to the considerable impact of the Gaelic Scots in both motivating and frustrating various projects for that province, the most prominent of which were undertaken by Sir Thomas Smith in 1571 and Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex in 1573.

Contents

Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful to the many people who have assisted and encouraged my research. I have been extremely fortunate to have had two excellent supervisors, Professor Willy Maley and Dr. Rhona Brown, who afforded me scope to explore and whose support and constructive criticism has continually developed my skills and enhanced my work. I would also like to thank Dr. Alison Thorne for her consideration and encouragement during my earlier university education, and for introducing me to Professor Maley. I am grateful to all those who during the course of my PhD have offered advice and friendship. I would like to thank my family and friends, of whom I have seen little in recent times but thought of a great deal. Without them this journey would not have begun in the first place. Special thanks to Rille Raaper, the most incredibly patient, considerate and lovely person I know.

Finally, I would like to thank the AHRC for their financial support.

Declaration

I declare that, except where explicit reference is made to the contribution of others, that this dissertation is the result of my own work and has not been submitted for any other degree at the University of Glasgow or any institution.

Signature…………………………………
Printed name…………………………..

Introduction

The initial projected focus of this thesis was the literature relating to the early history and rise of the Ulster-Scots. Commencing with the Union of Crowns (1603) the intention was to plot a path through the settlements of the so-called founding fathers of the Ulster-Scots, James Hamilton (1605) and Hugh Montgomery (1606), followed by the 1609 Ulster plantation, continuing through the Caroline era (1625-1649), and concluding during the Interregnum (1649-1660). In the event, this particular journey never got underway and given its distance would most likely have been truncated. However, whilst surveying the preconditions to the momentous colonial events of the first decade of the seventeenth-century, it became apparent that the rise of Ulster-Scots society was predicated on the dismantling of an existing Gaelic Scottish community in Ulster during the second half of the sixteenth century.

There is, from a predominantly Anglo-Irish perspective, an abundance of historical and literary criticism on the subject of early modern colonial Ireland. Yet, there is no corresponding interest in the Gaelic Scots, despite many Tudor colonial texts being peppered with allusions to them, and often generated by them. The influence of the Gaelic Scots on Irish colonial politics, as well as nascent British politics is slowly coming to light, but at present it is reasonable to say that much is still in shadow. Chapter two 'The Scots in Ulster: Policies, Proposals and Projects, 1551-1575', spotlights twenty-four crucial years in Ulster and pieces together the Gaelic Scots experience through a range of English colonial literature and life-writing, which during this period increased in quantity and intensity, and underwent formal and thematic changes.

Shifting the focus from the Ulster-Scots to the more expansive 'Scots in Ireland' provided an opportunity to examine an earlier event in Irish-Scottish history, the similarly neglected Bruce Invasion of Ireland (1315-1318) and its representation in literature, most notably John Barbour's *The Bruce* (1375). Ulster, nonetheless, was a vitally strategic region throughout the invasion. From here Edward Bruce received support for his incursion and was crowned king of Ireland. Ulster was where the Scots came ashore, fought their first battles against the English earls and launched assaults the length of Ireland. Given that the septecentenary of this somewhat forgotten campaign would take place in my final year, it seemed remiss not to explore Barbour's and other writers' descriptions of the Bruces' three-year Irish expedition (particularly in light of the septecentenary of the battle of Bannockburn in 2014, which passed with considerable fanfare). There is a great deal of historical work on the Bruce invasion but insufficient analysis of its literary depictions. Thus the focus of chapter one entitled 'Robert Bruce and

the Last King of Ireland: Writing the Irish Invasion, 1315-1826', is among other things an attempt to both mitigate and understand the dearth of literary criticism on the invasion.

Chapter one is divided into two parts. Part one is entitled 'Barbour's other *Brus'*, and as the title implies it is concerned with alternative and critically marginalised aspects of the poem: the invasion portion, Edward Bruce, and the Irish. Part one provides an overview of literary criticism, a biography of Barbour, and an outline of the invasion. It examines the existing political and cultural connections between Scotland and Ireland and their mutual opposition to England. The section 'Barbour's other Bruce' contrasts the historic relationship between Robert and Edward Bruce with Barbour's skewed portrayal. It asks to what extent Barbour's progressively negative depiction of Edward (beginning during the Irish portion of the *Bruce*) is politically motivated and intended to benefit the memory and mythology of Robert Bruce and his descendants; and what effect it may have had on Edward's decline into historical inconspicuousness - with the exception of his infamous association with the Irish campaign of 1315-1318. The subsequent section '"Freedom is a noble thing": demystifying *The Bruce'*, places Barbour's Irish content, and the *Bruce* more generally, within the ideological framework of fourteenth-century feudal Scotland, its totemic concepts of chivalry and heroism, and its budding nationalism/patriotism. Part one concludes with an ethical consideration of Barbour's depiction of the invasion, the native Irish, and a laundry woman. Finally, drawing together its different strands, part one speculates whether Barbour's portrayal of the Irish invasion challenges traditional and populist perceptions of *The Bruce*, the legacy of Robert Bruce and Scotland's much-vaunted notions of 'freedom'

Part two of chapter one, entitled 'Cultural Memories of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, 1375-1826', is the first analysis of the Irish invasion from a cultural memory perspective; the first evaluation of Barbour's *Bruce* from the perspective of *ars memoriae* (art of memory), and current cultural memory theories. The invasion's reappearance in late sixteenth-century Anglo-Irish literature (pertaining to Ulster) is considered, particularly the utility of the invasion to Edmund Spenser's political program in *A View of the State of Ireland* (1596). The remainder of part two focuses on the contextual history of the early nineteenth century poem *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland* (1826), a hitherto neglected but notable counter-memorial text by the Ulster-Scots poet William Hamilton Drummond. Told from the native Irish perspective, Drummond's poem, it is argued, responds to Barbour's pejorative source material, and exploits the narrative of Ireland's subjugation by Scottish nobles to allude to the existing conflict within Irish-Scottish culture prompted by James Macpherson's publication of the Ossian fragments. It is also proposed that

Drummond mines the memory of Scotland's invasion of Ireland in order to comment on and condemn the existing democratic deficit within an Anglo-centric 'Britain'.

Broadly speaking this thesis examines three key moments in the intersecting histories of Scotland, Ireland and England, and their impact on literature. These moments, ranging from the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, are crucial to the development of Gaeldom - and one benefit of this broad study is that it traces the historical fluctuations in this relationship - and 'Britain'. Part one of chapter one focuses on a period during the fourteenth century when the Scots and Irish aligned to some degree against the English, while part two highlights a period of Celtic cultural dispute during the early nineteenth century. Chapter two underlines the schisms within Gaeldom in sixteenth-century Ulster, but above all the struggle between the Gaelic Scots and the English, who on occasion were not above collaborating against the Irish. Under combined pressure from London, Dublin and Edinburgh, and marginalised by the Union of Crowns and the 1609 Ulster plantation, the always unpredictable Gaels inevitably fractured.

The writing examined comes from a range of Scottish, English and Irish literary and historiographical sources. The first half of chapter one focuses on the predominant Scottish version of the Bruce invasion but also alludes to contemporary Irish and English historiography, while the second half examines a Scottish, English and Irish text from the Medieval, Early Modern and Celtic Revival periods. The writing considered in chapter two comes from the abundance of Tudor colonial literature relating to Ulster including administrative writing, state papers, position papers, promotional pamphlets, memoirs and correspondence.

Conceptual framework

This study is influenced by radical historicist criticism. Cultural materialism and new historicism, especially, have encouraged and coloured aspects of my research, rather than rigidly frame it. However, a pre-existing interest in such criticisms notwithstanding, the chronological range and variety of literature and ideas examined in this thesis necessitated a combination of theoretical approaches. For example, in its attempt to understand the historicity and socio-cultural function of Barbour's *Bruce* and its representation of the Irish invasion, a historico-political approach and attentiveness to ideology was required; while Classical and contemporary models of memory and cultural memory were indispensable for understanding the practices and political motives behind the recall of the Bruce invasion in the late fourteenth, late sixteenth, and early nineteenth centuries; and finally the

sixteenth-century literature and life-writing examined in chapter two is interpreted as colonial, and a branch of England's broader imperial philosophy and discourse.

My overall critical approach could best be described as flexible. It uninhibitedly avails itself of both cultural materialist and new historicist thought; in view of the fact that both address issues of power and ideology, and because both are notoriously difficult to pigeonhole. Their elusiveness is confounded by the absence of a 'unifying theory or consistent critical method', in addition to, as Kiernan Ryan points out, reluctance among its practitioners to identify with either criticism.[1] Ryan suggests we view cultural materialism and new historicism as sited on a 'wide spectrum of radical historicist criticism', which blurs ostensible differences and disagreements, and permits critics to 'adopt different positions on the spectrum at different times, depending on their aims and the nature of the text being tackled'.[2]

Fundamentally, and in keeping with my own approach, both criticisms consider texts as 'indivisible from contexts'.[3] New historicists, broadly speaking, view literary texts and other texts equivalently, and non-literary texts as 'co-texts'; essentially, 'expressions of the same historical "moment"'.[4] Cultural materialists, broadly speaking, give preference to canonical texts but seek to isolate them from their elevated status and associated criticism, so as to defamiliarise the text and bring to light other perspectives.[5] Though specific literary texts predominate in both chapters of this thesis, non-literary texts, or co-texts, are conscripted for the purpose of deeper critical analysis. Analysis of Barbour's invasion material, for instance, is augmented with contemporary diplomatic and historiographic writing, which offer additional instructive insights on the primary text. Drummond's politically motivated Irish version of the invasion is contextualised via contemporaneous literature, essays, polemic, and cultural debate. The second chapter relies heavily on sixteenth-century administrative writing, correspondence and memoirs; some of which blur the line between literary and non-literary texts.

In common with new historicists the author regards most canonical texts as 'confederates of oppression', and it is in this sense that Barbour's invasion poetry is initially considered.[6] However, though Barbour and his poem stand accused of collaborating with dominant political and cultural interests, it is also argued that the *Bruce*'s invasion section undermines both the structure and ideological function of the

---

[1] Kiernan Ryan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism: A Reader* (London: Arnold, 1996), p.x.
[2] Ryan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, p.xi.
[3] Ryan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, p.xi.
[4] Peter Barry, *Beginning Theory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), p.173.
[5] Barry, *Beginning Theory*, p.179.
[6] Ryan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, p.xi.

overall work. The Irish material fits awkwardly when read against the rest of the poem and arguably contradicts the lofty themes and historical significance of the work. Reading *The Bruce* through the invasion section (and its history) rather than reading the invasion section through *The Bruce* and traditional *Bruce* criticism, breaches the text's thematic and conceptual defences, through which an alternative perspective is made visible, and from which marginalised figures breakout. Not only does the invasion section appear to resist the poem's structure, genre and discourse it is designed to comply with, the Irish characters in the poem are discernibly resistant, if not rebellious. My wider approach and conclusions therefore meet with the central cultural materialist position that canonical texts are possible sites of struggle.[7] By focusing on a neglected part of the poem - the invasion - and by excluding much of the previous criticism on *The Bruce* (but not criticism on the invasion section; though there is little to speak of) this study to some extent 'defamiliarises' the text.

An additional influence is Michel Foucault's philosophical/theoretical contribution to the concepts of history and power, articulated in his series of lectures (1975-76) included in *Society Must Be Defended* and the essay 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, and History'. Foucault's ideas on historiography - for example, its excessive emphasis on war and its endorsement of certain types of heroes to the exclusion of other forms of politics or archetypes - has influenced both cultural materialists' and new historicists' concern for the victims of historical and cultural marginalisation. Foucault's concept of 'the insurrection of subjugated knowledges' - a practice whereby 'historical contents that have been buried or masked in functional coherences or formal systematizations' are revealed through critique and scholarship - has also been informative.[8] In this interplay, Foucault perceives 'a historical knowledge of struggles'; the method of uncovering such struggles he terms 'genealogy':[9] a practice whereby an attempt is made 'to desubjugate historical knowledges, to set them free, or in other words to enable them to oppose and struggle against the coercion of a unitary, formal, and scientific theoretical discourse.'[10]

It is emphatically the case that within Scottish history and popular culture the Bruce Invasion and the Gaelic Scots in Ulster are overshadowed by more historically convenient

---

[7] Ryan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, p.xi.
[8] Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, *Lectures at the College De France, 1975-76*, eds. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, trans. David Macey (London: Penguin Books, 1997; 2004), p.6.
[9] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, p.8. Of less importance is Foucault's 'archaeological' method (the precursor to genealogy): the study of rules and rationalities which reinforce a particular discourse, although it too rejects historical continuity and the search for origins. Michel Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice, Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1977), p. 140; Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, pp.10-11. Genealogy, practically and metaphysically, involves cutting through 'a field of entangled and confused parchments' and 'documents that have been scratched over and recopied many times'. Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', p.139.
[10] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, pp.10-11.

and culturally constructive events, and often abetted by contemporaneous literature and conventional criticism. Notwithstanding the existing historical writing on the Bruce invasion, in cultural terms the campaign is typically eclipsed, as in the case of Barbour's *Bruce*, by the more expedient Bannockburn. Drummond's reinterpretation of the invasion, told from a native Irish perspective, is a neglected but significant counter-historical and counter-memorial text that contrasts sharply with Barbour's 'establishment' work. The story of the Gaelic Scots in sixteenth-century Ulster meanwhile has typically been a sub-topic of Anglo-Irish studies, but the literature confirms that the Gaelic Scots were constant and critical characters in the colonial conversation taking place between Dublin and London. This study is partly an attempt to draw attention to such episodes, to highlight certain events and figures on the periphery of popular Scottish and Irish history and established academic study. And it does so by examining much the same literature.

The various forms of literature examined are generated respectively by political, military and cultural struggles occurring at three decisive moments between 1315 and 1826, between Ireland, Scotland and England, between feudal kings and native rebels, between imperialist expansion and traditional social and cultural systems. A recurring and key theme is violence: martial, political, cultural and colonial. There is the violence of invasion and occupation perpetrated by the Scots in Ireland in the fourteenth century, the political and colonial violence enacted against the Scots by the English in Ulster in the sixteenth century, and the cultural violence (and there is a case for calling it this) carried out against the Irish by James Macpherson and a section of Scotland's enlightened elite with the publication of the Ossian fragments, which, I contend, Drummond's 'Invasion' is partly targeted at.

In 'Nationalism and Historical scholarship of modern Ireland' (1989), Brendan Bradshaw contends that traditional Irish historiography since the 1930s 'has been vitiated by a faulty methodological procedure', and historians, especially nationalist historians, have adopted a 'value-free' approach to their research rather than tell it 'as it really is'.[11] The same, in truth, could be said of literary critics, especially those with nationalist sympathies. Moreover, as Catherine Belsey points out 'a discipline that purports to be outside politics in practice reproduces a very specific political position'.[12] Bradshaw's complaint more broadly echoes Foucault's disdain for historical 'truth' and his rejection of objectivity (influenced by Nietzsche's 'effective history'). Since objective history is

---

[11] Brendan Bradshaw, 'Nationalism and historical scholarship in modern Ireland', *Irish Historical studies*, 26, 104 (1989), pp.329-351, p.329. See Steven G. Ellis, 'Nationalism, historiography and the English and Gaelic world in the late middle ages', in *I.H.S.*, 25, 97 (1986), pp.1-18.
[12] Catherine Belsey, 'Towards Cultural History – in Theory and Practice', *Textual Practice*, 3, 2 (1989), pp.159-68, p.159.

influenced by 'passion, the inquisitor's devotion, cruel subtlety, and malice', Foucault concludes that 'all knowledge rests upon injustice'.[13] Whereas 'objective history is meant to function like a mirror that provides us with a reflection of the past, in contrast, effective history is meant to function like a lever that disrupts our assumptions and understandings about who we think we are.'[14] The purpose of history, argues Foucault, 'is not to discover the roots of our identity but to commit itself to its dissipation.'[15] Contrary to a 'value-free' approach it is the intention of this thesis, and in the best tradition of radical historicist criticism, to present a 'quite different history [to] what men have said'.[16] The author acknowledges his political commitment and its intended and unintended influence on this study.

This thesis also owes a debt to John Kerrigan's transnational and context driven approach in his seminal *Archipelagic English* (2008). In it Kerrigan underlines how in the early modern period the four nations were 'in different degrees and for a variety of reasons […] interactive entities'.[17] Though Kerrigan's focus is the early modern period, his ideas have been attractive to scholars of the Romantic period, and, as a 'spatial interrelational model', could be applied without too much difficulty to the Late Middle Ages, particularly the 'Anglo-Scottish Wars' (1296 -1346).[18]

This study is not, strictly speaking, archipelagic in scope since it omits the Welsh context. Much more in the vein of *Archipelagic English* however is its extensive use of history and historiography. Kerrigan recognises that the historicist approach, though sometimes 'restrictive', has 'opened up issues that cannot be probed in other ways and equipped us more fully to make judgments about the value of texts.'[19] In the case of especially challenging texts, Kerrigan argues that we can assist our understanding by 'recovering the circumstances of their composition and reception'.[20] One noticeable difference between *Archipelagic English* and this study is the application of particular

---

[13] Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', pp.162-3.

[14] Fendler, *Michael Foucault*, p.42.

[15] Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', p.162.

[16] Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Oxon: Routledge, 1969), p.154.

[17] John Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.vii.

[18] Nick Groom, 'Gothic and Celtic Revivals: Antiquity and the Archipelago', in Robert Demaria, Heesok Chang, and Samantha Zacher, eds. *A Companion to British Literature, Volume 3: Long Eighteenth-Century Literature, 1660-1837* (Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, 2014), pp.361-380, p.364. Prior to this conflict, Edward I was diligently exploiting Ireland financially, and in 1295 conquered Wales where he honed his military machine for its expedition into Scotland. Colm McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces: Scotland, England and Ireland, 1306-1328* (Scotland: Tuckwell Press, 1997), p.16. After forcing the English from Scotland the Bruces then threatened England's hegemony in Wales, attacked Anglesey and attempted to provoke a Welsh revolt. McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces*, p.2. The Bruces, as we will discover, also initiated a three year campaign in Ireland to ostensibly oust the English.

[19] Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, p.vii.

[20] Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, p.vii.

theoretical principles and practices, methods Kerrigan appears to reject when describing them as belonging to 'last century's new historicism'. [21] One final point about archipelagic studies is that it has developed 'within current devolutionary contexts', a central focus of which is the 'loss and recovery' of identity.[22] The devolutionary movement across Britain has increased in recent years, especially in Scotland, and its passionate debate on independence and the 2014 referendum formed the political and cultural background to this thesis. It has not however explicitly influenced it. Nonetheless, a number of its dominant themes - autonomy, nationalism, history and mythology - are considered, and may therefore be of some interest to present-day considerations of them.

---

[21] Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, p.vii.
[22] Groom, 'Gothic and Celtic Revivals', p.364.

Chapter one: Robert Bruce and the Last King of Ireland: Writing the Irish Invasion, 1315-1826

Part one: Barbour's (other) *Bruce*

The Scottish invasion of Ireland (1315-1318) is a major episode within the Wars of Independence (1296-1328), medieval history, and the history of Britain more generally. It directly followed Scotland's against the odds victory at Bannockburn and involves its victorious king and national hero Robert Bruce. The Bruces' Irish campaign has been immortalised twice in poetry, most famously by John Barbour in his national epic *The Bruce* and considerably less famously by the Ulster-Scots poet William Hamilton Drummond in his poem *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland* (1826). Despite its historical significance and proximity to Bannockburn the Irish invasion has failed to fire public imagination in Scotland to the same extent, or for that matter achieve the notoriety of Culloden or Glencoe. It remains instead a shadowy event in Scottish historical memory.

Literary criticism

Barbour's *Bruce* devotes 1407 lines to the Irish invasion, around 10% of the poem;[1] however, despite the tremendous amount of literary attention afforded to *The Bruce* and the invasion's prominence in it, it is fair to say that around 10% of the text has received insufficient consideration. The reductive nature of much early *Bruce* criticism and its general indifference towards the post-Bannockburn material may have set an unfortunate precedent. The celebrated and influential biography of Robert Bruce (1965) by G. W. S. Barrow, for example, assigns a single extended paragraph to the Irish campaign while George Eyre-Todd, writing in the nineteenth century, remarks that 'the poem should end, perhaps, after the battle of Bannockburn. The object of its action was then attained and its epic meaning complete.'[2] For Eyre-Todd, the rest of the poem, including 'the Irish wars of Edward Bruce', 'appears as a sequel, and, like all sequels, possesses diminished interest'.[3]

Perhaps the most extensive analysis of the Irish invasion material, prior to this study, is David Coldwell's thesis 'The Literary Background of Barbour's 'Bruce' (1947), which allocates twenty pages to the Irish campaign but is, as Coldwell explains, 'a simple covering of Barbour's narration and a brief comparison of it with the contemporary

---

[1] Sean Duffy, 'The Anglo-Norman Era in Scotland: Convergence and Divergence', in *Celebrating Columba: Colm Cille a Cheiliuradh: Irish-Scottish Connections, 597-1997*, T. M. Devine and James F. McMillan (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1999), p.20.
[2] George Eyre-Todd, *Early Scottish Poetry* (London: Edinburgh, Sands & Co., 1891), p.69.
[3] Eyre-Todd, *Early Scottish Poetry*, p.69.

historical accounts'.[4] Similarly, in his study on the historicity of Barbour's *Bruce* (2004), James Taggart assigns a probability rating to the episodes in the poem based on their frequency in contemporary historiography and concludes that the *Bruce* is a largely correct account of the Wars of Independence (as understood at the time).[5] However, as with most studies, Coldwell and Taggart subsume the Irish invasion within a primarily Anglo-Scottish history that is indispensable to locating the invasion within its wider political context but precludes a discrete analysis of Barbour's Irish campaigns.

Previous studies have recognised, if not fully explored, the various implications of Barbour's inclusion of the Irish invasion. In '"Freedom is a Noble Thing!": The Ideological Project of John Barbour's *Bruce'* (1984), R. James Goldstein writes that 'no one, so far as I know, has noticed the serious contradiction which occurs in Barbour's account of the Bruces' invasion of Ireland.'[6] R. D. S. Jack's essay 'What's the "Matter"?: Medieval Literary Theory and the Irish Campaigns in *The Bruce'* (2007) presents a partial response to Goldstein's query, though its primary concern is with *The Bruce'*s structure. Jack similarly questions why a poem obsessed with liberty is in practice 'blurred by extended analysis of a failed Scottish attempt to deprive another land of its freedom'?[7] The explanation, Jack claims, stems from 'modern critical expectations' that highlight the poem's inaccuracies from a mimetic and naturalistic perspective, by employing materialist and political evidence as support.[8] Jack's assessment elaborates on W. A. Craigie's (1893) earlier and somewhat crude demand for critical separation between Barbour the historian and Barbour the poet.[9]

Jack refutes the historians' description of Barbour as 'a naïve artist' and stresses the influence of Aristotelian and Scholastic thought on his poem, both of which eschewed the imitation of reality, emphasised the 'final cause', and believed that the principal aim was the 'effective moral persuasion of a given audience […] rather than mimesis *per se.*'[10] For Jack, the pertinent question is not why *The Bruce* is factually and structurally unsound but rather the anticipated effect on Barbour's audience.[11] Despite its title, Jack's essay

---

[4] David Coldwell, 'The Literary Background of Barbour's "Bruce"', (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1969), p.94.

[5] James Hand Taggart, 'The Historicity of Barbour's *Bruce'* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Glasgow, 2004), p.iii.

[6] R. James Goldstein, '"Freedom is a noble thing": the ideological project of John Barbour's *Bruce'*, in *Scottish Language and Literature, Medieval and Renaissance*, Dietrich Strauss and Horst W. Dreschler eds. 4th International Conference 1984, Proceedings (1986), pp.193-206, p.201.

[7] R. D. S. Jack, 'What's the 'Matter'?: Medieval Literary Theory and the Irish campaigns in *The Bruce'*, *Journal of Irish and Scottish Studies*, 1, 1 (2007), pp.11-25, p.12.

[8] Jack, 'What's the Matter'?, p.12, 13.

[9] W. A. Craigie, 'Barbour and Blind Harry as Literature', *Scottish Review*, 22 (1893), pp.173-201, p.175.

[10] Jack, 'What's the Matter'?, pp.13, 14.

[11] Jack, 'What's the Matter'?, p.15.

disappointedly skims the surface of the Irish invasion and alludes to it only to demonstrate how its inclusion fits into Barbour's Classical and Christian influenced approach.

Prior to Jack's study, Lois Ebin (1972) also notes *The Bruce's* 'abrupt transitions', 'didactic digressions', and 'apparently extraneous matter' that have led many critics to 'feel it lacks development and continuity'.[12] Ebin concludes that the fault lies with the approach of critics who view *The Bruce* as a 'conventional epic, romance, or chronicle', which, Ebin believes, 'are inappropriate to its development and have confused rather than clarified Barbour's purposes.'[13] Sarah Tolmie's bold interpretation of *The Bruce* in 'Sacrilege, Sacrifice and John Barbour's *Bruce*' (2007) acknowledges the bricolage quality of the text and the difficulty historians and literary critics have, even with the assistance of contemporary ideological criticism, in determining its genre. Tolmie imaginatively suggests that Barbour's historiographical work 'inhabits an anthropological domain', and drawing on the work of Rene Girard perceives a profound ritualistic level in the *Bruce* that, for Tolmie, represents a civic and national 'sacrificial crisis' symbolizing the Wars of Independence and the coalescing of external and internal strife under a legitimate king.[14] In this sense *The Bruce* becomes 'a narrative of inauguration', ultimately concerned with the reconfiguration of royal lineage following usurpation, which 'primarily reinforces the governing fictions of kingship as an institution'.[15]

Theo van Heijnsbergen's recent essay on *The Bruce* (2014) to some extent follows in the footsteps of Jack when urging historians to take a less empirical and more conceptual approach to the text and treat it 'as a work not a document'.[16] Van Heijnsbergen's aim is to locate Barbour's historiography within the realm of a pre-existing 'complex set of [rhetorical] conventions', for example 'grammar, rhetoric and dialectic'; designed to persuade an audience of its veracity through morally instructive, pleasure inducing and emotionally involving language rather than with 'known' facts.[17] Van Heijnsbergen highlights Barbour's blending of Classical and Christian ideals, for example Quintilian's notion of 'utility' that eschews chronological and episodic exactitude for whatever 'is most expedient or advantageous'.[18]

---

[12] Lois A. Ebin, 'John Barbour's Bruce: Poetry, History, and Propaganda, *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 9 (1971-72), p.219.
[13] Ebin, 'John Barbour's Bruce', p.219.
[14] Sarah Tolmie, 'Sacrilege, Sacrifice and John Barbour's *Bruce*', *International Review of Scottish Studies*, 32 (2007), p.12.
[15] Tolmie, 'Sacrilege, Sacrifice and John Barbour's *Bruce*', pp.8, 9.
[16] Theo van Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past: a Textual Community of the Realm', in *Barbour's Bruce and its Cultural Contexts: Politics, Chivalry and Literature in Late Medieval Scotland*, eds. Steve Boardman and Susan Foran (forthcoming: Autumn 2015) (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2015), p.1.
[17] Van Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.1.
[18] Van Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.3.

Coldwell and Taggart's studies seek to confirm or repudiate the historical exactitude of Barbour's poem (including the Irish campaign) but from an ostensibly apolitical perspective. Those critics, such as Goldstein and Jack, who recognise the contradictory effect of the invasion material, and possible implications, decline to tease them out and focus instead on the poem's structural issues, despite being perhaps one of the implications. Jack's explanation is more a criticism of materialist practices, and a subtle endorsement of textual practices that focus chiefly on formal and classical influences as opposed to social and culture forces. Belsey takes exception to literary departments' characteristic attentiveness 'to the formal properties of texts, their modes of address to readers and the conditions in which they are intelligible.'[19] Cultural historians on the other hand, Belsey argues, ought to

> appropriate and develop those strategies, putting them to work not in order to demonstrate the value of the text, or its coherence as the expression of the authorial subjectivity which is its origin, but to lay bare the contradictions and conflicts, the instabilities and indeterminacies, which inevitably reside in any bid for truth.[20]

In his petition for a less empirical analysis of Barbour's *Bruce*, van Heijnsbergen, similar to Jack, seeks to extract the historical teeth from the text, and appears content to set it within an apparently benign rhetorical context aimed at persuading the readership of a text's objective truth through emotional and moral manipulation rather than facts. On the subject of Shakespearean drama, Alan Sinfield notes how some critics, even when identifying the 'ideological structures' produced by the dominant culture, have a tendency to 'admire the patterns they find and collaborate in rendering them plausible, instead of offering a critique of them.'[21]

Barbour, van Heijnsbergen notes, employs the Classical strategy of 'utility', which avoids accuracy for whatever 'is most expedient or advantageous'.[22] 'Expedient' and 'advantageous' to the literary work and its effect one presumes. Yet, this literary practice sounds conspicuously similar to the social and cultural practices employed in the pursuit and maintenance of hegemony - as defined by Gramsci - whereby 'a class and its representatives exercise power over subordinate classes by means of a combination of coercion and persuasion.'[23] Domination is achieved not by force but by consent, and ideology is crucial to acquiring it. Ideology, according to Gramsci 'has material existence' and is the glue that binds the different classes, social forces, interests and practices

---

[19] Belsey, 'Towards Cultural History', p.167.
[20] Belsey, 'Towards Cultural History', p.167.
[21] Alan Sinfield, *Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p.35.
[22] Van Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.3.
[23] Roger Simon, *Gramsci's Political Thought: An Introduction* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982), p.21.

together.[24] The coercive processes involved, vis-à-vis the cultural domain, are alluded to in Stephen Greenblatt's description of how 'sites of resistance' in Shakespeare's second tetralogy are 'co-opted' into reinforcing the central function of the plays', essentially a

> celebratory affirmation of charismatic kingship. That is, the formal structure and rhetorical strategy of the plays make it difficult for audiences to withhold their consent from the triumph of Prince Hal […] The subversive perceptions do not disappear but, in so far as they remain within the structure of the play, they are contained and indeed serve to heighten a power they would appear to question.[25]

Substitute Robert Bruce for Prince Hal and Greenblatt could easily be describing Barbour's *Bruce*.

Ideology, as Sinfield observes, is 'produced everywhere and all the time in the social order, but some institutions […] are vastly more powerful than others. The stories they endorse are difficult to challenge, even to disbelieve. Such institutions, and the people in them, are also constituted in ideology; they are figures in its stories.'[26] Literary departments and literary criticism are not exempt from ideological and canonical influence and often, as Belsey notes, reaffirm the value and coherence of a text instead of questioning its contradictions and conflicts. The *Bruce* is one such story, and John Barbour is one such figure.

John Barbour

John Barbour (1330s-1395) is thought to have begun *The Bruce* in 1372 and completed it by 1375. Regarded as a masterpiece of medieval literature the *Bruce* is part narrative, biography, historiography, and the richest source for the Bruce invasion of Ireland. Written sixty years after the event *The Bruce* is 'prone to exaggeration and confused chronology and is particularly emphatic about the hero Robert'.[27] The domestic disputes that beset Scotland between the years 1340 and 1371, including the rebellions against the Crown by Stewarts and Douglases (1360's), the instability of the reign of David II and the consequent revival of the English threat, may go a long way to explaining many of the

---

[24] Simon, *Gramsci's Political Thought*, p.25.
[25] Stephen Greenblatt, 'Resonance and Wonder', in *Literary Theory Today*, eds. Peter Collier and Helga Geyer-Ryan (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990), pp.74-9, 75.
[26] Sinfield, *Cultural Materialism*, p.32.
[27] James Lydon, 'The impact of the Bruce invasion, 1315-27', in *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars: The Invasions of Ireland, 1306-1329*, ed. Sean Duffy (United Kingdom, Tempus, 2002), pp.119-153, p.127; James Taggart argues that textual analysis of *The Bruce* indicates the involvement of at least four and as many as six writers with Barbour as lead author and editor. Taggart, 'The Historicity of Barbour's *Bruce*', p.iii.

Bruce's themes, especially its emphasis on loyalty.[28] Ebin finds Barbour's blandishment of Bruce, Stewart and Douglas as 'applicable to their immediate descendants and namesakes' at the time of writing.[29]

As Archdeacon of Aberdeen and a member of the clergy, Barbour held several public positions and received various grants and favours following the ascension of Robert II (1371) (the son of Robert Bruce's daughter), under whose auspices and encouragement, it is believed, he composed the *Bruce*.[30] *The Bruce* glorifies that king's heroic ancestor and in turn strengthens his descendant's right to the Scottish throne. Barbour is also believed to have produced a further work, now lost, celebrating the Stewarts' lineage, entitled the 'Stewartis Original'.[31]

Historical criticism

If literary critics tend to overlook Barbour's account of the Irish invasion, historians - acutely aware of the importance of the historical event - generally regard it as a valuable resource. Robin Frame remarks that 'it is hardly too much to say that during this brief period the future political shape of the British Isles depended on the outcome of an often obscure series of campaigns and alliances in Ireland'.[32] Likewise, James Lydon suggests that the Bruce invasion 'may rightly be regarded as a great turning point in Irish history.'[33] Owing to its broad archipelagic context, as well as the variety of conflicting historiography, the Bruce invasion continues to generate numerous explanations.

The most dominant theory identifies the invasion as part of a pan-Gaelic strategy to divest itself of English authority. Colm McNamee highlights evidence of 'a growing 'Celtic' consciousness in Ulster and parts of Scotland and Wales while Tom Devine and James McMillan claim that in spite of a general weakening between Scotland and its Irish-Gaelic ancestry there are numerous accounts of Scots declaring their Irish origins 'in order to validate its [Scotland's] antiquity and claim to freedom'.[34] Devine and McMillan

---

[28] Lois A. Ebin, 'John Barbour's 'Bruce': Poetry, History, and Propaganda', PhD thesis (Michigan: University Microfilms, 1969), pp.187-8; Diane Watt, 'Nationalism in Barbour's *Bruce*', *Parergon*, 12, 1 (1994), pp.89-107, p.92.
[29] Ebin, 'John Barbour's 'Bruce', thesis, p.195.
[30] Ebin, 'John Barbour's 'Bruce', thesis, p.197.
[31] Ebin, 'John Barbour's 'Bruce', thesis, p.200.
[32] Robin Frame, *Ireland and Britain, 1170-1450* (London: Hambledon Press, 1998), p.71.
[33] James Lydon, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland: An Examination of Some Problems', in *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars: The Invasions of Ireland, 1306-1329*, pp.71-89, p.88.
[34] Colm McNamee, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland', *Historical Ireland*, 1, 1 (1993), pp.11-16, pp.11-12; Devine and McMillan, *Celebrating Columba*, p.iv-v.

describe the invasion as 'a concerted attempt […] to unite Scottish and Irish political interest'.[35]

The Gaelic alliance theory is chiefly supported by two pieces of historical correspondence: Robert Bruce's letter to the Irish chiefs (1306-7) and the Irish 'Remonstrance to the Pope' (1317).[36] Sean Duffy suggests that these texts also insinuate that Scotland and Ireland were motivated more by 'their common experience of English domination' than by 'any sense of shared ancestry'.[37] While England's dominance would have provided an incentive for a Gaelic alliance it stands to reason that a shared ancestry would have been the point of departure for any negotiation. However, regardless of the extent of its authenticity, it is reasonable to presume, as MacNamee does, that 'the Bruces would have been keen to harness this consciousness for political ends' and may have intended to exploit Ireland's resources themselves.[38] In view of the environmental failures and socio-economic conditions of the time, Michael Penman (2014) favours the latter claim as a persuasive secondary motive for the invasion, which, he argues, would have brought essential resources into Scotland with the added consequence of denying them to England, particularly the strategic English border towns which had up to this point benefitted from them.[39] James Lydon and Robin Frame likewise view the invasion as a second-front in Scotland's war against England, aimed at 'breaking the impasse which Bannockburn had created' by reducing England's presence in Scotland by drawing their military resources into Ireland.[40] Historians more recently, including Jonathon Barden and Sean Duffy, interpret the Bruces' campaign as 'a full-scale invasion designed to conquer and hold land'.[41] The general tone of the present study subscribes to the latter interpretation, but its intention is not to resolve or augment the historical debate but rather to redress the current imbalance with regard to the representation of the Irish invasion and Edward Bruce within literary criticism of *The Bruce*.

[35] Devine and McMillan, *Celebrating Columba*, p.iv-v.

[36] James Lydon, 'The Scottish Soldier Abroad: the Bruce Invasion and the Galloglass, in *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars: The Invasions of Ireland, 1306*-1329, pp.89-107, pp.90-91.

[37] Sean Duffy, 'The Bruce brothers and the Irish Sea World, 1306-29', in *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars: The Invasions of Ireland, 1306*-1329, p.46.

[38] McNamee, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland', pp.11-12.

[39] Michael Penman, *Robert the Bruce: King of the Scots* (Newhaven and London: Yale University Press, 2014), p.165.

[40] Lydon, 'The impact of the Bruce invasion', p.127; Frame, *Ireland and Britain, 1170-1450*, p.75.

[41] Lydon, 'The impact of the Bruce invasion', p.127; Jonathon Bardon, *A History of Ulster* (Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1992), p.49.

Outline of the Irish campaign

With Scotland's victory over England at Bannockburn in June 1314 the Anglo-Scottish conflict or Wars of Independence, which had begun in 1296, entered a new stage. It appeared that Robert Bruce was advantageously positioned to secure Scotland's autonomy and its crown, but many months later Scotland's sovereignty and Bruce's rule remained unrecognised by Edward II. The Irish campaign, which followed hard on the heels of Bannockburn, appears to have been conceived as a solution to the stalemate. Allegedly the design of Edward Bruce who led it, the campaign was hugely critical to Robert Bruce's political and military objectives.

Purportedly 6,000 men, including elite Scottish knights, landed at Larne on 26 May 1315 and with the assistance of a number of the Irish chiefs defeated the Anglo-Irish lords of Ulster and occupied Antrim and Down. It was from sympathetic Ulster chiefs that Edward Bruce had received prior support for his incursion, and Ulster remained a vitally strategic base throughout the campaign. In the spring of 1316 the Scots defeated Sir Edmund Butler, gained victories at Kells and north Leinster and returned to Carrickfergus, which they had taken after a prolonged siege.[42] In May, Edward was proclaimed king of Ireland at Dundalk, yet his jurisdiction was largely limited to Ulster which was employed 'as a base from which to launch destructive expeditions to other parts of the country'.[43] In December, Robert Bruce arrived in Ireland with fresh troops and in early 1317 the brothers marched together on a destructive expedition as far as Dublin only to turn around and withdraw to Ulster.

Unluckily for the Scots, and lamentably for the native Irish, the invasion coincided with a devastating famine, exacerbated by the Bruces' scorched earth policy. Robert Bruce hastily returned to Scotland and soon after Edward's campaign floundered. In 1318, Edward Bruce, massively out-numbered by his enemies, led the Scots to defeat at Faughart and was killed on the battlefield, signalling the end of the invasion and Robert Bruce's wider political ambitions. Robin Frame suggests that up until April 1317 and the Bruces' retreat from Limerick, 'a Scottish conquest of Ireland must have appeared to be within the bounds of possibility'.[44] It is uncertain why the Bruces' withdrew when poised to strike at the heart of England's power in Ireland, but if they had continued and triumphed it would

---

[42] Richard Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors: With a Succinct Account of the Earlier History*, 1 (London: Longmans, Green, and co., 1885), p.66; The Anglo-Irish were of English descent born in Ireland and to some extent acculturated to Irish language and culture, collectively termed by Verstraten Veach as 'the middle nation'. Freya Verstraten Veach, 'Anglicization in medieval Ireland: was there a Gaelic Irish "middle nation"?', in *The English Isles: Cultural transmission and political conflict in Britain and Ireland, 1100-1500*, eds. Sean Duffy and Susan Foran (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), p.118.
[43] Frame, *Ireland and Britain, 1170-1450*, p.71.
[44] Frame, *Ireland and Britain, 1170-1450*, p.71.

have 'marked a re-convergence of Scottish and Irish interests', which Sean Duffy claims would have in any case succumbed 'under the Stewart successors, to a gradual, inexorable, and unhappy divergence'.[45]

Though the Bruce Invasion of Ireland failed in its main object of expelling the English and securing power for the Bruces, it is accepted that the invasion nonetheless checked England's ascendancy in Ireland. In addition, James Lydon claims that if Robert Bruce's plan had been to divert English energy from Scotland, in effect 'carrying his war against England into Ireland', then 'contrary to the common view that the invasion was a failure, it must, in fact, be considered as in the main successful.'[46] It is worth bearing in mind however how the initiative the Scots undoubtedly held after Bannockburn, and which ultimately empowered the expedition into Ireland, was regained by the English as a result of their victory there over the Bruces. Post-invasion, the English re-established a degree of control in Ulster by restoring Richard de Burgh and defeating the Irish chief Donal O'Neill (who had been well-disposed and central to the Bruce campaign) in 1319. Moreover, the defeat at Faughart lent momentum to Edward II's ambitions to invade Scotland, for which he raised an Irish army in 1322.[47] While posing a range of concerns for the English and decelerating their planned conquest of Ireland for two hundred years, the Bruces' eventual defeat, in addition to the devastating impact wrought by their campaign on the native Irish and their lands, ultimately curbed Robert Bruce's wider geopolitical ambitions and encouraged Irish opposition. Perhaps worse than the loss of political initiative however was the bloody mark left on Irish-Scottish history by the Bruces' hubris.

Celtic connections

A.A.M. Duncan describes the Bruce invasion as 'an expedition which cannot be explained by a close or continuous inter-relationship of Irish and Scottish families or politics'.[48] In contrast, Sean Duffy argues that the invasion can *only* be explained by an appreciation of the Irish-Scottish relationship.[49] With such conflicting opinion it is small wonder that research largely eschews a straightforward account and explanation for the Irish campaign.

There are persuasive arguments to support Duffy's position. First, lineage and geographic proximity helped form 'a northern political and cultural world which touched

---

[45] Duffy, 'The Anglo-Norman Era in Scotland', pp.29-30.
[46] Lydon, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland: An Examination of Some Problems', pp.73-74.
[47] Robin Frame, *English Lordship in Ireland, 1318-1361* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), p.132.
[48] A.A.M. Duncan, 'The Scots Invasion of Ireland, 1315', in *The British Isles: 1100-1500, Comparisons, Contrasts and Connections*, ed. R. R. Davies (Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers, 1988), pp.100-118, p.102.
[49] Duffy, 'The Anglo-Norman Era in Scotland', p.24.

the rest of the Irish lordship only intermittently'.[50] Second, although of Anglo-Norman extraction the Bruces could lay claim to Gaelic heritage on their mother's side (on account of her marriage to the Gaelic Earl of Carrick), in addition to land in east Ulster previously held by their grandfather, Duncan of Carrick and contemporaneously by Richard De Burgh (who was ejected soon after Edward's arrival in Ireland and is represented in the poem as Sir Richard Clare).[51] Third, it is alleged that Edward Bruce spent time in Ulster as a youth, while both brothers (though it is frequently only Robert who is cited) are said to have hidden in a cave on Rathlin Island (1306) following the defeat to the English at Methven (it is here the apocryphal tale of the spider is said to have taken place).[52] *The O'Conors of Connaught* (1891) states that after this concealment, Bruce received from his Ulster allies 'a fleet of thirty-three galleys and around 300 men', which he used to 'initiate that career of victory which ended in his country's independence'.[53] Fourth, in *The History of the Viceroys of Ireland* (1865), J. T. Gilbert writes that in 1313, Robert sent a scouting party to the Ulster coast and although initially 'repelled by the settlers', a discussion took place and a relationship was established between the Bruces and the Irish chiefs, including Donal O'Neill who would later be closely involved in the 'Remonstrance'.[54] Arguably, this assortment of associations strengthened Anglo-Irish relations and helped legitimise the Bruces' claim to rule Ireland.

There are two contemporary texts, one composed prior to and one during the invasion, which provide the strongest case for a close Irish-Scottish relationship, or at the very least recognition of a shared history and common foe in England. In his letter to the Irish chiefs (1306-7), Robert Bruce writes:

> The king sends greeting to all the kings of Ireland, to the prelates and clergy, and to the inhabitants of all Ireland, his friends.
> Whereas we and you and our people and your people, free since ancient times, share the same national ancestry and are urged to come together more eagerly and joyfully in friendship by a common language and by common custom, we have sent to you our beloved kinsmen, the bearers of this letter, to negotiate with you in our name about permanently strengthening and maintaining inviolate the special friendship between us

---

[50] Robin Frame, 'The Bruces in Ireland, 1315-18', *Irish historical Studies*, 19, 73 (1974), pp.3-37, pp.16-17.
[51] W. A. Hanna, *Intertwined Roots: An Ulster-Scot perspective on Heritage, History, hostility and Hope in Northern Ireland* (Dublin: Columba Press, 2000), p.18-19; Duffy, 'The Bruce brothers and the Irish Sea World', pp.59-60; Coldwell, 'The Literary Background', p.96. In 1302 Robert had married Elizabeth de Burgh, and Penman suggests it may have been orchestrated by Edward I with the purpose of convincing Richard de Burgh to participate, alongside his son-in-law, in expeditions against the Gaelic Scottish threat in the Irish Sea. Penman, *Robert the Bruce, King of the Scots*, p.72.
[52] Cited in McNamee, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland', p.11; Hanna, *Intertwined Roots*, p.18-19.
[53] *The O'Conors of Connaught: An Historical Memoir, compiled from a MS. Of John Donovan with additions from the State Papers and Public Records*, ed. Charles O. O'Conor (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and co., 1891), p.131.
[54] J. T. Gilbert, *History of the Viceroys of Ireland; with Notices of the Castle of Dublin* (Dublin: James Duffy, 1865), p.132.

and you, so that with God's will your nation may be able to recover her ancient liberty.[55]

Though Bruce's letter is widely accepted to have been written before the Irish invasion, Duffy is doubtful that it had any influence.[56] Barrow argues however that 'behind the obvious propaganda appeal of Bruce's letter lay important truths', the shared history of Scotland and Ireland and Ireland's subjugation by England.[57] The letter shows Robert's eagerness to align himself not just politically with 'Kings' but with the religious body and the 'inhabitants' (the serfs) also. This was a letter aimed at hearts and minds and though brief it employs a range of measured language with emotive meaning, including 'free' and 'liberty'; notions of patriotism such as 'national' and 'nation'; co-operative words like 'friendship' (twice), 'common language', 'common custom' and 'kinsmen', and a recognition of historical intransience with words like 'ancient' (twice) and 'ancestry'.

Though Duffy is rightly cautious to avoid manufacturing an explicit link between Bruce's letter and the 1315 invasion, it nonetheless affords some insight into any later alliance and likely provided some diplomatic groundwork. What the letter makes abundantly clear is that negotiations were aimed at establishing durable ties, to 'permanently' strengthen and maintain 'inviolate the special friendship', thereby suggesting that Robert Bruce had more than just a fleeting visit in mind.

The 'Remonstrance' is essentially a denunciation of England's presence in Ireland, sent in 1317 by Donal O'Neill and unnamed chiefs to Pope John XXII. As with Bruce's letter, it too emphasises the connection between the Irish and 'the kings of lesser Scotia' who, the Irish claim, 'drew the source of their blood from our greater Scotia, retaining to some extent our language and habits'.[58] Though the 'Remonstrance' only briefly alludes to the Bruces by name in its closing passage, their endorsement as a potential counter weight to the English is no less emphatic:

> in order to shake off the harsh and insufferable yoke of servitude to them [the English] and to recover our native freedom which for the time being we have lost through them […] we call to our help and assistance the illustrious Edward de Bruce earl of Carrick, the brother of the lord Robert by the grace of God the most illustrious king of Scots, and sprung from our noblest ancestors'.[59]

Ted Cowan hesitates to read too much into the 'Remonstrance', detecting a likely Scottish influence on both its production - it was composed during Robert's time in Ireland - and its

---

[55] Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon*, 6, ed. D. E. R. Watt (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1998), p.385.
[56] Duffy, 'The Bruce Brothers and the Irish Sea World', p.52.
[57] G.W.S Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1965), p.435.
[58] Bower, *Scotichronicon*, p.401.
[59] Bower, *Scotichronicon*, p.401.

preservation, first in the manuscripts of John of Fordun's *Chronicle* and then Bower's *Scotichronicon*.[60] A.A.M. Duncan similarly remarks that the legitimacy of the 'Remonstrance' 'crumbles at the touch'.[61]

There is no mention in the *Bruce* of either Bruce's letter or the 'Remonstrance'. Instead, Edward Bruce, driven by sibling rivalry and kingly ambition is presented as the catalyst for the invasion.[62] It is conceivable that Barbour was unaware of Bruce's letter, or if he was aware (like Sean Duffy) saw it as unrelated. The omission of the 'Remonstrance' is more difficult to explain especially if Barbour was aware of it. Assuming for a moment that the document *was* driven more by the Bruces and Scottish propaganda than the Irish could or would admit it is, to all intents and purposes, a war document: it was composed and conveyed to the pope during the invasion and it legitimised a Scot as king of Ireland. Its absence suggests Barbour was more determined to forge a direct link between Edward's ambitions and the invasion than he was in defending the Scottish campaign by way of corroborating diplomatic correspondence.

As for the 'Remonstrance' itself it is useful to speculate on its origins. By 1317 the Scots were embedded in Ireland and likely in a strong enough position to either inspire the Irish chiefs to write it or to urge them to. Penman positions the 'Remonstrance' among other contemporary diplomatic letters 'designed to justify the Bruces' continued prosecution of war on two fronts in the face of a papally imposed truce.'[63] It also suggests that the Bruces, or at least Robert, recognised the futility of trying to conquer Ireland and thus pursued a cessation to hostilities by persuading the pontiff, via the Irish chiefs, to legitimise Scottish authority and Edward's kingship. From this perspective, the 'Remonstrance' appears more like an act of desperation.

Contemporary literature tends to complicate rather than clarify the invasion and is 'scarce, difficult to interpret and frequently ill-informed or unconvincing'.[64] It is also inconsistent. For example, *The Annals of Ireland by Friar John Clyn* (1333-1349) and the *Annals of Connacht* (mid-sixteenth century) both partly support the notion of a Gaelic alliance that has as its object the removal of the English from Ireland, yet there is some ambiguity in the accounts. The *Annals of Clyn* reports that 'all the time they [the Scots] were in Ireland almost all of the Irish of the land adhered to them with only a very few

---

[60] Edward J. Cowan, '*For Freedom Alone': The Declaration of Arbroath*, 1320 (Great Britain: Tuckwell Press, 2003), p.48; Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, p.181.
[61] Duncan, 'The Scots Invasion of Ireland, 1315', p.104.
[62] All citations and translations cited from *The Bruce* are taken from John Barbour, *The Bruce*, trans. A. A. M. Duncan (Edinburgh: Canongate, 1997), 14, 4-5.
[63] Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, p.182.
[64] Frame, *Ireland and Britain, 1170-1450*, p.71.

keeping faith and fealty'.[65] The *Annals of Connacht* claim that Edward and 'his warlike slaughtering army caused the whole of Ireland to tremble, both Gael and Gall [English].[66] The later *Annals of Clonmacnoise* (early-seventeenth century) similarly states that the Scots 'made the lands and inhabitants of Ireland to shake for feare', asserts the English and Irish were 'stricken with great terror', and claims that Edward '*made* the Ulstermen to consent and acknowledge him as theire king' [my emphasis].[67]

Scottish chroniclers tend to favour the idea of Gaelic collusion whilst condemning Edward Bruce for the invasion's atrocities. Hector Boece (1540) writes that following the Scots' successes against the English 'the princis of Ireland, opprest be lang tyranny of Inglismen, and traisting, because sa huge ambassatouris to King Robert, desiring him to send his bruthir Edward, to resave the croun of Ireland.'[68] In his *Chronicle of the Scottish Nation* (1360), John of Fordun writes that Edward entered Ireland and 'destroyed the whole of Ulster, and committed countless murders'.[69] Contemporary English correspondence and chronicles are unequivocal that the campaign was instigated by the Irish, prearranged with the Scots, and formed part of Robert's broader political strategy. John of Tynemouth in his *Nova Legenda Anglie* (mid 14th c.) observed that 'Edward […] having been invited more pressingly by a certain magnate of Ireland with whom in his youth he has been educated, gathered together an army and invaded Ireland with the support of the Irish'.[70] The *Vita Edwardi Secundi* (the Life of Edward II) (1325-26) claims that Robert

> sent his brother Edward to Ireland […] to stir up that people against the king of England, and subject the country, if he could, to his authority. And there was a rumour that, if he gained his desire there, he would at once cross to Wales […] for these two races are easily roused to rebellion, they bear the yoke of slavery reluctantly, and curse the lordship of the English.[71]

English interest in Ulster prior to and during the invasion produced a great deal of anxious correspondence between Ireland and London. The English court dispatched John de Hothum to Ireland to agitate and organise resistance against the Scots and to relay

---

[65] *The Annals of Ireland by Friar John Clyn*, ed. trans. Bernadette Williams (Dublin, Four Courts Press, 2007), p.162.
[66] *Annála Connacht*, Celt: Corpus of Electronic Texts, p.232: http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/T100011/index.html [accessed 04/04/2014]
[67] *The Annals of Clonmacnoise being Annals of Ireland from the earliest period to A. D. 1408*, trans. Conell Mageoghagan, ed. Denis Murphy (Dublin: University Press, 1896), p.268.
[68] Hector Boece, *The History and Chronicles of Scotland*, 2, trans. John Bellenden (Edinburgh: W. and C. Tait, 1821), p.396.
[69] *John of Fordun's Chronicle of the Scottish Nation*, 1, ed. William F. Skene (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872), p.340.
[70] Cited in McNamee, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland', p.11.
[71] *Vita Edwardi Secvndi: the Life of Edward the Second*, trans. Wendy R. Childs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005), p.107.

information on the deepening crisis.[72] In 1315, Nicholas de Verdun warned Edward that 'unless the Scots are attacked by the king and his forces in Scotland, the Scots will attempt to conquer Ireland during the coming winter'.[73] In February 1316 it is reported that a number of Anglo-Irish in Ireland were obliged to take a pledge of loyalty to Edward II, during which they recognised 'that the Scottish invaders of Ireland have been joined by all the Irish of Ireland and by many of the great lords and lesser folk of English descent'.[74] In October 1315 in response to a demand from Edward II for information, the writer replies that 'since the enemy arrived in Ireland, they have been received and aided by the Irish of the march of Ulster and of Uriel and by some of the English, notably the Bissets and the Logans' (described by McNamee as 'casual in their allegiances').[75] In September, John Fitz Thomas informed Edward that 'the Irish of the parts of Ulster which are closest to Scotland received the Scots willingly when they arrived and as men who hate the English language, in common with the other Irish, they are prepared to assist in the conquest of Ireland from the king and his successors'.[76] In 1316, Edward II complained in a letter to a Franciscan minister that friars in Ireland, who were supposed to support English policies and monitor the Irish population, had persuaded the Irish natives to align with the Scots.[77]

On the Gaelic Irish side there is a tract on the invasion entitled *Cath Fhochairte Brighite* (CFB) which among other details describes the battle of Faughart. It is also more generally supportive of the invasion than any other Irish source and contrasts sharply with that of English annalists whom Duffy argues had likely 'good reason to play down the extent of the Irish commitment to the invasion.[78] In what Duffy terms 'one of the more remarkable episodes', the CFB asserts that a lack of Irish unity under any single leader prompted Donal O'Neill (with the approval of Ulster kings) to send ambassadors to Robert Bruce.[79] First published in a journal in 1905 the CFB is now recognised as a forgery. After extensive analysis to determine its reliability, Sean Duffy concludes that while owing

---

[72] Including battle reports. J. R. S. Phillips, 'Documents on the Early Stages of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, 1315-1316', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish academy, History, Linguistics, Literature*, 79 (1979), pp.247-270, p.247.
[73] 'Reply of Nicholas de Verdun to Edward II's letter of 10 July 1315: Autumn of 1315', in Phillips, 'Documents on the Early Stages of the Bruce Invasion', p.262.
[74] 'Pledge of loyalty to Edward II by certain of the magnates of Ireland: 4 February 1316', in Phillips, 'Documents on the Early Stages of the Bruce Invasion', p.254.
[75] 'Reply by an unnamed writer to Edward II's letter of 10 July 1315: 18 October 1315', in Phillips, 'Documents on the Early Stages of the Bruce Invasion', p.257; McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces*, p.170.
[76] 'Reply of John Fitz Thomas to Edward II's letter of 10 July 1315: 8 September 1315', in Phillips, 'Documents on the Early Stages of the Bruce Invasion', p.259.
[77] Anne Muller, 'Conflicting Loyalties: the Irish Franciscans and the English Crown in the High Middle Ages', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 107C (2007), pp.87-106, pp.87, 88.
[78] Sean Duffy, 'The Gaelic Account of the Bruce Invasion "Cath Fhochairte Brighite": Medieval Romance or Modern Forgery?', *Seanchas Ardmhacha: Journal of the Armagh Diocesan Historical Society*, 13, 1 (1988), pp.59-121, p.81.
[79] Duffy, 'The Gaelic Account of the Bruce Invasion', p.76.

much of its contents to medieval chronicles and non-Gaelic sources it was composed around 1845 and possibly by a man named Nicholas Kearney.[80] Duffy concludes therefore that there are no 'very good grounds for accepting the idea of an Ulster embassy to Robert Bruce offering him the kingship of Ireland.'[81]

While much historiography presents 'an exaggerated estimate of the situation', it does on the whole, and as Lydon suggests, 'illustrate the common belief that most of Gaelic Ireland sided with Bruce.'[82] The number of inconsistencies between and within the respective literature explains why historians have largely been unwilling 'to accept what these sources appear to tell us at its face value? One reason seems to be the powerful influence of Barbour's *The Bruce*'.[83]

Barbour's other Bruce

It is not unreasonable to suggest that in both Scotland, and to some degree Ireland, Robert Bruce continues to be regarded as a significant and heroic figure. Unsurprisingly the 700th anniversary of Bannockburn witnessed a revival in Bruce's celebrity after being squeezed out of the limelight in recent years by William Wallace. 2014 saw several publications of note including Robert Crawford's *Bannockburns: Scottish Independence and Literary Imagination, 1314-2014*, Michael Penman's *Robert the Bruce: King of the Scots* and James Robertson and Jill Calder's *Robert the Bruce: An Illustrated History*. Though it could be argued that 'the Bruce' and Wallace were peripheral figures in the 2015 Scottish referendum debate, Robert's association with Bannockburn ensured his steady presence.

The less virtuous aspects of Robert Bruce's political and military career are generally acknowledged - for example his usurpation of the throne by deposing Balliol and the irreverent murder of John Comyn (1306) - but too often softened by the unsatisfactory and simplistic conclusion that men act brutally in brutal times. Robert's role in the Irish invasion is not commonly known, and what recriminations there have been are mostly reserved for his brother Edward, whose infamous association with the invasion is ironically the only occasion when he successfully wrestled centre stage from his big brother. In spite of his association, Edward Bruce, like his Irish invasion, has largely been forgotten.

The strongest influence on Edward's biography is Barbour's *Bruce*. Two early studies on the Bruce invasion, Caroline Colvin's thesis 'The Invasion of Ireland by Edward Bruce' (1901) and Olive Armstrong's *Edward Bruce's Invasion of Ireland* (1923), rely

---

[80] Duffy, 'The Gaelic Account of the Bruce Invasion', pp.59, 111, 116.
[81] Duffy, 'The Gaelic Account of the Bruce Invasion', p.91.
[82] James Lydon, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland: an Examination of Some Problems', p.87.
[83] Robin Frame, 'The Bruces in Ireland, 1315-18', *Irish Historical Studies*, 19, 73 (1974), pp.3-37, p.5.

heavily on Barbour's historiographical material and, as their titles illustrate, his representation of Edward. It is also likely that *The Bruce* influenced Irish annalists who memorialise Edward as the 'Destroyer of Ireland', the Bruce who 'terrified the people of all Erinn'.[84] John of Fordun is particularly scathing and calls Edward 'a very mettlesome and high-spirited man', 'the cause of this war', who 'entered Ireland, with a mighty hand, in the year 1315; and, having been set up as king there, he destroyed the whole of Ulster, and committed countless murders'.[85]

It is worth noting how little interest Fordun takes in the actual invasion (two short passages) and particularly Robert's hand in it. Fordun summarily mentions Robert's visit to the 'southern parts' of Ireland 'to afford his brother succour and help', and his return due to famine.[86] Fordun, like Barbour, draws an explicit connection between Edward's temperament and the invasion, stating that Edward 'would not dwell together with his brother in peace, unless he had half the kingdom to himself; and for this reason [war] was stirred up, in Ireland'.[87] The contemporary English chronicler Nicholas Trevet (1257-1334) similarly cites Edward's vaulting ambition as the main stimulus behind the invasion and argues that Edward's objective was not solely to be 'king of Ireland' but 'conqueror of the isles'.[88] The *O'Conors of Connaught* describe him as

> a proud, imperious man, ambitious in the extreme, impatient of inferiority to his elder brother, and had already made a claim to a share in the sovereignty of Scotland. The offer of the Irish envoys afforded him an opportunity for gratifying his ambition'.[89]

Edward's ambition, impatience and his 'claim to a share' in Scotland's sovereignty combine to present him as a looming presence in Scotland, a domestic threat whose ambition could only be sated with the kingship of Ireland. It should be remembered however that Edward was a significant political and military figure in his own right and his 'claim' may refer to the decision taken at the first parliament in Ayr, when by the consent of the Three Estates Robert received the crown of Scotland: 'tailyet to him and the aris-male gottin of his body; and faileing thairof, the croun to cum to Edward Bruce, his bruthir' (if Robert should die with no male heir the crown would pass to Edward).[90] This final condition not only demonstrates Edward's considerable standing but also suggests that his kingly 'claims', initially anyway, were based on practical succession planning and

[84] *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters*, ed. John Donovan (Dublin: Hodges, Smith and co., 1856), p.521; *The Annals of Loch Ce,: A Chronicle of Irish Affairs from A. D. 1014 to 1590*, ed. William M. Hennessy, 1 (London: Longman, 1871), p.595; *The Annals of Clonmacnoise*, p.282.
[85] *John of Fordun's Chronicle,* p.340.
[86] *John of Fordun's Chronicle*, p.340.
[87] *John of Fordun's Chronicle*, p.340.
[88] Cited in Duffy, 'The Bruce brothers and the Irish Sea World, p.59.
[89] *The O'Conors of Connaught*, p.131.
[90] Boece, *The History and Chronicles of Scotland*, p.387.

not simply raw ambition. Indeed, given Robert had no male heir and amid rumours of a conspiracy to restore Balliol, Edward's death triggered a parliament at Scone in order to deal with the monarchy's 'freshly exposed vulnerability' regarding succession.[91] It seems unlikely then that Robert would willingly put Edward in harm's way in Ireland based on alleged unseemly ambitions and a war-mongering disposition.

Edward's defeat and death in 1318, along with the termination of the campaign itself, has long been attributed to his flawed character while his death is portrayed in several Irish annals as an unequivocal blessing. *The Four Masters* record that 'no achievement had been performed in Ireland for a long time before, from which greater benefit had accrued to the country than from this'.[92] The *Annals of Clonmacnoise* report that his death brought 'great joy & comfort of the whole kingdome in general, for there was not a better deed, that redounded better or more for the good of the kingdome since the creation of the world.'[93] However, as Sean Duffy points out,

> it is not true to say, as has frequently been asserted, that his [Edward's] death was 'universally' applauded by the Irish annalists: only one native obituarist condemns him, it is just that almost all surviving sets of Irish annals stem from this one source and therefore contain the entry. Nonetheless, it was the case that by the time of his death the Irish had had three years of war, famine, and misery and Bruce inevitably found himself being held responsible for events over which he had no control'.[94]

Brothers in arms

According to Barbour, Robert Bruce purportedly visited Ireland in 1316 and for the next year fought together with, and on occasion in the absence of, his brother. Yet, if Robert's special guest appearance may implicate him in the invasion it also provided Barbour with an opportunity to engage in a face-saving exercise by comparing and contrasting the Bruce brothers against the chivalric archetype of the period, much to the benefit of Robert.

A somewhat anomalous detail about Robert's arrival in Ireland is that it is Edward who requests his company. After the seizure of Carrickfergus Castle, Edward grants the Earl of Moray's request to return to Scotland and charges him to inform Robert that he

> Cum intill Irland him to se,
> For war thai bath into that land
> Thai suld fynd nane suld thaim withstand.[95]

Taking into account Barbour's insistence that the invasion was driven by Edward's egotism and fraternal insecurities it seems somewhat uncharacteristic for Edward to

---

[91] Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, pp.162, 190.
[92] *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland*, p.521.
[93] *Annals of Clonmacnoise*, p.282.
[94] Duffy, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland: A Revised Itinerary and Chronology', pp.42-43.
[95] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 11-14.

request his brother's company. If accurate, then an account in the *Laud Annals* for November 1 1316, describing the killing of 300 Scots by their 'causal' allies John Logan and Hugh Bisset, may perhaps explain Robert's journey to Ireland since he was likely astute enough to recognise that when your allies start attacking you conditions are far from ideal.[96] Despite a tempting gap in surviving reports on Bruce's movements and contrary to the annals, Penman doubts the likelihood of Robert's visit, highlighting a lack of corroboration in English accounts.[97]

Barbour, nonetheless, puts Robert Bruce in Ireland and in Book Sixteen has the brothers march south together, though at a distance. Alert to the brother's movements, Richard Clare 'of all Irland assemblit' an army numbering 40,000 men including burgesses, knights, hobelars and peasantry.[98] Deciding against engaging the Bruces in open ground, Clare ambushes the Scots as they advance through a forest; fortunately for Clare,

Schyr Edward weill fer forouth rad	rode well ahead
With thaim that war of his menye,	
To the rerward na tent tuk he,	paying no heed to the rear
And Schyr Richard of Clar in hy	
Quhen Schyr Edward wes passyt by	
Send lycht yomen that weill couth schout	shoot well
To bykkyr the rerward apon fute. [99]	harass

Edward, with scant regard for the rear rides ahead, while Clare, seizing the moment, despatches his concealed troops to attack the detached and vulnerable rear. The ambush is a crucial moment in the construction, or rather deconstruction of Edward's character, both in literary terms and temperament. The ambush reveals his carelessness, impetuosity and worst of all he puts the hero's life in danger.

More importantly the ambush scene affords Barbour the opportunity to present Robert, in direct opposition to Edward, as everything a leader and chivalric aristocrat should be. Robert is first to identify the enemy and anticipating nearby support swiftly organises and prepares his men for combat, crying out 'that na man sall be sa hardy / to prik [gallop] at thaim.'[100] A knight by the name of Colin Campbell breaks rank and attacks the enemy and for his disobedience is knocked unconscious by Robert, but not before being reminded that 'breking of bidding / mycht caus all our discomfiting'.[101] Campbell's dressing-down is a reminder to the rest of Robert's soldiers but also to the reader of what is unacceptable within chivalric notions of combat. Furthermore, Campbell's irresponsibility

---

[96] Cited in Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.580; Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 55.
[97] Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, p.171.
[98] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 78-81.
[99] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 96-101.
[100] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 110-111, 113-114.
[101] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 135-6.

accentuates Edward's initial error and foreshadows his final act of recklessness at Faughart. Sensing an imminent attack, Robert orders his men to prepare for battle against what turns out to be forty thousand men who enter the plain in four divisions, and bravely, announces:

> Now, lordingis, lat se
> Quha worthy in this fycht sall be,
> On thaim foroutyn mar abaid.'[102]   without more delay

The description of the battle is short but Robert, against incredible odds, is shown to be an impressive leader, strategist and fighter. In the confusion of the surprise attack he is presented as calmness personified, able to instantly assess a situation and act. The battle concludes with Clare's retreat to Dublin and Barbour boasts that 'in all the wer off Irland / Sa hard a fechting wes nocht sene'.[103] It is at this point Barbour directly compares the brothers:

> The-quhether of gret victours nynteyne
> Schyr Edward was withoutyn wer,
> And into les than in thre yer […]
> Bot in all tymys he wes yete
> Ay ane for five quhen lest wes he.[104]

Although Edward has achieved nineteen victories in less than three years the greatest odds he faced were five to one, unfortunately for Edward, Robert has just defeated odds of eight to one. Barbour recounts that when Edward re-joined the rear and learned what had occurred in his absence, 'mycht na man se a waer [angrier] man';[105] it was however Edward's turn to be rebuked by Robert:

> […] the gud king said till him than
> That it wes his awne foly
> For he raid sua unwittely   rode   carelessly
> Sa far before, and na vaward   in advance, vanguard
> Maid to thaim of the rerward.[106]

Robert impresses upon his brother the responsibilities and rules of engagement and the repercussions of failing to follow them. Again, Barbour employs ironic foreshadowing as Robert warns Edward that his rashness could cause 'gret perell sua fall thar mycht' (come their way).[107] Robert's prophecy would eventually come to pass at Dundalk.

---

[102] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 151-3.
[103] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 178-9.
[104] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 180-87.
[105] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 249.
[106] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 250-54.
[107] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 259.

Barbour's black sheep

While the *Bruce*'s uneven structure and indefinite genre are regularly discussed, one awkwardly shifting feature rarely commented on is Barbour's portrait of Edward Bruce. Not long into the Irish section, Barbour's portrayal shifts precipitously from approbation to condemnation, and finally to an admission by the narrator that Edward was the wrong man to lead such a potentially profitable campaign. As some historians note, there is little evidence to support Barbour's assertion, and indeed the assertions of medieval historiographers, that Edward Bruce exclusively engineered the invasion and its failure. Why then is Barbour so clearly determined to make it appear so?

Barbour's account of the Irish invasion begins in Book Fourteen with an ostensibly flattering description of Edward as 'stouter […] than a libard' (leopard), yet, lest it appear too complimentary, Barbour follows it with the observation that Edward

> Had na will to be in pes,   peace
> Thocht that Scotland to litill wes
> Till his brother and him alsua,
> Tharfor to purpose gan he ta
> That he off Irland wald be king.[108]

This passage is remarkably similar to that in Fordun's *Scotorum* quoted earlier (p.32): that Edward 'would not dwell together with his brother in peace'.[109] As Fordun composed his chronicles between 1363 and 1384 it is conceivable that one writer influenced the other.[110] Contrary to both Barbour and Fordun, Frame sees 'little reason to accept the old view that Robert Bruce launched the Irish enterprise as a way of ridding himself of a turbulent brother'.[111]

Book Fourteen is dedicated to the undoing of Edward Bruce, yet up to this point he is more lauded than lambasted. He is first described in detail in Book Nine as 'gud schyr Edward the worthy / Wys and wycht [wise and strong]; a 'noble knycht' who 'throu his chivalrous chivalry / Galloway wes stonayit gretumly.[112] Also in Book Nine, Edward's disposition is described as 'suete and joly' (sweet and cheerful); moreover, Barbour tells us

> […] he wes outrageous hardy
> And of sa hey undertaking
> That he haid never yeit abaysyng[113]

---

[108] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 3-7.
[109] *John of Fordun's Chronicle*, p.340.
[110] David Wallace, *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.234.
[111] Robin Frame, *Colonial Ireland, 1169-1369* (Dublin, Helicon Limited, 1981), p.114.
[112] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 2, 480; 9, 49-52; 9, 541-558.
[113] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 9, 485-494.

At this stage, Edward's 'outrageous' bravery and his victories against greater odds fit the chivalric mould perfectly, to the extent that Barbour writes 'off his hey worschip and manheid / Men mycht a mekill romanys mak' ('whoever would recount all the acts of his great valour and courage would [enable] men to make a long romance').[114] This is very similar to the description of Edward in Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica* (1355-1362) (written before *The Bruce*): 'He remained there [Ireland] two years and a half, performing there feats of arms, inflicting great destruction both upon provender and in other ways, and conquering much territory, which would form a splendid romance were it all recounted'.[115] Likewise, *The Four Masters* recount that during the Scottish Wars of Independence, Edward's bravery in battle earned him 'valorous and warlike fame'.[116]

Unfortunately for Edward, from the moment he arrives in Ireland the features of his character which previously elicited approval from Barbour and secured so many victories against the odds - his 'boldness' or spontaneity - begin to work against him and his 'chivalrous chivalry' progressively comes to resemble recklessness. In Book Nine, for example, Edward's much-admired 'hardyment' is contingent on his spontaneity:

> Lo! How hardyment tane sa sudandly
> And drevyn to the end scharply
> May ger oftsys unlikely thingis
> Cum to rycht fayr and gud endingis
> As it fell into this cas her.[117]

Duncan translates this passage as describing how 'boldness, shown without hesitation and driven ruthlessly to a conclusion' can transform a bad situation into a good one.[118] Also in Book Nine, during the battle of Cree, Barbour describes how Edward, judging that retreat would result in defeat, rushed at the enemy 'with a schout and gained victory.[119] Barbour describes the action as 'a rycht fayr point perfay' ('a truly glorious deed!').[120] There is no noticeable tension in these passages, no attempt to vilify Edward Bruce or his actions; but by Book Fourteen (the battle of Dundalk) Barbour begins to adapt his narrative so that Edward's actions, though still objectively courageous, have far-reaching and adverse consequences. The battle, Barbour writes, was long and hard-fought with the victor uncertain:

> Bot than Schyr Edward that wes stout
> With all thaim of his company

---

[114] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 9, 495-297.
[115] Sir Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica* (Glasgow: James Maclehose, 1907), p.57.
[116] *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland*, p.521.
[117] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 9, 637-644.
[118] Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.352.
[119] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 9, 596.
[120] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 9, 636.

```
Schot apon thaim of sa sturdily
That thai mycht thole no mar the fycht,          withstand
All in a frusche thai tuk the flycht
And thai folowyt full egrely,                    the scots followed quickly
Into the toun all commonaly
Thai entryt bath intermelle. [121]               intermixed
```

Edward and his company attack the enemy so fiercely that they flee; the Scots give chase and pursue them into a town where hand-to-hand combat ensues. Edward is presented with an obstacle, he impulsively attacks and once again is successful, but on this occasion there is an equalising consequence as the violence spills into a nearby town with non-combatants the likely collateral. From this juncture in the narrative, Edward becomes a more unpredictable, dictatorial and ultimately less chivalric figure whose actions could be viewed as detrimental to the maintenance of native Irish sympathy.

Book Eighteen narrates Edward's march to Dundalk and his death but it is his dispute with the Scottish nobles before the battle that encapsulates and finalises Barbour's progressively hypercritical portrayal. The opening lines return us to the beginning of the invasion and Book Fourteen, as Edward the 'leopard', driven by pride, impulsively and fatally decides to march south instead of waiting a further day for reinforcements:

```
Bot he that rest anoyit ay                       irritated by inaction
And wald in travail be always,
A day forouth thar aryving
That war send till him fra the king,
He tuk his way southwart to far
Magre thaim all that with him war,[122]          despite those with him
```

Barbour tells us that Edward had no more than two thousand men along with several Irish chiefs who rode in contingents. In contrast Richard Clare 'assemblit […] / Off all Ireland off armyt men', including twenty-thousand cavalry and additional foot soldiers. [123] Aware of Clare's approach, Edward dispatches Soulis, Stewart and Mowbray who on their return strongly advise against an attack. Edward ignores them, answering 'that he suld fecht that day / Thoucht tribill and quatribill war thai' (treble, quadruple).[124] Mowbray beseeches Edward to 'think na foly for to bid / Your men that spedis thaim to rid, / For we ar few, our fayis [foes] ar fele [many]', to which Edward angrily responds

```
This day bur mar baid fecht will I,              I will fight today without delay
Sall na man say quhill I may drey                let know man say while I live
That strength of men sall ger me fley[125]       superior numbers   flee
```

[121] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 202-215.
[122] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 1-6.
[123] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 14-15.
[124] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 28-31.
[125] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 37, 43-45, 49-54.

Edward's readiness to fight against the advice of his most capable nobles emphasises his irresponsibility and his responsibility for the defeat at Dundalk, and ultimately the Scottish withdrawal from Ireland. Nevertheless, it could be argued that Edward's actions are ostensibly no different from those described in previous battles that resulted in victory and praise.

In the pre-Dundalk exchange, Barbour is particularly keen to ensure that Edward's actions are not interpreted as brave, as previously, but 'foly'. Informed by Mowbray and Stewart that the enemy are on route and number up to fifty thousand, Edward responds that 'the ma thai be / the mar honour all-out haff we / giff that we ber us manlyly' ('the more they are, the greater honour we shall have for ourselves').[126] With some finality, Edward informs his men:

> We ar set her in juperty
> To wyn honour or for to dey,
> We ar to fer fra hame to fley.[127]

Barbour's description of the disastrous battle of Faughart (14 October) is short and with the exception of Mowbray, who is knocked unconscious, all the principal protagonists are killed. Barbour writes that 'schyr Edward that had sic valour wes dede', and his summation is less of a eulogy and more a damning indictment:[128]

> On this wis war thai noble men
> For wilfulness all lesyt then,
> And that wes syne and gret pite
> For had thar outrageous bounte
> Bene led with wyt and with mesur,
> Bot gif the mar mysaventur
> Be fallyn thain, it suld rycht hard thing
> Be to lede thaim till outraying,
> Bot gret outrageous surquedry
> Gert thaim all deir thar worschip by.[129]

Duncan translates this as: 'this is how these noble men were lost there through stubbornness, a sin and a great sorrow. For if their outstanding courage had been led with intelligence and moderation, unless a greater misfortune had befallen them, it would have been a very difficult task to lead them to disaster. But a great unbridled pride led them to buy their valour dearly.'[130]

The Scottish historian Boece and the *Annals of Clonmacnoise* contend that Edward made such a calamitous decision because he was unwilling to share his success or have it

---

[126] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 254-260, 273-75.
[127] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 276-78.
[128] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 108-9.
[129] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 175-184.
[130] Barbour, *The Bruce*, pp.674-5.

appropriated by Robert. Edward, according to Boece, was in 'dred that his bruthir suld reif him the glore of victory'.[131] *Clonmacnoise* reports that Edward attacked 'feareing his brother Robert Bruce king of Scotland (that came to this kingdome for his assistance) would acquire and get the glory of that victory'.[132] There is a clear sense in both texts that Robert himself led the reinforcements and it would certainly be in keeping with Edward's psychology, and make more narrative sense (Barbour provides a similar scenario with the forest ambush) if Robert's imminence had provoked his brother's doomed assault. This is something Sean Duffy considers a possibility given that there is no record of Robert Bruce in Scotland at this time.[133] Barbour relates that Edward's expected reinforcements 'war send till him fra the king' (sent by the king),[134] and Duncan raises the issue of whether Robert led the cavalry, in addition to Barbour's apparent reluctance to confirm it as other sources do; yet, for Duncan, Barbour 'echoes them' through John Stewart's somewhat ambiguous statement to Edward that 'men sayis my brother is cummand', which seems to refer to Stewart's brother but is in closer inspection conjecture and could refer to Robert.[135] Though it would have been entirely appropriate for Barbour's chivalric romance and the myth of Bruce to have him arrive heroically but tragically too late, Barbour seems to have decided that discretion is the better part of valour and chose not to explicitly involve his eponymous hero in his brother's and Scotland's final ignominy.

The Northern English *Lanercost Chronicles* offer an alternative insight asserting that the reinforcements - which provide damning evidence of Edward's misjudgement as well as an opportunity for one last assault on his character - had in fact landed in Ireland a considerable length of time before the battle. It states that Edward

> came to the town of Dundalk with his Irish adherents and a great army of Scots which had newly arrived in Ireland to enable him to invade and lay waste that land and [to harass] the King of England's people […] But by God's help, nearly all these were killed by a few of the commonalty, excepting only those who saved themselves by flight […] Edward fell at the same time and was beheaded after death.[136]

Again there is some discrepancy between the English, Scottish and Irish accounts. If we momentarily consider *Lanercost* as a reliable source it would lend further credence to the claim that Irish and Scottish writers, Barbour especially, unreasonably sought to lay the blame squarely on Edward's shoulders. Unfortunately for Edward, at the end of the battle, blame would be the only thing on his shoulders!

---

[131] Boece, *The History and Chronicles of Scotland*, p.396.
[132] *The Annals of Clonmacnoise*, p.281.
[133] Duffy, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland: A Revised Itinerary and Chronology', p.42.
[134] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 4.
[135] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 33, p.667 n.
[136] *The Chronicle of Lanercost*, pp.225-6.

On the day of his final battle, Edward, for some inexplicable reason has Gib Harper wear his coat of arms and suit.[137] Consequently when the victors sweep the field looking for Edward's body to mutilate, the head that is lopped off, salted and sent to England belongs to Harper. Historically, Edward's body is said to have been quartered and parcelled out to the English colonies with his heart and arms going to Dublin and his head to Edward II.[138]

Edward Bruce's deleterious influence did not end here however; even in death he proved a headache for Scotland and his brother. As Barbour tells it, upon receipt of Edward's head, Edward II

> In hart tharoff he tuk sic prid
> That he tuk purpose for to rid
> With a gret ost in Scotland
> For to veng him with stalwart hand
> Off tray of travail and of tene
> That done tharin till him had bene.[139]

(Edward's heart was so full of pride that he 'formed the intention' to ride with a vast army to Scotland to take revenge for the trouble they have given him).[140] Edward II then gathered an army and fleet to utterly destroy Scotland so 'that nane suld leve tharin levand' (no-one would remain alive).[141]

Since this invasion of Scotland (1322) took place four years after the end of the Irish campaigns it begs the question why Barbour elected to include it as a direct consequence of Edward's defeat? Barbour obviously collapses time for dramatic ends but it illustrates, first, just how significant and far-reaching the invasion and its outcome were in the larger Anglo-Scottish conflict, and second, how vital Edward Bruce was, not merely in the inauspicious sense of having, according to Barbour, precipitated Edward II's later invasion of Scotland - thus extending Edward's blame beyond Ireland - but in terms of his fundamental importance to Scotland's struggle for sovereignty and the future of the Bruce monarchy. The English political elite were so emboldened by the Bruces' defeat in Ireland that they were 'enthusiastic to meet the Scots in the open field', and Penman suggests that Edward's death 'was surely a catalyst for a simultaneous plot to kill and depose Robert, the only remaining brother.'[142]

The *Bruce* is famous for providing 'biographical' details for one of Scotland's greatest figures, but it also contains a significant and enduring account of Edward. The pre-

---

[137] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 94.
[138] Gilbert, *History of the Viceroys of Ireland*, p.146.
[139] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 229-234.
[140] Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.678.
[141] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 240.
[142] Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, pp.189-90.

invasion sections present him as an impulsive but highly successful knight and set the standard from which he plunges in the later books. The most scathing assessment of Edward occurs after the ambush when the narrative voice says of him:

> Couth he haf governyt him throu skill
> And folowyt nocht to fast his will
> Bot with mesur haf led his dede
> It wes weill lik withoutyn drede
> That he mycht haiff conquer weill
> The land of Irland ilkadele,
> Bot his outrageous sucquedry
> And will that wes mar than hardy
> Off purpose lettyt him perfay,
> As ilk hereafter sall you say.[143]

('If he could have controlled himself by discretion, and not been too self-indulgent but governed his actions with moderation, it was doubtless very probable that he could have conquered the whole of Ireland, every bit. But his excessive arrogance and stubbornness, which was more than hardy, distorted his resolve.')[144]

The story of Edward Bruce, his contribution to Scotland's defeat of England, his nearness to the Scottish throne, his time in Ireland and his short reign as the last king of Ireland, his relationship with Robert, and his fading from Scottish historical memory is certainly worth exploring, and the reality is that if Edward Bruce had been a Scottish or English king instead of an Irish one there would probably be a play about him. No less culpable than his brother for the devastation wrought on Ireland during their campaign together, Edward, in the main, has attracted the greater share of responsibility and opprobrium. As one historian writes however: 'it is hard to see why the failure of the Irish venture should be attributed to the political and military misjudgements of Edward Bruce; in his campaigns with king Robert he had if anything done rather better.'[145] Barbour's inexact, inconsistent and cumulatively negative portrayal of Edward Bruce is therefore extremely significant.The intention of this analysis is not to salvage Edward's historical reputation but to recognise, with the *Bruce*'s Irish material in mind, his literary portrayal, its possible implications, and likely beneficiaries.

Barbour's depiction of Edward and his role in the disastrous and bloody Irish campaign is undoubtedly intended to simultaneously protect the legacy of Robert I and bolster the contemporary reign of Robert II. As to the possibility that Barbour's vilification of Edward could have backfired and damaged both, and the Bruce name indefinitely, I would imagine that the combined weight of the *Bruce*'s themes of war and chivalry, its

---

[143] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 325-334.
[144] Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.596.
[145] Frame, 'The Bruces in Ireland, 1315-18', p.24.

budding nationalism and inspiring rhetoric, acted as a form of ideological ballast. After driving the English from the country and uniting the Scottish aristocracy behind him, Scotland's independence and embryonic identity was identified with Robert *the* Bruce. In the case of Barbour' poem, it is calculatedly so; and as Barbour's title (*The Bruce*) suggests - along with the definite article applied to Robert Bruce's name posthumously - only one Bruce really mattered.

'Freedom is a <u>noble</u> thing': demystifying *The Bruce*

The beginning of the chapter touched upon the lack of critical analysis of the *Bruce*'s Irish material and highlighted the central arguments of what analysis there is, including issues relating to structure, genre, rhetoric, and ideology. Though alert to the poem's inconsistencies and conflicts (many partly related to the Irish material), a number of studies are largely content to view the *Bruce*, and consequently its 'problematic' Irish section, through a classical, formalist, impressionistic, and no doubt on occasion, nationalist perspective. Meanwhile, the *Bruce*'s devotion to the politico-cultural practices and values connecting and reinforcing the dominant interests, and its ideologies, has not been adequately explored.

The Marxist critic Raymond Williams (who coined the term 'cultural materialism' (1977)) claims that literature for the most part collaborates with the 'effective dominant culture', and consequently cautions against separating it from other social practices or subjecting it to 'special and distinct laws'.[146] Influenced by Gramsci's concept of hegemony, Williams asserts that 'in any society, in any particular period, there is a central system of practices, meanings, and values, which we can properly call dominant and effective', and which we can only fully comprehend if we first 'understand the real social process on which it depends.'[147] In this section several of the *Bruce*'s themes are considered in light of the prevailing 'practices, meanings, and values' of feudal Scotland (and northern Europe more widely), including monarchy, power, political rhetoric, chivalry, nationalism, and cultural mystification. Drawing on the Irish invasion and the wider social processes at play this section's purpose is to demystify the *Bruce*'s most lauded themes, thereby subverting the supposed meanings of the text and its consequent cultural reception and reputation.

The Bruce belongs to a flourishing literary culture during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries that includes John of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, Walter

---

[146] Cited in Ryan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, p.3
[147] Raymond Williams, *Problems in Materialism and Culture* (London: Verso, 1980), p.38.

Bower's *Scotichronicon* (a continuation of Fordun's history) and Andrew Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland*. These texts are largely concerned with consolidating Scottish history and respond to a politically turbulent time which demanded 'one story of overwhelming significance, namely the preservation of the Scottish kingdom and its institutions against the ambitions of the English crown'.[148] As the individual deemed most responsible for securing Scotland's autonomy, stabilising internal friction and bringing the country together under one sovereign, it is entirely logical that Robert Bruce should be subject to memorialisation. Every good story requires a hero and *The Bruce* along with the historiography of the period 'tend to justify and celebrate the success of the Bruce/Stewart royal line'.[149]

Barbour's political philosophy, as Ebin notes, is that 'the character of the ruler is critical for the survival and well-being of the nation. His behaviour determines the prosperity of the kingdom and is a model for the actions of its people.'[150] In consequence, Barbour's portrayal of 'the Bruce' is contingent on the omission of specific episodes, for example the numerous occasions before 1305 when Bruce's loyalty vacillated between Scotland and England as he put personal ambition before country.[151] Barbour presents Balliol as Edward I's willing marionette whereas Bruce is presented as 'a pioneer of Scottish nationalism', who rejects Edward I's pledge to make him king with the rather ironic response: 'as God saves me, I do not hanker after the kingdom, unless it falls rightfully to me'.[152]

Regarding the Irish invasion, it is clear that Barbour viewed it as a misadventure and missed opportunity; what is less certain is whether he deemed the invasion potentially harmful to the myth of Robert he sought to cultivate. If he did, he could not simply omit the three year campaign and Robert's role in it; to have done so would have appeared anomalous in the fourteenth century and incriminating thereafter; however, as a skilful publicist and propagandist, Barbour was able, to some extent, to minimise the trauma of the Irish invasion by framing it, and Robert, within the concept of chivalry. Furthermore, Barbour's explicit strategy of juxtaposing the statesman-like Robert against the incompetent war-mongering Edward strongly suggests that the poet did consider the

---

[148] Stephen Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland: Robert the Steward, John of Fordun and the "Anonymous Chronicle"', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 76, 201 (1997), p.23.
[149] Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda', p.23.
[150] Louis Ebin, 'John Barbour's "Bruce": Poetry, History, and Propaganda' (doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1969), p.60.
[151] Ebin, 'John Barbour's "Bruce"', thesis, p.38. See *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, 2, ed. Joseph Bain (Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1881-8); Sir Francis Palgrave, *Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland* (London: Record Commission, 1837).
[152] Watt, 'Nationalism in Barbour's *Bruce'*, p.97; Duncan, *The Bruce*, 1,157-78.

invasion and its implications as potentially damaging to the memory of Robert Bruce. As the Prologue to *Beowulf* declares, 'Behaviour that's admired / is the path to power among people everywhere'.[153] In the main, Barbour's strategy appears successful given that Edward Bruce traditionally attracts much of the criticism while Robert is perceived, for the most part, as a symbol of resistance and freedom.

This is not to suggest that Robert I's association with such concepts is completely unjustified, indeed from a nationalist's perspective they might appear entirely just. Nevertheless, national mythologies demand close and critical scrutiny and the political and practical reality is that the Irish invasion could not have got off the ground nor been sustained for three years without Robert's initial consent and continued provision of men and resources. It is only 'with the consent of [his] king', Barbour tells us that Edward journeyed to Ayr and set sail 'till Irland held he straucht his wai'.[154] Moreover, Barbour emphasises that the decision to conquer all Ireland was not taken until after Robert's arrival, suggesting that the ensuing destruction, extending from Ulster to Limerick and back again, can be justifiably shared between the Bruce brothers.

A cult of war

As previously discussed, Barbour's literary assassination of Edward is a crucial feature of his attempt to fashion an antithetical character with which to distinguish the heroic and valorous Robert. Though Edward predictably plays second fiddle to the king, Barbour relegates him behind Douglas and Mowbray whose daring exploits and loyalty follow the values of chivalry more closely. Barbour's overall portrayal of Edward, as previously noted, is inconsistent and it is worth considering these inconsistencies against the backdrop of chivalry. Indeed, Edward's inconsistencies only appear as such if we consent to the poem's romantic take on chivalry and interpret Robert, Douglas and Mowbray as chivalric archetypes instead of military combatants in a foreign invasion.

For Tolmie, the 'disjunction' that readers and critics experience throughout Barbour's poem is in part due to the poet's struggle to combine contradictory detail into a consistent narrative; for Tolmie this is exacerbated by the 'explosive nature of the material itself, the frightful truth of communal violence during the wars of independence and the competing metaphors used to explain and yet obfuscate it'.[155] In Book One Barbour describes his poem as a 'romanys' (romance), thus framing his work within the medieval

---

[153] *Beowulf, A Verse Translation*, trans. Seamus Heaney, ed. Daniel Donoghue (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002), 24-25, p.3.
[154] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 16-21.
[155] Tolmie, 'Sacrilege, Sacrifice and John Barbour's *Bruce'*, p.12.

concept of chivalry, exponents of which tended to be 'men of high lineage', obsessed with 'the martial world of the mounted warrior'.[156] The 'age of chivalry' described, in effect, a hierarchical and hegemonic structure with the king at the top followed by 'feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, [and] serfs'.[157] We ought therefore to be wary of acceding to Barbour's chivalric fantasy and aggrandising of alleged 'heroes' who in reality embody the dominant, aristocratic values of the elite.

Today, the literary genre of chivalric romance - fashionable among the elite of the Late Middle Ages and early modern period - is still likely to invoke images of armoured knights on white chargers slaying villains and rescuing damsels in distress. The reality of course is far less romantic and the brutality of the period is generally obscured by its ideologically soaked imagery. In an article probing present-day considerations of violence in thirteenth-century Ireland, Thomas Finan disapprovingly remarks that 'of any branch of historians, medievalists seem content with the idea of violence as a necessary aspect of society, or at least medieval society'.[158] Finan calls attention to the ethical contradictions of both English and Gaelic societies which vacillate between a 'violent, militaristic society, and […] chivalry which stressed honour and prestige above violence'.[159]

Barbour, who was likely influenced by the French Knight Geoffrey de Charny (1300-1356), was unlikely to have interpreted the invasion as anything other than a noble chivalric venture.[160] As did Sir Thomas Gray, who as we recall enthused that Edward's campaign 'would form a splendid romance'.[161] Interestingly, features of chivalry, for example honour and loyalty, seem to have been graded like a medieval form of top-trumps.[162] Nigel Saul suggests that the most intense moments of Edward I's Arthurian

---

[156] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 1, 446; Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1984), p.2.

[157] Karl Marx and Frederick Engel's, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1970), p.31.

[158] Thomas Finan, 'Violence in thirteenth-century Ireland', *Eolas: The Journal of the American Society of Irish Medieval Studies*, 4 (2010), pp.86-97, p.86.

[159] Finan, 'Violence in thirteenth-century Ireland', p.86.

[160] The French Knight Geoffrey de Charny (1300-1356) was the poster-boy for chivalry and authored several books on the subject. He was a founder member of the Order of the Star (1351) (the French equivalent of England's Order of the garter (1347)), renowned as the 'perfect knight' and, according to Froissart, visited Scotland at least twice, on one occasion staying for two months. Barbara W. Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous 14th Century* (New York: Penguin Books, 1978), p.141; Sir John Froissart, *Chronicles of England, France and Spain and the Surrounding Countries*, 2, trans. Thomas Johnes (London: William Smith, 1848), pp. 35-50.

[161] Sir Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica: The Reigns of Edward I, Edward II and Edward III*, trans. Sir Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: University Press, 1836; 1907), p.57.

[162] Keen, *Chivalry*, p.171. In *The Bruce* for example, during the battle of Bannockburn, Sir Giles d'Argentine (a renowned knight who is mentioned several times) is killed in a brave solo charge against Edward Bruce's forces. Barbour informs us that 'Off hys deid wes rycht gret pite, (great sorrow) / He wes the third best knycht perfay'. Barbour, *The Bruce*, 13, 320-23. Such sorrow for the death of the third best knight in Christendom suggests a popular admiration for celebrity knights whose military exploits were likely circulated (perhaps in the form of collectable pocket-sized wood etchings replete with medieval chewing-

complex coincide with the most successful period of his reign which saw Edward, emboldened by his successes in Wales embark 'on the much greater task of subduing Scotland'.[163] Chivalry was much more than a feudal ideology that encouraged 'aristocratic prejudices' and validated violence. It was also an expedient propaganda tool in the struggle for supremacy over the British Isles.[164]

Unlike medieval concepts of kingship and religion, Finan submits that its violence is entirely relevant to our modern world since how we react to violence in the past is just as important to how we react to violence in the present.'[165] While the largely select readership of the *Bruce* in the fourteenth century may have been attuned to its chivalric themes, I am not entirely convinced that present-day readers would automatically reach the same conclusions. Duncan, in contrast, believes that Barbour's themes, especially that of freedom, 'resonate […] powerfully in the late twentieth century' (and one assumes twenty-first).[166] It may be the case however that the inescapable exposure to the realities of military violence via a range of media, along with an increasing familiarity with foreign invasion from Poland to Vietnam to Iraq, suggests that some current readers (in spite of the best efforts of the reigning militarist ideology) may be less accepting of Barbour's celebration of and commitment to chivalry and its characteristic brutality.

Barbour's portrayal of Edward Bruce may also be received differently by modern readers who may perceive Edward's inconsistencies and flaws as 'realistic' and thus more identifiable in contrast to the poem's 'heroes': Robert, Douglas and Stewart, whose appeal evokes a period whose reigning ideology has been shown as counterfeit.[167] One prominent

gum). Apparently, Robert Bruce was ranked at number 10, while Edward I was almost certainly top trumps. Cited in Keen, *Chivalry*, p.171; Edward I commissioned a round table (the Winchester table) in the 1280's, around which, during the knighting of his son (the future Edward II), Edward I swore 'to avenge himself on the new Scots leader Robert Bruce', to which his son responded 'that he would not sleep two nights in the same place until he had fulfilled his father's undertaking against the Scots' Nigel Saul, *For Honour and Fame, Chivalry in England, 1066-1500* (London: The Bodley Head, 2011), p.80; Cited in Saul, *For Honour and Fame*, p.81.

[163] Saul, *For Honour and Fame*, p.85.

[164] It is worth briefly considering a corollary of chivalry - the crusades - which Maurice Keen describes as 'a cult of war and […] belligerence that was deeply embedded in the traditions of the medieval west, being part of its heritage from the warrior ethos of the barbarian past, and which was fundamental to what we call chivalry'. Maurice Keen, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms in the Middle Ages* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996), pp.1-2. According to Carruthers and McIlvanney, *The Bruce* 'implicitly transposes the struggle between Christian Crusaders and Muslims into the battle between righteous Scots and barbarous Englishmen'. Gerard Carruthers and Liam McIlvanney, 'Introduction', in *The Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature* eds. Gerard Carruthers and Liam McIlvanney (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p.3. *The Bruce* concludes (Book Twenty) with the death of Robert at Cardross and the entrusting of his heart to Douglas who then transports it, inside a silver case hanging from his neck, to the holy land and into war against the Saracens. While in Christendom, Douglas is visited by many knights anxious to pay homage 'and honouryt him [Bruce] full gretumly'. Barbour, *The Bruce*, 20, 366-370.

[165] Finan, 'Violence in thirteenth-century Ireland', p.87.

[166] Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.1.

[167] The *Westminster Review* of July 1826 includes a piece entitled the 'age of chivalry', which it defines as 'the age of aristocracy'; and of its own time complains that 'the illusions of chivalry are to this hour the great

exception to this is Robert Crawford who contends that Barbour's Robert Bruce, 'though on occasion fallible, emerges as a paragon of chivalric kinship'.[168] Such an assessment, I would argue, is largely contingent on an acceptance of the poem's chivalric ideology and its mandatory and excessive violence.

Cosmo Innes, for example, extols Robert Bruce for regaling his knights with romantic tales during the crossing of Loch Lomond.[169] He writes that 'they give us a higher idea of chivalry than any writer of fable has reached.'[170] Notwithstanding Bruce's thoughtfulness for his men, what Barbour records is Bruce's internecine conflict with the Western Islands of Scotland, which purposefully coincided with Edward's expedition to Ireland in the summer of 1315.[171] Bruce's myth-busting efforts were connected to his broader aim of dominating the 'highly competitive world of west-coast and North Channel politics'.[172] It may also have been an act of retribution for his defeat by the Lord of Argyll in 1306.[173] In essence, Barbour's prophetic tale veneers Bruce's raw political motives and serves to legitimise a military coup in the north-west as well as deny its ruthlessness.[174] In

---

stronghold of aristocratic prejudices'. The *Review* attempts to form a 'correct estimate' of the period and concludes 'that the compound of noble qualities, called the *spirit of chivalry* was almost unknown in the age of chivalry; that the age so called was equally distinguished by moral depravity and by physical wretchedness; that there is no class of society at this day in any civilized country, which has not a greater share of what are called knightly virtues, than the knights themselves; that, far from civilizing and refining the rest of the world, it was not till very late, and with great difficulty, that the rest of the world would succeed in civilizing them'. *The Westminster Review*, 6, July (London: Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1826), pp.65-6.

[168] Robert Crawford, *Bannockburns: Scottish Independence and Literary Imagination, 1314-2014* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), p.33.

[169] There was, Barbour tells us, a prophecy which foretold that whoever carried their ships over the isthmus at Tarbert (between Loch Long and Loch Lomond) would have dominion over the Isles. Robert fulfils the prophecy and when the islanders hear of Bruce's feat they subsequently submit (15, 295-300). We are told that only one Islesman, John of Lorn, disobeyed the prophecy and was captured and taken to the king while his unfaithful followers were killed (15, 304-308). John of Lorn represents John MacDougall of Argyll who in early 1315 retook the Isle of Man and dominated the Irish Sea. 'The MacDonald Lordship and the Bruce Dynasty, c.1306-c.1371' in *The Lordship of the Isles*, ed. Michael D. Oram (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014), pp.62-88, p.70.

[170] Cited in Eyre-Todd, *Early Scottish Poetry*, p.69.

[171] Duffy, 'The Bruce Brothers and the Irish Sea World', p.59.

[172] Dauvit Broun, 'Scotland and the monarchy of Britain in the first English Empire', in *The English Isles: Cultural transmission and political conflict in Britain and Ireland*, p.90; Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, p.157; Frame, *English Lordship in Ireland, 1318-1361*, p.132.

[173] Alexander Grant, *Independence and Nationhood: Scotland, 1306-1469* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1984), p.5.

[174] This internecine conflict highlights a fundamental difference between Scotland and Ireland and Wales but a similarity with England, specifically a 'centralizing and modernizing monarchy', that was inclined to employ similar approaches to England including the domination of smaller regions, for instance the west-coast, Orkney and the Isle of Man. Matthew Hammond, 'The Scottish experience in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries' in *The English Isles: Cultural transmission and political conflict in Britain and Ireland, 1100-1500*, p.73; Barbour informs us that with all the Isles 'brocht till his liking les and mar', Robert stayed in the west coast for a season, taking time to relax and enjoy his freedom and, according to his biographer, spent a lot of the time 'hunting gamyn'. Barbour, *The Bruce*, 15, 316-18.

addition, Penman speculates that despite having fought with the Bruces at Bannockburn the MacDonalds were far from enthusiastic about the Bruce's invasion of Ireland.[175]

The illusion of Freedom

As alluded to earlier, regarding the concept of freedom in the *Bruce*, Goldstein and Jack raise the implications of Barbour's inclusion of the Irish invasion but fail to fully explore them. For Duncan, *The Bruce*'s 'invocation of freedom' ripples across the centuries and 'resonates' in our own time. Accordingly the first four lines of the 'praise of freedom' are displayed proudly on the back cover of the 1997 Canongate edition, edited by Duncan.[176] The first and most germane question to ask is what Barbour means when he writes of 'freedom'? There are over forty references in the poem and of variant meaning, confirming Hans Utz's assertion that there is no 'unequivocal conception of *free*(dom) in *The Bruce*'.[177] The 'praise of freedom' contains five 'freedoms':

> A! Fredome is a noble thing
> Fredome mays man to haiff liking
> Fredome all solace to man giffis
> He levys at es that frely levys.
> A noble hart may haiff nane es
> Na ellys nocht that may him ples
> Gyff fredome failyhe, for fre liking
> Is yharnyt our all other thing.
> Na he that ay has levyt fre
> May nocht knaw weill the propyrte
> The angyr na the wrechyt dome   fate
> That is couplyt to foule thyrldome,
> Bot gyff he had assayit it.
> Than all perquer he suld it wyt,   perfectly
> And suld think fredome mar to prys   prized
> Than all the gold in warld that is.[178]

Freedom, the poem proclaims, ennobles, provides pleasure and solace and allows a man to live at ease, thus freedom should be yearned for above all else. Those who have never known subjugation are unqualified to understand the anger and wretchedness it creates, but if they did they would prize their freedom more than the entire world's gold.

'Freedom', however, 'as a political term […] is burdened with emotion, it has, being controversial, been much abused in the past six centuries so that it has come to mean

---

[175] Penman, 'The MacDonald Lordship, p.70.
[176] Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.1.
[177] Hans Utz, 'If Freedom Fail… "Freedom" in John Barbour's *The Bruce*', *English Studies*, 50 (1969), pp. 151-65, p.154. According to Utz, one of the forty is the first occasion when freedom is used in a political sense. Utz, 'If Freedom Fail', p.153.
[178] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 1.225-240.

opposite things'.[179] The so-called Enlightenment's much vaunted 'revolutionary rallying cry of liberty', for example, has been described as 'a rationalization of the freedom to exploit'.[180] Though a pre-capitalist stage, feudal societies were organised along class lines with the king at the top and below him, broadly speaking, lords and serfs. Serfs lived a life of bondage, obligated, among other things, to work the land on which they lived for the benefit of the owner.[181] In the fourteenth century the assertion 'freedom is a noble thing' meant precisely that: 'For the nobility the fight for freedom might include, or even be identical with, the defence of class privilege.'[182]

The Anglo-Normans introduced feudalism into Ireland with the objective of dividing the colonists from the native Irish, while in Scotland the feudal nobility were 'a mixture of new Anglo-French or Flemish adventurers and an established Celtic aristocracy.'[183] By the end of Robert I's reign 'the nobility of Scotland, with a few notable exceptions, was still the old nobility, the nobility of the thirteenth, even the twelfth century.'[184] In Ireland, moreover, the Bruces and the Scottish nobility were not offering the Irish serfs an alternative to the existing social structure but merely imposing their own, which not only mirrored English policy but also reflected the feudalism of north-west Europe more generally. Had the Bruces succeeded in conquering Ireland it would have been business as usual for the peasant class in both Ireland and Scotland.

The Marxist philosopher Slavoj Žižek describes feudalism as a period when 'relations between people are mystified, mediated through a web of ideological beliefs and superstitions. They are the relations between the master and his servant, whereby the master exerts his charismatic power of fascination.'[185] This fascination is abetted by literature, genre, and rhetorical practices which seek to 'persuade an audience to embrace particular political choices', within a medieval reading community more interested in mythology than fact.[186] In the medieval period the 'mechanisms for transmitting ideologies to the masses were notably weak' (there was no widespread education or literacy);[187] however, van Heijnsbergen argues that there existed 'textual communities' and 'a lively

---

[179] Utz, 'If Freedom Fail, p.153.
[180] Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London: Verso, 2007), p.61.
[181] Narrowly defined as 'the nature of relations between and within the upper strata of society', feudalism finds concrete expression in traditions, institutions, ceremonies and property ownership; it also obligated 'protection and service between superior and inferiors'. S. J. Connolly, ed. *Oxford Companion to Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp.199-200.
[182] Utz, 'If Freedom Fail, p.157.
[183] Connolly, *Oxford Companion*, p.200; Michael Lynch, *Scotland: A New History* (London: Pimlico, 1992), p.54.
[184] Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, p.402.
[185] Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London: Verso, 2008), p.31.
[186] Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', pp.2-3.
[187] Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p.35.

and diverse manuscript community for the *Brus'* that included various sections of society: 'churchmen, royal administrators, university graduates, professional lawyers […] and members of the merchant class'.[188] In her analysis of the *Bruce* as a 'narrative of inauguration', Tolmie writes that

> Barbour is helping his society to avoid another outbreak of civil destruction by dint not of rationalizing, but of mystifying, Bruce's rise to power. Authors, individual or collective, who participate in the genre of inaugural narrative, are necessarily caught up in this project of cultural mystification.[189]

Foucault likewise asserts that just as in antiquity the historical narratives of the Middle Ages 'remained related to the rituals of power'.[190] Barbour's *Bruce* can therefore be categorised, in a Foucauldian sense, as 'both a justification of power and reinforcement of that power.'[191]

The social hierarchy of the medieval feudal system is represented in *The Bruce* by the numerous acts of homage and fealty, its emphasis on honour, courage and loyalty, and the sequestering of large number of serfs, on all sides, to kill, maim or die for their lord, laird or chief. Predictably, Barbour pays scant attention to the individuals involved both militarily and collaterally in the Irish invasion but endorses, indeed celebrates, the culture of the feudal nobility, especially 'the ethos and blood-spattered reality of chivalry.'[192] *The Bruce* then is a 'national' epic initially intended for, and pending widespread levels of literacy, principally limited to the aristocracy and the medieval professional class. Consequently the 'freedom' Barbour invokes is neither universal nor existential in scope but is quite literally 'a noble thing'. As Diane Watt notes, the topics Barbour considers, for example loyalty and the right of succession are all pertinent to the ruling classes.[193] Ultimately Barbour 'serves the interests of his class by lending support to existing relations of power.'[194]

During the Wars of Independence, Scottish nobles were chiefly concerned with the security of their own feudal interests then under threat from Edward I's attack on Scottish property rights. [195] As such, Utz argues, the Scottish nobles 'set their particular interests

---

[188] Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.5.
[189] Tolmie, Sacrilege, Sacrifice and John Barbour's *Bruce'*, p.12.
[190] Foucault, *'Society Must Be Defended'*, p.66.
[191] Foucault, *'Society Must Be Defended'*, p.66.
[192] Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.1.
[193] Watt, 'Nationalism in Barbour's *Bruce'*, p.95.
[194] Goldstein, '"Freedom is a Noble Thing!", p.194.
[195] Goldstein, '"Freedom is a Noble Thing!", p.194. Indeed, many Scottish nobles also held additional property in the form of land in England. Christopher Harvie, *Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics, 1707 to the Present* (London; New York: Routledge, 1977), p.12. Post-Bannockburn, a parliamentary statute decreed that land could no longer be held in both Scotland and England, since it led to

above those of the country as a whole, because there could be no doubt about Edward's ambition to conquer and to control a united kingdom of the British Isles.'[196] Goldstein notes that when Barbour describes Edward I's violation of Scottish property 'the poet is always careful to set the action in a landscape familiar to his Scottish audience', a landscape 'which provides the basic means of production and to which determinate property rights are attached.'[197] As Eagleton observes, freedom is a 'value' to be desired 'as long as one recognises […] when it takes the historically contingent form of private property'.[198] In short, and contrary to general belief, *The Bruce's* notions of freedom may have more to do with property rights than with English oppression. In *Scotland and Nationalism* (1977), Christopher Harvie assesses the celebrated line from the Declaration of Arbroath (inscribed on the wall of the National Museum of Scotland): 'we fight not for glory, nor riches, nor honour, but for freedom', and questions whether this signifies 'freedom from unfreedom' or the 'liberties' of a privileged class? Harvie concludes: 'initially, the second […] but enduringly the first.'[199]

Duncan's belief in an affinity between medieval notions of freedom - as espoused by Barbour - and modern sensibility presumes that the concept of freedom has changed little in the intervening centuries; it also presumes that medieval notions of freedom are stable or are of value in the first place. In the following segment I would like to explore these assumptions and briefly consider notions of 'freedom' in texts of the early fourteenth century which may have fed into Barbour's *Bruce* and influenced his portrayal of the Irish invasion.

The Bruce's preoccupation with freedom echoes a similar fixation sixty years earlier in diplomatic literature written during the Wars of Independence and the Irish campaigns. Edward I's desire to dominate Scotland triggered not only a martial response but a 'continuum' of texts engaged with ideas of autonomy and tyranny including a letter from Robert Bruce to the Irish chiefs (1306-7), the 'Declaration of the Clergy' (1309-10), the 'Remonstrance' (1317), and the 'Declaration of Arbroath' (1320).[200] Duncan notes that

---

collaboration between Edward II and the Scottish guardianship, but with Bruce now king there would be no split loyalty. Grant, *Independence and Nationhood*, p.11.

[196] Utz, 'If Freedom Fail', p.151.

[197] Goldstein, '"Freedom is a Noble Thing!", pp.195-196.

[198] Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p.xvii.

[199] Harvie, *Scotland and Nationalism*, p.13; In an extract from the *Bruce* commonly referred to as 'Bruce's address to his army', Robert lists three advantages to defeating England, the second of which is the procurement of the riches the English had brought with them so 'that the pourest' of them would be 'bath rych and mychty tharwithall'. Barbour, *The Bruce*, 12, 242-3. This promise of wealth targeted directly at the serfs fighting on behalf of their lords as foot soldiers jars with the celebrated phrase above, as it does with the sentiment expressed in Barbour's 'praise of freedom': that if those with freedom could know what it felt like to lose it, they would prize it above all the world's gold. Barbour, *The Bruce*, 1, 225-240.

[200] Edward J. Cowan, *'For Freedom Alone': The Declaration of Arbroath*, p.40.

'the different rhetorics of the 1309 and 1320 declarations […] are exemplified by one word: "freedom".'[201] These texts as R. R. Davies points out are part of a 'propaganda war' coordinated by the Scots and dependant on lofty concepts such as freedom and liberty, 'common bonds of descent between the Scots, the Irish and the Welsh' and 'virulent anti-English sentiment', which according to Davies, had the English 'on the ropes ideologically as well as militarily'.[202]

The negotiations between Robert Bruce and the Irish chiefs, of which Bruce's letter is a product, can be read as an attempt to reboot a mutually historic but diminished sense of national and cultural autonomy. Similarly, the 'Remonstrance', though predominantly focused on Irish freedom, offers the Scottish aristocracy authority over Ireland *if* they remove the English. In the 'Declaration of the Clergy', freedom is linked with tyranny and torture and it complains that the reign of John Baliol saw Scotland 'reduced to servitude […] tortured by wars, made captive, chained and imprisoned, oppressed, subjugated and enslaved by immense slaughters of innocents and ceaseless conflagrations.'[203]

The last of the documents to be written - originally and rather dully entitled 'a letter from the Scottish magnates to John XXII' (1320) - the 'Declaration of Arbroath' draws together the various versions of freedom alluded to in the previous documents. It highlights three forms: first, historical narratives of freedom; second, political freedom; and third, the rhetoric of freedom: 'we fight not for glory nor riches nor honours, but for freedom alone.'[204] Over the last 700 years the Declaration of Arbroath ('Arbroath') has developed 'a near-mythic status', and is now 'regarded as inextricably linked to Scottish identity and nationalism.'[205] Crawford observes that 'attuned to the rhetoric of Bannockburn, the Declaration of Arbroath resonates'.[206] 'Arbroath' resonated across (and beyond) the Atlantic where it enjoys a reciprocal relationship with the 'American Declaration of Independence' (1776), which it is said to have partly inspired.[207]

---

[201] Archie Duncan, 'The Declarations of the Clergy, 1309-10', in *The Declaration of Arbroath, History, Significance, Setting*, ed. Geoffrey Barrow (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2003), pp.32-50, p.38.

[202] R. R. Davies, *The First English Empire*, p.174.

[203] Duncan, 'The Declarations of the Clergy, 1309-10', p.44.

[204] 'The Declaration of Arbroath', in Barbour, *The Bruce*, ed., trans., A. A. M. Duncan, appendix, ppp.779, 780, 781. Historical narratives of freedom include the expulsion of the Britons and Picts and the defence against Scandinavian hordes and English, from whom they had been 'free of all servitude ever since'; political freedom from the 'countless evils' perpetrated by Edward I, from whom 'the lord Robert' had set the Scots 'free'; and last, the rhetoric of freedom: 'we fight not for glory nor riches nor honours, but for freedom alone.' As Sean Duffy points out, what the declaration cannot tell us is the number of signatories who were descendants of migrants from England, Normandy, Brittany and Flanders. Sean Duffy, 'Medieval Scotland & Ireland: Overcoming the Amnesia', *History Ireland*, 7, 3 (1999), pp.17-21, p.17.

[205] Cowan, '*For Freedom Alone': The Declaration of Arbroath*, p.1.

[206] Crawford, *Bannockburns*, p.30.

[207] The American Declaration inspired a name change in the former during the twentieth century from 'a letter from the Scottish magnates to John XXII' to the more assertive 'Declaration of Arbroath'. Edward J.

'Arbroath' is included in the appendix of the 1997 edition of *The Bruce*, a juxtaposition which cannot fail to encourage a comparison between the texts, and this is likely the editor's intention given that ideological parallels in the *Bruce* and 'Arbroath' have been noted by historians and literary critics.[208] Ted Cowan contends that the 'Declaration' 'was much better known in the medieval manuscript tradition than some scholars have allowed, having attained a near-legendary character by the fifteenth century.'[209] Meanwhile, Ranald Nicholson argues that 'Arbroath' should not necessarily be seen as representing all Scots but more accurately as Bruce propaganda.[210]

It is conceivable that Barbour was familiar with and was influenced by 'Arbroath', and if so it might, in part, explain Barbour's largely dismissive attitude toward the Irish. Written two years after the invasion, three after the 'Remonstrance' which offered the Bruces the kinship of Ireland, and a decade after Bruce's letter to the Irish chiefs, 'Arbroath' makes no mention of Ireland and accordingly no mention of the Irish invasion. The absence of the ancient Irish connection in 'Arbroath' suggests some cooling in the relationship between the Gaels, or as Bruce previously termed them, our 'beloved kinsmen'. This is a significant reversal as up until this point 'the Scots regarded Ireland as the source from which they sprung'.[211] Cowan considers it likely that the Irish bond was 'suppressed' in light of the fact that the Bruces had been excommunicated, in part, for invading Ireland and for the atrocities committed whilst there, thus 'there was no need', he writes, 'to remind the holy father that Scottish atrocities in Ireland could in any way be compared to English depredations in Scotland.'[212]

'Operation Enduring Freedom'

Fredric Jameson claims that literature 'often tries to repress historical truth, but analysis can reveal its underlying ideology'.[213] The 'elaborate mythology' of chivalry for example (and its thematic satellites 'valour' and 'loyalty') helped reinforce the nobility's sense of

---

Cowan, 'Declaring Arbroath', in *The Declaration of Arbroath, History, Significance, Setting*, ed. Geoffrey Barrow (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2003), p.13.

[208] Watt, 'Nationalism in Barbour's *Bruce*', pp.89-107, p.90.

[209] Cowan, 'Declaring Arbroath', p.13.

[210] Ranald Nicholson, *Scotland: The Later Middle Ages*, *The Edinburgh History of Scotland*, 2 (Edinburgh: Mercat, 1974), p.101. The ambiguity of 'freedom' found in 'Arbroath' has been highlighted in the American Declaration of Independence by Jacques Derrida, who asks if it is the case that the 'people' had already freed themselves before the signing of the Declaration and are merely stating this fact, or become free at the moment they, via the 'representatives', vicariously sign the declaration? As Derrida notes the 'we' spoken of in the declaration, 'do not exist as an entity […] before this declaration, *not as such*'. Jacques Derrida, 'Declarations of Independence', *New Political Science*, 7, 1 (1986), pp.7-15, pp.9, 10.

[211] Cowan, *'For Freedom Alone': The Declaration of Arbroath*, p.46.

[212] Cowan, *'For Freedom Alone': The Declaration of Arbroath*, p.47.

[213] Cited in Barry, *Beginning Theory*, p.166.

their society's 'innate sense of honour and justice',[214] but it concealed a material reality that was far from honourable or just for the vast majority of people upon whom it impacted.

During the most recent war in Iraq the material realities (political and economic) behind the invasion were deliberately distorted and obscured (mystified) by patriotic appeals to 'freedom' which projected America and its allies as liberators. (The invasion was entitled 'Operation Iraqi Freedom' while the later war on terror in Afghanistan was called 'Operation Enduring Freedom'). During his 'address' to Americans at the launch of the attack, President George W. Bush, in the guise of humanitarianism, informed the American public that the invasion of Iraq would 'free its people'.[215] While Iraq was liberated from the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein the gravely inadequate post-war strategy compelled the western liberators to convert to occupiers. With hindsight, it is clear that Bush's concept of 'freedom' was at best ambiguous and transferred from the 'mundane realm to a sinisterly metaphysical one', lessening the need to 'look for a political explanation'.[216] Terry Eagleton refers to this tactic when writing of the 'dense layers of self-deception which prevent us from seeing the [historical] situation as it really is.'[217] Bush inadvertently peeled back these layers when at the outset he employed an 'inappropriate' analogy and described the invasion as a 'crusade'. In truth, the analogy, as well as its historical associations of conquest, slaughter, theft of land and resources, was an accurate one and a rare instance of a politician saying exactly what they meant! As Eagleton more generally observes: 'the problem with the West is not that its governing values are hollow. It is that they cannot help betraying them.'[218]

Some might find equating the theme of freedom in the *Bruce* to the ideology of freedom associated with the Iraq war to be somewhat tenuous. Yet, Tony Pollard's recent research on the Bruce invasion of Ireland draws fascinating and instructive parallels with twentieth-century conflicts. An expert in battlefield and conflict archaeology, Pollard researched and presented the *BBC 2* two-part historical dramatisation of the Irish invasion entitled *After Bannockburn*, and 'discovered, [that it] bore more than a passing resemblance to recent military misadventures, including notably the American involvement

---

[214] Alan Woods, 'George W. Bush and the Crusades', *In Defence of Marxism*, May 2003, http://www.marxist.com/iraq-bush-crusades080503.htm [accessed: 03/05/2014]
[215] 'George Bush's address on the start of war', *The Guardian*, 20 March 2003, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/20/iraq.georgebush [accessed 23/03/2014]
[216] Terry Eagleton, *After Theory* (London: Penguin Books, 2004), p.141.
[217] Eagleton, *After Theory*, p.132.
[218] Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction*, p.xvii.

in Vietnam during the 1960s and 70s.'[219] Pollard's provocative description of the Irish invasion as 'Medieval Scotland's Vietnam', is a somewhat ironic analogy insofar as historians have described Elizabeth I's Irish war in the 1590s as 'England's Vietnam'.[220] Having surveyed the routes of Edward's campaign, Pollard concludes that the Scots had no clear aim or exit strategy and

> as the Americans discovered in Vietnam - and indeed the British more recently in Afghanistan - a lack of clear aims means that extracting oneself from a difficult position can be very difficult. And, as we know, Edward Bruce hung on in there for over three difficult years, when cutting his losses earlier might have made better sense.'[221]

Pollard identifies further similarities between recent wars and the Bruce invasion such as untrustworthy allies, hostile environment and landscape, lack of supplies, loss of combatants, and civilian deaths.[222]

'Freedom', superficially, has a range of guises; it can appear moral, magnanimous, and 'noble'. As history shows however, 'freedom', in its discrete forms has a darker side, an almost inevitable extension or distortion of its virtuous features. The freedom to own property was extended to so-called inferior peoples; freedom of expression often produces hate speech, negating the fundamental democratic value of the freedom itself; the freedom of unfettered capitalism has permitted restricted control over economic resources: 'the economic freedom of one person limits the freedom of another person when the former creates a hierarchical organisation - a company - in which the latter has to function'.[223] With the exception of the capitalist, one must seriously question whether freedom is even compatible with capitalism, which 'creates unequal freedom' by forcing others to 'accept rules and ways of life which they have not chosen autonomously'.[224]

Freedom can also be employed as a principle for intervening (or invading) in another country, with the lofty intention of liberating its citizens. The extent of the liberation however is determined by the material purpose of the liberator. The 20th century is littered with such military 'interventions' and 'liberations'; most recently Iraq (2003), Libya (2011) and Syria (2011). Prior to and during such interventions, 'freedom' is employed by the governing classes for the purposes of realpolitik, and to ultimately, and

---

[219] Tony Pollard, 'Medieval Scotland's Vietnam: Edward Bruce's invasion of Ireland in 1315', BBC2, After Bannockburn: http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/articles/41ccq3Mkt2DV2Wz87XJ9m7H/medieval-scotland-s-vietnam-edward-bruce-s-invasion-of-ireland-in-1315 [accessed 20/05/2015]
[220] R. B. Outhwaite, 'Dearth, the English Crown and the "Crisis of the 1590s"', in *The European Crisis of the 1590s: Essays in Comparative History*, ed. Peter Clark (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985), pp.23-43, p. 32.
[221] Pollard, 'Medieval Scotland's Vietnam'.
[222] Pollard, 'Medieval Scotland's Vietnam'.
[223] Filip Spagnoli, *Homo-Democraticus: On the Universal Desirability and the Not So Universal Possibility of Democracy and Human Rights* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2003), p.414.
[224] Spagnoli, *Homo-Democraticus*, p.414.

contradictorily, benefit one group over another. The concept is employed ideologically as a propaganda tool to convince and then solicit open and tacit agreement from its citizens. The practice simultaneously sweetens the deal by effecting a patriotic enthusiasm and righteous conviction within the devotional citizen. The same practices are evident during the medieval crusades, which were organised, executed, recounted and mystified (in the West at least) through the lens of chivalry. In Barbour's *Bruce* the implications of the Irish invasion - appropriation of power, land and resources - are couched in a similar linguistic and symbolic register, and while Barbour laments the 'wretchedness' that comes from the loss of freedom it is evident this insight does not extend to the Irish during the invasion. As Ted Cowan submits 'freedom' in Scotland 'has all too often been construed as "freedom for me but no necessarily for you"'.[225]

National epic

Duncan claims in the introduction to *The Bruce* that the poem is about 'war', 'chivalry', 'valour' and 'fidelity', adding that 'despite the rhetoric of freedom and country, patriotism is not a central theme.'[226] Duncan's assertion is somewhat supported by the fact that the word 'nation' appears only once in *The Bruce* and in reference to England.[227] Conversely, however, Kurt Wittig argues that Barbour is unconcerned with chivalry, that patriotism is more than 'an incidental theme', and that the principal message of the *Bruce* is the importance of '"freedom" and "richt"'.[228] In contrast to both Duncan and Wittig, Utz regards the poem as 'above all a document of budding Scottish patriotism' and finds in the poem 'the Scottish nation in the making and […] the awakening of patriotism, a feeling of allegiance to "patria", the native country, as distinct from […] one's feudal lord or one's clan'.[229] A crucial difference between Duncan and Utz's interpretations is the latter's attentiveness to the poem's ideologies and possible impact on nascent national identity, and the former's focus on the themes of chivalry and freedom. Utz is not the first to view the *Bruce* as a nationalist text; George Eyre-Todd finds in Barbour's composition

---

[225] Cowan, '*For Freedom Alone': The Declaration of Arbroath*, p.39.
[226] Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.13
[227] Barbour, *The Bruce*, Duncan, 1, 193.
[228] Kurt Wittig, *The Scottish Tradition in literature* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958), p.13.
[229] Utz, 'If Freedom Fail', p.160; Utz's contention that allegiance to 'country' was 'distinct' from that given to the feudal lords is also worth brief consideration. It is the author's view that the nationalist ideology in the *Bruce* ultimately reinforces feudalism, given that it employs features of feudal culture (chivalry) as a vehicle for its dissemination, chiefly among the feudal elite. Identification with nation is therefore not 'distinct' from feudal loyalties, in the sense of a discontinuity, but instead it emerges from the feudal state and is to some extent an extension of it. Consequently Duncan's assumption that the themes of chivalry and freedom are unconnected to ideas of nation feels flimsy since they are themes through which national ideology is transmitted.

something of the ancient function of the bard […] His intention was the exhibiting of a hero, the stirring of popular enthusiasm, as much as the recording of simple fact. His scheme was larger than mere detail of history. He painted the birth of a nation, and his work remains outstanding among national poems as conspicuously the epic of freedom. The sword had already done its part - Scotland stood erect; it was the poet's time to step forward, to show the true meaning of the struggle which was just over, and to pen its lesson upon the hearts of the people in letters of fire. None who read *The Bruce* will aver that Barbour failed in what was demanded of him. The awakened soul of the nation was to be kept alive, and, for its growth in strength and beauty, heroic and gentle ideals had to be kept before its eyes. These things Barbour accomplished.[230]

Nation and nationalism are typically identified as emerging towards the end of the eighteenth century and many historians see the roots of nation in the Enlightenment, the American and French revolutions, and industrialisation and capitalism.[231] Though wary of the 'danger of imposing a retrospective nationalism onto communities and cultures, whose identities and loyalties were local, regional, and religious, but barely national', Anthony Smith finds modernist theories of nation to be 'too dismissive of the legacies of pre-modern ethnic and cultural ties.'[232] Benedict Anderson also acknowledges that 'if nation-states are widely conceded to be "new" and "historical", the nations to which they give political expression always loom out of an immemorial past'.[233]

Medievalists point out that many of the features of nationalism and nation 'are fully appropriate for the understanding of pre-sixteenth, let alone much pre-late eighteenth century, history'.[234] Unconvinced 'by the great divide between pre-modern and the modern', Adrian Hastings (2006) goes further than Smith and finds in the histories of Monmouth and Cambrensis 'clear enunciations of a sense of English nationhood'.[235] Liah Greenfeld writes that 'the birth of the English nation was not the birth of a nation, it was the birth of the nations, the birth of nationalism'.[236] English nationalism, it is argued, arose out of its opposition to the Welsh, Irish and Scots,[237] and subsequently altered the 'national consciousness' of the 'Celtic' countries 'from the late eleventh to the fourteenth-

---

[230] Eyre-Todd, *Early Scottish Poetry*, p.67.

[231] Such as Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson, Eric Hobsbawm, Tom Nairn and Michael Hechter. Anthony D. Smith, *Myths and Memories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp.6, 10; Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p.1.

[232] Anthony D. Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp.5, 7.

[233] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 2006), p.11.

[234] Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, pp.8, 9. A 'nation', it is proposed, emerges when one or more ethnicities develop a self-conscious cultural, ethical and political identity whereupon it requires or, in some cases, demands autonomy and territory. Nationalism arises out of a belief in the value and importance of one's own culture, ethics etc. and an impulse to defend its distinctiveness; nationalism increases 'where and when a particular ethnicity or nation feels itself threatened.' Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, p.4.

[235] Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, p.8; Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008), p.96.

[236] Cited in Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, p.5.

[237] Smith, *Nationalism*, p.96; Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, p.6.

century.'[238] Dauvit Broun submits that by the time of Alexander III (1249) there was a strong sense 'that Scotland was a sovereign kingdom.'[239]

For Hastings the Wars of Independence liberated Scotland from English dominance and generated a 'recognisable nationalism'.[240] Think of Bruce's letter to the Irish chiefs and its use of 'national' and 'nation';[241] additionally, Cowan describes the 'Declaration of Arbroath' as 'the most impressive manifesto of nationalism that medieval Europe produced'.[242] As a sub-theatre of the Wars of Independence, the Bruces' invasion of Ireland must also be seen as part of Scotland's 'national' development. At this time, and in opposition to England, Ireland was developing its own identity, and according to Anne Muller this nascent Irish identity was 'considerably sharpened under the impact of the Bruce invasion'.[243] It could be argued that Barbour's accounts of Irish 'treachery' and insurrectionary activities capture this emergent Irish identity, developed first in opposition to England and then Scotland.

Nations, Hastings argues, are fed from numerous springs, and three founts proposed by him are attributable to Barbour's *Bruce*: war, developments in literature, and 'nationalist propaganda'.[244] Focusing on genre, Thorlac Turville-Petre rejects Barbour's description of *The Bruce* as a romance and views it instead as a chronicle, 'the most overtly polemical and political form of medieval writing'.[245] Chroniclers and poets are essential to creating and stabilising cultural-historical myths (especially national heroes), and Smith bemoans the lack of attention paid to the 'elements of historical fact and legendary elaboration' that underlie national identity.[246] It is worth remembering that for his nationalist epic and for what, according to Gerard Carruthers and Liam McIlvanney, 'might be called nation building', Barbour was awarded £10.[247]

---

[238] Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, p.71.
[239] Broun, 'Scotland and the monarchy of Britain', pp.99-100.
[240] Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, p.28.
[241] Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon*, p.385.
[242] Cited in Edward J. Cowan, *'For Freedom Alone', The Declaration of Arbroath,* p.6.
[243] Anne Muller, 'Conflicting loyalties: The Irish Franciscans and the English crown in the High Middle Ages', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 107C (2007), pp.87-106, p.88.
[244] Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood*, pp.4, 26.
[245] Thorlac Turville-Petre, 'Politics and Poetry in the Early Fourteenth Century: The Case of Robert Manning's Chronicle', *Review of English Studies*, 39 (1988), pp.1-28, p.3.
[246] Smith, *Myths and Memories*, p.57. Smith distinguishes between two types of myth: genealogical ancestry ('biological') and ideological ('cultural-ideological'). In the former power rests on a biological link between 'a hero, a founder, or even a deity' and a community that views itself as descended from this noble ancestor and therefore 'entitled to privilege and prestige'. Smith, *Myths and Memories*, p.58. Arguably, Robert Bruce's status as a national hero (the king who fought for and won independence), in addition to his dynastic legacy (the houses of Bruce and Stewart), conforms to features of the biological criteria.
[247] Carruthers and McIlvanney, 'Introduction', in *The Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature*, p.3.

Smith warns that 'deep within what appears to the outside as a unifying myth, are hidden many tensions and contradictions.'[248] It is a central proposition of this chapter that as a consequence of its depiction of Edward Bruce and the Irish invasion, *The Bruce* contains such 'tensions and contradictions'. Ebin views *The Bruce* as an 'exemplum or mirror designed to illustrate the importance of the ideals of freedom and loyalty for the Scottish nation'.[249] Since Scotland's national identity was to be founded on heroic struggle and a righteous belief in its autonomy (that arguably continues to this day), it is unsurprising that in contrast to the previous year's victory at Bannockburn, the Irish invasion appears less fertile ground for the cultivation of nascent Scottish national identity. Moreover, previous to the Irish invasion, Robert Bruce held considerable leverage in Ireland and a strong presence on the North Channel and Irish Sea; after its failure 'his power in the west was much diminished'.[250] In other words there is not a great deal to write home about. Far from neglecting the invasion, Barbour does his uppermost to shield Robert Bruce and Scotland's budding national mythology from any potential fall-out.

An ethical evaluation of Barbour's depiction of the Irish

In *Subaltern Ethics in Contemporary Scottish and Irish Literature* (2011), Stefanie Lehner formulates a model of 'subaltern aesthEthics' based on an 'ethical revaluation of contemporary writings' (Irish and Scottish) from an interpersonal, national and global level.[251] Convinced that matters of 'disempowerment, marginalisation and oppression are too often overlooked in the field of Irish and Scottish cultural criticism',[252] Lehner argues that the critic has 'an irreducible responsibility: to make audible and bring to light that what is perhaps not obvious or perceptible on the surface layer of a visual image or a literary text'.[253] Lehner's claim echoes that of Frederic Jameson: that digging beneath the outer layer of literature can 'restor[e] to the surface the repressed and buried reality of this fundamental history'.[254] In this final section, I wish to modestly take up Lehner's broader challenge and consider marginalised and exploited figures in the *Bruce*'s Irish section. First the Irish, especially the soldierly, and then the character of the laundry woman and her brief but beguiling encounter with Robert Bruce.

---

[248] Smith, *Myths and Memories*, p.71.
[249] Ebin, 'John Barbour's Bruce: Poetry, History, and Propaganda', p.219-220.
[250] Frame, *Colonial Ireland, 1169-1369*, p.116.
[251] Stefanie Lehner, *Subaltern Ethics in Contemporary Scottish and Irish Literature* (Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), p.29.
[252] Lehner, *Subaltern Ethics*, p.5.
[253] Lehner, *Subaltern Ethics*, pp.1, 29.
[254] Frederic Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (London and New York: Routledge Classics, 1983), p.4.

Barbour's representation of the Irish

On the whole, Barbour depicts the Irish as untrustworthy and often rebukes them for their conspiracies and cowardice. He distinguishes between the Irish and the chivalrous Scots and English, in much the same way as he compares Edward Bruce with Robert. Nevertheless, this section argues that Barbour's Othering of the Irish inadvertently reveals the depth of discontent the native Irish felt towards their Gaelic cousins, and interprets the so-called 'traitorous' actions of the Irish as opposition, and Barbour's condemnation as a form of containment.

Scotland's 1315-1318 Irish campaign initiated a decline in Robert Bruce's influence in Ireland and may have encouraged the large number of Irish who fought for the English against the Scots in 1322, 1333 and 1335.[255] However, post-Bannockburn, the 'noble stand made by the Scots for their independence', according to *The O'Conors of Connaught* 'had a magical effect on the Irish', who thus inspired 'sent deputies to Bruce, and having placed themselves and all that belonged to them under his protection, they prayed that if he himself could not be spared from his royal duties, he would send his brother Edward to be their king'.[256] Before launching his Irish campaign, Barbour tells us that Edward solicited assurances from the Irish that they would appoint him king and assist him in seizing the country from the English:

> Tharfor he send and had tretyng
> With the Irschery off Irlan,
> That in thar leawte tok on hand   loyalty/fidelity
> Off all Irland to mak him king
> With-thi that he with hard fechting
> Mycht ourcum the Inglismen
> […] And thai suld help with all thar mycht.[257]

Barbour recounts that the Scots arrived in Ulster without 'bargan or assay' (opposition or attack) and felt secure enough to immediately send their ships back to Scotland, leaving Edward and six thousand men to conquer Ireland.[258] The uneventful landing and the immediate discharge of the ships suggest that the Scots anticipated, and according to *The Chronicle of Lanercost*, received 'some slight aid from the Irish'.[259] The Scots' first skirmish was against the Anglo-Irish lords of Ulster and despite being outnumbered almost four to one the Scots were victorious and 'in that bataill wes tane or slane / all hale the flur

---

[255] Frame, *Colonial Ireland, 1169-1369*, p.116.
[256] *The Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272-1346*, trans. Sir Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1913), p.212; *The O'Conors of Connaught*, p.131.
[257] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 8-15.
[258] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 32.
[259] *The Chronicle of Lanercost*, p.212.

off Ulsyster [flower of Ulster].[260] Soon after the battle, we are told, up to twelve kings of Ireland visited Edward and 'maide fewte' (fealty). Barbour does not provide names or the territories of the Irish kings but Frame suggests that they were predominantly from the Ulster region.[261]

Ulster, however, as Barbour makes clear, was not immune from Irish disloyalty. He writes of two Irish chiefs who, after paying homage to Edward, subsequently ambushed the Scots in a narrow pass in a place called Innermallan. (Failing to recognise the danger, Edward rides into a trap and is saved along with his men by the bravery of the earl of Moray).[262] The Irish chiefs are named as 'Makartane' and 'MakGullan';[263] Makartane's (MacCartan/MacArthain) territory was in South Down and MakGullan's (likely Mac Duilechain of Clanbrassil) County Down, though Duncan suggests MakGullan could refer to MacQuillan (Mac Uighilin) who possessed the Rout, North Antrim.[264] What is important to note is that the plotters came from Ulster (east), suggesting that not all the Irish were happy to see their Gaelic brethren.

In Book Fourteen, Barbour tells of an elaborately planned ruse involving the Leinster king O'Dempsy who, after swearing fealty to Edward, invites him to visit and feast with him.[265] O'Dempsy has the Scots camp near a great river (Bann) where 'with hungyr he thocht thaim to feblis' (enfeeble) and then to 'bring on thaim thar ennemys'.[266] The account concludes with a spectacular sea rescue by a pirate called Thomas Dun.[267] Barbour's insinuation that O'Dempsy's plan was in progress before his act of deference renders the Irish as characteristically disloyal and the act itself as meaningless. A. A. M. Duncan believes that Barbour views the natives as 'typically faithless Irish', yet notes that

> their behaviour was surely a response to an unexpected and profoundly objectionable demand. They would not consent to his becoming king, not to the precipitate choice of a new loyalty […] to some kings of Ulster it was also that, an unwelcome intimation that the English lordship was to be replaced by a Scottish kingdom and not by Irish freedom.[268]

[260] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 80-2.
[261] Frame, *Ireland and Britain, 1170-1450*, p.82.
[262] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 113-115.
[263] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 103-4.
[264] Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.524.
[265] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 332-3.
[266] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 349-350.
[267] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 14, 376; Thomas Dun was a Scottish privateer operating against English ships on the coasts of England, Wales and Ireland. Frame, *English Lordship in Ireland, 1318-1361*, p.134; McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces*, p.173.
[268] Duncan, 'The Scots Invasion of Ireland, 1315', p.110.

In Book Sixteen, during the Scots occupation of Carrickfergus Castle, Robert Bruce arrives in Ireland and initiates a second ceremony in which the Irish chiefs, but for one or two, again pay homage to Edward:[269]

> The kingis off Irchery
> Come to Schyr Edward halily
> And thar manredyn gan him ma   homage
> Bot giff thay it war ane to twa.[270]   except for one or two

The Irish chiefs then depart having 'undertuk in allkyn thing / For till obey to the bidding / Off Scyr Edward that thar king callit thay.'[271] Since evidence for a second ceremony is tentative at best it is worth reflecting on why Barbour thought it necessary to include it. The most obvious answer is that Edward's fragile authority is validated by Robert's presence and forewarns the Irish chiefs that future disloyalty would be an offence not solely against Edward but Robert himself. In keeping with the view of certain Irish annalists who present Edward as a puppet king, Barbour may repeat the ceremony, in Robert's presence, to actually undermine Edward. It is only at this moment, with Robert in attendance, that Barbour announces that the Scots are ready 'to conquer the land halyly' (altogether):

> For he had apon his party
> the Irschery and Ulsyster,
> and he was sa furth on his wer
> that he was passyt throu Irland
> Fra end till uthyr.[272]

Perhaps the most significant example of so-called Irish disloyalty occurs at Dundalk before Edward's final battle, when after dismissing the appeals of his Scottish knights, Edward opts to fight, at which point the Irish 'consaillyt him full tenderly / For till abid his men (wait for more men);[273] however, 'quhen thai saw he was sa thra / To fycht' the Irish told him 'that nane of us will stand to fycht.'[274] The Irish remove themselves from the battlefield and watch the drama unfold from a safe distance. Though inexplicit, Barbour's judgement on the Irish decision not to fight fits neatly into the poem's general view of them as untrustworthy.

According to Duncan, Barbour viewed the invasion 'as a great chivalrous adventure by Edward Bruce and the Scots, in which the Irish proved only their unreliability,' adding

---

[269] Current research casts doubt that a second gathering of Irish kings took place, but Duffy is less dismissive and suggests it may have occured at this time the 'Remonstrance' was written and sent by Domnall O'Neill to the pope. Duffy, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland: A Revised Itinerary and Chronology', p.38.
[270] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 305-8.
[271] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 313-17.
[272] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 16, 318-24.
[273] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 59-62.
[274] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 71-75.

that post-invasion 'the Irish were unanimous in presenting themselves as the hapless victims of a brutal Scottish invader'.[275] Both Barbour and Duncan's positions are predicated on an assumption that the Irish were, initially at least, willing accomplices, but who precisely were these willing accomplices? In the 'Remonstrance', Donal O'Neill claims to speak 'on behalf of the whole of Gaelic Ireland'.[276] Yet, for Lydon, its many omissions and its 'misrepresentation of facts' means that the 'Remonstrance' is insufficient

> evidence that Gaelic Ireland, for the most part, was willing to accept the sovereignty of Edward Bruce. Nowhere do the Gaelic sources suggest that anything more than a handful of chieftains were party to the invitation extended to Bruce. In fact, if the denunciations of Bruce by the annalists and other Irish writers represent in any way the true feelings of the Gaelic race, and not merely their disillusionment at his failure and their disgust at the destructive tactics he employed, then we can only suppose that most of Gaelic Ireland was in no way responsible for calling in Edward Bruce. The number of chieftains who actually fought against him is also indicative of the same thing.[277]

Donal O'Neill may have instigated the Scottish incursion into Ireland and backed Edward Bruce as king but there is little doubt that O'Neill, who at the time was subject to the authority of Richard Earl of Ulster, had his own agenda and was eager to extend his influence over other resistant chiefs.[278] There can be little doubt too that Barbour grossly over-simplifies and vilifies the actions of the Irish and we should therefore be cautious when assessing their conduct.

There *are* instances of Gaelic Irish rebellions against the English, driven respectively by the Bruces, Donal O'Neill and the Franciscans,[279] but there are also contemporary accounts of the sufferings endured by the native Irish during the invasion such as Seán mac Ruaidhrí MacCraith's (John Macrory Magrath) *Cathreim Thoirdhealbhaigh* (*Triumphs of Torlough*) (1369?), in which MacCraith describes the Scots' arrival in Ireland as an

> overwhelming wave, broken-topped, hoarsely rumbling, virulent in destructiveness, scorching terribly and giving off lively sparks; an earnest of enduring malice and ill-will, breaking down all embankment, all hills and every hoary rock. Or (if it like you better) a black cloud with vaporous-creeping offshoots and dark mist, hard to meet. (Whichever of the two you choose, at all events it was) made up of close-packed Scots and, as a thick-billowed deep-thundering flood, covered our Ireland's surface.[280]

Its lyricism notwithstanding, MacCraith's depiction may well capture actual conditions, and the Scots might have earned their later description as 'merciless ravagers' by the Irish

---

[275] Duncan, 'The Scots Invasion of Ireland, 1315', p.100.
[276] Lydon, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland: An Examination of Some Problems', pp.73-4.
[277] Lydon, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland: An Examination of Some Problems', p.74.
[278] Frame, *Colonial Ireland, 1169-1369*, p.115; Frame, 'The Bruces in Ireland, 1315-18', p.18.
[279] Penman, *Robert the Bruce*, p.173.
[280] Seán mac Ruaidhrí Mac Craith, *Cathre im Thoirdhealbhaigh*, p.83. CELT: Corpus of electronic Texts, http://www.ucc.ie/celt/online/T100062.html [accessed: 23/01/2014]

historian Thomas Leland (1814).[281] MacCraith's account, as Frame notes, underlines 'that not all the Irish supported Bruce'; Frame adds however that though some Irish fought against the Scots, 'many pursued their own "selfish" ends, and that most were disillusioned by the end of the invasion - partly because they condensed its effects and those of the famine into one and blamed Edward for both.'[282] The latter effect is evident in Leland's account of the invasion, clearly influenced by previous historiography, and almost certainly by Barbour's *Bruce*:

> Such was the event of this Scottish invasion; an enterprise rashly undertaken by an inspiring young prince, who for almost three years had pursued the wild scheme of his ambition, through danger and calamity, involving the nation, which he sought to govern, in greater distress than a distressed and afflicted nation had experienced for ages; and closing the bloody roll of those his madness had destroyed, by his own untimely end. Unhappily for Ireland, the calamities which this war had introduced were of such a kind as could not cease with their immediate cause.[283]

Like Finan, Bradshaw objects to Irish history's general indifference to violence and stresses how 'the countless wars, plagues, famines, and revolts […] were just as destructive for the common person as they were for the great history makers of the past.'[284] Bradshaw's complaint can be levelled at the majority of historiography since, as Finan notes, the common folk 'did not leave us commentaries that explain how they viewed the violence in their world'; this does not mean however 'that they simply accepted the violence as a given.'[285]

Citing the historian Ranajit Guha, Lehner proposes that historical writings often constitute 'an act of appropriation which excludes the rebel as the conscious subject of his own history and incorporates the latter as only a contingent element in another history with another subject.'[286] In this sense might the Irish be considered as excluded 'rebels'? If so their acts of 'disloyalty' appear not unlike the actions one would expect and associate with insurgents responding to an occupying force. Take for example the acts of treachery by Makartane and MakGullan (Ulster chiefs) and their ambush of the Scots at Innermallan. Barbour portrays the episode as a traitorous act but from the Irish viewpoint it reveals intent to sabotage the advance of an invading army. Additionally there is O'Dempsy's scheme to lure the Scots into a trap then starve, weaken and drown them, and the repeated

[281] Leland, *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II*, 1, p.267.
[282] Frame, 'The Bruces in Ireland, 1315-18', p.24.
[283] Thomas Leland, *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II*, 1 (Dublin: Brett Smith, 1814), p.275.
[284] Cited in Finan, 'Violence in thirteenth-century Ireland', p.87.
[285] Finan, 'Violence in thirteenth-century Ireland', p.96.
[286] Cited in Lehner, *Subaltern Ethics*, p.14.

Irish guerrilla-style attacks on Scottish reinforcements on their return to Carrickfergus. Barbour tells us that they were 'assailyeit with Irschery' several times on the way.[287]

The laundry woman

Peasants constitute the greatest proportion of people in Medieval Europe but its prevailing illiteracy means that scant details on their lives or thoughts survive. What is known about them comes indirectly from literature written generally by and in support of the ruling and social elite.[288] This section highlights such an example in Barbour's *Bruce*, when during the Irish invasion Robert Bruce encounters a member of the peasant class, a pregnant laundry woman.

The laundry woman is conspicuous among *The Bruce's* list of characters as she belongs to a social group for the most part excluded from the poem.[289] The scene however has been singled out on several occasions as characterising Robert at his chivalric best, most recently in *Bannockburns*, when Robert Crawford describes the woman's encounter with the Scottish king as a 'female-accented passage' that has 'the effect of a folktale, or an incident from a romance'.[290] Without denying such a reading it could also be said that Crawford's interpretation positions the laundry woman somewhat in the damsel in distress category; furthermore, as co-editor, Crawford previously included the passage (alongside extracts from Barbour's 'praise of freedom') in *The Penguin Book of Scottish Verse* (2001), and as is the case with *Bannockburns*, the Irish context for the encounter is unacknowledged.

Largely inattentive to the post-Bannockburn books, including the Irish invasion, the Scottish literary critic and editor George Eyre-Todd, like Crawford, finds 'value' in the 'unique story' of the 'king's courtesy to women'.[291] 'It is impossible', Eyre-Todd writes, 'to estimate the service to the civilization of his country silently effected by the praise of such gentle traits as that detailed in the passage beginning "The king has heard a woman cry."'[292] While empirically identifying the effect of Bruce's actions on the development of Scotland's humanity may be beyond us, we *can* to some extent locate the laundry woman in her historical and gendered context, and estimate the socio-political conditions that likely dictated her life experiences.

---

[287] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 18, 194.
[288] Shulamith Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1983; 2003), p.248.
[289] There is also a scene in Book Seven when the fugitive Bruce takes shelter in the cottage of a peasant woman (7.240-66).
[290] Crawford, *Bannockburns*, p.35.
[291] Eyre-Todd, *Early Scottish Poetry*, p.69.
[292] Eyre-Todd, *Early Scottish Poetry*, p.68.

Jane Whittle and Henrietta Leyser inform us that in the Middle Ages laundry work was the exclusive occupation of women to the extent that men avoided the activity all together and washing came to symbolise women.[293] Serving as a laundress however may in fact have afforded an opportunity for peasant women to earn money and achieve a degree of independence.[294] It is likely though that many women turned to prostitution to increase their income.[295] What then can we deduce about Barbour's laundry woman? how did she find herself ensconced within a military campaign? and what of her pregnancy?

It is not uncommon in history for women to be part of a military campaign. During the First Crusade there is overwhelming evidence that 'thousands' of women accompanied the campaign and according to one chronicler, Albert of Achen, there was prodigious sexual interaction between the men and women.[296] Conor Kostick contends that unmarried and young women in lowly professions were more likely to turn to prostitution but stresses that prostitution was far-reaching in its application extending from a financial exchange to general immodesty.[297] As for the motivation of women joining the crusade, Kostick suggests that they may have identified an opportunity to 'escape a sexually restrictive society?'[298] In spite of this, Kostick concludes that 'thousands of women who went on the crusade - to find a promised land, or to get away from the towns in which many of them had been abandoned - did so as participants, as pilgrims'.[299]

Barbour does not provide any details that might assist our understanding of the motivations of the laundry woman. Indeed we cannot be sure of her nationality. She may be Irish or an Anglo-Irish detainee, and if a Scot, she may even have elected to take part in the Bruce campaign. In 'The weaker vessel'?: the impact of warfare on women in seventeenth-century Ireland', Bernadette Whelan examines the participation of women during the Irish Confederate Wars (1641-1653) and the Williamite War in Ireland (1688-1691) and concludes that warfare provided women not only with the opportunity to fight, but independence and the ability to act on their political beliefs and possibly gain status as

---

[293] Jane Whittle, 'Rural Economies', in *The Oxford Handbook of Women and Gender in Medieval Europe*, eds. Judith M. Bennett and Ruth Mazo Karras (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp.311-327, p.320. Henrietta Leyser, *Medieval Women: A Social History of Women in England 450-1500* (London: Phoenix Press, 1995; 2003), pp.151, 152.

[294] Moreover, given that the washhouses were exclusively a female space and are said to have been a hotbed of gossip it stands to reason that within this delimited space the women attained some small measure of autonomy. Sandy Bardsley, *Women's Roles in the Middle Ages* (London: Greenwood Press, 2007), p.65.

[295] Bardsley, *Women's Roles in the Middle Ages*, p.141.

[296] Conor Kostick, 'Women and the First Crusade: prostitutes or pilgrims?' in *Studies on Medieval and Early Modern Women 4: Victims or Viragos?*, eds. Christine Meek and Catherine Lawless (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), p.57-58.

[297] Kostick, 'Women and the First Crusade', p.64.

[298] Kostick, 'Women and the First Crusade', p.58.

[299] Kostick, 'Women and the First Crusade', p.68.

landowners.[300] As a feudal peasant in the early fourteenth century however it is reasonable to suppose that the laundry woman was compelled by land and property rights to participate.

Barbour does not mention the woman's age but having taken her pregnancy to full term while travelling as part of a military convoy we can assume she is a young woman, but, as Kostick suggests, we need not presume that she is a prostitute. Then again, according to Whittle, in North Western Europe it was common for men and women to work as servants before marriage.[301] Taking this into account we can postulate that she is not betrothed, and so we have a young pregnant servant woman ensconced, probably against her wishes, within a column of battle hardened soldiers. One can only imagine what manner of romantic and chivalric encounters would be the commonplace experience of such laundry women.

Reflecting on the Scottish king's encounter with the laundry woman, Crawford writes that it 'speaks volumes for Bruce as a king that he is ready to attend to the needs of the humblest of his followers, simply because he "has hard [heard] a woman cry".[302] Crawford's interpretation echoes that of J. T. Gilbert who writes in his *History of the Viceroys of Ireland* that 'the cruelties ascribed by some writers to the Scots, are at variance with Robert Bruce's well-known humanity.' [303] Gilbert also cites the laundry women as support and includes the same passage as Crawford:

> This wes a full gret curtasy
> That swilk a king and sa mychty
> Gert his men dwell on this maner
> Bot for a pouer lauender [304]

The laundry woman is undoubtedly employed to serve Barbour's mythologising and to buttress Bruce's chivalric legacy. Nonetheless, Crawford writes that 'without downplaying the carnage, Barbour humanises Bruce even as he renders him heroic'.[305] Heroism here however derives from a member of the aristocracy condescending to care about a 'pouer lauender'. While it is likely that Barbour's contemporary and exclusive readership would have extoled Bruce for his moment of mercy, it is not obligatory to do so now. Such flattering attention to Robert Bruce, both textual and critical, completely relegates the laundry woman to a mere literary device and reaffirms her role as 'a contingent element in

---

[300] Bernadette Whelan, 'The weaker vessel'?: the impact of warfare on women in seventeenth-century Ireland', in *Victims or Viragos? Studies on Medieval and Early Modern Women 4.* eds. Christine Meek and Catherine Lawless (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), pp.120-142, p.141.
[301] Whittle, 'Rural Economies', p.320.
[302] Crawford, *Bannockburns*, p.35.
[303] Gilbert, *History of the Viceroys of Ireland*, p.140.
[304] Barbour, *The Bruce*, Duncan, 16, 293-6, p.595.
[305] Crawford, *Bannockburns*, p.34.

another history with another subject.'[306] She exists solely in order to scrub Bruce's transgressions as much as his clothes, and leave the heroic king of Scotland looking whiter than white.

---

[306] Lehner, *Subaltern Ethics*, p.14.

Part two: Cultural Memories of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, 1375-1826

Introduction

Robert Crawford's *Bannockburns* (2014) is, to all intents and purposes, a book concerned with the cultural memory of Bannockburn, and while its introduction raises issues related to cultural memory, the study does not employ its theories to explain why or how, as Crawford accurately states, the eponymous battle 'reverberates throughout seven succeeding centuries of imaginative writing.'[1] Nevertheless, Crawford's method of tracking the numerous allusions to Bannockburn across the centuries and cultures provides a useful model for this chapter which employs a similar method but by way of a cultural memory with a much smaller footprint.

Part two explores the cultural memory of the Bruce invasion in three literary works from the Medieval, Early Modern and Romantic periods. The first, and by far the most significant memorialisation of the invasion is Barbour's *Bruce* (1375), which is examined for the first time from its contemporary perspective of *ars memoriae* (art of memory), as well as present-day cultural memory theories. Topics include canonisation, memory and narration, communicative and cultural memory, intertexuality, reception, and forgetting. The *Bruce* is evaluated as a site of memory and Barbour's methods and understanding of memory are compared through an analysis of Icelandic literature of the same period. Such an enquiry inevitably impacts on the constituent parts of the poem and may increase our understanding of Barbour's depiction of the invasion and its subsequent reception, as well as Barbour's use of *ars memoriae* more generally.

The second example comes from Anglo-Irish colonial literature of the late sixteenth century. The chief focus is Edmund Spenser's *A View of the State of Ireland* (1596; 1633), in which Spenser recalls the fourteenth-century episode in order to explore and inform contemporary Anglo-Irish politics. This analysis argues however that Spenser's interplay between the periods reveals a tripartite struggle between Ireland, England and Scotland for dominance of Ulster within the larger context of an emerging British State. The third literary work is William Hamilton Drummond's *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland*, a romantic Irish version of the Bruces campaign in which the bards and the native Irish combine to overthrow the Scots. *Bruce's Invasion* is much more than an Irish retelling of the 1315 invasion. Drummond, it will be argued, approaches the Irish invasion as a site of memory and brings an excluded experience to the surface, a counter-memory that responds to both

---

[1] Crawford, *Bannockburns*, p.2.

the source material and contemporary Irish politics. The analysis of *Bruce's Invasion* is in two parts: the first explores the possibility that Drummond's poem alludes to the existing cultural relationship between Ireland and Scotland, in respect of the debate surrounding Macpherson's publication of his Ossian fragments. The second part argues that Drummond utilises the Scots' invasion in order to comment on Ireland's existing inequitable relationship with England and Britain more broadly.

Though each of the three poets examined have specific reasons and objectives for their recollection of the 1315-1318 campaign, there are several other notable parallels, beside an interest in the invasion. In each work the writer indulges in interplay between the past and present on behalf of and to the advantage of the present; each reflects on the art of memory; and each acknowledges the 'value of narrativity in the representation of reality',[2] and its centrality to what is remembered and what is forgotten. The following background section outlines the history of *ars memoriae* and current cultural memory theories, while the concluding section touches upon present-day memories of the invasion.

The Art of Memory

It is recognised that the principles of imagination and originality so valued in our own time were less revered during the Middle Ages, a period whose focus and 'awe' was largely reserved for memory and for individuals whose superior memorising skills rendered them exceptional.[3] According to Mary Carruthers 'medieval culture was fundamentally *memoria* [memory], to the same profound degree that modern culture in the west is documentary.'[4] In education, memory was a fundamental component of the language arts (alongside grammar and logic) and considered one of the five types of ancient and medieval rhetoric, and by some as the 'noblest'.[5] Frances Yates traces the origins of the art of memory to the rhetorical techniques employed by orators to develop their memory and enable them to recite long speeches with 'unfailing accuracy', a practice that subsequently spread across Europe and into 'comparatively modern times'.[6] In a world of limited literacy and books, however, memory offers a vital 'space' for the retention and transmission of historical and

---

[2] Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (London: The John Hopkins Press Ltd., 1987), p.198.
[3] Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p.1.
[4] Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p.9.
[5] Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, pp.8, 11.
[6] Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: The Bodley Head, (2014; 1966), p.18. Students trained in memory were expected to recite a text forwards, backwards and be proficient enough to move around the text at will and without error. Furthermore, it was believed that the possession of such skills and the consequent absorption of knowledge and literature would inevitably and positively modify an individual's 'character, judgment, citizenship, and piety.' Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p.11.

artistic works, yet, according to Carruthers, book technology 'did not profoundly disturb the essential value of memory training until many centuries had past'.[7] The fact that memory retains its importance after the development of print culture underlines its intrinsic historical and cultural value.

The art of memory, broadly speaking, 'seeks to memorize through a technique of impressing "places" and "images" on memory.'[8] It was conceived or at least established in Greece before being transplanted to Rome and from there into wider Europe.[9] The availability of Aristotle's work in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had a dramatic impact on memory, the form and content of medieval education, and influenced historiography up to the fifteenth-century.[10] In *De Anima*, Aristotle (384-322 BC) suggests that memory is a product of all sensory information that inscribes itself on a corporeal site, and describes individual memory as a 'phantasm' or 'appearance'.[11] Aristotle's *De Anima* and *De Memoria et Reminisentia* triggered a shift from viewing memory merely as a valuable practice for retaining knowledge and enhancing oration, to the recognition that the image itself could be *made* memorable. A connection was formed 'between the act of memorisation and the writing of history', and by the application of more 'analytical' methods than those customarily employed in rhetoric; memory, in effect, was pushed beyond the 'specifics of circumstance, of time, place and person'. [12] Memory was no longer what Kempshall calls a 'reiterative store of experience': it was dynamic, it was malleable, and it was an 'ethical activity'.[13]

The most influential work for the development of memory from classical times to Renaissance Europe is the unidentified (though previously attributed to Cicero) *Ad. C. Herennium libri*, which broadly sets out the five parts of rhetoric: *Inventio*, *Dispositio*, *Elocutio*, *Memoria*, and *Pronuntiato*; describes memory as a 'treasure-house' and the 'guardian of all the parts of rhetoric', and proposes two types of memory, natural and

---

[7] Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p.9.

[8] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.11.

[9] It is reputed to have begun with the poet Simonides of Ceos (557-467 BCE) who while attending a banquet was somewhat preternaturally called away moments before the roof fell in on the guests seated at the table. The bodies were unidentifiable but by remembering the order in which the guests had sat, Simonides, in the first example of the relationship between remembrance of the dead and memory, was able to identify each of the crushed guests. Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.17; Aleida Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999; 2013), p.25. The experience is said to have inspired the poet to develop the principles of the art of memory based on the understanding 'that orderly arrangement is essential for good memory.' Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.17.

[10] Matthew Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), p.456.

[11] Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, p.19. Aristotle employed the metaphor of a signet ring imprinted in wax to describe the process. Cicero, Quintilian and Augustine later reproduced this. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, pp.19, 25.

[12] Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp.456, 457.

[13] Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, pp.457.

artificial:[14] natural memories are those rising from routine thought while artificial memory is formed and exercised through training and is like a form of 'inner writing'.[15] *Ad. Herennium*'s author finds inspiration in nature, which he claims is unmoved by the 'common ordinary event' but stimulated by a 'new or striking occurrence'.[16] To go beyond the 'ordinary', the author argues, and in order to construct a more 'striking form' to ensure adherence in memory, it is necessary to 'disfigure' the image (*imagines agentes*).[17]

In *De Oratore*, Cicero (106-43 BC) casts memory as one of the five parts of rhetoric, but, according to Yates, it is Cicero's earlier *De Inventione* that had the greater impact on the development of artificial memory in the Middle Ages, thanks in part to its integration with the virtue of Prudence that along with Justice, Fortitude and Temperance make up the Four Cardinal Virtues.[18] Composed over a century later, Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* is indifferent to the concept of artificial memory and ignores the *imagines agentes*.[19] Quintilian (35-100 AD) advocates intensive learning strategies such as reading aloud in order to improve one's memory and oratory skills; he seeks to clarify memory from a mnemotechnical perspective and offers instruction on how to navigate memory through cognitive architectural structures such as houses, buildings and streets.[20] Like Quintilian, Augustine (354-430 AD) favours the mnemotechnic tradition and architectural system, describing memory in Book 10 of his *Confessions* as a 'great field or a spacious palace, a storehouse for countless images of all kinds'.[21] Augustine privileged memory further by including it as one of the three powers of the soul, the others being Understanding and Will.[22]

Cicero and Quintilian were not commonly available and thus not fully integrated into the memory tradition until the Renaissance; however, *De Oratore* (probably in partial form) was known to numerous medieval scholars. The fundamental authority and greatest influence on the art of memory in the medieval period, and its two luminaries Albertus Magnus (1193-1280) and Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), was the *Ad. Herennium*.[23] Both Magnus and Aquinas identify memory as not only of immeasurable practical use but of

---

[14] *Ad. C. Herennium libri*, III, xvi, Harry Caplan, trans. (London: William Heinemann LTD, 1954), p.205; Yates, *The Art of Memory*, pp.20, 22.
[15] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, pp.20, 22.
[16] *Ad. C. Herennium*, III, xxii, p.219.
[17] *Ad. C. Herennium*, III, xxii, p.221.
[18] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.35.
[19] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.38.
[20] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, pp.38-40.
[21] Dave Tell, 'Beyond Mnemotechnics: Confession and Memory in Augustine', *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 39, 3 (2006), pp.233-253, p.1; Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.60.
[22] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.62.
[23] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.68.

'religious and ethical importance'.[24] This revision strongly influenced scholasticism into the fourteenth century, a period that Yates describes as the 'age of memory', a phase that required the creation of 'new imagery' for the memorising of 'new knowledge.'[25]

Cultural Memory and current theories

In the twentieth century, Maurice Halbwachs's concept of collective memory (*memoire collective*) (1925) stressed the socio-cultural roots of both personal and collective memory and paved the way for what has ultimately become known as 'cultural memory'.[26] Influenced by Sigmund Freud, Halbwachs nonetheless challenges Freud's contention that memory 'is a resource of the individual psyche' and argues that when seeking origins for memory one should consult the 'conscious and readily identifiable one of social understanding'.[27] For Freud, memory is essentially hidden but ultimately recoverable; in contrast Halbwachs saw memory as an active force, continually reconstituting itself and consequently weakening connections with the initial cause of the memory to the extent that it becomes unrecoverable.[28]

Halbwachs illuminates the potential social pressures at work in this process and warns of the potential consequences of frequent re-modification, namely the degradation and ultimate disappearance of the original source. A further distinction between Freud and Halbwachs is how memory is performed: Freud's focus on repetition recalls Quintilian's intensive learning techniques, while Halbwachs focuses on recollection: a process occurring at the moment; in addition, the memories produced are 'configurations of the power in which they were formulated.'[29] In short, the individual is influenced by 'social forces' and 'social groups' which in turn are dependent on and maintained by 'social frameworks'.[30]

By the end of the 1980s collective memory had acquired academic prominence and has since become a key term in contemporary cultural studies.[31] Current theorists such as Jan and Aleida Assman, Astrid Erll, Ann Rigney and Patrick Hutton have advanced the

---

[24] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.89.
[25] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, pp.94, 95.
[26] Astrid Erll, 'Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction', in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, eds. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), p.3.
[27] Patrick Hutton, 'Collective Memory and Collective Mentalities: The Halbwachs-Aries Connection', *Historical Reflections / Reflexions Historiques*, 15, 2 (1988), pp.311-322, pp.313, 314.
[28] Patrick H. Hutton, 'Sigmund Freud and Maurice Halbwachs: The Problem of Memory in Historical Psychology', *The History Teacher*, 27, 2 (1994), pp. 145-158, 148, 149.
[29] Hutton, 'Freud and Maurice Halbwachs', p.148.
[30] Hutton, 'Freud and Maurice Halbwachs, p.149.
[31] Anne Rigney, 'The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts between Monumentality and Morphing', in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, p.345.

foundational work by Halbwachs and Pierre Nora. Assman for example splits Halbwachs collective memory model into 'communicative memory' (relating to everyday interaction and contemporary historical experience) and 'cultural memory' (encompassing 'media, practices, and structures as diverse as myth, monument, historiography, ritual, conversational remembering, configurations of cultural knowledge, and neuronal networks'),[32] which Assman describes as 'exteriorized, objectified and stored away in symbolic forms that […] are stable and situation-transcendent […] [and] may be transferred from one situation to another and transmitted from one generation to another'.[33] Unlike communicative memory, cultural memory exists in 'disembodied form' and is contingent on symbolisation which must be preserved and regularly resurrected to prevent its decline and eventual disappearance.[34]

Astrid Erll divides cultural memory into two levels, the first of which is literal (that is to say biological), shaped by context (dependent on others), and relates to oral history, social psychology and the neurosciences.[35] The second level concerns 'the symbolic order' and includes a diverse range of practices and rituals that permit people to connect with others who share similar values, beliefs, and identity, which are then reaffirmed by the interaction.[36] This study refers to both classical and current theories throughout.

The Bruce: site of memory

The field of literature is a vast and precious repository of cultural memories and just as prehistoric sites attract archaeologists, literature's capacity for capturing, transmitting, maintaining and reconfiguring events from the past exerts a strong pull on cultural memory researchers. Owing to its 'aesthetic dimension' literature succeeds where other forms of memory do not. It compels the reader/listener to 'suspend their belief'; in addition, it stockpiles socio-historical and cultural material.[37] The original archivists or 'specialised carriers' of cultural memory were the poets and bards of the oral tradition.[38]

---

[32] Erll, 'Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction', p.1.
[33] Astrid Erll, *Memory in Culture*, trans. Sara, B. Young (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), p.28; Jan Assman, 'Communicative and Cultural Memory', in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, p.111.
[34] Assman, 'Communicative and Cultural Memory', p.111.
[35] Erll, 'Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction', p.5.
[36] Erll, 'Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction', p.5.
[37] Rigney, 'The Dynamics of Remembrance', p.347.
[38] Assman, 'Communicative and Cultural Memory', p.114.

Canonisation and cultural memory

Perhaps the most important phase of literary memory is the process of canonisation. The canon, Erll writes, is the base upon which the 'memory of literature is upheld in societies'.[39] Once viewed as a required reading list the western canon is now understood in terms of 'the relation of an individual reader and writer to what has been preserved out of what had been written', and has come to be seen as 'identical with the literary Art of Memory'.[40] The functions of the canon, as defined by cultural memory theorists, include 'the creation of collective identities, the legitimization of societal and political relationships as well as the upholding or undermining of value systems.'[41]

In *The Western Canon*, Harold Bloom laments the state of contemporary literary criticism and its tendency to view canonisation as an ideological act rather than a selection process based on artistic criteria; however, given that the process of selecting the literary canon, even by artistic merit, entails the survival of some texts and the sidelining of others, the potential for ideological bias appears inevitable.[42] As Erll and Nunning remark, in spite of the significance of the canon to 'memory-forming processes' the process of selection and exclusion is rarely made explicit.[43] Bloom concedes that many western canonical writers from Homer and his glorification of military violence to Edmund Spenser's promoting of genocide in Ireland 'are subversive of all values, both ours and their own'.[44]

Such is the authority of the canon that a book, play or poem can become a *lieu de memoire* (a 'site of memory'),[45] a concept introduced by Pierre Nora in his three volume study on French memory and identity that investigates 'sites' ('remains' or 'traces') considered to be 'invested with enduring and emotive symbolic significance', which includes books, monuments, museums, archives, cemeteries, festivals, anniversaries, and treaties.[46] Literary sites of memory often provide a fixed point of reference for a nation or community and may come to be seen as a 'textual monument', which not being set in stone

---

[39] Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning, 'Where Literature and Memory Meet: Towards a Systematic Approach to the Concepts of Memory in Literary Studies', in *Literature, Literary History, and Cultural Memory*, ed. Herbert Grabes (Tubingen: Narr, 2005), pp.265-98, p.278.
[40] Harold Bloom, *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (London: Papermac, 1995), p.17.
[41] Erll, and Nunning, 'Where Literature and Memory Meet', p.278.
[42] Erll, Nunning, 'Where Literature and Memory Meet', pp.277, 278.
[43] Erll, Nunning, 'Where Literature and Memory Meet', p.278.
[44] Bloom, *The Western Canon*, pp.22, 29.
[45] Rigney, 'The Dynamics of Remembrance', pp.349, 347. An obvious but nonetheless important distinction between fixed monuments (statues, buildings etc.) and literary texts is that the latter possess a spatial, chronological and textual flexibility that enables them to be reprinted (reformed) and rewritten innumerable times; they can be rolled up, folded and can also be restructured into other art forms, for example cinema and stage. This is what Rigney calls the 'combination of monumentality and morphing', the 'persistence and malleability' of the text. Rigney, 'The Dynamics of Remembrance', p.349.
[46] Nancy Wood, 'Memory's Remains: Les lieux de mémoire', *History and Memory*, 6, 1 (1994), pp. 123-149, p.123, 124.

is open to continual reinterpretation amidst a changing social context.[47] Barbour's *Bruce* is a rare example of a textual monument that not only describes but is in part responsible for the development of another site of memory: 'Bannockburn'. Barbour's account of the famous battle implies that it was already an important geographical site prior to *The Bruce* and would have undoubtedly elevated the status of the poem and the poet, Barbour, who invests his work with an incorporeal value in addition to patriotic, if not nationalist, sentiment.

Comparisons of memory in medieval Icelandic literature and Barbour's Bruce

Pernille Hermann's research (2009) on medieval Icelandic literature and its conceptual and practical approaches to memory helps to reveal some of the techniques employed by Barbour in *The Bruce*. Herman focuses on one of the great writers of Icelandic and Medieval Europe, Snorri Sturlluson (1179-1241), whose most celebrated works include a history of Norwegian kings, the *Heimskringla* (1230), and the *Prose Edda* (1220-1225).[48] Snorri died ninety years before Barbour's birth (1330s-1395) and composed the *Edda* and *Heimskringla* almost one-hundred and fifty years before *The Bruce*, but, since there is manuscript evidence that the *Edda* was known during the late Middle Ages the possibility exists that Barbour was aware of Snorri's works, particularly the section entitled 'Skaldskaparmal'.[49] Before a brief comparison between the literature and lives of Snorri and Barbour it is helpful to provide a historic and cultural framework between Iceland and Scotland (and Ireland) to underpin my assertions, and indeed for the benefit of further research within this particular lacuna.

Recent research by Kristján Ahronson strongly suggests that Iceland was settled by Christian Gaelic pioneers from Scotland and Ireland during the early ninth century, before the Vikings arrived. Archaeological evidence comes from the presence of carved crosses within two-hundred man-made caves in Southern Iceland that are stylistically comparable to Medieval monastic sculpture from the west coast of Scotland and Ireland.[50] Support for

---

[47] Rigney, 'The Dynamics of Remembrance', p.349: Ann Rigney's research on the historical novel is at the forefront of literary cultural memory studies and Rigney stresses that much remains to be done on the relationship between 'aesthetic power, and cultural longevity'. Rigney, 'The Dynamics of Remembrance', p.347.

[48] The *Prose Edda* is described by Marlene Ciklamini as 'a poetical handbook and repository of myths and heroic tales'. Marlene Ciklamini, *Snorri Sturluson* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1978), p.15. The *Edda* and *Heimskeringla* were written roughly a century after the Norse stories was first written down. Ciklamini, *Snorri Sturluson*, p.35.

[49] Ross, *Skaldskaparmal*, p.11.

[50] Kristján Ahronson, *Into the Ocean: Vikings, Irish, and Environmental Change in Iceland and the North* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015), pp.76, 129. 'Move over Vikings, it was the Scots and Irish who colonised Iceland', *Sunday Herald*, May 24 2015, p.25. In Reykjavik, the interest in Iceland's Celtic inheritance seems to have inspired the Scottish and Irish theme pub 'The Celtic Cross'. Ahronson, *Into the*

a north-west and Scoto-Icelandic relationship is also evident in the Icelandic Sagas (Family Sagas), prose histories composed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries about the early Icelandic settlers in the late-ninth to the eleventh century. The *Laxdæla saga* (the *Laxdale Saga*) (1230-1260?) for example recounts the inhabitants of the Breiðafjörður area of Iceland (890-1100),[51] but fascinatingly begins with a journey to Scotland by Ketill Flatnose, who is well received, offered a position of status and opts to settle with his family.[52] Ketill's daughter, Unn (Unnr), dubbed 'the deep-minded', is the principal character of the early books who following the death of her father and her son Thorstein[53] (Thorstein, we are told, warred with the Scots and after acquiring half of Scotland in the subsequent negotiation was murdered in Caithness)[54] leads a settlement party to Iceland.[55] On her journey Unn pauses in the Orkneys where she marries off a family member, the origin of the Orkney earls;[56] from there onto the Faroe Islands,[57] and then to Iceland where Unn divides the land among the noble men who accompanied her.[58] At the end of chapter seven Unn dies and is laid with her treasure within a burial mound.[59]

Said to have landed in 892, Unn is among the first settlers of Iceland and an early example of Scottish colonisation. Moreover, archaeological remains of the first settlers show that while the men originated from Scandinavia, the women, who make up 60% of the remains found, are from the British Isles, thus offering historical support to the *Laxdale Saga* and demonstrating a strong north-west link.[60] Scotland and Iceland are 700 miles apart and at the time of the *Laxdale Saga* both were staging-posts in a maritime territory stretching from Norway across the north Atlantic.[61] This connection continued into the Viking Age via the Old Norse language, spoken in the Outer Hebrides, the Western Isles of

---

Ocean, p.149. Additionally, Ahronson (2015) explains that place names such as *pap-* derive from Old Norse and are 'found across a northern region incorporating Scottish Islands, the Faroe Islands, and Iceland', and are indicative of early settlements of Christian Gaels. Ahronson, *Into the Ocean*, pp.58-9. During this period, Ahronson describes a contact 'zone stretching from Scotland to Iceland'. Ahronson, *Into the Ocean*, p.203.

[51] *Laxdæla Saga*, ed. Einar Ól. Sveinsson, Íslenzk fornrit 5 (Reykjavick: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag, 1934), p.25.

[52] *Laxdæla Saga*, trans. Muriel A. C. Press (London: J.M. Dent, 1899), Chapter 4: 'Ketill goes to Scotland, A.D. 890'.

[53] *Laxdæla Saga*, Chapter 1: 'Of Ketill Flatnose and his Descendants, 9th Century A.D'. Though the author of the *Laxdæla Saga* is unknown the text is seen as 'an unusually feminine saga' and was perhaps composed by a woman. Ármann Jakobsson, '*Laxdæla* Dreaming: A Saga Heroine Invents Her Own Life', *Leeds Studies in English*, 39 (2008), pp.33-51, p.43.

[54] *Laxdæla Saga*, chap. 4.

[55] The saga tells us 'that scarce may an example be found that any one, a woman only, has ever got out of such a state of war with so much wealth and so great a following. From this it may be seen how peerless among women she was'. *Laxdæla Saga*, chap. 4.

[56] *Laxdæla Saga*, chap. 4.

[57] Cross-marked stones found in the Faroe Islands have been linked to Gaelic Christian sculptural traditions. Ahronson, *Into the Ocean*, p.160.

[58] *Laxdæla Saga*, Chapter 5: 'Unn goes to Iceland, A.D. 895'; Chapter 6: 'Unn divides her land'.

[59] *Laxdæla Saga*, Chapter 7: 'Of the wedding of Olaf 'Feilan, A.D. 920'.

[60] *The Viking Sagas* (BBC Four, 2014).

[61] *The Viking Sagas*.

Scotland and the Isle of Man, up until the thirteenth century and prior to the late medieval dominance of both the Gaelic language and the Scottish king in the Hebrides and the Isle of Man (1468-9).[62] The Norse language was part of the wider political and cultural world that Medieval Scotland and Ireland inhabited.[63] Robert Bruce was part of this world and is said to have concealed himself in Orkney around the same time as he hid from the English on Rathlin. Moreover, Barbour relates how towards the end of his life Bruce withdrew to Cardross in the north-west of Scotland,[64] where he built a manor house (1326) and where he died in June 1329.[65]

Snorri and Barbour

As with Unn and Euphemia, there are several interesting similarities between Snorri and Barbour. The former was profoundly involved in Icelandic politics and owing to his support for the Scandinavian Church rose in power and wealth,[66] while the latter rose to the position of Archdeacon of Aberdeen and held a number of public positions. Snorri gained courtly prominence and kingly favour by composing praise-poems for Norwegian kings.[67] Ciklamini contends that the *Edda* was written as an eulogy to Jarl Skuli and the child king Hakon Hakonarson,[68] from whom Snorri received the title of Skutilsveinn, 'page at the

---

[62] Ahronson, *Into the Ocean*, p.61.
[63] Ireland is also mentioned. A principal character in the sagas is Unn's great-grandson whose son Olaf (the Peacock) travels to Ireland to find his grandfather but maroons his ship in an unfavourable region where the locals claim his property, but Olaf, who can speak Irish, fends them off. *Laxdæla Saga*, Chapter 21.
[64] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 20, 151.
[65] Penman, *Robert The Bruce*, pp.260, 302. Cardross was then a parish that stretched to Dumbarton where there is now a council estate called Brucehill. As a final point, in the sixteenth century, Robert Stewart, the illegitimate son of James V of Scotland and his mistress Euphemia Elphinstone (1509-1542/1547?), became the 1st Earl of Orkney and Lord of Shetland, while Euphemia later married John Bruce of Cultmalindie, a descendant of Robert the Bruce. Their son, Laurence Bruce, was later appointed Sherriff of the Shetland Isles by his half-brother Robert.[65] *Shetland Documents 1195*-1579, eds. John H. Ballantyne, and Brian Smith, *Shetland Islands Council* and *The Shetland Times Ltd*., Lerwick, 1999. According to legend and not unlike Unn, many Shetlanders are descendants of Euphemia. Joseph Robertson, *Inventaires de la Royne d'Ecosse* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1863), n.38; Euphemia Elphinstone, *Undiscovered Scotland*, http://www.undiscoveredscotland.co.uk/usbiography/e/euphemiaelphinstone.html [accessed 13/07/2015]. The SNP and supporters of Scottish independence have looked to the Nordic countries as a model for Scotland. David McCrone and Michael Keating, 'Social Democracy and Scotland', in *Scottish social democracy: progressive ideas for public policy*, ed. Michael Keating (Brussels: Peter Lang, 2007), p.17. Nordic conferences have included delegates from Scotland and in the run up to the Scottish referendum the Icelandic Prime Minister is reported as having remarked that if the vote was 'yes', Scotland would be allowed to join as a member of the Nordic council. Michael Gray, 'Icelandic Prime Minister ready to welcome an independent Scotland, *National Collective*, June 10, 2013: http://nationalcollective.com/2013/06/10/exclusive-icelandic-prime-minister-ready-to-welcome-an-independent-scotland [accessed 23/03/2015]. Michael Gray, 'Scottish EU membership straightforward and in Denmark's interest's', *National Collective*, June 10, 2013: http://nationalcollective.com/2013/07/10/exclusive-scottish-eu-membership-straightforward-and-in-denmarks-interest/ [accessed 23/03/2015]
[66] Ciklamini, *Snorri Sturluson*, pp.26-27.
[67] Ross, *Skaldskaparmal*, p.9; Ciklamini, *Snorri Sturluson*, pp.26-27.
[68] Ciklamini, *Snorri Sturluson*, p.43.

royal table'.[69] Barbour began writing *The Bruce* after the ascension of Robert II (1371) (the son of Robert Bruce's daughter), and on behalf of his monarch and patron extols that king's heroic ancestor to reinforce his descendant's right to the Scottish throne. According to one critic, Snorri's *Heimskingla* shows the author's sensitivity to the politics of the period and his belief that his country's independence was 'imperilled' by Norwegian expansion.[70] Similarly, the domestic crisis and monarchic instability in Scotland between 1340 and 1371, combined with the renewed threat from England, obliged Barbour to revisit a period when Scotland's autonomy was previously threatened by English expansion but defeated under the banner of 'the Bruce'.

The Edda and the Bruce

Hermann notes in Icelandic literature the presence of two prevailing concepts: first, memory as a 'storehouse' for 'authentic' and 'original' past experiences that due to their 'static' nature may potentially be forgotten; and second, the concept of cultural memory: a focus on the 'representational dimension and the plasticity of memories', stemming from 'a dynamic interplay between past and present', that are 'continually reconstructed and cultivated according to the needs of the present.'[71] The Icelandic Sagas essentially 'store' the histories of the first settlers, a memorial purpose encapsulated somewhat in Unn's nickname: 'deep minded'. The sagas also represent an astonishing flowering of historiography that not only bolstered the budding Icelandic identity but also launched a literary culture. Written at least sixty years after the events described, Barbour's *Bruce* is similarly engaged in reconstructing the past for present needs, including bolstering the beleaguered monarchy and reinvigorating national enthusiasm. It also takes pride of place within Scotland's blooming literary scene in the late-fourteenth century.

Icelandic literature frequently reflects on writing as a guarantor of memory and as Hermann notes, typically does so in prologues.[72] The *Edda's* Prologue is today deemed essential to understanding the overall structure and meaning of the work which deals broadly with 'mythography and poetics'.[73] In the Prologue, language is seen as 'a mnemonic device' and deemed essential to recording 'perceptions about the cosmos and its divine controller'.[74] Snorri writes that such was the belief that God 'ruled' the earth, sky,

---

[69] Ciklamini, *Snorri Sturluson*, p.27.
[70] Ciklamini, *Snorri Sturluson*, p.65.
[71] Pernille Hermann, 'Concepts of Memory and Approaches to the Past in Medieval Icelandic Literature', *Scandinavian Studies*, 81, 3 (2009), pp.287-308, pp.287-88.
[72] Hermann, 'Concepts of Memory', p.292.
[73] Ross, *Skaldskaparmal*, pp.12, 10. The *Edda* consists of broadly four sections: the 'Prologue', 'Gylfaginning', 'Skaldskaparmal', and 'Hattatel'.
[74] Ross, *Skaldskaparmal*, p.15.

stars, winds and sea that it was vital 'not only to tell of this fittingly, but also that they might fasten it in memory, they gave names out of their own minds to all things'.[75] Although *The Bruce* foregoes a prologue, a case could be made that Book One performs a similar function in the terms proposed above by Hermann. At the start of Book One the narrator ruminates on the facility of writing to safeguard 'communicative' ('living') and cultural memories:

> Storys to rede ar delatibill,
> Suppose that thai be nocht bot fabill;
> Than suld storys that suthfast wer,
> And thai war said on gud maner,
> Have doubill pleasance in heryng,
> The first pleasance is the carpyng,
> And the tothir the suthfastnes,
> That schawys the thing rycht as it wes;[76]

Stories, we are told, are enjoyable to read despite being fables (untrue); yet, true stories 'said on gud maner' (presumably narrativised) are doubly enjoyable to hear, and will also, as the poet goes on to suggest, make the story more memorable. Skills' permitting the poet intends to write a 'suthfast story':

> That it lest ay furth in memory,
> Swa that na tyme of lenth it let,
> Na ger it haly be forget.

(That it will be remembered and time will not cause it to be altogether forgotten). What the poet describes is the process - as instructed in *Ad. Herennium*, and observed by Hermann in Icelandic literature - of making the 'ordinary' remarkable by reshaping the image (memory).[77] History ('truth') is narrativised so as to increase memorability and durability and Barbour clearly grasps the methods and principles of *ars memoriae* and its historic-cultural significance for the past, present and posterity.[78]

In his role as historian (and there is no doubt that *The Bruce* is part historiography), Barbour, like many influential Greek and Roman historians,[79] was committed to and

---

[75] Snorri Sturluson, *The Prose Edda*, trans. Arthur Gilcrest Brodeur (New York: The American Scandinavian Foundation, 1916), Prologue, 2, p.5.

[76] John Barbour, *The Bruce*, 1, 1-8.

[77] From a rhetorical or theoretical perspective Ross suggests that Snorri may have been aware of the rhetorical handbook *Ad Herennium*, though she adds that connecting terminology are not present. Ross, *Skaldskaparmal*, p.28. The first critic to link Snorri and the classical rhetoricians was Halldor Halldorsson (1975) who saw parallels between the terminology in Skaldskaparmal and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* and regarded Snorri's use of the term fornafn as similar to pronominatio. A possibility Ross calls 'dubious' due to the fact, as Halldorsson admits, that *Institutio Oratoria* was unlikely known in Iceland at this time Ross, *Skaldskaparmal*, pppp.61, 62, 29, 77.

[78] The accounts and anecdotes associated with Robert Bruce, including his invasion of Ireland, were given literary expression first by Barbour, although *The Bruce* remained unprinted until 1570. Adam Fox and Daniel Woolf, *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), p.27.

[79] Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p.456.

reinforced the authority of the sovereign and the paradigm of sovereignty. The method of history practised by Roman and Middle Age societies is described by Foucault as 'binding and dazzling, subjugating, subjugating by imposing obligations and intensifying the luster of force'.[80] As Roman history was written by Romans for the glory of Rome, Barbour asserts a Scottish history, written in veneration and for the benefit of Scotland's sovereignty. The bridge, or rather viaduct, between Roman and Medieval historical discourse, and the decisive break with the practices of antiquity during the sixteenth century is alluded to when examining the memory of the Bruce invasion in Spenser's *A View of the State of Ireland*.

Memory and narration

Barbour's opening discussion on memory reveals a complementary rapport between historicity and narrative. Van Heijnsbergen notes that Barbour interweaves 'true or plausible material' into his poem in order to make it 'more convincing or probable'.[81] Snorri, according to Marlene Ciklamini, was also 'committed to historical truth',[82] while Margaret Ross argues that the *Edda* reveals Snorri to be a 'creative mythographer' as opposed to just an 'archivist'.[83] In a recent essay van Heijnsbergen urges historians to refrain from analysing the *Bruce* empirically and treat it instead as a 'work' rather than a 'document', specifically 'as a structured text rather than a repository of information'.[84] Herman alternatively argues that this medieval approach of representing the past 'may actually challenge modern attempts to classify medieval texts according to the dichotomy between history and fiction.'[85] Peter Gay sums up the symbiotic nature of this synthesis when he writes that 'historical narration without analysis is trivial, historical analysis without narration is incomplete'.[86] Since the *Bruce*, as Barbour makes clear, is a fusion of history and narrative it is flexible enough, I believe, to be examined from either position or in combination. Nothing is lost by approaching the text from diverse angles, and it is certainly the case that historians, thus far, have done much more with *The Bruce's* account of the Irish invasion than literary scholars have.[87]

---

[80] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, pp.67-8.
[81] Theo Van Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.1.
[82] Ciklamini, *Snorri Sturluson*, p.41.
[83] Ross, *Skaldskaparmal*, p.21. It is important to remember that the bards of the oral tradition were to a large degree archivists of cultural memory.
[84] Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.1.
[85] Hermann, 'Concepts of Memory', p.300.
[86] Peter Gay, *Style in History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1974), p.189.
[87] Both Halbwach and Nora set memory and history in opposition to each other but the historian Philippe Aries later demonstrated the interconnectedness of memory and history, and argued that history emerges from memory in the first place. Hutton, 'Collective Memory', p.312. Currently cultural memory is regarded

The respective efforts by R.D.S. Jack and Theo van Heijnsbergen (alluded to earlier) to clarify Barbour's uneven historiography can be enhanced further from a cultural memory perspective. From a rhetorical standpoint, van Heijnsbergen argues that the practices employed by Barbour sought to 'persuade' the audience into 'wishing' the poem was true rather than convince them it was true.[88] In the same vein, Jack's essay argues that the perceived errors in Barbour's historical accuracy are relatively minor since Barbour 'worked from different artistic premises'.[89] The overarching concern seems to be, in the words of Hayden White, 'how to translate knowing into telling'.[90] White asks:

> what is involved then, in that finding of the 'true story', that discovery of the 'real story' within or behind the events that come to us in the chaotic form of 'historical records'? What wish is enacted, what desire is gratified, by the fantasy that real events are properly represented when they can be shown to display the formal coherency of a story? In the enigma of this wish, this desire, we catch a glimpse of the cultural function of narrativizing discourse in general, an intimation of the (psychological impulse) behind the apparently universal need not only to narrate but to give to events an aspect of narrativity.[91]

The appeal of narrative is most pronounced in historical writing since it is here that 'our desire for imaginary, the possible, must contest with the imperatives of the real, the actual'.[92] Historical texts such as annals typically consist of a list of chronologically ordered events; while chronicles partly resemble stories but provide no narrative closure.[93] White concludes that

> the representation of real events arises out of a desire to have real events display the coherence, integrity, fullness, and closure of an image of life that is and can only be imaginary […] The notion that sequences of real events possess the formal attributes of the stories we tell about imaginary events could only have its origin in wishes, day-dreams, reveries.[94]

Once again, what is essentially being described is the process whereby the 'real' is enhanced with fictitious elements to ensure its memorability. A tension summed up most succinctly by the cultural memory theorist Anne Rigney who remarks that 'those who

---

as an interdisciplinary field that transcends boundaries and Astrid Erll recommends 'dissolving the useless opposition of history vs. memory in favour of a notion of different *modes of remembering* in culture.' Erll, 'Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction', pp.4, 5, 6.

[88] Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.1.

[89] R. D. S. Jack, 'What's the 'Matter'?', pp.12, 13.

[90] White, *The Content of the Form*, p.1.

[91] White, *The Content of the Form*, p.4.

[92] White, *The Content of the Form*, pp.4, 5.

[93] White, *The Content of the Form*, pp.4, 5. Foucault, however, believes that annals and chronicles have a memorialising function that like stories 'also serve to reinforce power'. Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, p.67.

[94] White, *The Content of the Form*, p.24.

"stick to the facts" may paradoxically end up with a more historical and authentic story, but also a less memorable one'.[95]

Communicative and cultural memory

In his memorialisation of Robert Bruce and Bannockburn, Barbour may well have utilised 'vicarious recollection', a form of collective memory with two phases: first, 'communicative memory' ('living memory', comparable to modern concepts of history) which corresponds to an early phase during which multiple and competing eyewitness narratives circulate and which, if unsupported by symbolic representation, have a shelf-life of around eighty years assuming there is appropriate communication.[96] Since Barbour was writing sixty years after Bannockburn it is entirely possible that he gathered details from living memory. The second phase - cultural memory - occurs after the period of living memory when eyewitness narratives are supplanted by 'stories'.[97] (Owing to its reconfiguring of history and its favouring of meaning over fact, Hermann suggests that cultural memory is 'akin to modern conceptions of fiction.')[98]

Icelandic literature has been found to employ both phases. In Snorri's *Edda* for example both stages of memory coexist and support each other.[99] It employs living memories to ensure their historicity, and cultural memories, Hermann argues, 'with an eye to present needs.' The same approach is taken by Barbour in the opening lines of Book One:

> For aulde storys that men redys,
> Representis to thaim the dedys
> Of stalwart folk that lyvyt ar,
> Rycht as thai than in presence war.
> And certis, thai suld weill have prys
> That in thar tyme war wycht and wys
> And led thar lyff in gret travaill,
> And oft in hard stour off bataill.[100]

This passage identifies stories as representations of the past that can be employed to interact with and inform the present. Barbour's practice and political objectives can be understood in light of Foucault's valuation of the Middle Ages as a time when historians wrote of

---

[95] Rigney, 'The Dynamics of Remembrance', p.347.
[96] Assman, 'Communicative and Cultural Memory', p.111.
[97] Rigney, 'Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation of Cultural Memory', *Journal of European Studies*, 35, 1 (2005), pp.11-28, p.14.
[98] Hermann, 'Concepts of Memory', p.300.
[99] Hermann, 'Concepts of Memory', p.299.
[100] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 1, 14-25.

the antiquity of kingdoms, brought great ancestors back to life, and rediscovered the heroes who founded empires and dynasties. The goal of this 'genealogical' task was to ensure that the greatness of the events or men of the past could guarantee the value of the present, and transform its pettiness and mundanity into something equally heroic and equally legitimate.'[101]

In a similar vein, Ciklamini finds in Snorri's writing 'an awareness that despite the passing of time, human conduct and motivation remain alike.'[102] Ross contends that Snorri 'gave to Icelanders of his age […] an interpretation of the old traditions which they could understand in terms of their own, contemporary intellectual world.'[103] In much the same way, Barbour sought to furnish Scots with a link between the heroic figures of *their* past and the contemporary world.

Heroes

The effect of recall, as Barbour's describes it in the passage above, is so intense that heroic men of the past literally appear in the present. In the eighteenth-century the French philosopher and writer Jean de Boyer, Marquis d'Argens (1704-1771) identified the close

---

[101] Foucault, *'Society Must Be Defended'*, p.66.

[102] Ciklamini, *Snorri Sturluson*, p.41.

[103] Ross, *Skaldskaparmal*, p.21. A further northern country with analogous ties to Scotland is Estonia, with whom Scotland shares northerly latitude and a history of trade. After the Wars of Independence, Scotland was reliant on crops from the Baltic States, including Estonia, and during the Middle Ages and Early Modern period many Scottish traders settled there, a trend replicated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when a community of Scottish traders settled in the city of Narva. T. M. Devime, *Scotland's Empire: The Origins of the Global Diaspora* (London: Penguin Books, 2012), p.8; 'Scots in Estonia', *Estonia.eu*, http://estonia.eu/about-estonia/history/estonias-history.html [accessed 12/07/2015]. There are interesting similarities too with the Estonian national epic *Kalevipoeg* (*The Son of Kalev*) (1861), written by F. R. Kreutzwald, and based on the legends of the Finno-Ugric peoples. Kreutzwald transformed the legends into a traditional Estonian runo-song (folk song) that became culturally and nationally meaningful during the 'Estonian Age of Awakening', a period when Estonians articulated their identity and sought to govern themselves (with the assistance of sympathetic Baltic German's who promoted Estonian culture and language). F. R. Kreutzwald, *Kalevipoeg* (Tartu and Tallinn: Estonian Literary Museum, 2011), p.9; see D. Kutsar 'Social change and stress in Estonia', *International Journal of Social Welfare* 4.2 (1995), 94–107. Estonia became an independent State in 1918 but was soon occupied by Russia until 1991 when it regained its independence. *Kalevipoeg* is an unusual national epic in that it is relatively recent but shares thematic, conceptual and nationalist similarities with *The Bruce* and Icelandic literature. It is claimed that *Kalevipoeg* supported Estonians 'during even the most taxing historical ordeals', and it does appear, based on my own experiences (having lived in Estonia), that *Kalevipoeg* continues to be part of Estonia's contemporary culture and sense of self. Kreutzwald, *Kalevipoeg*, p.9. In the impact of *Kalevipoeg*, still evident today, we can glimpse how Barbour's *Bruce* may have impacted on Scotland's nascent nationalism. Additionally, just as Estonia adopted its national narratives from Finnish stories, in eighteenth-century Scotland, James Macpherson adopted Irish culture to support Scotland's growing nationalism and cultural revival. Furthermore, as regards *Kalevipoeg*, its opening 'Invocation' and subsequent 'Introduction', much like Edda's prologue and Book One of *The Bruce*, begins with a summoning of ancient memories as a bard requests a lyre since he longs 'to bring forth in song / Fine legacies of ages past. / Awaken, ancient bygone voices!':

 let's reveal the truth, oh ancient shadows!
 let's bring forth the long-departed faces,
 Show the ventures of the Kalevs,
 Valiant men, and also wizards!
 Kreutzwald, *Kalevipoeg* , p.17.

links between collective memory and 'heroic or poetic glory'.[104] Similarly, Russell contends that literary texts often collaborate with the dominant ideology and provide obliging space for valiant and elite figures to 'inscribe themselves eternally in the collective memory of humanity'.[105] Not only literature but, as Foucault points out, history (including annals and chronicles) 'makes things memorable and, by making the memorable, inscribes deeds in a discourse that constrains and immobilizes minor actions in monuments that will turn them to stone and render them, so to speak, present forever.'[106]

In *De Oratore*, Cicero writes that 'good looks […] resources and riches' are neither inherently commendable nor an acceptable topic for panegyric, whereas courage is 'beneficial […] to the human race in general', and the highest praise is reserved for men who have performed great deeds but did so, crucially, 'without reward or profit'.[107] Christianity too has a tradition of commemorating the lives of specific individuals: Psalm 112:6 for example proclaims that 'surely the righteous will never be shaken; they will be remembered forever'.[108] More recently Nicholas Russell (2006) submits that the selection process is based on 'ethical and aesthetic' considerations and the supposition that 'exemplary figures from the past should serve as models for ethical behaviour.'[109] The heroes of medieval literature are typically brave and prudent men and for Barbour the figures of Robert Bruce and Douglas (but not Edward Bruce) fit the archetypal mould perfectly. He writes:

> Of thaim I thynk this buk to ma;
> Now God gyff grace that I may swa
> Tret it and bryng it till endyng,
> That I say nocht bot suthfast thing![110]

Ars memoriae is evoked by Barbour's plea to treat the text ('tret it'), while his intention to bring it to an end alludes to its narrative structure and distinguishes it from history, especially chronicles, which typically forego a conclusion. The penultimate line of the passage is concerned with narration but is ostensibly contradicted by the last line which asserts that the poet will say nothing but what it true (suthfast). The rhyming couplet captures the mutually beneficial but frequently tense synthesis of historicity and narrative. In his exalting of 'the Bruce' and Douglas, Barbour to some degree utilises the classical

---

[104] Cited in Nicholas Russell, 'Collective Memory Before and After Halbwachs', *The French Review*, 79, 4 (2006), pp.792-804, p.793. *Lettres juives* (*The Jewish Spy*) (1738-1742).
[105] Russell, 'Collective Memory', pp.793-4.
[106] Foucault, *Society Must Be defended*, p.67.
[107] Cicero, *De Oratore in Two Volumes*, 1, trans. E. W. Sutton (London: William Heineman, 1948), pp. 84-85, 342-347, 461.
[108] 'Psalm 112:6', *The King James Bible Online*, http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Psalms-112-6/ [accessed: 03/11/2014]
[109] Russell, 'Collective Memory', p.793.
[110] Barbour, *The Bruce*, 1, 33-36.

concept of *fama*.[111] Originally named by Homer and known to the Greeks as Ossa, the Roman goddess Fama was tasked with recording great deeds and identified as the personification of rumour.[112] In Classical Greece fame was democratised and achievable not only through poetry, art and sport but also military action and heroic death.[113] There are according to Assman three interrelated requirements for *fama*: 'great deeds, a record of them, and remembrance by posterity'.[114] (Fame is rarely attributed to the commonplace).

In the Middle Ages, argues Assman, 'divine memory' was the noblest aspiration while the classical notion of 'worldly fame' was regarded 'as a dubious figure'.[115] Nonetheless, Barbour's Robert Bruce boasts many of the attributes of *fama* such as 'single-mindedness' and 'ruthlessness', while Barbour's manifest aim is the mythologisation of Bruce and his actions for posterity.[116] While a prerequisite of fame, heroic and selfless action alone is not enough to guarantee immortality. For Assman, much depends on the bard 'who would immortalise the deeds in his poem. He alone could promise the hero the privilege of overcoming the mortal fate of man by creating a perpetual memory of his deeds. The poet's function was that of a gatekeeper to eternal glory'.[117] Does this not accurately describe Barbour's responsibility, or perhaps opportunity in the composition of the *Bruce*?

Reception and Intertexuality

The reader/audience is complicit in and essential to the process of memorialisation. 'Heroes', Assman remarks, 'depend on poets, but poets depend on readers, and it is they who decide whether fame will last or not.'[118] Medieval and Renaissance writers understood that readers reproduce 'not just the meaning of the text but also the cultural priorities and political preferences that the writer intended the reader to extract from that text'.[119] Consequently, medieval writers employed specific rhetorical techniques and practices to persuade the reader, and Barbour was no different.[120] This implies a degree of uniformity

---

[111] Though *fama* is a form of memory, a fundamental difference is that whereas memory looks to the past to reconstruct the present, *fama* looks to the future. Aleida Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p.39.
[112] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.66; William Smith, ed. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, 3 (Boston: Little, Brown, & Company, 1869), p.63.
[113] Assman *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.33.
[114] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.29.
[115] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.35. A chronicler of the First Crusade, Fulcher of Chartres (1059-1127), for example, thought it beneficial to the living and the dead to recite the deeds of heroic men from a text or memory. Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p.24.
[116] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.51.
[117] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.29.
[118] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.174.
[119] Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.4.
[120] Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.4.

in reading habits, which van Heijinsbergen contends is 'crucial in creating durable myths as well as realities, i.e. in sustaining a national "textual community" that, through careful processes of selective memory, coheres around a more or less agreed narrative of collective identity.'[121] The centrality of Robert Bruce and *The Bruce* in Scottish history and culture to this day is evidence, van Heijinsbergen claims, of 'shared habits of reading'.[122]

Intertextuality is crucial to the formation of conceptions of the past. 'Without a dialogue between texts, textual loans, repetition of motifs, and temporal modalities', Hermann argues, 'it would not have been possible to create such strong and well-defined visions of the past as in medieval Icelandic literature'.[123] The practice of citation was in the medieval period 'foundational to any creative and indeed scholarly composition'.[124] *The Bruce*, as discussed in the previous chapter, was part of, if not exactly a larger literary movement, then a general textual strategy that sought to consolidate Scottish history. Historians such as Wyntoun, Fordun and Bower judge Barbour's *Bruce* to be a reliable history of the Wars of Independence and consequently do not linger on the subject. Wyntoun confesses that Barbour 'mare wisely tretyde in to wryt, / Than I can think with all my wyt'; while Bower skips over much of Robert Bruce's history and defers to Barbour.[125] The deference paid to Barbour's consciously narrativised history by contemporary historiographers, together with their exclusion of specific historical events in favour of citing Barbour, guaranteed the reputation and posterity of *The Bruce* and Robert Bruce, as Barbour intended, and from which the Bruce/Stewart line benefited greatly.

---

[121] Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.5.
[122] Heijnsbergen, 'Scripting the National Past', p.4-5. In *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland* (1775), Samuel Johnson explains it somewhat differently: the Scots, he writes, 'have something to plead for their easy reception of an improbable fiction: they are seduced by their fondness for their supposed ancestors. A Scotchman must be a very sturdy moralist, who does not love *Scotland* better than truth: he will always love it better than inquiry; and if falsehood flatters his vanity, will not be very diligent to detect it.' Samuel Johnson and James Boswell, *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland, The Journal of A Tour to the Hebrides*, ed. R. W. Chapman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), p.108. Johnson fails to add however that this could be applied to most native populations. The Irish writer Sylvester O'Halloran (1728-1807), who will be considered again in the Drummond section, echoes Johnson when he claims that the English have no 'pretensions to a remote antiquity which they could not well prove […] that Scotch writers alone should oppose the truth of history, and for the sake of singularity, advance tenets as opposite to truth as light is to darkness; nay, advance them contrary to the general sense of the people!' Sylvester O'Halloran, *An Introduction to the Study of the History and Antiquities of Ireland* (London: J. Murray, Dublin: Thomas Ewing, 1772), p.309.
[123] Hermann, 'Concepts of Memory', p.299.
[124] Ardis Butterfield, 'Introduction', in *Citation, Intertextuality and Memory in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, 2, eds. Giuliano Di Bacco and Yolanda Plumley (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013), pp.1-6, p.1.
[125] Andrew Wyntoun, *Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland*, 2, in *The Historians of Scotland*, 3, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872), 2927-28, p.368.

Sub-total recall

It is often the case that when specific figures, feats and events are selected for memorialisation, supposed lesser acts, incidents, groups and occasionally contradictory accounts are marginalised or omitted and thereafter lost or forgotten. The partiality of memory, Rigney submits, 'is not merely a shortcoming […] but also a precondition of it being meaningful for particular groups of people'.[126] This is especially so with memories and sites of memory associated with a nation's identity, and the art of 'forgetting', as Ernest Renan notes in his seminal essay 'What is a Nation' (1882), is a 'crucial factor' in its creation. [127]

In *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson helpfully draws out the 'cultural, ideological, and political work that forgetting performs'; however, as Christopher Ivic points out, Anderson's post-enlightenment position overlooks the importance of forgetting in both early modern and Medieval periods.[128] In Icelandic literature, Hermann identifies an appreciation of how 'memory's counterpart' - forgetting - is fundamental to the processes of memory.[129] Hermann notes that Snorri's *Edda* eschews many other versions of Scandinavian mythology thereby ensuring that other potential memories are 'side-lined or rejected in the creative processes'.[130]

As the preceding chapter argues, the invasion of Ireland is subsumed within Barbour's larger biographical and national imperatives. Thus the events in Ireland, seen from a Scottish perspective, confirm rather than complicate the objective of the poem. Despite Barbour's efforts to accommodate numerous notorious episodes from the life of Robert Bruce (the commonplace violence, the murder of Comyn, the usurpation of the Scottish throne, and the Irish invasion) within his mythology, many critics note the collateral damage on its structure. Sarah Tolmie writes that the 'strain is not just evidence of the task of compilation; it stems from the explosive nature of the material itself, the frightful truth of communal violence during the wars of independence and the competing metaphors used to explain and yet obfuscate it.'[131]

Since nations commonly arise from confrontation, often involving acts of violence that may complicate or contradict the stated ideals of the new state, uncomfortable

---

[126] Rigney, 'Plenitude, Scarcity', p.18.
[127] Ernest Renan, 'What is a nation?' in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi K. Bhabha (London: Routledge, 1990), pp.8-23, p.11.
[128] Christopher Ivic, 'Reassuring fratricide' in *I Henry IV*, in *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture: Lethe's Legacies*, eds. Grant Williams and Christopher Ivic (London: Routledge, 2004), pp. 99-110, p.100.
[129] Hermann, 'Concepts of Memory', p.293.
[130] Hermann, 'Concepts of Memory', p.293.
[131] Tolmie, 'Sacrilege, Sacrifice and John Barbour's *Bruce*', p.13.

memories need to be marginalised, modified or forgotten. Consequently, one of the central questions of cultural memory studies 'is not how a past is represented, but why it was received or rejected.'[132] Though rarely read today, *The Bruce* is a canonical Scottish work, a textual monument, a fixed point in the history of Scotland and crucial to the story the Scottish nation communicates to itself and to others. Ostensibly a biography, Barbour's *Bruce* is principally interested in promoting the idea of a Scottish nation and identity with the aim of advancing the existing monarchic regime. (Barbour's subject was at least partly proposed, and indeed recompensed by the ruling elite). It follows therefore that the poem's meanings have to favourably correspond to the practices and values (feudalism and chivalry) of the dominant interests.[133]

'Is there nothing more to history than praise of Rome?' [Ascribed to Petrarch]
In light of the extant literature and the ideological bias of medieval writers like Barbour and Snorri we could be forgiven for thinking that it was *only* kings and heroes who were considered suitable subjects for literature and history. Yet the writings of the historian and theologian Paulus Orosius (385-420) attest to the possibly of interpreting and telling history differently. In *The Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*, Orosius interprets the sources in a manner and purpose contrary to the sources and his contemporaries by describing 'all the troubles caused by wars', including its collateral effect on ordinary people.[134] Of earlier historians, Orosius writes that they 'do not have the same motive […] although they deal with the same affairs - for they unroll the history of wars, while I am unrolling wars' miseries'.[135] Troubled by the potential consequences of his editorial choices, Orosius fears that the omission of an event will weaken its veracity, but understands that by addressing everything, and succinctly, too much may seem unimportant. These issues he writes are 'of the greatest concern, since I am taking care to

---

[132] Alon Confino, 'Memory and the History of Mentalities', in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, p.81. Ivic identifies a significant act of forgetting in the early modern period and the Tudor desire to 'wash' the Wars of the Roses from their 'collective memory'. Ivic, 'Reassuring fratricide', p.101. In John Speed's *Description of the Civill Warres of England* (1601), Ivic asserts that Speed 'forgets' the 'nastiness of war' and the 'geographic and political divisions' within England at the time and tries instead to 'consolidate an Elizabethan sense of nationhood, constructing a stable Elizabethan identity out of volatile fifteenth-century proto-national identities.' Ivic, 'Reassuring fratricide', p.101.
[133] From a cultural memory standpoint Barbour was essentially reconfiguring events of the relatively recent past using a chivalric mould, itself a system of memorial continuity, and to the advantage of present-day society.
[134] Orosuis, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, trans. A. T. Fear (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010), 1, 10, p.32.
[135] Orosuis, *Seven Books*, 3, 2, p.109.

do the opposite and give an account of the true forces of history, not a mere picture of the past'.[136]

To brand Barbour a public relations officer for the Scottish monarchy may be going too far, and be somewhat anachronistic; but, it is undeniable that the manner in which the Irish invasion is represented is intended to benefit Team Bruce. As courtier to Robert II, and to all intents and purposes the national poet, Barbour was unlikely to portray the invasion as anything other than a) necessary within the broader war with England, b) a campaign instigated by the Irish chiefs, and c) the result of an over-ambitious and belligerent brother. Its failure meanwhile had to be attributed to a) the over-ambitiousness and belligerence of Edward Bruce, and b) the native Irish traitors. Barbour's approach emulates that of the Greek and Roman historians whose primary concern was 'praise and imparting instruction'.[137] However, as Orosius observes, Roman history is full of tragedy,

> and this despite the fact that the writers of the time, whose main task was to give praise, took care to leave out a considerable number of disasters in order not to offend those for whom their accounts were written, and not to be seen to terrify rather than educate their listeners with all the examples they had drawn from the past.[138]

Despite the exclusionary characteristics of remembering it is often the case that 'faint traces' of the rejected remain,[139] and through their existence, Orosius reflects, 'we can see how much must have been deliberately suppressed because of its horrible nature when so many things of this sort are faintly discernible amid their praises'.[140] It is from such traces in Barbour's *Bruce* - the depiction of the Irish for instance - that Drummond generates his nineteenth-century Irish version of the Bruce invasion, soon to be discussed. In the meantime we move forward to the sixteenth century and Edmund Spenser.

A 'matter of […] memory': The Bruce Invasion in Sixteenth-century Anglo-Irish Literature

The early modern period witnessed a revival in *ars memoriae* and, according to Yates, 'astonishing developments' took place in memorial practices.[141] Aleida Assman submits that three forms of memory predominate in this period: 'remembrance of the dead, posthumous fame, and historical memory' and all would develop into separate strands of

---

[136] Orosuis, *Seven Books*, 3, 1, p.109.
[137] Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p.73.
[138] Orosuis, *Seven Books*, 4, 10-11, p.163; Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p.73.
[139] Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p.73.
[140] Orosuis, *Seven Books*, 4, 13, p.163; Kempshall, *Rhetoric*, p.73.
[141] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.2; Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.21.

cultural memory study.[142] The dissolution of the monasteries and the dismantling of their vast archives during the Reformation prompted 'a radical restructuring of [Tudor England's] cultural memory'.[143] Ecclesiastical memory was superseded by secular and national memory and a growing body of humanist scholarship. Renaissance writers, Assman asserts, realising that 'direct access to the past was blocked by forgetfulness and dislocation', threw themselves into national historiography and typically selected memories based on their benefit to national identity and posterity.[144] History became an appropriate subject for poets while the development of the printing press provided an opportunity for writers and artists to immortalise not just historical figures but themselves.[145]

Edmund Spenser was one such writer and his work exhibits an intense interest in national history, *ars memoriae,* and often explores the relationship between 'story and history'.[146] Assman perceives in Spenser's work an interest in memories of a 'common past and common origin', with which Spenser attempts to fashion England's national identity and 'underpin the state'.[147] In *Spenser's Ruins and the Art of Recollection* (2013), Rebeca Helfer sets out to examine Spenser's 'profound engagement with locational memory' (art of memory), an engagement, the author claims, that has been 'underestimated'.[148]

---

[142] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.9.

[143] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.47. In response the Elizabethan period especially witnessed intensification in heraldry, funeral rituals and tomb building. Williams and Ivic, '*Introduction'*, p.5.

[144] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.43.

[145] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.37.

[146] Rebeca Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins and the Art of Recollection* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), p.6.

[147] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.46.

[148] Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins*, p.xi. Helfer views the art of memory 'as fundamental to the entire Spenserian project' and a 'guiding principle of Spenser's poetics'. Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins*, p.xi. Spenser's interest in memory is complemented by an interest in ruins. In *A View* and *The Faerie Queene*, for example, Ireland is portrayed as 'a place of ruin and recollection'. Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins*, pp.9, 235. Indeed, Spenser is described by Willy Maley, and in very cultural memory terms, as 'a poet of ruins, raking in the ashes of English in order to remember the cinders of his heritage'. Willy Maley, 'Spenser's Languages: Writing in the Ruins of English', in *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp.162-179, p.169. In the Renaissance, 'ruin represents a master metaphor of sorts […] for the activity of disinterring the past for the present', and 'ruins' can refer to buildings or books, regions or countries and can be employed figuratively to describe language and poetry. Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins*, p.9. Elizabethan England's fascination with 'ruins' is, according to Philip Schwyzer, largely informed by the fact that post-Reformation England and Wales 'was littered with substantial ruined structures.' Philip Schwyzer, *Archaeologies of English Renaissance Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p.73. A situation that persuades Maley to describe the Renaissance as a 'Ruinaissance'. Maley, 'Spenser's Languages', p.169.

Spenser, memory and history

An interesting example of Spenser's interest in locational memory occurs in Book II, Canto IX of *The Faerie Queene* as two knights led by Alma traverse a castle that is an 'allegorical figure for the human body'.[149] Spenser's use of Quintillian's mnemonics is evident, as is his use of an architectural concept of memory involving navigation through cognitive structures. The knights' end their tour in 'th'hindmost rowme' a 'ruinous and old' chamber wherein sits an old man 'halfe blind'.[150] The chamber/library is covered with 'rolls, / And old records from auncient times deriud' and are 'worm-eaten, and full of canker holes.'[151] The chamber clearly represents the physical site of memory and its steady decay. The knights are each drawn to a particular book, one selects *Briton moniments* ('that of this lands first conquest did deuize') and the other *Antiquitie of Fairie land* ('th'ofspring of Elues and Faryes there he found').[152] The knights' choices of histories reflect the contemporaneous interest in national history and Spenser's interest in both history and story.

National memory is the subject of the first stanza of Book II, which Assman judges to be an apology for the poet's 'poetic license':[153]

> Right well I wote most mighty Soueraine,
> That all this famous antique history,
> Of some th'aboundance of an ydle braine
> Will iudged be, and painted forgery,
> Rather then matter of iust memory.[154]

The addressee (soueraine) is clearly Elizabeth I and the 'antique history' refers to *The Faerie Queene*, 'some' of which, the poet admits, sprang from the imagination. From a cultural memory standpoint this is a notable admission, especially the act of deception suggested by the description of the poem as a 'painted forgery'. It suggests that Spenser would rather disclose his artistic license and have his work received under such provisos than have it read as a true account ('iust memory'), particularly in view of its historical

---

[149] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.45.
[150] Tis man of infinite remembraunce was,
And things foregone through many ages held,
Which he recorded still, as they did pas,
Ne suffred them to perish through long eld,
As all things els, the which this world doth weld,
But laid them vp in his immortall scrine,
Where they for euer incorrupted dweld.
Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited, 2007), 2, 9, 55-56.
[151] Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 2, 9, 57.
[152] Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 2, 9, 59, 60. The man of 'infinite remembraunce' is not a man of infinite life, it is the 'scrine' that is immortal, a box or chest within which things of value are kept, often the relics of saints. 'Scrine', n., Oxford University Press, (2014), *OED Online* [22/01/2015]
[153] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.46.
[154] Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 2, p.157; Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.46.

deficiencies. Spenser therefore could be said to anticipate the view of Ann Rigney who in the essay 'Fiction as a Mediator in National Remembrance' writes that

> the downside is that while poetic license makes it easier to narrativise events, it inevitably reduced the writers' claim to be giving a believable account of history or to be contributing to discussions of history. But this downside may in practice be of secondary importance in relation to the initial – and sometimes lasting – appeal of a 'memorable' story to the public at large.[155]

There are some comparisons and contrasts between Spenser's stanza and Barbour's pseudo-prologue: both poets endeavour to cement their country's history: Barbour legitimises the Bruce monarchy while, in *The Faerie Queene*, Spenser explicates the ancient lineage to which Elizabeth I belongs. Both combine history and story and both, to various degrees, acknowledge the process, but while Spenser does so with the intention of mollifying any potential charge of bad historiography, Barbour makes no apology and instead delves into the motivations behind the memorial process, specifically the conviction that narrativised history is more enjoyable and thus more likely to be remembered.

A further distinction arises by way of Spenser's scepticism over the authenticity of history. In *A View* and *The Faerie Queene*, most notably Book II and the 'faeire land' archives of the Mutabilitie Cantos,[156] Helfer observes that Spenser 'plays the part of historiographer in order to expose the fictions that make up history'.[157] With regard to Rigney's belief that narrativised events weaken the writers claim to be providing a credible history, Spenser, somewhat subversively, acknowledges his inaccuracy to make just this point.

In Spenser's scepticism we can see something of the rupturing in the continuity of the historical discourse practiced by the Romans and continued during the Middle Ages that Foucault speaks of. For both societies history was 'a ritual that reinforced sovereignty',[158] but during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Foucault argues that different forms of history and historical discourse developed which contrary to medieval forms of history, strove to 'unmask Rome' and challenge the continuity of antiquity.[159] Memory too appears to play a part in this development. England, like Rome and most early modern European states, drew their origin myth from ancient times, primarily the defeated

---

[155] Ann Rigney, 'Fiction as a Mediator in National Remembrance' in *Narrating the Nation, Representations in History, Media and the Arts*, eds. Stefan Berger, Linas Eriksonas and Andrew Mycock (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), pp.79-97, p.86.
[156] 'In *Faery* Land mongst records permanent'. Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 7, 6, 2.
[157] Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins*, p.246.
[158] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, p.69.
[159] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, pp.69, 74.

Trojans, but the emergence of new (or non-classical) peoples and nations - for example 'the Franks, the Gauls, and the Celts', and the subsequent history of 'rulers and subordinates' and 'victors and the vanquished'[160] - refocused the aim of historical discourse, so it was

> no longer the discourse of sovereignty, or even race, but a discourse about races, about a confrontation between races, about the race struggle that goes on within nation and within laws. To that extent it is, I think, a history that is the complete antithesis of the history of sovereignty, as constituted up to that time.[161]

The new discourse reveals that sovereign power is more dependent on 'violent conquest' than 'divine right', leading Foucault to describe it as anti-roman and a 'counterhistory',[162] the essential lesson of which is that 'one man's victory is another man's defeat'.[163] Thus the inherent struggle of history concealed and mystified by Roman and Medieval writers (for example Barbour's absorption of the Irish invasion within the grander story of Robert Bruce) is laid bare.

A View of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland

Just as Helfer asserts that Spenser's interest in memory is 'underestimated', Maley argues that Scotland is more important to Spenser's work than has been recognised and devotes a chapter to the Scottish presence in *A View* in *Salvaging Spenser* (1997). Maley submits that *A View* exposes 'a three-way struggle' between Ireland, England and Scotland and 'the tensions within the emerging British state'.[164] Helfer similarly asserts that Spenser revisits the art of memory in *A View* 'in order to recollect the matter of Ireland' and to pose 'an implicit challenge to Tudor myths of power and empire'.[165] While Spenser's ostensibly incidental remarks on the Bruce invasion have been insightfully considered by Maley and Helfer, they have yet to be examined thoroughly from a cultural memory perspective. In addition to his preoccupation with the past (memory), Spenser is also committed to a practice whereby specific 'elements' (considered important) from the past, are

---

[160] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, pp.75-6.
[161] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, p.69.
[162] Seth L. Sanders, *The Invention of Hebrew* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2011), p.157. The new discourse Foucault argues is much closer to the bible, as a 'form for the articulation of religious, moral, and political protests against the power of kings'. Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, p.71.
[163] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, p.69. Foucault offers the example of William the Conqueror whose epithet reveals the illegitimacy of his sovereignty, and its dependency on war. Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, p.72.
[164] Willy Maley, *Salvaging Spenser, Colonialism, Culture and Identity* (Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1997), p.155.
[165] Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins*, p.246.

reconstructed for the present.[166] This practice is perceptible in Spenser's treatment of the Bruce invasion.

The 'three-way struggle' is evident in Irenius's history of Ireland which is interwoven with England's failed attempts to conquer it and Scotland's persistent presence. Irenius identifies the Wars of the Roses and the consequent return of the Anglo-Irish lords to England as the moment England's grip on Ireland loosened. This departure, he tells Eudoxus, triggered an Irish exodus from their mountain refuges and the repossession of the plains from the remaining English. As critics observe, however, Irenius's history is often inaccurate, as when he erroneously associates the Wars of the Roses with an earlier Irish uprising.[167] Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley suggest that such inconsistencies stem from Spenser's faulty memory and reliance on oral sources and chronicles, thus implying that Irenius's erratic history is inadvertent.[168] Helfer similarly concludes that Irenius's history is 'disorderly' but adds that it evokes 'parallels and repetitions', and by bookending his brief history with the rebellions of Shane O'Neill 'he implies a historical pattern of ruin that would undercut both his ostensible present-day focus and his ambition to achieve a permanent state.'[169]

Back to the future

Responding to Irenius's earlier remarks, Eudoxus inquires by what means 'such evill occasions' arose and the Irish realm almost entirely lost. In response Irenius recalls the reign of Edward III who sent the duke of Clarence to push the Irish back to the 'narrow corners and glennes under the mountains foote'.[170] Irenius then cites the rebellion of Murrogh en-Rannagh O'Brien and his self-coronation (the fourteenth-century rebellion of Murrogh en-Rannagh is situated in the fifteenth due to Irenius's mix-up between the duke of Clarence and an earlier forebear)[171] and confesses that he cannot recall any other Irish king 'but onely Edward le Bruce', to which Eudoxus replies

> What? was there ever any generall King of all Ireland? I never heard it before, but that it was always (whilst it was under the Irish) divided into foure, and sometimes into five kingdoms or dominions. But this Edward le Bruce, what was hee, that could make himself King of all Ireland?[172]

---

[166] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization*, p.39.
[167] Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins*, p.251.
[168] Edmund Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, eds. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997), p.25, n., 18.
[169] Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins*, p.251.
[170] Spenser, *A View*, pp.24-25.
[171] Spenser, *A View*, n., 18, p.25.
[172] Spenser, *A View*, p.25.

Eudoxus's surprised response echoes that of many people today when the author has had occasion to mention the Bruce invasion and Robert's less famous brother. That such unfamiliarity should exist today is not unexpected. Eudoxus's ignorance however is surprising given that the Bruce invasion, if not exactly a recurring theme in Elizabethan literature, was nonetheless an important exemplar in several late sixteenth-century Anglo-Irish colonial texts, to which Spenser's *View* belongs. Furthermore, the events of 1315-1318 were transmitted across the succeeding centuries in a range of genres, from Barbour's *Bruce* by way of the annals, chronicles and histories of Ireland, Scotland and England, and into the sixteenth century via some of the major historians of the time including John Mair (1521), Hector Boece (1540), Raphael Holinshed (1577) and George Buchanan (1582). Given the substantial historiographical memory of the Bruce invasion, Eudoxus's bewilderment has something of a hollow ring to it. Obviously, as a narrative device, Eudoxus's ignorance allows Spenser to explore the Bruce invasion in greater detail. The question is why he should want to?

In the sixteenth century, as in the fourteenth, the Scots represented a clear and present obstacle to England's long sought-after dominance of Ireland. Just as the early fourteenth-century Gaelic alliance had kept England's Irish conquest at bay, so too in the sixteenth century the relationship between the native Irish and Gaelic Scots, between Ulster and the west coast of Scotland, proved a significant impediment to England's plans for conquering the whole of Ireland. English literature of the period pulses with exasperation at the disruptive presence of the Gaelic Scots in Ulster (the subject of the second chapter). Furthermore, the familial alliance between Antrim and the west coast of Scotland and the steady flow of Scottish mercenaries into Ireland were significant enough to provoke a number of assaults and schemes against the Scots in Ireland, Rathlin Island, and the Western Island of Scotland during the 1550s and 1570s. In *A View*, referring to the current state of Ireland, Spenser remarks that if the Scots should gain control of Ulster it 'were but to leap out of the pan into the fire: For the chiefest caveat and provision in reformation of the North, must be to keep out those Scottes'.[173]

England had not confronted such a united pan-Gaelic threat since 1315 and the reconfiguration of the invasion in Anglo-Irish literature during this period strongly suggests that English writers were cognisant of the similarities, and that some sought to clarify England's present difficulties and propose stratagems to improve them by recalling this past event. The Bruce invasion 'becomes exemplary of an approach to history that

---

[173] Spenser, *A View*, p.111.

Eudoxus regards as "very profitable for matters of policy"'.[174] As Sir James Perrot writes in *The Chronicle of Ireland, 1584-1608*:

> the most auncient and remote stories may yelde delight, perchaunce benefitte in the reading, but those which make knowen the state of our present age, and actions of our own contrie or of our nearest neightbours, yeldes not only a light to see which way others walked, and where they went astray, but shewes how by other mens presidents we may avoyde theyr perils.[175]

It is important to remember that the original title of *A View*, as entered into the Stationers' Register in April 1598 by the printer Matthew Lownes, is *A viewe of the PRESENT state of Ireland.* By the time of its publication in James Ware's *Ancient Irish Histories* (1633) the 'present' had been dropped. Helfer believes this revision obscures the text's actual focus 'on the "present" rather than the "past" - a claim that the work itself repeatedly undercuts'.[176] In a similar vein, Maley writes that 'the "present state" of Ireland the *View* describes is one of 'on-going anxiety'.[177]

Spenser has Irenius recall the Bruce invasion to ostensibly explain but also to explore the existing Irish political situation. Again alluding to cultural memory concepts, Maley notes that the first reference to the Scots

> intervenes between the antiquarian excursus that inscribes the Scots at the origins of Ireland, and that history of the present that sees the Scots as a menace in the North. Again, it is a question of con-quest and con-text, for between the 'original' influx of Scots into Ireland and the contemporary threat of Scottish activity in Ulster in the 1590s, Spenser inserts the invasion in 1315.[178]

The temporal interaction between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries is apparent in Irenius's reply to Eudoxus's earlier question regarding Edward Bruce: 'I would tell you', Irenius says, 'in case you would not challenge me anon for forgetting the matter which I had in hand, that is, the inconvenience and unfitnesse which I supposed to be in the laws of the land'.[179] The matter at hand is the 'state' of late sixteenth century Ireland, a topic that Irenius must necessarily abandon if he is to relate the Bruce invasion. Thus an implicit connection is made between the two periods. Eudoxus's subsequent response meanwhile makes it explicit:

> no surely, I have no cause, for neither is this impertinent there-unto; for sithence you did set your course (as I remember in your first part) to treat of the evils which hindred the peace and good ordering of that land, amongst which, that of the

---

[174] Maley, *Salvaging Spenser*, p.152.

[175] Sir James Perrot, *The Chronicle of Ireland, 1584-1608*, ed. Herbert Wood (Dublin: Stationery Office, 1933), p.3.

[176] Helfer, *Spenser's Ruins*, p.246; Spenser, *A View*, p.xxiii.

[177] Maley, 'A View of the Present State of Ireland (1596; 1633)', in *A Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*, ed. Bart van Es (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), pp.210-230, p.210.

[178] Maley, *Salvaging Spenser*, p.148.

[179] Spenser, *A View*, p.25.

inconvenience in the laws, was the first which you had in hand, this discourse of the over-running and wasting of the realme, is very material thereunto, for that it was the beginning of al the other evils, which sithence have afflicted that land, and opened a way unto the Irish to recover their possession, and to beat out the English.[180]

In other words, since Irenius intends to 'treate of the evils' currently besetting Ireland it makes sense to begin with the 'beginning of al the other evils', the initiating action, specifically the 'over-running and wasting of the realme' by the Bruces. Spenser's superimposing of the Bruce invasion over the misfortunes of Elizabethan Ireland can be understood from a cultural memory perspective, in terms described by Patrick Hutton:

> Memory selects from the flux of images of the past those that best fit its present needs. One might say that memory colonizes the past by obliging it to conform to present conceptions. It is a process not of retrieval but of reconfiguration, for memory bends the data it selects to its conceptual schemes.[181]

If indeed the memory of the invasion is intended to draw a comparison with contemporary Ulster it may be that Spenser's reference to lord John Birmingham - who 'over-threw' and 'slew' the Scots and then 'suffered them not to breathe, or gather themselves together againe, until they came to the sea-coast' - is encouraging the purging of Ulster's troublesome Scots.[182] Furthermore, Spenser's parallel is compelling evidence for just how little change had occurred in the intervening centuries. The Scots remain as much of an obstacle to English conquest in the sixteenth century as they had in the early fourteenth, regardless of their defeat by Birmingham. Is this evidence, as Helfer suggests (and in the spirit of Foucault), of Spenser undercutting England's sense of continuity, and historical progress in general?

Irenius does eventually narrate the invasion in detail but only after Eudoxus convinces him that

> it will give a great light both unto the second and third part, which is the redressing of those evils, and planting of some good forme or policy therein, by renewing the remembrance of these occasions and accidents, by which those ruines hapend, and laying before us the ensamples of those times, to be compared to ours, and to be warned by those which shall have to doe in the like. Therefore I pray you tell them unto us, and as for the point where you left, I will not forget afterwards to call you backe againe there.[183]

Encouraged by Eudoxus, Irenius describes how Robert Bruce, bearing 'a most malicious and spightfull minde' against Edward II, dispatched Edward Bruce 'with a power of

---

[180] Spenser, *A View*, pp.25-26.
[181] Hutton, 'Collective Memory and Collective Mentalities', p.314.
[182] Spenser, *A View*, p.27.
[183] Spenser, *A View*, p.26.

Scottes and Redshankes' to work 'more mischiefe' by combining with the Irish.[184] Irenius lists the ensuing destruction and concludes with Edward's defeat and death at Dundalk. Eudoxus's reaction is one of sympathy for Ireland and he tells Irenius:

> what with your discourse of the lamentable desolation therof, made by those Scottes, you have filled mee with a great compassion of their calamities, that I doe much pity that sweet land, to be subject to so many evils as I see more and more to be layde upon her.[185]

The Bruce invasion is recalled on two further occasions. First, when discussing the legitimacy of Hugh O'Neill's (earl of Tyrone) right to the 'ancient seigniory' over Ireland, which Irenius claims was gained as a direct result of the death of the duke of Clarence whose land in Ireland was 'formerly wasted by the Scottes, under the leading of Edward le Bruce'.[186] The final recall occurs as the characters discuss ways to improve Ireland and Eudoxus proposes that the English government refuse to reform the country for fear that English citizens

> should grow so undutiful as the Irish, and become much more dangerous: As appeareth by the ensamples of the Lacies in the time of Edward the second, which you spake of, that shooke off their allegiance to their natural Prince, and turned to Edward le Bruce, to make him king of Ireland.[187]

Spenser's recollection of the Bruce invasion and its ruinous impact on Ireland reveals a degree of anxiety stimulated by the threat posed by the Gaelic Scots in contemporary Ulster. For Spenser, as well as for William Herbert and John Davies - who will be discussed presently - the Scots presented as potent a threat to English ambitions as they had in 1315.

Had Spenser lived a few more years he would likely have been surprised to see how England's perennial problem was solved, perhaps less so by the succession of a Scottish king to the English throne, but most definitely by the king's distribution of Ulster land to (primarily lowland) Scots as part of his 'British' social engineering project. Maley sums up this previously inconceivable shift in policy and attitude when he writes that 'Spenser's injunction not to allow Scots access to the North of Ireland became, within a decade of his prohibitive discourse, an imperative in the interests of solving competing Anglo-Scottish claims to that territory.'[188]

---

[184] Spenser, *A View*, p.27.
[185] Spenser, *A View*, p.27.
[186] Spenser, *A View*, p.111.
[187] Spenser, *A View*, p.144.
[188] Maley, *Salvaging Spenser*, p.145.

William Herbert and John Davies

Five years before Spenser's *View*, the Munster colonist William Herbert (1553-1593) wrote *Croftus sive de Hibernia liber* (1591), a treatise based on Herbert's discussions with his familial friend and former Lord Deputy of Ireland, James Croft, about his deputyship, and in it Herbert laments 'the diseases, ailments, and sicknesses' which afflict Ireland to such an extent that 'sometimes she has almost given up the breath of life'.[189] Significantly, Herbert writes that 'it now follows that we have to speak of foreign aggression and evils which proceed from elsewhere, namely the ravages, furies and arms of the Scots and of the methods by which we may most conveniently meet and relieve these disasters'.[190] Herbert goes on to describe the Irish invasion in some detail, how Edward Bruce invaded Ireland with 6000 Scots and 'devastated' Ulster with the support of the Irish and some English, brought together in common cause against England. When recounting the defeat at Dundalk and Edward's death, Herbert refers to Edward as he 'who had declared himself king of Ireland' and states that[191]

> from that time to this the Scots, lured by many favourable opportunities, have especially harassed that region. They do this both because it is nigh and abiding to Scotland and because it is at the furthest remove from the kings council, the justice, the civilisation and refinement of the province and is therefore full of rebellious men, who very easily make common cause with the Scots and delight in pillage and plunder.[192]

Herbert's phrase, 'from that time to this', echoes the interplay between the Irish invasion and the sixteenth century found in *A View*. Herbert similarly submits proposals for improving the region, including the establishing of colonies in the ruined regions of Ulster along with permanently garrisoned troops in Carrickfergus (a strategic location taken by Edward Bruce following a prolonged siege) to 'aid and defend the colonists and cope with the Scots invading from the Hebrides.'

In *A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was Never Entirely Subdued* (1612), John Davies (1560/63-1625), who visited Ireland as a surveyor with Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex (1599), recalls how king Edward I 'subdued and reduced' Scotland while his timorous successor, Edward II, chose to send one small army into Ireland, not to conquer but rather to protect the exiled Piers Gaveston who then held the position of lieutenant of

---

[189] Christopher Maginn, 'Herbert, Sir William (*c*.1553–1593)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), online edn., 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13056 [accessed: 25/01/2015]; William Herbert, *Croftus sive de Hibernia liber*, ed. Arthur Keaveney and John A. Madden (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 1992), p.93.
[190] Herbert, *Croftus*, p.93, 45.
[191] Herbert, *Croftus*, p.95.
[192] Herbert, *Croftus*, p.95.

Ireland.[193] Gaveston was recalled by Edward on account of the Bruce invasion and the accompanying Irish rebellion which

> did not only disable this king to be a Conqueror, but deprived him both of his kingdom and life. And when the Scottish nation had over-run all this land under the conduct of Edward le Bruce (who stiled himself King of Ireland) England was not then able to send either men or mony to save this Kingdom.[194]

Davies's declaration that 'the impediments of the Conquest of Ireland, are so notorious, as I shall not need to express them', complicates somewhat Eudoxus's claim that he is unacquainted with the Bruce invasion and Edward Bruce's short-lived reign as king of Ireland.[195]

The Politico-Cultural Context of *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland* (1826)

> May sage history's voice,
> Fraught with the wisdom of a thousand years,
> Teach not in vain, whence springs a nation's good
> And whence her misery. Let Erin learn
> Not on the past, but on the days to come,
> To found her glory. *Clontarf*.

Though his current status is that of minor poet, William Hamilton Drummond (1778-1865) was a significant figure in Ulster-Scots literary and political circles in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[196] Born in Larne in Antrim (where the Bruce invasion party landed), Drummond was educated in Belfast and Glasgow and trained as a Presbyterian minister before becoming a Unitarian.[197] His oeuvre covers a variety of topics from the topographical and scientific (*The Giant's Causeway*), to religion (*Sermons* (1867)), liberty and tyranny (*Hibernia* (1776), *The Man of Age* (1797)), and the historical (*Battle of Trafalgar*, *Clontarf* and *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland*).

---

[193] J. J. N. McGurk, 'Davies , Sir John (1560/63–1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), online edn, 2008, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7242 [accessed: 26/01/2015]

[194] John Davis, *Historical Relations*, *A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was Never Entirely Subdued nor Brought Under Obedience of the crown of England Until the beginning of the reign of King James of Happy memory* (Dublin: Samuel Dancer, 1612; 1666), p.76.

[195] Davies, *A Discovery*, p.77.

[196] While research on Ulster-Scot writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries justifiably continues to grow, Drummond typically follows in the wake of Thomas Moore, James Orr, Samuel Thomson, and William Drennan. For biographical details on Drummond see: 'William Hamilton Drummond', in *Belfast Literary Society 1801-190: Historical Sketch with Memoirs of some Distinguished Members* (Belfast: M'Caw, Stevenson & Orr, 1902), pp. 37-9; Samuel Shannon Millin, 'The Poetry of William Hamilton Drummond, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 7, 1 (1901), pp.37-43; R. K. Webb, 'Drummond, William Hamilton (1778–1865)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/8090 [accessed 11 June 2015]

[197] Drummond later became active in the Unitarian cause and his poem 'The Doctrine of the Trinity' (1827) explores a third alternative to the protestant-Catholic discussion. Webb, 'Drummond', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

Drummond's literature is a product of the political and constitutional change sweeping through Ireland during a period that witnessed the emergence of an identifiably 'Irish' literature alongside a revival in Celtic culture and historiography, fuelled by radical politics, criticism and patriotism.[198] Drummond was a member of the Society of United Irishmen (UI) (1791) and a contributor to the radical newspaper the *Northern Star* (1792-1797),[199] and so provocative was Drummond's political verse deemed to be that he was singled out for having encouraged the Irish Rebellion of 1798 and allegedly had a pistol held to his head.[200] Following the failed rebellion and the threat on his life, Drummond's later work, such as the *Battle of Trafalgar* (1807) and *The Giant's Causeway* (1811), appears considerably less confrontational than hitherto. Nonetheless, both poems possess a political edge, and as Frank Ferguson observes, commemorate a revival in politics and culture in the North of Ireland.[201]

Primarily a topographical poem, *The Giant's Causeway* is partly concerned with Irish and Scottish connections and foreshadows Drummond's explicit examination of the relationship in *Bruce's Invasion*. Written immediately after the event, *Trafalgar* commemorates the British victory (1805) against the French and Spanish navies, while *Clontarf* (1822) narrates the Danish invasion of Ireland in 1014 where the Scandinavian force 'received their most signal overthrow' at the hands of the Irish.[202] It is conspicuous that *Trafalgar*, *Clontarf* and *Bruce's Invasion* all deal with war, conquest, and successful resistance against an oppressive or occupying force, and to this extent encourage violent struggle as a means of defeating autocracy. This can be seen in a passage from the fourth canto of *Bruce's Invasion* entitled 'The Battle':

> True - war is an angel of wrath and of power,
> Commissioned by heaven to waste and devour.
> Yet, good blends with evil in all things below,
> And bliss may be found in the chalice of wo.
> From evils more dire than the sword war can save;
> It dissevers the chains that would nations enslave.
> 'Tis the thunder that shakes purple tyrants with dread,
> The lightning that strikes the state-pestilence dead.[203]

---

[198] Murray Pittock, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.93.

[199] The UI were a predominantly Presbyterian and middle class organisation influenced by Irish patriotism and the radicalism of the American and French revolutions, who sought political reform and the cessation of English authority in Ireland. Connolly, *Oxford Companion to Irish History*, p.598.

[200] Frank Ferguson, ed. *Ulster-Scots Writing: An Anthology* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008), p.148. Immediately after the 1798 rebellion, Drummond had considered writing a poem entitled 'The Rebels' but decided against it; by this time he was Minister of the Second Presbyterian Church, Belfast and by 1801 one of the founders of the Belfast Literary Society. John Gray, 'Burns and his Visitors from Ulster: From Adulation to Disaccord', *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 33, 1 (2004), pp. 320-334, p.333.

[201] Ferguson, *Ulster-Scots*, p.148.

[202] William Hamilton Drummond, *Clontarf: A Poem* (Dublin: Archer; Hodges and M'Arthur, 1822), p.viii.

[203] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, p.66.

Drummond's appeal to cultural memory studies is obvious. His body of work demonstrates a penchant for narrativising, or in the case of *Invasion*, wholly reimagining historical conflicts to reflect on the present. In the preface to *Clontarf*, Drummond outlines a philosophy very similar to that of the *ars memoriae*, when, reflecting on poetic descriptions of scenery, he warns that

> repetition wearies, and mere beauty of scene, unless accompanied with some singular phenomena, which may afford room for the speculations of the philosopher, or the researches of the antiquary, and are, at the same time, susceptible of poetical embellishment, does not afford sufficient materials, nor is it capable of exciting a powerful enough interest for the objects of the poet. Description soon satiates the reader. Tired with the contemplation of woods and lakes, of rocks and mountains, he longs for subjects of higher moment; and unless the scene described, be mingled with historical, fabulous, and romantic associations, turns from it with indifference or disgust. The actions of human beings stamp true importance on every celebrated region: and hence a barren plain, or rocky pass, from the circumstance of its having once been the theatre of some mighty struggle, shall possess more power in wakening the imagination, than the most beautiful landscape in nature. The spot which witnessed the achievements of the hero, and the triumph of liberty, become hallowed in his estimation. He sees the spirits of the mighty dead hovering around him, or he transports himself back to the age which their actions have immortalized. He becomes an actor in the scene, and a participator in the triumph.[204]

Like Barbour and to some degree Spenser, Drummond recognises that the reader requires 'subjects of higher moments' which necessitate that the scene be 'mingled with historical, fabulous, and romantic associations'. Drummond goes a step further than Spenser and Barbour when suggesting that the 'scene', even after 'poetical embellishments', is unable to excite the necessary interest in the poet. Unlike his predecessors, Drummond explicitly proposes human activity as the crucial factor that determines if a scene, even 'the most beautiful landscape in nature', becomes a 'celebrated region', or as it is now termed, a site of memory.

A site's power to stimulate imagination is ultimately dependent on its association with 'the achievements of the hero, and the triumph of liberty'; much like, for example, the geographical and metaphysical site of Bannockburn.[205] It is at such 'hallowed' sites that the subject may receive an intense temporal experience, akin to that described by Barbour in the 'prologue' when heroes of the past, like ghosts, literally appear in the present. Barbour rhetoricises and mythologises Robert Bruce in order to impose the present on the

---

[204] Drummond, *Clontarf*, p.xiv. In his conviction that a scene must be 'accompanied with some singular phenomena', for it to appeal to the poet, Drummond recalls the view of the author of *Ad. Herennium*: that nature is indifferent to ordinary events but stirred by a 'new or striking occurrence'. Cited in Yates, *The Art of Memory*, p.24. *Ad. Herennium*, as we recall, also advocates reshaping the *imagines agentes* for memorable effect.
[205] The recent construction of the Battle of Bannockburn Visitor Centre, quite literally a site of memory erected upon a site of memory, permits patrons to experience, through 3D technology, medieval combat, 'like never before'. *The Battle of Bannockburn*: http://battleofbannockburn.com/ [accessed: 04/03/2015]

past, vis-à-vis the late fourteenth century Bruce monarchy. Both poets endeavour to trigger a visceral effect on the reader/audience; Drummond's subject 'sees the spirits of the mighty dead hovering around him' but, in contrast to Barbour, Drummond is concerned with bringing the past into the present by paradoxically 'transport(ing)' the subject back to a specific time to become 'an actor in the scene, and a participator in the triumph'. To return, one assumes, imbued with rebellious spirit and inspired to resist. Far less radically, Barbour's *Bruce* records Scottish resistance against England but does so to stabilise an existing monarchy.

Drummond's use of cultural memory is entirely in keeping with the period's obsession with the past (in Ireland and Scotland in particular) and its practice of recalling evocative historical events and eminent figures for national and political functions. The most vital of which, to be discussed presently, was the figure of the bard. Julie Kipp affirms that Irish and Scottish writers at this time

> capitalised on (and helped foster) mainstream Romanticists' preoccupation with memory and an idealised past, the recuperation of an authentic language of 'real men', and the celebration of visionary rebellious enthusiasm as part of a broader program that served variously the functions of preserving, legitimising, and sometimes mobilising Scottish and Irish cultural resources in the early decades of the nineteenth century.[206]

Drummond's allusions to *ars memoriae* are largely inexplicit, and in critical terms hitherto unacknowledged; however, as evidenced by the *Clontarf* preface, Drummond knowingly participates in the process and does so with the aim of re-inflating Irish confidence via narrativised and epic histories in which the Irish see off the Danes, the Scots and the French. Barbour on the other hand performs this process to legitimise the Bruce monarchy and advance national identity, while Spenser compares distant episodes to reveal, among other things, persistent problems and misconceptions of historical progress.

When set against the backdrop of Irish radicalism and Celtic Romanticism, Drummond's work, especially *Clontarf* and *Bruce's Invasion*, strives not only to retell history but to create a historical nexus wherein the reader is transported back to the event in question in the hope that some emotional or political identification between past and present occurs. By identifying the extent of Drummond's interest in memory we can interpret '*Invasion*' from this perspective with confidence. At its most obvious the poem is an indictment of the Scottish invasion and can be straightforwardly compared and contrasted with Barbour's *Bruce* and the relevant historiography; however, the intense

---

[206] Julie Kipp, 'Remembrance, Rebellion and the Gender Politics of the Bardic Nation: Irish and Scottish Romanticisms', in *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700-2000*, eds. Liam McIlvanney and Ray Ryan (Dublin: Four courts Press, 2005), pp.113-129, p.115.

political period which produced the poem, along with the poet's documented radicalism strongly suggests that the poem is more than a simple retelling and rebuke of the 1315 invasion.

The Drummond section is in two parts: the first explores the possibility that Drummond's story of Scottish nobles subjugating Ireland is an allusion to the prevailing Irish-Scottish relationship, in light of the Ossian controversy. The second part posits that Drummond exploits the historic invasion of Ireland by the Scots in order to comment on and condemn the existing democratic deficit within 'Britain', and England's/Britain's dominance over Ireland. To begin with however I will offer a brief comparison between Barbour's *Bruce* and Drummond's *Invasion*.

Drummond admits to having 'availed himself of Barbour's narrative', but amid the many parallels with the *Bruce* there are considerable differences.[207] Drummond agrees that the invasion was Edward Bruce's idea but contrary to Barbour who portrays the Irish as enthralled by the Scots victory at Bannockburn, Drummond describes the Irish as 'wearied and exhausted by sanguinary wars'. Fearing no end to its hostilities with England, they turn to the Scots but only after soliciting the English to be afforded the same rights and privileges as they. It is after their appeal is rejected by the Irish parliament that 'the chiefs, mortified and disappointed […] had recourse to their last and only alternative, the sword'.[208] 'Thus was the leopard [Drummond lifts Barbour's enigmatic nickname for Edward Bruce] solicited to protect the fold which had been already wasted by the wolf and the bear.'[209]

Like Barbour, Drummond posits that if the campaign had been 'conducted with more prudence' and had Edward possessed similar 'virtues' to Robert, he would have become established as Ireland's king. Barbour calls the Irish 'traitors' to the Scottish cause whereas Drummond lambasts the Irish as traitors to each other and to Ireland: 'kinsmen and brothers pierce each other's breasts / With steel that should ring on the ravagers' crests.'[210] So too the Irish nobles and clergy - 'who to wreck private wrongs shed their dear country's blood!' - are condemned for collaborating with the Bruces; thus, the narrator laments: 'Erin is conquered by Erin alone'.[211] Finally, as one might expect from an Irish portrayal, the Scots in Drummond's poem are unrestrained conquerors: their 'horrific

---

[207] William Hamilton Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland: A Poem* (Dublin: Hodges and M'Arthur, 1826), p.5.
[208] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion* pp.1-2.
[209] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, p.3.
[210] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, 1, p.15.
[211] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, 1, p.16.

barbarities and rapacity […] soon alienated the minds of [the] Irish allies, and gave them alarming proofs of what they were to expect from a change of masters'.[212]

Counter-memory

Cultural memory studies often exhume alternate histories long interred in the limits of the traditional focus of historians and critics, and while the exclusionary process may ultimately strengthen the dominant memory the risk remains that, to cite Orosius, a 'faint trace' of the relegated group/identity remains. This is particularly true of literature and the arts which often afford space for marginalised histories, or 'counter-memories' (counter-memories typically involve the non-heroic, the marginalised, the exploited, and the lower-classes), often 'defined in opposition to hegemonic views of the past.'[213] There is some overlap here between cultural memory theories and 'counter-memories', and Foucault's theory of 'counter-history' and 'effective' history. The former has the capacity to liberate subjugated voices and experiences that challenge established perceptions of history and specific events and the latter rejects a teleological view of the past as one of 'patient and continuous development' and instead 'introduces discontinuity'.[214] An 'event' described through 'effective' history is not a 'decision, a treaty, a reign, or a battle, but the reversal of a relationship of forces, the usurpation of power […] the entry of a masked "other"'.[215]

In both Barbour's *Bruce* and Spenser's *View*, the Irish are essential to the discourse, but essentially voiceless, and for someone else to triumph they must lose. Barbour, for example, is careful to subsume the Irish campaign within the greater project of 'Bannockburn' and 'the Bruce'. Whereas, in the preface to his poem, Drummond acknowledges that 'if Bruce were assailed by only a tenth part of the numbers mentioned by Barbour, the great majority must have been Irish, although our annalists notice only the principal English leaders.'[216] Drummond imaginatively expands on the traces left by Barbour and in the vein of Orosius reimagines the entire invasion from an Irish perspective, focusing on its initially demoralising impact on the native Irish followed by their spirited response and victory. Drummond approaches the Irish invasion as a site of memory, effectively promoting a marginalised experience to the centre, and thereby liberating a counter memory that both contradicts its source material and resonates powerfully with contemporary politics.

---

[212] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, pp.4-5.
[213] Rigney, 'The Dynamics of Remembrance', p.348; Rigney, 'Plenitude, Scarcity', p.13.
[214] Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', pp.153-4.
[215] Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', pp.154.
[216] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, p.6.

Drummond's poem was not the only reconfiguration of the memory of the Bruce invasion around this time. As touched on in chapter one, the Gaelic Irish tract *Cath Fhochairte Brighite* (1845?) recounts the invasion but has in recent times been exposed as a forgery with Nicholas Kearney as the chief suspect. Duffy suggests that the tracts existence stems from 'someone's need for an "authentic" Gaelic account of the Bruce invasion'.[217] In view of the identical subject matter and likely political motivation, it is credible that Drummond's '*Invasion*' influenced the author of *Cath Fhochairte Brighite*. What is more, there is evidence of, at the very least, a literary association between Kearney and Drummond. Kearney's name appears several times in the notes to Drummond's *Ancient Irish Minstrelsy* (1852) (59, 64, 88, 174) and it has been suggested that Kearney assisted Drummond with annotations and possibly translations.[218]

Bardism

It is crucial to position *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland* within the context of Irish and Scottish Romanticism, the Celtic Revival and the re-emergence of an archetypical cultural memory figure: the bard.[219] The bard's (file) primary function was to compose eulogies for their patron or against their patron's enemies, to commit to memory through songs and poems the deeds of heroic men and the genealogies of the Celtic elite.[220] The 'bards', as the original archivists of society's memories, *are* cultural memory and maintain a link between the past and present and consequently a group or community's identity.

In view of this fact it was of the upmost importance to England's imperial strategy that the bards in Wales and Ireland be abolished. Infamously, in 1282, Edward I massacred a large number of Welsh bards in a bid to sever the ties of Welsh tradition and identity.[221] In *A View*, Spenser writes that the Irish bards 'deserve to bee sharpely disciplined' since

---

[217] Duffy, 'The Gaelic Account of the Bruce Invasion, p.116.

[218] Duffy, 'The Gaelic Account of the Bruce Invasion', p.70. Kearney was a priest and scholar and sought to prove that 'the Irish language is the natural one, nay, the language which the omnipotent creator spoke all animate and manunate into existence'. Nicholas Kearney to John O'Daly, 19 Jan. 1845, NLI, ms G389, pp.267-69. Cited in Nicholas M. Wolf, *Language, Change and the Evolution of Religion, Community, and Culture in Ireland, 1800-1900*, thesis, *ProQuest* (2008), pp.27-8.

[219] The forefather of the bards is undoubtedly the Greek poet Simonides. Hired to perform at a feast, Simonides, much to the dislike of his patron, exalted both men and gods (Castor and Pollux). Upon receipt of half his fee the poet was advised to get the rest from the gods who duly compensated by summoning Simonides moments before the dining disaster. His later display of memory to identify the guests led to Simonides being credited with inventing a mnemotechnic technique that confirmed the 'power of human memory over death and destruction'. Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilisation*, p.26.

[220] An earlier elite class of Irish poets were the fili. Primarily active before the twelfth century, they were mostly associated with the church, composing mainly religious and historical works. Connolly, *Oxford Companion to Irish History*, p.40. Like the bards however one of the functions of the fili 'was to provide political and social validation for the ascendant elite.' Marc Caball, *Poets and Politics, Continuity and Reaction in Irish Poetry, 1558-1625* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1998), p.2.

[221] Katie Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and The British Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p.5.

they 'forge and falsifie every thing as they list, to please or displease any man'.[222] Marc Caball describes the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods as 'of critical significance in the history of Gaelic literature and culture' and sees 'a tendency towards innovation in bardic poetry at this juncture.'[223] These innovations were linked to a programme of conquest and colonisation which impressed itself on the bardic poetry of the period.[224] In the Romantic period the bard is reimagined as the 'sole survivor of that culture [Celtic]' and as a result 'acquired the absolute power of incontestable narration'.[225]

That the bards could rise to such cultural and historical standing was inconceivable to the Catholic priest and historian Thomas Innes (1662-1744). (Innes's fascination is evident in his 'Critical Essay on the Ancient Inhabitants of the Northern Parts of Britain or Scotland', which mentions the bard 144 times). According to Innes, the 'preserving of memory of past transactions' without writing meant that history was embellished 'under the conduct of their ignorant and venal guides, the bards, famous for flattering their patrons with ancient pedigrees, and whole nations with ancient successions of kings'.[226]

In spite of Innes's cautionary criticism the work of mid-eighteenth century British antiquaries and editors brought about a renaissance in bardism and a re-fashioning of the bard tailored to their national needs. In 1757, Thomas Gray published 'The Bard: A Pindaric Ode' (1757) (drawing on Welsh bardic traditions),[227] while in Scotland, James Macpherson published *Fragments of Ancient Poetry Collected in the Highlands of Scotland* (1760) (which controversially drew on Irish sources), and in Wales, Evan Evans published *Some Specimens of the Poetry of the Antient Welsh Bards* (1764). Trumpener argues that English writers, mimicking the bardic tradition of Wales, Ireland and Scotland did so 'without grasping their historical and cultural significance', and consequently the 'Celtic' nations viewed England's bardic reproduction as another form of 'cultural subjugation'.[228] Macpherson and Evans were among the first Celtic writers to re-establish 'the cultural rootedness of bardic poetry and its status as historical testimony', and used the bard to articulate a distinctive nostalgia 'for independence and for a lost feudal unity'.[229]

---

[222] Spenser, *A View*, pp.76, 46.
[223] Caball, *Poets and Politics,* p.6.
[224] Caball, *Poets and Politics*, p.1.
[225] Fiona Stafford, 'Romantic Macpherson', in *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Romanticism*, ed. Murray Pittock (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), pp.27-49, pp.27-28.
[226] Thomas Innes, 'Preface' to 'A Critical Essay on the Ancient Inhabitants of the Northern Parts of Britain or Scotland', in *The Historians of Scotland*, 3 (Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1879), pp.1-20, p.1.
[227] Pittock, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism*, p.13.
[228] Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, pp.6, 7.
[229] Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, pp.4, 7.

While Celtic nationalist antiquaries rummaged through history for patriotic ideals and radical ideas, English poets focused on the figure of the bard himself.[230] In England the bard (minstrel) was a melancholic, isolated, but inspired figure, whereas for the Celts the bard was an inspirational symbol, opposed to tyranny and 'the champion of national liberty'.[231] Both English and Celtic bards deal in inspiration but whereas the spiritual English bard finds inspiration in that spirituality, the Celtic bard actively seeks to inspire others.

Rebellious bards

Bruce's Invasion of Ireland is a poem firmly rooted in the ideas of Romanticism and Irish nationalism and employs many of its themes and motifs. Most obviously, Ireland is personified as a female, Erin, who is strongly identified with Irish liberty in Thomas Moore's 'Erin, Oh Erin' and 'Irish mythmaking' in William Drennan's 'When Erin First Rose'.[232] The harp, which had been heavily politicised when adopted as an emblem by the United Irishmen - whose motto was: 'It is New Strung and Shall be Heard' - occurs throughout Drummond's poem. The 1792 Belfast harpists' festival was intended to (according to advertisements at the time) 'revive and perpetuate the ancient Music and Poetry of Ireland', and is regarded as the highpoint of the 'first Celtic revival' which purposely took place around Bastille Day and was organised by the radical Henry McCracken.[233] In *Bruce's Invasion* it is the bard's stirring music that ignites the Irish defence:

> As the bards in grand chorus the strings sweep along,
> The ranks catch the life-spark, and burst into song,
> Empassioned and wild as the spirit that rings
> On the harp of the winds, when the hurricane sings.[234]

---

[230] Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, p.6.
[231] Mary Helen Thuente, *The Harp Re-strung: The United Irishmen and the Rise of Irish Literary Nationalism* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1994), pp.28, 29.
[232] Leith Davis, 'Irish Bards and English Consumers: Thomas Moore's "Irish Melodies" and the Colonized Nation', *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*, 24, 2 (1993), p.10; Norman Vance, 'Celts, Carthaginians and Constitutions: Anglo-Irish Literary Relations', *Irish Historical Studies*, 22, 86 (1980), pp.16-238, p.228.
[233] Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, p.10.
[234] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, p.59. In the 'Introduction' section of the Estonian epic *Kalevipoeg*, a bard attempts to inspire the present through memories of the past with assistance from elemental forces:
Fan the ancient memories now,
All that's heard of the Kalev Heroes…
quickly mighty wind gusts come,
From afar the sound of waves:
… Speak of all the very dearest
Things that long have been forgotten,
Memories long lost from mind. Kreutzwald, 'Introduction', *Kalevipoeg*, 1-31.

Lamenting the state of Ireland, Joseph Walker muses that 'the songs of early Bards, and the glimmering lights of tradition, often bewilder their followers; but they sometimes lead them to truth.'[235] Drummond's Ireland begins appropriately in 'dark chaos'; the hills and valleys where 'poets once sung' are untenanted, leading the narrator to question the purpose of such natural beauty 'if those valleys and hills but re-echo thy screams'.[236] The 'discord' produced by the absence of the bards is 'more dire […] than famine and plague' and turns Ireland's 'glory to shame'.[237] But the bards are then revitalised by the spirit of Ossian (much as Macpherson's Ossian energised Scottish culture and identity) and in turn encourage the native Irish to rise up and force the tyrannical Scots out of Ireland.

Drummond's extensive use of the bards, who represent Ireland's last line of defence against tyranny, positions the poem within the existing Irish literary movement but equally the existing political milieu. Moreover, the inclusion of the bards within the larger counter-memory of the invasion narrative simultaneously seeks to stir an equivalent rebelliousness in contemporary Irish readers. Drummond's minor epic poem is in point of fact a rich and complex example of bardic nationalism.

The Ossian controversy

The complex cultural relationship between Ireland and Scotland, and their writers, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is a subject that would assuredly repay further research, and is, this study argues, an important backdrop to interpreting *Bruce's Invasion*. Traditionally, Anglo-Irish studies have overlooked the importance of Scotland, but the recent rise of Irish and Scottish Studies has made some progress in 'negat[ing] those accounts of either culture which assume that each is defined only ever against England'.[238] By the same token however it is often necessary and indeed often more illuminating to view the respective histories as a three-way struggle, within the larger matter of Britain.

Ireland and Scotland (the North of Ireland and the West of Scotland in particular) share a long and complex history, particularly a migratory history, and in the past, and present, have often undergone parallel political, social and religious shifts. More specifically, the planting of Antrim and Down by the 'founding fathers' of the Ulster-Scots, James Hamilton (1560–1644), 1st Viscount of Clandeboye (1605), and Hugh Montgomery (1560-1636), 1st Viscount Montgomery of the Great Ards (1606), and the

---

[235] Joseph C. Walker, *Historical Memoirs of the Irish Bards* (Dublin: Luke White, 1810), p.2.
[236] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, 2, p.26.
[237] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, 2, p.26.
[238] Cairns Craig, 'National literature and cultural capital in Scotland and Ireland', in *Ireland and Scotland: culture and society, 1700-2000*, p.48.

later Ulster Plantation (1609) forged non-Gaelic links that had by the eighteenth century developed into 'an ideological community' between Ulster-Scots and Presbyterian Scots with Glasgow as 'its intellectual centre'.[239]

As Ireland underwent its cultural and national revival, Scotland too saw an increase in national literature and along with Ireland engaged in 'a struggle over patriot historiography', seeking to reverse what they saw as the destruction of their Gaelic culture by England.[240] Many Irish writers expressed camaraderie with the Scots, especially during the 1790s, a period of intense political and constitutional change. In 1792 the UI sent a fraternal address, written by the poet and founding member William Drennan, to the third reform convention in Edinburgh congratulating the Scots on their fortitude post-union not to be 'merged and melted down into another country' but steadfastly remain 'Scotland – the land where Buchanan wrote, and Fletcher spoke, and Wallace fought'.[241] The Edinburgh reformers however 'denounced the address as "high treason against the union betwixt England and Scotland."'[242] Jim Smyth ascribes the Scottish rebuff to the broad bond of Protestantism they shared with the English, the influence of the kirk, and the welcome revenue from trade and empire, adding that in the 1790s the majority of Scots 'were content to call themselves North Britons.'[243] While all these factors no doubt influenced the condemnatory character of the Scottish response there are additional explanations.

The French Revolution (1789-1799), for example, was on-going. In 1791 Thomas Paine published part one of *The Rights of Man*, and between 1792 and 1793 the *Society of the Friends of the People* was established in England and Scotland for the purpose of parliamentary reform. In Scotland the rise of radicalism and the swell of reform provoked a visit by the home secretary Henry Dundas who was alarmed at the spread of radical

---

[239] Elaine MacFarland, *Ireland and Scotland in the Age of Revolution: Planting the Green Bough* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994), p.1; L.M. Cullen, 'Scotland and Ireland, 1600-1800: their role in the evolution of British society', in *Scottish Society, 1500-1800*, eds. R.A. Houston and I. D. Whyte (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p.230.

[240] Pittock, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism*, p.92.

[241] Jim Smyth, 'Introduction: the 1798 rebellion in its eighteenth-century contexts', in *Revolution, Counter-revolution and Union: Ireland in the 1790s*, ed. Jim Smyth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp.1-21, pp.10-11; Liam McIlvanney and Ray Ryan, 'Introduction', in *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700-2000*, pp.11-23, p.19. R. F. Foster argues that the UI were originally modernisers and internationalists rather than nationalists, more interested in American and French radicalism than traditional Celtic culture. R. F. Foster, *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972* (London: Penguin Books, 1988), p.270. Thuente on the other hand, in her study on the UI asserts that the society was significantly influenced by Celtic literature, as attested by their harp emblem and motto. The UI's choice of emblem demonstrates that a 'connection between poetry and the political life of a nation continued as a literary image and became a literary model for Irish political activists, Volunteers and united Irishmen alike'. Thuente, *Harp Re-strung*, pp.26, 31.

[242] Smyth, 'Introduction', p.11.

[243] Smyth, 'Introduction', p.11.

groups.[244] Moreover, the 'September Massacres' (1792), the execution of prison inmates in French cities on the orders of radicals, terrified Britain's, and especially Scotland's ruling class.[245] Dundas briefly considered a military response but the government's assault took place in a court of law in December 1792 with the trials of several members of the Scottish reform movement. [246]

The most high-profile defendant was Thomas Muir who was charged with agitation on the grounds of encouraging people to read Thomas Paine. More significantly Muir was held 'responsible for the reception of treasonable communications from the United Irishmen'.[247] At the reform convention Muir had delivered Drennan's 'Address from the Society of United Irishmen in Dublin to the reformers in Scotland'. The address itself, as the author of *The Life of Thomas Muir* writes, is 'couched in warm and glowing language':

> We take the liberty of addressing you in the spirit of civic union, in the fellowship of a just and a common cause. We greatly rejoice that the spirit of freedom moves over the face of Scotland, that light seems to break from the chaos of her internal government; and that a country so respectable in her attainments in science, in arts, and in arms; for men of literary eminence, for the intelligence and morality of her people, now acts from a conviction of the union between virtue, letters, and liberty; and now rises to distinction, not by a calm, contented, secret wish for a Reform in Parliament, but by openly, actively, and urgently willing it, with the unity and energy of an imbodied nation.[248]

Christopher Whatley asserts that the events of the third convention led directly to the trials.[249] This is unsurprising given the radical tenor and fraternal language expressed by the address which was certain to alarm the political establishment. Similar comradeship is evinced in 'The Social Thistle and the Shamrock' by the poet and founding member of the UI, Henry Joy McCracken (1767-1798) who writes that 'the Scotch and Irish friendly are, their wishes are the same […] Our historians and our poets, they always did maintain, / that the origin of Scottishmen and Irish were the same.'[250] McCracken was a crucial figure in the lead up to and during the 1798 rebellion and was afterwards arrested, convicted and hanged.[251]

As a result of his radical activities - although one presumes more for his support of and connections with the Irish reformers - Thomas Muir was branded a traitor and

---

[244] John Cannon, *Parliamentary Reform 1640-1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p.126.
[245] Christopher A. Whatley, *Scottish Society, 1707-1830: Beyond Jacobitism, Towards Industrialisation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), p.301.
[246] Cannon, *Parliamentary Reform*, p.127.
[247] Cannon, *Parliamentary Reform*, p.127.
[248] Peter MacKenzie, *The Life of Thomas Muir, Esquire, Advocate* (Glasgow, W. R. M'Phun, 1821), p.8.
[249] Whatley, *Scottish Society*, p.302.
[250] Cited in Pittock, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism*, p.104.
[251] Foster, *Modern Ireland*, p.266.

sentenced to fourteen years transportation.[252] Taking the fierce political climate into account together with the Edinburgh show-trials, as it seems apposite to call them, the basis of the subsequent rejection of the Irish approach by the Edinburgh reformers appears to be based on much more than religious sympathy or a sense of Britishness. In addition the legal system was harnessed by the government and enormous pressure applied to Scottish reformers and allies of the Irish radicals such as Thomas Muir. For the Edinburgh reformers it was a case of self-preservation, and from a political perspective a fine example of realpolitik.

Culturally at least the links between the West of Scotland and the North of Ireland continued, due in no small part to the influence of Allan Ramsay and Robert Burns, with whom the Ulster poets shared a similar language and an inclination towards using vernacular poetry in their national cultural project.[253] Burns is the subject of much Ulster poetry including William Drennan's 'To the memory of Robert Burns', James Orr's 'Elegy on the death of Mr. Robert Burns', and Samuel Thomson's 'Epistle to Mr. R****t B***s'.[254] For a long time it was assumed that the Ulster poets were mere flatterers and imitators of Burns but in recent years this has been viewed as a 'Scoto-centric construction' that ultimately subordinates the Ulster poets.[255] Carol Baraniuk submits that Burns' success likely inspired the Ulster poets to write and publish in vernacular language (though some Ulster poets were already doing this before Burns), but they were poets in their own right drawing on a pre-existing Scottish heritage in Ulster.[256] The poem 'To Captain M'Dougall' by Samuel Thomson captures the complex duality of Ulster-Scottish heritage and the strong connection many Ulster poets felt with Scotland: 'yet tho' I'm Irish all without, / I'm every item Scotch within', Thomson writes.[257] In the case of William Hamilton Drummond, despite being born into an Ulster-Scots community in Larne, Antrim, and educated at the University of Glasgow, Drummond clearly felt that Irish culture had been mistreated by the purloining of its legends by the Scots. I would argue that in Barbour's version of the Bruce invasion, Drummond found an analogous

---

[252] Cannon, *Parliamentary Reform*, p.128.
[253] McIlvanney, 'Introduction', p.20.
[254] William Drennan, *Glendalloch and other poems by the late Dr. Drennan, with additional verses by his sons* (Dublin: William Robertson, 1859), p.272-8; James Orr, *Poems on Various Subjects* (Belfast: Smyth and Lyons, 1804), pp.9-12.
[255] Carol Baraniuk, '"No Bardolatry" here': the independence of the Ulster-Scots poetic tradition', in *Revising Robert Burns and Ulster: Literature, religion and Politics, c.1770-1920*, eds. Frank Ferguson and Andrew R. Holmes (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), pp.64-83, p.64.
[256] Baraniuk, 'No Bardolatry here', pp.66, 81.
[257] Samuel Thompson, *Simple Poems on a Few Subjects* (Belfast: Smyth and Lyons, 1806), p.88.

mistreatment of the Irish and a perfect vehicle to reinstate the Irish experience of 1315 and at the same time restate Ireland's cultural authority in 1826.[258]

Irish responses to Ossian

When James Macpherson published *Fragments of Ancient Poetry* (1760), followed by *Fingal* (1761), *Temora* (1761) and *The Works of Ossian* (1765) (2015 is the 250th anniversary of the collected edition) and held them to be the remains (or memories) of a third-century Scottish warrior and poet named Ossian, Irish sentimental identification with Scotland became somewhat strained. On the one hand these works raised the standing of Gaelic poetry across Europe, stimulated European Romanticism, affirmed the ideals of an Enlightenment project that championed the primitive, stimulated scholarly and critical analysis, and formed a close 'connection between poetry and the political life of a nation'.[259] On the other hand, Macpherson's assertion of Ossian's Scottish origins was viewed by many Irish as an unambiguous high-jacking of Irish historical myth.

To begin with the Irish response was 'intermittent and fragmented' but gradually an antiquarian quarrel developed concomitantly with a period of Irish reclamation.[260] As many critics note, the Irish, primarily out of self-preservation, did not contest the historicity of Macpherson's work, merely his Scottish claims to Irish history and

---

[258] This Irish and Scottish connection is explored spatially in the contemporary topographical poem *Rathlin: a descriptive poem* (1820) by the Ulster-Scots poet Thomas Beggs (1789 - 1847). Beggs was born in County Antrim (cousin to the poet James Orr) and was fascinated by Rathlin Island, composing his poem while on a walking visit. Frank Ferguson, *Ulster-Scots*, p.171. Though primarily a nature poem - at one point the narrator declines to describe a scene exclaiming 'let DRUMMOND dwell / On wonders he has sung so well!' Thomas Beggs, *Rathlin: A descriptive poem, written after a visit to that Island* (Belfast: Hugh Clark and Company, 1820), p.23. Beggs's poem also describes Rathlin's history (from Robert Bruce's concealment in a cave to the sixteenth-century hostilities between the MacQuillans and MacDonnells) and existing culture, portraying the island as a hub between Ireland and Scotland and eulogising the 'historical, cultural, and linguistic connections between North-East Ireland and the west coast of Scotland.' David Grey, 'Peatland and the Ulster-Scottish Culture of North-East Ireland in Thomas Beggs's *Rathlin'*, *Scottish Literary Review*, 6, 2 (2004), pp.49-56, p.52.
Such is the significance of Rathlin Island to the story of the Scots in Ulster that it is appears regularly in chapter two. For the moment it is worth noting that Rathlin first emerges as a symbolic site of memory after Barbour alleges that Robert Bruce, fleeing the English, hid there in a cave in 1306-7. Beggs's poem references Robert Bruce's cave (Robert Bruce is portrayed in the poem as an exemplary figure) where he is said to have been secreted escaping the English and where, after his epiphanic moment with a spider, he was inspired to defeat them. Thomas Beggs, *Rathlin*, pp.16-17, 24. Interestingly, with regard to the bards, the narrator claims that Rathlin is so picturesque that it does not 'need the aid of bard to bring / His lustre from lone Lethe's spring [the mythical Greek river Lethe is associated with forgetfulness] / For poor the praise that bard bestows, / Where wisdom shines and goodness glows'. Beggs, *Rathlin*, p.8. In essence, Beggs is suggesting that there is no need to remember or be led via the bard or the past.
[259] Thuente, *The Harp Re-strung*, p.31.
[260] Clare O'Halloran, 'Irish Re-Creations of the Gaelic Past: The Challenge of Macpherson's Ossian', *Past & Present*, 124 (1989), pp. 69-95, p.73. Thomas Percy's pro-English *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1795) refutes MacPherson's and Scotland's 'claims to cultural primacy within Great Britain'. Frank Ferguson, 'Burns the Conservative': revising the Lowland Scottish tradition in Ulster poetry, in *Revising Robert Burns and Ulster: Literature, Religion and Politics, c.1770-1920*, pp.83-106, p.86.

tradition.[261] Charles O'Conor's *Dissertations on the History of Ireland* (1753) was an earlier and implicit response to plagiarist Scots prior to Macpherson, such as the historian Thomas Dempster (1579-1625) who had asserted the Scottish origins of several Irish philosophers and saints,[262] and in reply, O'Conor presents the early Irish as civilised and literate people.[263] The first Irish writer to counter Macpherson directly was Sylvester O'Halloran (1728-1807), who saw the Scots activities as intensifying the prevailing raid 'on [Ireland's] history and annals'.[264] O'Halloran penned two broadsides on Ossian for the *Dublin Magazine* and described Macpherson's actions as 'Caledonian plagiary' (1763).[265] In *An Introduction to the Study of the History and Antiquities of Ireland* (1772), O'Halloran declares:

> I publicly complain of the constant abuse, poured out by Caledonian writers, for centuries against my country. I do not confine this charge to their historians; this malignity is perceptible in Pictish writers of every denomination; and one of the reasons is obvious. By throwing our annals and nation into contempt, they hope to rear up a system of Caledonian antiquities on their ruin. But never were they further from attaining this end, which they have so perseveringly pursued for ages, than at present.[266]

Joseph Cooper Walker's *Historical Memoirs of the Irish Bards* (1786) politely reproaches Macpherson's amendments and seeks to return Ossian to an Irish context.[267] In *Reliques of Irish Poetry* (1789), Charlotte Brooke attempts to 'rescue from oblivion a few of the invaluable reliques of her [Ireland's] ancient genius', and in a conciliatory tone cites unfamiliarity as an explanation for the misappropriation of Ireland's culture, and suggests that Ireland and Britain get 'better acquainted'.[268] In a poem entitled 'An Extract from a Poem: In Imitation of Ossian' (1797), published in the *Northern Star*, Dublin born Thomas Moore (who would come to be described as a bard) calls on the Irish to 'strike off their chains', while in an advertisement for his *Irish Melodies*, Moore admits that 'if Burns had been an Irishman' he 'would willingly give up all our claims upon Ossian for him'.[269]

---

[261] Luke Gibbons: 'From Ossian to O'Carolan: the Bard as Separatist Symbol' in *From Gaelic to Romantic: Ossianic Translations*, eds. Fiona J. Stafford, and Howard Gaskill (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998), p.231.
[262] O'Halloran, 'Irish Re-Creations', p. 77.
[263] O'Halloran, 'Irish Re-Creations', p.74.
[264] O'Halloran, 'Irish Re-Creations', pp. 69-95, p.50; Sylvester O'Halloran, *Insula Sacra or The General Utilities arising from some permanent Foundation, for the Preservation of our Antient Annals, demonstrated and the Means Pointed Out* (Limerick: Welsh, 1770), p. ii.
[265] O'Halloran, 'Irish Re-Creations', p.78.
[266] O'Halloran, *An Introduction to the Study*, p. 333.
[267] Walker, *Historical Memoirs*, pp.v, 39; Walker asserts that 'though Ireland has been long famed for its Poetry and Music, these subjects have never yet been treated of historically'. Walker, *Historical Memoirs*, p.42.
[268] Charlotte Brooke, *Reliques of Irish poetry: consisting of heroic poems, odes, elegies and songs* (Dublin: J. Christie, 1816), p.vii-viii.
[269] Thomas Moore, *The Poetical Works of Thomas Moore, including his melodies, ballads etc. Complete in one volume* (Philadelphia: J. Crissy, 1836), p.316. An ambiguous figure, Moore's remarks reflect the

Moore's view is symptomatic of the elevation of Burns even to the detriment of native Irish writers.[270] However, Moore is alone in his readiness to surrender Ossian for Burns. As Seamus Deane notes:

> all through the late eighteenth and well into the nineteenth-century, Irish commentators had fought the Ossian battle over and over, denying to the Scots the primacy they claimed in the Celtic hierarchy, insisting instead that it was the Irish who had been the original founders of the culture of which Scotland was a derivative.[271]

If Brooke's purpose and tone is ostensibly diplomatic, and Moore's ambiguous, Drummond's attitude is demonstrably combative and much closer in tone to O'Halloran. In an essay entitled 'On the Subject Proposed by the Royal Irish Academy, to Investigate the Authenticity of the Poems of Ossian' (1807), Drummond writes that the subject should be 'pursued with most advantage', especially with Irish 'honour' in 'jeopardy'.[272] Drummond protests that Ireland's 'claim to the Fenian bards and heroes' had never been 'disputed', and records how 'she heard with amazement of the usurpation of her right' by the 'sorcerer' Macpherson.[273] In a section of the essay entitled 'Fin Mac-Cumhal and Ossian were Natives of Ireland, not of Scotland',[274] an exasperated Drummond complains that

> in vain had Ireland possessed an undisputed claim to the warrior and the bard for 1500 years. In vain had her poets celebrated the actions of the one, and imitated the strains of the other. In vain had her historians handed down in written records, never to be effaced […] All this was now to be set aside, and the popular traditions and the written annals of Ireland falsified, to make room for the fictions of MacPherson, who had metamorphosed the Irish general into a Caledonian king, and placed him on the throne of a kingdom which no muse of history has ever condescended to notice![275]

Written a decade later the English writer Anne Plumptre's (1760-1818) *Narrative of a Residence in Ireland During the Summer of 1814, and that of 1815* (1817) succeeds in

---

patriotic character of his work and his pragmatism. Moore declares that his Melodies are not meant to 'appeal to the passions of an ignorant and angry multitude' but the middle classes who were sophisticated enough to find the poems inspiring but retain their composure. Leith Davis, 'Irish Bards and English Consumers', p.8. Leith Davis writes that the melodies 'reflected a colonial ideology produced by England back to England' since they 'were conceived, produced, and distributed within a hegemonic system of English colonialism'. Davis, 'Irish Bards and English Consumers', p.11. Likewise, Norman Vance writes that 'Irish cultural nationalism was at least partly an enthusiasm of the Anglo-Irish elite rather than the Celtic Irish.' Vance, 'Celts, Carthaginians', p.220.

[270] Such as the Gaelic poet Turlough Carolan (1670-1738). Seamus Deane, *Strange Country: Modernity and Nationhood in Irish Writing since 1790* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp.42-43.

[271] Deane, *Strange Country*, pp.42-43.

[272] William Hamilton Drummond, *Essay on the Subject Proposed by the royal Irish Academy to Investigate the authenticity of the Poems of Ossian, Both as Given in MacPherson's Translation, as Published in Gaelic, London, 1807, Under the Sanction of the Highland Society of London; on the Supposition of Such Poems not Being of Recent Origin, to Assign the Probable Era and Country of the Original Poet or Poets* (Dublin: R. Graisberry, 1830), pp.3-4, 12. The Highland Society waited until after Macpherson's death before commissioning an investigation into Ossian's authenticity and published its findings in 1805, two years before Drummond's essay. Stafford, 'Romantic Macpherson', p.28.

[273] Drummond, *Essay on the Subject*, pp.12, 15.

[274] Drummond states that the first evidence of Fingal is in Barbour's *Bruce*, 3.67-70.

[275] Drummond, *Essay on the Subject*, p.15.

capturing both Ulster's strong connections with Scotland and its continuing irritation over Macpherson's Ossian poems. Though Ireland is the focus, Plumptre writes of Scotland and Scots, especially in Antrim and Down (which 'have been very much colonised by Scotch families'), as much as Ireland and the Irish.[276] At one point Plumptre describes a stay in Dublin with a Mr Mason and her discovery of his vast library that included masses of old manuscripts and fragments of Irish language poetry. Plumptre remarks that 'of these fragments he [Mason] has already a considerable number, and he is confident that he shall at length prove irrefutably the claims of Ireland to the Ossianic heroes, which Scotland has so long arrogated to herself, since he will be able to produce poems in manuscript to substantiate the Irish claims, while Scotland has only oral tradition to justify hers.'[277]

In his later *Ancient Irish Minstrelsy* (1852), very nearly fifty years after his essay, Drummond was still aggrieved and laments how

> the glory of their green isle was no longer theirs, but discovered by the new revelations of a wonder-working magician […] Strong feelings of indignation succeeded the first emotions of surprise. They claimed Finn and his son Ossian as their own, and in no measured terms expressed their resentment as the piratical attempt to rob them of their martial and minstrel fame. Those who were acquainted with Irish history, though but partially soon saw through the imposture.[278]

In addition, the title page of *Ancient Irish Minstrelsy* includes an extract from 'The lay of Talc MacTrone', a poem in which Ossian recounts the story of the Hill of Slaughter which begins 'Sweet Ossian! who with thee can vie, / In all the arts of minstrelsy'.[279] Moreover, Drummond dedicates the *Minstrelsy* to Rev. Richard MacDonnell, Provost of the University of Dublin, Irish patriot, supporter of Irish literature and antiquarianism who also sat on the Council of the Royal Irish Academy (of which Drummond was a member) and

---

[276] Anne Plumptre, *Narrative of a Residence in Ireland During the Summer of 1814, and that of 1815* (London: Henry Colburn, 1817), p.96.

[277] Plumptre, *Narrative of a Residence*, p.35. In John McKinley's *Poetic Sketches, Descriptive of the Giant's Causeway and the Surrounding Scenery* (1819), no mention is made of the Scots but it contains a single reference to both Ossian and Spenser's *Faerie Queene*:

> At such an hour might sightless Ossian hear
> The spirits of his kindred hovering near;
> In such a landscape, sure, did Spenser dream,
> By branchy grove, deep glen, and haunted stream
> And in these dewy dells, so sweet and lone,
> His 'Faery Queen' might fix her leafy throne;
> —But no! the regions of the elfin reign
> Must seldom hear the human foot profane,
> While frequent fence, and cottage-skirted glen,
> Mark these the cultivated haunts of men.

John McKinley, *Poetic Sketches, Descriptive of the Giant's Causeway and the Surrounding Scenery: with Some Detached Pieces* (Belfast: Joseph Smith, 1819), pp.31-2.

[278] William Hamilton Drummond, *Ancient Irish Minstrelsy* (Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1852), pp.x-xi.

[279] Drummond, *Ancient Irish Minstrelsy*, p.190.

proposed the subject of the essay which Drummond wrote in 1807.[280] Interestingly this essay was sponsored two years after a three hundred page report on the authenticity of the poems of Ossian, undertaken by the Highland Society, to all intents and purposes acknowledged them as fake.[281] Evidently the Irish academy, Drummond, and Mr Mason were far from satisfied by its findings.

Drummond's essay, in addition to the later references in the *Minstrelsy*, is convincing evidence that the poet was more than a little aggrieved by Macpherson's appropriation of Irish historical legend (evidently much more than Thomas Moore, for example), and for a considerable length of time. This is no more apparent than when Drummond protests that Ireland's 'pride was alarmed, her history falsified, her literary glory threatened with extinction.'[282] Effectively the same situation Scotland had found itself in after the 1707 Union and Culloden (1746).

Like the Irish writers of the late eighteenth century, Macpherson was engaged in the retrieval of national and cultural memories and his *Fragments* reflect the fragmented state of contemporary Scottish culture and a nation lacking in identity. It also reflects, according to Murray Pittock, 'a renewed attempt to give priority to Celticism proper without unduly threatening [the] growing British consciousness.'[283] It is suggested that Macpherson was initially reluctant to undertake the task of gathering and translating the ancient Gaelic poems but was persuaded by influential friends in Edinburgh such as David Hume, Hugh Blair and Adam Ferguson.[284] In this way Macpherson's 'misappropriation' appears more like an act of requisitioning for a national cause since for the Edinburgh intelligentsia it was vital that he memorialise a vanishing culture and assist a 'community convulsed by political rising and suppression'.[285] Cairns Craig states that it transformed a devastated Gaelic Scotland 'into one of Scotland's most valuable cultural assets.'[286]

Craig also describes Macpherson's *Fragments* as a 'poem of memory' and potentially the 'first clarion calls of the modern nation as memory machine', drawn as it is

---

[280] Drummond, *Ancient Irish Minstrelsy*, pp.v-vi.
[281] Henry Mackenzie, *Report of the Committee of the Highland Society Appointed to Inquire into the Nature and Authenticity of the Poems of Ossian* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1805), p.1; Cairns Craig, 'National literature and cultural capital', p.42. The Highland Society exploited its connections with all regions of the highlands to collect 'what materials or information it was still practicable to collect, regarding the authenticity and nature of the poems ascribed to Ossian, and particularly of that celebrated collection published by Mr James Macpherson.' Henry Mackenzie, *Report of the Committee*, p.1.
[282] Drummond, *Essay on the Subject*, p.16.
[283] Murray Pittock, *Celtic Identity and the British Image* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), p.35
[284] George Watson, 'Aspects of Celticism', in *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700-2000*, pp.129-144, p.132.
[285] Stafford, 'Romantic Macpherson', p.31.
[286] Craig, 'National literature and cultural capital', p.40.

'from the tissue of memories inhering in the national landscape and in national legend.'[287]
This last assertion implies that Macpherson selected from a wide geographical and cultural
network, specifically Gaeldom and therefore may have viewed his work less as cultural
larceny and more a strategic adoption of a pre-existing common culture between Gaelic
Ireland and Gaelic Scotland extending back to the original Irish settlers in Dalriada. This
appears to be the view of the Scottish minister, writer and rhetorician Hugh Blair (1718-
1800) who in 'A Dissertation Concerning the Poems of Ossian' makes just this point in
response to those who question the authenticity of Macpherson's work:

> Though it is not easy to conceive how these poems can belong to Ireland and to me, at
> once, I shall examine the subject […] Of all the nations descended from the ancient
> Celts the Scots and Irish are the most similar in language, customs, and manners. This
> argues a more intimate connection between them, than a remote descent from the great
> Celtic stock. It is evident in short, that at some period or other they formed one society,
> were subject to the same government, and were, in all respects, one and the same
> people.[288]

Blair was a staunch confederate of Macpherson and his 'Dissertation' (1763) quickly
became part of any publication of Macpherson's poems. As arguably the public voice of
Macpherson we can perhaps glean information about the poet's views through an
examination of Blair's.

It is unquestionably the case, in spite of Blair's rhetoric in the passage above, that
Macpherson undertook his national project with apparently little or no thought for and at
the expense of Ireland. In Blair's notes and prefaces to *Fingal* and *Temora* he incriminates
Macpherson through his intention to undercut Irish historical and literary sources in order
to demonstrate the authenticity of Macpherson's poems. In the preface to *Fingal* he
describes Irish stories attributed to Ossian as 'spurious pieces' whereby 'the bards of
Ireland, by ascribing to Ossian compositions which, are evidently their own, have
occasioned a general belief, in that country, that Fingal was of Irish extraction, and not of
the ancient Caledonians, as is said in the genuine poems of Ossian'.[289] Additionally, Blair
declares that

> from internal proofs it sufficiently appears, that the poems published under the name of
> Ossian, are not of Irish composition, the favourite chimera, that Ireland is the mother
> country of the Scots, is totally subverted and ruined. The fictions concerning the
> antiquities of that country, which were forming for ages, and growing as they came
> down, on the hands of successive *senachies* and fileas are found, at last, to be the
> spurious brood of modern and ignorant ages. To those who know how tenacious the

---

[287] Craig, 'National literature and cultural capital', p.53.
[288] Hugh Blair, 'A Dissertation Concerning the Poems of Ossian' in *The Poems of Ossian, translated by James Macpherson, to which are prefixed Dissertations on the Aera and Poems of Ossian*, 1 (London: Cadell & Davis, 1806), pp.36-7.
[289] James Macpherson, 'Preface', *Fingal, An Ancient Epic Poem* (London, T. Beckett, 1762).

Irish are of their pretended Iberian descent, this alone is proof sufficient, that poems, so subversive of their system, could never be produced by a Hibernian bard.[290]

In effect, Macpherson and Blair, to employ a present-day media term, 'spin' the conventional belief that northern Scotland had been colonised by the Irish or the Scoti (in spite of apparently drawing on texts such as Keating's *History of Ireland* and the MS *Book of the Dean of Lismore*),[291] 'by simply inverting the model and changing the direction of colonization'.[292]

Macpherson's activities were not entirely to Ireland's detriment given that they fuelled a subsequent interest in Irish antiquity, identity and literature. In point of fact, Macpherson's conception of a sentimental, nostalgic and primarily passive bard whose lamentations symbolised the loss of Celtic identity post-'45, not only catalysed Irish (and Welsh) national literature, but ultimately reassured English/British readers of the demise of rebellion in Scotland and the retreat of the Celtic threat. Luke Gibbons remarks that

> one of the many anomalies presented by Irish and Scottish culture in the eighteenth century was that Scotland, the country which produced an Enlightenment, failed to inspire a revolutionary or independence movement, while Ireland, steeped in superstition and barbarism according to Scottish theories of progress, gave rise to a republican and separatist tradition.[293]

Drummond's use of the bards and Ossian as a defence against the Scots in *Bruce's Invasion* is ironic testament to Macpherson's influence.[294] Nonetheless, Macpherson received a great deal of criticism from numerous Irish writers, antiquaries and intellectuals on the basis that his poetic subject and claims were an affront to Irish culture. Macpherson's deceit understandably grated against Ireland's already heightened sensitivity to exploitation. In a letter to Macpherson's confidante Hugh Blair, David Hume excoriates

---

[290] 'A Dissertation Concerning the Poems of Ossian', p.38.
[291] Vance, 'Celts, Carthaginians', p.221.
[292] Clare O'Halloran, 'Irish Re-Creations', pp. 69-95, p.74.
[293] Gibbons, 'From Ossian to O'Carolan', p.226.
[294] A catalyst for this Celtic dispute may well be the interruption in Celtic tradition brought about by England's domination and anglicisation of Wales, Ireland and Scotland. From a Scottish perspective, its archival history was first seized during Edward I's invasion in 1296, along with several national symbols including the Stone of Destiny, all of which were removed to London, a process later repeated during Cromwell's conquest and occupation during the 1650s. Elizabeth M. Hallam and Andrew Prescott, eds. *The British Inheritance: A Treasury of Historic Documents* (British Library Publishing Division, 1999), p.25. The absence of historical data was bemoaned by Thomas Innes as it 'left modern-day historians without the full documentation needed to refute the bardic inventions'. Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, p.5. Innes stresses the distinction between 'historical accounts, written in times of light and learning' and the 'uncertain and fabulous relations of bards, a set of illiterate men […] governed in their rhapsodies by passion and interest', there is nothing 'more capable to decry the history of any country', Innes argues, 'than for an author to put the bards' accounts of it, in remote ages, on a level with the histories written in times of learning, and to seem to give equal credit to both.' Innes, 'A Critical Essay', pp.83-4. For the defence, Trumpener cites the Welsh antiquary Edward Jones (*Musical and Poetical Relicks of the welsh Bards* (1784)), who views the use of inauthentic stories as essential to Celtic resistance against English domination. Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, p.5.

'the absurd pride and caprice of Macpherson himself, who scorns, as he pretends, to satisfy any body that doubts his veracity, has tended much to confirm this general scepticism'.[295] The Irish poet James Hardiman robustly asserts Ireland's primacy over Scotland and contends that 'none of the Northern Nations of Europe can produce such ancient, authentic and valuable poetic remains, as Ireland', and announces that 'the best informed and most liberal Scottish writers, seem at length inclined to admit, that Macpherson's long contested "Poems of Ossian" are principally founded on Irish metrical remains, which, like our music, had long been common to both countries, until exclusively claimed by Scotland in the last century.'[296]

Among the catalogue of Irish writers who protested a special case could be made for William Hamilton Drummond, for whom the Ossian controversy continued to rankle into the 1850s. It may be a stretch to claim that the Ossian debate influenced the confrontational nature of *Trafalgar* and *Clontarf*, but we can, I believe, speculate with some confidence that it influenced *Bruce's Invasion*. Drummond's description of Macpherson's work as an 'attempt to rob' Ireland of its cultural history and the 'usurpation of her right' finds a parallel in the Bruces' usurpation of power in Ireland in 1315. In his essay, Drummond depicts the arrival of Macpherson's Ossian as a 'sudden and unexpected invasion' but one which 'did not rob her [Ireland] either of the courage or the weapons by which it could be successfully repelled.'[297] This, to a large degree, is the narrative of Drummond's *Invasion*.

To begin with the narrator questions every constituent of Ireland's response to the Scottish occupation, including the military, religious, Anglo-Irish and most prominently, the bards. Appalled at their passiveness the narrator summons Ireland's ancient bards in an attempt to shame their descendants, and accordingly reclaims the figure of Ossian:

> O spirit of Ossian! thou sweet soul of song,
> Sire of Oscar the brave, son of Fionn the strong,
> In hall and in bower must thy harp's thrilling sound
> In the drone of that cursed highland bagpipe be drowned?
> From thy dark airy hall, as thou sailest on high,
> Hear the groans of the land, and in terrors come nigh,
> These wasters behold of thy harp's native soil,
> Who e'en of thy glory would Erin despoil.
> Rough, prickly, and horrid, wherever they tread,
> The thistle springs up in the shamrog's green bed.[298]

---

[295] 'Copy of a Letter from David Hume, Esq. to the Reverend Dr Hugh Blair, on the Subject of Ossian's Poems', in Mackenzie, *Report of the Committee of the Highland Society*, p.5.
[296] James Hardiman, ed. *Irish Minstrelsy, or Bardic Remains of Ireland; with English Poetical Translations*, 1 (London: Joseph Robins, 1831), pp.173-4.
[297] Drummond, *Essay on the Subject*, p.16.
[298] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, p.27.

Drummond describes the invasion in culturally symbolic terms; the sound of the harp is drowned out by the bagpipe, while the stabbing thistle overwhelms Ireland's moss-topped soil.[299] Yet the bardic metaphor coupled with the reference to Ossian returns us to the perceived 'usurpation' of Ireland's cultural history by Macpherson. Note also that Drummond, in an earlier extract from his essay describes Macpherson's 'fictions' as comparable to placing 'a Caledonian king' on the Irish throne. Macpherson's metamorphosing of a legendary Irish general (Ossian) into a Scottish king is reminiscent of Edward Bruce's (relatively speaking) non-violent rise to become Ireland's sovereign, which, as Eudoxus's obliviousness and Drummond's narrator suggests, 'no muse of history has ever condescended to notice'.

British Union

Drummond's *Invasion* is a deceptively dense poem. Its complexity stems largely from the clash between its historical subject and the existing political context. It is simultaneously a poetic interpretation of a medieval conflict between Ireland and Scotland, a reinterpretation of Barbour's version of the invasion, a potential riposte to Scotland's perceived usurpation of Ireland's culture, and most probably, and directly, a response to early nineteenth-century Irish politics and Ireland's relationship with England and Britain more widely. In actual fact, the three samples of the cultural memory of the Bruce invasion examined in this study by Barbour, Spenser and Drummond are all to a large degree occupied with the matter of Britain and England's dominance over it. Deane argues that the Ossian controversy 'highlight[s] the relation between the devastated Gaelic order and the British state in an unprecedented fashion',[300] and suggests that Hardiman, like many Irish poets, views Ireland as the

> 'original' Gaelic culture precisely because the Scots had not kept their Gaelic tradition intact in any comparable way […] But the whole political force of the Ossian controversy in Ireland was that Scotland could not have it both ways – claim to be an authentic Gaelic culture and remain in union with Great Britain.[301]

Ossian is mentioned by name twice in Drummond's *Invasion*, once in in canto four but first and perhaps more significantly in canto two, sub-titled 'the rising of Erin and Albyn's retreat'. The connection made between Ossian and Irish opposition to Albyn reflects contemporary Ireland's opposition to Scotland's commandeering of Ossian. Scotland is

---

[299] In the preface to *Bruce's Invasion*, Drummond writes that 'the Scottish thistle was to Ireland as the bramble which threatened to send forth fires that would devour the cedars of Lebanon.' Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, p.5.
[300] Deane, *Strange Country*, p.37.
[301] Deane, *Strange Country*, p.108.

referred to as 'Albyn' twenty-one times in the poem rather than the more familiar Alba (the Scottish Gaelic name for Scotland), an allusion perhaps to the Scottish title of Albany associated with the House of Stuart (James VI inherited the title following the death of his father Lord Darnley).[302] Albyn may also allude to the historical conflation between Scotland, England and Britain since Alba historically refers to the island of Britain and is related to the Brythonic name Albion (Alba appears in Greek texts and Albion in later Latin writing), employed subsequently to romanticise the English nation.[303] The potential allusion to Albany, moreover, reinforces 'Albyn's' broader association to Britain, particularly in light of the significance of the Albany name in the successional plays *Gorboduc* (1561) and *King Lear* (1606).[304] The choice of 'Albyn' strongly suggests that Drummond wishes to conflate Alba, Albion and Albany in order to illustrate parallels between Scotland and England (Britain) both in the past and present. This is also evidence of the cross-cultural linguistics typical to the languages and writing of Britain, as remarked on by Kerrigan in *Archipelagic English*.

Drummond's source (Barbour) recounts a crucial episode in the Wars of Independence, ostensibly a conflict between England and Scotland but one which in fact encompassed the archipelago. Likewise, as previously discussed, Spenser's *View* is preoccupied with the trilateral struggle between Ireland, England and Scotland for control of the North of Ireland. In truth, it is a concern with the future balance of power in Britain. Drummond's interest in Britain is most evident in *Trafalgar* which commemorates Britain's victory against the French navy and expresses a strong British sentiment in the opening three stanzas which respectively address Albion, Caledonia and Erin with each

---

[302] Leah Marcus, 'Dramatic Experiments: Tudor Drama, 1490-1567', in *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1500-1600*, ed. Arthur F. Kinney (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp.132-152, p.150.

[303] 'Albion, n.' *OED Online. Oxford University Press*, [accessed 15 June 2015]. Alexander MacBain, *An Etymological Dictionary of the Gaelic Language* (Glasgow: Gairm Publications, 1896; 1982). According to the British origin myth, Brutus named his land 'Britaigne' after himself and after discovering a land 'joined to Brytaigne in the north', bequeathed this territory to Albanactus, then named 'Albayne after his name […] now is called Scotland'. *The Brut or The Chronicles of England*, 1, ed. Friedrich W. D. Brie (London: Kegan Paul, 1906), pp.11-12. The conflation between Alba and Albion is also considered in Edmund Campion's *A Historie of Ireland, Written in the Yeare 1571* (Dublin: Hibernia Press, 1809), pp.49-50. In *Basilikon Doron* (1599), James VI raises the political and constitutional consequences of the Brutus myth to instruct his son that if he should divide his kingdom 'yee shall leave the seed of division and discord among your posteritie; as befell to this Ile, by the division and assignment thereof, to the three sonnes of *Brutus*, *Lochrine*, *Albanact*, and *Camber*.' James VI, *Basilikon Doron*, in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p.42.

[304] Shakespeare's *Lear* is based on the legend of a Brythonic Celtic king, Leir of Britain, while in *Gorboduc* the character of Fergus, Duke of Albany (a Scot) likely personifies Mary Stewart and the threat she posed to the English Crown, but, Albany also anticipates the ascension of James VI to I in his remark that "if ever time to gain a kingdom here / Were offered man, now it is offered me". Kenneth Hurlstone Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain: a chronological survey of the Brittonic languages, first to twelfth century A.D.* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1953), p. 459; Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton, *Gorboduc*, ed. Irby B. Cauthen (Great Britain: Edward Arnold, 1970), 5.1.132-36, p.63.

country prevailed upon to mourn the death of Nelson.[305] *Trafalgar*, however, is fundamentally a poem about the defeat of despotism and perhaps functions more as a metaphor for 'Britain's' imperial project rather than for French or Spanish imperialism, or empire in general. O'Halloran (1772), culturally at least, equates Scotland and England and writes that 'almost all the writers of England and Scotland […] represent[ed] the Irish nation as the most brutal and savage of mankind, destitute of arts, letters, and legislation'.[306]

Nonetheless (and despite Scotland's place in the Union and role in Empire) Scotland and Ireland share common experiences of union with England. 'Neither the Anglo-Scottish union of 1707 nor the British-Irish union of 1800, were federal; both entailed the extinction - not the partnership - of national parliaments.'[307] One significant difference, already alluded to by Gibbons, is the sharp contrast between the intensity of radicalism and republicanism in Ireland and in Scotland. Nevertheless, the loss of political autonomy was countered in both countries by a cultural revival: Macpherson's Ossian emerges from the disorientating mist of post-union and post-Culloden Scotland; and while Drummond's first major post-union poem, *Trafalgar*, was composed in the glow of 'Britain's' victory against France, his later works *Clontarf* (1822) and *Bruce's Invasion* (1826) are entirely different in tone. The bardic poetry of Macpherson, Gray and Evans is recognised for having 'dramatiz[ed] the refusal of a nation to give up its culture in support of the empire.'[308] I wish to apply the same recognition to William Drummond, and his epic poem *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland*, the central theme of which is bardic inspired rebellion.

When Drummond writes: 'when a nation thus rises united and true, / What might upon earth can her spirit subdue?',[309] he captures the radical and rebellious energy then permeating through Ireland's intellectual and artistic sphere. An important source of radical energy was the Irish revolutionary figure and founder member of the United Irishmen, Theobald Wolfe Tone (1763-1798). In an 'Essay on the necessity of Domestic Union', Tone complains of the inequality between England and Ireland 'of whom much above half are degraded, and ought to be discontented slaves'. The English government in Ireland is 'founded', 'supported' and 'exists but in the disunion of Ireland'.[310] Ireland,

---

[305] William Hamilton Drummond, *The Battle of Trafalgar: A Heroic Poem* (Belfast: Smyth and Lyons, 1806), pp.5-6.

[306] Sylvester O'Halloran, *An Introduction to the Study*, p.i.

[307] Jim Smyth, 'Arguments for and against union: Scotland and Ireland, 1700-2000', in *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700-2000*, p.24.

[308] Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, p.8.

[309] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, 2, p.33.

[310] William Theobald Wolfe Tone, ed. *Life of Theobald Wolfe Tone* (Washington: Gales & Seaton, 1826), p.559.

Tone writes is not just 'paralytic; she is worse; she is not merely dead of one side, whilst the other is unaffected'.[311] In a pre-emptive essay entitled 'Considerations approaching war with Spain' (included in a collection of Tone's writings, edited by his son and published in 1826, the same year as the publication of *Bruce's Invasion*), Tone urges his readers to 'look a little deeper into things' and consider 'whether Ireland be, of right, bound to support a war, declared by the King of Great Britain, on motives and interests purely British?'[312] If war occurs in spite of parliamentary legislation and without Ireland's 'consent', 'will' and 'interest' then 'the independence of Ireland is sacrificed' and their charters 'waste paper.'[313] The overall purpose of a war with Spain, Tone explains, is that the 'consolidated power in the "empire"' is increased but 'distributed entirely to one of the components, while the other is at a certain loss'. [314]

In Thomas Moore's *Memoirs of Captain Rock* (1824), written two years before the publication of the first volume of the *Life of Theobald Wolfe Tone* and *Bruce's Invasion*, Irish history, according to Murray Pittock, is presented as a succession of unsuccessful rebellions. Pittock contends that Moore borrows ideas from examples of Scottish patriot historiography that had been employed to resist empire.[315] However, as Leith Davis points out, in spite of Moore's supposed radicalism, Moore's 'presentation of the Irish nation situated in the past or in a permanently deferred future made it easy for readers to ignore the circumstances of the 1798 rebellion and the subsequent enforcement of Union.'[316] The tenor and language of Drummond's *Invasion* is much closer to the language of Tone. Drummond's bard, unlike that of Wales and Scotland, is a hardened survivor, a soldier, and an agitator of patriotic rebellion.[317] As Trumpener notes, 'the displacement of political anger into cultural expression had been a central tenet of bardic nationalism from its beginnings.'[318] In *Bruce's Invasion* there is no greater expression of this than when the narrator demands that the bards arouse the Irish people so that

> They may feel as they felt in the good days of old;
> Send them forth in defence of their dear father-land,

---

[311] Tone, *Life of Theobald*, p.559; Cited in Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, p.128.

[312] Tone, *Life of Theobald*, p.328. Tone asserts the sovereignty of Ireland and its independent legislature, and remarks that Ireland's 'constitution and powers of parliament' are the same as in the rest of Great Britain. Tone, *Life of Theobald*, p.328. Therefore, Ireland is no more 'committed' to going to war purely on the declaration of their king, than England is; moreover, the Irish, Tone adds, are even less committed to a declaration by the King of Great Britain 'when […] the quarrel and the profit are merely and purely English.' Tone, *Life of Theobald*, p.329.

[313] Tone, *Life of Theobald*, p.329.

[314] Tone, *Life of Theobald*, p.335.

[315] Pittock, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism*, p.100.

[316] Davis, 'Irish Bards and English Consumers', p.18.

[317] The English and Welsh bards (or minstrels) are in contrast mournful and melancholic; Macpherson's Ossian is described by Trumpener as 'at once venerable and feeble'. Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, p.8.

[318] Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism*, p.11.

> With a sword by their side, and a harp in their hand,
> Replete with thy spirit, again to re-start,
> In accord with its own, all the strings of the heart.
> Let this be the song - […] "Men of Erin arise!
> Your country invokes you with agonized cries".[319]

Following this clarion call Erin 'springs to the field, / Unsheathed is her sabre, and struck is her shield. / Loud her harp-strings have rung in their old native tone'.[320] The land shakes with cries of "men of Erin arise!" and causes old and young men to rush from the hills, valleys, cities and woods, the 'shepherd leaves his flocks, / The ploughman his share, and the sailor his oar; / His corragh the fisher draws up on the shore', and children play at war, while the women 'chant "Erin go brah"'.[321]

'Erin go bragh' is a slogan dating from the 1798 revolution and is often translated as "Ireland forever".[322] A Scottish song from the nineteenth-century entitled 'Erin-go-Bragh' tells the story of a Highland Scot who is mistaken for an Irishman: [323]

> My name's Duncan Campbell from the shire of Argyll
> I've travelled this country for many's the mile
> I've travelled through Ireland, Scotland and a'
> And the name I go under's bold Erin-go-bragh
>
> One night in Auld Reekie as I walked down the street
> A saucy big polis I chanced for to meet
> He glowered in my face and he gi'ed me some jaw
> Sayin' "When cam' ye over, bold Erin-go-bragh?"
>
> [...]
>
> So come all you young people, wherever you're from
> I don't give a damn to what place you belong
> I come from Argyll in the Hielands so braw
> But I ne'er took it ill being called Erin-go-bragh.[324]

A Scotsman from the west coast, who has spent time in Ireland, assumes a name associated with Irish radicalism and is misidentified as an Irishman by an Edinburgh policeman, suggesting not just a similarity of language between the Gaelic Scots and Irish, but a negative association with being from Ireland. In some way this well-known ballad sums up the historic, instinctive, but often complicated relationship between Ireland and Scotland, captured in all his complexities by Drummond and many of his contemporaries at a

---

[319] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, 2, p.28.
[320] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, 2, p.29.
[321] Drummond, *Bruce's Invasion*, 2, p.31.
[322] 'Slainte! Erin Go Bragh! Translation Of These & Other Irish Sayings', *The World Post*, 25/ 05/2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/03/17/slainte-erin-go-bragh-tra_n_837097.html [accessed: 13/01/2015]
[323] Angela Cran, James Robertson, *Dictionary of Scottish Quotations* (Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1996), p. 336.
[324] *Dick Gaughan's Song Archive*, http://www.dickgaughan.co.uk/songs/texts/eringobr.html [accessed: 02/01/2015]

moment which it was at once strengthened by means of political empathy but to some extent strained due to a cultural dispute.

Cultural Commemoration and Historical Amnesia

We are three years into what has been called in Ireland a 'Decade of Commemoration' (1913-1923). In Ireland, within this time frame, occur a number of centenaries of key events, most notably the First World War, but also the Ulster Covenant (1912), the 1916 Easter Rising, and the partitioning of Ireland (1921). In comparison to the current Easter Rising commemorations the Bruce invasion of 1315 slipped by largely unnoticed. In Scotland meanwhile, the 700th anniversary of Bannockburn in 2014 was commemorated and celebrated on a large scale, and here too the Bruce invasion sneaked by without rousing much attention. It was always likely to be the case, given that the anniversary of Bannockburn and the Bruce invasion took place amid an intense period of national and constitutional debate.

A more fundamental reason perhaps for the contrasting levels of attentiveness is that one represents a great against-the-odds victory over Scotland's natural adversary, England, while the other recalls a defeat at the hands of Scotland's natural ally, Ireland. No nation likes to commemorate its military blunders or war crimes, but, though significant, the disparity between Bannockburn and the invasion in Scotland's historical memory cannot simply be ascribed to success over failure. It is also a matter of national and political priorities. 'A heroic past, great men, glory […] this is the social capital upon which one bases a national idea', said Renan.[325] In the end the Bruce invasion has far less utility than Scotland's other sites of memory - Bannockburn, Culloden, and Hampden - when it comes to forming and reforming Scotland's national identity.

Timed to coincide with the 700th anniversary of Bannockburn, Robert Crawford's *Bannockburns* also coincided with the build-up to Scotland's independence referendum, which, alongwith the declared nationalist sympathies of the author, added a measure of political weight to the publication's already substantial cultural mass. Borrowing briefly from cultural memory studies, Crawford designates Bannockburn a 'site of memory' and views the battle and its theme of independence as intrinsic to Scotland's identity.[326] Crawford writes that

> it is naïve to regard this as foolish. Mythology, imagination and the play of literature
> are not separate from real life: they are important parts of the historical process

---

[325] Renan, 'What is a nation', p.19.
[326] Crawford, *Bannockburns*, p.7.

because they encapsulate and engender values, losses and gain […] they help make us who we are both at individual and societal levels.[327]

Though probably true, Crawford's contention omits to describe what the 'historical process' is? what drives it? or whose values are encapsulated and engendered? Given that the *Bruce* is the source of the Bannockburn narrative (a foundational national narrative) it is worth remembering the political and social values the text reproduces - namely the feudal ideology, encapsulated in its ideals of chivalry and kingship - as well as the social-status and aims of its poet. All of which, ought to 'undermine the transcendent significance traditionally accorded to the literary text'.[328]

Crawford also writes that 'recent imaginings of Scottish independence in literature and politics have attempted to carry forward ideals of freedom while moving away from battlefield violence'.[329] Though a noble aim, in this case the separation of violence and freedom, in cultural memory terms, could be said to describe a reconfiguring of the 'ideals' of (Scottish) freedom which are themselves based irrevocably on historical and cultural concepts, patriotic poetry, and tied indefinitely to 'battlefield violence'. As Assman observes, 'a reconstruction of identity always entails a reconstruction of memory'.[330] That battlefield violence has to be divorced from freedom in the first place confirms its characteristic interdependence. Notwithstanding the principled intentions, such a decoupling may potentially push uncomfortable memories to the periphery and, as Halbwachs suggests, further from the source of the memory, which in the case of Bannockburn is likely to be Barbour's ultra-violent poem. Oddly enough, *Bannockburns*, it could be argued, re-establishes the relationship between freedom and violence since it re-mythologises the celebrated battle as well as the figure of Robert Bruce, a warrior king seldom admired for his non-violent stance.

An important critical study, *Bannockburns* is also an attempt to reconfigure Scotland's most significant site of memory for present-day purposes and in this sense continues a tradition initiated by Barbour and repeated by poets, writers and artists thereafter. *Bannockburns* therefore belongs to the tradition of 'imaginative writing' (cultural memory) it examines, and perhaps this is the point. Given the subject of Crawford's book it should not come as a surprise that no mention is made of the Irish invasion, yet, as the previous chapter argues, the Irish invasion, both in historical and literary terms, complicates the 'Bannockburn' brand and its powerful association with

---

[327] Crawford, *Bannockburns*, p.2.
[328] Barry, *Beginning Theory*, p.182.
[329] Crawford, *Bannockburns*, p.4.
[330] Assman, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilisation*, p.54.

freedom, which Crawford deems integral to Scotland's national identity. However, as cultural memory theory suggests, forgetting is inseparable from remembering. Sites of memory emerge from a process of selection that works to the advantage of some and to the disadvantage of others. This uneven practice is crucial to the formation, preservation and reformation of national identity which, as Erll notes, is contingent on 'a nation's version of its past'.[331] In *After Theory* (2003), Terry Eagleton suggests that

> amnesia, not remembrance, is what is natural to us. The ego is what it is only by a necessary blindness to much of what constitutes it. To make history, we need first to blot out the squalid, blood-stained genealogy which went into our manufacture […] Reflecting too sensitively on the world around you paralyses action, as Hamlet discovered […] if we raise questions about the foundations of our way of life, in the sense of thinking too much about the barbarism on which our civilization is founded, we might fail to do the things that all good citizens should spontaneously do.[332]

Though the invasion is omitted, and thus a critical three-year episode in the Wars of Independence overlooked, Crawford does, as previously discussed, allude to a scene from the Irish invasion section involving a laundry woman, yet the Irish context is forgotten, or conveniently whitewashed.[333] As we pass through this intense period of remembrance there is still time to reflect on the motivation, meaning and memorialisation of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland. Such reflection assists us in understanding the complexities of Irish-Scottish, Anglo-Scottish and Anglo-Irish history.

---

[331] Erll, 'Cultural memory Studies: An Introduction', p.6.

[332] Eagleton, *After Theory*, p.63.

[333] In Greek mythology, it is said that those who drink from the river Lethe (one of the rivers in Hades) would forget the past. 'Lethe, n.', *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, [accessed: 2/08/2015]
Adrian Poole writes that 'the liquefying Lethe into which characters sink can dissolve the very difference between remembering and forgetting'. Adrian Poole, 'Laughter, forgetting and Shakespeare', in *English Comedy*, eds. Michael Cordner, Peter Holland and John Kerrigan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp.85-100, p.95. There is a slim but interesting connection between Lethe and the process of washing away memories. In *Twelfth Night* Sebastian exclaims to Olivia:
> What relish is this? How runs the stream?
> Or I am mad, or else this is a dream.
> Let fancy still my sense in Lethe steep;
> If it be thus to dream, still let me sleep! William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, ed. M. M. Mahood (London: Penguin, 2005), 4.1.60.
To 'steep' is a word connected to washing and generally means to soak or soften. The OED describes the activity as 'altering in properties' and 'cleansing', and locates its first usage in 1400. 'steep, v.', *OED Online*. Oxford University Press [accessed: 2/08/2015]

Chapter two: The Scots in Ulster: Policies, Proposals and Projects, 1551-1575

Introduction

When referring to Ulster in a *View of the State of Ireland*, Edmund Spenser has Irenius remark that 'the chiefest caveat and provision in reformation of the north [of Ireland] must be to keep out those Scots'; thereby encapsulating a Tudor preoccupation with the Gaelic Scots in Ulster, evident throughout the second-half of the sixteenth century, and temporarily abandoned following the succession of James VI and I and the acceptance of an Anglo-Scottish solution to the Ulster problem.[334] When in 1649, Milton called the Ulster-Scots 'unsufferable upstarts' he was playing on a vein of anti-Scottish sentiment whose roots lay in the mid-sixteenth century.[335] This chapter examines how these roots nourished the growth of English militarisation and colonialism in the region, ultimately producing large scale plantation projects prior to James VI and I's 1609 'British' plantation of Ulster.

The abundance of English literature and cultural material pertaining to sixteenth-century Ireland has led, somewhat understandably, to a propensity within Ulster research to accentuate the Anglo-Irish perspective to the disadvantage of the Gaelic Scottish influence in the region. Thus the latter history is a marginalised one, overshadowed by the history of the Ulster-Scots, itself something of a relegated history until relatively recently. Willy Maley remarks that the term '"Ulster-Scots" does not begin to do justice to the subtle nuances of the Scoto-Irish context', a context 'lost in the hyphen of "Anglo-Irish" history'.[336] A case in point is John Harrison's *The Scot in Ulster* (1888), the starting point of which is the 1609 Ulster plantation, thus completely overlooking the history of the Gaelic Scots in Ulster that stretches back centuries.

Gerard Hayes-McCoy's *The Scots Mercenary forces in Ireland 1565-1608* (1937) provides a detailed account of the movement of Scottish galloglaigh (gallowglass) and redshanks into Ulster and occasionally considers the wider political tensions between the Scots, Irish and English. Donald Gregory's *The History of the Western Highlands and Isles of Scotland* (1881) touches upon the relationship between the west coast of Scotland and Ulster, while Robert Dunlop pays considerable attention to the Gaelic Scots in 'Sixteenth Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster' (1924-5). J. Michael Hill's *Fire and sword* (1993) takes a historical view of this 'neglected Gaelic topic' and examines the impact of

---

[334] Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland*, p.111.
[335] John Milton, 'Observations on the Articles of Peace', *The Prose Works of John Milton*, 1 (Philadelphia: John W. Moore, 1649; 1847), p.36.
[336] Maley, *Salvaging Spenser*, p.144.

the MacDonnells from within a British and European context from 1580 to 1640,[337] framing the hostility between the MacDonnells and the English as a Gaelic struggle 'against a centralised, quasi-modern state'.[338] Hiram Morgan's 'The End of Gaelic Ulster: a thematic interpretation of events between 1534 and 1610' (1988) and particularly Jane Dawson's *The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary, Queen of Scots: the Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland* (2002), also examine the Scottish perspective. Several of the essays in the recent collection *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice* (2012), edited by Micheál Ó Siochrú and Eamonn Ó Ciardha, engage with crucial subjects commonly absent from associated research, including the native Irish experience and the impact of the Gaelic Scots, and perhaps for the first time presents a genuinely triangular perspective on Ulster in the early modern period. Finally, *Elizabeth I and Ireland* (2014) edited by Brendan Kane and Valerie McGowan-Doyle, like *The Plantation of Ulster* assembles historians and literary scholars to examine the roles of Elizabeth and the Irish in shaping relations between the two countries, and while the editors are correct to say that research on Elizabeth typically omits Ireland, it is equally accurate to say that the collected essays omit the role of the Scots.

It would be an exaggeration, as the above research attests, to label the story of the Scottish Gaels in Ulster as a hidden history; however, it is no exaggeration to suggest that it struggles for prominence within the colonial history of early modern Ireland. The development of Irish and Scottish Studies and the advancement of the Gaelic Scottish perspective within academic research and popular history is crucial to forming a greater understanding of early Anglo-British colonialism, and the opposition mounted against it by, an albeit loose, pan-Gaelic resistance. What is more, the context to the first British colony in Ulster in 1609 cannot be fully understood without acknowledging the Gaelic Scottish community who occupied north Ulster before the plantation and whose exclusion and fragmentation was fundamental to it.

Evidence for such an assertion comes from a range of English literature[339] including state papers, position papers, pamphlets, memoirs and correspondence, and the

---

[337] J. Michael Hill, *Fire and Sword: Sorley Boy MacDonnell and the Rise of Clan Ian Mor, 1538-1590* (London: Athlone Press, 1993), p.4.

[338] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.xii.

[339] The focus on English literature of this period is essentially a consequence of quantity; Gaelic sources are scarce. In 1567 John Carswell (1522-72) printed *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh*, a Gaelic translation of the *Book of Common Order* (The *Book of Common Order* was first printed in Edinburgh in 1564).patronised by the fifth Earl of Argyll and published in both Ireland and Scotland. Micheál MacCraith, 'The Gaelic Reaction to the Reformation', in *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, eds. S. G. Ellis and Sarah Barber (London: Longman, 1995), pp.139-61, p.142. Carswell augmented the *Book of Common Order* with two epistles and a poem; both the second epistle and the poem refer to the Gaels and describe Ireland and Scotland as close. John Carswell, *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh*, ed. R.L. Thomson (Edinburgh: Oliver and

purpose of pulling this material together is to tell the story of the Gaelic Scots and underline their influence on England's colonial politics at a key juncture in archipelagic and nascent British history. The accumulative writing attests that the Scottish Gaels frustrated the Tudor conquest of Ireland to a significant extent, both motivating and thwarting various 'enterprises' and 'schemes' for that province, the most prominent of which were undertaken by Sir Thomas Smith (1571) and Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex (1573). The militarisation of Ulster during the 1550s and 1560s is fundamental to the emergence of colonial schemes for that region and it is critical to incorporate the Gaelic Scots within it.

Imperialism and Colonialism

Colonialism is a consequence of imperialism, and imperialism fundamentally 'means thinking about, settling on, controlling land that you do not possess, that is distant, that is lived on and owned by others.'[340] Marxist theory views colonialism as a 'phase in the history of imperialism' (imperialism is understood 'as the globalisation of the capitalist mode of production'), and the end of the Middle Ages as a period of 'primitive accumulation' and source of European capitalism.[341] The origins of Anglo/British imperialism continue to be contested by historians, however, the dual processes of centralisation and expansionism during the sixteenth century leads some to ascribe its origins to Tudor England's approach to Ireland.[342]

The administrative measures and reforms implemented against the Irish and Scottish Gaels and the stream of minor and major colonial projects are symptomatic of centralisation in England and its imperial, religious rivalry with Europe. Brendan Bradshaw views events in Ireland from the perspective of the religious wars taking place in Northern and Eastern Europe that he claims were 'engulfed by that other manifestation of early modern Europe's aggressive spirit, the westward enterprise of conquest and colonisation.'[343] The Protestant ascendancy and the parallel Anglo-Scottish religious

---

Boyd, 1970), p.lxxii. Carswell states that his translation is meant for distribution in Gaelic Ireland as well as Scotland. MacCraith, 'The Gaelic Reaction to the Reformation', p.142. Marc Caball proposes that this was intended to counter the 'unwelcome prospect of the circulation of Calvinist doctrine in Ireland'. Marc Caball, 'Print, Protestantism, and cultural authority in Elizabethan Ireland', in *Elizabeth I and Ireland*, eds. Brendan Kane and Valerie McGowan-Doyle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp.286-309, p.287.
[340] Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage, 1994), p.5.
[341] Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse/ Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), p.2; Joseph Schumpeter, 'Imperialism and Capitalism', in *Imperialism: Theoretical Directions*, ed. Ronald H. Chilcote (New York: Humanity Books, 2000), p.101.
[342] David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000; 2009), p.24.
[343] Bradshaw, 'Nationalism and historical scholarship in modern Ireland', p.339.

conflict also offer fertile ground for English imperialism, specifically 'Anglo-British imperialism'.[344]

While John Gillingham agrees that sixteenth-century Ireland furnished England with 'an experience which helped to sharpen and harden attitudes', he believes it to be 'roughly 400 years wide of the mark', and identifies England's 'formative experience' in the policies of Henry II in the 1170s.[345] David Armitage views nascent imperialism through the lens of 'composite monarchies': the structure whereby a powerful centre controls other regions, often attempting to settle and or dominate them via culture and economics.[346] At various times England dominated the surrounding Celtic countries, regions in France and the Channel Islands, while Scotland controlled Orkney, Shetland and the Western Isles.[347] Consequently, Armitage applies the term 'colonialist' to both England and Scotland. The work of Gillingham and Armitage reveals England's deep-rooted imperial attitude and demonstrate that 'it was not just in the modern era that Englishmen decided the Irish were savages and should be either anglicised or exterminated: they had thought so for centuries.'[348]

The anglicisation of Scotland began in the thirteenth century when the English language gained a linguistic foot-hold in lowland areas, but, according to Michael Hechter, what distinguishes Scotland from Ireland and Wales is that the subsequent attempts to anglicise the north of Scotland were carried out by lowland Scots as opposed to the English, though almost certainly with their support.[349] Lowlanders, according to Arthur Williamson saw themselves as 'under the governance of reason', and in possession of a 'civic capacity' that they shared with the English.[350] Like English imperialism the origins of the socio-cultural rift between the highlands and lowlands of Scotland begins in the

---

[344] David Armitage and John Gillingham alternatively propose the Middle Ages as the source of English imperialism and cite the works of William of Malmesbury (1095/96-1143) and Gerald of Wales (1146-1223) and their overarching concern with national identity, difference, and their support for the anglicisation of the archipelago. Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, p.7; John Gillingham, 'The Beginnings of English Imperialism', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 5, 4 (1992), pp.392-409, pp.405-6.To these works we can add Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain* (1136).

[345] John Gillingham, 'Images of Ireland, 1170-1600: The Origins of English Imperialism', *History Today*, 37, 2 (1987), pp.16-22, p.17.

[346] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, p.26.

[347] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, p.27.

[348] Gillingham, 'Images of Ireland', p.17.

[349] Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic fringe in British national development, 1536-1966* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), pp.77-8.

[350] Arthur H. Williamson, 'Scots, Indians and Empire: The Scottish Politics of Civilization, 1519-1609', *Past & Present*, 150 (1996), pp. 46-83, p.60.

Middle Ages and as one historian comments 'became increasingly coterminous with linguistic division.'[351]

Notwithstanding lowland Scotland's attempts to dominate its northern regions, the origin of Anglo-British imperialism has of late been linked to England's forcible colonisation of the 'Celtic crescent surrounding the English core-state'.[352] Armitage contends that external Anglo-British imperialism drew and developed its 'ideologies of racial supremacy, political hegemony, cultural superiority and [its] divinely appointed civilising mission' from its experiences in Ireland in the sixteenth-century.[353] Gillingham cites the classic studies by D. B. Quinn, A. L. Rowse and Nicholas Canny who: a) reject the idea that Elizabethan and Jacobean colonisation commences with the Caribbean and North American projects; b) argue that Ireland 'set the pattern for subsequent transatlantic ventures'; and c) stress that many of the English adventurers who voyaged to America had gained valuable experience in Ireland during the 1560s and 1570s.[354] The external settlements were immediately more successful than England's longstanding attempt to conquer Ireland and Thomas Scanlon suggests that the difference in success stems from England's 'heavy-handed and unrelenting brutal treatment of the native Irish'.[355] A claim strongly supported by historical and written evidence but which fails to include the role of Gaelic Scots both in terms of England's heavy-handedness or their lack of success in the north of Ireland.

Despite the stress laid on Ireland as preceding and therefore influencing England's external plantations, Armitage nonetheless rejects the teleological narrative that depicts Ireland as a perpetual colony of England and 'its non-Protestant inhabitants the subdued "natives"'.[356] Moreover, Armitage states that if the origins of a '*British* ideology of empire' are to be understood it is vital to incorporate Scotland alongside the Anglo-Irish perspective.[357] Rees Davies similarly suggests that while the development of the English state should be primarily examined from an English perspective, 'one may occasionally wonder whether some of the distinctive features of that state and its mythology of

---

[351] Williamson, 'Scots, Indians and Empire', p.61. In the early-sixteenth century the Scottish historian John Mair divides the wild Highlanders from the lowlanders on the grounds of language, dress, morality and belligerence. John Major, *History of Greater Britain* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1892), pp.48-9, 59.

[352] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, p.6.

[353] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, p.6.

[354] Gillingham, 'Images of Ireland, p.16.

[355] Thomas Scanlon, *Colonial Writing and the New World, 1583-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999), p.58.

[356] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, p.24.

[357] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, p.26.

legitimacy could not be even better appreciated if it were studied from its peripheries and satellites as well as from its metropolitan base.'[358]

In Scotland, several of its Highland clans were intimately involved in Ulster politics. None more so than Archibald Campbell, 5th Earl of Argyll (1532/1537-1573), one of the foremost figures in Scottish politics during the reign of Mary Stewart and the early days of the reign of James VI. The later attempts by James VI and I to plant the Hebridean regions of Lewis, Lochaber and Kintyre in 1597, 1605 and 1607 can be seen as preparation for the 1609 Plantation that smothered insurgent Ulster politics and estranged the Gaels. This leads Martin MacGregor to suggest that it is reasonable to view Gaelic Scotland as 'a laboratory for Ulster'.[359] To this I would add that James I's Hebridean plantations were possibly influenced by England's colonial projects and propaganda for Ulster prior to 1603, especially those of Sir Thomas Smith and Walter Devereux.

There are numerous parallels between the experience of Irish and Scottish Gaels in their respective encounters with English and Scottish administrations: both are subject to a domineering centralising authority and a nascent Protestant British state, both are crucial to their development or collapse, and for these reasons both had to be contained. The Hebridean settlements of James VI and I, for example, mark the beginning of the dismantling of the Highland administration, 'catholic or Episcopalian in religion; Gaelic in speech; and Celtic in social organization.'[360] James followed this with the far more successful plantation of Ulster in 1609 that rescinded the ban on Scots migrating to Ireland but disqualified Gaelic Scots. The general pan-Gaelic experience reveals the threat they posed to English, Scottish, Anglo-Irish and potential British interests.

The Gaels however should not be narrowly viewed in terms of an obstruction to Anglo-British imperialism but more broadly understood as a competitor, both culturally and politically. The serendipitous succession to the English throne by the Scottish James VI meant that he was uniquely placed to affect the 'conquest' of Ulster, long desired but unattained by the English administration. For Armitage the Scottish connection is evidence that Anglo-British imperialism is not a linear process but 'triangular, encompassing Anglo-Scottish, Anglo-Irish, and Hiberno-Scottish relations from the 1540s to the 1620s.'[361] Nevertheless, like much historical writing on Ulster during this period, particularly earlier

---

[358] Rees Davies, 'Issues and Agendas: The English State and the 'Celtic' Peoples, 1100-1400', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 6, 1 (1993), pp.1-14, p.2.
[359] Martin MacGregor, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland: the Scottish Isles and the Stewart Empire', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, eds. Eamonn O Ciardha and Micheal O Siochru (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), pp.33-55, p.36.
[360] Hechter, *Internal Colonialism*, p.112.
[361] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, p.27.

studies, Armitage (like Scanlon) overlooks the significant influence of the Gaelic Scots who are too often lost within the broader 'British' colonial ventures in Ireland and overseas.

The Gaelic Scots and Scottish politics in general are an essential feature of and influence on the imperial and colonial narrative of sixteenth-century Ulster, and it may be that James VI and I's Hebridean plantations were influenced by England's projects in Ulster, themselves shaped by the Scots therein. It is equally possible that the failure of England to conquer and settle Ulster, due to its disastrous colonial schemes, provided an example or a cautionary tale for James's approach to his largely successful Ulster plantation, which ultimately removed the analogous Gaelic thorn in the side of both English and Scottish administrations.

The English colonial mind

Phil Withington and Andrew Hadfield have recently discussed the humanist background to England's colonial policy in Ireland in their respective essays in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*. Humanism, and its anthropocentric philosophy that 'sought to dignify and ennoble man', offered an expedient justification to conquer, supplant and enslave indigenous people from Ireland to the Americas.[362] For Withington, one explanation for this apparent contradiction is that 'over the course of the sixteenth century the […] humanism practised by Thomas More was corrupted, and narrowed by the exigencies of state-formation and pathologies of reformation'.[363] This explanation however, takes for granted the integrity of the founding humanists, and as Hiram Morgan notes, the idea of over-population as justification for colonisation can be found in More's *Utopia* (1516), itself something of a how-to manual for colonising neighbouring territories.[364] Sir Thomas Smith's Irish colonial pamphlet *A Letter from I. B. Gentlemen*

---

[362] J. A. Cudden, *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (London, Penguin, 1992), p.402.

[363] Phil Withington, 'Plantation and civil society', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, p.56.

[364] Hiram Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture of Sir Thomas Smith in Ulster, 1571-1575', *The Historical Journal,* 28, 2 (1985), pp. 261-278, p.269. A passage from Book two (social relations) of Thomas More's *Utopia* captures a ruthlessness implicit in humanism: 'And if the population throughout the entire island exceeds the quota, they enrol citizens out of every city and plant a colony under their own laws on the mainland near them, wherever the natives have plenty of unoccupied and uncultivated land. Those natives who want to live with the Utopians are adopted by them. When such a merger occurs, the two peoples gradually and easily blend together, sharing the same way of life and customs, much to the advantage of both. For by their policies the Utopians make the land yield an abundance for all, though previously it had seemed too poor and barren even to support the natives. But those who refuse to live under their laws they drive out of the land they claim for themselves, and against those who resist them, they wage war. They think it is perfectly justifiable to make war on people who leave their land idle and waste yet forbid the use and possession of it to others who, by the law of nature, ought to be supported from it.' Thomas More, *Utopia*, eds. George M. Logan and Robert M. Adams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 2, p.54.

(1571) alludes to More's book when highlighting the short journey from England to Ireland: 'The cut betweene the Cuntries, short, streight, & not fiue dayes jorney. How say you now, haue I not set forth to you another *Eutopia*?'[365]

Withington's second explanation focuses on the concept of 'monarchical republicanism', the suggestion that while Tudor England was 'ostensibly a monarchy the nature of governance was such that enormous power and responsibility increasingly devolved across the social spectrum […] not merely to the Privy Council and parliament […] but to the governors of counties, cities and boroughs'.[366] 'Monarchical republicanism' has implications for the study of particular forms of civic humanism and for understanding the motivation of the numerous 'English poets and statesmen' who went to Ireland and 'who in many respects epitomised the ideal of "monarchical republicanism"', and staunchly believed that 'it was a shibboleth that Irish society could and should be "civil" like England'.[367] Withington cites Markku Peltonen, who emphasises a third explanation: that civic humanism did not so much decline but was overtaken by the 'proliferation of classical and republican templates and their application to the problems of modern governance.'[368] Peltonen's claim finds strong support in the surfeit of Classical and Republican allusions and quotations in the colonial literature of the sixteenth century.

In 'Educating the Colonial Mind', Hadfield speaks of 'an intellectual history that needs to be uncovered' and identifies 'the classrooms of England' as its source. Here, Hadfield argues, an education focused on rhetoric and dialectics prepared elites for governmental service.[369] Hadfield underlines how

> the discussions of colonial policy by soldiers, statesmen and academics, developed out of an intellectual culture that helped to put theory into practice. Reading Latin and Greek literature at school and university led to an understanding that the establishment and maintenance of colonies was a central element of a responsible government's concerns.[370]

In effect, what Hadfield suggests is that English universities groomed a generation of 'gentleman adventurers'. The classical education of Sir Thomas Smith for example clearly influences his ideological and colonial writings while his social circle at Cambridge

---

[365] Sir Thomas Smith, *A Letter from I.B. Gentleman unto his very frende Maystet [sic] R.C. Esquire vvherin i s contained a large discourse of the peopling & inhabiting the cuntrie called the Ardes* (London, 1572), p.10.
[366] Withington, 'Plantation and civil society', p.55.
[367] Withington, 'Plantation and civil society', p.55.
[368] Cited in Withington, 'Plantation and civil society', p.56. See Markku Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
[369] Andrew Hadfield, 'Educating the colonial mind: Spenser and the plantation', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, pp.158-176, pp.163-4.
[370] Hadfield, 'Educating the colonial mind', p.170.

included the renowned humanists and colonial apologists Gabriel Harvey and Edmund Spenser.

It was the misfortune of Ireland to provide the most favourable opportunities for the expression of England's humanist ideals (or 'monarchical republicanism') and it was England's misfortune during the second half of the sixteenth century to find the Irish and Scottish Gaels (often in combination) obstructing its 'civilising' mission and ultimate aim of expanding its imperial ambitions abroad under the banner of Britain. Gaeldom therefore had to be subdued and systematically dismantled.

Ireland must be destroyed

The Age of Atrocity (2007) is described by its editors as 'in essence, a book about killing', and seeks to return 'the violence and brutality of early modern Ireland' to its 'proper place in the historical record.'[371] In one of its essays entitled 'The escalation of violence in sixteenth-century Ireland', David Edwards argues that English atrocities are traditionally overlooked by historians who tend to focus on 'reform rather than conquest', and represent atrocity as an 'inadvertent' consequence of failed policies and projects: 'at a stroke the violence was pushed from the foreground of sixteenth-century studies to the margins.'[372] Edward states that 'combatants committed the worst excesses: multiple murders, summary executions, the mass slaughter of unarmed civilians (women and children included), dismemberment, even famine inducement, all became widespread in the course of one of the bloodiest and nastiest epochs in Irish history'.[373] Colonial Ireland is now considered within the history of European and world genocide and this chapter argues that the experience of the Gaelic Scots ought to be included.

Genocide is it said, emerged alongside modernity and the nation-state, and is described by Alexander Hilton as the 'Janus face of western metanarratives of "civilisation" and "progress"'.[374] These metanarratives led to 'tens of millions of "backward" or "savage" indigenous peoples perish[ing] from disease, starvation, slave labour, and outright murder.'[375] The United Nations defines genocide as the destruction of

---

[371] Clodagh Tait, David Edwards and Padraig Lenihan, eds. 'Early Modern Ireland: A History of violence', in *Age of Atrocity: Violence and Political Conflict in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), p.19.

[372] David Edwards, 'The escalation of violence in sixteenth-century Ireland', in *Age of Atrocity*, p.36.

[373] Edwards, 'The escalation of violence', p.34.

[374] Alexander Laban Hinton, 'The Dark Side of Modernity: Toward an Anthropology of Genocide', in *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), pp.1-42, p.1.

[375] Hinton, 'The Dark Side of Modernity', p.1. Coined in the twentieth-century by the Polish lawyer Raphael Lemkin (1943-1944), the practice of 'genocide' stretches back to classical times when emperors and kings

a nation or of an ethnic group,[376] and while genocide relies on violence there are distinctions: 'Violence' can refer to physical and psychological injuries perpetrated on an individual or group, or their property, while 'political violence' involves covert or 'overt state-sponsored or tolerated violence' against individuals or groups 'with the express intent of realizing certain social, ethnic, economic and political goals'.[377] It is undeniable that in sixteenth-century Ireland, England engaged in both forms of violence, and while seeking to conquer Ireland engaged in violent actions and atrocities against not one but two ethnic groups in the Gaelic Irish and Scots.

Hinton claims that 'with few exceptions anthropologies have remained remarkably silent on the topic of genocide'.[378] Hayes-McCoy is one historian reproached by the editors of *The Age of Atrocity* for describing the massacre of the Scots on Rathlin by the Earl of Essex as 'lessons in frightfulness', and for failing to consider such incidents 'in detail' because the 'overall focus was on the overarching political developments of the Elizabethan period'.[379] Bradshaw more forthrightly brands English colonisers such as Essex and Smith as 'conquistadores'; and of the former writes that the 'deeper depths of inhumanity were plumbed in the massacre of the defenceless women and children of the MacDonnells by Essex and his freebooters on Rathlin island in 1575.'[380] Bradshaw compares such incidents with Cromwell's massacres at Drogheda and Wexford in 1649 and argues that they form 'part of a pattern of violence which was central to the historical experience of the inhabitants of the island in the early modern period.'[381]

In Hayes-McCoy's defense, he does point out that Smith, Essex and their supporters encouraged the subjugation of those occupying regions designated for planting, thus demonstrating that when the 'English confronted the Gaelic Irish, they considered them, out of hand and apparently as matter of course, to be inferior to themselves and even, in the last resort, expendable.'[382] However, while *The Age of Atrocity* briefly mentions the Essex led massacre of the Scots on Rathlin Island (as well as including it in a list of atrocities punctuating the period) the collection largely confines itself to a discussion of the

---

engaged in what Helen Fein describes as 'despotic genocides'. Hinton, 'The Dark Side of Modernity', pp.3, 37.

[376] 'genocide', n. *OED Online*, Oxford University Press http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/Entry/77616?redirectedFrom=genocide [accessed June 30, 2015]

[377] Hinton, 'The Dark Side of Modernity', p.6.

[378] Hinton, 'The Dark Side of Modernity', p.1.

[379] Tait, et al., 'Early modern Ireland: a history of violence', p.15. G. A. Hayes-McCoy, 'The completion of the Tudor conquest and the advance of the counter-reformation, 1571-1603', in *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland, 1534-1691*, eds. T. W. Moody, F. A. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p.44.

[380] Bradshaw, 'Nationalism and historical scholarship', p.329.

[381] Bradshaw, 'Nationalism and historical scholarship', p.329.

[382] Hayes-McCoy, 'The completion of the Tudor conquest', p.44.

atrocities committed against the Irish and fails to give proper consideration to the Gaelic Scots. This chapter explores such atrocities more fully, particularly the actions of the Earl of Essex.

Lastly, it has been suggested that the violence in Ulster was in part due to the internecine wars between Irish chiefs and Anglo-Irish rulers.[383] To this friction we can add the largely unwanted presence of the Scottish Gaels, specifically the MacDonnells whose movement into Connacht, Leinster and Munster during the 1520s precipitated a decline in the power of the native O'Neills.[384] However, as England's colonial literature abundantly demonstrates, the strategy of the administrations in London and Dublin was to play the Gaels against one another, fostering hostility between them amid the common violence and atrocities meted out by the English.

When in Rome

As the section on the English colonial mind shows, the course of English and European modernisation and imperialism was channeled through a reassertion of Classical and Republican politics and martial policies. In such models, England found solutions to contemporary imperial issues, models which, according to Peltonen, superseded civic humanism. The 'cults of antiquity' and 'a fetish for agriculture' are two dominant ideas to emerge from the revival and make their way into the culture of 'genocidal violence that accompanied Europe's early modern expansion'.[385]

In the sixteenth century, English imperialists turned to Pagan writers for guidance and for examples of the triumphs of genocide. Just as the topical civil wars of the Late Republic had caught the imagination of its writers, the imperial achievements of the Roman Empire captured the colonial imagination of early modern writers who also adopted Rome's propensity to annihilate anyone who resisted it. The principal genocidal paradigm of sixteenth-century European expansion was General Scipio's destruction of Carthage during the Third Punic War (149–146 BC).[386] Rome encountered robust and chastening resistance at the hands of the Carthaginians, fuelling a thirst for revenge encapsulated in the famous and influential phrase attributed to Cato the Elder: *delenda est*

---

[383] Edwards, 'The escalation of violence', p.37.
[384] Edwards, 'The escalation of violence', pp.51-2.
[385] Ben Kiernan, *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), pp.2, 43.
[386] The fate of Carthage became widely known from the 1530s with the publication of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita Libri*, (*The History of Rome* (Book 44)) (27-25 BC) which traces Rome's history from its formation to Livy's own period.

Carthego (Carthage must be destroyed), which according to ancient sources concluded Cato's senate speeches.[387]

The annihilation of the Carthaginians is often cited 'as a prime example of an exterminated people', and has often been employed allegorically.[388] In the *Aeneid,* for example, Egypt's Cleopatra is personified as Dido of Carthage,[389] and in the seventeenth century, Anthony Cooper, 1st Earl of Shaftesbury (1673) employed Carthage to describe the third Anglo-Dutch war (1672–1674), while the slogan of a pro-German radio station in occupied France was 'England, like Carthage, shall be destroyed!'[390] In advance of the state-authorised murder of the Glencoe (Catholic) MacDonalds (1692), otherwise known as the 'Glencoe massacre', Sir John Dalrymple, the English secretary of state for Scotland, writes of the MacDonalds that 'there is no reckoning with them; *delenda est Carthago*',[391] and insists that the 'miscreants be cut off root and branch'.[392] In sixteenth-century England, 'Carthage' provided a template upon which English imperialists could configure and validate their genocidal tendencies. For example, D. B. Quinn asserts that for intellectuals such as Sir Thomas Smith, 'the English in Ireland were the modern Romans, bringing to a savage land law, peace, and civilization'.[393]

As previously stated, at this time European enthusiasts of Roman writing developed a propensity to express colonial concepts in agricultural terms.[394] The word 'plantation' stems from this development; and as Darlrymple's 'root and branch' reference above shows, the propensity continued into the late seventeenth century at least. Ben Kiernan contends that Virgil's pastoral/ agrarian verse became the 'poetry of new empires modelled on Roman antiquity'.[395] In the 'Preface' to *The History of the World* (1614),

---

[387] Kiernan, *Blood and Soil*, p.68; Charles E. Little, 'The Authenticity and Form of Cato's Saying "Carthago Delenda Est"', *Classical Journal*, 29, 6 (1934), pp. 429-435, p.429.
[388] Kiernan, *Blood and Soil*, p.68.
[389] Kiernan, *Blood and Soil*, ppp.59, 64, 60.
[390] George Michael, *Theology of Hate: A History of the World Church of Creation* (Florida: University of Florida Press, 2009), p. 26.
[391] Kiernan, *Blood and Soil*, p.68.
[392] Cited in Kiernan, *Blood and Soil*, p.69. The rhetoric of war reports of the classical period, for example the war reports of Julius Caesar′s annihilation of Germanic tribes, chimes with Tudor accounts of the state of Ireland. Having pursued the tribesmen across the Rhine, Caesar writes that ′I stayed a few days in their territory, burning till their villages and buildings and cutting down their crops.' Cited in Kiernan, *Blood and Soil*, pp.58-9. Compare this with Lord Sussex's own account of his expedition in the western islands of Scotland to curb the Scots in Ulster (provided in full in the third chapter): ′I londed and burned the hole countrye; from thens I went to Arren [Arran], and did the lyke there, and so to the Isles of Combras [Cumbrae], whyche I also burned.′ CSP, Irel., 2, p.149, 71-71i.˙
[393] D. B. Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory', *American Philosophical Society*, 89, 4 (1945), pp.543-560, p.546.
[394] In legend the soil of Carthage is said to have been salted to prevent re-habitation, however no evidence exists to support this and this connection is said to be an eighteenth-century invention. R.T. Ridley, 'To Be Taken with a Pinch of Salt: The Destruction of Carthage', *Classical Philology* 81, 2 (1986), pp.140–146, p.144.
[395] Kiernan, *Blood and Soil*, ppp.59, 64, 60.

Walter Raleigh pays considerable attention to the Punic Wars and says of Carthage that at 'home and the rest, no fruit, flower, grasse, nor leafe, springing upon the face of the earth, of those seedes: no, their very roots and ruines doe hardly remaine.'[396] A letter from Sir Thomas Smith to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, William Fitzwilliam in 1572 is peppered with agricultural allusions: Smith entreats Fitzwilliam for assistance exhorting that 'these weake & new planted thinges […] do most require your cherishing,' and in 1574, Smith beseeches Fitzwilliam to 'be as a father to his pore colonye / which is a yong tree that hath bene oft cut of when it began to grow / So I trust with experience & felyng of the precedent euills / will take suerer roote now at the last.'[397] The bureaucratic problems that plagued the colonial projects of Sir Thomas Smith and Walter Devereux suggest that while poets and propagandists embraced the agricultural metaphor, administrators like Fitzwilliam were more cautious

Faction and fiction

In 'Angling for Ulster: Ireland and plantation in Jacobean literature', Maley assesses whether 'events in Ireland from 1603 to 1625 impacted sufficiently on English literary culture to feature more than fleetingly in the writing of the period.'[398] At this time a swing is said to occur from the literary towards a more political discourse, an assumption Maley argues that 'overlooks the blurred boundary between fiction and history in the period'.[399] Maley's contention, though primarily concerned with the Jacobean period, has implications for the Elizabethan,[400] when with regard to Ireland a 'blurring' ensued between political/colonial discourse and the literary. What is more, as Patricia Palmer asserts in *The Severed Head and the Grafted Tongue* (2013), during the Elizabethan conquest of Ireland 'real violence bleeds into literary depictions of warfare and decapitation'.[401]

Palmer's recognition of the 'disconcerting conjunction' between 'violence and art'[402] during this period underlines the synergy between colonialism and literature that subsequently led to literary developments in colonial literature. The expediency of

---

[396] Kiernan, *Blood and Soil*, pp.58-9. Walter Raleigh, 'Preface', *History of the World* (London: Walter Burre, 1614), para. 9.
[397] Cited in Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.554.
[398] Willy Maley, 'Angling for Ulster: Ireland and Plantation in Jacobean Literature', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, pp.218-238, p.218.
[399] Maley, 'Angling for Ulster', p.220.
[400] And more generally opens up opportunities for literary critics to study texts typically the concern of historians but which employ linguistic and literary characteristics.
[401] Patricia Palmer, *The Severed Head and the Grafted Tongue: Literature, Translation and Violence in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p.1. Interestingly, there are several beheadings associated with the Scots in Ulster: Edward Bruce's head was severed after death and delivered to Edward II; after being murdered by the MacDonnells, Shane O'Neill's head was cut off post-burial and sent to Henry Sidney, while Alexander Og MacDonnell's head was also removed after exhumation.
[402] Palmer, *The Severed Head and the Grafted Tongue*, p.1.

literature is reflected in a letter sent to William Cecil, Lord Burghley by Sir Thomas Smith who defends his controversial Irish colonial pamphlet *A Letter from I. B. Gentleman* on the grounds 'that nothing was left but persuasion, either by words or writing and writing goes further'.[403] Smith's explanation is a significant statement that highlights a shift from a formal colonial discourse couched in administrative language to a more self-conscious, sophisticated, and well-crafted colonial literature.

The discourse relating to the Gaels is inevitably and unremittingly negative, but as intruders and therefore outside English legal jurisdiction and monarchical rule, the Scots, in literature at any rate, are sometimes received worse. They are despised and demonised, essentially 'othered' by English writers. A state of affairs caused in part, MacGregor argues, by the defection of the 5th Earl of Argyll from the Anglo-Scottish regime to the Gaels, which 'helped lay down a road to Britishness that must needs be confrontational and colonial, with Gaelic Scotland and Gaelic Ireland cast as hostile peripheries to be conquered and suppressed in order to make good a very different imperial vision.'[404] By the twentieth century, according to Michael Hechter (1975), the various groups that had inhabited the 'British Isles' had for the most part come to view themselves as 'British'.[405] The remaining Celtic communities therefore had to be 'othered' and 'disallowed access to political identity within the British Isles'; to be afforded access would threaten 'Britain and Britishness, by contesting its political space'.[406] In sixteenth-century Ulster the Scottish Gaels contested a region that England believed to be its 'political space'.

To gain as complete a picture as possible of the impact of England's colonial policies on the Scots in Ulster, in addition to the Scots influence on said policies, it is essential to examine what Palmer (in *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland: English Renaissance literature and Elizabethan imperial expansion* (2009)), calls 'non-literary texts of conquest', such as state papers, statutes, letters and position papers that help 'reconstruct the linguistic corollary of the conquest.'[407] This practice is part of a wider movement within critical theory, which has, in the words of Kerrigan, 'eroded the once-vaunted autonomy of the literary object and toppled the hierarchy of genres which put tragedy and lyric poetry at the top of an aesthetic pyramid and pamphleteering somewhere

---

[403] Cited in Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.551.
[404] MacGregor, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland', p.43.
[405] Hechter, *Internal Colonialism*, p.10. The groups who disappeared or 'amalgamated' into British include the 'Picts, Frisians, Angles, Saxons, Danes, and Normans', while the so-called 'Celts' (to which Gaels belong) survived. Hechter, *Internal Colonialism* , p.10.
[406] Pittock, *Celtic Identity and the British Image*, p.11.
[407] Patricia Palmer, *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland: English Renaissance literature and Elizabethan imperial expansion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p.3.

near the bottom.'[408] Scanlon similarly questions the validity of a literary criticism that differentiates between writers' 'literary productions' and 'non-literary' productions.[409] A prime Elizabethan example is the poet, polemicist and propagandist Edmund Spenser and indeed Palmer writes in *The Severed Head* that Spenser's description of the *Faerie Queene* as a 'historical fiction' captures the way 'in which art and fact were spliced together by writer-fighters crossing back and forth between military faction and literary fiction.'[410]

Literature associated with Ireland such as Smith's *A Letter from I. B.*, William Herbert's *Croftus* (1591), Henry Sidney's *Memoir* (1583) and Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland* (1596) all exhibit a 'blurring' between the documentary and the literary. Commenting on the *Memoirs* of Sir Henry Sidney's time in Ireland, Ciaran Brady writes that Sidney abandons a 'time-honoured, semi-official form of representation', and instead elects to 'provide a detailed narrative account', thus, Brady concludes, Sidney 'consciously or not, committed himself to a complex literary strategy'.[411] Furthermore, the large number of position papers on Ulster can be seen as precursors to the more sophisticated colonial literature to which *A Letter from I. B.* belongs and which in terms of quality and repute peaked with Spenser's *View*.

The colonial literature that supplemented England's domination of its smaller neighbours can be understood within wider European colonial writing, recognised by Said as representative of Europe's attempt to 'rule distant lands and peoples'. [412] 'What are striking in these discourses', Said argues, 'are the rhetorical figures one keeps encountering in their descriptions [of the colonial people] […] the notions about bringing civilization to primitive or barbaric peoples', in addition to punishing them 'when "they" misbehaved or became rebellious, because "they" mainly understood force or violence best; "they" were not like "us", and for that reason deserved to be ruled.'[413] We do not have to dig too deep into English colonial literature to unearth such discourse relating to the Gaelic Irish and Scots.

It is important to note however, as Said does, that it was never the case that the western imperialist fought against a 'supine or inert non-western native', but always found some resistance in what Said considers to be a 'general worldwide pattern'.[414] Gaelic resistance is ubiquitous in the literature of this period; most obviously in the policies and

---

[408] Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, p.2.
[409] Scanlon, *Colonial Writing*, p.69.
[410] Palmer, *The severed Head and the Grafted Tongue*, p.1.
[411] Ciaran Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication: Sir Henry Sidney's Memoir of Service in Ireland, 1556-78*, 1583 (Cork: Cork University Press, 2002), p.7.
[412] Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, pp.xii-xiii.
[413] Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, pp.xii-xiii.
[414] Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, p.xvii.

propaganda but also in the palpable anxiety of the English administration in Dublin and London, and perhaps most of all in the violence and atrocities perpetrated against the Gaels. We are conditioned to the axiom that violence begets violence but, as Maley notes, 'less attention is paid to the ways in which colonial violence begets resistance.'[415] The story of the Gaelic Scots in Ulster, as told from an English imperial perspective, is a story steeped in violence and resistance.

Finally, it could be argued, based on the textual evidence presented in this chapter, that the necessity to counteract the effect of the Scots in Ulster was in practical terms as significant in driving English colonialism and its accompanying literature as its long-standing desire to conquer Ireland, as well as the social stresses taking place in England (primogeniture, the Reformation etc.), and its educational programme. D. B. Quinn observes that the 'official views on colonisation in Ireland were not static between 1550 and 1580 but developed in accordance with changing circumstances in Ireland.'[416] As we will see, the Gaelic Scots play a prominent role in these changing circumstances.

Noisy Neighbours, 1551-1567

The spilling over of the Anglo-Scottish conflict into Ireland in 1315 produced an additional theatre of conflict and Ulster became a second frontier between the English and Scots.[417] Despite ending in defeat the Bruce's Irish campaigns rekindled the historic relationship between Gaeldom and curtailed England's conquest of Ireland. One historian writes that the effects of the invasion 'in the North, where the Scots remained for some years in league with the Irish chiefs, were so to weaken the English colonists that they became the subordinate power.'[418] The death of Robert Bruce (1329) triggered the unfettered expansion of MacDonalds into the Western Isles, while in Ulster the death of William de Burgh in 1333 hastened an English retreat and the consolidation of Tyrone by the O'Neills and later Antrim by the MacDonnells.

The pan-Gaelic relationship was reinforced in 1399 through the marriage of Eoin Mor MacDonald, brother of Donald, Lord of the Isles, and Margery Bisset, daughter of Hugh Bisset of the Glynnes (the last surviving Anglo-Norman heir to the Antrim Glynnes),

---

[415] Willy Maley, 'Something Quite Atrocious: English Colonialism Beyond the Pale and the License to Violence', *Eolas: The Journal of the American Society of Irish Medieval Studies*, 3 (2009), pp. 82-111, p.85.
[416] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.543.
[417] James Lydon, 'Edward I, Ireland and the War in Scotland, 1303-1304', in *England and Ireland in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. James Lydon (Dublin: Irish academic Press, 1981), pp.43-61, p.45.
[418] 'Marshal Bagenal's Description of Ulster, 1586', ed. Herbert Hore, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 2 (1854), pp.137-160, p.140.

ushering in large numbers of Clan Donald South.[419] The traffic of galloglaigh (gallowglass) into Ireland interrupted by the Bruce invasion resumed during the late fourteenth century, swelling the numbers of Scots in Ulster, particularly those belonging to clan MacDonnell.[420] Over the next two hundred years, Gaelic Ireland, with some assistance from the Scottish Gaels, recovered territory from the Anglo-Normans, and as the sixteenth century developed, Ulster and the English Pale became locked in an antagonistic struggle.[421] By this time many Irish chiefs and Shane O'Neill especially, were as eager as the English to see the back of the embedded Scots. Ultimately both England's and O'Neill's future prospects in the region depended on either defeating or forcing the Scots out of Ulster.

European politics also focused attention on Ulster. The Hapsburg-Valois conflict (Italian Wars 1494-1559), involving at various times Italy, France, Spain, England and Scotland, had shifted from Italy to the borders between France and the Holy Roman Empire.[422] As the daughter of Mary of Guise, the unmarried Catholic Mary Queen of Scots became a political rag doll as England and France wrestled to acquire her in marriage and secure an alliance with Scotland.[423] Agreement was reached in 1548 when the Scots consented to Mary's betrothal to the French Dauphin, raising the likelihood that France would exploit its Franco-Scottish and Irish-Scottish connections in Ulster and western Scotland and use them as an entry point against their protestant rival England.[424]

Fearing foreign invasion Henry VIII sought to control Ulster and in 1542 succeeded in gaining Con O'Neill's submission. O'Neill retained his lands in Tyrone but was compelled to pass on its title to England's preferred heir the well-disposed Matthew O'Neill, 1st Baron of Dungannon.[425] Owing to O'Neill's submission, but despite being unable to control Scottish migration into Ulster, Henry VIII did not view the region as an immediate threat. Before the late 1550s and in spite of its European and Irish issues, England, according to Michael Hill, did not seek 'outright conquest' of Ireland.'[426] Instead,

---

[419] Hiram Morgan, 'The End of Gaelic Ulster: A Thematic Interpretation of Events Between 1534 and 1610', *Irish Historical Studies*, 26, 101 (1988), pp.8-32, p.14; Philip Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-1670* (Dublin: St Martin's Press, 1984), p.45.

[420] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, pp.5-6.

[421] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.22.

[422] Jane E. A. Dawson, *Scotland Re-formed, 1488-1587* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), p.155

[423] Dawson, *Scotland Re-formed*, p.176.

[424] Sidney thought that James MacDonnell would lead a Franco-Scottish invasion of Ulster. Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.47.

[425] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.26.

[426] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.27.

Henry VIII sought both change and 'broad continuity', encapsulated in his policy of surrender and regrant.[427]

In contrast to Henry VIII, Elizabeth I engaged in ambitious and often costly projects in Ireland and handed responsibility to influential administrative and court figures whose colonial schemes destabilised local regions, while their plan to establish plantations to deal with Gaelic insurgency proved to be financially unrealisable. Consequently the English administrations in both Dublin and London found themselves constantly reacting to events rather than shaping them and the 'result was pronounced discontinuity of policy encouraging the growth of an articulate opposition movement which cut across traditional factional politics, undermined respect for the Viceroyalty, and threatened to unite Gaelic and Old English opinion against Tudor rule'.[428]

With the end of the Hapsburg-Valois conflict and the signing of the Treaty of Cambresis (1559) the Irish-Scottish menace lost much of its immediate threat.[429] Nonetheless throughout the reign of Elizabeth (1558-1603) the English viewed the Scots as 'intruders from a foreign kingdom' and implemented strategies to deal with the threat.[430] George Hill contends that 'in every plan formed by the English government for the management of Ireland […] the expulsion of the Scots from Ulster was invariably recommended as an indispensable measure to begin with'.[431]

The deputyship of Sir James Croft (1551-1552)

During the early 1550s the consolidation of the Scots in Ulster triggered a triangular clash between the MacDonnells, O'Neills and the English in northern Ulster. Pivotal to this tension, according to Michael Hill, was the growing authority of Sorley Boy MacDonnell, which 'began a fundamental shift in Ulster's balance of power.'[432] As will be discussed later the first tenure of Sir Henry Sidney as Lord Deputy of Ireland is seen by some as occasioning a significant shift to more aggressive policies, but with regard to the Gaelic Scots it is the appointment of James Croft to the position of Lord Deputy in 1551 that sets the ball rolling.

---

[427] Steven G. Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603* (London and New York: Longman, 1985), p.228.
[428] Ellis, *Tudor Ireland*, p.228.
[429] Jane E. A. Dawson, *The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary Queen of Scots: the Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.2.
[430] Morgan, 'The End of Gaelic Ulster', p.15.
[431] George Hill, 'Shane O'Neill's Expedition against the Antrim Scots, 1565', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, First Series, 9 (1861/1862), pp.122-141, p.125.
[432] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.35.

By 1551 the Scots, according to the historian Richard Bagwell, 'had lately made themselves supreme from the Giants Causeway to Belfast'.[433] Hiram Morgan writes that the Scots' strong position in Ulster, especially the north-east, 'made the [English] government's plan to demilitarise the northern lordships more difficult and more urgent'.[434] Croft was originally despatched to Ireland in early 1551 to counter an anticipated Franco-Scottish invasion and led an expeditionary force to north Ulster to 'forcibly eject' the Scots.[435] Described by Hill as a 'moderate reformer' who preferred garrisons to military conquest, Croft swiftly replaced the incumbent Lord Deputy, Anthony St Leger,[436] and succeeded in convincing several Ulster chiefs to accept his authority, consent to his arbitration in local disputes, and join him in expeditions against the Scots.[437]

In the summer of 1551, Croft despatched Sir Ralph Bagenal (Lieutenant of the Army in Ireland) and Captain John Cuffe to Rathlin where the MacDonnells led by James MacDonnell had recently retreated. Rathlin was the Scots' island stronghold off the coast of Antrim and 15 miles from the Mull of Kintyre and here they maintained a small but pivotal settlement where they typically stored food, horses, cattle and whatever booty they had appropriated from Irish chiefs.[438] Rathlin Island held symbolic meaning for the Scots since Barbour's claim in *The Bruce* that Robert Bruce had hidden there from his English pursuers in 1306-7, and by the sixteenth century, it had become a stepping stone between the west coast of Scotland and Ulster and a strategic site in the conflict between Gaelic Scots and the English administration in Dublin. The Scottish occupation of Rathlin rendered it a legitimate target and occasional punch bag for English frustration throughout the latter half of the century, most notably the massacres of 1558 and 1575.

With the heads of the MacDonnell clan temporarily out of Ireland and in one place the Dublin authorities sensed an opportunity to strike. The assault failed however, compromised by a lack of vessels, rough seas and the steel of patient Scots on the shoreline. The soldiers who survived the surf were slaughtered on site and the officers, including Bagenal, taken prisoner and exchanged for the release of James MacDonnell's brother Sorley Boy who was being held in a Dublin Castle.[439] Thomas Cusack's (Lord

---

[433] Richard Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors, with a Succinct Account of the Early History*, 1 (London: Longman's, Green and co., 1885), p.360.
[434] Morgan, 'The End of Gaelic Ulster', p.17.
[435] Robert Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 22, 85 (1924), pp.51-60, p. 51; Herbert, *Croftus*, p.xiv.
[436] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.36.
[437] Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors, 1*, p.362-63; Herbert, *Croftus*, p.xiv.
[438] Donald Gregory, *The History of the Western Isles of Scotland* (Great Britain: John Donald, 1881; 2008), p.195; Herbert, *Croftus*, p.xiv.
[439] Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors*, 1, p.363; Gregory, *The History of the Western Isles*, p.195.

Chancellor of Ireland (1551-54)) account of the assault is reproduced in George Hill's *An Historical Account of the MacDonnells of Antrim* (1873):

> The nexte morowe certain prisoners of the Skottes were brought before my Lord, who told his Lordship that James M'Connyll and his breathern, with a nomber of Skottis were all togidder in the Island of Raghlin, and had with them the mooste parte of all the praies of kyne and garrans that VI daies before were taken by them out of Claneboy, and for that the same Island was scant from the land iv myles by sea, and that there was at the same place tow barkes and tow small galleys that thai dud take from the Skottes vi daies before. The Captaynes of the footemen was mooste willing to be set a land with iii or iv hondreth men, as well to revenge themself upon the people for invading the kingis lande.[440]

> After which determinacyon, Sr. Raulf Bagnall and Captayne Cuffe determyned to advaunce fonvarde vvith thre hondreth souldiers [...] towards the island [...] And whiles the lieftenaunte were thus beholdinge the same, a soddaine sourde [surge] of the sea came at an ebb and sett their boate upon the rockes. Soe as after thai could not com thense, but abide the hazarde, and then as many as were in that boate wer drowned and slayne to the nomber of xxv., and the lieftenaunte, Capytayne Cuffe, and two more taken prisoners.[441]

James Ware's *Annals of Ireland* (1654) provides a succinct description of the Rathlin attack, the ensuing slaughter, the negotiations for Sorley's release, and describes 'one of the Ships suffering Wrack'.[442] The earlier *Annals of the Four Masters* (1632-6) reports the slaughter and Sorley's release but omits the storm that is so critical to Cusack and Ware's explanation of its failure:

> The lord justice marched with a force in the beginning of harvest into Ulster, and despatched the crews of four ships to Reachrann (the Island of Rathlin, off the coast of Antrim), to plunder it. James and Colla Maol Duv, the sons of MacDonnell of Scotland, were on the island to defend the place; an engagement ensued, in which the Saxons were overthrown, and not one of them escaped to tell the tale excepting the lieutenant who commanded them, whom the Scots kept as a prisoner until they got in his stead their own brother, namely, Somhairle Buidhe MacDonnell (commonly called Sorley Boy MacDonnell), who had been imprisoned by the English of Dublin, a year before that time, besides another great ransom along with him.[443]

Rathlin is known for its fast moving and dangerous currents, yet, one might speculate that Cusack embellishes his account (or exploits the known dangers of the surrounding tides) in order to shift the blame for the failed assault onto a devastating storm. A speculation given some credence by the positive spin Cusack attempts to put on the debacle:

> Soe all this came through misfortune, assuring your honor that ther coulde noe governour sett forthe men more discreatlie and wise than my Lord dud, and for as

---

[440] Cited in George Hill, *An Historical Account of the MacDonnells of Antrim* (Belfast: Archer & Sons, 1873), p.47.

[441] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.49.

[442] James Ware, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland* (Dublin: A. Crook, 1705), p.124.

[443] *The Annals of Ireland, of the Four Masters*, trans. Owen Connellan (Dublin: Bryan Geraghty, 1846), p.432-433.

goode a cause and purpose as ever men was sent. And thankes be to God, save onely for the losse of our men, there is like suche goode successe to followe, as the Skottes will noe more attempte to inhabite Irlande.[444]

Cusack's rhetoric implies that the MacDonnells had actually been defeated and would henceforth present little difficulty for the English administration. In reality the Scots quickly returned to Antrim and continued to consolidate their position. In another piece of misguided prophecy Cusack naively declares that Croft's attacks

doe natoorely insue great quietnes to the contre but alsoe profitt to the kingis [...] besydes the wynninge of subiectes and bannesinge of enemyes, which will not be oute of remimbrans in Irlande.[445]

Cusack's conviction that the banishing of the Scots would live long in the memory proved to be short-lived while his assurance that quietness would ensue was similarly wide of the mark. We should therefore be cautious in accepting Cusack's further claim that Croft's audacity and determination so astonished the Scots that James MacDonnell felt compelled to inform the Lord Deputy that

he never knew that anie deputie was in Irlande before nowe, meaninge that he thocht that noe deputie wolde hev travailed soe ferre in suche a wyldernes and desart places wher as noe governour went with men sence the conquest.[446]

It is unknown whether such correspondence actually took place. Cusack's later acknowledgment in his 'Book' on the state of Ireland (1553) of the dominance of the MacDonnells in north Ulster confirms that the Scots had not been adversely affected by Croft's actions.[447]

The responsibilities and experiences of James Croft's time in Ireland are recounted in William Herbert's (1553-1593) *Croftus sive de Hibernia liber* (1591), described by D. B. Quinn as 'largely a justification of England's treatment of Ireland as a field for colonisation'.[448] Herbert's work belongs to a cluster of humanist writing on colonisation during the second half of the sixteenth century that includes Sir Thomas Smith's *De Republica Anglorum* (1562-5), Richard Beacon's *Solon his Follie* (1594), and Edmund Spenser's *A View of the State of Ireland* (1596). Herbert was a distant relative of Croft and refers to him as 'cousin', and in writing *Croftus* drew his material from conversations with the former Lord Deputy.[449] Ireland is represented as a diseased body and when explaining

---

[444] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.50.
[445] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.49.
[446] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.49.
[447] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, pp.50-51.
[448] David B. Quinn, Edward Walshe's 'Conjectures' concerning the State of Ireland [1552], *Irish Historical Studies*, 5, 20 (1947), pp.303-322, p.313.
[449] Herbert, *Croftus,* p.viii.

the 'causes of the diseases by which the state has long [...] been weakened', Herbert ascribes it to a 'foreign power, namely [...] the plundering, the fury and the wars of the Scots',[450] who are described as an 'evil [...] from elsewhere'.[451] Herbert's remedy to 'relieve these disasters' takes the form of a medical prognosis that 'prescribes precautions and antidotes' with which to 'anticipate and avert relapses and recurrences'.[452]

The deputyship of Thomas Radcliffe, Lord Fitzwalter (Earl of Sussex) (1556-1558)
In April 1556, Thomas Radcliffe, Lord Fitzwalter (soon to be 3rd Earl of Sussex) became Lord Deputy and alongside Sir Henry Sidney travelled to Ireland armed, according to James Ware, with twenty-five thousand pounds 'towards the Charge of the Expedition against the Scotch Islanders, that invaded the Northern part of Ulster, and some few Irish Rebels'.[453] The Scottish mercenaries, a disruptive but essential factor in an Irish chief's military, now posed, from an English perspective, a serious threat to the stability of the region. The unfettered movement of MacDonnells, MacDougalls and other Scots from Argyllshire and the Hebrides into Ulster was creating what Philip Robinson describes as 'an autonomous colony' in North Antrim.[454]

With no legal claim to land in Ulster (except for the MacDonnells of Antrim) the Scots were not recognised by the English monarchy or subject to its regulations and thereby operated outside its influence.[455] The latent threat of a self-governing enclave of Gaelic Scots became more immediate when in 1554 Mary of Guise was invested as Regent of Scotland, renewing the 'auld alliance' and raising the possibility that the north of Ireland would be used as a backdoor for a foreign invasion. Consequently, when Radcliffe became Lord Deputy at the height of the crisis the expulsion of the Scots was a priority.[456]

An entry for 27 April 1556 in *The Calendar of State Papers for Ireland 1509-1573* (1860) refers to 'A present remedy for the reformation of the North and the rest of Ireland' that recommends holding a parliament to discuss the crisis and an expedition against the

---

[450] Herbert, *Croftus,* p.55, 21.
[451] Herbert, *Croftus,* p.93, 45.
[452] Herbert, *Croftus*, pp.xiii, 35, 21, 45. The metaphor of the Scots as a disease resurfaces in a later polemical attack on Scotland by Edward Ward in *A Journey to Scotland Giving a Character of that Country, the People and their Manners* (1699), wherein Scotland's topography and character are compared to a louse which 'preys upon its own fosterer and preserver […] whose proboscis joyns too close to England, has suckt away the nutriment from Northumberland.' Edward Ward, *A Journey to Scotland Giving a Character of that Country, the People and their Manners. By an English Gentleman* (London, 1699), p.4. In the eighteenth century the concept of the 'Scotch Itch' would depict the Scots as literally diseased.
[453] Ware, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.139; Gregory, *The History of the Western Isles,* p.197.
[454] Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster*, p.47; *The Annals of Ireland, of the Four Masters*, pp.433-434.
[455] M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), pp.3-4.
[456] Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster, British Settlement in an Irish landscape, 1600-1670,* p.47.

Scots.[457] The expedition began in July when Radcliffe attacked the Scots at Knockclogrim where 'more than two hundred were slain, a great many taken prisoner, and the rest put to flight'.[458] Despite this victory, Radcliffe, like Croft before him was unable to dislodge the Scots, a failure that necessitated the restrictive acts passed by the Irish parliament a year later (June 1557) when it forbid anyone to induce Scots into Ulster or retain them for purposes of war; it also made it a treasonable offence to intermarry with them.[459]

This shift in strategy led James McDonnell to open negotiations with the English in April 1557. In a letter, Radcliffe (now Lord Deputy Sussex) informs the Queen that McDonnell 'desires peace and prays for a pardon under the Great Seal to him, his brothers, and relations'.[460] In return Sussex was offered use of the Bann for fishing under the condition that he pay 'the accustomed droits' and recognise McDonnell's patrimonial right over certain lands in Ulster, allegedly including areas not belonging to him.[461]

Unimpressed, Sussex chose to discredit the MacDonnells' legal claim to land in Antrim and engage in a smear campaign against James MacDonnell, describing him as 'one of the redshanks […] permitted to overrun the North from the 6th year of King Edward VI'.[462] Sussex stresses the detrimental influence of the Scots, how they 'enthralled several chiefs of large countries and many of the people', how they had attacked the English 'planted by Bellyngham and Croft, and put man, women, and child to the sword, razing the castles and burning everything to the gates of Dublin', and finally the financial cost (1000, 000 sterling) to the government of both Henry VIII and Edward VI.[463] An expedition against the Scots was immediately proposed requesting 300 additional men 'to expulse them out of Ireland',[464] and two months later Sussex 'marched [...] towards the north, against James MacDonnell […] There he drove away preys, the Scots everywhere shunning the battle, and hiding themselves in the woods.'[465]

The Scottish threat intensified when in February 1558 the French retook Calais from the English leading to fears in the Dublin administration that the Irish would join with

[457] *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland 1509-1573*, ed. Hans C. Hamilton (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1860), 1, 13, p.133.
[458] Ware, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.139.
[459] Perceval-Maxwell, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster*, pp.3-4; Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp.51-60, p.53. Curiously, in Ware's *Annals*, when cataloguing the acts of that parliament, Ware apparently and rather flippantly almost forgets to include the acts pertaining to the Scots: 'also (which I had almost forgotten) for the constant Incursions of the Scotch Pyrates into the North, there was a Law made, that the coming of any armed Scots into Ireland should be Felony, for so they call all capital crimes, except treason. James Ware, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.142.
[460] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 28, p.136.
[461] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 28, p.136.
[462] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 28, p.138.
[463] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 28, p.136.
[464] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 31, p.137.
[465] Ware, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.142; Gregory, *The History of the Western Isles,* p.197.

the Franco-Scots and devastate the English pale. The day after Calais, Henry Sidney responds to the 'dolorous newes' by reporting that James McDonnell 'is coming hither [Dublin] with a great force of Scots and Frenchmen'.[466] Sidney beseeches Sussex (who was in England at this time) to impress upon the Queen that assistance was critical 'for yt shal be more for the Queene ys honor that we be called home by order than dryven out with shame'.[467] Though the attack never came the correspondence of this period demonstrates the profound anxiety the Scots in Ulster were generating within the English administration in Ireland.

This anxiety is encapsulated in the correspondence and conduct of George Dowdall (1487-1558), Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland (1553–1558). In a letter addressed to the Archbishop of York and the Privy Council dated 17 November 1557, Dowdall launches a scathing attack on Sussex's administration and complains that

> this pore realme was never in my remembraunce in worse case then it is nowe, except the tyme onely that Oneyll and Odonyll enwaded the English pale and burned a great pece of it. The Northe is as farr out of frame as ewer it was before, fore the Scotts berrithe as great rule as they dothe wysshe, not onely in suche lands as they did lately usurpe, but also in Claneboy.[468]

Sussex refuted Dowdall's charges claiming they were based on personal rancour.[469] Undeterred, in July 1558, a few days before his death, Dowdall delivered a speech in London to Queen Mary's advisors now entitled 'The Archbishop of Armachane's Opinion touching Ireland', in which he strongly recommends that the Scots be removed from Ulster. To achieve this the native Irish should first be placated (given their supreme numbers) and employed against the Scots who

> are soe ffar ffrom the Pale, that they be not Able to hinder it, unlesse, some greate Irisheman drawe them, whereof there is noe Perill nowe […] to banishe the Scottes, out of the whole realme, the most easiest waye, shalbe by Pollecye, to procuer all the Irishemen, wch you call wylde Irishe, against them; And that none entertayne any parte of them for their warres, the one against, the other, thoroughe all the whole Realme.[470]

Along with the existing threat from the native O'Moores and O'Connors, Dowdall includes the Scots among the 'sorest matters, that the Lorde Deputye have in hande, at this present, in Irelande, and most like to be ympedimte ffor this kinde of refformacon, that ffor the

---

[466] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 10, p.141.
[467] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 14, p.142.
[468] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 61, p.140; George Dowdall, Archbishop of Armagh, to Nicholas Heath, Archbishop of York, and Lord Chancellor and Privy Council, 17 November 1557, SP 62/1/61.
[469] In response, the Crown (April 1558) requested that the nobility of Ireland present their opinions on Sussex's conduct. *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 2, 32-32i, p.144
[470] George Dowdall, 'The Archbishop of Armachane's Opinion touching Ireland, Delivered in Julye, 1558', in 'The Archbishop of Armachane's Opinion touching Ireland, Thomas Gogarty, *Journal of the County Louth Archaeological Society*, 2, 2 (1909), pp.149-164, pp.158-9.

tyme I doe pretende.'[471] Though this strategy was not immediately pursued by Sussex it may have influenced England's subsequent on-off negotiations with Shane O'Neill and their mutual attempts to expel the Scots.

Sussex opted for a more direct method and persuaded Queen Mary to consent to a joint expedition on land and sea against the outer isles of Scotland.[472] The ships arrived in early September 1558 and perhaps remembering Croft's ill-fated expedition against the Scots on Rathlin, Sussex informs Mary that he trusts 'to accomplysh your hyghnes commandment yf wynd and wether serve'.[473] Two days later Sussex sailed to Rathlin, but with 'wynd and wehter' against him 'one of his vessels by force of the Tempest was split [...] whereby some of the citizens of Dublin were swallowed up by the Waves, and perished'.[474] Unlike Croft, Sussex and his troops landed successfully and 'having killed those that resisted, they wasted the island'.[475] The state papers include a startling account Sussex's account of the expedition detailing his movements from arriving in Kintyre on the 19 September to the ensuing atrocities and finally his return to Dublin on 8 November:

> I londed and burned the hole countrye; from thens I went to Arren [Arran], and did the lyke there, and so to the Isles of Combras [Cumbrae], whyche I also burned. And rydyng at Anker betwene Combras and Bute (where I also thowght to have londed), there rase soddenly a terrybell tempeste in whyche I susteyned sume losse [...] The same daye I landed and burned eight myles of leynght, and therwith James M'Conell's chief howse, called Saudell, a fayre pyle and a stronge. The neixte day I crossed over the lande, and burned twelve myles a leynght on the other syde of the lowghe, wherin were burned a fayre howse of his called Mawher Imore, and a stronge castell called Donalvere. The thirde daye I returned an other waye to the shipps.[476]

Sussex planned to continue onto Islay but was driven by the sea back to Carrickfergus where he 'plundered and burned several villages inhabited by the Scots' in the Glynns and Route before returning to Dublin.[477] Despite the overall failure of the attacks, Sussex entreats the Queen not to be discouraged 'but to consider that whatever I wrote of was feasible, and shall with the grace of God be put into execution'.[478]

Sir Henry Sidney, Shane O'Neill, and the MacDonnells of Antrim
Sir Henry Sidney was the Lord Deputy of Ireland between1565-1571 and 1575-78, the Lord President and Council of the Marches of Wales (1559-86) and a hugely significant

---

[471] Dowdall, 'Opinion touching Ireland', p.160.
[472] Gregory, *The History of the Western Isles,* p.198; Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp.50-60, p.54.
[473] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 69, p.149.
[474] Ware, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.145.
[475] Ware, *Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.145.
[476] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 2, 71-71i, p.149.
[477] Ware, *Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.145; Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp.50-60, p.54; Gregory, *History of the Western Isles,* p.198.
[478] Cited in Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp-50-60, p.54.

figure in English colonial politics. In Ireland, Sidney was largely surrounded by his own clan as the brother-in-law of both Thomas Radcliffe (Earl of Sussex), and William Fitzwilliam who held the post of Lord Deputy from 1571-5 and again from 1588-1594. He was also the father of the poet Philip Sidney who spent time in Ireland and in 1577 composed a tract entitled 'Discourse on Irish Affairs' justifying his father's approach and policies in that country. In 'Certein Special Notes to be imparted to Mr Philippe Sidney' (27 April 1582), Henry Sidney endorses his son as his replacement as Lord Deputy,[479] much as Sir Thomas Smith 'envisaged his incompetent son, Thomas, leading out a colony to Ulster like a Roman general extending the empire.'[480]

Stuart Kinsella asserts that Sidney 'had a significant influence on the colonial governance of Ireland over at least twenty one years' from 1557 to 1578.[481] (An assertion reinforced by the correspondence between Sidney and Elizabeth I during the former's first tenure as Lord Deputy that includes conversations concerning mapping and planting Ireland). It was Sidney who initiated the Irish surveys undertaken by Robert Lythe between 1567 and 1570,[482] and it is the opinion of some critics that Sidney deviated from the relatively cautious negotiations associated with surrender and regrant to a programme of 'colonization and ethnic stereotyping'.[483] While Sidney's Welsh and Irish experiences are widely recognised his experiences with the Scottish Gaels are not.

Edwards points out that in terms of the MacDonnells neither Sussex or Sidney were disposed to compromise or show 'much mercy; indeed, the government was prepared to carry on killing the MacDonnells even when they were at peace with the state'.[484] England unquestionably envisioned colonising Ulster prior to Sidney's arrival, as the 'Conjectures' of Edward Walshe (1552) prove. However, Sidney arguably set the scene and tone for the calamitous and brutal planation projects by Sir Thomas Smith and Walter Devereux.

---

[479] Philip Sidney, 'Discourse on Irish Affairs', in *Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney*, eds. Katherine Duncan-Jones and Jan Van Dorsten (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp.3-8. 'Certein Special Notes to be imparted to Mr Philippe Sidney, in the Handwriting of Edm. Molineux and signed by Sir Henry Sidney', 27 April, 1582, in Arthur Collins, ed. *Letters and Memorials of State, in the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the first, part of the reign of King Charles the second, and Oliver's usurpation*, 1 (London: F. Osborne, 1764), p.295.
[480] Ellis, *Tudor Ireland*, p.266.
[481] Stuart Kinsella, 'Colonial Commemoration in Tudor Ireland: The Case of Sir Henry Sidney', *Sidney Journal, Special Issue: Sir Henry Sidney in Ireland and Wales*, 29 (2011), 1-2, p.105.
[482] Thomas Herron and Willy Maley, 'Introduction: Monumental Sidney', *Sidney Journal*, p.14. The Protestant Sidney's arrival in Ireland is seen by some historians as representing a break with previous policies and negotiation style and the introduction of a more coercive strategy in Ireland. Nicholas Canny (*Making Ireland British* (2005)) and Vincent Carey (*Surviving the Tudors* (2002)) consider English Protestant reform as an explanation for the rise in violence in the latter half of the sixteenth century. Mark A. Hutchison, 'Reformed Protestantism and the Government of Ireland, c. 1565 to 1582: the Lord Deputyships of Henry Sidney and Arthur Grey', *Sidney Journal*, pp.71-105, p.73. Certainly the emphasis on Protestant reform was continued by the later Lord Deputies William Fitzwilliam and John Perrot (1584).
[483] Herron and Maley, 'Monumental Sidney', p.12.
[484] Edwards, 'The escalation of violence in sixteenth-century Ireland', p.73.

Palmer contends that under Sidney martial law was countrywide, rendering the mid-1570s 'a time of massacres', and writes that Essex's project demonstrates just 'how easy the slippage into atrocity was'.[485]

Sidney's first tenure as Lord Deputy began in January 1566 at a time when, according to James Ware, Ireland was in 'a Miserable State [...] and Ulster […] was in open Rebellion under O Neal' [Shane O'Neill].[486] In his *Memoirs*[487] (1583) of his Irish service (the longest Tudor document of its kind and pertaining to Ireland)[488] Sidney writes that his

> first deputacion was against Shane O'neile, the Arch-traytor, who not onely had usurped [...] the whole estate of tyrone but [...] held in his subjection the lordship and lords of Clandeboy and the route; the Scotts of the Glynnes he held in pay, and they were his mercenary soldiers.[489]

Notwithstanding his reliance on Scottish mercenaries during the internecine conflict with his father Con and brother Matthew (who refused to concede to his ascendency), Shane O'Neill saw the Scots, and principally the MacDonnells of Antrim, as intruders in his country.[490] What is more the Scots were ensconced within native settlements opposed to their presence but compelled by the tradition of coign and livery to sustain them.

As the 1550s ended the failure and expense of the attempts by Croft in 1551 and Sussex in 1557/1558 to expel the Scots tempered England's approach, and as Hayes-McCoy describes it: 'a policy of momentary friendship took the place of warlike measures'.[491] The rise of Shane O'Neill was pivotal to England's conciliatory tactics. Mere months after the attack on Rathlin and Kintyre, and at the suggestion of Sussex, Elizabeth praised James MacDonnell (June 1559) for 'his fidelity and diligent service'.[492] At the same time a position paper entitled 'A Device for the government of Ireland' examines 'by

---

[485] Palmer, *The Severed Head*, p.25.

[486] Ware, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.9.

[487] 'The longest English-language account of an individual's royal service' during the sixteenth century, Sidney's *Memoir* was never printed nor likely circulated in manuscript form. Robert Shepherd argues that Sidney wrote the memoir not for posterity but as a 'compendium of talking points and refutations of criticisms' for assisting Walsingham and Philip Sidney's support for Sidney's fourth term as governor of Ireland. Robert Shephard, 'The Motives of Sir Henry Sidney's Memoir (1583)', in *Sidney Journal*, pp.173-187, pp.173-4.

[488] Herron and Maley, 'Monumental Sidney', p.2.

[489] Ciaran Brady, ed. *A Viceroy's Vindication? Sir Henry Sidney's Memoir of Service in Ireland, 1556-78* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2002), p.44.

[490] Ciaran Brady, 'Shane O'Neill Departs from the Court of Elizabeth: Irish, English, Scottish perspectives and the Paralysis of Policy, July 1559 to April 1562', in *Kingdoms United? Great Britain and Ireland since 1500: Integration and Diversity*, ed. by S. J. Connolly (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), pp.13-21, p.15.

[491] Gerard A. Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland (1565-1603)* (Dublin and London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd, 1937), p.80.

[492] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573,* 1, 38, p.154; Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.125.

what means the Scots may be exiled', confirming the disingenuousness of Elizabeth's praise.[493] The 'Device' grudgingly concedes however that

> ther be certen Skotts that dwellith in the Northe contre by the see side, that have certeyn territories of certan gentlemen by marriage and have continued and kept their possession theis 300 yeares, and ar now natural Iryshemen and subjects.[494]

The realpolitik behind the 'Device' and England's rapprochement with the Scots more broadly is revealed by John Alen (1500-1561), Archbishop of Ireland (former Lord Chancellor) who in the margin of the above passage has written 'a lye'.[495] As the English sought to neutralise the MacDonnells they were also teasing Shane O'Neill with whispered promises that he would succeed his father in title and lands.[496] In response Shane informs Elizabeth that Ulster would

> hereafter be faithful, obedient, and trwe subjects unto God, and unto your highness. And also havinhe my requestes, I shalbe able to exile your Graces enemyes, sudue traytours, owercome rebels, and suche as will disobeye.[497]

The enemy to be exiled is undoubtedly a reference to the Scots; however, O'Neill soon reneged on his promise and rebelled, forcing the English to hurriedly switch their attention back to the Scots in the hope of deterring them from aligning with O'Neill, who in July 1560 sought an alliance with the 5th Earl of Argyll, and proposed that he marry Lady Agnes Campbell, Argyll's aunt.[498] Unbeknown to Shane, in February in Berwick a number of Scots including Argyll had switched allegiance from the French to the English.[499] Argyll was involved in the drafting of the Treaty of Berwick that contains a clause obliging the Earl to

> employe his force and good will, whair he shalbe reqyred by the Quenes Majestie, to reduce the north pairtis of Ireland to the perfyte obedience of England, conforme to ane mutualle and reciproque contract, to be maid betwixt hir Majesties lieutenant or depute of Ireland being for the tyme, and the said Erlle; quhairin shalbe conteaned what he shall do for his parte, and quhatt the said lieutennent, or depute, shall do for his supporte, in caise he shall have to do with James Mackonnell, or ony utheris of the Iyles of Scotland, or realme of Ireland.[500]

Argyll's dominant position in western Scotland meant he could intercede in Ireland on England's behalf and Jane Dawson contends that this clause diminished 'England's

---

[493] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.126
[494] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573,* 1, 84, p.158; Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.126.
[495] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573,* 1, 84, p.158.
[496] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.126.
[497] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 1, 79, p.158; 60, p.156.
[498] Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland,* p.81; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573,* 2, 26, p.160.
[499] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, p.1.
[500] John Knox, *The Works of John Knox, Volumes 1 & 2: History of the Reformation in Scotland*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2004), p.50; Cited in Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, pp.1-2.

hostility towards the presence of the Scots' and once again 'reversed English policy in Ireland'.[501]

George Hill depicts the Scots at this time as disinterested observers who 'were almost invariably drawn into the conflict, on the one side or other'.[502] Hill however overstates the integrity and misfortune of the Scots and his confidence in their neutrality is not substantiated by the records. In July 1560, Argyll offered Elizabeth assistance to subdue Ulster and in return secured the safety of the MacDonnells of Antrim by estranging them from other Scottish families and most importantly Shane O'Neill.[503] (In the ensuing months both James and Sorley MacDonnell expressed a willingness to assist the English against O'Neill).[504] In point of fact it is the resourcefulness of Argyll and the MacDonnells that Hill should praise rather than their impartiality.[505]

The Anglo-Scottish machinations of 1560 provide the background to the combined assault by the English and Scottish against O'Neill the following year. On 8 June 1561, a proclamation was issued 'shewing the presumptuous, arrogant, rebellious and traitorous deeds of Shane O'Neill, and denouncing him as a rebel and traitor'.[506] The proclamation also refers to the budding relationship between the MacDonnells and English officials:

> During this tyme, James McConnell and his brethren, accepting themselves no longer to be forren enemies after peace proclaimed between England and Scotland, sought to reconcile themselves also to the Queens grace and favour [...] and offered their service [...] in all causes wherein they shuld deale [...] upon knowledge whereof Shane, that falsely and traitorously had always combined with them whiles they were forren enemies, dyde, so soone as he perceyved them to be drawne to hyr majesties devocion, enter warre presentlye against them, and to being always a traytor and frynde to them (the MacDonnels) when they were foren enymies, became also a traytor and enymie to them when they grewe trewe and frendlie to this estate.[507]

At the beginning of 1562 a contrite Shane O'Neill travelled to London to pay homage to Elizabeth who, after agreeing terms, pardoned and awarded the Irishman with the 'state and name of O'Neill'.[508] At the same time a position paper, purportedly written by Captain William Piers, advises Elizabeth to play the Scots and Shane against one another.[509] As

---

[501] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, p.2.

[502] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.129.

[503] Brady, 'Shane O'Neill Departs from the Court of Elizabeth', p.15.

[504] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 2, 27, 31, 33, pp.160-161.

[505] The attacks by Sussex two years earlier would have considerably weakened the MacDonnells, necessitated time to regroup, and impacted upon the decision of James and Sorley Boy MacDonnell to stand aside and 'permit' the Irish and English 'to settle their own quarrel'. Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.129.

[506] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 4, 1, p.173.

[507] Hill, *An Historical Account*, pp.125-126; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 7, 34, p.208.

[508] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 9, 38, p.224; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 9, 9, p.222.

[509] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 9, 83, p.228.

Hayes-McCoy notes, 'one side of the picture was being shown to Shane, the other to MacDonald and within a few months both were being instigated to attack each other'.[510]

In return for his pardon and titles, Elizabeth insisted, more than once, that Shane perform a service for the Crown and finally in 1564, following several reminders, the Council in Dublin was informed that Shane could 'see no greater rebels and traitors than the Scots' and had a mind to do them 'some mischief'.[511] Shane finally attacked and defeated the Scots in Antrim in May 1565, capturing both James and Sorley Boy MacDonnell.[512] As its architects the English Privy Council demanded an account of the expedition including the forts and castles Shane had 'reduced to the Queen's obedience'.[513] O'Neill's report outlines his 'progress towards the North in the Queen's service against the Scots', whom he describes as 'her majesty's enemies and the usurpers of her territory':[514]

> In the first place, I took care to clear all the passes in the woods by which I could have access to Clann-aidh-boe (Clanaboy) [...] I proceeded thence towards the territories occupied by the Scots, and Somhairle Boy defended a certain pass, with the object of preventing my further progress. But by divine aid I gave them battle, in which many of his men were slain; the remnant fled [...] Thence we advanced, the following day, through their valleys and protected routes until we came to the castle of James MacDonnell [...] which, with the town, we burned, and afterwards plundered all the adjoining district [...] Early on the next morning, we advanced upon them drawn up in battle-array, and the fight was furiously maintained on both sides. But God, best and greatest, of his mere grace, and for the good fortune of her Majesty the Queen, gave us the victory against them [...] Glory be to God, such was the result of these my services undertaken for Her Majesty in the Northern parts. Nor here alone, but everywhere throughout Ireland, where my aid may be required, I am ready and prepared to make sacrifices for her Grace [...] Her Majesty's faithful servant and your obedient.
> "By me, Son of ONELL.[515]

Shane's report was followed a month later by a more detailed account by Gerald Fleming who relates the efforts of James MacDonnell to secure his release:

> James McConill, being prisoner, offrid O'Nele all the goodes [...] and lands that he had in Irelande and Scotland and to sett himself at liberty, affirming by oath that he would never seeke revenge [...] whose answere was, that the service he went aboute was not his but the princes, and that it lay not in himself to doe anything but according to her direction.[516]

Both accounts implicate Elizabeth as the driving force behind the attack: Shane was acting in the 'Queen's service' against the 'usurpers of her territory' and could not negotiate

---

[510] Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland,* p.82-3.
[511] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573, 9,* 76, p.224.
[512] Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland,* p.83; Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.132; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573,* 13, 34, p.260; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573,* 11, 80, p.245.
[513] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573,* 18, 65, 71, pp.263-4.
[514] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.133.
[515] Cited in Hill, 'Shane O'Neill's Expedition against the Antrim Scots', p.130.
[516] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.137. See Hill, 'Shane O'Neill's Expedition against the Antrim Scots' for Gerald Fleming's letter in full, p.131-133; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573,* 13,82, p.265.

without first knowing 'her direction'. In July 1565 in response to the Earl of Argyll's request for the release of the MacDonnell brothers, Shane again implicates Elizabeth when he writes 'that he cannot deal therein until he knows his own Queen's mind'.[517] By incriminating Elizabeth, Shane was likely preparing his defence should he have cause to deal with the Scots again, which he inevitably did. This defence however neither exonerated nor spared him from Scottish retribution, and when it came it appears, somewhat ironically, to have been instigated by the English Crown.

While the English 'rejoiced' in O'Neill's defeat of the Scots, something they had failed to achieve throughout the 1550s, the Irishman's dominance in the North quickly became a problem.[518] O'Neill ignored the appeals of Elizabeth, Mary Queen of Scots and Argyll, and let James MacDonnell die of his wounds.[519] In November 1565, Elizabeth expressed her concerns to Sidney concerning Shane's emboldened behaviour and offered strategies to counter it. Shane requested 'a maintenance and assistance against the Scotts', and the Queen informs Sidney that if O'Neill 'hath so good an intention of his doinge to serve us from delivering of that contrey from the scots, as by his wrytings and messages report is made to us he shall fynde you both enhablid by our authoritee, and well willing of yourself in all his reasonable requests to satisfy him fully.'[520] Meanwhile, a letter the following year (March 1566) reveals how Elizabeth's tolerance of O'Neill, on account of his anti-Scottishness was near exhaustion and she complains that Shane's 'advises and advertisements' against the Scots were no longer sufficient 'to excuse his disorders and contempts'.[521] Elizabeth advises Sidney 'to employ your whole care, consideration and wisdom, how such a cankrid dangerous rebell may be utterly extirpid.'[522]

Sidney sought to initiate a war in the north during the winter, a suggestion rejected by Elizabeth along with council members versed in Irish politics (June 1566), although Elizabeth did redirect soldiers from Berwick and handed Sidney control over their deployment.[523] Elizabeth recommends that certain parts of Ulster's northern coastline be possessed 'as the Scotts may be impeached from coming to succor the rebell'.[524] Early the following year (January 1567) Sidney is instructed to prepare for the 'reformation of

---

[517] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 14, 32, p.268.
[518] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 15, 39, p.278. Sidney remarked that if Elizabeth didn't send help she would lose Ireland as she had lost Calais. *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 18, 9, p.304. Sidney is informed that her 'majesty is very greatly heated and provoked to the extirpation of Shane O'Neill'. *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 16, 67, p.293.
[519] Bardon, *A History of Ulster*, p.79; Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.139.
[520] Queen to Sir Henry Sidney, 12 November, 1565, *Sidney State Papers, 1565-70*, ed. Tomas O Laidhin (Dublin: Stationary Office, 1962), pp.5-6.
[521] Queen to Sir Henry Sidney, 28 March, 1566, *Sidney State Papers*, p.18.
[522] Queen to …, 28 March, 1566, *Sidney State Papers*, p.18.
[523] Queen to Sir Henry Sidney, 16 June, 1566, *Sidney State Papers*, p.27.
[524] Queen to …, 16 June, 1566, *Sidney State Papers*, p.27.

Ulster', but his most immediate concern was what to do about Alexander Og, brother of James and Sorley MacDonnell, who had recently offered his services against O'Neill. In a particularly long and revealing letter Elizabeth admits that though Alexander 'hath very well served in prayeng upon Shane', she is unable to 'give such answer unto, as may be cleere on all sydes', adding that:

> We take it for certan, that the best way were, as you also have thought (if tyme and other oportunityes might serve us), to suffer no Scot to have any habitation or abode in Ireland, but, considering we have to do with Shane, whome we must of necessity refourme, we fynd it not meete at this tyme to deale with them both.[525]

To this end Elizabeth writes 'we think it good that you use Alexander Og with good words and reasonable intretaynment […] some convenient wages […] And as concerning his request to have habitation grauntid him […] you may cause him to be dealt withal, so as he may remain in hope of obteyning his desire requiring to have his requests in wryting.'[526] Elizabeth's decision to string Alexander Og along was 'the onely meanes at this present […] to avoid that which we most mislyke, that is, to graunt him habitation there, and also to keepe him in hope and intretaynment from joyning himself with Shane.' The strategy she admits is to 'provokid' Shane 'to make some quarrel with them […] as heretofore it hath ben knowne that they have in tymes past fallen out emongs themselves, which hath ben likewise a commen practise to sturre up disobedient Irish men thone against thither, that the obedient cuntreys might lyve more in quyetnes.'[527]

     Concluding the letter, Elizabeth further suggests that Sidney delay attacking the Scots until furnished with an appropriate military presence to plant and hold the north after seizing it, and she admonishes Sidney for failing to specify the regions currently possessed by the Scots or locate their favoured landing places that she believes to be between Loch Foyle and Knockfergus: 'for we thinke those be the principall places by which the Scots make their entrée into Irland, and the more meanes might be used to get them into our possession, the lesse annoyance we shulde have by the Scotts.'[528] Elizabeth adds that she intends 'to wryte to the Queen of Scots, to prohibit the frequentation and passage of her people into that our realm.'[529]

---

[525] Queen to Lord Deputy and Lord Chancellor, 15 January, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.48.
[526] Queen to …, 15 January, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.48.
[527] Queen to …, 15 January, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.48.
[528] Queen to …, 15 January, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.49.
[529] Queen to …, 15 January, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.49. *CSP, Irel.*, *1509-1573*, 20, 8, p.324.

The murder of Shane O'Neill

For a while the English were content to exploit Gaelic hostilities and wait for the Scots to take the initiative and revenge on O'Neill, but in June 1567 Sidney forced the issue by attacking O'Neill, compelling him to take the extraordinary decision to seek sanctuary with Alexander Og.[530] In his memoirs, Sidney explains Shane's predicament:

> He (no longer being hable to make men of his owne, to make head against the smallest forrey that I could send into his country) practised with Alaster Oge Macdonnell, an Irish Scott, and amonge them a graund capten, to serve him; but as I writ to you before, upon the battayll fought at the fort of Derry, the most of his mercenary Scottes left him, with whom and amonge the rest, this Alaster Oge was one.[531]

On the evening of June 2, the Scots, including the son and wife of the murdered James MacDonnell, laid on a feast for Shane and to celebrate his release of Sorely Boy. The *Attainder of Shane O'Neill* (1569), written two years after his death, recounts what happened next: 'aftyer a few dissembled gratulatorie words used betwixt them, they fell to quaffing and drinking of wine', at which point MacDonnell's son, 'inflamed with malice and desire of revenge for the death of his father and uncle […] began to minister quarrelling talke to Oneyle' and demanded to know of his secretary who had 'bruted abroad' the slur that Agnes MacDonnell 'did offer to come out of Scotland into Ireland to marrie with Oneile', to which the secretary admitted responsibility, answering that if Agnes 'were Queen of Scotland, shee might bee well contented to match herselfe with Oneyle'.[532] O'Neill's support for his secretary's views induced several angry Scots to depart who once outside proceeded to kill O'Neill's men, then 'assembled together in a throng and thrust into the tent, where the said Oneile was, and there with their slaughter swords hewed him to pieces, slew his secretary and all those that were with him, except for a verie few which escaped by their horses'. After the butchery, Alexander Og instructed that O'Neill's 'mangled carcasse […] be carried to an old ruinous church […] and there miserably interred.'[533] After 'foure dayes in earth', the *Attainder* says that William Piers disinterred the corpse, cut of its head and sent it to the Lord Deputy.[534]

---

[530] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 21, 8, p.335; Bardon, *History of Ulster*, p.81. Hill suggests that O'Neill and MacDonnell ostensibly met 'for the purpose of forming a permanent alliance against the Sassanagh, their common enemy'. Hill, 'Shane O'Neill's Expedition against the Antrim Scots', p.139.
[531] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.91.
[532] *An Act for the Attainder of Shane Oneile, and the extinguishment of the name of Oneile, and the entitling of the Queens Majestie, her heyers and successours, to the country of Tyrone, and to other countries and territories in Ulster, in The Statues at Large, passed in the Parliament held in Ireland* (Dublin: Boulter Grierson, 1569), pp.327.
[533] *An Act for the Attainder of Shane Oneile*, pp.327-8.
[534] *An Act for the Attainder of Shane Oneile*, p.328. Ware's *Annals* confirm the story. Ware, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.11; Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors*, I, p.49.

The killing of Shane O'Neill continues to be a source of contention. In the early seventeenth century, John Davies writes that he was 'slain upon meer accident by the Scots and not by the Queen's army'.[535] However, a number of considerations combine to make Shane's murder look less like a 'meer accident' and more like an assassination. Typically sympathetic to the Gaelic Scots, George Hill suggests that Sorley Boy 'concocted the whole plot', while Hayes-McCoy places responsibility on the English, particularly Piers, who he claims made 'overtures' to the Scots to enter 'Ireland and avenge themselves with English connivance'.[536] More recently, Ciaran Brady and Hiram Morgan assert that Shane's death 'was not a random or revenge killing' but was arranged by Sidney through William Piers who acting as an intermediary persuaded the Scots to murder Shane by promising that they could remain in Ulster.[537]

The English crown's appreciation for the Scot's efforts did not extend to tolerance and it was expected that the majority of them would now leave Ulster with only those with Irish ancestry permitted to remain; tellingly, this included the MacDonnells of Antrim.[538] Sidney, Canny argues, saw the removal of Shane as a golden opportunity to 'drive the Scots from the glens [...] and settle Englishmen on the coastlands of Antrim and down'.[539] In his *Memoirs*, Sidney recounts the undertaking:

> I planted three garrisons in Clandeboy and the Glynnes [...] lastlie I made Alaster Oge and all his Scotts who killed Shane, and all other Scotts not born in Ireland, to depart the realm, and the rest born in Ireland and inhabiting the Glynnes offred to hould that country of her majesty by rent and service. All these things being agreed upon, engrossed, signed, sealed and delivered, I thought I had don a good worke to my sovereign and country, and to the people of that land.[540]

To add insult to injury the MacDonnells never received the reward of a thousand marks for Shane's head. Instead William Piers took possession of the head, preserved it in salt and sent it to Sidney who stuck it on a spike over Dublin Castle's gate.[541] In his *Memoirs*, Sidney mentions receiving the head and in doing so alludes to his role in the murder:

---

[535] Davies, *A Discovery*, p.64.
[536] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.139; Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland,* p.83.
[537] Morgan, 'The End of Gaelic Ulster', p.11-12; Bardon, *A History of Ulster,* p.81. An entry in the state papers for July 1567 commending Sidney and recommending rewarding Alexander Og for his service in killing him, supports Brady and Morgan's contention.
[538] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 21, 49, p.340.
[539] Nicholas Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565-76* (New York: The Harvester Press, 1976), p. 75.
[540] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.56. Sidney's memoir survives in three drafts suggesting it was material for a further draft that was not written or has not survived. The memoirs are included in Walsingham's archive and were inserted into the state papers after his death. Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.5.
[541] Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors*, 1, p.49; Bardon, *A History of Ulster,* p.81; *CSP, Irel.*, *1509-1573*, 2, p.8; Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.141.

> The honest, valiant and polletique Capten Piers, beinge before made by me Seneshall of Clandeboy, according to my direction did deale so as the traytor's practice by some providence was prevented; and whereas he looked for service at their hands against me, for service of me they killed him the 22nd day of June [...] and sent me his head pickled in a pipkin [...] Thus had I that unnaturall monster's head, but then I did and yet do feare that the old cancred bodie whereof sometime it was head, I mean the lyniage and syrname of the O'Neles, will breede (Hidra fashion) more heads, and haply as ill or worse than he.[542]

Sussex's belief that 'yf Shane be overthrowen all is setteled, yf Shane settell all is overthrowen',[543] was shared by many English administrators who saw O'Neill's death as an opportunity to plant Ulster, assert English authority, banish the Scots, replace traditional systems such as tanistry, coign and livery, and implant civility.[544] In a letter sent to Sidney nine days after O'Neill's murder (11 June, 1567), Elizabeth writes that 'we covet nothing more in that behalf, then to here certenly of the extirpation of Shane ONeill', and she confirms that planting could begin.[545] A key concern of Elizabeth's letter is Sidney's approach to the Scots who 'have long tyme made clayme to dyvers parts upon the sea coast and have of late served you'.[546] The Queen considers what if any territory the Scots be permitted to retain, how many English colonists would be 'requisite to replenishe those contryes' cleared of the Scots, the length of the project, its preservation and cost, and finally what 'revenue shuld grow to us therby'.[547] In this letter Elizabeth reveals England's colonial strategy for the 1570s and it is clearly linked to the Scots:

> because we resolve to quyte the new come Scots […] it is fitte to consider how the same or the lyke shal be hereafter kept from retourning out of Scotland thither, which probably we cannot do but either by keeping of garrisons there to our contynuall charge, or else by planting the sea coast of the same with English subject, we do very well allow of your opinion declared to us by Agard, that some gentlemen of good

---

[542] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.53. The metaphor of the 'Hidra' is repeated in the story attached to the death of Alexander MacSorley, son of Sorley Boy MacDonnell, killed in battle in 1586. The story relates how the English coerced an old women until she 'for feare of death' indicated where Alexander was buried and after desecrating the corpse they cut of its head and sent it to the Lord Deputy to put on a spike on Dublin Castle. While visiting Dublin to submit to Elizabeth, Sorley was shown his son's head and is said to have replied 'it is noe matter […] my sonne hath many heads.' Perrott, *The Chronicle of Ireland,* p.47.

[543] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 21, 34, p.339. *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 4, 37, p.178; Cited in Hiram Morgan, 'Never Any Realm Worse Governed': Queen Elizabeth and Ireland', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6, 14 (2004), pp.295-308, pp.298-9.

[544] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 21, 34, p.339.

[545] Queen to Sir Henry Sidney, 11 June, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.65.

[546] Queen to …, 11 June, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.65.

[547] Queen to …, 11 June, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.65; In July 1567 a letter reports Alexander's occupation of the Glynnes and Route with men belonging to James MacDonnell and suggests that he 'be not suffrid to dwell and inhabite in any parte of Irland with any of the same Scots […] and for other the Scotts, which have inhabitid there of long tyme, and be by birth of sundry descents in the same land, percyving also by that they have done us good service at this tyme, and ar well disposed so to contnew in due obedience, we leave the ordre of theim and their contrey to your discretion'. Queen to Sir Henry Sidney, 6 July, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.71.

howses within our realme here, may be induced to com over with their owne tenants and freends'.[548]

These are the debates that give rise to the later Smith and Essex colonial schemes and the Scots are crucial to their evolution.

In the meantime Sidney's belief that the 'syrname of the O'Neles' would like a hydra 'breede' another head was immediately confirmed by Turlough Luineach O'Neill's (1532–1595) claim to the title of O'Neill. Turlough soon married the widow of James MacDonnell, Lady Agnes MacDonnell, thus forging a Gaelic coalition which 'posed a considerable threat to English authority'.[549] During the 1570s the English crown embarked on a radical policy of colonisation, supported, in good will at least, by England's administration. The most significant schemes were those led by the gentlemen adventurers Sir Thomas Smith and Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex. The success of these proto-plantations depended upon breaking the 'Gaelic alliance' and expelling the Scots, and there ensued a triangular struggle between the O'Neills, MacDonnells and the English colonisers. These disastrous attempts at plantation were among the first bloody steps on a colonial path that ultimately led to the Ulster plantation of 1609.[550]

Devices, Advices, and Descriptions, 1567-1575

> When private men attempt the conquest of countries at their own charge, commonly their enterprizes doe perish without successe.[551]

The vacuum left in Gaelic Irish and pan-Gaelic politics by the death of Shane O'Neill was immediately and unceremoniously filled by his brother Turlough Luineach O'Neill. Judged as weaker than his predecessor, Turlough also diverged from Shane in terms of his willingness to not only work with the MacDonnells against the English but to unite the disparate clans through marriage. Consequently, for the first time since the Bruce invasion of Ireland in 1315 the English found themselves confronted by a robust Gaelic alliance, or as George Hill describes it: a 'Northern League'.

The 'league' was fabricated from (and therefore contingent on) the double marriage between Lady Agnes Campbell and Turlough O'Neill, and Agnes's daughter Finola and the

---

[548] Queen to …, 6 July, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.71. The Queen concludes the letter by saying 'this much have we thought meete to impart to you concerning the expulsion of the new entrid Scots, the continuance of the ancient, and the peopling and fortifying of the rest of that contrey upon the sea syde.' Queen to …, 6 July, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, p.73.
[549] Hill, *An Historical Account*, pp.148-52; Hiram Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture of Sir Thomas Smith', p.263.
[550] Maley, 'Angling for Ulster', p.224.
[551] Davies, *A Discovery*, p.159.

Irish chief Hugh O'Donnell. The marriages strengthened pre-existing networks between the west coast of Scotland and North Antrim and according to Michael Hill 'ushered in a new and more complex era in Ulster's history.'[552] This often fractious and fragile alliance prompted numerous short-lived communications and concessions between the English and the respective Gaels, and a plethora of projects which had as their aim the separation of the Gaels and the purging of Ulster of its troublesome Scots.

It is around this time that the 5th Earl of Argyll assumes a more influential role in Ulster politics. Hitherto an English confederate and 'British' enthusiast, Argyll underwent a sea change in the late 1560s, distancing himself from Edinburgh and London and intimately involving himself in the relations between western Scotland and north Ulster.[553] In his essay 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland: the Scottish Isles and the Stewart Empire' (2012), Martin MacGregor asserts that Argyll's influence in Ulster 'delayed the Tudor reconquest for a generation'; moreover, as regards Argyll's influence on nascent British politics, MacGregor intriguingly adds that Argyll viewed Gaeldom as 'the potential core of a truly early modern Britain'.[554] It is a fascinating idea, supported to a large degree by England's tactic of dividing Gaeldom and an abundance of contemporary writing. It is clear that the success of the centralising forces in England and Scotland (and ultimately London), hinged on the pacification of Gaeldom in the north of Ireland and Scotland, who, in line with MacGregor's view, offered an egalitarian alternative to authoritarian and Anglocentric 'British' reform. Furthermore, given that Ulster would be the site of James I's 1609 'British' project, it stands to reason that a Gaelic version of Britain could also have begun here.

The combination of the Gaelic marriages, Argyll's shift in allegiance, Turlough's usurpation of Tyrone, and the rise of Sorley Boy MacDonnell sparked an eruption in 'advices', 'devices', 'petitions' and 'descriptions' for Ulster that reveal an English administration immersed in chronic indecision, riddled with anxiety and habituated to political deception. The key English figures involved in Ulster during this period include the Lord Deputies of Ireland, Sir Henry Sidney, Sir William Fitzwilliam, various Captains including William Piers, Nicholas Malby and John Smith, and 'gentleman adventurers', most notably Sir Thomas Smith and Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex.

---

[552] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.136.
[553] Argyll's considerable impact on Ulster politics is examined in detail by Jane Dawson in *Scotland Reformed, 1488-1587* (2007); *The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary Queen of Scots: the Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland* (2002); and 'The Fifth Earl of Argyle: Gaelic Lordship and Political Power in sixteenth-century Scotland' (1988).
[554] MacGregor, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland', p.43.

This section demonstrates the strong correlation between the Scots in Ulster and England's plantation policies for that region. Moreover, given the influence of the Scots on England's Irish colonial policies, propaganda and projects, it is reasonable to assume that the Scots had a degree of influence on the development of England's broader colonial/imperial ideology and strategy. The seminal pamphlet *A Letter from I. B. Gentleman* (1571), for example, regarded by D. B. Quinn as 'the first printed publicity for an English colonial project', has not been fully considered from a Scottish standpoint.[555] Nor has Essex's correspondence which confirms that his colonial 'enterprise' was deeply concerned with overthrowing of the Scots. Essex's letters also provide a fascinating insight into the psychology of a struggling colonial adventurer in Ulster.

'Unfaithful Irish' and 'false Scots'

Having claimed the title of 'O'Neill' without the endorsement of Queen Elizabeth, Turlough Luineach's reign was short-lived and in June 1567, Henry Sidney was tasked with dispensing the Irish chief's rebuke. Sidney recalls the occasion in his memoirs:[556]

> I then, in the presence and hearing of all that were in my camp, as well as them who came with me, as those that came with him, and all other the potentates and landlords of Ulster, rebuked him sharply for taking upon him the title of O'Neill afore Her Majesty's pleasure were known, affirming unto him that I would not confirm the same, but would write to her Highness to nobilitate him […] which he seemed reverently to accept and willingly to expect her Majesty's resolution. I then set down in form of articles certain covenants briefly […] that he should not take upon him the name of O'Neill till Her Majesty's pleasure were known; that he should disclaim any superiority, rent or service taken before by Shane, or any of his ancestors […] and that he should cease to exact other rent or service […] of the country called the Route […] nor of the Glens, then and possessed by Scots, but of right ought to have been the lands of the Barons Missett **[Bisset],** being English […] nor entertain any Scots, either borne in the Glens or in Scotland, without special licence of the governor for the time being.[557]

---

[555] D. B. Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.551.

[556] A contemporary sketch of Turlough's submission is included in John Derricke's *Image of Ireland* (1581) and depicts Turlough kneeling in front of Sidney with his longhaired warriors kneeling behind him. Dressed magnificently, Sidney is raised on a platform enclosed within a tent furnished with tapestries and curtains with his English soldiers lined up on either side of the platform. Gillingham, 'Images of Ireland', p.17. The sketch succeeds in capturing England's assumed dominance over the O'Neills but as propaganda it is an artificial depiction of the situation on the ground. Sidney's undermining of Turlough in the company of prominent Irish chiefs is predicated on the likelihood of Turlough later requiring military assistance from the same chiefs against the English. Though intermittently censured by the English court, Shane O'Neill had never been subject to such public mortification; furthermore, when Shane was obliged to apologise in person to Elizabeth in 1562 he received a golden handshake of entitlements, including, provisionally at least, the title of 'O'Neill'. *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 9, 9, p.222. Effectively divested of influence while simultaneously tantalised with promises of 'nobilitation', Turlough consented to Sidney's 'covenants' in the expectation that he would ultimately receive the title of 'O'Neill'; however, by 'disclaiming any superiority, rent or service', Turlough would have little left to rule.

[557] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication,* p.554-5.

As the passage above suggests, the fate of the 'O'Neill' was again entwined with that of the Scots, whom Turlough was forbidden to 'entertain' whether recently arrived or born there. Sidney's covenants also question the legality of the MacDonnells claim to the Glynnes that had been in Scottish hands since the Bisset-MacDonald union in 1399.

Turlough's power-grab led to a somewhat bizarre suggestion a month later when Vice-chamberlain Knollys (1514-1596) suggested that instead of conferring the title of O'Neill on Turlough they should 'offer his freehold to Alexander Oge and his new Scots on condition that they expel him [Turlough] and take it themselves.'[558] By the end of 1567 however, Elizabeth was advising that the Scots 'be speedily expelled'.[559] The growing relationship between the MacDonnells and the O'Neills was a primary factor in England's decision to expel the Scots so soon after judging them the ideal tool for removing Turlough (as they had his brother). Letters from the Lord Justices Fitzwilliam and Robert Weston to Cecil warn that 'the state of Ulster will be dangerous, by the covert combination of the unfaithful Irish with the false Scots.'[560] In December 1567, encouraged by Elizabeth's directive to expel the Scots, Captain Piers and Captain Malby were poised to attack but were assuaged by Sorley's timely offer of friendship and his promise to Piers and Malby that he would leave Ireland 'the first fair day after the arrival of their gallies'.[561] Elizabeth received word of Sorley's departure on January 12 1568, though the message expresses a 'mistrust of the Scots returning in greater numbers.'[562] This mistrust was vindicated when five days later news arrived that Turlough had hired a 'certain number more of Sorley Boy's Scots', while Sorley had gone to 'fetch a greater number over'.[563]

The state papers suggest that the English assumed they were being hoodwinked; nevertheless the anxiety and uncertainty caused by the Gaels provoked another shift in English policy. A mere two months later, Lord Justice Fitzwilliam urges that 'peace with the Scots must be observed. They being so friended by Turlough Lynagh, it will be a costly work to expel them forcibly.'[564] The indecision of the English administration reveals how little control they actually held in Ulster, especially the north.

---

[558] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 21, 56, p.341.
[559] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 22, 37, p.353.
[560] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 22, 54, 56, p.354.
[561] *CSP*, Irel., *1509-1573*, 23, 10 v, p.358.
[562] *CSP*, Irel., *1509-1573*, 23, 10, p.358.
[563] *CSP*, Irel., *1509-1573*, 23, 11, p.358.
[564] *CSP*, Irel., *1509-1573*, 23, 15, 35, p.365.

The 5th Earl of Argyll

The overall objective of the Gaelic alliance, along with the identity of its architect was initially unclear to the English, though they had their suspicions. In January 1568, Turlough received a force of Campbell redshanks and attempting to shift suspicion from himself and Argyll informed the English captains that 'the Scots […] which he retains, are enemies of the Clan Donaill', and promised to send messengers to the Earl of Argyll 'to agree with him to attack the Clan Donnells'.[565] Captain Malby was unconvinced and the following month warned Sidney that Turlough had entered negotiations with Argyll.[566] In March, Nicholas Bagenal also highlighted the growing relationship between the O'Neills and the Campbells and reports that Sorley Boy had begun fortifying Rathlin (which would explain Sorley's departure from Ulster at the end of the previous year).[567]

Jane Dawson describes Sorley's actions as 'a smokescreen', the long-term objective of which was legal recognition of his right to lands in Antrim.[568] Kept guessing, the English had little time to avert the genuine purpose behind the duplicity, namely the marriages between the clans MacDonnell, O'Neill and O'Donnell, all skilfully stage-managed by the 5th Earl of Argyll. 'Through his control over the supply of redshanks and over the marital destiny of his kinswomen', Dawson argues that Argyll 'altered the complexion of politics in the north of Ireland.'[569]

Hitherto, between 1559 and 1565, Argyll had allied with the English and pursued what MacGregor describes as a 'pioneering and idealistic British policy'.[570] Argyll had participated in the Treaty of Berwick (1560) and extended support to the English in their struggles with Shane O'Neill.[571] This relationship was tested however with the return of Mary from France (1561) and her subsequent marriage to Robert Darnley (1565).[572] The marriage meant that two Catholics were in line to the English throne and for the Protestant Scottish nobles this was insupportable. Following the conclusion and failure of the subsequent rebellion against Mary (the Chase-about Raid), many rebel Scottish nobles were exiled to England;[573] yet despite his role in the rebellion and his opposition to Mary's

---

[565] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 23, 32ii, p.363.
[566] *CSP*, Irel., *1509-1573*, 23, 39, p.365.
[567] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 23, 32iv, p.363.
[568] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, p.163; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 23, 10ii, p.358.
[569] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion,* p.163-4.
[570] MacGregor, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland', p.43.
[571] *The works of John Knox*, *2,* p.50; Cited in Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, pp.1-2.
[572] Initially, the 'British Protestant elite', including Argyll, Sir Richard Maitland of Lethington (1496-1586) and Mary's half-brother James Stewart, 1st earl of Moray (1531-1570), supported Mary and campaigned to have her claim to the English throne recognised in London. Roger A. Mason, ed. *On Rebellion / John Knox* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p.214.
[573] William Dickinson, ed. *A source Book of Scottish History, Vol. 2, 1424-1567* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1953), p.188. By 1565, in the wake of Mary and Darnley's marriage and the 'Chaseabout raid',

marriage, Argyll fared far better and was likely spared, Dawson argues, on account of his blood ties with Mary (Argyll had married Jean Stewart, the illegitimate daughter of James V), as well his initial support on her return.[574]

It is also likely that Argyll escaped punishment on account of his influential position in northern Scotland and Ulster. Argyll's political reach was extensive and his considerable land and naval forces made him 'the most important source of military might within the British Isles out with the government of Scotland and England.'[575] Argyll's forces were comprised of battle-hardened highlanders and 5000 of them could be raised quickly, rivalling the numbers that could be raised in a similar time by Scotland or England.[576] Moreover, Argyll's navy could either 'threaten or protect the Scottish west coast, the Irish coast, north-west England and Wales as far south as the Bristol Channel.'[577] Argyll's naval omnipotence maintained the movement of large numbers of Scots from the Highlands and Islands to the Irish coast, and by 1568 his navy posed such a threat that the Dublin administration curbed the export of boards from Carrickfergus and Wexford, effectively banning the export of timber into Scotland, 'to impede the earl of Argyle in making galleys.'[578]

By the 1560s, Argyll had determined that the English crown would not 'accept' the Scots in Ulster, particularly the MacDonnells, and subsequently shifted his support from the English to his 'Gaelic dependents', and began to regard 'the Dublin and London administrations as a foreign power.'[579] MacGregor argues that Argyll's

> post-1565 strategy of shoring up MacDonald power in Ulster delayed the Tudor reconquest for a generation and paved the way for the plantation […] In his eyes, Ulster and the West Highlands were an axis not of evil but of opportunity, the starting-point for a Reformed theocracy embracing the Three Kingdoms. Gaeldom was the potential core of a truly early modern Britain. He was perhaps the first but not the last Scottish politician to discover that god was an Englishman, and that his English counterparts either identified England with Britain, or regarded 'Britain' as useful only insofar as it was compatible with English interests and security.[580]

---

the consensus of the Treaty of Berwick as well as the prospect of a united Protestant British mainland was in doubt and 'England and Scotland were on the brink of war.' Dawson, *The Politics of Religion,* p.140-1. Roger Mason submits that between Mary's return in 1561 and 1567 the English administration 'found itself apparently robbed of one of its most valuable assets: sympathetic Scots like Maitland and Moray'. Mason, *On Rebellion / John Knox*, p.213.

[574] Jane Dawson, 'The Fifth Earl of Argyle: Gaelic Lordship and Political Power in Sixteenth-Century Scotland', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 67, 183 (1988), pp.1-27, pp.14, 2.
[575] Dawson, 'The Fifth Earl of Argyle', p.3.
[576] Dawson, 'The Fifth Earl of Argyle', pp.3-4.
[577] Dawson, 'The Fifth Earl of Argyle', p.5.
[578] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 25, 70, p.384; Dawson, 'The Fifth Earl of Argyle', p.5.
[579] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion,* p.142-143.
[580] MacGregor, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland', p.43.

Upon his return to Ireland in September 1568, Henry Sidney is said to have been suspicious of Argyll and believed that 'Scottish politics were very largely responsible for the disturbed state in which he found Ulster.'[581] Sidney's immediate concern, according to Dunlop, was to 'prevent more Scots landing', and to this end advised Elizabeth to secure strategic locations such as Carrickfergus, establish a line of forts around the coast and seize Rathlin Island, 'the very staple and baiting-place of the Scots'.[582] Sensitive to Elizabeth's well-known frugality, Sidney suggests that if his advice be rejected the Queen should withdraw her soldiers from the region 'and let the Scottish enemy or Irish rebel occupy the country' since the cost of maintaining troops was more than the country was worth.[583]

The English 'were being painfully taught the lesson that the only person capable of making the triangular British approach work was Argyll, and he was now employing it against them.'[584] Argyll remained disposed to conference with the English but now did so mainly in terms of securing concessions for Mary Queen of Scots.[585] The exchanges are often coloured with explicit threats, as in a report sent to Cecil in November 1568 that states that 'the earl of Argyle said if the Queen would help the Queen of Scots, he would minister all neighbouring offices to Ireland, otherwise he would invade Ireland in person with 5000 men'.[586] So determined was Argyll to be the 'power-broker in the Gaelic heartland' that he offered Lady Agnes as a wife to an Irish lord of Elizabeth's choosing, on the stipulation that Agnes and her MacDonnell heir were granted the Glynnes.[587]

'John Smyth's Advice'

The intrigues, policies and anxieties of the late 1560s are encapsulated in a tract referred to in the state papers as 'John Smith's Advice to prevent the scots out of Ulster, and also out of Connaught and Munster, where they do great harm' (1569).[588] Curiously a facsimile of Smith's 'Advice' provided in the appendix of Hayes-McCoy's *Scottish Mercenary Forces in Ireland* (1937) is retitled: 'John Smyths Advice for the Realme of Ireland'. The earlier title though markedly different provides a far more accurate description of its contents. In his 'Advice' Smith sets out fifteen key points, thirteen of which deal explicitly with

---

[581] Robert Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 22, 86 (1925), pp. 115-126, p.115.
[582] Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp. 115-126, p.115. Elizabeth also advised Sidney to erect castles at Olderfleet, Glenarm, Red bay, Skerries and Portrush.
[583] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 26, 18, pp.393-4; Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp. 115-126, pp.115-116
[584] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion,* p.202.
[585] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion,* p.202.
[586] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 26, 18, p.393.
[587] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.135.
[588] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 28, 10, p.407.

counteracting the Scottish presence in Ulster by means of strategic fortifications and furtive negotiations with sympathetic Ulster chiefs:

1. *ffyrst for the quietnes of Owlster and Connoght is to take away thyle of the raghlens* [Rathlin] *from the Scotts and there to place xxvtie souldiers in that castell that one soyrle booy dooth now keepe for thys raighlens is the greatest enemy that Ireland hath, yt is thonely succour of the scotts for thether they brynge theyr spoyles oute of Ireland, and theare keepe them until they can well conveigh them into Scotland.*
2. *ffor when the scottes come owte of Scotland, and make rooides into Ireland theare they lye lurcking tyll by theyr espialles they may understand wheare to dooe the moost myschyef.*
3. *Thearefore to prevent theym yf yt please the queens majestie to have theare a pinna or galley well furnished to scowre the scotts gallies aswell aboute thyles of Scotland as ouldreflet the river of the Bann Loghfoylle, Loghsollye, Sheephaven, and esroy* [Assaroe], *so shall the said pinnas or Gallie, do the Scotts muche myschyef on theyr owne coaste and also kepe theym from fyshyng of the Bann and other places of the countrye wher they have suche commodytye as they can not wel live wythoute.*[589]

The first three objectives are comparable to policies pursued during the earlier deputyships of James Croft (1551-2) and Thomas Radcliffe (1556-1558). Both saw Rathlin as a crucial site and launched assaults there with vastly different success. Smith's third proposal: to harm the Scots 'on theyr owne coaste', echoes an earlier proposal entitled 'A present remedy for the reformation of the North and the rest of Ireland' (27/04/1556) that advocates an expedition to Rathlin and the west coast of Scotland, and which may have influenced Sussex's burning of areas in the Western Isles of Scotland including Kintyre and Arran in September 1556.

The third proposal also articulates the economic motives behind the Scots expulsion, specifically the seizure of the fishing grounds around the Bann held by the MacDonnells and previously offered to Sussex in exchange for land titles and money. By driving the Scots out of the abundant Bann and other key locations and isolating them from '*commodytye(s) as they can not wel live wythoute*', the English would effectively starve them out of Ulster. Points four and five clarify how the fishing areas may be procured and exploited through 'the men of Brystowe [Bristol]' who will 'travel thither so that little they cann not want, having Cnockefergus and thile of man to freend and all along the coaste of Ireland so that no man is to hurt them but the Scotts onlye.'[590]

Smith's sixth point: 'ffor the keeping of the Scotts out of Connoght', and seventh, both comment on the marriages between Hugh O'Donnell and Finola, and her mother

---

[589] See Appendix in George Hill, *An Historical Account,* p.345; 'John Smith's Advice for the Realme of Ireland', April 1569, SP 63 / 28 / 10.
[590] 'John Smith's Advice', p.345.

Agnes, widow of James MacDonnell and 'now wife to Turlagh Lonnagh who now beareth the name of Oneill'.[591] The political and military implications of this familial network are not lost on Smith and he offers a solution in point eight:

> The best remedy vs that the quenes majestye wryte her graces lettres to the said Odonnill chardging hym upon his alleageaunce that […] he suffer no scotts to anny number to enhabite in his countrye nor suffer anny scotts to passé by anny of the said passadgs els the Queenes majestie will with force and Justice correct hym, and I shall enforme her hyghenes and your LL. An easye and reddy waye to correct the said O donill and to bring hym to good Obedience.[592]

The strategy of intimidating Hugh O'Donnell was part of a wider plan, elaborated in point nine, of shrinking the areas within Ulster that the Scots could securely traverse:

> Then yf the said Scotts be stopped that they can not enter by odonill they can not passé logh hernye [Erne] which is magwyres countrye for he woold never suffer theim to passé his countrye nor here to fore yt is not hard [heard] that he hath done nor can in anny wyse abide theym.[593]

The tenth point asserts that if the Scots 'attempt to passe through oneyles [O'Neills] countrye, then is the inglishe pale hard at hand so that they may com to a gennerall sport'.[594] Eleven concerns the 'quieting of Connoght', and Smith entreats Elizabeth to write to O'Rourke and John Boorke McOlliverus, who were transporting redshanks in Ulster, to 'stay to bring in anny suche bluddy and wild nacion to destroy the people promising theim Justice and theyre causes to be heard.'[595] The penultimate point makes a case for exploiting Con O'Donnell, who had grown up in the English pale and spoke English. Smith claims that Con O'Donnell urged him

> to move som of her majesties cownsaill to be ameane that the quenes majesty woold wryte her graces lettres for his apparaunce heare, and so he said upon sight of her majestys lettres he would come and make enformacons how the raghlens may be got, and kept from the scotts as also other secret service which by mouth hee would declare himself to the quenes majestie.[596]

In the fifteenth and final point Smith describes how his stratagem developed as he travelled 'the countrye both wyth the governor and at the govnors appointment by my self alone'.[597] In reality Smith was crisscrossing Ulster desperately trying to secure support through intimidation and bribery and his 'Advice', perhaps more than other any document from this decade, is boldly transparent about English methods for eradicating the Scots.

---

[591] 'John Smith's Advice', p.346.
[592] 'John Smith's Advice', p.346.
[593] 'John Smith's Advice', p.346.
[594] 'John Smith's Advice', p.346.
[595] 'John Smith's Advice', p.346.
[596] 'John Smith's Advice', p.347.
[597] 'John Smith's Advice', p.347.

A marriage made in Scotland

The prospect of a marriage between the Gaels is remarked on in January 1568 by Nicholas Bagenel who reports that Turlough had 'sent into Scotland for more Scots and a wife'.[598] London, as Michael Hill observes, 'saw the pending marriage as a threat to English authority not only in the northeast, but in all of Ireland', and in anticipation Malby readied the English navy to 'intercept' the women en route to Ulster.'[599] Later in June 1569 the English Crown authorised 2000 pounds to fortify areas in the north coast to

> impeache the resort of the scotts unto that realme by sea amonge which although it hath byn thought none meter that the ile of Raughlyn and Skirryes Portrusshe yet we leave the choice therof to yourself how you shall thinke fittest for the same money to be bestowed as a degree to diminisshe the usuall resorte of the said scotts into these partes and to stay the perill.[600]

No amount of money or carefully placed troops could prevent the inevitable and in August 1569 on Rathlin Island, allegedly with Argyll in attendance, the weddings took place between Lady Agnes and Turlough O'Neill, Finola and Hugh O'Donnell.[601]

The marriages were politically expedient, more concerned with the unification of the three key chiefs in Ulster than with happily ever after. They calmed the customary hostilities between the Irish and Scottish chiefs and provided the Irish, especially Turlough, with a significant and legitimate number of Scottish soldiers (redshanks) as part of the respective dowries.[602] The political implications were not lost on the English who knew a 'united and hostile Ulster would undermine the stability of the entire kingdom of Ireland' and ultimately 'be turned against them'.[603] A contemporary report highlights the 'danger growing to the realm by the increase of Scots in the north', while a report by Piers warns that the north of Ireland is[604]

> in danger to be utterly lost for the Scots are already in such numbers and fortifying upon her majesty's land and manuring the same, that if they be suffered they will shortly look into the English pale […] I am of the mind that until the north of Ireland be reformed, which is the only original of all rebellion, all the rest of the land will never be good.[605]

---

[598] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 23, 11.i, p.359.
[599] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.131.
[600] Queen to Sir Henry Sidney, 6 June, 1569, *Sidney State Papers*, p.108.
[601] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion,* p.163.
[602] Dawson, 'The Fifth Earl of Argyle', p.17.
[603] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, p.204.
[604] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 31, 41, pp. 441-2.
[605] Cited in Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, p.203.

As a result of the marriages, Dawson contends that Argyll 're-aligned Ulster politics' and 'laid the foundation for that provinces successful resistance to Elizabethan conquest.'[606] Similarly, George Hill draws a direct connection between the marriages and the subsequent colonial schemes:

> the Scots had now another interval of comparative peace, for so many of their countrymen had arrived about the time of the two distinguished marriage alliances abovementioned, that the forces of the northern chieftains were thus amply and efficiently recruited. This improved state of affairs continued until the summer of 1572, when rumours of a most formidable English invasion […] created a violent excitement throughout Ulster. The Northern League, which had shown symptoms of dissolution, was re-invigorated, and the redshanks became once more the most important people of Ulster.[607]

'This Scottish woman will make a new Scotland of Ulster'

Lady Agnes, the daughter of the 3rd Earl of Argyll, sister of the 4th, and aunt to the 5th,[608] was used to being offered as a bride having been previously touted as a possible wife for Shane O'Neill. Again, Argyll had been the orchestrator and had attempted to pressurize the English with an O'Neill-MacDonnell-Campbell combination.[609] Agnes's marriage to Turlough allowed her to emerge as a politically significant figure in Ulster during the 1570s and 1580s and together with her daughter Finola, dubbed 'inneen Dubh' (dark haired), influenced English policy during a period that witnessed a surge in plantation projects for Ulster.

The primary role of Agnes and Finola was to 'funnel redshanks' into Ulster at the behest of Argyll, yet it would be a mistake to view them as mere pawns or gunrunners; Agnes was as much concerned with securing land and titles in Ulster for her sons as she was with strengthening Argyll's position.[610] Buttressed by the redshanks she regulated and her familial connection with Argyll and Clan Campbell, Agnes was more than an equal partner. Few women yielded such political and military muscle as Agnes Campbell and given her strategic role in Ulster, and therefore influence on the triangular relationship, she must be considered one of the most notable Scottish figures of the period, and more should be known about this interesting figure and her daughter. The English were acutely aware of them and government records debate their political impact and personalities. While identifying them as political agitators the reports compliment their civility and learning. In his 'Advice', Smith writes:

---

[606] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, pp.164-5, 143.
[607] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.152.
[608] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.21.
[609] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.104.
[610] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, p.204.

these too women beying trained up in the scotts courte & speake both French and inglyshe yet are they trayners of all scotts into Ireland as also conveighers of all commodities oute of the realme so that by these two women arriseth all mischief against thinglishe Pale.[611]

Smith's views are supported by the first-hand descriptions of Henry Sidney and Ralph Bagenal. Following a meeting in Armagh, Sidney writes: 'in truth (Sir) she was a grave, wise and well-spoken lady, both in Scots, English and French, and very well mannered.'[612] In 1575, Bagenal finds Agnes to be a 'verie nobell, wysse woman, and as dutyfullie using herself to further the Queen's service every waye, as if she weare a natural borne subjecte'.[613] Though Smith, Sidney and Bagenal approve of their manners and intelligence, Agnes and Finola represent not just a political obstacle but a cultural contradiction.

When describing them as 'trayners' of Scots into Ireland, Smith seems genuinely surprised that someone educated and multilingual would engage in such uncivilised actions. Additionally, Smith's allegation that from Agnes and Finola 'arriseth all mischief against thinglishe Pale' confirms the extent of the territorial threat they posed. In 1577, Sidney criticises Agnes's influence, blaming Turlough's rebelliousness on the 'lewd counsel of his wife' who had 'a design to make her younger sons by James MacDonnell *stark* [hard, unyielding, strong, violent][614] in Ireland'.[615] In 1580 Nicholas Malby notifies Leicester of, what Hill describes as, a 'fear-inspiring fact', namely:

> a great bruit of 2000 Scots landed in Clandeboye. Tyrlagh Lenagh's marriage with the Scot is cause of all this, and if her Majesty do not provide against her devices, this Scottish woman will make a new Scotland of Ulster. She hath already planted good foundation; for she in Tyrone, and her daughter in Tyrconnell, do carry all the sway in the North, and do seek to creep into Connaught, but I will stay them from that.[616]

Hill was the first to remark on the numerous references to Lady Agnes in state documents and concludes that due to being vilified and complimented in equal measure it is difficult to gain a true picture of her.[617] Given that Hill refers to English depictions of Agnes, some bias is to be expected. Seen from a Scottish or Irish perspective however, Agnes was merely protecting her patrimony and the future of her kin in the region. Bearing in mind the powerful figures who opposed her, Sidney, Piers, Essex and latterly John Perrot, we

---

[611] 'John Smith's Advice', p.346.
[612] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.75-6.
[613] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.157.
[614] 'Stark', adj. and adv, *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/Entry/189130?rskey=2gdG2U&result=4#eid, [accessed: 04/06/2015]
[615] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.157.
[616] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.158.
[617] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.157.

can assume that Agnes was resilient, resourceful and wielded considerable power. These are attributes not generally admired in adversaries by a colonising force.

Meanwhile in 1570, the rapid and large influx of redshanks solidified the Scots' position but proved disastrous for Turlough whose 'major difficulties' according to Hayes-McCoy included 'the maintaining of himself in Ulster, the working of his scheme for Scottish aid through his wife and her relations, and the quartering of and provision for what Scots mercenaries he employed'.[618] Even before the influx there are reports of Turlough being 'eaten out' by the redshanks and being 'so wasted […] he is a verie beggar'.[619] Moreover, the O'Neill's were not a happy couple and in April Agnes left Turlough and returned to the Western Isles of Scotland taking her mercenaries with her.[620] News of the separation reached Sidney who had been waiting for such an opportunity to negotiate with Turlough, who was incapable of making a decision in spite of and because of his wife's absence. Turlough, Sidney writes, 'promised me faithfully when his wife returned out of Scotland he would come to me into some more convenient place of meeting.'[621]

A speech allegedly given by Sidney before the Irish Parliament in 1570 neatly captures the prevailing mood. In it Sidney tries to convince the Irish of England's benevolence towards them and the necessity of having the English on their side against the Scots:

> are your enemies more tractable than they have been? are they fewer? are you by yourselves of force to match them? if you be, then weare Englande starke madd to disbusse twentie or thirtie thousand poundes a yeare for none other purpose but to vexe and greve you. That weare like the husband who gealdes himself to anger his wife. You must not thinke we love you so evill. Nay, rather thinke trulie we tender your quietnes and preservacion as a nation derived from our ancetors, engraffed and incorporate into one bodye with us, disturbed by a sorte of barbarous odious to God and man that lapp your blood as gredelie as ours […] Touchinge Scotlande it is well knowen they were never the men whome England needed to feare. They are but a corner cut oute, and easelie tamed when they waxe owtragious. Your foes lie in the bosome of your countries, more in number, ritcher of ground, desperate theves, ever at an inche, unpossible to be severed from yowe, withowte anye fence beside your owne valiantnes and the help of our souldiers.'[622]

Early in 1571 Agnes returned to Ulster and following a meeting with Sidney was persuaded to make peace with the English.[623] In his memoir, Sidney describes their encounter thus:

---

[618] Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland*, p.108.
[619] *CSP*, *Irel.*, *1509-1573*, 29, 86, p.424; Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, p.204.
[620] *CSP*, *Irel.*, *1509-1573*, 30, 37, p.428; Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland*, p.108.
[621] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.59.
[622] Edmund Campion, *Two Bokes of the History of Ireland (1571)*, ed. A. F. Vossen (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1963), p.148-50. See also Herron and Maley, 'Monumental Sidney', p.24-25.
[623] Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland*, p.115; *CSP*, *Irel.*, 31, 33, p.440; Dawson, *The Politics*

> I went northward to Armargh, and there had meeting with Turlo Lenogh, who then brought his wife [Agnes Campbell] with him, before mentioned, to be in Scotland at the time of my arrival. Truly (sir) I found her a good counsellor to him, a well-wisher to peace, and a reverent speaker of the Queen's majesty. She would still persuade him to content himself to be a subject, and to contain him in all his actions like a loyal subject; alleging many examples of her own country of Scotland […] but daughter she was to an Earl of Argyle, who challenged as much *jura regalia*, and other sovereignties, as he could, and yet contended themselves to submit their causes to the laws of the realm, and themselves to the king's pleasure.[624]

In March, Agnes sought peace with Elizabeth, beseeching the Queen to 'grant to her husband O'Neill a sufficient right and evidence under Her seal to those rooms which he possesses presently'.[625] Genuine or not, Agnes's solicitations for peace were unlikely to move Elizabeth or her administrators given that concord between the rival factions did not factor into their long-term strategy for Ulster. Diplomatic cohabitation, comparatively speaking, between Irish, Scots and English would not occur until James's accession to the English throne and the unfurling of his British project.

Devices, Advices, and Descriptions

The 1609 plantation of Ulster, though a pioneering event, was in many ways the summit of a sequence of lesser and less official paths towards the pacification of Ulster during the second half of the sixteenth-century. D. B. Quinn argues that in order to gain a richer appreciation of English colonial ideas one must consider the 'plans and speculations of English statesmen' between 1550 and 1580.[626] Edward Walshe's 'Conjectures' (1552) has been identified as an early indicator 'that the English were moving towards a classical military solution to the Irish problem';[627] while Thomas Heron and Willy Maley assert that 'the roots of the Jacobean Ulster plantation lie in the 1560s'.[628]

Preceding the larger schemes of Smith and Essex is the Sidney supported 'Ulster project'. Proposed in 1565 as a response to Shane O'Neill the project generated some interest but failed to develop beyond the planning stage, principally because of O'Neill's timely execution at the hands of the Scots.[629] The brainchild of a corporation part-funded by the English Crown, the 'Ulster project' would establish a colony of '4000 inhabitants of her [Elizabeth] natural subjects' with the purpose of ousting the Scots.[630] Nicholas Canny

---

of Religion, p.205.
[624] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.75-6.
[625] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 31, 25, p.439.
[626] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.543.
[627] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.42.
[628] Herron and Maley, 'Monumental Sidney', p.14.
[629] Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture', p.263.
[630] Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest*, p.71.

(1976) cites a proposal from May 1565, purportedly from 'The Ulster Project', in which Sidney recommends that 'Capt Peers [Piers] […] inhabit betwene them (the Scots) and the sea whereby with some shipping all hope of succor shalbe cut from them'.[631]

In the late 1560s and early 1570s, no doubt due to the increasing pan-Gaelic threat, the English administration received a glut of proposals for planting Ulster including: the 'Device for the plantation of Ireland with Englishmen' (January 1568),[632] the 'Petitions of Edmund Waterhous in behalf of the Lord Deputy' (March 1569),[633] and the 'Second book and offer of Sir Thomas Gerrarde and companions for planting the Glynns and part of Claneboy' (March 1570).[634] These proposals form part of a conversation among primarily administrative figures with first-hand experience of Ulster, many of whom held serious concerns about the Scots. In Captain Piers' 'device for planting Ulster and banishing the Irish Scots' (July 1571),[635] Piers writes:

> If it might seem good to your highness to grant a commission and to send hither one small ship and a galley to remain here but for one year, I dare take upon me in a short time to enforce the […] Scots not only to leave these parts, but also to crave for quiet in their own country.[636]

Piers was favourably placed to assess the situation and judges Turlough as 'potentially more dangerous than Shane'; he also writes of the Scots that 'of all people my nature abhorreth them to be in Ireland'.[637]

Hiram Morgan proposes two primary factors driving the colonial policies of the 1570s: first, the collaboration between Turlough Luineach and Sorley Boy MacDonnell which 'posed a considerable threat to English authority,' and second, a desire to reduce expenditure that necessitated private enterprise.[638] Elizabeth's reluctance to finance any of the variety of proposals led to 'a radical departure' from normal policy.[639] English entrepreneurs were encouraged to invest in their own plantation schemes and consequently the self-funded schemes of Captain Thomas Chatterton and Captain Nicholas Malby were accepted while the projects of those seeking state subsidy were for the most part rejected.[640] An exception was the proposal of Sir Thomas Gerrard who requested '100 horse and 400 foot […] and the Queens ships for defence against the Scots'.[641] Gerrard

---

[631] Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest*, pp.70-1.
[632] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 23, 26, p.362.
[633] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 27, 64, p.406.
[634] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 30, 32, p.428.
[635] *CSP*, Irel., *1509-1573*, 32, 1, p.451.
[636] Cited in Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p. 143; Piers to Queen, 6 July 1571, SP 63/33/1.
[637] Cited in Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p. 143.
[638] Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture', p.263.
[639] Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture', p.263.
[640] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 30, 32, p.428; 34, 42, p.462.
[641] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 30, 32, p.428.

planned to plant a private colony in Clandeboye and the Glynnes 'to aid in cutting the Ulster Gael's access to the western Highlands and Isles of Scotland.'[642] With Gerrard's proposal in mind, Elizabeth tells Sidney to

> use all the best means […] to reduce such captains that serve there […] to settle themselves upon some parts of the frontiers, specially upon the sea coast towards Scotland […] We […] understand […] your opinion for the keeping of the seas betwixt Ireland and Scotland for the impeaching of the frequent resort of the Scots into Ireland and of your opinion for fortifying at Rathlin.[643]

The Colonial 'Project' of Smith and Son

As a member of the Privy Council (1571) and Secretary of State (1572), the political philosopher and coloniser Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577) was intimately involved in Irish affairs yet never set foot in Ireland.[644] Smith's project, undertaken by his son (Thomas Smith), was predicated on the belief that it was possible to 'win or inhabite any parte of Ireland, without the Queenes pay, hir forces and expenses'.[645] According to Michael Hill 'the arrival of the first wave of adventurer-colonists led by Smith and his bastard namesake' ended a 'period of relative tranquillity in the Gaelic heartland'.[646]

No mention is made of Scotland in Smith's most famous works *Discourse of the Commonweal of This realm of England* (1549) and *De Republica Anglorum* (1562-65); however, following the Scottish Reformation, Smith along with William Cecil saw the potential for a unified and Protestant 'Britain' and both were convinced that Ireland should be brought closer to England.[647] Interestingly, several years earlier (1566) in a letter from Cecil to Smith, the former complains of the difficulties in Ulster and describes how the new Lord Deputy (Sidney) 'hath found all out of joint there [Ireland]. The good subjects in all parts oppressed, the Irish bearing rule, but in all no peril, saving in Shane […] We have cause to fear that O'Neill's boldness is fed out of Scotland.'[648] Withington recently argues (2012) that it was Thomas Smith's *A Letter from I. B.* (1571) rather than Spenser's *View Of the Present State of Ireland* (1596; pub. 1633) that set the 'agenda' for later planation,

---

[642] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p. 140.

[643] Cited in Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.140; Queen to Sir Henry Sidney, 17 May, 1570, *Sidney State Papers*, 126-7.

[644] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.545.

[645] Sir Thomas Smith, *A Letter from I.B. Gentleman unto his very frende Maystet [sic] R.C. Esquire vvherin is contened a large discourse of the peopling & inhabiting the cuntrie called the Ardes* (London, 1572). p4.

[646] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.142.

[647] Smith had been Cecil's tutor at Cambridge, served in Somerset's Protectorate and in 1547 accompanied Somerset and his army against the Scots. Armitage, *The Ideological Origins*, p.47.

[648] Cited in Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.101; Cecil to Sir Thomas Smith, 26 March 1566, London, British Library, Lansdowne MSS, 102, f. 71.

most immediately the plantation of 1609.[649] While Hadfield (2012) agrees that Smith's text influences Spenser's *View,* he favours the latter as providing 'the rationale for the future development of the policy of plantation'.[650]

In practical terms the plantations provided career opportunities for the sons of the landed gentry, squeezed out by the practice of primogeniture and a lack of religious employment in post-Reformation England.[651] Those involved in the colonial projects offered classical precedents to justify their actions; however, the political reality is that the schemes were a response to the Gaelic alliance and the strong position the Scots held in Ulster. Dunlop describes Smith's project as 'essentially a military expedition directed against the Scots on the one side and the Irish on the other.'[652] In addition, the grant the Smiths received (January 3 1572) of 'the country called the Ardes, and part of other countreys adjacent in the Erledom of Ulster', include areas occupied by Scots.[653] State papers confirm that in April 1571 the Ards and Dufferin were 'replenished with Scots' who were building, manuring the ground and settling 'as though they should never be removed'.[654] In common with Walter Devereux's later 'enterprise', Smith's project was aimed at preventing the Scots from arriving or leaving and, recalling the earlier philosophies of St Leger and Croft, proposes that garrisons be constructed to keep 'continuall scoute watche, & warde so narrowly, that one single person undiscried shal not be able to enter or flee out of the Countrie.'[655]

The indenture the Smiths received in October 1571 contains the Crown's reasons for sponsoring the project and raises the subject of the Scots:[656]

> the Queen and Sir Thomas Smith, to whom was Thomas his son joined […] witnessed, that whereas there were in her Highness's earldom of Ulster divers parts and parcels that lay waste, or else were inhabited with a wicked, barbarous and uncivil people, some Scottish and some wild Irish, such as late were rebellious to her highness and commonly are out of all good order and as yet were in continual rebellion to her majesty, considering how great a benefit it should be to her realm of Ireland, honour and commodity to her majesty […] to have the same peopled with good and obedient subjects, which should acknowledge the great benefit of God, her highness' royal authority, and be of force at all times to her majesty's deputy or other officers to repress all rebels and seditious people and be an occasion by their example to bring the rude and barbarous nation of the wild Irish to more civility of manner, have often

---

[649] Withington, 'Plantation and civil society', p.58.
[650] Hadfield, 'Educating the colonial mind', p.159.
[651] Ellis, *Tudor Ireland*, p.266; *A Letter from I. B*., p.13.
[652] Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp. 115-126, p.117-118.
[653] *The offer and order giuen forthe by Sir Thomas Smyth Knighte, and Thomas Smyth his sonne, vnto suche as he willing to accompanie the sayd Thomas Smyth the sonne, in his voyage for the inhabiting some partes of the North of Irelande.*
[654] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 32, 9, p.444.
[655] *A Letter from I. B*., p.6.
[656] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.548; John Strype, *The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1820), p.131.

desired and wished that some occasion might be offered […] And then the terms follow:[657]

The indenture is organised into nine instructions and begins with the rousing statement that 'they, their friends, followers, and adherents […] with the travail of their bodies and perils of their lives, should enter into the said earldom of Ulster with a power of English, to subdue and repress all rebels'.[658] Point eight and nine deal specifically with the Scots: eight instructs 'not to sell to any mere Irish, or any Scottish persons, any estate or freehold, or any longer or greater estate than for five years, in any castle, manor, lordship'; and nine reminds them 'not to marry to or with any mere Irish, or Scottish-Irish persons, without licence or assent from sovereign'.[659] One gets the sense however that the Smiths were more immediately concerned with establishing and stabilising a plantation, and that their promotional literature pays lip-service to England's long-standing problems in the region.

'Writing goes further'

Smith's 'project' represents a step forward in England's colonial ideology and its complementary literature. Quinn describes it as 'an intensive propaganda drive', and *A Letter from I. B.* as 'the first piece of sustained argument for colonization to be published in England.'[660] *A Letter from I. B.* is more practically a 'printed statement of the advantages that were likely to accrue to all those who took part in the adventure'.[661] Those persuaded would be led by Thomas Smith and 'would form an aristocratic elite, retaining servile Gaelic tenants to work the soil'.[662] They would first however have to drive out the 'wicked barbarous and uncivil people, some Scottish and some wild Irish'.[663]

A Letter from I. B. encouraged up to eight hundred men to register by May 1572,[664] but despite the successful recruitment drive, Thomas Smith's decision to publish the pamphlet in advance of the project alerted the Irish chiefs to its imminence, provoking hostility in Ulster. The text was so inflammatory that Piers solicited the Lord Deputy to arrange the dissemination of contrary news in order to prevent an Irish revolt.[665] Moreover,

---

[657] Strype, *The Life of*, p.131; Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.551.
[658] Strype, *The Life of*, p.132.
[659] Strype, *The Life of*, p.132.
[660] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', pp.548, 550.
[661] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.548.
[662] Ellis, *Tudor Ireland*, p.266.
[663] Strype, *The Life of*, p.131; Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p. 551.
[664] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.548.
[665] *CSP*, *Irel.*, *1509-1573*, 34, 2, p.463. As England's 'man on the spot' and one of the four regulators of policy in Ireland, the others being Elizabeth, the Privy Council, and the Lord Deputy (Sir William Fitzwilliam)), Piers understood better than most the potential for disaster. Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture', p.265.

the success of any plantation in Ireland was contingent on assistance from the Lord Deputy but following the publication of *A Letter from I. B.*, Fitzwilliam was disinclined to assist and complains to Thomas Smith that he 'could well have wished rather some abstinence had been used and [his] landing done in actual deed with [his] companies by her majesty's authority than these rumours spread both by vulgar talk and show of printed writing.'[666]

The Irish chief most under threat was Brian Mcphelim O'Neill of Clandeboye who in the 1560s was 'installed […] with English backing', serving Sussex, Croft and Sidney.[667] Brian O'Neill complains to the Privy Council in March 1572 that 'there have bene certaine books spred in print that it hath pleased the Quene's Highnes to geve unto Sir Thomas Smith, knight, and Thomas Smith his sonne, some parte of the country and the which hath bene possessed by myne auncestours above fourteen discents as their inheritaunce'.[668] In response, Thomas Smith politely informs O'Neill 'that he will shortly come to live near him as good neighbour' and 'trusts they will live on friendly terms.'[669] Unconvinced, O'Neill readied his forces. The following month Dublin warned the English administration that the publication of any further texts regarding Smith's enterprise would 'produce more trouble than the first'.[670]

Fear of an Irish rebellion delayed Smith's expedition until July, by which time the 800 enthusiastic adventurers had dwindled considerably.[671] Smith's promotional literature, though necessary to secure financial and military support, ironically deferred the project, ensured the colonisers a hostile reception and energised the Irish and Scots who 'made mutual pacts and braced themselves for resistance.'[672] Attempting to absolve himself from any blame, Sir Thomas Smith claims that he was in France when the pamphlet unbeknownst to him had been published. He also stresses the humanitarian features of his project which

> neither sought to expel or destroy the Irish race, but to keep them in quiet, in order, in virtuous labour and in justice, and to teach them English laws and civility, and to leave robbing, stealing and killing one another […] they [the Irish] should as farmers or copyholders have the use of the rest, without being eaten out with coyne and livery and bonaght or otherwise spoiled at the coming out of a rebel.[673]

---

[666] Cited in Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture', p.265. In addition, Fitzwilliam had been trying to reduce the cost of administration in Ireland, which was dependent on accord with the Irish and correctly assumed that Smith's project would incite the Irish to rebel. Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture', p.265.

[667] Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture', p.262; Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors*, 1, p.213.

[668] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 35, 45, p.469.

[669] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 36, 22, p.472.

[670] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 36, 46, p.474.

[671] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.548.

[672] Ellis, *Tudor Ireland* , p.266.

[673] Cited in Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.553; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 38, 30, p.488.

Smith expresses his regret to Cecil, explaining 'I did not like of it at the first myself, as my son can tell, but […] neither he nor I had tenants or great countries of our own, to gather such a number together, as was necessary'.[674] In a letter to the Privy Council, Smith is more robust in defence of his son and their approach and writes that 'if any be offended by my son's books, I pray you to understand, neither he nor I had lands or tenants enough to compel to it, nor authority to muster any man; so nothing was left but persuasion, either by words or writing and writing goes further.'[675]

Like many texts relating to Ireland in the early modern period, *A Letter from I. B.* is peppered with classical precedents and biblical models to buttress its colonial ideology. Arguably however no English text up until *A Letter from I. B.* had been so unguarded about its intentions (though regarding the Scots, John Smith's 'Advice' (1569) is comparable), nor had such an incendiary effect. The starting point for Smith's pamphlet, like many others, is the 'first entry […] [that] Englishe men made into Irelande […] in Henrie the seconds time'.[676] The Norman Conquest offers an intrepid precedent with which to entice enterprising Englishman into Ireland and the Smiths present their project as salvaging a region that is English by historical conquest, representing colonisation as the repossession and repopulation of largely unoccupied land.

The word 'replenish' is used several times to describe the project's objective: it is a condition of Elizabeth's that 'they [Smiths] possesse and replenish them [Irish/Scots] with Englishe men'.[677] The term also appears in the official order for the project, which states that the Smiths 'hathe taken in hande withoute hir Majesties pay to win and replenish with Englishe inhabitants the country called the *Ardes*.'[678] When discussing the state of the Ards and Dufferin in 1571 the state papers report that they were 'replenished with Scots'. The use of 'replenish' moderates the harsh reality of the engagement, that is, the 'occupying' or 'colonising' of a region and its inhabitants for political and economic motives.

Before publishing his pamphlet, Thomas Smith, like John Smith, journeyed around Ireland on a part reconnaissance, part lobbying mission.[679] Smith concludes that the

---

[674] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.551.
[675] Cited in Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.551. Sir Thomas Smith's belief that 'writing goes further' is evinced by three associated pieces of propaganda the Smith's published in 1571: a broadsheet entitled *The offer and order given forth by Sir Thomas Smyth, Knighte, and Thomas Smyth, his sonne, unto suche as be willing to accompanie the sayd Thomas Smyth, the sonne, in his voyage for the inhabiting some partes of the North of Irelande*; *A Letter from I. B.*; and a helpful map of the Ards and surrounding area. Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.550. Taken together the publications resemble a do-it-yourself plantation kit for colonial enthusiasts.
[676] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.4.
[677] *The offer and order giuen for the by Sir Thomas Smyth […]'*
[678] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.4.
[679] Smith writes that he travelled in the company of Fitzwilliam 'to see and knowe the truthe […] (for now beganne the desire of this attempt to root in his hart) to declare his opinion, if hee thought it might be

situation in Ulster is not the consequence of insubstantial planting during the original conquest, or the fault of negligent or corrupt governors but 'hathe growne by the necessitie […] to give protections & pardons unto moste heinous rebels and outlawes'. In other words, the problem with Ulster was the mistaken belief that it was necessary not only to tolerate but occasionally conciliate with 'rebels and outlawes', or more precisely, the Gaelic Irish and Scots.

As part of his general survey and with a view to colonisation, Thomas Smith also examines 'the estate of Countris abrode', and in a fascinating statement recounts 'that all the Countries adjacent […] were as wel peopled or better than we be, or else more barren, so that except we might master and expel the inhabitants, it wold not availe'.[680] To engage in mastery and expulsion would, Smith argues, 'fall in variance with *Fraunce* or *Spaine'*, a possibility rejected on the principle that 'where bothe fret, neither increaseth'.[681] Instead, Smith asserts that their objective is 'to inhabite & reforme so barbarous a nation as that is [Ireland], and to bring them to the knowledge and lawe', which he considers 'bothe a godly and commendable deede, and a sufficient worke for our age.'[682] Smith employs something of a goldilocks principle when determining where to 'replenish': though suitably 'barren', Scotland is rejected on account of being 'sufficiently' peopled and having a 'frend king' (potentially the next King of England); Ireland too is deemed barren but lacks its own James IV, and is at present 'the Queens inheritaunce […] given to hir acte of parliament of the same realme, others hirs by dissents, the which lye almoste desolate.'[683]

The plan
Anticipating a hostile response from the Irish, *A Letter from I. B.* informs adventurers that their strategy is to dig-in and wait-out the Irish who 'must of necessitie for lacke of victual disperse themselves, and give us libertie with the advantage over them to break forth & proceede with our enterprize.'[684] The strategy of waiting for the Irish to starve misjudged the strength and resourcefulness of the Gaels and Smith's naivety is evident when

---

accepted, and hath founde that the decay of the government there hath not chaunced because that the planting at the firste of the English Nation (so muche as it was) was not for the time substantially done, nor by the negligence and corruptnesse of the governours there […] But hathe growne by the necessitie whiche hath constrained the governours to give protections & pardons unto moste heinous rebels and outlawes, after they have spoyled, murthred, & made havocke of the good Subjects, for lack of sufficient forces where with to attache and execute the sayde malefactours. *A Letter from I. B.*, p.2.
[680] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.7.
[681] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.7.
[682] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.8.
[683] *A Letter from I. B.*, pp.7-8.
[684] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.11.

describing the Ards as 'a peece of ground as easie to be wonne, inhabited, safely kepte and defended, as any platte within the realme of Ireland.'[685]

Though militarily optimistic, *A Letter from I. B.* is at least pragmatic about conditions post-plantation and confesses that the colonisers 'shal never have rest nor profite of the soyle, nor live w'out feare, as it happeneth many times upon the frontier of the Englyshe pale, for all the Queenes Majesties garrison.'[686] Smith is encouraged nonetheless by what he believes to be the existing political situation in Ulster: 'who is there now of the Lords in the North can make two thousand men', he writes, '*Onell* though he joined with him all the Lords of the Easte side of Ulster, and the Scottes is not able to make three thousand fighting men'.[687] Smith is further emboldened by 'the overthrowe of a thousand Skottes in Connaught the laste yeer by Captian Colyer and his foot band.'[688]

On Friday 30 August 1572, Smith left Liverpool and sailed towards Ireland.[689] Upon arrival a meeting was arranged with Brian O'Neill who failed to show. Unconvinced by Smith and unmoved by assurances from Elizabeth, O'Neill 'discovered his Irish nature full.'[690] Fitzwilliam reports that

> it is advertised by sundry letters, he [Brian McPhelim O'Neill] hath not only joined with Turlough Luineach, but also that he is the very drawer of him and the Scots to this mischievous dealing, hoping by furthering of Turlough's demands to amend withal his own reckoning concerning the Ardes.[691]

In an act of unity, Turlough demands that 'Mr Smith may not be permitted to inhabit on the lands of Sir Brian McFelim' and that 'Sorley Boy be not harmed.'[692] In October the three combined forces clashed with Smith and 'entered the Ardes, burning and spoiling'.[693] In November, in order to secure O'Neill's obedience his youngest daughter was taken captive, triggering a degree of calm in the region. At this time it is reported that 'Smith's

---

[685] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.6.
[686] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.5.
[687] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.11.
[688] *A Letter from I. B.*, p.11. In addition, recent history provided comforting examples of small bands of Englishmen driving out the Irish and Scots, for example 'the overthrowe given unto Shan Onell with three thousand Irishe by Capitaine Randell and three hundred English men onely. The driving of Shan Onell out of Dundak after hee had taken it, when hee was in his greatest forces, by two bands of English men: with infinite other example.' *A Letter from I. B.*, p.11.
[689] Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes, 1925, pp. 115-126, p.122. Separated during the voyage, around one hundred colonists led by Smith landed the following day in Strangford village where they immediately set about their task. Bardon, *A History of Ulster*, p.82.
[690] Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp.115-126, p.122.
[691] Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp.115-126, p.122. In October, Turlough was again unabashedly explaining to the English that the large number of Scots he had received would 'do no harm to the English, but will act against the Irish who do not fulfil the peace.' *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 38, 10, p.485.
[692] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 38, 11, p.485.
[693] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 38, 25, p.487; Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp.115-126, 123; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 38, 12, p.485.

son's enterprise needs rather maintenance than stomach';[694] however, as Dunlop notes and the state papers confirm the quiet circumstances can also be attributed to Turlough's military inactivity and his marital problems (Lady Agnes had returned to Scotland taking custody of 'the strongest part of the Scots'), rather than McPhelim's coerced compliance.[695]

The English strategy of divide and conquer was simple but difficult to achieve. In May 1573 developments took an unexpected turn with the opening of communication between Thomas Smith 'colonel of the Ardes' and Sorley boy.[696] Sorley asked to be made a denizen of England and Sir Thomas Smith relayed the negotiation in a letter to Cecil:

> I have received this day a letter from my son out of Ireland. Still he proceedeth with his communication with Sarleboy to make those two nations [the Ardes colony and the Glynnes] all one, and, as it, appeareth, the Scot is the more earnest […] considering indeed that if the English and Scottish should strive together, when the one hath weakened the other, the wild Irish […] might drive them out, or carry both away. In my opinion, the Queen's Majesty can lose nothing if Sarleboy be made denizen.[697]

Strype's *Life of Thomas Smyth* largely omits the Ulster project but touches on the interaction between Smith and Sorley and claims that Smith

> was in a good forwardness of reducing Sarleboy to obedience; for they had much converse together, and came at length to articles of agreement: the main of which was, that he should be made a denizen of England by the queen […] and the same privilege should the rest of his Scots enjoy; paying to the queen a yearly rent in acknowledgement, and he to become homage to her by oath, and so to be a faithful subject, or else lose his right […] He laboured also to unite the English and Scots that were there, who did not, it seems, very well agree; that their strength being united, they might be the more able to withstand the wild Irish. And this the Scots were promoting, as considering that if the English and they should strive together, when the one had weakened the other, the wild Irish, like the puthawk, might drive them out, or carry away both.'[698]

Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam also describes the negotiations and employs a pastoral metaphor that personifies the Gaels as 'strayed sheep' and the English, one assumes, as shepherds:

> We are given to understand that a nobleman named "Sorley Boy", and others, who be of the Scotch-Irish race, and some of the wild Irish at this time are content to acknowledge our true and mere right to countie of Ulster and to the crowne of Ireland, to profess due obedience to us and our crowne of England or Ireland […] submitting themselves to our laws and orders, upon condition that they may be received as denizens of England and Ireland; and we (being willed by all gentle means to bring the strayed sheep home again to the right fold, and to maintain peace and quietness in the

---

[694] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 39, 28, p.495.
[695] Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp.115-126, p.123; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 38, 38, p.489-90. Normal business resumed in early 1573 when Smith and Malby attacked McPhelim, who in retaliation burned Knockfergus in May. *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 39, 45, p.497; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 41, 48, p.504.
[696] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 40, 77, p.508.
[697] Cited in Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.146.
[698] Strype, *The Life of*, p.134.

realm, and to refuse none that will acknowledge their duty) are content that any mere Irish, or Scotch-Irish […] from that day be content to hold their lands of us and the said colonel [smith].[699]

In comparison to Fitzwilliam's self-assured language and tone, Michael Hill finds Sir Thomas Smith's tone 'desperate'.[700] In the letter to Cecil, Smith admits that the English were ill-equipped to oppose the Scots militarily, strongly suggesting - despite the assertions of Smith and his biographer that the denizenship was Sorley's idea - that negotiations, as Hill suggests, were driven by anxiety and expediency. Even the Earl of Essex was disposed to adopt Sorley 'as an assistant against the "Irishry"'.[701] In his 'instructions to the council in England through Waterhouse' (1573), Essex writes:

> I wish it might come in question whether it were necessary to use his (Sorley's) service against the Irish, who wilfully have refused the grace and mercy of her Majesty, broken their fidelity, and vowed confederacy in rebellion. If it be thought the less ill to retain him, than to bound him to a place certain, and a number certain, to make him a denizen, and assign him a service in lieu of rent, as captain of her majesty's kerne, which he, being a mercenary man and a soldier, will easily consent unto; time, hereafter, and law, shall keep him within bounds, and a stronger force than his own shall ever master him […] You may enlarge this matter as you think good; which, though it threaten peril, yet a continual eye being had upon him, time may disarm him, and make him a plague in the mean season to the obstinate Irish.[702]

While Smith pursued a 'conciliatory policy' hoping to estrange Sorley from the Irish chiefs, Elizabeth was swayed by Essex's more aggressive approach and they 'engaged in some double-dealing to negate [Smith's] agreement.'[703] Immediately after Sorley's denizenship, Essex was granted the rights to Clandeboye, the Glynnes, the Route and Rathlin Island.[704] Ultimately the royal grant Sorley received was comprised of land he believed he already held and it is reputed that upon receiving the Queen's patent Sorley placed the documents on the point of his sword and 'thrust them into a fire kindled specially for the occasion, announcing […] that he intended to hold his lands by his sword, and not by royal favour!'.[705]

In late October 1573, Thomas Smith was murdered by 'certain Irishmen of his own household, to whom he overmuch trusted.'[706] Following the death of his son and the failure of his plantation project, Sir Thomas Smith made a final attempt at planting Ulster with a

---

[699] *Calendar of the Patent and Close Rolls*, p.154.
[700] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.147.
[701] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.153.
[702] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.153; Essex to Waterhouse, 2 Nov. 1573, SP 63/42/66.
[703] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.147.
[704] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.147.
[705] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.155.
[706] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.41.

colony in the Ards in 1574, overseen by Jerome (Hierome) Brett and George Smith. [707] Of the 1574 colony, Smith writes: 'my chief order is, that they shall offer no injury to eny irish persone, nor take anything from them without paying for it, but quietly build their howses, fortifie their towne, & plow their growndes, and be good neighbours, if the yrish will be so to them.'[708] Smith's earlier humanist objective of implementing 'English laws and civility' is replaced by caution, and perhaps some humility. [709]

Sir Thomas Smith died in August 1577. His memorial tablet recognises his Irish exploits, describing him as 'Ardae Australisque Claneboy in Hibernia Colonellus.'[710] Smith's biographer grumbles that his family and heirs never received the land granted them in Ulster and adding insult to injury, Strype claims that Smith's nephew, Sir William Smith (who attempted to settle the Ards in 1579), was 'tricked out of it by the knavery of a Scot'.[711] The Scot in question was James Hamilton (1st Viscount of Clandeboye) (1560-1644), King James's Scottish agent in Ireland, whom 'upon the first coming in of king James I […] minded to get these lands confirmed to him by that king, which had cost Sir Thomas (besides the death of his son) 10,000.'[712] In late 1605, Hamilton was granted the lordship of Upper (South) Clandeboye and the Great Ardes in County Down and the success of his plantation, along with that of the Scot Hugh Montgomery in Newtownards in County Down (1605) set the scene for the 1609 plantation. [713]

The Colonial 'Enterprise' of the Earl of Essex

Herbert Hore (1861-2) describes Smith's project as 'the precursor to Essex's enterprise - the pilot balloon sent up to try the force and direction of the wind, and thus whether it were favourable to colonising descents on Ulster shores.'[714] In contrast to Smith's independent project the Crown partly financed the enterprise Essex 'had projected for the settlement of the Scoto-Irish problem'.[715] At the time of Essex's arrival the Scots occupied the Route, Glynn, and lower Clannaboy,[716] and should he succeed his reward would be the northern

---

[707] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.559.
[708] Cited in Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.554.
[709] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', pp.553-4.
[710] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.549.
[711] Strype, *The Life of*, p.137; Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith', p.549.
[712] Strype, *The Life of*, p.137; Maxwell, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster*, p.51.
[713] R. J. Hunter, 'Hamilton, James, first Viscount Claneboye (1560-1644), 2004, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*: http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/12086?docPos=11
[714] Herbert F. Hore, 'Colonel Thomas Smyth's Settlement in the Ardes, 1572', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 1st series, 9 (1861/1862), pp.177-182, p.178.
[715] Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp.115-126, p.124.
[716] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.152.

half of Clandeboye and the greater part of Antrim.[717] On July 19 1573, Essex personally received his orders from Elizabeth and reiterated them to Cecil the following day:

> Upon the taking of my leave, she told me that she had two special things to advise me of: the one was, that I should have consideration of the Irish there, which she thought had become her disobedient subjects rather because they had not been defended from the force of the Scots, than for any other cause.[718]

The letter reveals that Elizabeth saw the Scots as a bad influence on the Irish who once liberated would 'yield themselves good subjects'.[719] Essex, consequently, is instructed that neither he 'nor any of his company shall offend any person that is knowne to be our good subject'.[720] Concentrating on east Ulster, 'Essex envisaged that his principal targets of attack would not be the queen's Irish subjects, but the Scottish interlopers - the Clan Donald' and as the threat from Scotland resurfaced 'the sealing off of this exposed frontier seemed a prudent move.'[721]

With the corruptive influence of the Scots arrested the English were convinced that the northern Irish could 'be brought by degrees to be apt to erect such laws and ordinance as be used in the English Pale.'[722] Despite Elizabeth's ostensible benevolence towards the native Irish, Essex's duties were far from moderate. In addition to the construction of castles and forts, Essex was instructed to plant towns, introduce laws and destroy any towns or individuals who rebelled against him: 'to annoy them by fire and sword or any manner of death […] to make slaves and to chain to ships and galleys all or any such of the Irish sort Scoto-Irish as should be condemned of treason.'[723] Essex consented to watch over Elizabeth's Irish subjects but in a letter to Cecil expresses doubts about the success of such an approach, explaining that he had

> determined to deal so with them as I found best for her service when I came there, and for the present I could not say what is best to be done. But this Her majesty should be

---

[717] Jonathan Bardon, *A History of Ulster*, p.82.

[718] Walter Bourchier Devereux, ed. *Lives and letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex, in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I, 1540-1646*, 1 (London: John Murray, 1853), p.32.

[719] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.32.

[720] Nicholas Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest,* p.120. Essex's orders are similar to the later *Lawes and Orders of Warre', established for the good conduct of the seruice in Ireland* (1599) issued by his son Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex in 1599 that state that 'No Souldier of the Armie shall do violence to the person, or steale, or violently take, or wilfully spoyle the goods of any Irish good subiect, vpon Paine of death'; but as one scholar points out 'who distinguished a "good subject" from a rebel in the heat of battle - or the hunt for booty - is another matter.' Cited in Maley, 'Something Quite Atrocious', p.83. The earlier deputyship of James Croft had taken a similarly paternalistic attitude towards the Irish and Croft, according to Canny, had been 'unwilling to countenance stern measures against any inhabitants in Ireland other than the Scots whom he regarded as intruders.' Canny *The Elizabethan Conquest*, p.120.

[721] Ciaran Brady, 'Coming into the weigh-house', in *Elizabeth I and Ireland*, eds. Brendan Kane and Valerie McGowan-Doyle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp.113-142, p.132.

[722] Cited in Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest*, p.120.

[723] Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 22, 87 (1925), pp. 199-212, p.202.

sure of, that I would not imbrue my hands with more blood than the necessity of the cause requireth.[724]

Essex would quickly learn that the situation in north Ulster demanded a great deal of bloodshed.

'Evil success'

Despite an aggressive and concerted offensive throughout the summer of 1573,[725] by the end of June, Piers reports an increase in Scots.[726] In autumn, Essex was compelled to defend his aggression on the grounds that his actions were representative of 'Her Majesty's commiseration of the natural born subjects of this province, over whom the Scots did tyrannise.'[727] By the end of September, Essex's campaigns secured the submission of Brian O'Neill and Essex reports that

> since the time of his submission, he [Brian McPhelim] seemeth very desirous to draw blood upon the Scots, and offereth to bewray divers that have practised with him for his maintenance in rebellion […] in the meantime both he and his followers seem to be greatly comforted with some orders sent down here by me […] and for that I do not only suffer them to reap their corn quietly, but also have given them all the Scots' harvest.[728]

With McPhelim restrained, Turlough (to whom Essex had informed his intention 'to expel the Scottish alien') and Sorley 'bound themselves with an oath to maintain the war.'[729] Soon after O'Neill rebelled again, combined with Turlough and Sorley and increased his force with 500 Scots.[730] Essex's experiences with the Gaels led to increasing frustration and triggered a shift in approach. In a letter to Elizabeth in September 1573, Essex reports that

> since the writing of my last letter, some alteration is happened in these parts, for that Brian McPhelim […] is again revolted, and joined himself to the Scots and Tirlogh Lenoghe […] I am sorry for this revolt, which bewrayeth their settled determination to continue in disorder, yet, in respect of mine own surety and quiet enjoying of this country, I am glad that this has happened […] for now I have no occasion to trust the Irish, whereby I might have been more abused, than by open force I shall.[731]

---

[724] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.32.
[725] During this time Fitzwilliam warns that if Clandeboye is inhabited, then 'Scotland, which is not six hours sailing, may be punished from thence'. *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 41, 61, p.515.
[726] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 41, 56, p.515.
[727] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.34.
[728] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.35.
[729] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 42, 18.1, p.521; Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p. 36; Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p. 36.
[730] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 42, 29, p.522.
[731] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.37-8.

Essex concludes his letter with the ominous remark: 'My first actions showed nothing but lenity, plainness, and an equal care of both nations; my next shall shew more severity of justice abroad, and less trust at home'.[732]

Essex's problems were exacerbated by the growing dissatisfaction of his English colonisers who were 'feigning excuses to repair home', and the unruly hired soldiers who fought solely for pay.[733] He was also being undermined by Fitzwilliam, whose lack of assistance, Essex claims, gave the impression that the expedition was a wholly private venture, thus encouraging rebellion.[734] Since the Irish were 'fully persuaded' that the wars were his sole responsibility, conditions would improve, Essex informs Elizabeth, if 'all the officers, soldiers, and dealers in this war may seem to be your Majesty's; the war yours, and the reformation your Majesty's, and I only the instrument and executor of this service.'[735]

By the end of 1573 the pressures of Ulster politics and the administrative restraints placed upon him by antagonistic officials hardened Essex's attitude towards the Gaels. In a revealing letter to Elizabeth, reflecting on his initial leniency and subsequent lack of success, Essex rejects his original strategy for a more aggressive alternative:

> I began […] with the mildness that might both have allured, and thoroughly won, any nation well affected to your majesty's obedience; yet since this people, by good sufferance, to increase their own plague, have refused your majesty's mercies, and taken upon them wilful war and rebellion, I trust to be the instrument, under your majesty, to punish their breach of faith, and to compel the most obstinate of them to confess the greatness of your Highness.[736]

As 1574 began the 'obstinate' Irish and Scots had still not acknowledged Elizabeth's greatness and Essex worriedly writes that Ireland would 'assuredly grow to rebellion in most parts, if there be not good forces sent before April.'[737] In March, Essex was alerted to a meeting at Castle Tome between the Gaelic triumvirate,

> at the which Brian McPhelim hath delivered unto Tirlogh, for pledge, four of his principal followers, for assurance of his continuance in rebellion and cleaving unto him; he hath also (as I hear) enjoined him to find upon his create 500 Scots. I have intelligence by espial from Tirlogh, that he doth determine to entertain upon his own and neighbour's create 1600 Scots, which he prepareth to come over unto him about the middle of April. This doing of his made me to enter into consideration what were best to be done, and upon weighing thereof, finding that Tirlogh was the only head and principal maintainer of all the rebellion in Ulster, I thought it not best to forbear him

---

[732] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.39.
[733] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.46. An example of this were the 200 hired kerne whom Essex complains revolted on their first day, 'became followers to Brian, and turned their weapons gainst mine own company.' Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.42; *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 42, 55, p.525.
[734] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 43, 1, p.530; Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.43.
[735] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.46.
[736] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.45.
[737] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 44, 34, p.5.

any longer: I supposed that the sending of some force against him at this present, he being weak, was the likeliest way to bring him to yield, almost to what I would require of him. And having neither force upon the borders, nor knowing any means to get men to perform the same, I wrote to the Lord Deputy, and made him privy of Tirlogh's dealings: I laid before him a platt of a journey to be made into Tyrone.[738]

Unable to secure assistance for his 'journey' from Fitzwilliam, Essex again expresses doubts about the success of the enterprise, though for his own part claims 'I will not leave the enterprise as long as I have any foot of land in England unsold.'[739] In response, Elizabeth writes:

true it is that we were once resolved to have revoked you, in respect of the evil success that hitherto your enterprise hath had, and the adventurers abandoning you; yet now being loth to discourage your forward mind […] we are content to yield to your stay there until such time as we see what issue the enterprise will take.[740]

Elizabeth reveals her own frustrations with the enterprise when demanding that Essex, with assistance from Fitzwilliam:

proceed with all the force he can make against [Turlough Luineach] […] now that his cattle is weak, and before the Scots you advertise of repair unto him […] To the end now that this enterprize against Tirlogh Lenoghe may take the better effect, we would have you do your endeavour, upon notice given by our said Deputy when he shall be in readiness to invade him at the self same instant to employ all your forces to the expulsion of the Scots, and to reduce Brian McPhelim by force or by fair means to submit himself.[741]

Agreeing to pay for 600 footmen and 100 horsemen, Elizabeth expected Essex 'not only to expel the Scots, but also to reduce Clandeboye within a very short time to such state as the same may either be planted with English people'.[742] After another U-turn at the end of April, Essex is again instructed to treat with Turlough,[743] and in a letter to the Privy Council Essex recounts how the Irish chief refused to meet with him:

I thought it fit thereupon to send him word that if he did break with me I would invade his country: his answer was, he would not come at me, but desired peace for one month, hoping, indeed, of aid out of Scotland from James McDonnell's son who is since arrived with 600 Scots.[744]

---

[738] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.54.

[739] *CSP*, *Irel.*, *1509-1573*, 45, 7, p.11; Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p. 58.

[740] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.64. In the 'instructions for the Earl of Essex' enclosed with the above letter, Elizabeth endorses Essex's position by agreeing that 'Tirlogh Lenoghe is the only head and principal maintainer of all rebellion and disorder in Ulster, without whose expulsion or conformity that country can never be reduced to good order.' Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.66.

[741] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.66.

[742] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.64.

[743] *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland of the reign of Elizabeth, 1574-1585*, ed. Hans Claude Hamilton (London: Longman's, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1867), 45, 86, p.21.

[744] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.82-3.

The following night '200 horsemen and 600 Scots' led by Turlough launched a surprise attack on Essex's camp only to retreat when shot at.[745] Deprived of a conventional or satisfactory battle, Essex proceeded to 'spoil and burn' and attempted to recruit Irish chiefs including O'Donnell and O'Doherty to the English cause.[746]

Elizabeth had demanded two things of Essex: to expel the Scots and 'to reduce Brian McPhelim by force or by fair means'. In May, McPhelim was branded a traitor and with a 200 pound bounty on his head was left little choice but to again submit, whereupon he insisted that the pressure applied by his allies was the root of his rebellion.[747] McPhelim offered to rebuild Belfast for Elizabeth's use and combine with Essex for an assault upon the Scots,[748] but amidst the concord there occurred what Richard Bagwell calls: 'a unique act of treachery'.[749] After their covenant, Essex and his followers, including - according to the *Annals of the Four Masters* - Fitzwilliam, were invited to a feast in Belfast Castle (October 1574) where, in practically a repeat performance of Shane O'Neill's murder at the hands of the Scots, Essex and his men proceeded to slaughter the Irish there present.[750] Canny describes the murder of Brian McPhelim O'Neill as the 'most extreme action of the enterprise', and one that convinced Elizabeth and her advisors that 'the Gaelic-Irish were an unreasonable people, and that they, no less than the Scots intruders in Ulster, might be slaughtered by extra-legal methods.'[751]

Desperate times…

Michael Hill argues in *Fire and Sword* that McPhelim's murder 'far from being an act of desperation' was a 'calculated move designed to break up the Ulster allies and strike fear into the hearts of the minor Irish chieftains who had not yet taken sides.'[752] Clearly the English sought to divide the Gaels yet their actions are perhaps not as far from 'desperate' as Hill suggests. In Essex's case it is demonstrable. On the one hand the consistent shifts in

---

[745] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.83.
[746] Essex relayed Elizabeth's intention to 'expulse him [Turlough] by war', and reminded them that 'her highness did expect at their hands all their assistance and forces against this obstinate rebel', whereupon every chief except Con O'Donnell allegedly 'very frankly answered that it was their duty so to do'. Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.85.
[747] *CSP, Irel., 1574-1585, 46*, 12, p.23
[748] *CSP, Irel., 1574-1585,* 46, 12, p.23; Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp. 199-212, p.203.
[749] Bardon, *A History of Ulster*, p.83; Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors,* 2, p.289.
[750] The *Four Masters* record that 'peace, sociality, and friendship, were established between Brian […] and the Earl of Essex', and a feast was prepared by the former to which the Lord Justice and the chiefs of his people were invited. The English and Irish 'passed three nights and days together pleasantly and cheerfully. At the expiration of this time, however, as they were agreeably drinking and making merry, Brian, his brother, and his wife, were seized upon by the Earl, and all his people put unsparingly to the sword, men, women, youths, and maidens, in Brian's own presence. Brian was afterwards sent to Dublin, together with his wife and brother, where they were cut in quarters. Such was the end of their feast'.[750]
[751] Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland*, p.121.
[752] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.160.

English policy and their alternate wooing of Sorley, Turlough and Brian McPhelim implies a degree of flexibility, on the other hand it indicates inconsistency, confusion and ineffectiveness, which led inexorably to further desperate actions.

In his review of *The Age of Atrocity*, Maley queries the editors' declaration that their collection is 'about killing', and maintains that 'atrocity is more than a question of killing'; it is also a matter of 'vengeance'.[753] The slaughter of Brian O'Neill and his household, and the later Rathlin Island massacre are arguably acts of vengeance driven by Essex's personal anxieties and frustrations - themselves a consequence of native resistance and English bureaucracy - as evidenced by his letters.

An exchange of letters between Elizabeth, Essex and Fitzwilliam in May 1575 offers fascinating insights into both Essex's anxiety and the queen's persuasive rhetoric, and provides valuable background to the ensuing acts of violence conducted against the Scots. In the letters Essex is often critical of Elizabeth's decisions and her desire to bring the enterprise to an end. On 22 May, she informs Essex that

> having more just occasion of late to look inwardly into our estate at home, and finding great cause for us to forbear the prosecution of your enterprise, not for that we have any cause at all to mislike the same, or to doubt the likelihood of the good success thereof […] or should not be by you well executed […] we thought it very convenient […] to give you notice thereof, to the end you may, upon knowledge of the same, direct the course of your proceedings in such sort, as the enterprise may yet be so given over as our honour may best be salved.[754]

Elizabeth's discourse contrasts sharply with the bluntness of a letter she sent to Fitzwilliam, also on 22 May:

> We have thought good to forbear the prosecution of the enterprise for the reformation of Ulster, taken in hand by the earl of Essex. It is very expedient that the enterprise should be so broken off as thereby may grow no danger in the said province nor dishonour to the Earl. We have therefore willed him that, before this be commonly known, either by composition or otherwise he should so deal with Tirloghe Lenoghe and the rest of the heads of that province, that some good way may be devised for the stay of that part of the realm.[755]

Despite their differing tone, both letters reveal Elizabeth's shrewdness. In her letter to Essex (May 22), Elizabeth defends her lack of guidance on the practical difficulty of 'not seeing the true state of things there [Ulster]', adding 'we thought it most expedient to refer it to your own good consideration, and when you shall have so yourself thoroughly resolved on the course that you think best in your opinion to be taken.'[756] While ostensibly

---

[753] Maley, 'Something quite atrocious', p.85.
[754] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.105.
[755] *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, 1, ed. J. S. Brewer and William Bullen (London: Longmans, 1867-71), p.12.
[756] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.105.

passing the buck, Elizabeth's disinclination to offer counsel is couched in precise and highly suggestive language. Ostensibly advocating independent action she 'refers it' to Essex's 'own good consideration', a theme repeated in three successive clauses: 'you shall have so yourself thoroughly resolved on the course', 'you think best', and 'your opinion to be taken'. 'You' is employed five times and becomes a provocative refrain.

Leah S. Marcus writes that Elizabeth's default policy towards Ireland was one of 'benign neglect' (and to some extent Elizabeth's protection of her Irish subjects supports this), and though, as Marcus admits, Elizabeth did 'occasionally […] support efforts at plantation in Ireland' she considers it unfair to 'blame her for their failures'.[757] Though detached from the daily reality of colonial Ireland, Elizabeth could still influence the character of the conduct and actions of her colonists, especially Essex in whose project she had invested. In the letter of 22 May, Elizabeth instructs Essex to 'direct the course of your proceedings in such sort, as the enterprise may yet be so given over as our honour may best be salved', in effect exhorting one last effort from Essex, one last futile gesture.

Essex's immediate response was to write to the Privy Council: 'I must content myself to see the ruin of my work', he writes, 'but let it be so far off, as in the fall it crush me not, either in credit or otherwise.'[758] Of Fitzwilliam he lyrically remarks: 'I see he hath borne the part in the cool of the morning, and I began at noon, and must endure the heat of the day.'[759] He then accuses the Privy Council themselves 'of unkindness', reminding them that he had 'spent great sums in this service of Her Majesty and […] country', adding 'I have brought myself in debt […] I have sold my land, and have been encouraged to spend and spoil myself in an action which, as it now appears, was never intended to be performed'.[760] Essex's letter is a parting shot at the bureaucrats whom he believed had opposed him from the start. His parting shot at Ulster would be brutal. Unlike the Smiths, Essex judged the sword to be mightier than the pen.

Despite his disillusionment, Essex, as directed, intensified the pressure on the Gaels and began building fortifications in the strategic valley of Blackwater, including the construction of a stone bridge over the Bann.[761] In June, Turlough appealed to Essex to halt construction and despatched Lady Agnes to sue for peace.[762] By now Agnes's charm was wearing thin and Piers denounces her as 'a great practiser for the bringing of that part of

---

[757] Leah S. Marcus, 'Elizabeth on Ireland', in *Elizabeth I and Ireland*, eds.Brendan Kane and Valerie McGowan-Doyle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp.40-60, p.42.
[758] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.106.
[759] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.106.
[760] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.107.
[761] *CSP, Irel., 1574-1585,* 52, 32, p.71; *CSP, Irel., 1574-1585,* 52, 33, p.71; Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.162.
[762] *CSP, Irel., 1574-1585,* 52, 51, p.68-9; *CSP, Irel., 1574-1585,* 52, 44, p.72.

the realm [Ulster] to be Scottish.'[763] It was to the Scots that Essex next turned his attentions and on July 6 he marched

> towards Clandeboye, against such Scots and Irish as were confederated there, the chief captain of Clandeboye Neil McBrian Ertagh, sued for peace; declaring that though he were prepared to annoy me, and should therein have good assistance of Sorley boy and the Scots, yet he desired to be received in favour, and to take such portion of land as I would assign unto him […] This done, I marched through the woods to Massareen, where I was by my espials advertised that the Scot had left the Glinnes, and carried all his cattle to a strong fastness near the Bann, to which place I removed presently. Sorley was there […] they shewed themselves upon a hill, and were viewed and judged to be to the number of 900 and upwards.[764]

Some of the Scots attacked but found themselves trapped in a bog. Sorley attempted a rescue but pushed back by Essex's attack the Scot had no choice but to, in the words of Essex, 'retire himself to his fastness, leaving his men to the slaughter which he saw executed, so as I had presently twenty-one of their heads.'[765] The following morning Essex resumed his attack and though the Scots 'fought a while very valiantly' they soon retreated with heavy losses including Sorley's son.[766] In the ensuing days Essex scoured the woods for Sorley and his men 'but found not one Scot, nor any of this country birth, in the whole country of Clandeboye, the Rowte, and the Glinnes, that made resistance.'[767] Sorley later petitioned Essex for peace and the reclamation of confiscated land to which the Essex responds: 'having no commission to deal with him [Sorley], I forbear to do anything in that matter'.[768]

Following the murder of Brian O'Neill, the treaty with Turlough and the removal of Sorley from Clandeboye - which Essex had left 'desolate and without people' - Essex could be forgiving for assuming his task almost complete.[769] He asks Elizabeth to

> send your speedy resolution what you will have done with these parts. Your peace is universal with all Ulster, saving the Scots […] and the Irish late of Clandeboye, being all under McBrian Ertagh, are now limited, and in assurance of their portions […] will, I think, rather continue peace than break it […] they make no claim either to Clandeboye or the Ardes, both which countries seem now ready to receive such government as you will appoint, if the Scots do not return. But as the Scots cannot be expelled without buildings and strong garrisons for a time, so the charge thereof being misliked, it is convenient for your Majesty to determine what order you will take for the northern bands, and that your determination be speedily sent to me.[770]

---

[763] Hayes-McCoy, *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland*, p.106; *CSP, Irel., 1574-1585,* 52, 48, 19, p.73.
[764] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.109-110.
[765] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.109-110.
[766] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.110.
[767] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.111.
[768] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.112.
[769] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.112.
[770] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.112.

Note how on three occasions in the above passage Essex qualifies a success with a reference to the threat of the Scots. The third instance suggests that Essex's successes and the entire enterprise more generally are dependent on establishing fortifications and garrisons to prevent the Scots re-flooding the region, and having gained momentum forcing the Scots out of North Ulster, Essex was determined to drive them out of Ireland completely and back to the west of Scotland.

'Raighlens is the greatest enemy that Ireland hath'

Soon after the McPhelim massacre, Essex embarked on what Jonathon Bardon calls 'an act of equal barbarity' when he attacked Rathlin Island.[771] Like Croft, Sussex and Sidney before him, Essex believed that crushing the Scots on Rathlin would have considerably more impact than defeating them in any part of Ulster. An English conquest of Rathlin would cut the cord between the two countries and in his letters Essex cites his determination

> to lose no opportunity that might serve to the annoying of the Scots, against whom only I have now to make war […] Captain John Norreys, to whom I gave a secret charge, that having at Carrigfergus the three frigates, and wind and weather serving, to confer with the captains of them, and on the sudden to set out for the taking of the island of the Raghlins, with care in their absence to leave a sufficient guard for the keeping of the town of Carrigfergus; and when I had given this direction, to make the Scots less suspicious of any such matter pretended, I withdrew myself towards the Pale, and Captain Norreys with his company to Carrigfergus.[772]

They set out on July 20 and two days later landed at Arkill Bay on the east side of Rathlin where they were 'discovered by the island men, who had put themselves in readiness with all their force to make resistance.'[773] The Scots fought to prevent a landing but, as Essex reports, the English

> captains and soldiers did with valiant minds leap to land and charged them so hotly, as they drave them to retire with speed, chasing them to a castle which they had of very great strength; and at the first charge was slain only one solider. The Scots, being thus put into their fort, were presently environed with your Majesty's force.[774]

Trapped inside the fort for several days and bombarded with English ordnance[775] the Scots 'called for a parle […] and made large requests, as their lives, their goods, and to be put

---

[771] Bardon, *A History of Ulster*, p.84.
[772] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.113-4. Sir John Norris commanded ships bound for Rathlin and this strategy forced Sorley to choose between keeping his army on the mainland, out of the firing line, and rescuing the non-combatants made up of women and children on Rathlin. Sorley took the military option. Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.1.
[773] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.114.
[774] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.114.
[775] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.166.

into Scotland', requests which Captain Norris refused, 'offering them as slenderly as they did largely require'.[776] The most slender of conditions was no more than their lives and the Scots capitulated at dawn on 26 July whereupon, despite the conditions of surrender, the English murdered all the inhabitants of Rathlin.[777] In a letter to Elizabeth, Essex exploits the pretence of revenge to justify his extermination, describing it thus:

> the soldiers being moved and much stirred with the loss of their fellows that were slain, and desirous of revenge, made request, or rather pressed, to have the killing of them, which they did […] there were slain that came out of the castle of all sorts 200; and presently news is brought me out of Tyrone that they be occupied still in killing, and have slain that they have found hidden in caves and in the cliffs of the sea, to the number of 300 or 400 more. They had within the island 300 kine, 3000 sheep, and 100 stud mares, and of bear corn upon the ground there is sufficient to find 200 men for a whole year. When this was ended, captain Norreys, taking the advice of the rest of the captains, finding the place both strong and fit to be kept for the service of your Majesty, which no doubt will greatly annoy the Scots, besides the keeping them out of your highness's realm, hath appointed to leave a ward there of 80 soldiers […] until I shall understand your Majesty's farther pleasure […] The taking of this island upon the neck of the late service done upon the Scot, doth no doubt put him to his wit's end. There hath been also burned by your Majesty's frigates lately, eleven Scottish galleys, so as by sea and by land they have as little left as I can give them.[778]

On the same day, Essex dispassionately informs Walsingham of intelligence garnered from an informant regarding the slaughter of women and children on Rathlin and the reaction of Sorley Boy who from afar watched his wife, children and clan members being butchered:

> I do now understand this day by a spy coming from Sorley Boy's camp, that upon my late journey made against him he then put most of his plate, most of his children, and the children of most part of the gentlemen with him, and their wives, into the Raghlins, with all his pledges (hostages), which be all taken and executed, as the spy sayeth, and in all to the number of 600. Sorley then also stood upon the mainland of the Glynnes, and saw the taking of the island, and was likely to run mad for sorrow, tearing and tormenting himself, as the spy sayeth, and saying that he then lost all he ever had.[779]

While no less barbaric than the murder of Brian McPhelim and his household, the Rathlin Island massacre stands out as a particularly brutal and spiteful killing spree intended to wipe out an entire community. George Hill points out that 'in the number of his victims, if not in the deliberate atrocity of its execution, this massacre was very much more appalling than that of Glencoe.'[780] Ultimately it was a pointless and pitiless exercise that had little impact on the situation.

Having pressed for such extreme action and upon hearing of the massacre Elizabeth praises 'the taking of the island of the Raughlins, the common receipt and harbour of such

---

[776] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.115.
[777] Bardon, *A History of Ulster*, p.84.
[778] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, pp.115-117.
[779] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.185.
[780] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.185.

Scots as do infest that realm of Ireland', and thanks Essex for being 'so serviceable in a calling whereof we may, in time to come, take so great profit'.[781] She also takes time to credit 'the young gentleman John Norrice, the executioner of [Essex's] well devised enterprise'.[782] Essex informs Elizabeth that his men

> think themselves happy when they may have any occasion offered them that is to do your highness acceptable service; and as I have had sundry proofs of them, and lately in the service done against the Scots in the fastness, and this now done in the Raghlins, so do I find them full willing to follow it untill they shall have ended what your Majesty intendeth to have done.[783]

The editors of the *Calendar of Carew Papers* (1868) remark that though 'one might find fault with the Queen for applauding these actions […] she believed the first were rebels and the second to be alien intruders.'[784]

The Essex enterprise was abandoned in 1575, after which Essex retired to Dublin where attempting to reclaim his fortune he died from dysentery in September 1576.[785] Of Essex's death, Henry Sidney writes: 'here heard we first of the extreme and hopeless sickness of the Earl of Essex, by whom Sir Philip being often most lovingly and earnestly wished and written for, he with all the speed he could make went to him, but found him dead before his coming, in the castle at Dublin.'[786]

Ultimately the colonial schemes of the Smiths and Essex failed in their objectives and provoked an unwelcome and confounding collaboration between the Gaels, an increase in hostility towards the English colonisers, and a retaliatory rise in acts of violence against both combatants and non-combatants. The Earl of Essex, in particular, scaled new heights of brutality and rather than resolving and advancing English interests in Ulster the schemes only served to exacerbate the situation.

---

[781] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, pp.119-20.
[782] *Calendar of Carew*, p.119; Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors*, 2, p.302; Bardon, *A History of Ulster*, pp.8, 4.
[783] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.117.
[784] *Calendar of Carew*, p. 21.
[785] Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest*, p.91; In his *History of Ireland* (1814), Leland reports that Leicester was suspected of poisoning Essex, a suspicion aroused by his subsequent marriage to the recently widowed countess of Essex. Thomas Leland, *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II with a Preliminary Discourse on the Ancient State of that Kingdom*, 2 (Dublin: B. Smith, 1814), p.258. In his 'Observations on the late queen Elizabeth, her times, and favourites' (1641), Robert Naunton writes that Essex was poisoned by a fellow named Crampton (the yeoman of his bottles) and his secretary Lloyd, at the instigation of Leicester. Robert Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia or Observations on the late Queen Elizabeth, her times, and Favourites,* (1641) in *The Somer's Collection of Tracts*, 1, ed. Walter Scott (London: T. Cadell, 1809), pp.251-283, p.275. A poem called 'leisters ghost' makes the accusation and ends with the couplet:
He died with poison, as they say, infected,
Not without cause, for vengeance I suspected. Naunton, *Fragmenta Regalia*, p.275.
[786] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.90.

The Return of Sidney

In September 1575 with Dublin 'grievously infected' with the plague, Henry Sidney arrived to replace Fitzwilliam and according to Ciaran Brady, soon discovered that Essex had intensified Ulster politics and 'ushered in a new savagery in Irish warfare.'[787] Sidney's first task was to quell the recent disorder by the Scots whom he found to be 'verie hawtie and proud by reason of the late victories he hath against our men.'[788] Sidney tells of journeying through north Ulster where he met Sorley, 'then grown a strong man proud and stubborn', who two days after his arrival 'had defeated a company of footmen left there as parcel of the Earl of Essex's regiment, led by Captain John Norrey's.'[789]

The historical accounts of Sidney's final term as Lord Deputy, as described in O'Donovan's edition of the of the *Annals of the Four Masters* (1848–51) and Ware's *Annals of Ireland* (1705), are worth reflecting on in comparison to Sidney's own account. The *Four Masters* favourably describes Sidney as 'a knight by title, nobleness, deed, and valour', and recounts how finding Ulster in chaos, Sidney 'established peace, friendship, and charity […] throughout every part of Ulster'.[790] Ware recounts how 'Sir Henry Sidney March'd with 600 Horse and Foot, and speedily brought Surleboy to terms of Agreement and submission […] soon after Turlough Lynough himself, came and Submitted, and was permitted to return Home.'[791] What these accounts neglect to comment on is by what means Sidney 'established peace', and England's broader political agenda.

As Michael Hill notes, Sidney's 'strategic goal - the pacification of Gaelic Ulster - differed little from his predecessor's', but Sidney pursued 'less heavy-handed methods' than Essex.[792] Sidney was essentially fire-fighting, snuffing out the conflagration the campaigns of Smith and particularly Essex had ignited. By his own admission Sidney had insufficient forces to combat the Scots and he complains to the Privy Council 'that either to daunt them, or banish them totally, for annoying those parts, that force is too little, that I am able to maintain.'[793] The only way to solve the immediate problem was to grant concessions to both the Irish and the Scots and as Hill points out, Sidney went as far as to exhume the policy of surrender and regrant and suggested peerages for the Gaels.[794] Sidney admits in his memoir that he

---

[787] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.82; Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.167
[788] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.155; cited in Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.171.
[789] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.82.
[790] *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters,* pp.163, 161.
[791] Ware, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p.18.
[792] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.169.
[793] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.155; cited in Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.171.
[794] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.169. E. W. Lynam remarks that 'Sidney's third period of office opened with peace s and pardons'. E. W. Lynam, 'Sir Henry Sidney', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 2, 7 (1913), pp.185-20

was not in very good case to make war with the Scot at that time, and finding him desirous of peace, and largely offering to hold the Glens and Route of the Queen by rent and service; and for that I was not well assured of Turlo Lenough, who was then also grown proud and strong; I was content for some time to temporise with the Scots, and made as sure covenants as I could with him for observation of the peace, which in truth he observed as long as I was there.[795]

In November 1575, Sidney travelled the country compiling a report on the state of Ulster and witnessed first-hand the failure of the Smith and Essex schemes to successfully or even adequately plant Ulster.[796] Brady claims Sidney was 'unambiguously hostile' towards the 'violent and intempestyne proceeding of the earl of Essex';[797] however, Morgan notes that despite the carnage of his campaign, by mid-1575 Essex had initiated peace agreements with Turlough and the captains of south Clandeboye.[798] Sidney renewed the peace agreement and after meeting Turlough and Lady Agnes writes that they

> desired to be nobilitated […] and to hold his lands of the queen by rent and service. The Scots sent their agents to me, craving that they might enjoy the land they occupied, and to yield rent and service for it. And the lady, Turlo's wife, as earnestly suing that she might have the same lands assured to her children.[799]

Sidney was less complimentary about Essex's fortifications at Blackwater, which remained unfinished. He describes Clandeboye as 'utterly disinhabited' and Rathlin Island as 'veri easy to be wonne at any tyme but very chardgious and hard to be held'.[800] Essex had ensconced 40 men on the island to guard against the Scots returning but Sidney immediately rescinded Essex's order, informing the crown that

> the forte of the Raghlins I cawsed to be abandoned […] for that I saw little purpose for the present to keepe it; so small commoditie at so great a charge to her majestie, being a place so difficult to be victualled; they within the Piece having no fresh water to relieve them […] the soldiers I cawsed to be brought hence, being 40 in number; they confessed that in this small tyme of their continuance there, they were driven to kill their horses and eat them, and to fed on them, and young coltes' flesh.[801]

The explanation offered by Sidney for the de-militarisation of Rathlin, namely the deprivation of the men, is at odds with the historical evidence. The reality is that by late 1575 Sidney had little choice but to 'negotiate […] a temporary cessation of hostilities'

3, p.196.
[795] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.82.
[796] Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture', p.267.
[797] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, pp.13, 60;
[798] Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture', p.267. Sidney even remarks that 'the plot my lord of Essex set down for the reformation of that province, to reduce the subject to obedience and her majesty to have profit of her own, was the true plot and best way indeed.' Cited in Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp. 199-212, p.211; Queen to Sir Henry Sidney, 22 July, 1567, *Sidney State Papers*, I. p.78.
[799] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, p.83.
[800] Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Tudors,* 2, p.305); Bardon, *A History of Ulster*, p.85.
[801] Cited in Hill, *An Historical Account* , p.156; cited in Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.171.

with the Scots.[802] Sidney claims Sorley 'humbly and very earnestly desired to have again the island of Raghlyns […] wherein the Earl of Essex had in the time of his general enterprise planted a garrison', an acceptable expenditure during the enterprise but 'it ceasing, to none at all but a great charge, needless and loss', Sidney opted to disband the garrison.[803]

Sidney believed that successful plantation was possible but that the wrong personal had been employed.[804] Criticising the strategy of commissioning independently financed schemes, Sidney concludes that plantation is 'no subject's enterprise, a prince's purse and power must do it',[805] and offers Elizabeth a choice between conciliation and conquest: if she pursued a policy of 'forceable subjection' then success depended on it being 'maintained by treasure and force,' and 'the people kept in obedience by violence and compulsion.'[806] If enacting these policies was considered too exacting on the state's resources then Elizabeth would have to stomach the Irish and the Scots. Elizabeth chose the latter option and left Sidney little choice but to ease the burden on English finances by setting the Gaels against one another. He writes:

> Thus leaving all things in the north in good quiet, and yet left such a pick between Turlo and Sorley as within one month after, Turlo (with the aid of some Englishmen whom I suffered him to hire) killed a great number of the best of Sorley's men, and his best and eldest son, to the great weakening of the Scots […] I wrote of my proceeding with Turlo and the Scots, for Turlo he was thought to base to receive such nobilitation; for the Scots it was deemed too dangerous a course to grant them plantation in Ireland; but yet I thank God I satisfied them, and kept that country in quiet as long as I tarried there.[807]

Conclusion

In *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland*, Nicholas Canny claims that the colonial schemes of the second half of the sixteenth century demonstrates that the 'English were slowly groping towards an efficient method of colonisation'.[808] Canny's assessment implies however that the militarism of the 1550s, the surge in colonial proposals during the 1560s, and the violent plantation projects of the 1570s, are the actions of a government edging, however uncertainly, towards imperial competency. While it is tempting to assume that the English pursued the most efficient means to conquer Ireland can we accurately or appropriately describe their often ruthless and violent measures, not to mention their

---

[802] Hill, *Fire and Sword*, p.171.
[803] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, pp.82-3.
[804] Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest*, p.91.
[805] Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest*, p.91.
[806] Cited in Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes', pp. 199-212, p.211.
[807] Brady, *A Viceroy's Vindication?*, pp.83-4.
[808] Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest*, p.90.

guiding ideologies, as 'groping'? Jane Dawson argues that the English administration in Ireland never completely surmounted their struggles, adding that 'it was easiest to ignore them or gloss over the difficulties, especially in the semi-fantasy world of proposals to subdue Ireland, which jostled for royal approval in the English court.'[809] These proposals reveal English politics to be opportunistic and xenophobic, and their ideology tuned to the literature and imperial 'achievements' of the Roman Empire.

The continual swings in policy and the commissioning of inadequately supported, overly-aggressive and ultimately futile plantation schemes support the proposition that England never really solved its northern Irish quandary, which ultimately required the involvement of a Scottish king. The English administrators and especially the so-called gentleman adventurers do indeed appear enthralled by a 'semi-fantasy world' in which they would subdue the Irish, turn them into subjects/slave labourers, expel the Scots, and then replenish barren areas of Ulster with Englishmen. It is evident from the literature that one of principal impediments to England making their fantasy a reality was the presence of the Gaelic Scots, who are therefore fundamental to forming a comprehensive interpretation of England's early imperialism in Ireland. In addition, the manner in which the Scots affected colonial policy there may well have influenced England's later colonial policies overseas, as well as an emerging multifaceted and literary colonial discourse. Furthermore, given their prominent position in Irish politics, the Scottish experience, like that of the Irish, ought to be viewed against the backdrop of England's adoption of Classical and Republican concepts and values vis-à-vis the conquering and governing of other countries.

Prior to their eventual success in the Third Punic War, the Romans had experienced a devastating and humiliating defeat at the Battle of Cannae (216 BC) during the second (leading to Cato's infamous words), and their revenge was total: Carthage was destroyed and its population enslaved. In Ireland, England too experienced defeat and humiliation but, and this is especially true of Ulster, never experienced ultimate victory as the Roman's had over the Carthaginians. In Ulster at least, England fell short in its attempt to emulate Rome's success.[810] Whether in collaboration or in competition the Gaels offered resistance. It may be the case that Gaelic tensions, often engineered by the English, confounded the situation and ultimately hindered rather than helped England.

The literature examined suggests that the violence perpetrated by the English on the Scots satisfies the conditions of atrocity and genocide as proposed in *The Age of Atrocity*:

---

[809] Dawson, *The Politics of Religion*, p.200.
[810] This did not prevent Sir James Perrot in his *Chronicle of Ireland, 1584-1608* from asserting that in its imperial and colonial achievements and 'other heroicall enterprises', England have 'exceeded most nations synce the decay of the most incomparable Romane Empier.' Perrot, *The Chronicle of Ireland*, p.4.

including murder, 'summary executions', 'famine inducement', dismemberment and the 'mass slaughter of unarmed civilians' (including women and children). The extermination of women and children on masse during Essex's premeditated attack on Rathlin (and the later summary executions of prisoners by Captain Norris), Sussex's assault on the Western Isles of Scotland and the murder of unarmed civilians in Kintyre and Arran in September 1556, surely qualify as atrocities. Such crimes comfortably fall within the classification of 'state-sponsored or tolerated violence': violence against individuals or groups motivated by 'social, ethnic, economic and political goals'.[811] Take for instance John Smith's recommendation (in his 'Advice') that the Scots be starved out of Ulster. At its core this is a question of economics, evidenced by Smith's description of the region as a 'commodyte'. Just as colonial Ireland is now considered within the history of European and world genocide, so should the Gaelic Scots, who played a critical role in generating the conditions that the English Crown deemed necessary to reverse by means of extreme violence.

Was there a 'Northern League'?

In 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland', Martin MacGregor questions the validity of describing the Gaels during the sixteenth century as united and in this section I would like to quickly address this issue based on the evidence from English sources.[812] Many texts provide ample evidence of collaboration; the marriages between the O'Neills, MacDonnells and O'Donnells demonstrate a willingness to unite, while the machinations of Sorley Boy MacDonnell and Turlough O'Neill reveal a mutual interest in deceiving and defeating the English; however, there are just as many inter-Gaelic instances of conflict, conspiracy and violence.

Ulster and the Highlands and Islands share deep cultural, historical and linguistic roots; 'nevertheless', writes MacGregor, 'such linguistic and ethnic fellow-feeling did not a unitary Gaelic polity, far less a sovereignty, make.'[813] MacGregor states that 'even before the Reformation added a confessional divide, major distinctions existed between Gaelic Scotland and Ireland in various spheres, not excepting areas of presumed uniformity such as language and culture.'[814] It may have been the 'confessional divide' or the 'major distinctions' that led the English to believe they could play one Gael off against the other.

---

[811] Hinton, 'The Dark Side of Modernity', p.6.
[812] MacGregor, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland', p.39.
[813] MacGregor, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland', p.39.
[814] MacGregor, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland', p.39.

Vice-Chamberlain Knollys's suggestion that they should offer the MacDonnells Turlough's 'freehold […] on condition that they expel him and take it themselves' is just one of numerous examples.[815] Similarly, there is little Gaelic unity to be found in in the actions of Shane O'Neill or their individual negotiations with the English: at various times Turlough (who was being 'eaten out' by the redshanks),[816] Sorley Boy (who attempted to become a denizen of England), and Brian McPhelim O'Neill ('seemeth very desirous to draw blood upon the Scots'), negotiated with the English and nearly always to the disadvantage of the other.[817]

For centuries Irish chiefs had employed Scottish mercenaries to assist them in their regional squabbles but 'by the later sixteenth century the yoke of constant billeting by Scottish mercenaries can have left […] little room for pan-Gaelic sentiment among the tenantry of Ulster.'[818] Above all the clans looked after themselves but were not opposed to cooperating against their mutual adversary, England, whose erratic and often frantic negotiations with the Gaels infer that not only was there a measure of authentic Gaelic unity, but that it presented a very serious threat to England's imperial ambitions. The extent of Gaelic unanimity is perhaps measurable by the number of plantation proposals and commissions during this period, two of which were vast in scale and impact. Essex's enterprise, for example, is said to have 're-invigorated' the waning 'northern league'.[819] The persistence of the Gaels in the face of such powerful forces is sufficient evidence that while there was never complete unity, and never enough to oust the English, there was more than enough to hinder them.

The Union of Crowns

The Union of Crowns (1603) is a seminal moment in the story of the Scots in Ulster, both from the perspective of the existing Gaelic Scottish communities and those from lowland Scotland who became the Ulster-Scots. As someone with experience dealing with 'barbarous' Gaels, James VI and I believed that he 'understood Ireland better than the English government', and was more favourably placed than Elizabeth I to deal with Ulster.[820] James's solution involved the coupling of the Scots and English in a common aim, a 'British' plantation. This strategy, which would have been an anathema to the Tudor

[815] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 21, 56, p.34.
[816] *CSP, Irel., 1509-1573*, 29, 86, p.424.
[817] Devereux, *Lives and Letters*, p.35.
[818] MacGregor, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland', p.39.
[819] Hill, *An Historical Account*, p.152.
[820] Jenny Wormald, 'The British crown, the earls and the plantation of Ulster', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, pp.18-23, p.20; James VI and I, *Basilicon Doron*, pp.24-25.

monarchy, obliged a legal, social and cultural U-turn and after James repealed the laws against Scots migrating to Ulster not only was it legally permissible for them to settle in Ireland they were actively encouraged, assuming they were the *right* Scots.

Though James regarded the Scots 'that dwelleth in our maine land' as 'barbarous for the most parte' though 'mixed with some civilitie', he deemed 'the other, that dwelleth in the Iles' as 'utterly barbarous, without any sort or shewe of civilitie'.[821] Accordingly, the 'Conditions' for the plantation stipulate that only 'inland Scots' be allowed to plant.[822] The exclusion of the Gaels was merely an extension of the anti-Gaelic policy employed by the Scottish Crown before and during the reign of James VI - comparable in many regards with London's attempts to conquer the Gaels in Ulster, both Irish and Scottish - that viewed the Highlands as a far-flung, semiautonomous threat, though economically and culturally backward. The plantation of Lewis, Lochaber and Kintyre in 1597, 1605 and 1607 were designed, much like those in Ulster, to 'break the power of the island families and bring civility, modernity and trade to these marginal lands'.[823] Whether due to a lack of success or a shift in strategy, James abandoned his plans for Highland plantations and set his sights on Ulster. The Hebridean plantations however were ideal preparation for the Plantation of Ulster, which offered a twofold opportunity to finally pacify Ulster and nullify the Gaelic Scots.

The prohibiting of Gaelic Scots from the 'British' plantations did not signal their end in Ulster. The MacDonnells remained largely unmolested and under the new regime they provided a 'buffer zone' between the lowland Scottish, English and Welsh colonisers and the remaining Gaelic territories of mid and west Ulster.[824] In 'The Origins of the Scottish Plantations in Ulster to 1625: A Reinterpretation' (1993), Michael Hill proposes that the 1609 plantation has been 'either misrepresented or misunderstood' and reassesses whether the Scoto-Irish were 'predominantly Celtic or non-Celtic ethnically and culturally?' Hill suggests that this ethnic dualism is based on traditional and simplistic views of 'lowlanders' as non-Celts and 'highlanders as Celtic Scots', when in fact it is much more complicated than this.[825]

---

[821] James VI and I, *Basilicon Doron*, p.24.
[822] *Conditions to be observed by the British undertakers of the escheated lands in Ulster* (London, 1610), 5; Colin Kidd, *British Identities before Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p.125.
[823] Colin Breen, 'Randal MacDonnell and early seventeenth-century settlement in northeast Ulster, 1603-30', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, pp.143-158, p.149; Raymond Gillespie, 'Success and failure in the Ulster Plantation', *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, pp.98-119, p.100.
[824] Breen, 'Randal Macdonell', pp.144, 150.
[825] J. Michael Hill, 'The Origins of the Scottish Plantations in Ulster to 1625: A Reinterpretation', *Journal of British Studies*, 32, 1 (1993), pp.24-43, pp.24-25.

It is one of the ironies of archipelagic history that a Scottish king realised the English vision of the pacification of Ulster. It may be that only a Scottish monarch could have achieved it. James VI and I initiated a programme of social engineering by planting the first seeds of British identity, and though largely successful this new identity never fully succeeded in eliminating Gaelic identity, nor Celtic identity as it became more recognisably known in opposition to Britishness throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, most notably the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745.

Further research

Time and word-count prohibit further research between 1576 and 1603 but this period would equally repay similar scrutiny. Several texts are worth a passing mention. 'Lord Chancellor Gerrard's Notes of His Report on Ireland' (1577-8) captures a relatively calm period in Ulster and details Turlough O'Neill's submission to Elizabeth and readiness to serve against the Scots. Such is the importance of Agnes Campbell-O'Neill to the rapprochement that Gerrard suggests 'that some olde caste gowne might be sent from the Queen's Mjestie unto her'.[826] The literature relating to the period of Sir John Perrot's Deputyship of Ireland (1584-88) tells a much different story. *The Government of Ireland Under the Honorable, Just and Wise Governor Sir John Perrott* [...] *Beginning 1584, and ending 1588*, contains several pieces of Perrot's writing including his 'Opinion for the suppressing of rebellion, and the well Governing of Ireland [...] 1582', which includes 15 articles for the improvement of Ireland. Number 8 suggests that if Elizabeth

> doe not thinke it good, utterly to destroy the Irish scots, that doe continually inuade your good Subjects, and ayde the Rebellions against your Highnesse: that it were well your Majesty did graunt to the Earle of Arguile an yearely Pention for a time, to the end he should restraine them from coming ouer into England. [827]

(Argyll's renowned artfulness seems to be hinted at in the spelling of his name, 'Ar<u>guile</u>'.) Believed to be written by the illegitimate son of Sir John Perrot, Sir James Perrot's *The Chronicle of Ireland, 1584-1608*[828] is organised in four parts, the last of which recounts 'the reduction of [Ireland] then to obedience', the 'departure of Tyrone with his

---

[826] Lord Chancellor Gerrard's Notes of His Report on Ireland, with Extracts from Original Irish Records exhibited by him before the Privy Council in England, 1577-8, *Analecta Hibernica*, 2 (1931), pp.93-291, pp.110-111.

[827] John Perrot, 'Opinion for the suppressing of rebellion', in *The Government of Ireland Under the Honorable, Just and Wise Governor Sir John Perrott, Knight, one of the Privy Councell to Queene Elizabeth, Beginning 1584, and ending 1588* (London: Thomas Walkley, 1626).

[828] James Perrot, *The Chronicle of Ireland, 1584-1608*, ed. Herbert Wood (Dublin: Stationery Office, 1933), pp.v-vi. Perrot's *Chronicle* covers the government of Sir John Perrot, William Russell, 1594-1597, Thomas Burgh (1597) and Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex (1599), Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy (1600-1603) and Sir George Cary (1603-1604).

complices', the 'plantation of Ulster thereupon with English and Scottish men in thrice yere after', and the 'settlement of the contrie in peace sithence, as it now standes'.[829] Perrot's *Chronicle* contains many of the same details as John Perrot's 'Opinion for the suppressing of rebellion', particularly those relating to the threat of rebellion and invasion from combined Gaelic forces guided by Sorley Boy.[830]

Henry Bagenal's 'Description and Present State of Ulster' (1586) is essentially a list of the troublesome regions in Ulster and the negative impact of the Scots therein. Dufferin for example is 'usurped and inhabited for the most parte, by a bastard sorte of Scottes […] which lyve most upon the praie and spoile of their neighbours.'[831] William Farmer's *Chronicles of Ireland, 1594 to 1613*, ranges from William Russell's deputyship to the end of Baron Mountjoy's, and provides a fascinating account of the immediate and contrasting reactions to James VI's succession to the English throne.[832]

Conclusion

This thesis draws attention to three significant but largely neglected episodes from the interrelated histories of Scotland, Ireland and England, through a consideration of the writing generated by them. Chapter one, 'Robert Bruce and the Last King of Ireland: Writing the Irish Invasion, 1315-1826', is the most detailed analysis of the literary representations of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland. Divided into two parts, the focus was on one event, the Bruce's Irish campaign between 1315 and 1318. The overall chapter however traversed the political landscape of the early fourteenth, late sixteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Part one, 'Barbour's (other) *Bruce*', presented an alternative view of Barbour's poem, perceived through the lens of its Irish material. It examined the background to the Bruce campaign, the existing Irish-Scottish relationship, Scotland's conflict with England, and the political and cultural conditions in Scotland at the time of the poems production. Next, the historic relationship between Robert and Edward Bruce was compared with Barbour's portrayal, and it was argued that the disproportionately negative picture of Edward was undertaken with Robert I's legacy in mind. The *Bruce*'s major themes including chivalry, heroism, and freedom were then considered from an

---

[829] Perrot, *The Chronicle of Ireland*, p.1.

[830] Harking back to Croft's disastrous assault on Rathlin in 1551, Perrot's *Chronicle* explains that after forcing Sorley to retreat to Rathlin, John Perrot was unable to pursue due to 'a vehement storme that aroase sodaynly and dangerously with which the waters grew greate and the passages difficult.' Perrot, *The Chronicle of Ireland*, pp.23, 32.

[831] 'Marshal Bagenal's Description of Ulster, 1586', p.153.

[832] William Farmer's *Chronicles of Ireland*, C. Litton Falkiner, *The English Historical Review*, 22, 87 (1907), pp.527-552, pp.531-535.

ideological standpoint, while the concluding section examined Barbour's treatment of the native Irish and made a case for interpreting their 'traitorous' actions as insurrectionary.

Part one sought to redress the lack of literary criticism on the *Bruce*'s Irish section, and the reductive character of early, and some contemporary, *Bruce* criticism. Some of which, I believe, further the mythology of Robert Bruce and Bannockburn to the disadvantage of 'lesser' figures and events like Edward Bruce and the invasion. Though indelibly linked with the Irish campaign, outside of historians, Edward Bruce is largely unknown. This is despite being a key political and military figure, the leader of an invasion and occupation of a neighbouring country, at one stage next in line to the Scottish throne, and the last king of Ireland. I propose that Edward's relegation from popular Scottish history rests upon his defeat, Barbour's partisan representation, and a general cultural aversion towards problematic historical events, in this case the Irish invasion. Highlighting the three year campaign inevitably exposes - or should expose – the Bruces to accusations of warmongering, and Barbour of jingoism. It was argued that Barbour's task was to distort the depth of Robert Bruce's involvement but the poem nonetheless implicates him in all aspects of the campaign. The nakedness of Barbour's partisan project, the social and political conditions in which it was composed, the somewhat incoherent portrayal of Edward, the veneration of Robert, and the structural intrusion and thematic incongruity of the invasion section itself - awkwardly inserted after Bannockburn - point to a striking dissonance within the poem's broader themes.

Robert Bruce's decision to invade and occupy parts of Ireland almost immediately after 'liberating' Scotland from English oppression, calls several of the *Bruce*'s hallowed themes into question. Concepts upon which Scotland's sense of identity and stereotypical reputation rests. To evaluate the historical invasion and Barbour's fictive account critically and unsentimentally is a form of self-examination and possible self-incrimination that most countries rarely indulge in. The septecentenary of the invasion however affords us the opportunity to reassess it, along with Robert and Edward Bruce's role, and Barbour's depiction.

Part two, 'Cultural Memories of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, 1375-1826', traced the literary memory of the invasion from Barbour's *Bruce* to Edmund Spenser's *A View of the State of Ireland*, to William Hamilton Drummond's *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland*, and positioned each writer and text in their prevailing memory paradigm. The *Bruce* was examined for features analogous to the principles and techniques of *ars memoriae*, and compared with Icelandic literature of the same period. The function of memory in the construction and stabilising of national history and therefore identity was examined along

with its dependence on heroes. Emblematic cultural memory concerns such as canonisation, memory and narration, reception, intertextuality, and forgetting were also discussed with reference to the *Bruce*. It was further suggested that Barbour's depiction of the invasion has considerable bearing on how the invasion was and continues to be remembered, or not, as the case may be. The memory of the invasion in *A View of the State of Ireland* was linked to contemporary Ulster politics and English policies in the region against the Gaelic Scots. Like Barbour, Spenser is concerned with memory, national identity, and the tense relationship between history and narrative; moreover, both authors draw upon a period when Scots obstructed England's conquest of Ireland. In addition to offering a an Irish counter-memory of the invasion, Drummond's *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland*, I believe, speaks to nineteenth-century Irish and British politics, as well as the spiky Celtic debate surrounding Macpherson's publication of his Ossian fragments.

'Cultural Memories of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, 1375-1826', breaks new ground in several respects: it is the first analysis of the literary memory of the invasion, and the first time *The Bruce* has been assessed from the perspective of *ars memoriae* and present-day cultural memory theories. It is, as far as I know, the first to compare *The Bruce* with the memorial practices of other northern European writers and nationalist/patriotic poetry. The exploratory nature of the study offers the opportunity for further research on the *Bruce*, not just in terms of construction and transmission, but its thematic links with contemporary northern European historiographical poetry. To this end I hope my efforts have loosened the ground for others to dig deeper.

The contextual analysis of Drummond's *Invasion* is also innovative, and the first to interpret the poem in respect of the Ossian controversy and the political and constitutional change taking place in Ireland in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It is the first to identify the importance of cultural memory to Drummond's poetry, and the first to assert the possibility that Drummond's *Invasion* is a counter-memorial response to Barbour's version of events, in addition to an allegorical response to both contemporary British politics *and* the Ossian controversy. Like the *Bruce*'s Irish invasion section, and the historical invasion generally, Drummond's *Invasion* is little discussed, but would assuredly reward attention. As would the complex and occasionally hostile relationship between Irish and Scottish cultural figures in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[833]

---

[833] A comparative analysis of Drummond's *The Giant's Causeway*, *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland*, and Thomas Beggs's *Rathlin* (1820) would undoubtedly generate interesting research. Above and beyond its obvious contribution to Ireland's cultural revival, *The Giant's Causeway* points to both a concrete and ancient connection with Scotland but it also points, geologically speaking, to a rupture between the countries, and could be read as an oblique companion piece to *Bruce's Invasion*.

Despite its general inconspicuousness, Drummond's *Invasion* is likely to generate some research during the next few years (in light of the 700th anniversary of the Bruce campaign); however, it is worth speculating why up till now there has been so little interest. This is especially perplexing bearing in mind the recent rise of Irish and Scottish and Ulster-Scots studies. Might Drummond's poem have been relegated due to its awkward subject matter? 2015 marked the anniversary of the Bruce campaign in Ireland, but it was also the 250th anniversary of Macpherson's Ossian fragments. I submit that it is time to extend Ossian criticism to include Drummond's complex and revealing work.

Chapter three, 'The Scots in Ulster: Policies, Proposals and Projects, 1551-1575', examined English administrative and colonial literature during twenty-four years in Ulster. This crucial but under-researched dynamic between London, Dublin and the Gaelic Scots is essential for a comprehensive understanding of Irish colonialism, early Anglo-British imperialism, the 1609 Ulster plantation, and the fragmentation of Gaeldom. The section entitled 'Noisy neighbours, 1551-1567' focused on administrative literature and life-writing relating to the deputyships of Sir James Croft, Sir Thomas Radcliffe, and Sir Henry Sidney, and their struggles with the MacDonnells and Shane O'Neill. Section two, 'Devices, Advices, and Descriptions, 1567-1575', dealt with the increasingly more complex relationship between the Scots, the English and Shane O'Neill's successor, Turlough O'Neill. Less openly hostile to the Scots, Turlough's marriage to the hugely influential (but now forgotten) Agnes Campbell strengthened the most significant Gaelic coalition since the Bruce invasion. The politically motivated marriages were strongly influenced by the 5th Earl of Argyll, whose support for the Gaels, on top of the rise of Sorley Boy MacDonnell, hindered Elizabeth's conquest of Ireland and spawned numerous plantation proposals for Ulster during this period.

Chapter two also highlighted Sir Henry Sidney's numerous experiences with the Scots, which when added to his Irish and Welsh connections confirm him as a highly significant colonial figure. Certain texts were inspected from a purely Scottish perspective and found to be excessively concerned with the Scots, or in the case of John Smith's 'Advice', wholly occupied. The Smith's colonial 'project' and *A Letter from I. B. Gentleman* (1571) were similarly assessed, revealing connections between the Gaelic Scots and the Smiths' pre-and-post-plantation strategies. The 'enterprise' of the Earl of Essex in 1575 was explored through Essex's correspondences, which attest to the strategic importance of the Scots in both planning and implementation.

The overarching ambition of chapter two was to demonstrate the prominence of the Gaelic Scots in English and Anglo-Irish colonial literature, and their considerable impact

on the growth of plantation proposals and projects during the 1560s and 1570s. Within the substantial corpus of historical and literary analysis on Elizabethan Ireland the Scots are too often included (when they are included) as support players when in fact they are among the leads. Numerous historians and literary scholars identify Ireland between 1550 and 1580 as the origin of English colonialism, as well as Jacobean Anglo-British plantation and imperialism. If this is accurate, which I believe it is, the Scots must be more fully integrated into the debate. An upcoming publication entitled *The Scots in Early Stuart Ireland* (2015), edited by David Edwards and Simon Egan, covers the period 1603-1650 and demonstrates not only an evolving interest in the Scots in Ireland but the topicality of this thesis, especially the third chapter, in addition to the importance of the literature gathered and examined. To some extent this thesis is a partial prequel to Edwards and Egan's collection.

I contend that the Scots to some extent shaped England's broader colonial/imperial ideology and strategy, but also its colonial literature. The colonial 'project' of Sir Thomas Smith and son and their influential pamphlet *A Letter from I. B. Gentleman* (1571) are recognised as advancing England's colonial ideology and complementary literature but its Scottish context has been, until this study, neglected. The same could be said of Essex's enterprise and his Irish correspondence. Though undoubtedly inhibited by administrative restraints and antagonistic officials, the fundamental impediment to Essex's success was Gaelic resistance. The 'enterprise' in general, as the correspondence shows, was unquestionably targeted at the Scots. As yet there has been no comprehensive analysis of Essex's Irish correspondence within Anglo-Irish studies or colonial studies. Essex's letters however are a uniquely rich repository for identifying the problems and pressures faced by English colonists. Essex's letters smack of frustration and reveal a man simmering with resentment who, with encouragement from Elizabeth I, vented his frustration with an act of atrocity against the Gaelic Scots (like Croft and Sussex before him) on Rathlin Island.

As stated at the outset, the impulse, curiosity, perspective, choice of topics and literature, which brought about and make up this study were gently influenced rather than steered by radical historicist criticism. It is for the reader to decide how 'radical' this research is; though for me it is not radical enough, but is, at present, the best I could do. Within late-medieval and early modern Scottish literary studies, however, this thesis may appear more radical given the field's seeming aversion to theory and its largely conventional and often national concerns. At the very least this study views familiar literary texts (*The Bruce* and *Bruce's Invasion*) and narrations (sixteenth century colonial Ulster) from unfamiliar perspectives, with the intention of (in the words of Kiernan Ryan)

'activating the dissident potential of past texts in order to challenge the present conservative consensus inside the educational institutions where it is forged.'[834]

Chapter one (part one) views Barbour's embracing of the period's cultural romance with war, battlefield violence and heroism, as ideologically motivated and aimed at securing favourable and durable historical status for Robert I and succeeding Bruces. So deferential is Barbour to the dominant interests of feudal Scotland, its ideology and symbols, that *The Bruce* can justifiably be interpreted as a 'vehicle of the values which underpin the status quo'.[835] It is my opinion that the *Bruce*'s material roots challenge, or at any rate complicates its historical and on-going reception, as well as its effect. This applies most directly to two of Scotland's most powerful symbols, Robert Bruce and Bannockburn. Robert Crawford asserts that the continuity of literary imaginings of Bannockburn and its refrain of independence demonstrates that the seven-hundred year old event can still affect present-day identity, culture and politics, and work to 'unsettle the status quo'.[836] The stated continuing cultural relevance of 'Bannockburn' notwithstanding, I have argued that the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, in both historic and literary form, casts doubt on the authenticity of the values and meanings first established by Barbour, which have continued to coalesce around Bruce and Bannockburn ever since.

Kiernan Ryan writes that the aim of historicist literary criticism should be to 'dethrone and demystify the privileged work: to destroy its immunity to infection by circumstance and other kinds of text, and to rob it of political innocence by exposing its discrete commitments, its subtle collusions in the cultural struggle for power'.[837] *The Bruce*, I believe, like many literary texts betrays its conservative intent to contain such struggles, and the task of the materialist critic is to 'expose the guilty political unconscious of the text' by bringing peripheral narratives and voices to the surface.[838] The Irish invasion episode is the *Bruce*'s guilty secret, and also Scotland's. According to Alan Sinfield, 'Stories comprise within themselves the ghosts of the alternative stories they are trying to exclude'.[839] In *Bruce's Invasion*, Drummond, I believe, releases Barbour's ghosts in order to exorcise Ireland's contemporary demons. Drummond constructs a radically new version of the Bruces' Irish campaign from Barbour's original structure, which ironically, I argue, it was meant to contain.

---

[834] Ryan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, p.xv.
[835] Peter Barry, *Beginning Theory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), p.163.
[836] Crawford, *Bannockburns*, p.7.
[837] Ryan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, p.xiv
[838] Ryan, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, p.xv.
[839] Alan Sinfield, *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992), p.46

Taken as a whole, Chapter two underlines the importance of the Gaelic Scots in Ulster to sixteenth-century Anglo-Irish colonial history, and early Anglo-British imperialism. It claims that the Gaelic Scots influenced Anglo-Irish colonial literature and writing (and perhaps nascent Anglo-British imperial literature), its growth, topics and characteristic contempt for Others. There is a danger however, as Kerrigan warns, of projecting modern concepts of imperialism 'back into a period in which colonial adventures were (initially, at least) limited and had little impact on literary texts'; Kerrigan adds however that 'while anachronism is indeed a danger, one should also not be purist, and, tied to the history of ideas, or vocabulary, miss how protean empire can be.'[840] Many of the texts examined in this chapter do not so much influence literature as borrow from it; to the extent that colonial writing, in structure, form and embellishment, cultivated literary traits. What is more, Palmer, as previously mentioned, identifies during the Elizabethan conquest of Ireland a 'disconcerting conjunction' between literature, art, and military violence.[841]

War, invasion, occupation and colonialism are recurrent themes in this study, as are the ideological and cultural practices that assist a monarchy, nation, and state to obfuscate its material interests, its realpolitik, its exploitation and its atrocities. It has focused on marginalised events, figures and groups, and often contradictory accounts, and it is my contention that The Bruce Invasion of Ireland and the later history of the Gaelic Scots in Ulster belong among the 'countless lost events, without a landmark or a point of reference', that Foucault believes make up history.[842]

---

[840] Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, p.3.
[841] Palmer, *The Severed Head*, p.1.
[842] Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', pp.155.

Bibliography

An Act for the Attainder of Shane Oneile, and the extinguishment of the name of Oneile, and the entitling of the Queens Majestie, her heyers and successours, to the country of Tyrone, and to other countries and territories in Ulster, in The Statues at Large, passed in the Parliament held in Ireland (Dublin, Boulter Grierson, 1569)

Annála Connacht, CELT: Corpus of Electronic Texts, http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/T100011/index.html [accessed: 11/08/2014]

A Speech Delivered by Sir Francis Bacon, In the Lower House of Parliament, concerning the Article of Naturalization of the Scottish nation (London: 1641)

Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, ed. John Donovan (Dublin: Hodges, Smith and co., 1856)

Ahronson, Kristján, *Into the Ocean: Vikings, Irish, and Environmental Change in Iceland and the North* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015)

Armitage, David, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000; 2009)

Assman, Aleida, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1999; 2013)

Assman, Jan, 'Communicative and Cultural Memory', in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, eds. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 109-118

Assman, Aleida, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Bagenal, Henry, 'The Description and Present State of Ulster' ('Marshal Bagenal's Description of Ulster'), 1586, ed. Herbert Hore, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 2 (1854), 137-160

Bagwell, Richard, *Ireland Under the Tudors: With a Succinct Account of the Earlier History*, 1 (London: Longmans, Green, and co., 1885)

Baranuik, Carol, '"No Bardolatry here": the independence of the Ulster-Scots poetic tradition', in *Revising Robert Burns and Ulster: Literature, religion and Politics, c.1770-1920*, eds. Frank Ferguson and Andrew R. Holmes (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), 64-83

Barbour, John, *The Bruce*, trans. A. A. M. Duncan (Edinburgh: Canongate, 1997)

Bardon, Jonathon, *A History of Ulster* (Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1992)

Bardsley, Sandy, *Women's Roles in the Middle Ages* (London: Greenwood Press, 2007)

Barrow, G.W.S, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1965)

Barry, Peter, *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, 2nd ed. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009)

Beggs, Thomas, *Rathlin: A descriptive poem, written after a visit to that Island* (Belfast: Hugh Clark and Company, 1820)

Belfast Literary Society 1801-190: Historical Sketch with Memoirs of some Distinguished Members (Belfast: M'Caw, Stevenson & Orr, 1902)

Belsey, Catherine, 'Towards Cultural History – in Theory and Practice', *Textual Practice*, 3, 2 (1989), 159-68

Beowulf, A Verse Translation, trans. Seamus Heaney, ed. Daniel Donoghue (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002)

Bevington, David, *Shakespeare: The Seven ages of Human Experience* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005)

Blair, Hugh, 'A Dissertation Concerning the Poems of Ossian' in *The Poems of Ossian, translated by James Macpherson, to which are prefixed Dissertations on the Aera and Poems of Ossian*, 1 (London: Cadell & Davis, 1806), xvi-Iii

Bloom, Harold, *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (London: Papermac, 1995)

Boardman, Stephen, 'Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland: Robert the Steward, John of Fordun and the "Anonymous Chronicle"', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 76, 201 (1997), 23-43

Boece, Hector, *The History and Chronicles of Scotland*, 2, trans. John Bellenden (Edinburgh: W. and C. Tait, 1821)

Bower, Walter, *Scotichronicon*, ed. D. E. R. Watt, 6 (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1998)

Bradshaw, Brendan, 'Nationalism and historical scholarship in modern Ireland', *Irish Historical studies*, 26, 104 (1989), 329-351

Brady, Ciaran, *A Viceroy's Vindication: Sir Henry Sidney's Memoir of Service in Ireland, 1556-78*, 1583 (Cork: Cork University Press, 2002)

Brady, Ciaran, 'Shane O'Neill Departs from the Court of Elizabeth: Irish, English, Scottish perspectives and the Paralysis of Policy, July 1559 to April 1562', in *Kingdoms United? Great Britain and Ireland since 1500: Integration and Diversity*, ed. by S. J. Connolly (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), 13-28

Breen, Colin, 'Randal MacDonnell and early seventeenth-century settlement in northeast Ulster, 1603-30', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice,* eds. Micheál Ó Siochrú, and Eamonn Ó Ciardha (Manchester: Manchester University Press), 143-158

Brooke, Charlotte, *Reliques of Irish Poetry: Consisting of Heroic Poems, Odes, Elegies and Songs* (Dublin: J. Christie, 1816)

Broun, Dauvit, 'A second England? Scotland and the monarchy of Britain in the first English empire', in *The English Isles: Cultural transmission and political conflict in Britain and Ireland, 1100-1500*, eds. Sean Duffy and Susan Foran (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), 84-103

Butterfield, Ardis, 'Introduction', in *Citation, Intertextuality and Memory in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, 2, eds. Giuliano Di Bacco and Yolanda Plumley (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013), 1-6

Caball, Marc, *Poets and Politics, Continuity and Reaction in Irish Poetry, 1558-1625* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1998)

Caball, Marc, 'Print, Protestantism, and cultural authority in Elizabethan Ireland', in *Elizabeth I and Ireland*, eds. Brendan Kane and Valerie McGowan-Doyle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 286-309

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, 2, ed. Joseph Bain (Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1881-8)

Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, *1509-1573*, ed. Hans C. Hamilton (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1860)

Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1574-1585, ed. Hans Claude Hamilton (London: Longman's, Green, Reader & Dyer, 1867)

Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth, 1, ed. J. S. Brewer and William Bullen (London: Longmans, 1867-71)

Campion, Edmund, *A Historie of Ireland, Written in the Yeare 1571* (Dublin: Hibernia Press, 1809)

Campion, Edmund, *Two Bokes of the History of Ireland (1571)*, ed. A. F. Vossen (Assen: Netherlands, 1963)

Canny, Nicholas, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565-76* (New York: The Harvester Press, 1976)

Cannon, John, *Parliamentary Reform 1640-1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973)

Carruthers, Gerard and Liam McIlvanney, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Carruthers, Mary, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Carswell, John, *Foirm na n-Urrnuidheadh*, ed. R.L. Thomson (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1970)

Ciklamini, Marlene, *Snorri Sturluson* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1978)

Cicero, *De Oratore in Two Volumes*, 1, trans. E. W. Sutton (London: William Heineman, 1948)

Cleveland, John, 'The Rebell Scot', in *Poems by J. C.* (London, s. n., 1651)

Coldwell, David, 'The Literary Background of Barbour's "Bruce"' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1969)

Collins, Arthur, ed. *Letters and Memorials of State, in the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, Part of the Reign of King Charles the Second, and Oliver's Usurpation*, 1 (London: F. Osborne, 1764)

Conditions to be observed by the British undertakers of the escheated lands in Ulster (London, 1610)

Confino, Alon, 'Memory and the History of Mentalities', in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, eds. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 77-85

Connolly, S. J., ed. *Oxford Companion to Irish History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Cowan, Edward J., '*For Freedom Alone': The Declaration of Arbroath*, *1320* (Great Britain: Tuckwell Press, 2003)

Cowan, Edward J., 'Declaring Arbroath', in *The Declaration of Arbroath, History, Significance, Setting*, ed. Geoffrey Barrow (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2003), 13-22

Craig, Sir Thomas, *De Unione Regnorum Britanniae Tractatus*, ed. C. Sanford Terry (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1909)

Craig, Cairns, 'National literature and cultural capital in Scotland and Ireland', in *Ireland and Scotland: culture and society, 1700-2000*, eds. Liam McIlvanney and Ray Ryan (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 38-65

Craigie, W. A., 'Barbour and Blind Harry as Literature', *Scottish Review*, 22 (1893), 173-201

Cran, Angela and James Robertson, *Dictionary of Scottish Quotations* (Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1996)

Crawford, Robert, *Bannockburns: Scottish Independence and Literary Imagination, 1314-2014* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014)

Crawford, Robert and Mick Imlah, eds. *The New Penguin Book of Scottish Verse* (London: Penguin Group, 2001)

Cudden, J. A., *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (London, Penguin, 1992)

Cullen, L.M., 'Scotland and Ireland, 1600-1800: their role in the evolution of British society', in *Scottish Society, 1500-1800*, eds. R.A. Houston and I. D. Whyte (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 226-245

Davis, John, *Historical Relations*, *A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was Never Entirely Subdued nor Brought Under Obedience of the crown of England Until the beginning of the reign of King James of Happy memory* (Dublin: Samuel Dancer, 1612; 1666)

Davis, Leith, 'Irish Bards and English Consumers: Thomas Moore's "Irish Melodies" and the Colonized Nation', *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*, 24, 2 (1993), 7-25

Davies, Rees, 'Issues and Agendas: The English State and the "Celtic" Peoples, 1100-1400', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 6, 1 (1993), 1-14

Davies, R. R., *The First English Empire: Power and Identities in the British Isles, 1093-1343* (Oxford: Oxford university Press, 2000)

Dawson, Jane E. A., *Scotland Re-formed, 1488-1587* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007)

Dawson, Jane E. A., *The Politics of Religion in the Age of Mary Queen of Scots: the Earl of Argyll and the Struggle for Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Dawson, Jane E. A., 'The Fifth Earl of Argyle: Gaelic Lordship and Political Power in Sixteenth-Century Scotland', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 67,183 (1988), 1-27

Deane, Seamus, *Strange Country: Modernity and Nationhood in Irish Writing since 1790* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

Derrida, Jacques, 'Declarations of Independence', *New Political Science*, 7, 1 (1986), 7-15

Devereux, Walter Bourchier, ed. *Lives and letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex, in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I, 1540-1646*, 1 (London: John Murray, 1853)

Devine, T. M., *Scotland's Empire: The Origins of the Global Diaspora* (London: Penguin Books, 2012)

Dick Gaughan's Song Archive, http://www.dickgaughan.co.uk/songs/texts/eringobr.html

Dickinson, William, ed. *A Source Book of Scottish History, 1424-1567*, 2 (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons LTD, 1953)

Dowdall, George, 'The Archbishop of Armachane's Opinion touching Ireland, Delivered in Julye, 1558', Thomas Gogarty, *Journal of the County Louth Archaeological Society*, 2, 2 (1909),149-164

Drennan, William, *Glendalloch and other poems by the late Dr. Drennan, with additional verses by his sons* (Dublin: William Robertson, 1859)

Drummond, William Hamilton, *Clontarf: A Poem* (Dublin: Archer; Hodges and M'Arthur, 1822)

Drummond, William Hamilton, *Bruce's Invasion of Ireland: A Poem* (Dublin: Hodges and M'Arthur, 1826)

Drummond, William Hamilton, *The Battle of Trafalgar: A Heroic Poem* (Belfast: Smyth and Lyons, 1806)

Drummond, William Hamilton, *Essay on the Subject Proposed by the royal Irish Academy to Investigate the authenticity of the Poems of Ossian, Both as Given in MacPherson's Translation, as Published in Gaelic, London, 1807, Under the Sanction of the Highland Society of London; on the Supposition of Such Poems not Being of Recent Origin, to Assign the Probable Era and Country of the Original Poet or Poets* (Dublin: R. Graisberry, 1830)

Drummond, William Hamilton, *Ancient Irish Minstrelsy* (Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1852)

Duffy, Sean, 'The Anglo-Norman Era in Scotland: Convergence and Divergence', in *Celebrating Columba: Colm Cille a Cheiliuradh: Irish-Scottish Connections, 597-1997*, eds. T. M. Devine and James F. McMillan (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1999), 15-35

Duffy, Sean, 'The Bruce brothers and the Irish Sea World, 1306-29', in *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars: The Invasions of Ireland, 1306-1329*, ed. Sean Duffy (United Kingdom: Tempus, 2002), 45-71.

Duffy, Sean, 'The Gaelic Account of the Bruce Invasion "Cath Fhochairte Brighite": Medieval Romance or Modern Forgery?', *Seanchas Ardmhacha: Journal of the Armagh Diocesan Historical Society*, 13, 1 (1988), 59-121

Duffy, Sean, 'Medieval Scotland & Ireland: Overcoming the Amnesia', *History Ireland*, 7, 3 (1999), 17-21

Duncan, Archie, 'The Declarations of the Clergy, 1309-10', in *The Declaration of Arbroath, History, Significance, Setting*, ed. Geoffrey Barrow (Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, 2003), 32-50

Duncan, A.A.M., 'The Scots Invasion of Ireland, 1315', in *The British Isles: 1100-1500, Comparisons, Contrasts and Connections*, ed. R. R. Davies (Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers, 1988), 100-118

Dunlop, Robert, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster', *The Scottish Historical Review,* 22, 85 (1924), 51-60

Dunlop, Robert, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 22, 86 (1925), 115-126

Dunlop, Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 22, 87 (1925), 199-212

Eagleton, Terry, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London: Verso, 2007)

Eagleton, Terry, *After Theory* (London: Penguin Books, 2004)

Ebin, Lois A., 'John Barbour's "Bruce": Poetry, History, and Propaganda, *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 9 (1971-72), 218-42

Ebin, Lois A., 'John Barbour's "Bruce": Poetry, History, and Propaganda' (doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1969).

Edgeworth, Maria, *Castle Rackrent* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

Ellis, Steven G., 'Nationalism, historiography and the English and Gaelic world in the late Middle Ages', in *I.H.S.*, 25, 97 (1986), 1-18

Ellis, Steven G., *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603* (London and New York: Longman, 1985)

Erll, Astrid, 'Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction', in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, eds. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 1-19

Erll, Astrid, *Memory in Culture*, trans. Sara, B. Young (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011)

Erll, Astrid, and Ansgar Nunning, 'Where Literature and Memory Meet: Towards a Systematic Approach to the Concepts of Memory in Literary Studies', in *Literature, Literary History, and Cultural Memory*, ed. Herbert Grabes (Tubingen: Narr, 2005), 265-98

Elphinstone, Euphemia, *Undiscovered Scotland*, http://www.undiscoveredscotland.co.uk/usbiography/e/euphemiaelphinstone.html [accessed 13/07/2015].

Eyre-Todd, George, *Early Scottish Poetry* (London: Edinburgh, Sands & Co., 1891)

Falkiner, C. Litton, 'William Farmer's Chronicles of Ireland', *The English Historical Review*, 22, 87 (1907), 527-552

Fendler, Lynn, *Michael Foucault, Continuum Library of Educational Thought* (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010)

Ferguson, Frank, ed. *Ulster-Scots Writing: An Anthology* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008)

Ferguson, Frank, 'Burns the Conservative: revising the Lowland Scottish tradition in Ulster poetry', in *Revising Robert Burns and Ulster: Literature, Religion and Politics, c.1770-1920*, eds. Frank Ferguson and Andrew R. Holmes (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009), 83-106

Finan, Thomas, 'Violence in thirteenth-century Ireland', *Eolas: The Journal of the American Society of Irish Medieval Studies*, 4 (2010), 86-97

Ford, John, 'Fames Memoriall, or The Earle of Devonshire Deceased', in *The Nondramatic Works of John Ford*, eds. L. E. Stock, Gilles D. Monsarrat (New York: Renaissance English Text Society, 1991), 701-7

Foster, R. F., *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972* (London: Penguin Books, 1988)

Foucault, Michel, *'Society Must Be Defended'*, *Lectures at the College De France, 1975-76*, eds. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, trans. David Macey (London: Penguin Books, 1997; 2004)

Foucault, Michel, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice, Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1977), 139-165

Fox, Adam and Daniel Woolf, *The Spoken Word: Oral Culture in Britain, 1500-1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002)

Frame, Robin, *English Lordship in Ireland, 1318-1361* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982)

Frame, Robin, 'The Bruces in Ireland, 1315-18', *Irish Historical Studies*, 19, 73 (1974), 3-37

Frame, Robin, *Ireland and Britain, 1170-1450* (London: Hambledon Press, 1998)

Frame, Robin, *Colonial Ireland, 1169-1369* (Dublin, Helicon Limited, 1981)

Froissart, Sir John, *Chronicles of England, France and Spain and the Surrounding Countries*, 2, trans. Thomas Johnes (London: William Smith, 1848)

Gay, Peter, *Style in History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1974)

Gibbons, Luke, 'From Ossian to O'Carolan: the Bard as Separatist Symbol' in *From Gaelic to Romantic: Ossianic Translations*, eds. Fiona J. Stafford and Howard Gaskill (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998), 26-48.

'George Bush's address on the start of war', *The Guardian*, 20 March 2003, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/20/iraq.georgebush [accessed 23/03/2014]

Gilbert, J. T., *History of the Viceroys of Ireland; with Notices of the Castle of Dublin* (Dublin: James Duffy, 1865)

Gillingham, John, 'The Beginnings of English Imperialism', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 5, 4 (1992), 392-409

Gillingham, John, 'Images of Ireland, 1170-1600: The Origins of English Imperialism', *History Today*; 37, 2 (1987), 16-22

Gillespie, Raymond, 'Success and failure in the Ulster Plantation', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice,* eds. Micheál Ó Siochrú, and Eamonn Ó Ciardha, (Manchester: Manchester University Press), 98-119

Goldstein, R. James, '"Freedom is a noble thing": the ideological project of John Barbour's Bruce', in Dietrich Strauss and Horst W. Dreschler eds. *Scottish Language and Literature, Medieval and Renaissance*, 4th International Conference 1984 Proceedings (1986), 193-206

Grant, Alexander, *Independence and Nationhood: Scotland, 1306-1469* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1984)

Gray, John, 'Burns and his Visitors from Ulster: From Adulation to Disaccord', *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 33, 1 (2004), 320-334

Gray, Michael, 'Icelandic Prime Minister ready to welcome an independent Scotland, *National Collective*, June 10 2013: http://nationalcollective.com/2013/06/10/exclusive-icelandic-prime-minister-ready-to-welcome-an-independent-scotland [accessed 23/03/2015]

Gray, Michael, 'Scottish EU membership straightforward and in Denmark's interest's', *National Collective*, June 10 2013: http://nationalcollective.com/2013/07/10/exclusive-scottish-eu-membership-straightforward-and-in-denmarks-interest/ [accessed 23/03/2015]

Gray, Sir Thomas, *Scalacronica: The Reigns of Edward I, Edward II and Edward III*, trans. Sir Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: Glasgow University Press, 1907)

Greenblatt, Stephen, 'Resonance and Wonder', in *Literary Theory Today*, eds. Peter Nick
Groom, Nick, 'Gothic and Celtic Revivals: Antiquity and the Archipelago', in Robert
Demaria, Heesok Chang, and Samantha Zacher, eds. *A Companion to British Literature,
Volume 3: Long Eighteenth-Century Literature, 1660-1837* (Oxford: John Wiley & Sons,
2014), 361-380
Collier and Helga Geyer-Ryan (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990), 74-9
Gregory, Donald, *The History of the Western Isles of Scotland* (Great Britain: John Donald,
1881; 2008)
Grey, David, 'Peatland and the Ulster-Scottish Culture of North-East Ireland in Thomas
Begg's *Rathlin'*, *Scottish Literary Review*, 6, 2 (2004), 49-56
Hadfield, Andrew, 'Educating the colonial mind: Spenser and the plantation', in *The
Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, eds. Micheál Ó Siochrú, and Eamonn
Ó Ciardha (Manchester: Manchester University Press), 158-176
Hadfield, Andrew, 'War poetry and counsel in early modern Ireland', in *Elizabeth I and
Ireland*, eds. Brendan Kane and Valerie McGowan-Doyle (Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 2014), 239-261
Hallam, Elizabeth M. and Andrew Prescott, eds. *The British Inheritance: A Treasury of
Historic Documents* (British Library Publishing Division, 1999)
Hammond, Matthew, 'Domination and conquest?: The Scottish experience in the twelfth
and thirteenth centuries' in *The English Isles: Cultural transmission and political
conflict in Britain and Ireland, 1100-1500*, eds. Sean Duffy and Susan Foran
(Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), 68-84
Hanna, W. A., *Intertwined Roots: An Ulster-Scot Perspective on Heritage, History,
Hostility and Hope in Northern Ireland* (Dublin: Columba Press, 2000)
Hardiman, James, ed. *Irish Minstrelsy, or Bardic Remains of Ireland; with English
Poetical Translations*, 1 (London: Joseph Robins, 1831)
Hastings, Adrian, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
Harvie, Christopher, *Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics, 1707 to the
Present* (London: New York: Routledge, 1977)
Hayes-McCoy, G. A., 'The completion of the Tudor conquest and the advance of the
counter-reformation, 1571-1603', in *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern
Ireland, 1534-1691*, eds. T. W. Moody, F. A. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (Oxford:
Oxford University Press, 2009), 94-140
Hayes-McCoy, G. A. *Scots Mercenary Forces in Ireland (1565-1603)* (Dublin and
London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd, 1937)
Hechter, Michael, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic fringe in British national development,
1536-1966* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975)
Helfer, Rebeca, *Spenser's Ruins and the Art of Recollection* (Toronto: University of
Toronto Press, 2013)
Herbert, William, *Croftus sive de Hibernia liber*, ed. Arthur Keaveney and John A.
Madden (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 1992)
Hermann, Pernille, 'Concepts of Memory and Approaches to the Past in Medieval
Icelandic Literature', *Scandinavian Studies*, 81, 3 (2009), 287-308
Hill, J. Michael, *Fire and Sword: Sorley Boy MacDonnell and the Rise of Clan Ian Mor,
1538-1590* (London: Athlone Press, 1993)
Hill, J. Michael, 'The Origins of the Scottish Plantations in Ulster to 1625: A
Reinterpretation', *Journal of British Studies*, 32, 1 (1993), 24-43
Hill, George, 'Shane O'Neill's Expedition against the Antrim Scots, 1565', *Ulster Journal
of Archaeology*, First Series, 9 (1861/1862), 122-141
Hill, George, *An Historical Account of the MacDonnells of Antrim* (Belfast: Archer &
Sons, 1873)

Hinton, Alexander Laban, 'The Dark Side of Modernity: Toward an Anthropology of Genocide', in *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 1-42

Hore, Herbert F., 'Colonel Thomas Smyth's Settlement in the Ardes, 1572', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, First Series, 9 (1861/1862), 177-182

Hunter, R. J. 'Hamilton, James, first Viscount Claneboye (c.1560–1644)' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004) http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/12086?docPos=11 [accessed 15/03/2015]

Hutchison, Mark A., 'Reformed Protestantism and the Government of Ireland, c. 1565 to 1582: the Lord Deputyships of Henry Sidney and Arthur Grey', *Sidney Journal*, 29, 1-2 (2011), 71-105

Hutton, Patrick, 'Collective Memory and Collective Mentalities: The Halbwachs-Aries Connection', *Historical Reflections / Reflexions Historiques*, 15, 2 (1988), 311-322

Hutton, Patrick, 'Sigmund Freud and Maurice Halbwachs: The Problem of Memory in Historical Psychology', *The History Teacher*, 27, 2 (1994), 145-158

Ivic, Christopher, 'Reassuring fratricide' in *I Henry IV*, in *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture: Lethe's Legacies*, eds. Grant Williams and Christopher Ivic (London: Routledge, 2004), 99-110

Innes, Thomas, 'Preface' to 'A Critical Essay on the Ancient Inhabitants of the Northern Parts of Britain or Scotland', in *The Historians of Scotland*, 3 (Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1879, 1-20

Jack, R. D. S., 'What's the 'Matter'?: Medieval Literary Theory and the Irish campaigns in *The Bruce'*, *Journal of Irish and Scottish Studies*, 1, 1 (2007), 11-25

Jakobsson, Ármann, '*Laxdæla* Dreaming: A Saga Heroine Invents Her Own Life', *Leeds Studies in English*, 39 (2008), 33-51

James VI and I, *Basilicon Doron*, in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Jameson, Frederic, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* (London and New York: Routledge Classics, 1983)

John of Fordun's Chronicle of the Scottish Nation, 1, ed. William F. Skene (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872)

Jackson, Kenneth Hurlstone, *Language and History in Early Britain*: *a chronological survey of the Brittonic languages, first to twelfth century A.D.* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1953)

Johnson, Samuel and James Boswell, *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland, The Journal of A Tour to the Hebrides*, ed. R. W. Chapman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970)

Keen, Maurice, *Nobles, Knights and Men-at-Arms in the Middle Ages* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1996)

Keen, Maurice, *Chivalry* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1984)

Kempshall, Matthew, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011)

Kerrigan, John, *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics, 1603-1707* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Kiernan, Ben, *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007)

Kidd, Colin, *British Identities before Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Kinsella, Stuart, 'Colonial Commemoration in Tudor Ireland: The Case of Sir Henry Sidney', *Sidney Journal*, 29, 1-2 (2011), 105-147

Kipp, Julie, 'Remembrance, Rebellion and the Gender Politics of the Bardic Nation: Irish and Scottish Romanticisms', in *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700-2000*, eds. Liam McIlvanney and Ray Ryan (Dublin: Four courts Press, 2005), 113-129

Knox, John, *The Works of John Knox, Volumes 1 & 2: History of the Reformation in Scotland*, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2004)

Kreutzwald, F. R., *Kalevipoeg* (Tartu and Tallinn: Estonian Literary Museum, 2011)

Kostick, Conor, 'Women and the First Crusade: prostitutes or pilgrims?' in *Studies on Medieval and Early Modern Women 4: Victims or Viragos?*, eds. Christine Meek and Catherine Lawless (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005)

Kutsar, D., 'Social change and stress in Estonia', *International Journal of Social Welfare* 4.2 (1995), 94–107

Laxdœla Saga, ed. Einar Ól. Sveinsson, *Íslenzk fornrit* 5 (Reykjavick: Hið íslenzka fornritafélag, 1934), 54-55.

Laxdœla Saga, trans. Muriel A. C. Press (London: J.M. Dent, 1899)

Lehner, Stefanie, *Subaltern Ethics in Contemporary Scottish and Irish Literature* (Houndsmill: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011)

Leland, Thomas, *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II*, 1 (Dublin: Brett Smith, 1814)

Leland, Thomas, *The History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II*, 2 (Dublin: B. Smith, 1814)

Leyser, Henrietta, *Medieval Women: A Social History of Women in England 450-1500* (London: Phoenix Press, 1995; 2003)

Lithgow, William, 'Scotland's Teares', *The Poetical Remains of William Lithgow* (Edinburgh: Thomas Stevenson, 1863), 113-20

Little, Charles E., 'The Authenticity and Form of Cato's Saying "Carthago Delenda Est"', *Classical Journal*, 29, 6 (1934), 429-435

'Lord Chancellor Gerrard's Notes of His Report on Ireland, with Extracts from Original Irish Records exhibited by him before the Privy Council in England, 1577-8', *Analecta Hibernia*, 2 (1931), 93-291

Lydon, James, 'The impact of the Bruce invasion, 1315-27', in *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars: The Invasions of Ireland, 1306-1329*, ed. Sean Duffy (United Kingdom: Tempus, 2002), 119-153

Lydon, James, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland: An Examination of Some Problems', in *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars: The Invasions of Ireland, 1306-1329*, ed. Sean Duffy (United Kingdom: Tempus, 2002), 71-89

Lydon, James, 'The Scottish Soldier Abroad: the Bruce Invasion and the Galloglass, in *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars: The Invasions of Ireland, 1306*-1329, ed. Sean Duffy (United Kingdom: Tempus, 2002), 89-107

Lydon, James, 'Edward I, Ireland and the War in Scotland, 1303-1304', in *England and Ireland in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. James Lydon (Dublin: Irish academic Press, 1981), 43-61

Lynam, E. W., 'Sir Henry Sidney', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 2, 7 (1913), 185-203

Lynch, Michael, *Scotland: A New History* (London: Pimlico, 1992)

MacBain, Alexander, *An Etymological Dictionary of the Gaelic Language* (Glasgow: Gairm Publications, 1896; 1982)

MacCraith, Seán mac Ruaidhrí, *Cathre im Thoirdhealbhaigh*, CELT: Corpus of Electronic Texts, http://www.ucc.ie/celt/online/T100062.html [accessed: 23/01/2014]

MacCraith, Micheál, 'The Gaelic Reaction to the Reformation', in *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, eds. S. G. Ellis and Sarah Barber (London: Longman, 1995), 139-161

McCrone, David and Michael Keating, 'Social Democracy and Scotland', in *Scottish social democracy: progressive ideas for public policy*, ed. Michael Keating (Brussels: Peter Lang, 2007)

Maginn, Christopher, 'Herbert, Sir William (*c.*1553–1593)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004, online edn. 2008), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13056 [accessed: 25/01/2015]

MacGregor, Martin, 'Civilising Gaelic Scotland: the Scottish Isles and the Stewart Empire', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, eds. Eamonn O Ciardha and Micheal O Siochru (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), 33-55

McGurk, J. N., 'Davies , Sir John (1560/63–1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004, online edn. 2008), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7242 [accessed: 26/01/2015]

McIlvanney, Liam and Ray Ryan, 'Introduction', in *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700-2000*, eds. Liam McIlvanney and Ray Ryan (Dublin: Four courts Press, 2005), 11-23

MacKenzie, Peter, *The Life of Thomas Muir, Esquire, Advocate* (Glasgow, W. R. M'Phun, 1821)

Mackenzie, Henry, *Report of the Committee of the Highland Society Appointed to Inquire into the Nature and Authenticity of the Poems of Ossian* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1805)

McKinley, John, *Poetic Sketches, Descriptive of the Giant's Causeway and the Surrounding Scenery: with Some Detached Pieces* (Belfast: Joseph Smith, 1819)

Macpherson, James, *Fingal, An Ancient Epic Poem* (London, T. Beckett, 1762)

Major, John, *History of Greater Britain* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1892)

Maley, Willy, 'Spenser's Languages: Writing in the Ruins of English', in *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 162-179

Maley, Willy, *Salvaging Spenser, Colonialism, Culture and Identity* (Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1997)

Maley, Willy, 'A View of the Present State of Ireland (1596; 1633)', in *A Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*, ed. Bart van Es (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 210-230

Maley, Willy, 'Angling for Ulster: Ireland and Plantation in Jacobean Literature', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice,* eds. Eamonn O Ciardha and Micheal O Siochru (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), 218-238

Maley, Willy, 'Something Quite Atrocious: English Colonialism Beyond the Pale and the License to Violence', *Eolas: The Journal of the American Society of Irish Medieval Studies*, 3 (2009), 82-111

Maley, Willy, '"Another Britain?": Bacon's certain consideration touching the plantation in Ireland' (1609) *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism*, 18, 1 (2008), 1-18

Marcus, Leah, 'Dramatic Experiments: Tudor Drama, 1490-1567', in *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1500-1600*, ed. Arthur F. Kinney (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 132-152

Marcus, Leah, 'Elizabeth on Ireland', in *Elizabeth I and Ireland*, eds. Brendan Kane and Valerie McGowan-Doyle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 40-60

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1970)

MacFarland, Elaine, *Ireland and Scotland in the Age of Revolution: Planting the Green Bough* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994)

Mason, Roger A., ed. *On Rebellion / John Knox* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

McLeod, Wilson, *Divided Gaels: Gaelic Cultural Identities in Scotland and Ireland C.1200-C.1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Michael, George, *Theology of Hate: A History of the World Church of Creation* (Florida: University of Florida Press, 2009)

Millin, Samuel Shannon, 'The Poetry of William Hamilton Drummond, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 7, 1 (1901), 37-43

Milton, John, 'Observations on the Articles of Peace', *The Prose Works of John Milton*, 1 (Philadelphia: John W. Moore, 1649; 1847)

More, Thomas, *Utopia*, eds. George M. Logan and Robert M. Adams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

Moore, Thomas, *The Poetical Works of Thomas Moore, including his melodies, ballads etc. Complete in one volume* (Philadelphia: J. Crissy, 1836)

Morgan, Hiram, 'The Colonial Venture of Sir Thomas Smith in Ulster, 1571-1575', *The Historical Journal,* 28, 2 (1985), 261-278

Morgan, Hiram, 'The End of Gaelic Ulster: A Thematic Interpretation of Events Between 1534 and 1610', *Irish Historical Studies*, 26, 101 (1988), 8-32

Morgan, Hiram, 'Never Any Realm Worse Governed': Queen Elizabeth and Ireland', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6, 14 (2004), 295-308

Muir, Edwin, 'Robert the Bruce (To Douglas in Dying)', http://allpoetry.com/poem/8496341-Robert-the-Bruce--To-Douglas-in-Dying--by-Edwin-Muir [accessed 07/06/2014]

Muller, Anne, 'Conflicting loyalties: The Irish Franciscans and the English crown in the High Middle Ages', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 107C (2007), pp.87-106

Naunton, Robert, *Fragmenta Regalia or Observations on the late Queen Elizabeth, her times, and Favourites,* (1641) in *The Somer's Collection of Tracts*, 1, ed. Walter Scott (London: T. Cadell, 1809), 251-283

McNamee, Colm, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland', *Historical Ireland*, 1, 1 (1993), pp.11-16

Nicholson, Ranald, *Scotland: The Later Middle Ages*, *The Edinburgh History of Scotland*, 2 (Edinburgh: Mercat, 1974)

O'Donovan, John, ed. *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters (Dublin: Hodges, Smith and co., 1856)*

Ó Siochrú, Micheál and Eamonn Ó Ciardha, eds. *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice* (Manchester: Manchester Press, 2012)

O'Halloran, Sylvester, *An Introduction to the Study of the History and Antiquities of Ireland* (London: J. Murray, Dublin: Thomas Ewing, 1772)

O'Halloran, Sylvester, *Insula Sacra or The General Utilities arising from some permanent Foundation, for the Preservation of our Antient Annals, demonstrated and the Means Pointed Out* (Limerick: Welsh, 1770)

O'Halloran, Clare, 'Irish Re-Creations of the Gaelic Past: The Challenge of Macpherson's Ossian', *Past & Present*, 124 (1989), 69-95

Orr, James, *Poems on Various Subjects* (Belfast: Smyth and Lyons, 1804)

Outhwaite, R. B., 'Dearth, the English Crown and the "Crisis of the 1590s"', in *The European Crisis of the 1590s: Essays in Comparative History*, ed. Peter Clark (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985), 23-43

Orosuis, *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, trans. A. T. Fear (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010)

Palgrave, Sir Francis, *Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland* (London: Record Commission, 1837)

Palmer, Patricia, *The severed Head and the Grafted Tongue: Literature, Translation and Violence in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

Palmer, Patricia, *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland: English Renaissance literature and Elizabethan imperial expansion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Perceval-Maxwell, M., *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973)

Poole, Adrian, 'Laughter, forgetting and Shakespeare', in *English Comedy*, eds. Michael Cordner, Peter Holland and John Kerrigan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 85-100

Penman, Michael, *Robert the Bruce: King of the Scots* (Newhaven and London: Yale University Press, 2014)

Penman, Michael, 'The MacDonald Lordship and the Bruce Dynasty, c.1306-c.1371' in *The Lordship of the Isles*, ed. Michael D. Oram (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014), 62-88

Perrot, Sir James, *The Chronicle of Ireland, 1584-1608*, ed. Herbert Wood (Dublin: Stationery Office, 1933)

Perrot, Sir John, 'Opinion for the suppressing of rebellion', in *The Government of Ireland Under the Honorable, Just and Wise Governor Sir John Perrott, Knight, one of the Privy Councell to Queene Elizabeth, Beginning 1584, and ending 1588* (London: Thomas Walkley, 1626)

Perrot, Sir John, 'Lord Deputie of Ireland, to the Commons House of Parliament in England', in *The Goverment of Ireland Under the Honorable, Just and Wise Governor Sir John Perrott, Knight, one of the Privy Councell to Queene Elizabeth, Beginning 1584, and ending 1588* (London: Thomas Walkley, 1626)

Phillips, J. R. S., 'Documents on the Early Stages of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, 1315-1316', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish academy, History, Linguistics, Literature*, 79 (1979), 247-270

Pittock, Murray, *Scottish and Irish Romanticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Pittock, Murray, *Celtic Identity and the British Image* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999)

Plumptre, Anne, *Narrative of a Residence in Ireland During the Summer of 1814, and that of 1815* (London: Henry Colburn, 1817)

Pollard, Tony, 'Medieval Scotland's Vietnam: Edward Bruce's invasion of Ireland in 1315', BBC2, *After Bannockburn*: http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/articles/41ccq3Mkt2DV2Wz87XJ9m7H/medieval-scotland-s-vietnam-edward-bruce-s-invasion-of-ireland-in-1315 [accessed 20/05/2015]

Pont, Robert, 'Of the Union of Britayne', in *The Jacobean Union: Six Tracts of 1604*, eds. Bruce R. Galloway and Brian P. Levack (Edinburgh: Clark Constable, 1985), 1-39

Quinn, D. B., 'Edward Walshe's 'Conjectures' concerning the State of Ireland [1552]', *Irish Historical Studies*, 5, 20 (1947), 303-322

Quinn, D. B., 'Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory', *American Philosophical Society*, 89, 4 (1945), 543-560

Raleigh, Walter, 'Preface', *History of the World* (London: Walter Burre, 1614)

Renan, Ernest, 'What is a nation?' in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi K. Bhabha (London: Routledge, 1990), 8-23

Ridley, R.T., 'To Be Taken with a Pinch of Salt: The Destruction of Carthage', *Classical Philology* 81, 2 (1986), 140–146

Rigney, Ann, 'Fiction as a Mediator in National Remembrance' in *Narrating the Nation, Representations in History, Media and the Arts*, eds., Stefan Berger, Linas Eriksonas and Andrew Mycock (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008), 79-97

Rigney, Anne, 'The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts between Monumentality and Morphing', in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies: An International and*

Interdisciplinary Handbook, eds. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 345-357

Rigney, Ann 'Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation of Cultural Memory', *Journal of European Studies*, 35, 1 (2005), 11-28

Robertson, Joseph, *Inventaires de la Royne d'Ecosse* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1863)

Robinson, Philip, *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-1670* (Dublin: St Martin's Press, 1984)

Russell, Nicholas, 'Collective Memory Before and After Halbwachs', *The French Review*, 79, 4 (2006), 792-804

Sackville, Thomas and Thomas Norton, *Gorboduc*, ed. Irby B. Cauthen (Great Britain: Edward Arnold, 1970)

Said, Edward, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage, 1994)

Sanders, Seth L., *The Invention of Hebrew* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2011)

Saul, Nigel, *For Honour and Fame, Chivalry in England, 1066-1500* (London: The Bodley Head, 2011)

Scanlon, Thomas, *Colonial Writing and the New World, 1583-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Shakespeare, William, *Twelfth Night*, ed. M. M. Mahood (London: Penguin, 2005)

Shakespeare, William, *Macbeth*, ed. Kenneth Muir (Surrey: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1951; 1997)

Shakespeare, William, *The Taming of the Shrew*, ed. Barbara Hodgdon (London, A & C. Black Publishers, 2010)

Shephard, Robert, 'The Motives of Sir Henry Sidney's Memoir (1583)', in *Sidney Journal*, 29, 1-2 (2011), 173-187

Shetland Documents 1195-1579, eds. John H. Ballantyne, and Brian Smith, *Shetland Islands Council & The Shetland Times Ltd*. (Lerwick, 1999)

Shulamith, Shahar, *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1983; 2003)

Schumpeter, Joseph, 'Imperialism and Capitalism', in *Imperialism: Theoretical Directions*, ed. Ronald H. Chilcote (New York: Humanity Books, 2000), 105-117

Schwyzer, Philip, *Archaeologies of English Renaissance Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

Sidney State Papers, 1565-70, ed. Tomas O Laidhin (Dublin: Stationary Office, 1962)

Sidney, Philip, 'Discourse on Irish Affairs', in *Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney*, eds. Katherine Duncan-Jones and Jan Van Dorsten (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973)

Sidney, Philip, 'Astrophil and Stella', *The Complete Works of Philip Sidney*, 2, ed. Albert Feuillerat (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922)

'Slainte! Erin Go Bragh! Translation Of These & Other Irish Sayings', *The World Post*, 25/05/2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/03/17/slainte-erin-go-bragh-tra_n_837097.html [accessed: 13/01/2015]

Sinfield, Alan, *Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)

Smith, John, 'Advice for the Realme of Ireland' (April, 1569), see Appendix in George Hill, *An Historical Account of the MacDonnells of Antrim* (Belfast: Archer & Sons, 1873)

Smith, Sir Thomas, *A Letter from I.B. Gentleman unto his very frende Maystet [sic] R.C. Esquire vvherin is conteined a large discourse of the peopling & inhabiting the cuntrie called the Ardes* (London, 1572)

Smith, Sir Thomas, *A Letter from I.B. Gentleman unto his very frende Maystet [sic] R.C. Esquire vvherin is conteined a large discourse of the peopling & inhabiting the cuntrie called the Ardes* (London, 1572)

Smith, William, ed. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, 3 (Boston: Little, Brown, & Company, 1869)

Smith, Anthony D., *Myths and Memories of the Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)

Smith, Anthony D., *Nationalism* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008)

Smyth, Jim, 'Introduction: the 1798 rebellion in its eighteenth-century contexts', in *Revolution, Counter-revolution and Union: Ireland in the 1790s*, ed. Jim Smyth (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1-21

Smyth, Jim, 'Arguments for and against union: Scotland and Ireland, 1700-2000', in *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700-2000*, eds. Liam McIlvanney and Ray Ryan (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 23-38

Spagnoli, Filip, *Homo-Democraticus: On the Universal Desirability and the Not So Universal Possibility of Democracy and Human Rights* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2003)

Spenser, Edmund, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A. C. Hamilton, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited, 2007)

Spenser, Edmund, *A View of the State of Ireland*, eds. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997)

Stafford, Fiona, 'Romantic Macpherson', in *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Romanticism*, ed. Murray Pittock (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011), 27-49

Sturluson, Snorri, *The Prose Edda*, trans. Arthur Gilcrest Brodeur (New York: The American Scandinavian Foundation, 1916)

Strype, John, *The Life of the Learned Sir Thomas Smith* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1820)

Taggart, James Hand, 'The Historicity of Barbour's *Bruce*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Glasgow, 2004)

Tell, Dave, 'Beyond Mnemotechnics: Confession and Memory in Augustine', *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 39, 3 (2006), 233-253,

Tait, Clodagh, David Edwards and Padraig Lenihan, 'Early Modern Ireland: A History of violence', in *Age of Atrocity: Violence and Political Conflict in Early Modern Ireland*, David Edwards, Padraig Lenihan and Clodagh Tait, eds. (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), 9-34

Thuente, Mary Helen, *The Harp Re-strung: The United Irishmen and the Rise of Irish Literary Nationalism* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1994)

The Annals of Loch Ce,: A Chronicle of Irish Affairs from A. D. 1014 to 1590, ed. William M. Hennessy, 1 (London: Longman, 1871)

The Annals of Clonmacnoise being Annals of Ireland from the earliest period to A. D. 1408, trans. Conell Mageoghagan, ed. Denis Murphy (Dublin: Dublin University Press, 1896)

The Annals of Ireland, of the Four Masters, trans. Owen Connellan (Dublin: Bryan Geraghty, 1846)

The Brut or The Chronicles of England, ed. Friedrich W. D. Brie, 1(London: Kegan Paul, 1906)

The Chronicle of Lanercost, 1272-1346, trans. Sir Herbert Maxwell (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1913)

The King James Bible Online, 'Psalm 112:6', http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Psalms-112-6/ [accessed: 03/11/2014]

The O'Conors of Connaught: An Historical Memoir, compiled from a MS. Of John Donovan with additions from the State Papers and Public Records, ed. Charles O. O'Conor (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and co., 1891)

The Viking Sagas (BBC Four, 2014)

The Westminster Review, 6, July (London: Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1826)

Thompson, Samuel, *Simple Poems on a Few Subjects* (Belfast: Smyth and Lyons, 1806)

Tolmie, Sarah, 'Sacrilege, Sacrifice and John Barbour's *Bruce*', *International Review of Scottish Studies*, 32 (2007), 7-32.

Trumpener, Katie, *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and The British Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997)

Tuchman, Barbara W., *A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous 14th Century* (New York: Penguin Books, 1978)

Turville-Petre, Thorlac, 'Politics and Poetry in the Early Fourteenth Century: The Case of Robert Manning's Chronicle', *Review of English Studies*, 39 (1988), pp.1-28

Utz, Hans, 'If Freedom Fail… "Freedom" in John Barbour's *The Bruce*', *English Studies*, 50 (1969), 151-65

Vance, Norman, 'Celts, Carthaginians and Constitutions: Anglo-Irish Literary Relations', *Irish Historical Studies*, 22, 86 (1980), 16-238

van Heijnsbergen, Theo, 'Scripting the National Past: a Textual Community of the Realm', in *Barbour's Bruce and its Cultural Contexts: Politics, Chivalry and Literature in Late Medieval Scotland*, eds. Steve Boardman and Susan Foran (forthcoming: Autumn 2015) (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2015)

Veach, Freya Verstraten, 'Anglicization in medieval Ireland: was there a Gaelic Irish "middle nation"?', in *The English Isles: Cultural transmission and political conflict in Britain and Ireland, 1100-1500*, eds. Sean Duffy and Susan Foran (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), 118-139

Vita Edwardi Secvndi: the Life of Edward the Second, trans. Wendy R. Childs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005)

Walker, Joseph C., *Historical Memoirs of the Irish Bards* (Dublin: Luke White, 1810)

Wallace, David, *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Ware, James, *The Antiquities and History of Ireland* (Dublin: A. Crook, 1705)

Ward, Edward, *A Journey to Scotland Giving a Character of that Country, the People and their Manners. By an English Gentleman* (London, 1699)

Watt, Diane, 'Nationalism in Barbour's *Bruce*', *Parergon*, 12, 1 (1994), 89-107

Watson, George, 'Aspects of Celticism', in *Ireland and Scotland: culture and society, 1700-2000*, eds. Liam McIlvanney and Ray Ryan (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005),129-144

Webb, R. K., 'Drummond, William Hamilton (1778–1865)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/8090 [accessed 11 June 2015]

Wentworth, Peter, *A pithie exhortation to her Majestie for establishing her successor to the crown* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1598)

Whatley, Christopher A., *Scottish Society, 1707-1830: Beyond Jacobitism, Towards Industrialisation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007)

White, Hayden, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (London: The John Hopkins Press Ltd., 1987)

Whittle, Jane, 'Rural Economies', in *The Oxford Handbook of women and Gender in Medieval Europe*, eds. Judith M. Bennet and Ruth Mazo Karras (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 311-327

Whelan, Bernadette, 'The weaker vessel'?: the impact of warfare on women in seventeenth-century Ireland', in *Victims or Viragos? Studies on Medieval and Early Modern Women 4.* eds. Christine Meek and Catherine Lawless (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 120-142

Williams, Patrick and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse/ Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994)

Williamson, Arthur H., 'Scots, Indians and Empire: The Scottish Politics of Civilization, 1519-1609', *Past & Present*, 150 (1996), 46-83

Withington, Phil, 'Plantation and civil society', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice,* eds. Eamonn O Ciardha and Micheal O Siochru (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), 55-78

Wittig, Kurt, *The Scottish Tradition in literature* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958)

Wolf, Nicholas M., *Language, Change and the Evolution of Religion, Community, and Culture in Ireland, 1800-1900*, (doctoral thesis, *ProQuest*, 2008), 27-8.

Wolfe Tone, William Theobald, ed. *Life of Theobald Wolfe Tone* (Washington: Gales & Seaton, 1826)

Wyntoun, Andrew, *Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland*, 2, in *The Historians of Scotland*, 3, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1872)

Wood, Nancy, 'Memory's Remains: Les lieux de mémoire', *History and Memory*, 6, 1 (1994), 123-149

Woods, Alan, 'George W. Bush and the Crusades', *In Defence of Marxism*, May 2003, http://www.marxist.com/iraq-bush-crusades080503.htm [accessed: 03/05/2014]

Wormald, Jenny, 'The British crown, the earls and the plantation of Ulster', in *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice,* eds. Eamonn O Ciardha and Micheal O Siochru (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), 18-33

The Annals of Ireland by Friar John Clyn, ed. trans. Bernadette Williams (Dublin, Four Courts Press, 2007)

Yates, Frances, *The Art of Memory* (London: The Bodley Head, 2014; 1966)

Zizek, Slavoj, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London: Verso, 2008)