The 'traiterous' and 'unfitting' words in Ireland's 1641 depositions: the legal, social, violent, and emotional implications of language

Grace Hoffman

Summary

This doctoral thesis examines the words and speeches recorded in the 1641 depositions. The 1641 depositions documented words of treason but also words of insult or name-calling, which this thesis will focus on primarily. This topic has never been studied comprehensively in seventeenth-century Ireland, and the silence on words is surprising. Early modern societies frequently punished spoken and written words deemed offensive, dishonouring, and violent, and Irish sources are also filled with words, speeches, and insult. At first, the analysis of insults may appear insignificant or secondary; however, they are key to understanding the complete experience of atrocities in the 1641 rebellion. They open many new questions and inform many areas of seventeenth-century Ireland that need deeper consideration. This thesis explores how words impacted law, society, power, reputation, gender, emotion, and even animal-human relationships.

A serious legal concern for language existed in the 1641 depositions and in Ireland's broader seventeenth century. Language was investigated and punished, and this created an environment, in which individuals across society could use their words to exert or claim power. The speaker's words could accuse the other of treason, but also target another's reputation. Both men and women faced insults in these accounts, however, Irish rebels often used different, gendered terms to label their victims. The 1641 depositions also recorded verbal abuse alongside harrowing accounts of physical violence, and these words were a part of deponents' violent experiences in the 1641 rebellion. In fact, words themselves were a particular form of violence. Furthermore, the presence and use of insults opens new questions about the role of emotion in the 1641 rebellion, which is often overlooked in historical analysis. The specific meaning of each term was important as well, and this thesis analyses this throughout each chapter. One insult 'English dog' clearly informed many areas including violence, emotion, the accuracy of the 1641 depositions, and the importance and impact of the animal-human relationship.

This thesis makes an original contribution to knowledge as this is the first in-depth study of words and speeches in the 1641 depositions. Each of the chapters touches upon topics that have been largely untouched in the 1641 depositions, but also more broadly in the seventeenth century. It reveals unexplored forms of violence, deeper understandings of social relationships and power dynamics, emotions, and the importance of animal studies in the 1641 depositions. While this thesis is firmly rooted in history, it draws upon the methods and insights of other disciplines including philosophy, anthropology, sociology, and literature to answer the new questions this study of words brought to light.

Table of contents-

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Jane Ohlmeyer, for her constant guidance and support. Her kindness, creativity, and enthusiasm throughout this project has continually inspired me. I am forever grateful for all that she has taught me both as a historian and as a person.

I also wish to thank John Walter. His support and insightful questions throughout the years have repeatedly encouraged me and given me new insights. From the beginning, his work was a great inspiration for my research, and therefore, our discussions about 'English dogs' and the importance of social history was a great honour for me.

I would also like to thank the Trinity History Department. In particular, I am grateful to Bríd McGrath for sharing her great knowledge of seventeenth-century Ireland and palaeography, and for her friendship and constant support. I would also like to thank Robert Armstrong and Graeme Murdock for their careful reading of my earlier chapter in my official reviews. Many of their suggestions led to deeper research and even new chapters.

I am indebted to each person who worked on the 1641 depositions project. Their work has opened up a whole new realm of possibilities for researchers, and this thesis is a clear example of that.

I must also express my gratitude for the Trinity Long Room Hub community and those at the Trinity Library.

I must also acknowledge the support of those at Trinity during COVID-19. I am proud to be a part of a community and university that comes together during challenging times. In particular, Ashley Clements was always supportive and kind throughout this process.

Finally, I am forever grateful for the support of my family and friends. Most especially, I am thankful for my parents and sisters who have always supported me throughout each of my adventures in life. Their constant love has given me the courage to step into new, uncharted territories and to move forward even when the going gets tough- something we all learned from my grandfather, Rick "Buppy" Hoffman. Although he is no longer with us, his stories sparked my love for history and still remind me to always see the person amid all the great events of the past.

Abbreviations

BL – British Library

Bodl. – Bodleian

HMC – Historical Manuscripts Commission

IMC- The Irish Manuscripts Commission

OED – Oxford English Dictionary

SP63- State Papers Ireland

TCD- Trinity College Dublin

TNA- The National Archives

Conventions

Dates throughout are given according to the Old (Julian) Calendar, which was used in Ireland, England, Scotland but not in most of continental Europe. The beginning of the year is taken, however, as 1 January rather than 25 March.

Modern spellings have been preferred for proper names (especially people and places).

All quotes retain their original spelling.

Chapter one: Introduction

This thesis will explore the 'traiterous' and 'unfitting words'[1] recorded in the 1641 depositions. The study of words illuminates many areas of society, and this thesis will demonstrate the important role language played within the reports of the 1641 rebellion. This thesis will focus primarily on words spoken in the moment, such as insults, name-calling, and slander. Although several historians have briefly noted the importance of language, there has been no specific study of spoken words in seventeenth-century Ireland.[2] Silence on this topic in the current historiography was surprising as evidence existed of early modern societies across Europe frequently punishing, censoring, and reacting to language deemed offensive, dishonouring, contemptuous, seditious, and violent. Therefore, this thesis will address this silence, and it will demonstrate the importance of understanding what was said, heard, and reported as spoken during Ireland's tumultuous 1640s and 1650s.

This introduction will first demonstrate the broad academic interest in language in early modern Europe, most specifically in England. It will also indicate the significance of language in early modern Ireland in the current historiography as it relates to the Irish and English languages as well as words of slander or insult. Second, this introduction will address the sources available in seventeenth-century Ireland for this work and explain how this thesis will engage with them. It will also consider the 1641 depositions and address both the importance and complexities of engaging with these accounts. Finally,

---

[1] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r; Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms f. 003r.

[2] Dianne Hall, 'Words as weapons: speech, violence, and gender in late medieval Ireland' in *Eire-Ireland,* xli (2006), pp 122-41; John McCafferty, 'Defamation and the church courts in early sixteenth century Armagh' in *Archivium Hibernicum: Irish historical records*, xlviii (Jan. 1994), pp 88-99; Clodagh Tait, 'Society, 1550-1700' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Ireland, volume 2:1550-1730* (Cambridge, 2018), p. 296; Mark Greengrass, 'Language and conflict in the French wars of religion' in Micheál Ó Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer, *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions* (Manchester, 2013)*,* pp 197-218.

this introduction will provide a brief overview of this thesis and a breakdown of the following chapters.

The historiography of language

In the 1970s and 1980s, historians began to recognise that language cannot be left solely to the interest of philosophical, anthropological, sociological, or literary analysis. In *The social history of language*, Peter Burke and Roy Porter argued that it was 'high time for a social history of language, a social history of speech, a social history of communication'.[3] They noted the importance of language in history and explored it in the context of dialects, gender, politeness, and insult. Language, in its varying forms, is an essential component of history in its relation to events, politics, society, violence, honour, and gender. As well, the meaning of specific words extends beyond their literal definition and cannot be fully understood without the social context. Alternatively, language is a fundamental part of culture and society, and knowledge of a particular society remains incomplete without an understanding the words in it. As a result, if scholars discount or overlook language, they can easily misinterpret sources or focus solely on traditional history to the detriment of social, gender, cultural, and emotional history.[4]

Historians have analysed the many roles of offensive or insulting language in relation to topics such as politics, religion, law, gender, society, violence, and poetry. Social historians have considered it in the context of reputation, honour, and gender. Others have explored social classes and political knowledge and awareness through the study of words. The study of slander, libel, and defamation began to develop in the 1970s with James Sharpe's work on defamation and slander in the church courts at York.[5] Since then Laura Gowing, Alastair Bellany, and Richard Cust have explored language in early

---

[3] Peter Burke and Roy Porter, *The social history of language* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 1.
[4] Burke and Porter, *The social history,* p.1.
[5] James Sharpe, *Defamation and sexual slander in early modern England: the church courts at York* (York, 1980).

modern England from a literary, social, political perspective.[6] Beyond England, historians of North America such as Roger Thompson and Mary Beth Norton, focused on defamation cases, while French historians, such as David Garrioch and Arlette Farge, studied insult as acts of verbal violence.[7]

Across disciplines, literary scholars, philosophers, anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, linguists, and social and political historians have all recognised the importance of words and insults, and they have acknowledged the significance of language throughout societies, political structures, and communities. For example, Lindsay Kaplan argued slander was both a literary concern as well as a legal and social one in early modern England. Furthermore, she suggested that this focus offered a more grounded and fluid account of power relations, moving away from the common focus on official censorship.[8] While this thesis will draw upon the work of early modern historians, it will also engage with a variety of disciplines. Their research and theories cannot be directly applied to a historical analysis, but they can bring forward new questions and topics relevant to it. Historians can benefit from the wider research on human relationships, power dynamics, and violence, and conversely, historians can provide nuanced analyses and understanding to the sometimes-broad claims of other disciplines.

---

[6] Laura Gowing, 'Gender and the language of insult in early modern London' in History workshop, xxxv (1993), pp 1-21; Alastair Bellany, '"Railing rhymes and vaunting verse": libellous politics in early Stuart England, 1603-1628' in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds.), *Culture and politics in early Stuart England* (London, 1994), pp 285-310; Alastair Bellany, 'Railing rhymes revisited: libels, scandals, and early Stuart politics' in *History compass*, iv (2007), pp 1136–79; Richard Cust, 'A Rutland quarrel, the court of chivalry and the Irish peerage during Charles I's personal rule' in *Midland history*, xxxv, 2 (2010), pp 149-73.
[7] Roger Thompson, '"Holy watchfulness" and communal conformism: the functions of defamation in early New England communities' in *The New England quarterly*, lvi (Dec. 1983), pp 504-22; Mary B. Norton, 'Gender and defamation in seventeenth-century Maryland' in *The William and Mary quarterly*, xliv (1987), pp 4-39; David Garrioch, 'Verbal insults in eighteenth-century Paris' in Peter Burke and Roy Porter (eds.), *The social history of language* (Cambridge, 1987), pp 104-20; Arlette Farge, *Subversive words: public opinion in eighteenth-century France* (Pennsylvania, 1995).
[8] Lindsay Kaplan, *The culture of slander in early modern England* (Cambridge, 1997), p. i.

The importance of language in Ireland

Language played a fundamental role in Ireland's history. In fact, Patricia Palmer stated that Ireland's history, especially in the late Tudor period, was a 'story of language'.[9] She argued that although historians often overlook language, it is a crucial element and a fundamental part of England and Ireland's encounter in the early modern period. It played a role in the confrontation of English settlers and the native Irish as the they came into closer proximity. Many of the misunderstandings between the new settlers and the Irish also existed at the simplest level: basic language and communication.[10] In *A new history of Ireland,* Alan Bliss's and Brian Ó Cuív's chapters analysed the struggle between the Irish and English languages in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[11] Throughout Ireland, different languages and dialects existed together or independent of one another. In the northern and eastern part of Ulster, Lowland Scots existed and influenced local dialects. In the rest of the country, English had spread widely through all provinces except for Connacht.[12]

Following the Elizabethan confiscations and plantations, the English language began to spread throughout Ireland. By the start of the seventeenth century, English was only spoken in a small number of places, and Irish remained the dominant language.[13] Ó Cuív argued that while Irish remained dominant in the early part of the seventeenth century, the Irish began to learn English for utilitarian reasons.[14] Interestingly, Alan Bliss noted that spoken language was different from the written. By Ireland's mid-sixteenth

---

[9] Patricia Palmer, 'Interpreters and the politics of translation and traduction in sixteenth-century Ireland' in *Irish historical studies,* xxxiii, 131 (May 2003), p. 257.

[10] Patricia Palmer, *Language and conquest in early modern Ireland: English Renaissance literature and Elizabethan imperial expansion* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 13.

[11] Brian Ó Cuív, 'The Irish language in the early modern period' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin, and F.J. Byrne (eds.), *A new history of Ireland, iii: Early modern Ireland 1534-1691* (Oxford, 1993), pp 509-45; Alan Bliss, 'The English language in early modern Ireland' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin, and F.J. Byrne (eds.), *A new history of Ireland iii: Early modern Ireland 1534-1691* (Oxford, 1993), pp 546-60.

[12] Bliss, 'The English language', p. 559.

[13] Bliss, 'The English language', pp 546-47.

[14] Ó Cuív, 'The Irish language', p. 529

century, written English documents no longer shared characteristics with medieval

Hiberno-English but conformed entirely with written English standards used in

England.[15] However, this was not necessarily the case for spoken English. Landowners

remained on their estates in remote areas and rarely met anyone but their Irish servants

and neighbours. Thus, even their English language became 'divorced from its cultural

roots'[16] and stagnated. Bliss also argued that a considerable amount of bilingualism

existed, as there was a fair degree of contact between English speakers and Irish

speakers.[17]

Nevertheless, in the mid-seventeenth century, monolingualism was still very

present. Irish remained the everyday language in many parts in the 1630s, and the

government had abandoned any cultural legislation that attempted to curtail the Irish

language in 1615.[18] And, Bliss noted how the events of the 1640s no doubt 'brought

English into places where it had seldom been heard before'.[19] More recently, Gerard

Farrell argued that bilingualism was in fact, the exception in seventeenth-century Ireland.

Previously, Raymond Gillespie and Nicholas Canny had emphasised the emerging

bilingualism of many in both the Irish and settler communities, based on 'examples of

accommodation between the cultures of the native and newcomer'.[20] However, Farrell

argued against this. Such claims were often based on evidence from sources, such as the

1641 depositions, that recorded seemingly unproblematic communication between the

Irish and the settlers. However, translation and interpretation were necessary across

---

[15] Bliss, 'The English language', p. 547.
[16] Bliss, 'The English language', p. 554.
[17] Bliss, 'The English language', p. 554.
[18] Bernadette Cunningham, 'Language, literature and print in Irish, 1630–1730' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Ireland, volume 2:1550-1730* (Cambridge, 2018), pp 434-457.
[19] Bliss, 'The English language', p. 553.
[20] Gerrard Farrell, *The 'mere Irish' and the colonisation of Ulster, 1570-1641* (Cambridge, 2017), p. 118; Raymond Gillespie, "Success and failure in the Ulster Plantation," in Éamonn Ó Ciardha and Micheál Ó Siochrú (eds.), *The plantation of Ulster: ideology and practice* (Manchester, 2012), p. 111; Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British* (Oxford, 2001), pp 452-3.

Ireland although seventeenth-century sources often remained silent about the presence of interpreters.[21]

Despite contemporary sources that presented speech between the Irish and the English as seemingly uncomplicated, this was not the reality. Interpreters were often needed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[22] While the Irish language was strangely absent from colonial tracts, as Patricia Palmer noted in the sixteenth century, this did not mean that it was not being spoken. Early modern English and Irish sources often remained silent about an interpreter's presence.[23] In the seventeenth century this was evident as well, as Farrell argued. Even in cases where the speaker was clearly monolingual, sources often excluded any mention of translation or interpretation.[24] Farrell suggested that the reason for this silence was due to their common presence in Ireland. The authors assumed the reader would know that interpreters were needed and used.[25]

When working with English language sources in early modern Ireland, historians must always remember the role of translation. The original words recorded in sources were sometimes originall spoken in English while at other times, they were translated from Irish or even a dialect. This raises questions about the accuracy of speech as found in seventeenth-century sources. This introduction will re-address the question of language and translation in relation to the 1641 depositions more specifically in a later section. However, this was one additional indication of the complexities of language in Ireland. Both the interaction of the Irish and English languages and the questions of translation further emphasised Palmer's claim that Ireland's history is a 'story of language'.[26] However, beyond the two languages, historians must also engage with the words said and

---

[21] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'.* p. 118.
[22] Patricia Palmer, 'Interpreters and the politics', p. 258.
[23] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 118; Patricia Palmer, 'Interpreters and the politics', pp 258-9.
[24] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 118.
[25] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp 118-9.
[26] Palmer, 'Interpreters', p. 257.

written, and not only ask questions about translation and accuracy. In fact, Palmer also touched upon the troubled conversations between Irish and English speakers, considering instances of slander, insult, and seditious speeches in the sixteenth century.[27]

Ultimately, language touched all aspects of history, as historian David Cressy argued. He wrote of the interconnectivity and wide importance of language across many historical topics, and he argued the need to integrate 'social and political history, historical sociological linguistics, and the history of law'.[28] Therefore, a focus on language has the potential to touch upon various topics and areas important and interconnected in Irish history. This thesis will demonstrate this in the 1641 depositions and hopes to prompt further studies of words and speeches in seventeenth-century Ireland.

However, this focus has not been overlooked entirely by all historians. Several have acknowledged the importance of words in Ireland. Dianne Hall and John McCafferty each published articles on Irish slander and defamation. Hall's 'Words as weapons: speech, violence, and gender in late medieval Ireland' focused on 'violent words' in late medieval Ireland and McCafferty's 'Defamation and the church courts in early sixteenth century Armagh' explored evidence of laws and cases punishing illegal words.[29] Most recently, Tait briefly reflected how insults were a form of 'social lowering' and undermining of enemies.[30]

More specifically, scholars have also addressed presence and use of language in the 1641 depositions. The multi-disciplinary project called 'Language and linguistic evidence in the 1641 depositions' asked how language served different agendas related to

---

[27] Palmer, *Language and conquest*, p. 13.
[28] David Cressy, *Dangerous talk: scandalous, seditious and treasonable speech in pre-modern England* (Oxford, 2010), p. xii.
[29] Hall, 'Words as weapons', pp 122-41; McCafferty, 'Defamation', pp 88-99.
[30] Tait, 'Society, 1550-1700', p. 296.

politics, religion, and law.[31] Linguist Nicola MacLeod's work has informed questions asked in this thesis and provided the most extensive study on terms used in the 1641 depositions. Referencing linguistic research that identified name-calling as 'a powerful ideological tool, and an accurate pointer to the ideology of the namer',[32] MacLeod explored how frequent words in the depositions played this role. Using various linguistic approaches, she explored how language was used to shape the Irish as 'other'.[33]

Furthermore, *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions*, a collection of essays applying new perspectives and methodologies for work on the 1641 depositions, included Mark Greengrass's chapter on language. In this, he highlighted the specific importance of words, particularly speech. He focused on a series of testimonies from a 1561 French religious riot, and he argued that similar work could be done with the 1641 depositions. Micheál Ó Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer acknowledged the important of Greengrass's focus and argued 'there is much in his methodology that might inspire scholars of the 1641 depositions, especially given the determination of the commissioners to record the reported speech of the insurgents'.[34] This thesis was inspired in part by this statement.

The 1641 depositions

On 22 October 1641 rebellion broke out in Ulster. This uprising was part of a larger plan, which included plots to take Dublin Castle and various English strongholds throughout Ireland. However, the Dublin government learned of this in advance effectively stopped an uprising from taking place in the city. While Dublin did not fall, the rebellion continued, and its leaders seized control of many of the key strongholds in the north.

---

[31] Micheál Ó Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions* (Manchester, 2013), p. 5.
[32] Nicola MacLeod, 'Rogues, villaines & base trulls: constructing the other in the 1641 depositions' in Annaleigh Margey, Eamon Darcy and Elaine Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 depositions and the Irish rebellion* (London, 2012), pp 113-28.
[33] MacLeod, 'Rogues, villaines', p. 125.
[34] Ó Siochru and Ohlmeyer, *Ireland: 1641,* p. 9.

They intended to negotiate with Charles I from a position of power and to reclaim property and secure religious toleration.[35]

At the start, leaders instructed the army to only kill in battle and to arrest the gentry, while sparing Scottish planters. However, the insurgents did not adhere to this. Many Irish Catholics attacked settlements and farms, robbing and killing Protestant settlers throughout Ireland. This in turn led to an English response in which an unknown number of Irish lost their lives. While the total number of lives lost is unknown, more lives were lost during the 1640s than in the later rebellions of Ireland's eighteenth and twentieth centuries.[36]

The very nature of the rebellion remains a topic of debate among historians. John Walter and Ciska Neyts have challenged the long-held idea that it turned into a popular rebellion. Neyts showed that more landowners and nobles participated in the robberies in County Cavan then was once thought and argued that studies of the 1641 rebellion must reconsider 'the dichotomy between the 'noble' and the 'popular' revolt',[37] and the idea that it spiralled out of control and became a violent event of the lower social orders. Walter also encouraged historians to reconsider the understanding of the rebellion as one that was two-tiered where the elite lost control as a popular movement took hold. Instead, he argued that the idea that 'popular fury' drove the rebellion's violence does not correlate with a close reading of the 1641 depositions, something other historians have started to see, even if further consideration is needed.[38] While this thesis will focus on words and speeches, it will also consider the nature of the rebellion in the conclusion

---

[35] John Gibney, 'Protestant interests? the 1641 rebellion and state formation in early modern Ireland', *Historical research,* lxxxii, 223 (Feb. 2011), pp 67-8.
[36] Ó Siochru and Ohlmeyer, *Ireland: 1641 contexts,* p. 1.
[37] Ciska Neyts, 'Mapping the outbreak of the rebellion: robberies in county Cavan (October 1641)' in Eamon Darcy, Annaleigh Margey, and Elaine Murphy (eds.) *The 1641 depositions and the Irish rebellion* (London, 2012), p. 50.
[38] John Walter, 'Performative violence and the politics of violence in the 1641 depositions' in Micheál Ó Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions* (Manchester, 2013), pp 146-7.

chapter. A close reading of the 1641 depositions and the words of the Irish rebels may provide some additional insights into this important and complex question.

On 23 December 1641, two months following the outbreak, the lords justice in Dublin established the 'Commission for the despoiled subject' from which the 1641 depositions were created. Throughout the 1640s and 1650s, commissioners documented thousands of eyewitness and hearsay testimony from survivors of the rebellion, and they recorded reports of physical violence, loss of goods and livestock, military movements, and many other actions. Between 1641 and 1647, eight commissioners recorded thousands of depositions as refugees escaped into the city fleeing from the violence across the country. Eight clergymen led by Henry Jones, dean of Kilmore, collected the accounts taken in the 1640s. Their purpose was threefold. They aimed to collect evidence against the insurgents, give a historical record of what happened, and assist in relief for victims. These depositions largely catalogued property losses suffered by English and Scottish Protestants, as well as tales of atrocities. The 1641 depositions also contained a second smaller group of documents taken later in the 1650s, known as the Commonwealth examinations. These documents were taken for the specific purpose of convicting perpetrators of violence. The 1641 depositions comprise thirty-three volumes and over eight thousand documents. This thesis will use examples from both the 1640s and 1650s, and this thesis' conclusion will re-visit and explore the differences and similarities discovered between these accounts in relation to words.[39]

The testimonies offered an insight into the atrocities of this time, and it became clear that the 1641 depositions provided a valuable starting point for the consideration of speech and words in seventeenth-century Ireland. Many other sources contained

---

[39] Naomi McAreavey, 'Portadown 1641: memory and the 1641 depositions' in *Irish University Review,* xlvii, 1 (May 2017), pp 16-7.

information about spoken words as well (and some of them will be utilised where appropriate in this thesis), however, there were many reasons to focus on the 1641 depositions. First, hundreds of accounts recorded the language of English victims, deponents, as well as the insurgents. These accounts provided examples of written texts, but also various types of spoken words. Numerous depositions contained information about treasonous speech as well as offensive personal words. They sometimes told of words too terrible to repeat, and they documented speech said both against and for the king of England. Other accounts existed that focused solely on speech. Each of these accounts opened a multitude of questions concerning the deponents' as well as the commissioners' concern with words of treason, slander and even insult. At the same time, they provided the opportunity to address and answer many of these questions.

Second and more specifically, hundreds of accounts recorded personal insults and name-calling used during the 1641 rebellion. Deponents told of verbal abuse experienced alongside harrowing accounts of physical violence, while others reported the specific insult used against themselves and other victims. Historian David Garrioch argued that 'insults, like other forms of speech, are a product of the society in which they are aired'. [40] Insults specifically could serve as enforcers of a society's dominant value systems. They were—at the very least—a form of socialisation and a way of teaching the values of society. However, they also held the potential to compel individuals to observe social priorities or to destroy an individual's place in society. They can provide insight into what was considered violence and what encouraged and furthered acts of physical violence.[41] Therefore, while the analysis of insults may appear insignificant or secondary amid other historical events, the examination of both the source of insult and the environment of

---

[40] Garrioch, 'Verbal insults', p. 104.
[41] Garrioch, 'Verbal insults', p. 113.

place, time and society surrounding it can provide insight into social relations in the early modern period. This was evident in the 1641 depositions. The numerous accounts documenting word and name-calling in the 1641 depositions signalled an incredible opportunity to ask new questions.

Third, Aidan Clarke underlined the 1641 depositions' inherent legal nature. The English administration intended to use the accounts to hold the Irish rebels to account for their participation in the 1641 rebellion.[42] The 1641 depositions, as a legal source, related similarly to the primary documents often used in English historiography. Early modern English studies relied heavily on legal records, as did John McCafferty's article on Irish slander in the sixteenth century.[43] While the available seventeenth-century Irish legal sources cannot compare to those in England due to the destruction of the Public Record Office in 1922, the 1641 depositions are a large body of material that contains thousands of legal documents. Despite their complexities which will be addressed in the following section, historians cannot overlook them as valuable legal sources. Therefore, any words or speeches in the 1641 depositions carried a degree of legal significance that will be an important part of establishing what language meant and did in the 1641 rebellion.

Fourth, the 1641 depositions are valuable for the better understanding of Ireland's social history. They contained records documenting language reported by individuals from across the social classes, including the middling sort and the lower orders. This allowed for a deeper analysis into the social implications of words alongside the legal. Fifth, the online 1641 depositions project, which digitised and provided transcriptions of the original manuscripts, allowed for deeper engagement. It enabled the identification of themes and frequent terms used. This database cannot replace careful reading of the

---

[42] Aidan Clarke, 'The 1641 depositions' in Peter Fox (ed.),*Treasures of the library, Trinity College Dublin* (Dublin, 1986), p. 118; Jennifer Wells, 'English law, Irish trials and Cromwellian state building in the 1650s' in *Past & Present,* ccxxvii, 1 (May 2015), p. 84.
[43] McCafferty, 'Defamation', pp 88-99.

depositions, but it provided valuable tools, particularly the search tool, for discovering specific terms of insults.[44] However, this online database has its flaws. For example, it only searches for the exact spelling of a word, and it does not account for the varied spelling prevalent in the seventeenth century. For instance, the 1641 depositions contained at least ten different spellings of the common term 'puritan', which this was the norm for many individual words. Historians cannot rely upon the online database search tool to bring forward every instance or spelling of these particular words.

The separate Cultura project rectified this problem for a time by allowing for searches across the normalised the spelling of words. It was not a perfect solution, but it brought forward additional accounts that did not appear through the 1641 website search tool. Unfortunately, this database no longer exists: a clear example that while databases can supplement research, they cannot be relied upon to produce all relevant material or provide its service indefinitely. Despite these challenges, this thesis is indebted to the work of those who worked on the 1641 website. They created an unprecedented opportunity for scholars and students to engage with the depositions, opening new research and insights.

Reliability of the 1641 depositions

It was vital to recognise the one-sided nature of the 1641 depositions. Its 'single purpose' was to record English Protestant losses and the cruelty of the Irish Catholics, and no equivalent source exists that recorded the Irish Catholic losses and sufferings. Despite this bias, both the Irish and the English committed extreme forms of violence upon one another during the 1641 rebellion. Therefore, when using the 1641 depositions, historians cannot avoid the question of reliability.[45]

---

[44] TCD 1641 project website, (http://1641.tcd.ie/index.php).
[45] Ó Siochru and Ohlmeyer, *Ireland: 1641 contexts,* p. 3.

Despite their legal nature, elaborations, exaggerations, or even manipulation filled many depositions. To address this problem, historians have presented several possible solutions. For example, some have suggested that a distinction between depositions containing eyewitness testimony versus those based on hearsay may be helpful. Nicholas Canny noted the importance of this distinction, arguing that the often-fantastic reports based on hearsay cannot be used as evidence that these events really occurred. Barbara Fennell, the principal investigator of the 'Language and linguistic evidence in the 1641 depositions project' at the University of Aberdeen also addressed this difference. She wrote that hearsay evidence often entered 'the realm of the fantastic and, in subsequent years, was frequently extracted from the depositions to spice the Protestant printed accounts of the insurrection. Such material cannot be accepted as evidence that these reported events ever occurred'.[46]

While this may be true in some accounts, a straight divide between eyewitness testimony and hearsay evidence did not work. This divide was complicated and nuanced. In fact, Eamon Darcy observed that reliability cannot simply be based on eyewitness versus hearsay and noted how some deponents and commissioners in the 1641 depositions specifically stressed the reliability of some hearsay evidence.[47] Alternatively, historians have also argued the unreliable nature of eyewitness accounts as well. Even eyewitness testimony raised questions, just like other accounts based on hearsay. There were many possible reasons why deponents changed their stories or may have provide exaggerated or false information, including the influence of trauma upon memory. Historian Erin Peters argued the importance of identifying or placing trauma into historical analysis. Peters considered accounts concerning individual psychological war

---

[46] Barbara Fennell, '"Dodgy dossiers"? Hearsay and the 1641 depositions' in *History Ireland*, xix (2011), pp 27-8.
[47] Eamon Darcy, *The Irish rebellion of 1641 and the wars of the three kingdoms* (Suffolk, 2013), p. 12.

trauma, and she explored the impact of personal and collective trauma. While historians must be cautious about interpreting trauma in the past and recognise that the experience of suffering and death was different in the early modern period, Peters nonetheless highlighted its importance. She also noted that trauma sometimes limited an individual's or community's ability to express the traumatic events they faced, and therefore their reports may contain inaccurate facts but still reveal how they, as victims, remembered or understood their experience.[48]

Naomi McAreavey addressed this topic in reference to the 1641 depositions in her article 'Portadown 1641'. She argued that historians cannot rely upon survivors of the 1641 rebellion to provide accurate timelines or details of the violence due to the effects of trauma.[49] Her focus remained on victims from northern counties who arrived in Dublin, which was a great distance from their homes and likely unfamiliar to them. Having survived the rebellion and also endured a long dangerous journey through rebel territory, they arrived in Dublin traumatised and exhausted. This experience likely impacted what and how they remembered and thus reported events. Although their accounts may be filled with inaccuracies, McAreavey argued that some traumatised deponents did not intentionally manipulate their stories. They may, in fact have believed what that they were reporting at the time through the lens of trauma. Their accounts, therefore, can communicate their real fears and experience although the facts of the actual events may have been different. Despite McAreavey's focus on those coming from the north, these ideas can apply to many other witnesses in the 1641 depositions across Ireland's counties.[50]

---

[48] Erin Peters, 'Trauma narratives of the English Civil War' in *Journal for Early modern cultural studies*, xvi, 1 (winter, 2016), p. 80.
[49] McAreavey, 'Portadown 1641', p. 19.
[50] McAreavey, 'Portadown 1641', pp 17-8.

Additionally, the use of the Irish language and its translation were evident in the 1641 depositions, which presented further complexities to accounts. In general, the conflict between the Irish and English languages, as noted by Alan Bliss and Brian Ó Cuív earlier, was also present in the 1641 depositions. Some accounts specifically mentioned this, as for example in the deposition of John Montgomery. He reported that the Irish rebels he encountered killed Protestants, desecrated bibles, took him and others as prisoners and all the while would not 'willingly suffer any one to speake the English tongue.[51]

The presence of the Irish language was clear; therefore, the unseen role of interpreters and translation also must be recognised in the 1641 depositions. As noted earlier, Gerard Farrell argued that words said in Irish were often recorded in English with little to no indication of this translation provided in the source, as was the case for most depositions.[52] Because many accounts did not mention this translation, there was always the possibility of reports 'inflecting the original meaning with the values of the target language'.[53] Occasionally, an account did state that words were originally spoken in Irish, as in the examination of Hiber Scott from 1653, and the deposition of Thomas Fleetwood from 1643.[54] Yet, these accounts did not provide the original Irish, which reinforced the possible mistranslation of words reported in English but originally spoken and heard in Irish.[55] Therefore, when analysing specific words recorded in the 1641 depositions, the possible mistranslation must always be remembered, even if historians cannot prove or disprove it.

---

[51] Deposition of John Mountgomery, 26 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 132r.
[52] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 118.
[53] Palmer, 'Interpreters and the politics', p. 262.
[54] Examination of Hiber Scott, 23 Dec. 1653, TCD, Ms 839, ff. 226v; Deposition of Thomas Fleetwood, 22 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 039r-039v.
[55] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 136.

Beyond translation, the 1641 depositions presented a biased and a one-sided report of spoken words in the 1640s and 1650s. They were taken in a formal setting by commissioners with a specific purpose and intent behind these records. It was very likely that words were manipulated or left out by the deponents or the commissioners in various accounts regarding speech. Just as some reports did not include the full account of robberies or killings, some may not include all offensive speech, and this point will be revisited throughout the following chapters. Overall, to generalise the reliability or unreliability of the entirety of the 1641 depositions is folly. There is no straightforward rule for determining accuracy. Some reports were accurate and some inaccurate, while some accounts seemed to provide a mixture of true and untrue events.

Yet, this uncertainty does not discredit the significance of studying speech in the depositions. Whether deponents truly heard what was recorded was not the only important point. The fact that they reported them can still reveal how deponents experienced and related the events recorded. Literary scholars have argued the importance of words despite their historical accuracy. In her book *Shakespeare and the popular voice,* Annabel Patterson was less interested in the reports' accuracy and more on the literary function. She, therefore, accepted passages into her analysis even if taken from unreliable sources.[56] Additionally, Naomi McAreavey argued that while the 1641 depositions may always not provide the 'facts' of what happened, they are a resource with insights into memories of the rebellion. Furthermore, Nicholas Canny argued the value of reports of physical atrocities in the depositions in *Making Ireland British* despite their accuracy. Their inclusion communicated a 'sense of the terror which gripped the minds of the settlers as word reached them of the breakdown of authority in several parts of the

---

[56] Annabel Patterson, *Shakespeare and the popular voice* (Oxford, 1989), p. 42. Of

country'.[57] In the same way, words offered this insight into the deponents' experience and how these events were interpreted. More generally, Canny argued that the 1641 depositions cannot be discounted 'because they constitute the only detailed information, we have of what happened'.[58] The same can be argued for the verbal exchanges recorded in these accounts. Historians cannot discount them because they may be one-sided, inaccurate, manipulated, or mistranslated.

In fact, Mark Greengrass discussed the difficulty working with unclear testimony when studying words, as the French testimonies he researched presented similar problems. Despite this, Greengrass argued the need to 'tune into' the sources' orality, including the 1641 depositions. By engaging questionable evidence, he suggested that historians may still be able to retrieve some of the rebel voice, which without such sources would be lost in entirety.[59] These points were significant, indicating that unreliability does not reduce words' importance in historical analysis. This thesis acknowledges the complexities of the 1641 depositions, but it maintains that the study of the words recorded in it had immense value despite them.

The remit of this thesis is to place words into our understanding of seventeenth-century Ireland. There are many questions still necessary to address in the current historiography, and this thesis aims to reveal the insights words bring, particularly to the 1641 rebellion. Because the 1641 depositions hold thousands of individuals accounts, which the majority of focus on robberies and lost property, every individual deposition contained in this archive was not read through systematically. Rather, this thesis initially relied on the online database's key word search to discover individual insults and words in the reports. Through this search, over three hundred depositions were identified.

---

[57] Canny, *Making Ireland British*, p. 468.
[58] Canny, *Making Ireland British*, p. 436.
[59] Ó Siochru and Ohlmeyer, *Ireland: 1641 contexts,* p. 9.

Common themes and questions arose from careful consideration of these accounts, and these individual words inspired the chapters of this thesis and further reading of additional, relevant depositions. Each chapter, except for chapter two which focuses on the various types of words found in the depositions, will provide a case study of the individual insults that initially raised the relevant questions for it.

However, it was also important to carefully read through many of the depositions that did not come from the key word search. In order to do so, this thesis also focused on both the 1641 project's categories and individual case studies. The online database provides a breakdown of depositions based on the subjects contained in them. Each deposition that was identified as including 'words' was considered in particular. Beyond this, individual depositions prompted deeper analysis of related accounts. For example, chapter three will explore some of the legal cases that involved words and the supporting documents that speak to a particular case involving language but do not necessarily record the specific terms used. Chapter three will also analyse the depositions about the infamous drownings at Portadown and Belturbet. Each of the depositions for these events were read and carefully explored for possible use of words. This thesis also focused on violence, and therefore, the most detailed accounts of violence were examined closely in order to understand if and how words played a role. These will be explored in chapter five.

Hundreds of depositions contained reported words and speeches. Chapter two will explore the kinds of language found in more detail; however, this thesis will primarily focus on insults and name-calling. The specific words used to insult another created a unique opportunity to ask questions about society, power, violence, emotions, and the human-animal relationship that have not been addressed prior to this thesis. But it will also explore treasonous words throughout due to the context of the 1641 rebellion and the

depositions. The accounts reported about a time of treason, disloyalty, and uprising, and it was impossible to separate insults from this context. Often, words were intertwined with various themes, and throughout this thesis, the nature of an individual word or case may often be unclear. An insult may be a personal attack or it may be a direct accusation of treason, and this thesis will explore these nuances. The end of chapter two will consider the additional types of language found in the depositions, but this thesis will not focus on them specifically. However, their presence in these accounts demonstrates the wide scope of words and the opportunity to continue to delve into the language of the 1641 depositions.

Additional sources

Just as the 1641 depositions contained hundreds of reports on words, other sources also referenced language and speech. Seventeenth-century sources were concerned with traducers, ill aspersions, defamations, the smart of evil tongues, and the 'paper bullets of reproachful slanders'.[60] These sources included legal records, letters, manuscripts, poetry in Irish and English, and printed books. While this thesis will primarily address the 1641 depositions, it will draw upon additional sources to indicate that this concern for words existed outside of the rebellion.

This thesis will consider additional legal sources. Although Ireland's legal records are limited, more material exists than once was thought, and questions once thought impossible to answer, can be addressed.[61] In the context of language and misspoken words, this holds true as well. Evidence of existing laws, cases, and resulting punishments

---

[60] Sir Ralph Lane to Sir Robert Cecil, 30 May 1601 (Cal. S.P. Ire., 1509-1603, p. 363).
[61] Jane Ohlmeyer, 'Records of the Irish chancery court: a preliminary report for 1627-1634' in Desmond Greer and Norma Dawson (eds.), *Mysteries and solutions in Irish legal history* (Dublin, 2001), pp 15-49; Mary O'Dowd, 'Women and the Irish chancery court in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries' in *Irish historical studies,* xxxi, 124 (Nov. 1999), pp 470-87; Ken Nicholls, 'Some documents on Irish law and custom in the sixteenth century' in *Analaecta Hibernica,* 26 (1970), pp 27-33; Bríd McGrath (ed.), *The minute book of the corporation of Clonmel, 1608-1649* (Dublin, 2006); Margaret Clayton (ed.), *Council book for the province of Munster, c. 1599-1649* (Dublin, 2008); Jon Crawford, *A star chamber court in Ireland: the court of castle chamber, 1571-1641* (Dublin, 2005).

for words survived. Material from the province of Munster, the county of Waterford, and the town of Clonmel survived, which provide insight into the treatment and punishment of words.[62] Additionally, parliamentary records indicated the existence of acts specifically against particular speech, while legal cases were evident in manuscripts found in Marsh's library and in cases in Ireland's castle chamber. Chapter two will consider these points in-depth.

Additionally, Ireland's state papers contain hundreds of documents that address words and document cases concerning language. The state papers were filled with 'malicioas and incredible foul defamation',[63] 'obloquy and slander',[64] 'malicious accusations',[65] 'odious and disgraceful speeches',[66] 'undutiful speeches',[67] and opprobrious speech. Furthermore, there were references to 'traitorous words[68] and 'villainous words'.[69] Documents spoke of 'ill and uncontrolled tongues'.[70] It contained calumnies,[71] insults,[72] aspersions[73] uncivil language[74] and scandalous ballads.[75] The Carte manuscripts also recorded words and speech in the seventeenth century. They contained references to cases in Ireland's castle chamber as well as letters that documented the spreading of false rumours, slanderous reports, and mentions of calumny. In particular,

---

[62] Clayton, *Council book*; G.T. Gilbert (ed.), 'Archives of the municipal corporation of Waterford', Historical Manuscripts Commission, *rep. 10, appendix 5* (London, 1885), pp 337-9; McGrath, *The minute book*.

[63] Sir Arthur Chichester to the Privy Council, 8 Oct 1609 (Cal. S.P. Ire., 1608-1610, p. 296).

[64] The Lord Chancellor Loftus, 1600 (Cal. S.P. Ire., 1509-1603, p. 425).

[65] The Lord Justice Loftus to Sir Robert Cecil, 19 Jan. 1600 (Cal. S.P. Ire., 1599-1600, p. 406).

[66] Captain Lionel Ghest to [Sir Robert Cecil], June 1600 (Cal. S.P. Ire., 1509-1603, p. 283).

[67] The Lord Chancellor Loftus and Thomas [Jones], Bishop of Meath, to [John Whitgift], Archbishop of Canterbury, 7 Apr. 1600 (TNA, SP 63/207/2 f.30); Sir Nicholas Walsh, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, to Sir Robert Cecil (TNA, SP 63/208/2 f.0163).

[68] Humphrey May to Cecil, 5 May 1603 (Cal. S.P. Ire., 1603-1606, p. 42); Conference passed betwixt Florence McCarthy and Donnell McCarthy (TNA, SP 63/207/2 f.202 Certain).

[69] Florence McCarthy to Sir Robert Cecil (TNA, SP 63/207/3 f.52).

[70] Sir Arthur Chichester to [Salisbury] (TNA, SP 63/225 f.152).

[71] Answer of the Earl of Cork to the bill of complaint of Margaret FitzGerald, widow (TNA, SP 63/247 f.188).

[72] The Lord Deputy Mountjoy and the Council to the Privy Council (TNA, SP 63/207/2 f.1).

[73] Lord Deputy Oliver St. John to the Lords of the Council (TNA, SP 63/235 f.7).

[74] Sir. Wm. St. Leger to the Admiralty (TNA, SP 63/254 f.30).

[75] Sir Ellis Leighton to [Joseph Williamson] (TNA, SP 63/329 f.101).

manuscripts from the later decades of the seventeenth century referred to 'printed libels scattered around marketplace in Derry and other libelous pamphlets',[76] and the name-calling of women as 'they who raised devils'.[77] Manuscripts recorded the imprisonment for words,[78] attempts to clear oneself 'from all aspersions' by the privy council,[79] court cases on defamation,[80] and quarrels.[81] There were also legal examinations and petitions that contained evidence of highly disloyal speech but also personal language across the seventeenth century. While the 1641 depositions remained central in this these, these additional sources will be reference throughout relevant chapters.

Irish language sources

The importance of Irish language sources also needed acknowledgment. As the 1641 depositions contained hundreds of accounts to consider (alongside additional sources in the seventeenth century), this thesis focused on English-language sources. However, bringing this into consideration with Gaelic sources cannot be entirely overlooked. For one, it is crucial to recognise that this concern with language and the power of words was not merely a transplanted idea from England brought over as a unique aspect of English law to Ireland. Words were an important part of Irish society, culture, and law. Bardic poetry and satirical works such as the *Pairlement Chloinne Tomáis* played a significant role in Irish identity and society. The words of praise poets, who were traditional custodians of high Gaelic culture, were key to the Irish identity in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. And Gaelic nobles were reliant on the poets for their lineage, who

---

[76] Bishop of Derry [George Wilde] to Ormond (Bodl., Carte Ms 45, f. 117).
[77] Bennet to Ormond Written (Bodl., Carte Ms 46, f. 21).
[78] Ormond to Bennet (Bodl., Carte Ms 143, f. 61-62); Sir Simon Degge to Sir William Aston (Bodl., Carte Ms 199, f. 10).
[79] Geoffrey Brown to Lane (Bodl., Carte Ms 215, ff. 97v-98).
[80] Petition of Jane Rathborne, wife of John Rathborne, of Dublin, Glover, to the duke of Ormond (Bodl., Carte Ms 154, f. 101v).
[81] A relation [of a quarrel amongst gamesters, and of an affray ensuing thereon], by Captain Bromidge (Bodl., Carte Ms 37, f. 12).

enjoyed 'intimate access to the ranks of the *élite'*.[82] As well, chapter two will note the importance of words in Gaelic history with the brief consideration of Fergus Kelly's work on early Irish laws. However, there may be further insights into the foundation of these laws. In fact, medieval historian Robin Stacy wrote *Dark speech: the performance of law in early Ireland*, which largely focused on the role of words in theatre but also touched upon the power of words and silences in constructing law.[83]

The work of historians such as Joep Leerssen and Terence McCaughey provided important insights that may help place some components of this thesis in relation to Irish sources. Joep Leerssen's article, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland' discussed the use of, or lack of, anti-English terms in political poetry. He argued that such poetry largely abandoned anti-English terms after the early seventeenth century, as a result of the defeat and flight of the earls in 1609.[84] Furthermore, Terence McCaughey considered the use of animal insults in the later seventeenth century. Particularly interesting compared to the 1641 deposition was McCaughey's claim that invective against English settlers focused on their slowness. They were depicted as 'slow, dull-witted, have no savoir-faire, are clumsy, and no match for the cleverness and sprightliness of the Sons of the Gael'.[85] This will be referenced again in chapter four in relationship to the portrayal of the Irish as

---

[82] Marc Caball, 'Language, print and literature in Irish, 1550-1630' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Ireland, volume 2:1550-1730* (Cambridge, 2018), pp 413-414; see also: Bernadette Cunningham, 'Language, literature', pp 434-457 ; Michelle O Riordan, *The Gaelic mind and the collapse of the Gaelic world* (Cork, 1990); Michelle O Riordan, *Irish bardic poetry and rhetorical reality* (Cork, 2007); Bernadette Cunningham, 'Native culture and political change in Ireland, 1580-1640' in Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie (eds), *Natives and newcomers: essays on the making of Irish colonial society, 1534-1641* (Dublin, 1986), pp 148-70; Tom Dunne, 'The Gaelic response to conquest and colonisation: the evidence of the poetry', *Studia Hib.*, xx (1980), pp 7-30; Marc Caball, 'The Gaelic mind and the collapse of the Gaelic world: an appraisal' in *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*, xxv (Summer 1993), pp 87-96; Marc Caball, 'Pairlement chloinne tomais I: a reassessment', *Eigse*, xxvii (1993), pp 47-57.

[83] Fergus Kelly, *Guide to early Irish law* (Dublin, 1988); Robin Stacy, *Dark speech: the performance of law in early Ireland* (Philadelphia, 2007).

[84] Joep Leerssen, 'Wildness, wilderness, and Ireland: medieval and early-modern patterns in the demarcation of civility' in *Journal of the history of ideas,* lvi, 1 (Jan. 1995), p. 35.

[85] Leerssen, 'Wildness, wilderness', p. 36.

uncivil through the words. Additionally, Gaelic bards compared their enemies to animals, which chapter seven will address.[86]

Thesis structure

A study of speech opened new questions that touched upon various topics that were interconnected, as shown in David Cressy's work.[87] In order to demonstrate the widespread importance of words in the 1641 depositions, this thesis did not limit research to one area, be it law or violence. Each chapter will focus on a separate topic in relation to words: law, power, honour and gender, violence, emotion, and human-animal relations. As well, the chapters will build upon each other while also engaging with new questions and historical topics. Therefore, each chapter will open with an analysis of the relevant historiography and interdisciplinary scholarship relating to that topic and the 1641 depositions. With the exception of chapter two, every chapter will also incorporate a focused analysis of individual terms of insult into it. This tighter focus on insults will serve as a more precise example of how words can hold legal, powerful, social, violent, emotion, and dehumanising implications. Ultimately, this thesis will demonstrate that all these chapters and topics informed and intersected with one another. A word can be used in multiple ways, and it can be understood differently by various people. While one person may feel their power is being taken, another feels violence while another is worried about reputation and another about the legal ramification. This is an important point that will be re-addressed in the final chapter of this thesis.

To begin, chapter two will establish the legal concern for language in its many forms including insult, slander, treason, and defamation in Ireland's seventeenth century. Language was a legal concern prior to the 1640s in Ireland, and this chapter will consider

---

[86] Terence McCaughey, 'Bards beasts and men' in Donnchadh Ó Corráin, Liam Breatnach and Kim McCone (eds), *Sages, saints and storytellers: Celtic studies in honour of Professor James Carney* (Maynooth, 1989), p. 108.
[87] Cressy, *Dangerous talk*, p. xii.

both Irish and English laws. It will ask what precedent existed for the investigation and punishment of words. More specifically, the official commission for the 1641 depositions expressly stated this legal concern, and this chapter will explore how and if the official commission for the 1641 depositions created a specific concern for words. This chapter will contribute to this analysis by demonstrating that throughout Ireland, words were of significant legal concern beyond the 164 depositions. Furthermore, it will establish the variety of language that appeared, including both treasonous words and words of insult, libel, and slander.

The third chapter will expand upon chapter two. Words held great power in the minds of official authorities, but English deponents of the middling sort and lower orders, as well as the Irish rebels, understood this power too. Therefore, chapter three will investigate the social engagement with laws on speech and the active use of words. It will analyse the various people who interacted with words, and it will explore the various reasons why deponents reported language they witnessed. It will also consider how individuals used the power of the law and of words to extend or challenge authority across society. Ultimately, this chapter will demonstrate that while authorities attempted to monitor speech, they were not always successful. Words challenged or re-enforced power dynamics in the 1641 depositions. This chapter will conclude with a focused look at three specific terms of name-calling: 'rebel', 'traitor', and 'puritan'. As chapters begin to focus on individual insults and words, definitions and meanings will become more relevant. However, the depositions do not always provide enough detail to know the exact meaning of the words as they were used in individual accounts and moments. Therefore, this thesis will provide definitions from the *Oxford English Dictionary* that were common during the seventeenth century in order to provide possible meanings. However, these definitions will only be used as a starting point for the meaning of a word, and this thesis

cannot claim that the OED's definition matched exactly with how a term was used in the depositions.

While the third chapter will focus heavily on treasonous accusations, the fourth chapter will explore non-political words linked to reputation and gender. It will assess the relationship between words, honour, and gender. Words like 'rebel', 'traitor', and 'puritan' related to treason, but the use of 'rogue' and 'whore' moved the focus away from solely disloyal language. First, this chapter will address the specific gendered implications of speech in the 1641 depositions, and it will investigate both the similar and different ways women and men were verbally challenged or attacked. While, men and women did face different insults, chapter four will also consider how they were similarly name-called. Second, this chapter will consider the depiction of Irish as insulters and slanderers in the 1641 depositions as an additional component that portrayed them as barbaric and dishonourable. Additionally, this chapter will indicate the different insults used against the English as opposed to those used against the Irish. The English use of derogatory words against the Irish rebels raised the question of certain language's 'legitimacy' in contrast to the 'unfitting words' of the Irish perpetrators.[88]

Chapter five will argue the need to include speech among the violence perpetrated in the 1641 rebellion, and it will ask how victims of violence viewed and reported their verbal abuse alongside physical harm. Physical violence and verbal violence may be seen as very different degrees of abuse today, however, language in the context of insult, slander, and libel was a serious concern to contemporaries, one that may have equated to physical violence. Words are often overlooked, but they are key to understanding the complete experience of atrocities. Therefore, chapter five will ask how insults contributed

---

[88] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r; Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms f. 003r.

to and informed the experience of physical violence, while also existing as a particular form of violence.

The final two main chapters will address topics that remained relatively unexplored in early modern Irish historiography. Chapter six will consider the emotional implications of words, while chapter seven will analyse the insult 'English dog' and ask questions of the human-animal relationship in the 1641 depositions. When analysing language, it became evident that individuals did not always speak words based on reason or clear rationale. Throughout the earlier chapters, hints of feelings and passions were present. Numerous accounts suggested an emotional component to their speech, and therefore chapter six will address the relationship between emotions and words. It will expand upon English historian Martin Ingram's suggestion that in relation to words and insults perhaps some victims were more concerned with their hurt feelings, than with the harm done to their reputation.[89] This would not necessarily negate previous chapters' ideas, but rather point to an additional motivation that is often overlooked in historical analysis. Words in the 1641 depositions could hint at the presence of an emotion, and they could also directly express feelings present during the 1641 rebellion. As well, they generated and prompted emotional reactions that could lead to violence.

Throughout this thesis, brief case studies of individual insult will be included, but, the final chapter will focus primarily on one term: 'English dog'. It will explore many components argued throughout the thesis. It will demonstrate the depth one insult can reveal within the 1641 depositions. In this chapter, the insult 'dog' opens questions of violence, dehumanisation, and the acceptable behaviour towards a human and an animal. It will explore what the relationship between humans and animals can reveal about what

---

[89] Martin Ingram, 'Law, litigants and the construction of 'honour': slander suits in early modern England' in Peter Coss (ed.), *The moral world of the law* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 145.

it meant to be human. It will address how animals were mistreated according to the 1641 depositions, and how this compared to the treatment of human victims. More specifically, this chapter will focus on dogs as the use of the insult 'dog' was far more prevalent than any other animal term used against humans. The view and treatment of the animal will be considered in order to also understand why this insult was so frequent and how it helped justify violence against another human being. This chapter will ultimately demonstrate the complexities of a single insult while also revealing the interconnections between dehumanisation, religious motivation, Irish-English relations, and the driving influence of emotions.

Finally, the conclusion will address several important insights raised throughout this research regarding the 1641 depositions and the nature of the violence and events of the rebellion. It will consider the breakdown of the 1640s depositions in comparison to the 1650s Commonwealth examinations, and it will examine if and how this study contributed to understanding the reliability of the 1641 depositions. And finally, it will address new research opportunities that became evident throughout this work and suggest what future work might ask and where it might begin.

No significant in-depth study of verbal attacks or insults and name-calling has been contributed to the current historiography in Ireland, and such an analysis has yet to be explored by Irish historians in a period filled with physical violence and turmoil. Additionally, no study has focused primarily on the speech as recorded in the 1641 depositions nor asked how this related to other seventeenth-century sources from Ireland. Ultimately, words can begin to illuminate the 1641 depositions and bring to light intricacies and concerns of people living in seventeenth-century Ireland. This thesis will listen to what they said to one another, what they reported as having been said, and just as importantly what they are saying to historians now.

Chapter two: The legal context of 'traiterous and disloyal speech' and 'unfitting words' in the 1641 depositions

Hundreds of witnesses reported seditious, scandalous, and slanderous words in the 1641 depositions. This was a strong indication that language was a serious legal concern during the investigation of the 1641 rebellion. However, to properly examine these many depositions, they needed to be placed into a wider legal context. Therefore, this chapter will first establish the legal context for speech in Ireland, and second, it will consider the specific legality of words in the 1641 depositions.

Laws controlling and monitoring language existed throughout early modern Europe, which was a clear indication of the importance of words in the period. Legal historian Peter Rushton wrote that the early modern period was the 'golden age' of prosecuting individuals for their words. He argued that 'spoken words were the most common form of attack in the early modern period and constituted the main focus of prosecution'.[90] Rushton suggested a need for further research into the role of language and how early modern societies and individuals understood words of insult, slander, and defamation. With this in mind, it became clear that more work on the legality of words in Ireland needed to be done. The early modern period was often characterised by hierarchy and social standing, and Rushton noted that spoken words were an essential part of 'public performances of loyalty, faith, obedience and deference in a hierarchical society'.[91] Thus, words that expressed the opposite—disloyalty, insult, treason, or attack—were illegal, restrained, and monitored heavily. This raised essential questions for developing the historiography of words in Ireland, which this chapter will consider. It will explore if seventeenth-century Ireland participated in this 'golden age' of punishing words, and what

---

[90] Peter Rushton, 'The rise and fall of seditious words, 1650 to 1750' in *Northern history,* lii, 1 (Mar. 2015), p. 68.
[91] Rushton, 'The rise and fall', p. 68.

sources, aside from the 1641 depositions, provided evidence of existing laws and punishment.[92]

There were many questions to ask in order to understand words in seventeenth-century Ireland. Both English and Irish law contributed some insight into a legal concern that pre-dated Ireland's 1640s and 1650s. Therefore, this chapter will touch upon the wider legal context in both early modern England and Ireland and ask what laws existed that controlled and punished words. It will also explore what speech was regulated, and it will consider the various courts that heard cases concerning speech and language. In order to answer these questions, this chapter will briefly consider both early English and Irish laws regarding words and speech. It will also address the role of church courts and how words were considered a spiritual offence in early modern Ireland. However, the legal concern for language extended beyond church courts, and therefore, this chapter will explore parliamentary acts prohibiting speech in Ireland as well as in England and Scotland. This chapter will also demonstrate a similarity between the English star chamber and the Irish castle chamber, and it will explore the presence of cases focused solely on words in these courts. In addition, it will argue that laws and cases existed across Ireland's early seventeenth century by considering evidence from the province of Munster, the county of Waterford, and the town of Clonmel, which all regulated and punished language in some form.[93]

This chapter will also ask similar questions of the 1641 depositions. It will explore if there was a clear legal focus on the words recorded in the accounts. As well, it will ask if the commissioners specifically investigated words based on official instruction, or if speech was simply included as a small part of some witnesses' reports. This chapter's

---

[92] Rushton, 'The rise and fall', p. 68.
[93] Clayton. *Council book*; J. T. Gilbert (ed.), 'Archives of the municipal corporation of Waterford', HMC, Rep. 10, Appendix 5 (London, 1885), pp 337-9; McGrath, *The minute book.*

second half will answer these questions. It will illustrate the importance of words in the official investigation of the 1641 rebellion, and it will argue that the official commission of the 1641 depositions prioritised words by instructing that both 'traiterous speech' and 'unfitting words'[94] be documented. Finally, this chapter will consider the wide range of language found in hundreds of accounts in the 1641 depositions. There were treasonous words, but also words labelled 'unfitting'. Therefore, this chapter will analyse what words were deemed treasonous and against whom they were spoken. And, it will ask why a category such as 'unfitting words'[95] was added as part of the instructions given in the official commission for the 1641 depositions.

Early Irish and English laws

Laws controlling and punishing words existed in both England and Ireland centuries before the outbreak of the 1641 rebellion. While England's role was significant (especially in the context of the 1641 depositions), it was not the sole reason words were considered dangerous and illegal in Ireland, and this must be acknowledged. A history of punishing written and spoken words also existed among the Irish. For instance, Fergus Kelly's *A guide to early Irish law* provided evidence of this. Early Irish law regarded verbal insult as a serious offence as Brehon Law recognised the power of words and viewed them as dangerous and capable of directly wounding an individual.[96] In this context, the concern for verbal offences directly correlated to the protection of an individual's honour. Because of this, the Irish kings controlled and punished speech. For example, they only granted poets the sole privilege and ability to use words of satire.[97] However, beyond satire, early Irish laws existed against various other forms of language

---

[94] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812 f. 003r.

[95] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812 f. 003r.

[96] Hall, 'Words as weapons', pp 123-4, 129.

[97] Kelly, *Guide to early Irish Law,* p. 43.

including mocking, taunting, wrongfully accusing, and publicly causing shame. It even punished individuals who publicised another's physical deformities. These early Irish laws originated in the seventh and eighth centuries. Although such laws pre-dated the seventeenth century by hundreds of years, they showed Ireland's long history of concern for the power of words existed separate from English influence.

In later centuries, English and Irish influence and laws began to overlap in many ways. To begin, in early modern England and Ireland, many ecclesiastical courts heard cases on language. For instance, English ecclesiastical courts regularly heard cases concerning words in the early modern period. Andrew Foster's book *The church of England: 1570-1640* argued that the church courts were a 'safety valve' where communities and individuals could defend honour and reputation, enforce social control, and punish transgressors. Furthermore, Foster noted that in these English courts, forty-three per cent of the cases heard focused on defamation and slander.[98] Church courts played a significant role in punishing words in England, Irish ecclesiastical courts did the same.[99] In fact, in sixteenth-century Armagh, the spiritual component, as well as the English influence on laws in Ireland, was clear. John McCafferty's article on defamation focused particularly on slander cases in the church courts of Armagh. In this, he noted that the legal foundation for these courts dated to the 1222 constitution of the council in Oxford, which excommunicated those who maliciously defamed another 'amongst good and serious people'.[100] This reference showed how England's history of words impacted later laws that developed in early modern Ireland. It also suggested a similarity between the role of ecclesiastical courts in Ireland and England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

---

[98] Andrew Foster, *Church of England 1570-1640* (New York, 1994), p. 61.
[99] Foster, *Church of England,* p. 61.
[100] McCafferty, 'Defamation', p. 89.

Unfortunately, Andrew Foster's ability to research English church courts in-depth and to determine the percentage of cases concerning words in them was impossible in an Irish context. Regardless of this limitation, evidence still existed that church courts played a significant role in the regulation and control of language in seventeenth-century Ireland. For example, a letter was written in 1628 by Charles I to Lord Viscount Falkland, which discussed words that had been said in Ireland as a challenge to the bishop of Clogher. Francis Blennerhasset, a major planter in Ireland in possession of Bannaghmore, had slandered and defamed the bishop by uttering 'unjust vexations' and 'petulant and irreverent speeches' against him alongside other acts of disrespect.[101] According to Charles I's letter, Blennerhasset had appeared 'in the ecclesiastical court of the diocese of Clogher for slander and defamation' where he was 'upon a manifest contempt, pronounced excommunicate' by Bishop Spottiswood.[102] However, Blennerhasset's slanders and defamations were not the direct cause of his excommunication. This is a complex case, and Spottiswood excommunicated Blennerhasset for contempt of court because he had failed to appear in the bishop's court to address his words and slanders. While there were many other components of this case and series of conflicts in the diocese that led to this and other crimes (including a fist fight that involved the bishop as well as a murder), Blennerhasset's 'irreverent speeches' played a role in the events that ultimately led to his excommunication.[103]

The role of the church court of Clogher signalled the spiritual offence of Blennerhasset's words. This spiritual component was important to consider, especially in the context of early modern Ireland, where the influence of Christianity was prevalent.

---

[101] James Morrin, *Calendar of patent and close rolls of chancery in Ireland, Charles I* (3 vols., London, 1863) ii, p. 404; Richard Somerset, *Parliamentary memoirs of Fermanagh and Tyrone, from 1613 to 1885* (Fermanagh, 1887), p. 103.
[102] Morrin, *Calendar of patent,* p. 404.
[103] Raymond Gillespie, 'The trials of bishop Spottiswood' in *Clogher Record,* vol. 12, no, 3 (1987), p. 331.

Christian scripture frequently noted the sinful nature of false and scandalous speech in both the Old Testament and the New Testament. For example, the Gospel of Matthew recorded how Christ himself proclaimed: 'I tell you, on the day of judgment, people will render an account for every careless word they speak. By your words will you be acquitted, and by your words, you will be condemned'.[104] Moreover, in the epistle of James, Christ directly linked words against another as an act against the law, saying: 'do not speak evil of one another, brothers. Whoever speaks evil of a brother or judges his brother speaks evil of the law and judges the law. If you judge the law, you are not a doer of the law but a judge'.[105]

While this thesis will not focus heavily on this scriptural and religious element, it cannot be overlooked entirely. At the same time, it did not exist separately from other legal concerns. Charles I's letter also revealed that concern for words extended beyond church courts. Words also threatened power, authority, and reputation. Blennerhasset challenged the church court's initial decision by presenting the case to Lord Viscount Falkland, who then commanded the bishop to absolve him of his crime and punishment. The bishop 'in obedience to that Table' followed Falkland's command and absolved Blennerhasset.[106] Falkland's decision in some way undermined the authority of the church courts. However, shortly after Falkland's command to absolve Blennerhasset, the bishop appealed directly to Charles I as Blennerhasset continued to 'vex him with suits and clamours' thus, distracting the bishop 'from attending his function in the church and the duty of his calling'.[107] Charles I acknowledged the seriousness of this offence, and he instructed Falkland further to investigate the case with the advice of additional

---

[104] Matthew 12:36, Stephen J. Hartdegen and Christian Ceroke, *The new American bible* (Canada, 1987), p. 1028.
[105] James 4:11, Hartdegen and Ceroke, *The new American bible*, p. 1345.
[106] Somerset, *Parliamentary memoirs*, p. 103.
[107] Morrin, *Calendar of patent,* p. 404.

archbishops. If Blennerhasset was found guilty of these additional vexations and clamours, Charles I instructed Falkland to consider ways to restore the bishop's reputation and to correct Blennerhasset's 'petulant and unreverend speeches'.[108] Ultimately, Blennerhasset's words against the bishop were a crime against God, but more importantly, his irreverent words and acts of disrespect targeted the bishop's authority. While the relationship between words, power, and reputation will be addressed in chapters three and four, this example, for now, illustrated the role of church courts. Words and acts of disrespect were brought before them, but these offences were not only a spiritual offence but also a concern for power, authority, and politics. Furthermore, individuals could appeal to higher authorities beyond the church courts, who also recognised the seriousness of language.

The Irish act of 1634: profane swearing and cursing

In England, the legal basis for prosecuting language drew from both statute and common law precedent, and this was reflected similarly in Ireland.[109] The direct link between English and Irish laws on speech appeared in the ordinances of both parliaments. In fact, the parliaments of England, Scotland, and Ireland all shared a common concern for profane swearing and cursing. During the reign of Queen Mary, the Scottish parliament was the first to enact an ordinance against such speech in 1601. Under this law, offenders were fined, or if they could not pay the fine, they were set in the stocks or imprisoned for four hours. At that time, although bills on profane words and curses were brought forward, the English parliament did not enact a similar law. In 1601, a bill against 'usual and common swering' was introduced in the House of Commons, but it failed after the first reading. No further attempts were made in England until 1606 when the English

---

[108] Morrin, *Calendar of patent,* p. 404.
[109] Andy Wood, *The 1549 rebellions and the making of early modern England* (Cambridge, 2007)*,* p. 106.

parliament enacted a law to prevent the use of God's name in plays and pageants. This act censured a particular type of speech in a specific space, but it was not nearly as extensive as the Scottish 1601 act. Scotland's parliament continued to lead in the seventeenth-century concern for profane words. Another act was passed in 1609, which increased the severity of punishments.[110] Scotland was a Presbyterian country, which undoubtedly influenced the passage of such legislation. This was another indication of the importance of religion.

For two decades, attempts were made in England to create a similar law. Finally, the English parliament approved a bill in 1624, which created 'an act against prophane swearing and cursing'. Historians may find it difficult to find this act, as secondary sources often misdated it to 1623, the year the parliamentary session started.[111] This act closely reflected the Scottish one. Anyone found guilty of cursing or swearing would be fined one shilling to be paid to the parish poor. If offenders could not pay this, their goods would be seized and sold to cover the fine, or they would spend three hours in the stocks. It added the clarification that offenders under the age of twelve faced whippings by the constable or by their parents or masters.[112]

A similar act appeared in Ireland. In 1634, the Irish parliament passed 'an act to prevent and reforme prophane swearing and cursing', which was almost identical to the 1624 English law and that of Scotland in 1601. The Irish 1634 act prohibited all profane cursing and swearing, which was to be punished by either paying a fine of twelve pence to the parish poor or being set in the stocks for three hours. If the offender was under the age of twelve, they were to be whipped. This act placed Irish laws in accordance with

---

[110] Geoffrey Hughes, *The encyclopedia of swearing: the social history of oaths, profanity, foul language, and ethnic slurs in the English-speaking world* (New York, 2006), pp 166-7.
[111] Hugh Gazzard, 'An act to restrain abuses of players (1606)', *The review of English studies,* New Series, lxi, 251 (Sept. 2010), p. 519, footnote 100.
[112] Gazzard, 'An act to restrain', p. 519; Richard Burn, Joseph Chitty, and Thomas Chitty, *The justice of the peace and parish officer* (4 vols., Oxford, 1785) iii, p. 696.

those in Scotland and England, which demonstrated how the concern for such language stretched across the three kingdoms.

Additionally, a relationship between spiritual offences and official legal concern was common, and it often appeared in early modern laws. Just as Scotland's Presbyterian background likely influenced the acts passed in the early seventeenth century, the Irish 1634 act also was connected to religion. It explicitly referenced the scriptural basis for such laws, and this was true regarding words and speech. For example, a parliamentary act from 1634 against profane swearing and cursing in Ireland explicitly stated that the primary reason for the law against such words was that: 'all prophane swearing and cursing is forbidden by the word of God'. [113] Furthermore, the public nature of these punishments reflected the offence's social impact. As well, public punishments further suggested that members of that society would have been aware of the illegal and dangerous nature of their words. Chapter three will consider the question of awareness more deeply. Furthermore, the Irish parliament specifically stipulated that the act be read aloud 'in every parish church, by the minister thereof, upon the Sunday after the evening prayer, twice in the year'.[114]

Overall, the 1634 Irish act provided several insights into the legality of language in Ireland. First, the context of these laws was tied to the broader context of England and Scotland. Second, the Irish parliament directly acknowledged the importance of monitoring and controlling a particular kind of speech in Ireland. Third, the focus on profanities and the spiritual link to the 'word of God'[115] demonstrated a concern for

---

[113] George Grierson, *The statutes at large, passed in the parliaments held in Ireland: from the third year of Edward the Second, A.D. 1310 to the twenty sixth year of George the Third, A.D. 1786 inclusive : with marginal notes, and a complete index to the whole : published by authority in thirteen volumes. Vol.2, Containing from the tenth year of Charles the First, A.D. 1634, to the fourteenth and fifteenth years of Charles the Second, A.D. 1662 inclusive* (Dublin, 1786), p. 135.
[114] Grierson, *The statutes at large,* pp 135-6.
[115] Grierson, *The statutes at large*, p. 135.

words that offended God and challenged society. Fourth, this act was enacted only seven years prior to the outbreak of the 1641 rebellion. This indicated that official concern for speech existed on a high level in Ireland and was clearly addressed and considered leading into the 1640s. Additionally, the English 1624 act was only intended to last until the next parliamentary session, but it was continued in 1627 and again in 1640.[116] Such a continuation indicated its importance throughout the changing context of the century. More specifically, its second continuation in 1640 took place only one year prior to Ireland's 1641 rebellion. This date, alongside the Irish 1634 act, suggested that when authorities commissioned the 1641 depositions, they did so in a broader environment where officials and laws in Ireland, England, and Scotland prioritised words and acknowledged them as an offence that required investigation.[117]

Treasonous words in seventeenth-century England and Ireland

Laws attempted to monitor society and prevent spiritual offences; however, they also punished treasonous speech. In seventeenth-century England and Ireland, words linked to treason and disloyalty were also of great concern and were monitored and punished. English historians have considered this more deeply, and their work provided insight into the relationship between words and treason. Social historian David Cressy explored the impact of speech across five centuries in his book *Dangerous talk: scandalous, seditious, and treasonable speech in pre-modern England*. He analysed how later ideas of free speech developed out of an earlier period where scandalous and treasonous words were heavily censored and punished. Throughout his book, it became clear that laws attempting to regulate various forms of language and speech existed starting in England's medieval period. A serious concern for treasonous words was evident and growing

---

[116] Hughes, *The encyclopedia of swearing*, pp 166-7.
[117] Hughes, *The encyclopedia of swearing*, pp 166-7.

beginning in the medieval period. For instance, Edward III passed a twelfth-century

statute that created the basis for treason accusations and trials for several centuries.

Following this statute, the relationship between words and treason was questioned, and

medieval judges often debated if words were acts of treason themselves. However, while

earlier centuries produced laws on language, it was England's seventeenth century that

really saw an increase in the regulation and punishment of speech.[118] In early modern

England, Cressy argued that the words of everyday people presented a real threat to

English society, political authority, and the power of the crown. In fact, the questions

raised from Edward III's twelfth-century statute remained increasingly relevant. In

particular. it was unclear if words were considered acts of treason themselves. This debate

remained important and complex in England's early modern period, and there was

evidence that Edward III's statute was referenced in later early modern cases.[119]

In fact, Cressy analysed a case from 1627 in which a man named Hugh Pyne was

accused of speaking words against the king. While it was agreed that he had said them, it

was unclear if his words constituted an act of treason. Within this case, Edward III's

statute was cited in an attempt to clarify the nature of words. This demonstrated a

continuation of the debate over the relationship between treason and words. Pyne's words

were ultimately determined to be 'very foul' but not treasonous.[120] This decision was

based upon the specifics of that case, and it did not establish a precedent or state that

words could *never* be an act of treason. Therefore, the treasonous nature of words

remained unclear in many cases in England. However, this case was evidence that courts

specifically considered words in relation to treason and recognised its significance. This

precise focus on words heightened their importance. In fact, Annabel Patterson argued

---

[118] Keith Allan, *The Oxford handbook of taboo words and language* (Oxford, 2019)*, p. 267.
[119] Cressy, *Dangerous talk,* p. 40.
[120] Cressy, *Dangerous talk*, p. 129.

that words were important and specific acts of treason during this time. In her article, '"For words only": from treason trial to liberal legend in early modern England', Patterson focused on the existence of laws and legal cases that focused solely on words.[121]

Despite this debate, both written and spoken words that challenged the monarch and the state appeared in many legal English cases, and Cressy provided numerous examples of the rampant use and punishment of seditious and treasonous words. For example, England's star chamber tried and prosecuted cases of slander and defamation related largely to disloyalty and treason. In fact, in 1599 the star chamber focused on authors of seditious libels. The court considered these authors 'instruments of the divell', who intended 'to fill the Ruder sorte with lies and stirre upp careles men unto contempt of state and move the common sorte unto sedicon'.[122] Moreover, in the early seventeenth century in 1608, the star chamber considered libelling, in general, as a 'heinous offence', while the specific libelling of a monarch bordered on treason. Additionally, between the years of 1625 and 1642, the privy council frequently heard reports of subjects who disparaged the king.[123] Ultimately, the relationship between words and treason in early modern England remained unclear. However, it indicated that words found in early modern sources cannot automatically be considered treasonous. Historians must ask this complex question of early modern Irish sources too.

While Irish legal sources can be difficult to engage with and find, there was still plenty of evidence available. Words challenging the king, or his officials, often appeared in seventeenth-century Ireland. In fact, a similarity between English and Irish laws and

---

[121] Annabel Patterson, '"For words only": from treason trial to liberal legend in early modern England', *Yale journal of law & the humanities,* v, 2 (Jan. 1993), pp 389- 416.
[122] Wood, The *1549 rebellions*, pp 113-4; PRO, SP12/273/37.
[123] Cressy, *Dangerous Talk,* p. 132.

courts for word extended beyond 'prophane words'.[124] Just as England's star chamber

dealt with slander and defamation, Ireland's court of the castle chamber heard and

punished words. In 1571, the castle chamber was established as the judicial arm of the

Irish privy council, and it prosecuted and tried similar cases in Ireland to those heard in

England's star chamber.[125] Jon Crawford's book *A star chamber court in Ireland*

published records from this court and made the surviving material readily available. In his

publication, numerous cases specifically dealt with either spoken or written language

referencing slanders, libels, and contemptuous speech. Cases also dealt with quarrels

between the New English, the 'slaundering of nobles' and the 'raysing of seditious

newes'.[126]

      Just as England's star chamber heard cases in the late sixteenth century on

sedition and false lies intended to 'stirre up careles men unto contempt of state',[127]

Ireland's castle chamber also 'took up cases in which seditious words threatened the

queen's peace'[128] in the late sixteenth century. Crawford acknowledged that while similar

cases had been heard before, there was a noticeable increase in them during the 1590s.

For example, in June 1591, John Delahide from Dublin was tried and found guilty of

speaking treasonable words. That same day, a husbandman from Kildare named John

Keaghan was also convicted for calling Elizabeth I 'barren'[129] in Irish. Several additional

cases referenced disloyal speech. A soldier named Thomas Brooke from Dublin was

convicted of contemptuous words against the queen, and Nicholas White from Kildare

was punished for slandering the queen in 1593. In 1594, the sheriff of King's County was

---

[124] Grierson, *The statutes at large,* pp 135-6.

[125] Jon Crawford, 'The origins of the court of castle chamber; a star chamber jurisdiction in Ireland' in *The American journal of legal history*, vxxiv, 1 (Jan. 1980), p. 24.

[126] Crawford, *A star chamber*, p. 86.

[127] Wood, *The 1549 rebellions*, pp 113-4.

[128] Crawford, *A star chamber,* p. 260.

[129] Crawford, *A star chamber,* pp 260

also found guilty of disloyal words.[130] Although these examples appeared in the sixteenth century, they presented relevant material and insights to ask of Ireland's 1641 rebellion and depositions.

Crawford reflected on the increase of such cases in the sixteenth century's final decade. He also noted how the castle chamber defended the crown, particularly during war and rebellion, including through the punishment of 'trayterous & sedicious speeches'.[131] During the 1590s, rebellion and unrest were prevalent in Ireland with the aftermath of the Armada and the ongoing Tyrone's rebellion between 1593 and 1603. Prior to these years, similar cases on words had been heard in the castle chamber, but nonetheless, there was a great increase in them in the 1590s. This increase was perhaps the result of great unrest or was a part of Fitzwilliam's strategy to crack down on sedition. While this may be, Crawford warned against automatically assuming that the increase in cases had a direct correlation or causation with rebellion.[132] Such a warning resonated with work on the 1641 depositions and words recorded in them. While the 1641 rebellion was time of unrest and confusion, historians cannot assume that this event was the direct reason for the investigation or reporting of words in the depositions. This point will be considered in relation to the depositions later in this chapter.

The legal concern for words continued beyond the tumultuous 1590s into the early seventeenth century. The castle chamber also heard several cases between 1611 and 1618 on calumnies, the publication of false news, and the spreading of rumours. In 1611, a man named Simon Paulee was committed 'to the grate of Dublin Castle until next market day', then whipped and set on the pillory with his ears nailed' for 'false, seditious, and slanderous words' against James I.[133] In 1618, two cases were brought to the court of

---

[130] Crawford, *A star chamber,* pp 260-1.
[131] Crawford, *A star chamber,* p. 59.
[132] Crawford, *A star chamber* p. 260.
[133] Crawford, *A star chamber* p. 146.

castle chamber concerning word spoken against the king and nobles. On 26 March 1618, the English privy council defended one of its own members against calumny in Ireland and wrote to the viceroy and Irish council to condemn the 'lewd and slanderous report' of the priest named David Verdon, who had slandered the archbishop of Canterbury. In that same year, Verdon was found guilty of slandering the archbishop and maligning the king.[134] He was fined and publicly punished, 'set on the pillory on a market day with a paper on his head and his ears nailed, to lose both of his ears, and to remain a prisoner during pleasure'.[135] In later decades, words against authority figures continued to be brought to the castle chamber. For example, in February 1624 Humphrey Walsh of Cavan was sued 'on behalf of the Earl of Westmeath for slander, rumours, and 'malicious speeches against the deputy'.[136] Between 1627 and 1630, a priest named Patrick O Mulvaney, who had turned Protestant and then reconciled with the Catholic Church, was punished for slandering members of the Irish nobility and the clergy by accusing them of treason and saying that he did so out of malice.[137] In one notorious case, he was whipped and pilloried, humbled before four courts, and imprisoned for life for falsely accusing the popish bishop of Down and several of the Russells from Down of treason. The bishop of Down had been imprisoned as a result of O Mulvaney's accusation and died in Dublin Castle.[138] This case demonstrated the serious consequences linked to those who spoke false words and to those accused.

Outside of Ireland's castle chamber, additional evidence existed of the regulation and punishment of words in the early seventeenth century. Records from councils and

---

[134] Crawford, *A star chamber* p. 70.

[135] HMC, *Report on the manuscripts of the earl of Egmont* (2 vols., London, 1905-09) vol.1, part 1, p. 56.

[136] Robert Mahaffy, *Calendar of the state papers relating to Ireland of the reign of Charles I, 1633-1647: preserved in the public record office* (London, 1901), p. 306.

[137] Mark Empey, 'The diary of John Ware, 1623-1666' in *Analecta Hibernica,* no. 45 (IMC, 2014), pp. 74, 78, 83, 85.

[138] Crawford, *A star chamber,* p. 363; Empey, 'The diary of John Ware', p. 83.

corporations provided insight into local dealings with 'unbeseeming' words, slanderous aspersions, and libellous pamphlets, as evident, for example, in Munster. Between 1570 and 1672, a council administered the province of Munster in an attempt to 'civilise' the area, based on previously successful councils that had succeeded in 'civilising' the Marches of Wales and Northern England. The *Council book for the province of Munster* remains the only extant register of the council of Munster, and it covers the years of 1601 to 1624.[139] This source was rare, as the remaining registers of Munster, as well as those of Connacht, have disappeared. Despite years of records lost, the *Council book* allowed for the historical reconstruction of the government hierarchy. At the same time, it also provided information about the 'slices of life hidden beneath' in Munster.[140] One of these 'slices', was the control of speech and written words in the province. Most clearly, the *Council book* published the oath of a councillor from 1615. Within this oath, a Munster councillor agreed to punish libellers and stop the spread of seditions, be it seditious books or reports of false news. Such a responsibility derived from the stated fact that 'divers Lewd and malicious persons' had recently 'deuised & spread false tales newes, sayinges, writtings, seditious bookes and Libelles which amounge the people haue wrought and hereafter may wourke great mischief and inconveniencies'.[141] With the need to apprehend these 'inventers and setters fourth' of libels and false sayings, the oath required that councillors use all mean to find the 'first aucthor' of the libel. Then it stipulated that 'such offendors shalbe duely and openly punished by the said Lord President and Councell or any two or more of them (whereof the Lord President to be one) be fyned ymprionment wearing of papers and the like according to their Discretions.[142] In this example, censorship and the regulation of *written* words were evident in Munster, but evidence

---

[139] Clayton (ed.), *Council book*, p. ix.
[140] Clayton (ed.), *Council book*, p. ix.
[141] Clayton (ed.), *Council book*, p. 255.
[142] Clayton (ed.), *Council book*, pp 242, 255.

from Waterford and Clonmel pointed towards punishment for *spoken* words against authorities and officials at the city and town level.

In the city of Waterford, a charter of the guild of tailors from 1626 included a 'provision in the charter for fines if any member speaks unbeseemingly to the mayor of the city or the master and warders of the guild'.[143] Additionally, the minute book of the corporation of Clonmel contained evidence that words were regulated and punished in local towns. In a case from 1624, a boatman named James O Kennedy was punished for his foul words. He was committed to the stocks for two hours during the next market day with a white paper on his head, stating that he had given 'badd words to the Mayor'. After which, he was required to beg for the mercy of the mayor publicly and to pay a fine 5 shillings sterling.[144] Additionally, in Marsh's library, several manuscripts focused on spoken words. For example, a merchant named John Arthur was investigated for defaming the bishop of Limerick in 1637. He 'malitiously irreverently and scandalously' did publicly 'scandalize abuse and vilifie and defame the reverend father in God George Lord Bishop of Limirick'. For his words, it was decided that he was 'severely to bee punished and censured'.[145]

Name-calling and insults

Clearly, the focus in these sources centred on authority. However, while these examples showed the legal concern for disloyal speech, they did not always detail what specific words qualified as unbeseeming or scandalous. However, other examples showed that even a simple insult was punishable. For example, insults were a specific focus of a 1626 examination found in Ireland's state papers. In this, a merchant named John merchant

---

[143] Gilbert, 'Archives', pp, 337-9.
[144] McGrath, *The minute book,* p. 126.
[145] Articles against J. Arthur, merchant of Limerick, for defaming G. Webb, bp. of Limerick, 1637; Libel of H. Savadge, skinner, of Dublin against Matilda Carlile for defamation, 1645 (Marsh's Library, Ms. Z4. 2. 1 Extracts).

testified against a man named Robert King and reported how he called the gentlemen Edmund Sarsfield of Cork a 'fool and a knave'.[146] Similarly, in 1620, a gentleman named Christopher Draycott insulted Sir Francis Roe, a knight and the mayor of Drogheda and was punished for his words. He 'used most vile, reviling, scandalous and opprobrious speeches' against Roe 'calling him a base knight, a scurvy knight, and a shitten pockye knight'.[147] His insults against Roe were part of a wider incident where Draycott assaulted Lady Rose, mistreated a porter, and threw the marshal of the prison down a set of stairs. Nonetheless, his words against Roe were a primary concern. Draycott further insulted Roe stating most 'outrageously and scandalously' that 'he cared no more for him than he cared for the rose of a herring, and as he was Mayor of Drogheda [or Tredah], he cared no more for him than he cared for a turd'.[148] Such words against a knight and a mayor were not overlooked. Draycott was fined, forced to confess and to ask for Roe's forgiveness 'upon his knees in the Court of Drogheda'. [149] His penance was performed in the sessions house in the face of the Country, demonstrating that his words were more wounding fro having spoken his words publicly. Roe's public reputation and the symbols of his office had been attacked and so public restitution needed to be made.[150] He was then taxed by the Lord Chancellor and held prisoner in Dublin Castle for 'vilifying his Majesty's lieutenant'.[151] Words of colourful insult and disrespect were also dangerous and punished when they vilified those in power or official positions like the mayor of Drogheda or Sarsfield.

---

[146] Examination of divers persons taken before the Bishop of Cork and Sir Randall Clayton about Mr Sarsfield and one Robert King, 20/21 Apr. 1626 (TNA, SP 63/242 f.235).
[147] HMC, *Report on the manuscripts of the earl of Egmont,* pp 58-9.
[148] HMC, *Report on the manuscripts of the earl of Egmont,* pp 58-9.
[149] HMC, *Report on the manuscripts of the earl of Egmont,* pp 58-9.
[150] Crawford, *A star chamber,* pp. 67, 334
[151] HMC, *Report on the manuscripts of the earl of Egmont,* pp 58-9.

Many of these examples primarily focused on words spoken against the king and authority, and this can detract from the full significance of words in early modern Ireland. Clearly, words challenging the king and his officials were controlled and punished in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. However, beyond treasonous words, other seventeenth-century sources reflected the importance of various other types of language and speech. This was clear from laws that focused on words against God, as demonstrated by the role of the church courts and the Irish parliamentary act of 1634 against profane cursing and swearing as explored earlier.[152] Additionally, words of insults were investigated and punished. For example, in 1625 an Irish Catholic priest name Cale O Connelly was imprisoned for calling a Protestant minister named Phillip Risenbeck and a man named Mr Pont 'hereticks and divells'.[153] This case was another indication of how words were monitored and that words that did not need to directly speak against the king or his representatives were also a legal concern. However, to some extent, this case remained connected to authority as the Irish priest insulted a Protestant minister and thus challenged the authority and legitimacy of the Protestant church. Other evidence existed of legal cases dealing with words disconnected entirely from treason and authority. Ireland's state papers were filled with concern for traducers, quarrels, odious speeches, ill aspersions, defamations, and the 'paper bullets of reproachful slanders'.[154] More specifically, a legal article found in Marsh's library provided evidence of a case from 1636 in which a husband was investigated for abusing his wife and naming her a 'whore' in Galway. This manuscript will be revisited in chapter four in more depth.[155]

---

[152] Grierson, *The statutes at large,* pp 135-6.
[153] The Lord Deputy of Ireland to Lord Conway, 22 Sept. 1625 (SP 63/241 f.252).
[154] TNA, SP 63/208/2 f.0276.
[155] Articles against James Lynch of Ballicone, in the Co. of Galway, for abusing his wife, the daughter of Sir John McCoghlan, of Castljordan, in the King's Co. 1636 (Marsh's library, Ms. 24. 2. 1: Extracts).

All of this may seem like piecing together a puzzle of various sources and different cases from across the early seventeenth century. Ultimately, historians cannot overlook the context, place, and years of all of these sources and examples. Certainly, a case from 1618, a law from 1626, or a punishment in 1627 cannot directly inform how the 1641 depositions engaged with words in Ireland's 1640s and 1650s. Nevertheless, each of these sources indicated the legality of language and revealed the existence of laws, cases, and punishments for language be it profanities, treasonous speech, or insults and name-calling. This widespread legal context in the seventeenth century suggested that an absence of words or concern for them in the 1641 depositions would have been a curious abandonment of an established and growing concern for language.

The 1641 depositions' legal concern for words

Aidan Clarke emphasised the inherent legal nature of the 1641 depositions.[156] They were commissioned for the purpose of recording and investigating offences with the intention to establish a future tribunal to try and punish the perpetrators and actors in the 1641 rebellion. Therefore, when commissioners recorded words, they would have done so with the understanding that these details could appear and be used in a legal tribunal. In this way, the very inclusion of words in the 1641 depositions indicated their legal significance. However, this only indicated some degree of legal concern. When commissioners heard of words, they considered them important enough to include, but it did not mean that they specifically focused on investigating words in the same way they questioned deponents about robberies or physical violence. Therefore, the 1641 depositions must be examined more closely in order to understand the full concern for speech.

---

[156] Clarke, 'The 1641 depositions', p. 118.

The official commission for the 1641 depositions provided some answers. On 23 December 1641, the first official commission detailed types of acts, words, and speeches that should be recorded from the 1641 rebellion.[157] It primarily focused on 'what robberies and spoyles' had been committed against 'good subiects british and protestant'.[158] But the commissioners were also specifically instructed to inquire and document

> w*h*at traiterous or disloyal words speeches or accions were then or at any other time vtter{ed} or comitted by those robbers or any of them, what violence or other lewd Accions were then performed by the said robbers or any of them, and how often.[159]

Simplified, this first commission focused on robberies, treason, and violence. Although reports of lost property were the primary focus, written and spoken language was also prioritised alongside other acts of treason and violence. Therefore, the specific inclusion of 'words' and 'speeches' in the category of treason immediately demonstrated the importance of language. From the first commission, it was part of the legal investigation and recording of the 1641 rebellion. However, these categories focused on general topics of robberies, treason, and violence, and words were only mentioned in relation to treasonous speech. Therefore, this commission narrowly focused on words that challenged the official authority of the king and English rule. There was no clear indication that language outside of this was prioritised.[160]

However, the first commission was quickly followed by a second and third issued in the early months of 1642. While both commissions maintained the initial categories of the first (robberies, violence, and treasonous words and acts), they also added another instruction. On 8 January 1642, the second commission instructed commissioners to

---

[157] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.
[158] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.
[159] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.
[160] Grierson, *The statutes at large,* pp 135-6.

investigate 'what vnfitting words or speeches concerning the presente Rebellion or by occasion thereof were spoken at any time by anie person or persons whatsoever'.[161] This additional sentence also appeared in the third commission on 11 June 1642.[162] This instruction was simple and yet incredibly important for placing language into a legal context in the 1641 depositions. It indicated that while the commission maintained its legal concern for treasonous speech, it also recognised the need to record and punish words that did not fit into this narrow category.

A focus on the commission can falsely suggest that reports of words in the 1641 depositions were entirely due to these instructions. However, there was evidence in several manuscripts that words and speech were reported and included in the investigation of the 1641 rebellion prior to these direct instructions. For instance, the 1641 depositions contained numerous accounts that pre-dated the first commission taken in December 1641, some of which included documentation of speech. For example, two documents taken in November 1641 investigated the report of a tailor named Bartholomew Lemon, who reported of words spoken against the king.[163] Two additional cases concerning language appeared in November 1641, including that of a man named Owen Kelly who was accused of verbally abusing a group of Englishmen, calling them 'rogues' and 'rascalls'.[164] Both words of treason and words on name-calling appeared a month prior to the first official commission. Additionally, Luke Marriot's petition revealed that consequences and punishment for words existed prior to the first commission. As a prisoner in Dublin Castle, Marriot requested his release in November 1641. He explained that he had been wrongfully accused and named a 'traytor' by a man

---

[161] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v.
[162] Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, ff. 003r-003v.
[163] Examination of Bartholmew Lemon, 1 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 062r-062v; Information of Bartholomew Lemman, 17 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 180r-181v.
[164] Information of Owen Kelly, 22 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 200r-201v.

named Apsley who seeking revenge intended 'to *do* your petitioner some mischief'. Due to Apsley's accusation, Marriot was committed to Dublin Castle, and 'direccon given that he & his accuser should be examined'.[165] Chapter three will revisit these cases in more detail. For now, these cases demonstrated how individuals spoke, reported, and faced the consequences for spoken words before the official commission. Therefore, the commission did not create the legal concern for words in the 1641 rebellion. Rather, it solidified and confirmed the legal importance of language in the midst of open rebellion.

Commissioners' questions and personal reports

The legal concern for words and speech in the official commission was clear. During the 1641 rebellion, commissioners encountered an influx of refugees and displaced people, bringing reports of lost property along with reports of extreme violence and loss of life. Amid all the confusion of the rebellion, the commissioners stayed consistent and included words, language, and speech in the reports. In fact, commissioners clearly asked direct questions about words. On 28 November 1642, Brian Stapleton's deposition provided direct evidence of the commissioners' questions. Stapleton's account explicitly wrote how he was 'demanded what Trayterous or rebellious speeches he hath heard' during his ten-month imprisonment by the Irish rebels. Stapleton answered that he had heard treasonous words, although it was 'not possible for him to remember all particulars'.[166] However, Stapleton did indicate that he remembered the general 'substance of theire sayeings'[167] and reported that they spoke against the English and said they would rather die than live among them again. Although he could not provide the commissioners with detail, Stapleton can provide historians evidence of the direct questioning of witnesses about treasonous words. His account, alongside the official instructions of the commission, also

---

[165] Petition of Luke Marriot, 6 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, f. 130r.
[166] Deposition of Brian Stapleton, 28 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 167r.
[167] Deposition of Brian Stapleton, 28 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 167r.

suggested that these questions were a part of the formulaic nature of the 1641 depositions. In fact, often the structure of numerous depositions supported this idea. Robberies often appeared at the start of depositions, followed by acts of physical harm or violence, and concluded by a simple statement concerning treasonous acts and words.

Furthermore, in 1642 William Grave the elder of Monaghan reported that he knew 'no treacherous speeches spoken by the aforesaid parties nor ay others'.[168] In this deposition, the commissioner's specific question was not recorded; however, Grave's negative response suggested that the topic had been presented to him. An additional deposition, given by William Grave the younger, supported this report. He also stated that he did not know of any disloyal speech spoken during the rebellion.[169] While commissioners asked about treasonous words, it remained unclear if they also specifically asked about 'unfitting words', as both Grave and Stapleton only referred to disloyal speech.

There was also evidence that commissioners recognised the importance of words from their own depositions. Several of them reported words in their personal testimony. For example, Henry Jones, the head commissioner, as well as a survivor of the rebellion, included language in his personal testimony. Jones's deposition, taken on 3 March 1642, was eight pages long, documenting a range of events, including military action, treason, plots, rumours, religious conflict, and words.[170] His first mention of words appeared when he affirmed his position as a 'Doctor in Diuinity' and head commissioner and repeated the instructions given to him, including the instruction 'requireing an accompt of what traitorous words' were spoken and written.[171] Following this introduction, Jones then mentioned and recorded specific moments in which both spoken and written words were

---

[168] Deposition of William Grave the elder, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 115r.
[169] Deposition of William Grave the younger, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 116r.
[170] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 001r-004v.
[171] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 001r-004v.

used, further affirming that commissioners understood the instruction and also followed it. In the first of these cases, Jones noted the many books seized in the city of Limerick, detailing one in particular that contained 'a discourse of the friers of the Augustine order, sometimes seated in the towne of Armagh'.[172] Second, he documented the speech of a Catholic 'popish' priest (as written in that same book) who claimed that within three years, there would be no more Protestants left in Ireland, 'or words to that purpose'.[173] Third, Jones reported the Latin words spoken by a Walter Nugent, who threatened a Protestant and called his religion diabolical saying 'Infra tres annos venient tempus & potentia in Hibernia quando tu longe (Likely meaneing, diu) pendebis in cruce propter diabolicam vestram religionem'. These words translated as: 'in less than three years there will come a time and power to Ireland when you will hang on the cross for a long time because of your diabolical religion'.[174]

Additionally, Jones's documentation of language extended beyond the 1641 depositions. In March of 1642, Jones travelled to London to address the House of Commons, and in that same year published his account of the 1641 rebellion, entitled *A remonstrance of divers remarkeable passages concerning the church and kingdom of Ireland*. The excerpts printed in *A remonstrance* focused on thefts and cruelty of the Irish rebels, but it also specifically noted the Irish use of 'traitorous words'.[175] In it, he also published an excerpt taken from the deposition of Edmund Welsh. In the original account, Walsh reported of treasonous words, but this detail was crossed out in the original manuscript. However, despite the original deposition marking these words out, Jones's *A*

---

[172] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 001r.
[173] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 001r.
[174] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 001v; This is my own translation.
[175] Henry Jones, *A remonstrance of divers remarkeable passages concerning the church and kingdom of Ireland* (Dublin, 1642), pp 13-4.

remonstrance published an excerpt from this deposition that included the words.[176] Jones actively thought of, engaged with, and made decisions about language.

Traiterous or disloyal words and speeches

This specific instruction also revealed that despite the unrest and open rebellion in Ireland, words remained important. This indication reflected Jon Crawford's consideration of increased cases on treasonous words in the castle chamber during the rebellions and unrest of Ireland's 1590s. As noted earlier, Crawford warned against assuming a correlation between Tyrone's rebellion and the cases in the castle chamber concerning disloyal words. Moving into the tumultuous 1640s in both England and Ireland, there was evidence in England that words remained important despite the unrest and violence of the time. In fact, in the midst of England's civil war, Charles I reaffirmed the need to monitor speech a proclamation was given ordering 'the further restraint of prophane swearing and cursing'.[177] Although only one example, it confirmed that even in the midst of war and rebellion in Ireland, the king recognised the importance of words and sought to censure them. The inclusion of words in the official commission for the 1641 depositions cannot be taken as evidence of an increased interest in them because of the rebellion. However, it did, at the very least, demonstrate that words continued to be important despite the many other events and atrocities taking place in Ireland.

Additionally, the precise breakdown of the category treason into 'words speeches and acts' eliminated any confusion that may have occurred if the commission had only instructed commissioners to investigate treason in general. As seen earlier, debates and confusion existed in England about the role and nature of words. And, it remained unclear if words were acts of treason or simply evidence of it.[178] This confusion may have

---

[176] Deposition of Edmund Welsh, 22 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 814, f. 118v; Jones, *A remonstrance,* p. 36.
[177] Allan, *The Oxford handbook of taboo* p. 267.
[178] Cressy, *Dangerous talk*, pp 129-30.

influenced why the commission did not simply instruct the recording of treason as a general category. The official commission clarified that language was a concern and a significant one as well by explicitly adding words and speeches to the instruction and as a part events to be investigated. Yet, this phrase did not distinctly indicate that words were acts of treason, and historians should avoid the assumption that this specification meant words were seen as acts of treason themselves.

However, there were individual accounts in the 1641 depositions that focused entirely on speech, just as Annabel Patterson showed that cases in England focused solely on words and their treasonous nature.[179] For example, the examination of Bartholomew Lemon was a short document of no more than seven lines of text, including introductory information and the closing signature. In this report, words against the king were the sole focus. On 1 November 1641, Lemon, a tailor in Dublin, reported that he 'did heare one George Hackett this day say (in one Savadges house a baker in Castlstreet) that the Kinge had the greatest hand in this present Rebellion & ffurther saith not'.[180] The significance of and concern for this speech was further revealed, when sixteen days later, another report was taken on 17 November 1641, which elaborated on the initial report. It recorded more precise details, environment, context, and motivation for these spoken words.[181] Lemon revealed that he and Hackett had spoken together about the 1641 rebellion, both expressing a desire to see it end and to witness the defeat of the rebels. While discussing this, Hackett took out a little book he was carrying, which Lemon believed to be an almanack. From it, Hackett listed individuals whom he claimed the 'principall Rebells', one of which was the king. Lemon reported how Hackett specifically said that he believed 'the King of England had the greatest hand in this Rebellion'.[182] There were several other

---

[179] Patterson, ''For words only', p. 401.
[180] Examination of Bartholmew Lemon, 1 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 062r-062v.
[181] Information of Bartholomew Lemman, 17 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 180r-181v.
[182] Information of Bartholomew Lemman, 17 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 180r-181v.

depositions from across the counties dedicated to the sole investigation of words, or which only included one or two other events alongside speech.[183]

Ultimately, the context of rebellion was significant. The inclusion of treasonous words did not mean that words were considered equal to other acts of treason; however, it did mean that despite all the events and atrocities recorded in the 1641 depositions speech was not overlooked and was specifically investigated and recorded. In many accounts, treasonous words often accompanied treasonous actions, and even if the account only focused on words, they were spoken in an environment of active rebellion. Thus, the concern for traiterous words in the 1641 depositions was always linked to the action of treason.

What was considered traiterous and disloyal speech?

The commission did not stipulate the specific type of language to be recorded under the category 'traiterous and disloyal'.[184] This lack of detail allowed for a potentially wide interpretation of what was recorded under this category. Many depositions provided clear disloyal speech directed against the king or his appointed officials. In William Fitton's eyewitness account from Limerick in 1646, the commissioners documented the words of an Irishman named 'Meagh' who spoke against the king, saying:

> then and there in most contemptous & traiterous manner made
> Answere *publickly* & said That if the king would not soe d{oe} they would have
> another king or wordes to that effect to his now best Remembrance.[185]

---

[183] Information of John Bevins, 22 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 206r- 207v; Examination of Bartholmew Lemon. 1 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 062r-062v; Information of Owen Kelly, 22 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 200r-201v; Petition of Nicholas Ardagh, 18 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 226r-227v; Examination of Nicholas Ardaghe, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 229r-229v; Examination of Hewe McMahowne, 22 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms ff. 005r-006v; Examination of John Reade, 10 Jan. 1643, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 194r-195v; Petition of Luke Marriot, 6 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, f. 130r; Declaration of Theodore Schout, 14 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 216r-216v.
[184] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.
[185] Deposition of William Fitton, 13 Apr. 1646, TCD, Ms 829, 105r.

He also claimed that the 'Lord Lieutenant generall of Ireland' worked to destroy all Irish, another act of treasonous speech against the king's authority. Therefore, while the king could be traitorously referenced and spoken against, those who acted on his behalf also faced disloyal or traitorous speech against them, and this would have been considered a challenge to their authority, and certainly the king's power.

A challenge to them was sometimes documented alongside reports of claims upon the king, but also stood separate from disloyalty towards the crown. For example, George Stockdale's examination from in March of 1643 reported of 'an Art Cavanagh', who spoke against 'Sir William Parsons himselfe & his brother Lord Justice' and said that he would cause them to hang upon a gibbet 'to bee set vpp att the high Crosse of Dublin'.[186] Stockdale further testified that Cavanagh spoke 'diuerse other traitorous languages which hee this Examinant cannot att this tyme well remember'.[187] With the clear label of 'traitorous' language, the subject of disloyal speech that the depositions were concerned with becomes clearer. From Stockdale's account, words threatening authority can be added to this category. These depositions provided details of what was said as well as the clear indicating word 'traiterous', and therefore, they illuminated different topics that existed in this category. Many depositions identified the specific presence of treasonous words with the inclusion of the labels 'treasonous', 'traiterous', or 'disloyal'. In fact, the deposition of William Reinolds hinted that a precise label was important. In 1643, Thomas Collins informed Reinolds of words spoken by the rebels against the king, stating 'that the Rebells of the name of the ô Relies in ffarnham frequently and comonly wished that they had the King of Englands head there, and that they vsed

many other treachayterous false & scandelous words & threats against his Maiesty not fitt

---

[186] Examination of George Stockdale, 7 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 086r.
[187] Examination of George Stockdale, 7 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 086r.

to be repeated'.[188] The correction from 'treacherous' to 'trayterous' was very interesting. The label of 'traiterous' was prioritised in this account over the label 'treacherous'.

Why this change? 'Treacherous' meant the same thing as 'traiterous', being a word 'characterised by treachery; deceiving, perfidious, false; disloyal, traitorous'.[189] Similarly, the definition for 'traiterous' included 'treacherous' as a synonym.[190] Therefore, perhaps the correction in Reinold's deposition was evidence of a commissioner's or clerk's focus on precision in this legal account. By replacing 'treacherous' with the exact word stipulated by the official commission, it clearly placed this report in line with that official instruction. Perhaps this was also an indication of the original description provided by William Reinolds, who may well have spoken of 'treacherous' words which were later corrected by officials more concerned with following a formula then staying true to the words of the witness.[191]

Historian John Bellamy's work on treason illustrated the importance of this precise terminology. Bellamy explored potential indicators of the relationship between words and treason in his book *The Tudor law of treason: an introduction.* Although his work focused on the Tudor period, he did address how legal sources that extended into the Stuart period also communicated the treasonous nature of words through the terminology use.[192] For example, in his book, Bellamy analysed the use of the term 'malicious', which was a word used to precisely speech or writing as treasonous and ill-intentioned. Some historians have argued the centrality of this word in delineating between insignificant or significant traitorous words. However, Bellamy demonstrated

---

[188] Deposition of William Reinolds, 12 July 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 258r.

[189] Oxford English dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/205331?redirectedFrom=treacherous#eid, 15 June 2020.

[190] Oxford English dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/204464?redirectedFrom=traiterous#eid, 15 June 2020.

[191] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.

[192] John Bellamy, *The Tudor law of treason: an introduction* (Cambridge, 1979), pp 33-4.

that while malicious intent was important, the adjective 'malicious' or adverb 'maliciously' was not common before the reign of Henry VIII. Even after his reign, the word was not central to demonstrating traitorous intent, but was simply a descriptor often used interchangeably with 'traitorously'.[193] Thus, it was not a required feature in determining treason through language. These small delineations demonstrated the complex relationship of language and treason, however, it also indicated that historians must carefully consider the precise treasonous nature of a word recorded in a legal source.

In the 1641 depositions, this word 'malicious' appeared in several accounts but was not present in most depositions concerning 'traiterous words'. Perhaps this was because, as noted earlier, in the context of open rebellion in Ireland, a specific term indicating malice or treasonous intent was unnecessary. However, it may instead be that as Bellamy noted, 'malicious' and 'traitorous' were interchangeable in an English legal context. In the 1641 depositions, 'traitorous' was the chosen term in the official commission, and it was the more common terminology used in specific accounts about treason and language.[194] However, while many depositions used the precise label of 'traiterous' or 'disloyal' to denote the nature of the words recorded, many others did not. For instance, although Alice Champion's deposition did not contain the label 'traitorous', her report in April 1642 of Irish rebels speaking against Ormond was a clear result of the first commission's instruction. Champion reported how the Irish rebels attacked Ormond by 'calling him the base and treacherous lord of Ormond and traitor & vseing other fowle and opprobrious words'.[195] And many accounts contained reports of seditious words and disloyal speech directed against the king, his relations, past monarchs, and other figures of authority including lords and earls. In 1642, Margret Bromley, a widow from Armagh,

---

[193] Bellamy, *The Tudor law of treason,* pp 33-4.
[194] Bellamy, *The Tudor law of treason,* pp 33-4.
[195] Deposition of Alice Champyn, 14 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 835, ff. 196r-197v.

deposed that while a prisoner with the Irish rebels, she heard an Irishman named Patrick mc Court speak these words: 'If I had the king of England in the Chamber *vizt* where hee the said Patrick then was,) ~~he~~ I would take of the kinges head ~~in~~ *within* halfe ~~and~~ an howre'.[196] Bromley further testified that many other rebels spoke against the king, saying that when they had conquered all of Ireland, Sir Phelim O'Neill would become the king of the north of Ireland.[197]

Words against those in close relationship with the king, such as the queen or his children, were recorded, containing a degree of treason by questioning his actions and decisions. In Thomas Muncke's 1642 deposition from Waterford, the king's decision was questioned regarding his daughter. This eyewitness account documented how a merchant named Paul Carew spoke against the king's decision to marry his daughter to the Prince of Orange, whom Carew named a traitor to the Spanish king.[198] Here, Carew claimed that the king could make a serious and wrong decision, further emphasised by his claim that he had married his daughter to a traitor to another monarch. Such words could be understood as a challenge to his authority and a dangerous questioning of his wisdom.

While Charles I and his representatives were targeted and words against them were of immediate concern, other speech challenged Elizabeth I in several reports within the 1641 depositions. As her reign ended thirty-eight years before the start of the 1641 rebellion, it was an interesting link to the past and evidence of some memory of former monarchs. It also provided a clear connection to concerns present in England at the time. Elizabeth I was the target of many libels, slanders, rumours, and insults in early modern England in the late sixteenth century and well into the seventeenth century. These attacks upon the queen began during her reign. She faced claims against her virginity, rumours of

---

[196] Deposition of Margret Bromley, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 040v.
[197] Deposition of Margret Bromley, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 040v.
[198] Deposition of Thomas Muncke, 27 June 1642, TCD, Ms 820, f. 048v.

bastard children. Laws were created, making it a felony to 'express words or sayings' that claimed or suggested she was not 'rightly queen'.[199] Such remarks were severely punished with harsh sanctions, fines, and imprisonments. In England, punishment for words against her developed during her reign but continued even into the seventeenth century.[200]

The 1641 depositions provided evidence that similar attacks upon Elizabeth I occurred in Ireland as well. For example, an eyewitness named Daniel Berwick reported in 1642 an Irishman's words against Elizabeth I, expressing his 'wonder that the Church of England should Canonise Queen Elizabeth for a Saynt she being a damned whore and other mixious words against the blessed Princesse, not fitt to be spoken or written'.[201] The significance of this report was clear when investigators revisited it over ten years later in 1653. Daniel Berwick was again questioned about the words against Elizabeth, which indicated that legal investigation for such topics went beyond initial documentation. This later deposition provided additional information as well. Berwick highlighted the strength of Delahoid's speech by expressing his own shame in having to repeat such language, and when asked to repeat them said that 'he can, yet is ashamed, ~~give an accompt~~, to expresse'.[202] Delahoid's words attacked the queen, questioning her legitimacy and morality, but they also spoke against the Church of England, claiming that they had made a serious error. The link between authority and the church in this example further demonstrated the connection between religion, laws, and politics. This relationship also raised the possibility that words against the Church of England and the Protestant religion could also fit under the category of 'traiterous and disloyal'.[203] In all of these examples, it became evident that the lack of specificity provided by the commissions was perhaps

---

[199] Cressy, *Dangerous talk*, p. 62.
[200] Cressy, *Dangerous talk*, p. 63.
[201] Part of the Examination of Daniel Berwicke, 21 May 1642, TCD, Ms 810, f. 112r.
[202] Deposition of Daniell Barwick, 23 May 1653, TCD, Ms 810, f. 115r.
[203] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.

purposeful. Many topics fell under the category of 'traiterous and disloyal'.[204] Words against the king were accounted for, as were those against other positions of authority, and even past monarchs.

Unfitting words

The second and third commission broadened the scope of investigated words by requesting evidence of 'vnfitting words or speeches concerning the presente Rebellion or by occasion thereof were spoken at any time by anie person or persons whatsoever'.[205] While the initial concern for directly treasonous speech corresponded to the context of the 1641 rebellion, this phrase expanded the words that could be legally investigation. Just as the first commission did not specify what was to be considered treason, the second and third commission did not provide any further information of what was 'unfitting'. In many ways, this category was even less clear than that of 'traiterous and disloyal speech'.[206] This lack of clarification created the opportunity for broad interpretation, which reflected previous English and Irish laws. For example, the 1634 Irish parliamentary act 'against prophane swearing and cursing' did not stipulate the specifics of 'prophane swearing', something that was also the case in England with both profanities and curses.[207] This created the opportunity for a broad interpretation of what was profane. In a similar way, 'unfitting words' opened the door for investigation of many different words. It created space for words that were not necessarily treasonous, but rather personal insult or profane curses or unjust vexations.[208] The danger of offensive, profane or

---

[204] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.
[205] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[206] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.
[207] Ashley Montagu, *The anatomy of swearing* (Philadelphia, 1967), p. 167; Allan, *The Oxford handbook*, pp 266-7.
[208] Grierson, *The statutes at large,* pp 135-6; Morrin, *Calendar of patent,* p. 103.

slanderous words were still important to the authorities within the tumultuous event of the 1641 rebellion.

In the 1641 depositions, 'unfitting words'[209] appeared frequently. Often, depositions indicated the presence of words through general, unspecific terminology rather than providing the exact detail and words spoken. Common references to such words were referred to with the use of phrases, such as 'opprobrious speeches' or 'ignominious terms' or perhaps 'fowle' language. The eyewitness deponent, Marmaduke Clapham from Kings County in 1642, referenced language as 'such ignominious tearmes not fit to be repeated',[210] while Edmund Spring from Dublin in 1644, spoke of witnessing 'very fowle threatening and opprobrious language'.[211] Eyewitness depositions such as that of Elizabeth Shore and Ellen Burden from Cork in 1642 referred to 'other ill Tearmes' or the abuse caused by words and 'vile language'.[212] Other accounts simply referenced words as giving 'evill speeches or threats'.[213] For example, Winyfrid Field reported in 1652 how she was turned out of her home by an Irishman 'who gave her only, an ould petticote and wastcoate of her own, and so turned her away with threats and evill language'.[214] Ultimately, many accounts provided evidence that some 'unfitting' words were spoken, but they did not identify the specific words used. Regardless of the lack of detail, these accounts remained important if only as an indication that commissioners considered even general reports of language worthy of inclusion. This decision placed greater significance on reports that did record the exact words said during the 1641 rebellion.

---

[209] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[210] Deposition of Marmaduke Clapham, 13 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 814, f. 162v.
[211] Deposition of Edmund Spring et al. Dublin, 8 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 810, f. 258r.
[212] Deposition of Elizabeth Shore & Ellen Burden, 5 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 823, f. 182r.
[213] Examination of Phelym mc Tirlagh Birne, 15 Sept. 1652, TCD, Ms 811, ff. 182r-183v.
[214] Examination of Winyfrid Field, 18 Oct. 1652, TCD, Ms 816, f. 241v.

In the 1641 depositions, deponents reported profane swearing and cursing, which reflected the words prosecuted in Ireland under the Irish 1634 parliamentary act.[215] For instance, in the examination of George Stockdale, commissioners recorded the use of 'diuerse other traitorous languages', but also documented four instances of swearing using the name of God and swearing specifically 'by his Saviour Jesus Christ'.[216] The presence of vows and oaths and curses was documented, as in John Morris's 1653 eyewitness account from Antrim, which recorded an Irishman named Patrick McCawell swearing 'many bitter oaths',[217] or in the deposition of Raph Yates, who deposed of Richard Dalton and his wife cursing the time that the English Protestants had come to their land and all of Ireland.[218] Additionally, curses and swears could be recorded alongside threats, as in the eyewitness testimony of Samuell Franck of Queen's County in 1643, a company of rebel 'enemys' approached the English and 'fell a cursing & rayling against the English and then run away, having first threatened them of the Castle'.[219] Additionally, speech against the Church of England may have been understood as treasonous in its relation to the king's authority, and as England and Ireland's official religion, but under the category of 'unfitting words',[220] blasphemous speech could be recorded without the need for a treasonous component. Furthermore, many depositions reported treasonous as well as 'unfitting' words, as in the deposition of William Reinolds, which documented how Irish rebels spoke treasonously against the kings and also profanely swore against God.[221]

---

[215] Grierson, *The statutes at large,* pp 135-6.
[216] Examination of George Stockdale, 7 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, ff. 085r-090v.
[217] Examination of John Morris, 27 May 1653, TCD, Ms 838, f. 296r.
[218] Deposition of Raph Yates, 14 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 43r.
[219] Deposition of Samuell Franck, 1 Feb. 1643, TCD, Ms 815, ff. 326r-326v.
[220] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[221] Deposition of William Reinolds, 12 July 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 258r.

There was language deemed anti-Christian or heretical, including 'damned heresies'[222] and 'blasphemous oaths'.[223] Words of heresy and blasphemy were referenced in reports such as that of the deponent, Elizabeth Crooker, who reported how the Protestants and herself used their words to 'call vpon god almighty to save help and deliuer them'.[224] Upon hearing Crooker's call to God, the deponent reported that the rebels responded 'in a most scornfull contempteous & blasphemous *manner*' with the 'speaking of other prophane wordes', and further bid Crooker 'and her distressed company call downe their god & see if hee would save them & their clothes'.[225] While the eyewitness deposition of William and Thomas Cole from 1643 revealed that blasphemous words were both said and spoken in Cavan, reporting how

> the Rebells most blasphemously, & *in* high & arrogant words *at Cavan aforesaid* sayd & published theis words vizt: yow English protestants where is now your God Now you may see your Religion is naught for your God hath forsaken you or to that effect.[226]

Beyond oaths and curses, there was also the presence of violent words. Evidence suggested commissioners and deponents understood language in the context of disloyalty and treason but also as a violent attack upon another. These words of violence varied across the years and geography of Ireland in the 1641 rebellion, and there is also an argument that words were not just in the context of disloyal or treasonous or unfitting words, but could also be understood as included in the instruction to record 'violence or other lewd accions'. This point will be explored in chapter five. Alongside physical violence, threats were recorded as those 'threatening speeches'[227] against John Adis of Westmeath in 1642. Women also reported witnessing and facing threats (as demonstrated

---

[222] Examination of Richard Byrne, 16 Feb. 1655, TCD, Ms 817, f. 126v.
[223] Deposition of Arthur Culme, 9 May 1642, TCD, Ms 833130r.
[224] Deposition of Elizabeth Crooker, 15 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 837, ff. 004v.
[225] Deposition of Elizabeth Crooker, 15 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 837, ff. 004v.
[226] Deposition of William and Thomas Cole, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 226v.
[227] Deposition of John Adis, 11 July 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 47r.

when Suzanna Stockdale of Dublin deposed that the rebels told her she would be hanged)

while they also vowed to do such if her husband 'would come & be amongst them

againe'.[228]

Additionally, words of poetry or verse containing slander or satire were reported

in the 1641 depositions. Libellous verse, or as Thomas Crant's account recorded 'libellous

dialogue',[229] was present. The deposition of Job Ward from Queen's County in 1642

provided the precise words of a 'certayne libellous *& rediculous* verses delivered vnto

him by one Peter Bremigham a Masse Preist' when Ward was being restrained and kept

prisoner by the rebels in Queen's County:

> Scotts are noe Rebells; why they are Conquerors/ since ffree boote espyed them
> by this conquered land/ Conquerors without blowe, howe our Courtyors/ for feare
> of blowes, doth graunt what they demaund/ ffye, hide your faces, confesse you are
> but dastards/ since England nowe is conquered twice by bastards;/ ffirst by the
> Normand who brought you vnto Slaverye,/ and nowe by Lashly or by your owne
> false knaverye Primeroe
> The stake is three Crownes. foure nations Gamesters we/ there's three to one; yet
> theres noe man dare/ take theise greate odds, the cause is as they say/ The foure
> knaves *the* [ ] stake and Cards we play./ This turnes the odds & makes some
> Gamesters shrinke./ the sett goes hard when Gamesters thinke it best/ though three
> men vye, the fourth man setts his rest.[230]

These verses, sung by Peter Birmingham, 'the tenor' as he was identified in Ward's

deposition, demonstrated that while printing and publishing such poems or verses was

censored and thus restricted in Dublin, the absence of printed content may not reflect an

Ireland in which such behaviour or language was truly absent. This idea reflected Thomas

Cogswell's argument about England. He argued that the absence of printed poems or

verses did not prove that the same gap existed in manuscripts or everyday verbal

exchanges. If it was not printed, it does not mean that it was not occurring; a point

---

[228] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093r; Examination of George Stockdale, 7
Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, ff. 085r-090v.
[229] Deposition of Thomas Crant, 13 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 832, f. 215v.
[230] Deposition of Job Ward, 23 July 1642, TCD, Ms 815, f. *283v.*

Cogswell emphasised in order to argue against privileging print culture in scholarship.[231] Written words and publications were of deep concern as well, and the spreading of false ideas or news through these was also a serious crime. Written words were not the main focus of this thesis; however, there is much space to develop this topic in the 1641 depositions and Ireland's broader early modern period.[232]

Ward's deposition also suggested the use of songs and language to taunt prisoners and victims, as well as demonstrate an individual's beliefs concerning the events unfolding and those who held responsibility for it. Taunts were found in Ward's example, but they existed in other accounts as well. For instance, George Twilly's eyewitness account in 1653 documented 'revilinge words' spoken by Sir Phelim and reported further taunts spoken by the Irish rebels. Taunts were complex but important. Tone plays a role in whether words were said in seriousness, taunts, or even humour, and that cannot be simply or generally deduced. It must be determined within each individual case. This topic raised the question of the role of emotion in speech, an idea that will chapter six will explore in-depth.

Finally, the category of 'unfitting words' also allowed for the recording of personal affronts, particularly in the form of insults and name-calling. These words appeared throughout the 1641 depositions, and commissioners recorded hundreds of examples of verbal abuse and name-calling were recorded. Due to this, the specific terms used to offend and challenge an individual, as reported, could be analysed. This was previously explored in my MPhil thesis 'Insult within the 1641 depositions: social and violent implications of spoken words', which focused on a study of a sample of two hundred and fifty-eight depositions and examinations in this overall source. Each of these two hundred

---

[231] Thomas Cogswell, 'Underground verse and the transformation of early Stuart political culture' in *Huntington library quarterly*, lx, 3 (1997), p. 305.
[232] Adam Fox, 'Ballads, libels and popular ridicule in Jacobean England', *Past and Present*, cxlv (Nov. 1994), pp 47–83; Toby Barnard, *Brought to book: print in Ireland, 1680–1784* (Dublin, 2017).

and fifty-eight documents all contained verbal insult, and within that sample, sixty-seven different words, terms, phrases, and labels appeared. Words of insults spanned Ireland throughout the 1641 rebellion. At least thirty counties were represented in the sources containing moments of name-calling.[233] Insults appeared alongside other 'unfitting' words as well as in accounts that reported treasonous speech. For example, William Higges of Queen's County reported how Irish rebels complained openly 'of the said Sir John', but he also included the words used against himself and others, including 'rogue', 'rascal', and 'traytor'. Here, the commissioner's and the deponent's interest in disrespectful language against a man of high social status and position was clear. It also showed their concern for insults and other speeches. Furthermore, the Irish rebels' words were spoken alongside other 'unfitting' language which Higges referred to as 'manye opprobrious speeches'.[234] The intersection of an insult and treasonous speech also interconnected when words such as 'traitor' or 'rebel' were used. In one way, the term 'traitor' fit into a broad interpretation of the first commission to document treasonous speech. For an Irish rebel to accuse an English Protestant of being a traitor was perhaps in itself understood as disloyal language. At the very least, to be called a 'traitor' broke forward questions of treason and loyalty. Later chapters will analyse the individual words of 'traitor', 'rascal', and 'rogue' more closely. For now, depositions like that of William Higges demonstrated that while 'traiterous' and 'unfitting' words were distinctly different categories in the official commission, they were often reported in the same account and, in some cases, words seemed to fit into both categories. Additionally, in the context of open rebellion in Ireland, treason was always an important and relevant factor to consider regardless if the words were explicitly disloyal.

---

[233] Grace Hoffman, 'Insult within the 1641 depositions: social and violent implications of spoken words' (M.Phil. thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2016).
[234] Deposition of William Higges, 7 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, f. 035v.

Conclusion

Just as contemporaries of the time asked about words, historians must also ask questions of language, both treasonous and personal, when engaging with the 1641 depositions. It was clear that language, in its many different forms, was a serious legal concern in seventeenth-century Ireland. Each report of words provided an opportunity to ask many new questions and gather new insights. The specific concern for language in the 1641 depositions showed that authorities did not overlook offensive or profane words when the rebellion broke out but rather prioritised them and inquired about them. Therefore, the 1641 depositions' legal concern for language showed that the importance of words remained even amid active treason, violence, unrest, and danger. However, just as Crawford warned against assuming that the unrest of Ireland's 1590s caused an increase in cases for treasonous words in the castle chamber, historians must also acknowledge that the 1641 rebellion did not generate this concern for words and speeches separate from a wider context.

It is important to recognise the immense value of the 1641 depositions from a period in which many legal sources are not readily available. However, historians cannot assume that the 1641 depositions saw an increased concern for language due to the rebellion. The 1641 depositions contained hundreds of records of words and speeches, but each additional source investigated referred to language to some extent. The existence of laws for spoken and written words in the earlier seventeenth century proved that the concern for language existed across Ireland in courts, laws, corporations, provinces, and counties prior to the rebellion. Regardless of these remaining questions, it was clear that a deep concern for words and speeches existed as part of the investigation of the 1641 rebellion. Understanding this official and legal concern can set the foundation for 'points

of departure for further, more probing inquiries',[235] and this immediately raised questions for the following chapter.

---

[235] Wells, 'English law, Irish trials', p. 84.

Chapter three: The power of words

This chapter will reveal how words both maintained and challenged power in the 1641 depositions, and it will inform the way historians can understand power relations during this time. While the previous chapter highlighted the official legal concern for language, this can falsely imply that authorities successfully controlled words and speeches and were the primary individuals concerned with it. However, Lindsay Kaplan argued that slander transgressed law, and therefore, the study of words provides a more holistic and fluid understanding of power relations outside of the commonly accepted concepts of official censorship and hierarchy.[236] Kaplan's work prompted further exploration of words and speeches in the 1641 depositions, which provided a window into power's nuances during the rebellion.

First, this chapter will analyse the relevant scholarship, both interdisciplinary and historical, on power. It will draw specifically upon early modern historians' work, who have engaged with the relationship between words and power. Second, this chapter will consider the public awareness of the impact of and concern for words. It will analyse if and how witnesses and perpetrators recognised the potential consequences of speaking and hearing treasonous or unfitting words. Third, this chapter will address who reported words during the 1641 rebellion and consider why individuals did so. It will explore their motivations, incentives, and the consequences for those who did not alert the authorities to a verbal offence. These question will be explored specifically through a small case study of the investigation and imprisonment of Nicholas Ardagh, who failed to report words spoken against the king and the earl of Ormond.

Fourth, this chapter will ask how individuals used their understanding of the laws and consequences of words to their advantage. Here, this chapter's primary point will be

---

[236] Kaplan, *The culture of slander,* p. i.

explored more directly by asking how the legal concern for language allowed individuals to exert or claim power. This chapter will also address how speech could challenge the stability of social standing and power and demonstrate the malleability of superiority and inferiority. There were many examples of challenging or re-enforcing power through language in the 1641 depositions. Reporting another's words to authorities was one method. However, those who spoke the 'traiterous' or 'unfitting' speech also used the power of words. To illustrate this idea, three specific words 'rebel', 'traitor' and puritan' will be considered. This analysis will assess how naming an individual as a 'traitor' or a 'rebel' served as an accusation of treason, which placed the accused at risk of investigation and punishment by authorities and gave power to the name-callers. It will conclude by exploring the term 'puritan' in order to demonstrate the nuances of words or labels that threatened another.

Historiography of power and words

Social historians of early modern England have boldly applied anthropologists' research to their early modern sources to challenge traditional ideas of power. Specifically, the work of anthropologists James Scott and Maurice Bloch provided valuable insights. They both argued that lower orders often find ways to undermine or resist authority. Scott's work *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance* argued that those in low social positions often use creative ways to resist and claim some power for themselves. Those often perceived as 'weak' can instead demonstrate strength and awareness in the methods they use to target and undermine authorities.[237] Notably, John Walter and Michael Braddick have applied Scott's theories to the early modern period in their published collection, *Negotiating power in early modern society*. In this work, historians Laura Gowing, John Walter, Justin Champion and Lee McNulty all referenced Scott's

---

[237] James C. Scott, *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance* (Yale, 2008).

work in their chapters.[238] Additionally, Walter drew upon Scott's research in *Crowds and popular politics in early modern England*. Walter argued that the lower orders of English society deployed 'weapons of the weak' to challenge or undermine authority. By referring to Scott's framework, Walter corrected two historiographical ideas in early modern England. First, the absence of riots or physical violence did not equal the acceptance of established roles of authority and subordination. Second, crowds were not devoid of popular political consciousness. Instead, Walter revealed that despite the lack of overt resistance; lower orders had political awareness and participated in active resistance to the power dynamic in small but significant ways.[239]

Anthropologist Maurice Bloch's work on speech events provided a more direct focus on words. Historian, Andy Wood, argued in his book *The 1549 rebellion and the making of early modern England* that Bloch's work raised a fundamental question for the social history of language. Bloch argued that a central issue within any social order 'is who gets to be heard…who is worth hearing'.[240] Interestingly, he proposed that 'speech events do not exercise power so much as they reproduce already existing relations of dominance'.[241] He claimed that speech reflects social hierarchies and does not produce change, but instead, it communicates an acceptance of the current power structures. At first, his point appeared to contradict evidence found in the 1641 depositions; however, it prompted a more in-depth analysis of the context of the 1641 rebellion, and it will be an important point towards the end of this chapter.[242]

---

[238] John Walter and Michael Braddick (eds.), *Negotiating power in early modern society* (Cambridge, 2001).
[239] John Walter, *Crowds and popular politics in early modern England* (Manchester, 2006), pp 15-6, 216.
[240] Wood, *1549 rebellions,* p. 108; Maurice Bloch, 'Introduction' in M. Bloch (ed.), *Political language and oratory in traditional* society (London, 1975), pp 6, 12.
[241] Wood, *1549 rebellions*, p. 109; Bloch, 'Introduction', p. 26.
[242] Wood, *1549 rebellions,* p. 110.

It is essential to recognise that directly applying outside theories and research can falsely create a narrative of a sharp divide between the powerful and the helpless. It can lead to an oversimplification, and it can overlook or reduce complexities unique to a particular society and history, especially considering the complexities of seventeenth-century Ireland. This point was especially true in the context of the 1641 depositions. Therefore, while historians can benefit from the work of anthropologists, they must do so with caution as their research often focuses on very different time periods and societies. For instance, Scott illustrated his argument by analysing of class conflict in Malaysia, a very different context to a place like 1640s Ireland. Historians must carefully consider his and Bloch's ideas and focus on drawing questions from their work rather than directly applying their conclusions. Despite this, historians cannot shy away from interdisciplinary work. While the context in early modern Ireland was different, historians can ask questions raised by anthropologists' insights like Scott and Bloch without automatically applying their conclusions onto a historical source. Therefore, this chapter will ask how words and speeches interacted with power in the 1641 depositions. It will explore who was speaking and using words, and if and how 'weak' individuals used their words as a weapon against authority and social superiors. Furthermore, speech in the 1641 depositions could reproduce or reflect pre-existing power dynamics, but it could also challenge and shift these relations.

Early modern English historians have also explored the relationship between power and language and demonstrated how various forms of language (be it spoken insults, libels, or poetry) could be used within social relations to challenge and lower an individual's position and standing. Several historians also argued that political leaders were not the only ones concerned with the power of words. Individuals could directly target authority and criticise them by speaking against it or disbursing manuscripts

throughout communities to a range of social classes. Through this, individuals found ways to resist in a world that monitored and censured language. For example, Thomas Cogswell and Adam Fox both argued that written language and slander and libel were a fundamental component of challenging hierarchical structures and targeting higher social orders. They provided a relevant perspective for studying words in the 1641 depositions as they demonstrated a specific relationship between language, power, and social dynamics. Cogswell's research focused on 'underground verse', and it revealed how lower classes used anonymous libels, satire, and slander to grasp for or resist power.[243] Similarly, Fox investigated ballads and libels in the context of popular ridicule in Jacobean England. He noted that across social levels, individuals used songs and ballads to shame and humiliate others. Also, records from the English star chamber showed that libels often targeted a social superior. In this context, libels threatened the social order of the time, and the star chamber attempted to monitor and prevent what was already occurring.[244]

Historian Toby Barnard noted the English legal system's role in defining and regulating the relationship between the government and those being governed in Ireland. However, this influence extended beyond the government and the governed to master and servant, landlord and tenant, and Protestant and Catholic. Laws shaped relationships of power across society, and Barnard argued this in the context of land, power and religion. However, was this relevant to laws concerning words?[245]

Several historians have noted the relationship between power and words in seventeenth-century Ireland. In his chapter, 'Language and conflict', historian Mark Greengrass expressly stated that 'language is about power'.[246] Moreover, he noted that

---

[243] Cogswell, 'Underground verse' pp 303-26.
[244] Fox, 'Ballads, libels and popular ridicule', p. 57, 72, 82.
[245] Toby Barnard, *A new anatomy of Ireland: The Irish protestants, 1649-1770* (Yale, 2003)*,* pp 7-9.
[246] Greengrass, 'Language and conflict', p. 205.

historians often neglect language even though power and speech are directly linked, and in the early modern period, 'words conveyed a voice of authority'.[247] Greengrass also argued that while laws existed for language, authorities frequently struggled to control speech. Hence, the existence of laws did not automatically mean that speech was successfully monitored and prevented. A simple rumour could subvert the voice and the power of authorities. Therefore, language reflected the fragile state of authority and demonstrated the connectivity of those governing and those governed. While his chapter primarily centred on a set of testimonies from a sixteenth-century French riot, Greengrass provided an example of how historians can consider this same relationship between power and words in the 1641 depositions.[248]

Furthermore, in his chapter 'The social order of the 1641 rebellion', Eamon Darcy argued that the rebellion created space for the lower social orders to improve their station. Across Ireland, they could now express their discontentment and grievances against the wealthier English settlers. In turn, this opportunity shaped and shifted power in 1640s Ireland, which was demonstrated through language, violence, and cultural expressions. Darcy briefly reflected on the Irish rebels' use of words, and he noted how they quickly adopted the language of the social order, including name-calling the English 'scum' and rascal'.[249] There was more to consider about the relationship between language and hierarchy in order to expand on these points.

Public awareness

Public consciousness of power, laws, and social dynamics was a fundamental part of Scott's anthropological argument. His research considered how individuals across a society understood and therefore, actively found ways to challenge power and authority.

---

[247] Greengrass, 'Language and conflict', p. 198.
[248] Greengrass, 'Language and conflict', pp 199, 207.
[249] Eamon Darcy, 'The social order of the 1641 rebellion' in Annaleigh Margey, Eamon Darcy, and Elaine Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London, 2012), pp 109, 111.

Therefore, public awareness was a key component of his argument. Similarly, this chapter must ask if social and individual awareness of the laws and power connected to words existed in the 1641 depositions. Without public consciousness, the concern for words and speeches would have stopped with authorities and remained merely a note placed in legal documents for officials and courts to consider and that most in Ireland would never read.

When placed into the broader context of seventeenth-century laws and punishments for words, it was clear that many (if not the majority of) deponents would have understood the legal significance of words, and they recognised their severe consequences. As chapter two demonstrated, laws and court cases existed for language across Ireland's early seventeenth century. Furthermore, authorities publicly proclaimed and enforced these laws. For example, the 1634 Irish act against profane swearing and cursing was explicitly made public by the Irish parliament's decree. It was 'read in every parish church, by the minister thereof, upon the Sunday after the evening prayer, twice in the year'.[250] Beyond this public proclamation, laws publicly punished those guilty of swearing or cursing in front of the community. If offenders could not pay the required fines, they were set in the stocks or whipped through the streets.[251]

From the very start of the century, people faced public punishment for their unfitting words. For instance, in 1600 Lord Deputy Mountjoy 'caused an Irishman to be whipped about the town, with a paper on his head stating that he was facing the consequence 'for slanderous speeches against the earl of Ormonde'.[252] In the castle chamber, individuals were convicted for their words and punished publicly, as happened to Simon Paulee in 1611 and Nicholas While who were whipped and pilloried for their words in Dublin and Kildare.[253] Individuals continued to face public consequences for

---

[250] Grierson, *The statutes at large,* pp 135-6.
[251] Grierson, *The statutes at large,* pp 135-6.
[252] The Lord Deputy Mountjoy to Sir Robert Cecil, 1 May 1600 (SP 63/207/3 f).
[253] Crawford, *A star chamber,* p. 502-503, 59.

their language in various parts of Ireland in years closer to the 1640s and the start of the 1641 rebellion. In 1638, another case in the court of castle chamber concerned two esquires named Thomas Lestrange and Robert Smith, who libelled Sir Arthur Blundell. On 23 February 1638, Lestrange was fined £10,000 for his offence. Beyond the cost, his offence also damaged his reputation. This libel needed to be publicly acknowledged and corrected. The court ordered him to appear in all the courts of Dublin and acknowledge his offence, where he was to wear 'a paper on his head briefly declaring his offence and to declare before the Judges sitting in these Courts' that he 'maliciously libelled' Sir Arthur Blundell. Finally, his career and social status were lost. He was to bear no office in the future, and he was removed from the commission of the peace and also forced to confess his crime at the King's County Assizes publicly.[254]

The importance of social positions was evident. As an esquire, Lestrange's punishment reflected his social standing, and this case compared with another example of punishment for language. In a case in 1624, John O Kennedy, a boatman from Clonmel, was fined, committed to the stocks for two hours during the next market day, and forced to beg for mercy publicly for 'badd words to the Mayor'.[255] Although this punishment was not as extensive as that given to Lestrange, it corresponded with their different social positions. For O Kennedy, the public punishment in the market may have created equal damage to his specific social standing as that of Lestrange's. Despite their differences, these punishments were both deliberately public, which served as a severe consequence for the offenders. It also signalled to others who witnessed these punishments that such offences carried serious consequences, and it communicated to them that those in power recognised the danger and threat of these words.

---

[254] Mahaffy, *Calendar of the state papers,* p. 183.
[255] McGrath, *The minute book,* p. 126.

While these punishments would have created some public awareness of the power of language, the 1641 depositions provided specific evidence that individuals understood the illegal and threatening nature and role of words. Several depositions illustrated a deponent's or a rebel's knowledge of such laws. For example, Henry Bringhurst's account showed that an awareness of potential punishment for words and the need to monitor one's speech existed. In 1644, Bringhurst reported that he heard Edmund Bourke 'vse such peremptory language to the Commissioners of the County of Galway and to slight & contempne the Lords of Clanrickard and Mayo'.[256] Significantly, Bringhurst also stated that Bourke was encouraged to speak these words because he was 'well assured that by the Countenance and consent of the more eminent they should incurr noe danger or feare of punishment' for their crimes.[257] This assurance played a vital role in emboldening and empowering his speech; Bourke spoke these words based on the belief that he would not face the consequences for them. This detail demonstrated that Bourke and Bringhurst understood the illegal nature of speaking against authority and vocalising one's disloyal thoughts.

Additionally, in a 1642 examination, an esquire from Dublin named John Pue reported how a man justified his words by explicitly stating that it was lawful and right for him to speak. Pue reported that Adam Beaghan of St Nicholas Street spoke with Lieutenant Edward Loftus, and he 'said that all the Parliament of England were Traitors whereat the said Leiutennant Loftus was displeased and rebuked the said Adam for speakeing the said word'.[258] However, Beagan responded to the rebuke and justified his use of such insults by claiming 'that itt was lawfull for him to call them Traitors for that the king called them soe by his proclamation'.[259] By clarifying his right to speak words

---

[256] Deposition of Henry Bringhurst, 11 Feb. 1644, TCD, Ms 831, f. 189r.
[257] Deposition of Henry Bringhurst, 11 Feb. 1644, TCD, Ms 831, f. 189r.
[258] Examination of John Pue, 21 June 1642, TCD, Ms 810, f. 211r.
[259] Examination of John Pue, 21 June 1642, TCD, Ms 810, f. 211r.

legitimately, Beaghan signalled his awareness of the legal concern for words. Similarly, Loftus's direct rebuke and Pue's report in this deposition also highlighted their recognition of the power and danger of treasonous and unfitting words.

Irish rebels also spoke and engaged with words, and there was evidence in some depositions that they understood the power of words and speeches. However, this evidence was less common, and the degree of their awareness was more challenging to determine. One account highlighted the awareness of Irish rebels. Joan Constable reported how a group of Irish rebels actively rejected the king's laws in 1643 Armagh. They had committed many 'bloudy barbarous & divillish murthers and Cruelties vpon the protestants in that Countie by fyre, drowning, *hanging* the sword, starveing & other fearfull deaths',[260] and Constable challenged them. She asked them 'how they durst doe & Committ their outrages and cruelties for feare of the kings Majesty & his Lawes'.[261] The rebels answered 'in a most base and contemptible & obsceane manner that they cared not a fart for the Kinge nor his Lawes'.[262] They continued to say and repeat this 'bouldly and sausily', and one Irishman 'named Turlogh ô Corr said he wished for the king of England's head'.[263] This blatant rejection of the king's laws also proved their knowledge of them. As well, Constable's question showed her own knowledge of the laws in Ireland. Thus, in the 1641 depositions, both deponents and Irish rebels were sometimes aware of the legal concern for words. Furthermore, this example demonstrated that knowledge of a law did not always stop a person from speaking words or committing crimes. The existence of a law did not automatically change or reform behaviour, and perhaps in some ways it may have heightened or even encouraged it more. This chapter will consider this

---

[260] Deposition of Joane Constable, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 88r.
[261] Deposition of Joane Constable, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 89v.
[262] Deposition of Joane Constable, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 89v.
[263] Deposition of Joane Constable, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 89v.

point as well, however, first it must consider which members of society engaged with words.

Who reported words in the 1641 depositions?

Many depositions that reported speech also included the witness' occupation, and this showed who understood, to at least some degree, the legal concern for speech. It was necessary to have a sense of how the 1641 depositions spoke about the different groups in society in order to answer this question. However, this was complex in itself. In seventeenth-century Ireland, many components contributed to ideas of authority, hierarchy, and social status. The individual breakdown of society and social groups remains unclear in English social history, but even more so in the context of Ireland. Gaelic Ireland's conceptions of social standing existed alongside English standards, and this itself presented a unique challenge to understanding society. Clodagh Tait reflected on the complexities of early modern Irish society in *The Cambridge history of Ireland*. In her chapter, she explored the designations of social status through the use of terms like gentleman or burgess. She argued that in early modern Ireland, social designations were malleable and not fixed. For example, in the 1641 depositions, some individuals identified as yeoman or gentleman, also engaged in other work or businesses including farming, tanning and malting.[264]

Moreover, Toby Barnard suggested that 'yeoman' was very malleable because this was a term that was often a courtesy label.[265] The designation of yeoman was not always a clear distinction from another individual labelled a tanner or a malster.[266] Yeoman was an unreliable label as were many others. For example, the occupations farmer and freeholder sometimes appeared together, but freeholder also referred to those who could

---

[264] Tait, 'Society', p. 282.
[265] Toby Barnard, *A new anatomy of Ireland: The Irish protestants, 1649-1770* (Yale, 2003)*,* pp 7-9.
[266] Tait, 'Society', p. 282.

claim gentry status including the Irish lords in Ulster and Connacht and their former chief tenants.[267] Therefore, there was flexibility, which demonstrated how individuals could cross over into multiple occupations and social roles. The listing of a specific occupation did not necessarily indicate that person's exact placement in the social order. This complexity must be kept in mind when working with the 1641 depositions.

Tait also argued that early modern Irish society often divided people into groups or 'sorts'. These sorts included: the chiefest, the middling, the meaner, the poor, and the vulgar. Although, this is a vague delineation of society and the different statuses that existed, its use increased in seventeenth-century Ireland and appeared in the 1641 depositions.[268] For example, one account told how the Irish rebels expelled groups of English from a fortified town. It reported how they sent those of the 'meanest sort' away first, followed by 'those of the midle sort next, & the chiefest reserved for the last'.[269]

In the 1641 depositions, many of the deponents were members of the middling sort. This sort was a group of individuals who worked for an income, trading their own products or skills or engaging in business.[270] Their inclusion provided the opportunity to ask how members of the middling sort and not only the chiefest interacted with words. In 1641, the lead commissioner Henry Jones, as well as commissioner Randall Adams, reported words, while in that same year, a tailor by the name of Bartholomew Lemon shared his account of a servant named George Hacket speaking words against the king at the house of a baker.[271] In this deposition, tradesmen living on the streets of Dublin, as

---

[267] Tait, 'Society', p. 282.
[268] Tait, 'Society', p. 273.
[269] Tait, 'Society, p. 275; Deposition of Thomas Turke, undated, TCD, Ms 836, f. 016r.
[270] Johnathan Barry and Christopher Brooks (eds.), *The middling sort of people: culture, society and politics in England, 1500-1800* (London, 1994), p. 2.
[271] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 001r-004v; Deposition of Randall Adams, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 045r; Examination of Bartholmew Lemon. 1 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 062r-062v.

well as a servant, became involved in a serious investigation of words and speeches. This example was not unique.

Gentlemen from various counties also heard and reported words of treason, insult or threat. For example, in 1644, a gentleman from Dublin, Edmund Spring, recounted how a company of Irish foot soldiers used threatening and opprobrious words against him and a group of English victims.[272] Captains and lieutenants also gave their testimony and reported a variety of spoken words.[273] As well, vicars, parsons, and ministers were also among the deponents, who reported speech. In 1642 in Kings County, two vicars testified of insults directed towards themselves and others.[274] In 1643, a curate and parson from Westmeath spoke of names used against English victims, as did the widow of a preacher from Galway in 1644.[275] A merchant from Kerry faced 'vile words',[276] and similarly, in 1645 a Waterford merchant deposed of 'badd language' spoken against an alderman named James White.[277] Yeomen also reported 'unfitting' words, as in 1643 in Cavan when William Reinolds reported of scandalous words and the use of the insult 'rogue'.[278] It was a British Protestant and a yeoman from Cork, who recalled bitterness of speeches spoken in 1643,[279] while in 1647, a yeoman's relict from Queen's described how Irish rebels called Protestants 'devils'.[280]

---

[272] Deposition of Edmund Spring et al. Dublin, 8 Jan. 1644, TCD, Mc 810, ff. 257r-259v.
[273] Examination of Hannyball Bagnall, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 229v.
[274] Deposition of Marmaduke Clapham, 13 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 814, ff. 162r-162v; Deposition of William Domvill and George Clapham, 16 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 814, f. 121r.
[275] Deposition of Thomas Fleetwood, 22 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 039r-039v; Deposition of Julian Johnson, 8 Feb. 1644, TCD, Ms 30, f. 140v; Deposition of Richard Parsons, 24 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 833, f. 276r.
[276] Deposition of Thomas Dight, 24 May 1642, TCD, Ms 828, f. 194v.
[277] Deposition of Benedicke Claybrooke. 30 Oct. 1645, TCD, Ms 820, ff. 013r-014v.
[278] Deposition of William Reinolds, 12 July 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 258r.
[279] Deposition of John Robinson, 27 June 1643, TCD, Ms 814, ff. 189r-190r.
[280] Deposition of Isabell Smith, 9 June 1647, TCD, Ms 815, f. 381v.

Two cooks deposed of the use of 'rogue' and 'foolish people' in 1641,[281] while husbandmen, who were 'petty farmers' of a similar standing of small traders or less well-off craftsmen, [282] also reported words and speeches spoken across Ireland.[283] Other occupations appeared as well, including two shoemakers, freeholders, farmers, students, button makers, clothiers, butchers, joiners, cutlers, millers, sailors, smiths, freemasons, bricklayers, weavers, tanners, and widows of various social standing testified as witnesses of spoken words.[284]

Women also frequently reported words used against their husbands, families, neighbours, and occasionally themselves. Their accounts reflected the same diversity as those of men. Using only depositions given by women, or even more narrowly that of widows, brought forward the same range of social positions of witnesses, perpetrators, and deponents. From multiple counties, widows of gentlemen, yeomen, rectors, parsons, farmers, clerks, esquires, doctors all deposed of speech during the 1641 rebellion.[285] Finally, servants and apprentices heard and reported words too. In 1642, Sir John Burke's servant provided testimony that Lady Burke spoke against the English, saying that the

[281] Information of Owen Kelly, 22 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, f. 200r; Examination of Henry White, 17 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff.178r-179v.

[282] Tait, 'Society', p. 283.

[283] Deposition of Thomas Rountree, 3 June 1642, TCD, Ms 829, ff. 002r; Deposition of Anthony Stephens, 25 June 1646, TCD, Ms 830, f. 43r; Deposition of James Curry, 15 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 820, f. 178r; Deposition of William Adams, 12 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, f. 160r.

[284] Deposition of William Astwood, 12 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 832, ff. 181r; Deposition of Richard Tailor, 21 Oct. 1645, TCD, Ms 814, f. 260v; Deposition of John Homes, 31 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 150v; Deposition of Samuell Franck, 1 Feb. 1643, TCD, Ms 815, ff. 326r-326v; Deposition of Stephen Love, 3 Feb. 1644, TCD, Ms 828, f. 127r; Examination of Daniell Curren, 29 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 820, f. 021r; Deposition of Amos Hatch, 14 Jan. 1643, TCD, Ms 818, ff. 128r-129v; Deposition of Thomas Ricroft, 10 June 1642, TCD, Ms 818, ff. 124r; Deposition of Henry Palmer, 12 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 818, ff. 088r-088v; Deposition of John Steele, 19 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 161r-161v; Examination of Richard ffepps, 13 Aug. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 241; Deposition of William and Thomas Cole, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 226v.

[285] Deposition of Elizabeth Pole (Poke), 26 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 833, ff. 256r-257v; Deposition of Joane Constable, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 88r; Deposition of Isabell Smith, 9 June 1647, TCD, Ms 815, f. 381v; Deposition of Alice Gregg, 21 July 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 096r; Deposition of Elizabeth Gough, 8 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 833, f. 002r; Deposition of Ellenor Fullerton, 16 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 050v; Deposition of Dennes Mountgomery, 17 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, ff. 163r-163v; Deposition of Elizabeth Holliwell, 10 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 830, ff. 035r-035v; Deposition of Martha Piggot, 31 Oct. 1646, TCD, Ms 815, f. 376v; Deposition of Ann Frere, 8 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 032v.

Irish had lived too long as 'slaves vnder the English' and that 'all Scotchmen weare trators'.[286] In Kildare in 1642, a maidservant called Hannah Farrell also deposed of misspoken words.[287]

A diversity of occupations and social positions, including the chiefest, middling, and meaner sorts, all interacted with the laws and investigations in place in some way. Ultimately, whether society was broken down clearly into categories of gentry and non-gentry, the elite and the people, the rich and the poor, the patrician and the plebeian, or the English deponents and the Irish rebels, it was clear that individuals across social groups participated in the reporting and reacting to spoken words.[288]

The case of Nicholas Ardagh

Witnesses reported their stories in a serious, formal, legal setting. Although this prevented deponents from reporting any and every detail they wanted, commissioners did, however, encourage them to elucidate their specific experience.[289] Their ability to share or explain their experience even a little raised an interesting question about reported words. This section will address this question, asking if deponents actively reported language with, and also without, the direct prompting of a commissioner. Several depositions reported multiple occurrences of speech, emphasising it and including it among other atrocities. In such cases, deponents provided additional information that seemed to go beyond a simple response.

While many reports of words can be attributed to the direct questioning by commissioners (as evident in chapter one), there were additional motivations for witnesses to inform authorities of speech they heard. First, some deponents may have

---

[286] Examination of Alexander Hay, 14 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, f. 406r.
[287] Deposition of Hannagh Farrell, 29 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 813, f. 248r.
[288] Barry and Brooks, *The middling sort,* p. 1.
[289] Morgan Robinson, 'An act 'soe fowle and grievous': contextualizing rape in the 1641 rebellion' in *Irish Historical Studies,* xxxix, 156 (Nov. 2015), p. 599.

recounted disloyal speech based on a sincere loyalty to the king. However, this genuine intention was difficult to discern within the accounts as the deponents answered questions in a legal, formal, and power-saturated setting, in which witnesses needed to carefully choose their responses to indicate their loyalty but also to avoid incriminating themselves. Second, deponents may have provided details of words in order to avoid consequences for failing to report them. Several depositions indicated that while authorities punished speakers of treasonous or unfitting words, individuals who failed to report the words they heard also faced the consequences. In the 1641 depositions, the following case of Nicholas Ardagh exemplified this most starkly.

On 18 January 1642, Nicholas Ardagh, a 'prisoner in his Majesties Castle of Dublin', petitioned the lord justices and council to be released from his present punishment and commitment to 'the Constable of his Majesties said castle'.[290] This petition prompted an in-depth investigation into this specific case, and commissioners recorded numerous other examinations related to this case in the following weeks. According to the initial petition, disloyal words caused Ardagh's imprisonment, and these words were the sole focus of the investigation. His case was one of the most extensive among those concerning speech in the 1641 depositions. However, his punishment was particularly interesting because he was not punished for speaking disloyal words himself but rather for failing to inform the earl of Ormond of 'words spoken by Mathew Tyling concerning his honor'.[291] A week after Ardagh's petition, commissioners questioned Matthew Tillinge. His examination revealed additional detail, and it clarified that the words spoken against Ormond were, in fact, said by a man named Robert Worrell.

---

[290] Petition of Nicholas Ardagh, 18 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 226r.
[291] Petition of Nicholas Ardagh, 18 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 226r.

Moreover, Ardagh was not even present when Worrell spoke these disloyal words. Instead, it was Matthew Tillinge, who witnessed Worrell speak against Ormond.

It all started in early January with name-calling. According to the examinations of Matthew Tillinge, Christopher Tillinge, and Richard Carrick, Worrell publicly insulted Tillinge and labelled him a 'rebel'. This accusation, especially during the 1641 rebellion, was very dangerous, and Tillinge recognised it. After his servant informed him of Worrell's claims, Tillinge immediately went to confront his accuser. Worrell admitted to his words. However, he continued to insult Tillinge and also spoke against the 'the lorde cheefe Baron and his ladie'.[292] In response, Tillinge demanded that Worrell bring this accusation before the earl of Ormond so that he might judge the truth of Worrell's words. However, Worrell 'replyed & saide that the Earle of Ormond was not the man which people tooke him to be for that he kept a company of troupers which were all rebells'.[293] Worrell's words accused the earl of Ormond of disloyalty and treason. These particular words became the focal point of the investigation concerning Nicholas Ardagh. At this point in the case, Worrell calling Tillinge a 'rebel' faded into the background; however, this word demonstrated the power of a single label to create or lead to a more serious problem. The specifics of this form of name-calling will be investigated later in this chapter. For now, it was important because it led to the words against Ormond and Ardagh's eventual imprisonment.

Following this initial confrontation, Tillinge recognised his responsibility to report Worrell, and he informed the mayor of the disloyal words. However, the mayor 'tooke noe course with Worrell for speakinge the said wordes'.[294] Despite the mayor's failure to

---

[292] Examination of Matthew Tillinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 228r.
[293] Examination of Matthew Tillinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 228r; Examination of Christophe Tyllinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228v; Examination of Richard Carricke, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228v-229r.
[294] Examination of Matthew Tillinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 228r.

act, Tillinge continued his attempt to notify Ormond. Eight days later he met Ardagh and told him of Worrell's crimes and asked him to inform Ormond 'to the ende that Worrell might be brought to question for speakinge the wordes'.[295] Here, the trouble for Ardagh began. Tillinge seemed to fulfil his responsibility to report this occurrence when he told the mayor and Ardagh of it. Now Ardagh had an obligation to report it to Ormond. However, Ormond did not receive this report and imprisoned Ardagh for failing to deliver the message.

In a later examination taken 25 January 1642, Ardagh once again pled his innocence. He claimed that he did not have direct access to the earl, and instead trusted a Captain Bagnall to bring his report before him. Having done so, Ardagh believed himself free from the responsibility and further stated that he had thought this decision would not be considered an offence.[296] This detail signalled Ardagh's recognition of the seriousness of his responsibility before his punishment. His imprisonment did not create awareness of the danger or consequences for words.

Bagnall heard of Worrell's treasonous words and yet Ardagh was still held responsible for failing to report. While analysing Ardagh's examination, it was unclear why this was the case. However, the official investigation also considered who to hold responsible as evident from Bagnall's own examination also taken on 25 January 1642. The captain claimed that he had encouraged and pressed Ardagh to tell Ormond, saying that he must not hear 'wordes of that nature spoken of his generall & pass them ouer'.[297] However, Bagnall denied that Ardagh entrusted him to deliver the message. Instead, according to Bagnall's examination, Ardagh assured him that he 'himselfe

---

[295] Examination of Mathew Tillinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 228v.
[296] Examination of Nicholas Ardaghe, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 229r-229v.
[297] Examination of Hannyball Bagnall, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 229v.

woulde acquainte his Lordship with it'.[298] Ardagh's claim and the captain's contradiction

blurred the lines of responsibility.

Individuals had the responsibility to report what they had heard, and perhaps,

Ardagh and Bagnall's contradictory reports both reflected their understanding the

consequences of being held responsible for this failure. They both equally had the

motivation to deny responsibility for the report in order to avoid or escape prison. If

Ardagh's claim were valid, then his imprisonment would have been a mistake, but if

Bagnall's claims were true, Ardagh punishment was appropriate in the context of the law.

The truth of this case was left unclear. There was no other evidence found in the 1641

depositions indicating when or if Ardagh was released, or who was ultimately held

responsible for failing to notify Ormond. Regardless, this case revealed that the presence

of speech could be dangerous to everyone whether they were directly and indirectly

involved. Ardagh had not even been the one to hear the original words, but their utterance

harmed him immensely.

Additionally, the involvement of individuals in various occupations and social

positions was evident. Witnesses included the merchant Matthew Tillinge, his brother

Christopher Tillinge, a cutler Richard Carricke, and a lieutenant Edward Dymmock.[299]

Robert Worrell, the man who spoke the words against the earl of Ormond, was a clerk,

and Tillinge's servant reported the initial insult of 'rebel' to his master. Tillinge also

informed the mayor, although he failed to acknowledge the seriousness of this offence

and hence did not report them to Ormond as well.

Both Ardagh's petition and examination did not indicate his social status but only

identified him as a prisoner in Dublin. However, the name Nicholas Ardagh appeared

---

[298] Examination of Hannyball Bagnall, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 229v.
[299] Examination of Mathew Tillinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228r; Examination of Christophe Tyllinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228v; Examination of Richard Carricke, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228v-229r; Examination of Edward Dymmock, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 229v.

again in 1647 (five years after this investigation) in a deposition concerning robberies, which identified him as a gentleman of the city of Dublin. The merchant Matthew Tillinge's examination suggested was the same person, as he believed Ardagh from the 1642 petition was an 'acquaintance with som of the Earle of ormondes gentlemen'.[300] This note indicated that Ardagh was of a higher social status than the merchant Tillinge, and therefore Nicholas Ardagh in both the petition and examination from 1642 and the deposition from 1647 were the same person. Nicholas Ardagh was also involved in Wentworth's trial, and his political background and involvement again indicated his status above a merchant like Tillinge.[301] There also seemed to be a social hierarchy associated with reporting in this case. From the beginning, this was evident. Matthew Tillinge's servant had heard Worrell's original words and reported directly to his master. Tillinge went to the mayor, and later to the apparent gentleman Ardagh.

Ultimately, this case showed the importance of words across society, and it highlighted the need for witnesses to report any treasonous or 'unfitting' words they heard directly or indirectly. It also added another potential motivation for deponents to report what words and speeches they heard. While some deponents may have simply answered a direct question from the commissioners, others may have willingly or eagerly reported words to avoid the punishment faced by those who failed to do so like Ardagh. Deponents answered the commissioners' questions, but they needed to clarify that they themselves also responded appropriately by indicating their rejection of the words and reporting it to the appropriate authorities.

---

[300] Examination of Mathew Tillinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228r.
[301] John Rushworth, *Mr Rushworth's historical collections abridg'd and improved, volume 3* (ECCO, 2010), pp. 492-3; See also: Maighréad Ní Mhurchadha, *Fingal, 1603-60: contending neighbours in North Dublin* (Dublin, 2005), pp. 185-6.

Similar accounts

These motivations may have existed in additional cases. In several accounts, witnesses reported their active rejection of the words they heard through simple response or rebuttal. For example, John Holmsted, a gentleman from Dublin, reported how he encountered a priest 'whoe vttered many vile and base speeches in heareing of this Deponent, against the Lords Justices and Counsell of Ireland: Calling them Roagues and Rascalls and Traiters'.[302] Holmsted reported his immediate response to this. He rebuked the priest for his words, telling him that 'it did not become him to speake soe basely of any that were absent and farr distant from him especially of his betters, and such honorable persons as those were'.[303] Despite his rebuke, Holmsted's response did not silence or change the behaviour of the priest but instead encouraged him to reply that those he spoke against

> were noe better then base Rascalls And if he were in Dublin he would speake soe of them: ffor they gave Comissions vnto the English Comanders of the Army to kill and distroy man woman, and child, and not to fulfill or performe any quarter to any of the Irish.[304]

The deposition did not document how Holmsted reacted to the priest's further insult upon the lord justices, but the inclusion of his initial response indicated that Holmsted understood the implications of such speech. He felt the need to respond as well as actively tell the commissioners how he reacted. Another possibility existed. Deponents may have accurately reported their authentic reactions to treasonous and unfitting words. However, it was also possible that deponent's overexaggerated, or even fabricated, their reaction to Irish rebels' treasonous words when questioned by the commissioners.

---

[302] Deposition of John Holmsted, 9 May 1643, TCD, Ms 814, f. 246r.
[303] Deposition of John Holmsted, 9 May 1643, TCD, Ms 814, f. 247r.
[304] Deposition of John Holmsted, 9 May 1643, TCD, Ms 814, f. 247r.

Manipulation of reports by deponents and commissioners always remained a possibility in the 1641 depositions. Unfortunately, Holmsted's deposition provided no evidence of this, and it is unlikely that historians would find remnants of these exaggerations or fabrications in other accounts even if this were the case. Besides, individuals and society generally understood the seriousness of words; therefore, many English settlers likely recognised this when they heard treasonous or unfitting speech and respond in some way against them. However, regardless if Holmsted accurately reported his reaction, his account still illustrated how one was *expected* to or should respond to illegal and disloyal speech.

Claims of the king's support were also directly challenged, as in Samuel Price's deposition from February 1642. The Irish rebels claimed to have a warrant from the king that 'iustified[ed] theire takeinge of the Englishmens goodes because the English were traitors and would haue put vp another Kinge when his Maiesty was in Scotland'.[305] Price, an esquire from Longford, responded to them by challenging their treasonous words and requesting evidence for their words against the king and the English.[306] His response was not successful in preventing further atrocities against himself and his family at that moment. They separated his wife and children from him and took his goods and his estate. However, by reporting his reaction to the commissioners, Price placed himself in immediate and direct opposition to their words. This response served two purposes. First, it defended the king. Second, it also protected Price from any accusation or investigation into his involvement with these claims. Therefore, in some cases, deponents may have purposefully reported speech and included their own active rejection of them.

---

[305] Deposition of Samuell Price, 25 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 157v.
[306] Deposition of Samuell Price, 25 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 157v.

Price's deposition also showed how he took these words as a personal affront and offence. He further reported that

> the separacion of his wife and children from him, the loss of his goodes and estate though greate and greevious vnto him was agrivated and made more insupportable by their base detraction and calumny cast vpon his Maiesty, and the odious aspercion by them layd vpon him and the rest of the English nacion of treason and rebellion.[307]

Here, the words against the king impacted Price personally. They were an offence against the king but also one that added to and heightened Price's loss of his family, his home, and property. This detail suggested that an awareness of the laws against treasonous words added to what individuals considered and experienced as atrocities in the 1641 rebellion.

In Ireland's state papers, a 1629 examination taken before the lord president of Munster showed an individual denying that he understood the meaning of 'unfitting' words. Nicholas Power, a twenty-seven-year-old merchant, was questioned about the disrespectful words of an alderman named Dominic Roche in Limerick city. Power met Roche on the streets of Limerick and heard him speak against James I and Charles I, accusing both kings of 'so foule a synn'.[308] Roche claimed that they each had an 'unnatural' relationship with the Duke of Buckingham, and he told Power that this caused the conflict between Spain and England when the King of Spain learned of it. Interestingly, Power failed to report Roche's words immediately. In his 1629 examination, he was asked why he took so long to report Roche to 'any publiwue Magistrate'. In response, Power said that he 'understood not the foulenes of the words, nor the heyniousness of the offence, until of Late'.[309] In fact, he claimed he only

---

[307] Deposition of Samuell Price, 25 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 157r- 158r.
[308] Sir William St. Leger to Lord Dorchester (TNA, SP63/249 f. 243).
[309] Sir William St. Leger to Lord Dorchester (TNA, SP63/249 f. 243).

recognised the illegal nature of these words after a friend told him to inform the authorities of Roche's offence.

It seemed very unlikely that Power did not understand the meaning of Roche's words. Roche spoke against two kings of England, the Duke of Buckingham, and accused each of them of a 'foule' sin. Therefore, it was more likely that Power's understood the words but failed to report them regardless. However, he found himself being questioned and therefore Power tried to avoid being implicated in an investigation of Roche by freeing himself from any consequences for failing to inform authorities about the words. In contrast to Power's claims in his examination, his denial rather indicated his very keen understanding of what Roche had said and an appreciation of the implications for himself.

The evidence in this 1620s examination cannot immediately translate to the 1641 depositions, however, it emphasised the difficulty of accepting reports in examinations or depositions at face values. Many individuals understood the implications attached to words, and they did not always share the exact facts of a case, but rather looked for ways to avoid punishment or association with 'unfitting' speech. However, it was also important to avoid conflating these examples and assuming that everyone reporting had a sharp consciousness of the dangers and importance of words. Some may not have understood the 'fouleness' of certain words, and instead they only reported them at the prompting of the commissioners who inquired after specific language or in response to the stories and reports of fellow witnesses.

The power of a deponent's reports

Laws and punishments served the authorities who aimed to maintain the established power dynamic. However, these same laws also created an environment in which individuals at varying social positions could use them for their purposes. Deponents reported because of the commissioner's question, loyalty, or to avoid punishment for

failure to report; however, there was another possible motivation. They could also *accuse* another of speaking words, including individuals of lower, equal, or higher status. By accusing someone of speaking 'unfitting words', they placed him or her in danger and impacted their lives and wellbeing.

For instance, Morris Kelly was accused of threatening speech and needed to defend himself against an accusation that he had struck a man named Alexander Bradford and spoke threats against him. Kelly immediately denied these claims, saying that he never struck Bradford 'or vsed any such threatning language'.[310] This account did not record who reported him for these words (perhaps it was the victim Bradford). Regardless, this unidentified person placed Kelly in grave danger. This account did not definitively prove that this was the primary intent of Kelly's accuser. Nonetheless, this example depicted an environment in which a person's reported words held consequences.

Other accounts provided more detail about those reporting, and evidence showed that they recounted words said by social superiors, equals, and subordinates. Therefore, the power to accuse another was not dependent on authority or social superiority. A complaint made by a social superior against an individual of lower social status appeared in two documents concerning the reports of the tailor Bartholomew Lemon. His first examination documented how he had heard a man named George Hacket speaking treasonous words. A second document taken sixteen days later reported that Hacket was the servant of a malster was named William Cox.[311] This case provided several insights.

First, Lemon was aware that he needed to report Hacket's words to the authorities and help to secure him. When he recognised the illegal nature of them, he went to find the constable and bring him to apprehend Hacket. Second, realising that Lemon had reported

---

[310] Examination of Morris Kelly, 22 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 812, f. 326r.
[311] Information of Bartholomew Lemman, 17 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 180r-181v.

him, Hacket attempted to escape. He was later found and successfully apprehended by the constable with Lemon's assistance, but his attempted escaped indicated some awareness of the severity of his words and the punishment that could follow. Third, this case may also be a demonstration that those of higher social status reported of words spoken by their subordinates. This statement cannot be definitive because it is difficult to discern their specific social standing. Although a tailor may have been of higher status than a servant, it is also true that tailors could sometimes be of humble standing. Servants, on the other hand, were not necessarily always lowly depending on their master's wealth, the standing of their birth family, and their position within the household. In this case, Lemon and Hacket could have been of relatively similar standing or they could have been clearly… Ultimately, Lemon's actions did not challenge power dynamics or hierarchies even if they were of relatively equal standing. It re-enforced them. If Lemon was of higher standing, it re-enforced his power over him. Those of higher social status used the laws in place to exert their authority over their social subordinates. If they were of similar standing, it still did not challenge social dynamics.[312]

In another case, it was clear that individuals of equal social status also accused one another of speaking 'unfitting' or treasonous words. The examination of William Bridgham documented a conflict between two merchants. In 1643, Ridgely Hatfield, a merchant from Dublin accused the merchant William Bridgham of speaking against 'the prime Officers, Captaines and the rest of the officers of the Armie garrisoned'[313] in Dublin. According to his accusation, Bridgham had called them 'were the veriest Scabbs and vnreasonablest Rascolls in the world' and 'the very scumme of the world'.[314] Bridgham denied ever saying these words and others that Hatfield accused him of

---

[312] Information of Bartholomew Lemman, 17 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 180r-181v.
[313] Examination of William Bridgham, 25 Aug. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, ff. 278r- 278v.
[314] Examination of William Bridgham, 25 Aug. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 278v.

speaking, including naming Irish merchants 'tame rebells'[315] and calling Hatfield a 'very foole'.[316]

Upon further analysis of this case, it became clear that Hatfield and Bridgham did not hold equal power. Bridgham had arrived in Dublin from London in September 1642 to collect a debt Hatfield owed to his master John Buxton, a linen draper. Hatfield owed Buxton over eight hundred pounds, and Bridgham immediately went to collect his payment when he arrived in Dublin. However, Hatfield delayed paying him, and therefore Bridgham brought the case before the high court of chancery 'for his said Masters debt, and served him with a subpena'.[317] In response, Hatfield 'was moved and swore presentlie that if this Examinant did not surcease his suites he would vndoe him'.[318] Hatfield carried out this threat when he 'vntruely and scandelously suggested'[319] that Bridgham spoke treasonous and unfitting words. In this way, Hatfield exerted power over Bridgham. Despite debts owed and a suit against him in the court of chancery, official concern for words created an opportunity for Hatfield to settle the score with Bridgham. Now, Bridgham faced investigation and potential punishment, even imprisonment. It was essential to recognise that official concern, as well as the public awareness of laws and punishments for words, created the possibility for individuals to harm another through accusation.

Name-calling: The power of the lower orders and the Irish rebels

Few servants or members of the meaner sort were the primary deponents in the 1641 depositions. As well, Irish Catholics were not generally deponents, therefore, they were unable to accuse another of speaking treasonous words in an official deposition.

---

[315] Examination of William Bridgham, 25 Aug. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 278v.
[316] Examination of William Bridgham, 25 Aug. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 279r.
[317] Examination of William Bridgham, 25 Aug. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 278v.
[318] Examination of William Bridgham, 25 Aug. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 278v.
[319] Examination of William Bridgham, 25 Aug. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 279r.

Nevertheless, there was clear evidence that social subordinates and the Irish rebels utilised the laws and their understanding of it to challenge or shift power dynamics and social hierarchies. This section will explore this point. However, because they were rarely deponents, they made their accusations not through official reports but by accusing another through public name-calling.

Treasonous words and actions were a definite concern of the 1641 depositions. Laws and official investigations attempted to control this by punishing treason and controlling language. However, this legal concern for treason also gave power to those who named another a 'traitor' or a 'rebel'. In the 1641 depositions, there were a variety of words that labelled individuals as enemies of the king or outsiders, especially 'rebel' or 'traitor'. Words that accused another of treason could have serious consequences. Use of them placed the accused in a precarious situation, one that needed to be corrected quickly. To be accused of treason or linked to traitors was incredibly dangerous, and individuals could use this to exert power or influence over their social superiors.

A clear example of the explicit use of 'traitor' to dominate or inflict harm upon a superior existed in the petition of Luke Marriott taken in November 1641. In 'the humble peticion', Lieutenant Marriott requested his release from prison. Marriott found himself in prison due to the claims of a soldier named Apsley in his company. According to this petition, Apsley had been living 'a most lewd and dangerous life',[320] and Marriott had punished him for his misconduct and wickedness. In response to his punishment,

> the said Apsley vowed to take some deepe revenge, and to *do* your petitioner some mischeif: which he most wickedly did, by taxing him to be a traytor: wherevpon your petitioner was committed and direccon given that he & his accuser should be examined.[321]

---

[320] Petition of Luke Marriot, 6 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, f. 130r.
[321] Petition of Luke Marriot, 6 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, f. 130r.

According to the petition, Apsley intended to do significant injury, which revealed that he understood the power of labels and the specific impact of the word 'traitor'. Thus, when he called Marriot this word, Apsley knew what he was doing. He was using his knowledge of the laws and punishments to enact his revenge, which showed how he understood how to target and undermine authority. By using the insult 'traitor', Apsley allowed the environment of distrust and concern for treason to work in his favour. Knowing that treason was a serious threat and that authorities took seriously, the soldier used this to harm his superior.

Apsley's strategy was effective. Lieutenant Marriott was committed to prison immediately due solely to one soldier's words. Therefore, to name someone a 'traitor' was a direct threat upon that individual. Apsley's words placed the burden of proving his innocence on Marriot, the named 'traitor'. Following this, Marriott attempted to prove his loyalty by recounting his past actions in support of the king. He explained that he had been preparing to depart Ireland for Spain when he heard of the outbreak of rebellion in Ireland. Hearing this news, Marriott changed his former intention and remained in Ireland to give himself and his soldiers 'to the service of his maiest{y} & of the good Subiects of this Realme'.[322] He further confirmed his continued loyalty, stating that while he, 'a poore Innocent gent is kept in prison', he is also restrained from serving the king in defeating the rebels 'as he willingly would doe'.[323]

The power of calling someone a 'rebel' or a 'traitor' was apparent; a soldier, seeking revenge, could inflict a punishment of imprisonment against his superior with this dangerous claim and term. The word 'rebel' appeared in thousands of depositions. It most frequently referred to the 'Irish rebels'. In such cases, it was used as a 'legitimate' label

---

[322] Petition of Luke Marriot, 6 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, f. 130r.
[323] Petition of Luke Marriot, 6 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, f. 130r.

because deponents and commissioners used it to describe those participating in the 1641 rebellion.[324] However, outside of the term 'Irish rebel', many depositions also recorded 'rebel' as a form of name-calling and an accusation of treason used by the Irish rebels against English men and women. The term 'traitor' was also commonly used in this way, and the labels of 'rebel' of 'traitor' appeared to be interchangeable.

Overall, both terms communicated the same idea: the person targeted was in opposition to the crown and was a treasonous threat. The fact that 'rebel' and 'traitor' often stood alone, rarely paired with adjectives, emphasised their precise meanings. Within the 1641 depositions, evidence of adjectives to further elaborate the term 'traitor' appeared in only two occasions. Both of these sources documented 'traitor' with the adjective 'English'. First, the 1642 deposition of John Fletcher recorded how an Irishman named Teah Leading drove Fletcher for a week towards Macroom, making him 'a spectacle to the Country, deriding the deponent, & calling him English traitor'.[325] Second, Jasper Horsey reported in the 1643 how John Roche and his company apprehended him and two other Englishmen, and they stripped them of their clothes, disarmed them, and took their money. During this time, Horsey reported how they specifically called him an 'English Traytor'.[326]

Although the 1641 depositions recorded both 'traitor' and 'rebel', commissioners seemed to prefer the word 'rebel' over 'traitor' in the deposition of Thomas Southwell. In his eyewitness account, Southwell reported how Irish rebels spoke against the king while also calling the English settlers the real traitors. However, the word 'traitors' was crossed out and replaced by the word 'rebells':

---

[324] Chapter four will analyse this idea of 'legitimate' labels.
[325] Deposition of John Fletcher, 16 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 824, ff. 265v.
[326] Deposition of Jasper Horsey, 16 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 822, ff. 109r-v.

He also sayth that he oftn heard Oliuer Stephenson the Shehyes the Pursells & the Herberts then say that they were allwayes for the king and that ~~his Maiesty had~~ we were the ~~traytours~~ rebbells.[327]

It was uncertain why someone made this change. However, the 1641 depositions referred to the Irish as 'rebels' much more frequently than as 'traitors'. Therefore, by changing the accusation against the English to 'rebel', it more clearly communicated the seriousness of this accusation; it connected the individual directly to the rebellion. Southwell was accused, not only as 'traitor' which could be proved in various ways but as a 'rebel' which associated him with the Irish rebels, as the depositions referred to them.

With such clear consequences attached to the label of 'rebel', it raised further questions about the earlier examined case of Nicholas Ardagh. A second assessment of this case revealed more about the use and power of the term 'rebel'. Worrell's words against Ormond resulted in Ardagh's imprisonment. However, this was not the speech that started the entire episode. In his examination, Matthew Tilllinge reported that he heard how Worrell was publicly calling him a 'rebel'. It may perhaps seem a minor note to consider the use of this word 'rebel' by Worrell, but by speaking such an insult and label, Worrell's speech drove the events forward. When Worrell named Tillinge a 'rebel', he placed Tillinge in a dangerous position and (whether consciously or not) used the laws and authorities' interest in finding and punishing treason to his advantage.[328]

The initial information provided did not explicitly show that Worrell understood the full implications of naming Tillinge a 'rebel the first time he did so'.[329] However, with the context of the laws and public nature of punishments, it was very likely that a man speaking such words on the streets of Dublin understood that his words carried weight and dangerous consequences. However, even if he was unaware previously, Tillinge's

---

[327] Deposition of Thomas Southwell, 14 Oct. 1642, TCD, Ms 829, f. 268r.
[328] Examination of Mathew Tillinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228r-228v.
[329] Examination of Mathew Tillinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228r-228v.

reaction and response to his words eliminated any ignorance Worrell possibly had before. Not only did Tillinge confront him, but he demanded that Worrell held to his accusation that they both go before Ormond to have the matter settled. Tillinge wanted Worrell to directly charge him as a 'rebel' in front of Ormond in order to have a clear decision made about this, have the opportunity to defend himself, and ultimately to clear his name.[330] Therefore, both Tillinge and Worrell recognised that this word was punishable at that time.

Overall, the case of Ardagh reflected the power words could hold, and consequently, the power the speaker could have. Worrell's words placed those in varying social and powerful positions at serious risk. They had the power to potentially affect Ormond, to create a legal investigation, to challenge individuals, and to affect the personal safety of a man superior to himself. When Worrell accused Ormond of treason, he challenged his authority and power, but he also placed those who heard him in danger of punishment including Tillinge, Ardagh, and the additional witnesses.[331] The term 'rebel' significantly threatened Tillinge and needed to be officially recognised by authorities as false. This demonstrated how understanding a single insult's implications and uses can illuminate new nuances and aspects of a case previously considered. By shifting the focus from treason against the earl to this insult against Tillinge, the more subtle or missed driving forces and exertion of power came to light.

The Irish rebels accused others of treason by naming them 'traitors' and 'rebels'. In the 1641 depositions, the Irish often claimed the support of the king and used this to validate these actions. In one way, the Irish use of these terms against English reflected a

---

[330] Examination of Mathew Tillinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228r-228v.
[331] Examination of Christophe Tyllinge, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228v; Examination of Richard Carricke, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 228v-229r; Examination of Edward Dymmock, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 229v; Examination of Hannyball Bagnall, 25 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 229v.

common theme. For instance, in 1642 in Longford, Samuel Price, an esquire, deposed that he heard three Irishmen say openly that

> they had a warrant from his Maiestye vnder his hand and seale to iustifie theire takeinge of the Englishmens goodes because the Englishmen were traitors and would haue put vp another Kinge when his Maiesty was in Scotland And that if the Englishmen did not departe the Kingdome within eight dayes they should loose theire lives.[332]

Upon hearing this claim, Price asked to see the said warrant, which the rebels refused.[333] The Irish rebels' use of 'traitors' acted as justification for their robbery of the English. However, it also demonstrated a power shift. Price was an esquire and an English Protestant, and yet the Irish felt capable of speaking these unfitting words to him. In the context of seventeenth-century Ireland, these words would have incurred severe punishment; however, the Irish openly expressed these beliefs. In this way, the Irish now believed they held power and could now speak. However, it was also important to analyse if words were a cause of a power shift, or if they were merely reflections of a change that had already occurred.

Anthropologist Maurice Bloch argued that speech does not shape or change power but only reflects the already-existing dynamic. Therefore, Bloch's point prompted further consideration of the relationship between words and power. According to Bloch's argument, the linguistic practices in the 1641 depositions would have only reflected pre-existing power dynamics; they would not have played a role in the creation of those dynamics. However, the relationship between authority and words was perhaps more complex and nuanced in the 1641 depositions.[334] The context of the source was again essential. When Irish rebels spoke against their English victims, they spoke their words in the environment of open rebellion through Ireland. Their words, in some instances, may

---

[332] Deposition of Samuell Price, 25 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 157v.
[333] Deposition of Samuell Price, 25 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. f. 158r.
[334] Bloch, 'Introduction', p. 26.

have challenged power dynamics in seventeenth-century Ireland. However, amid such

unrest, power may have already shifted by the time an Irish rebel spoke such words

directly to an English victim.

Additionally, both James Scott and John Walter focused on situations in which the

helpless used various 'weapons of the weak' in environments that rendered them

powerless. Walter noted that the absence of physical violence does not mean resistance

was absent.[335] This point was important when considering the 1641 depositions, which

documented the events of an open and active rebellion. Physical actions often occurred

alongside reports of words, and in some cases, Irish rebels may not have considered

themselves in a 'weak' position when they spoke their words. If so, then their use of

'traitor' instead reflected how dynamics had already shifted because of the rebellion,

which allowed them to now freely speak. The Irish rebels were able to make these

accusations openly.

Recognition of this power change was clearly present in the deposition of Stephen

Love from 1644. In his account, Love reported an Irish rebel who

> tould this deponent, you see quoth he how copious and lardge they expresse
> themselues, & you must vnderstand (said he) that whatsoeuer they doe (meaneing
> the rebells) is by vertue of a Comission from his Maiestie out of England & *you*
> *formerly called vs rebells but nowe we may be bould to call you traitors.*[336]

The italicisation in this quote reflects the original manuscript. In the manuscript, these

words were added into the text and written in smaller, tight handwriting between two

evenly spaced lines. This deposition demonstrated several significant points. First, the

Irish rebel directly acknowledged that the Irish rebels' expression were 'copious and

largde'. This detail suggested that previously such expression were withheld and only

now in the rebellion were they able to so openly express themselves. Second, Love

---

[335] Walter, *Crowds and popular politics*, pp 15-6, 216; Scott, *Weapons of the weak.*
[336] Deposition of Stephen Love, 3 Feb. 1644, TCD, 828, f. 127r;

recalled how they justified their words and, in fact, legally validated them by claiming the king's commission. This detail reflected how they understood the illegal nature of words said without the king's support. Third, the Irish rebels' words responded to past insults. They remembered being once called 'rebels', which reflected the seriousness of these accusations. It also, once again, showed that in this rebellion, they felt powerful enough to respond to past grievances or old offences. With the 1641 rebellion, the hierarchy had now shifted, and the Irish rebels' use of words further solidified this power shift.

Additionally, Irish rebels could now immediately respond to grievances and the words of English settlers. The 1655 examination of Richard Byrne documented an exchange between an Irish rebel named Oliver Magawley and an Englishman named Edmond Dalton. Magawley accused Dalton of having killed his father, and he told Richard Byrne that he hanged Dalton for revenge. Here, a response to past grievances was clear, and the environment of the rebellion had shifted the power and allowed Magawley to enact his vengeance. This examination also recorded the words spoken between Magawley and his victim. Before hanging Dalton, Magawley offered to bring him a priest several times. However, Dalton rejected and said that 'he cared not if all the priests were in the Sea'.[337] Hearing this, an Irishman responded by immediately swearing a blasphemous oath against him and said that 'if there were noe other occasion but that word he would hang the said Edmond'.[338] This immediate response may be an additional indication of how the power had shifted, and what that shift meant. Of course, Dalton's murder was the clearest evidence of a power change, but speech was also another signifier of this shift. Before the 1641 rebellion, perhaps Magawley would have remained silent despite insults against him or Catholic priests. Now, the Irish could openly swear

---

[337] Examination of Richard Bryne, 16 Feb. 1655, TCD, Ms 817, f. 126v.
[338] Examination of Richard Bryne, 16 Feb. 1655, TCD, Ms 817, f. 126v.

and speak blasphemous words that laws censored and punished throughout the seventeenth century.

'Puritan'

The terms 'rebel' and 'traitor' highlighted the importance of treason and the ability of words to threaten individuals through a direct accusation of disloyalty. However, the term 'puritan' also linked name-calling with treasonous accusation. While 'rebel' and 'traitor' were straightforward accusations, the meaning and use of 'puritan' was more nuanced and raised more questions. In general, the term 'puritan' first appeared in England in the 1560s, and it was used as a derogatory label for non-conformist clergy in the Elizabethan church.[339] In seventeenth-century England, the term 'puritan' was often used in the 1640s. However, by the 1650s, this term was going out of fashion and appeared less frequently.[340]

In the 1641 depositions, Irish rebels often spoke of puritans and it was a term used within the 1641 depositions to target English or Scottish individuals and groups. The majority of depositions that recorded 'puritan' were taken in the 1640s, and only one deposition from the 1650s was found that referred to a 'puritan'.[341] It was an interesting that while name-calling continued to be documented in the 1650s Commonwealth accounts, the specific term 'puritan' was rarely included. This seemed to mirror the broader decline of this word's use in England.

Historians must not mistake the presence of the word for the presence of a real puritan.[342] In the 1641 depositions, this word did not necessarily target real puritans. For example, Robert Browne reported how Irish rebels' 'words and expressions' generally

---

[339] John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), p. I.
[340] John Spurr, *English puritanism, 1603-1689* (London, 1998), p. 25.
[341] Deposition of John Crewes, 1 September 1653, TCD, Ms 829, f. 454v.
[342] Spurr, *English puritanism,* p. 12.

said 'that the Puritanes (so it pleaseth them to term them) had intended to cut them all offe and force them from their religion' in his 1642 deposition.[343]

Here, this account differentiated between what the rebels called their enemies and what they truly were. His report qualified the use of 'puritans' and emphasised that it was the choice of the rebels, not necessarily an accurate label. In this report, it was impossible to know if Browne or the commissioners chose to add this qualification, but regardless, they considered the rebels' use of 'puritan' an inaccurate label. Similar examples appeared in other accounts. Robert Maxwell's deposition reported Irish rebels who falsely called English Protestants 'puritans', and John Edgeworth's clearly stated that the term was a word chosen by the Irish rebels, writing that 'puritan' was what 'they tearmed them'.[344]

In England, a puritan referred to a person devoted to a deeper and fuller reform within the Church of England, and the reformers considered the label 'puritan' a slur against them the 'pious people'. However, this term was fluid and held numerous connotations and meanings in England accordin to historian John Spurr. It could be used to label a person as hypocrite, busybody, or political deviant.[345] The material within the 1641 depositions reflected Spurr's suggestion that a 'puritan' was a 'political deviant', or more specifically an enemy to the king and authority.[346] In the grievances of the peers and gentry of Ireland, the role of puritans was explicitly mentioned three times and in reference to religion and politics. The peers and gentry accused the English and the Scottish of coming to Ireland 'with the Bible in one hand, the Sword in the other'[347] to plant their puritan religion. Puritans were also accused of joining with Protestants in

---

[343] Deposition of Robert Browne, 5 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 103r.
[344] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 August 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 006v; Deposition of John Edgworth, 23 February 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f.. 144v.
[345] Spurr, *English puritanism,* pp 18-19.
[346] Spurr, *English puritanism,* p. 17.
[347] The grievances of the peers and gentry of Ireland, 25 Mar. 1642, TCD, MS 840, f. 025r.

Ireland to destroy the Irish, and the 'puritans of England' played a role in preventing the king from hearing grievances of the peers and gentry in Ireland.[348] Puritans targeted religion in Ireland, but they also acted against the king and prevented him from learning the truth.

Numerous deponents reported how Irish rebels spoke of puritans who opposed the king. A deponent named Robert Bonyne reported how the gentleman Richard Lyneham of Adamstown in Meath said that he hoped to see 40,000 Irish soldiers sent to England because the king needed help 'against the puritans there'.[349] Another deposition given by a merchant named John Comyne in 1643 reported how Irish rebels 'vsed to presse vpon protestants to sweare, to wit that ~~that~~ they should not Joine or adhere to the puritant faction against his Maiesty or the Catholick Relligion but to the vtter most of their powers mainteine the kinges perogatiue'.[350] The Irish rebels also declared that anyone who did not swear this oath or join their cause was 'in their esteeme a puritant'.[351] These depositions exemplified the clear political meaning of 'puritan' by directly connection it once again to the parliament puritans in England.

The majority of depositions that included 'puritan' referred to the puritan faction in England, and these examples were different from name-calling. However, this repetitive focus provided context for the accounts in which 'puritan' was used as an insult. 'Puritan' often acted as another word for 'traitor' or 'rebel' in the 1641 depositions, and some accounts explicitly linked these terms. For example, John Robinson reported how 'the Rebells rayled at the parliament in England ~~and~~ tearming them and the protestants here rebells traytors puritants'.[352] In 1642, Irish rebels called the

[348] The grievances of the peers and gentry of Ireland, 25 Mar. 1642, TCD, MS 840, ff. 025r, 026r.
[349] Deposition of Robert Bonyne, 25 Feb. 1643, TCD, Ms 816, f. 155v.
[350] Deposition of John Comyne, 31 May 1643, TCD, Ms 829, f. 102r.
[351] Deposition of John Comyne, 31 May 1643, TCD, Ms 829, f. 102r.
[352] Deposition of John Robinson, 27 June 1643, TCD, Ms 814, f. 190r.

English Protestants 'puritan rebbells' according to John Fletcher.[353] Similarly, they named George Man, Robert Willies, and others 'rebells and traytors' and added that they 'were all (meaneing the English & protestants) but rogues and puritanicall rascalls or woords to that effect'.[354] In 1642, Richard White recalled how English Protestants in Cork were called 'rebells, puritans and Parliament Rougs' because they were the 'kings enimes' and 'fought against the king'.[355]

Additionally, 'puritan' was linked to another label: 'roundhead'. A roundhead was a term used to identify a member of the parliament party, but it could also mean 'one considered to be puritanical in character'.[356] In the 1641 depositions, 'roundhead' rarely appeared, but three depositions reported the use of it alongside the insult 'puritan'.[357] This association further emphasised the political meaning of 'puritan' and its link to parliament, which Irish rebels often viewed as 'nowe infected with puritanisme'.[358]

Ultimately, when Irish rebels labelled their victims with words like 'puritanicall Rascalls and Parliament rogues',[359] they were calling them 'traitors' or 'rebels'. Therefore, to accuse another of puritanism gave the speaker power and undermined the victim's authority. However, 'puritan' also seemed to carry more nuanced meanings than 'traitor' as it carried both the political and religious meanings. Clearly, religion and politics cannot be separated as they are intertwined and connected within the depositions and the society. This relationship appeared throughout the 1641 depositions. For example, Simon Bridges reported how Irish rebels in Limerick named an Englishman a 'parliament rogue & traytour' and told 'him that they would send him home agen with the Deuills

---

[353] Deposition of John Fletcher, 16 September 1642, TCD, Ms 824, f. 265v.
[354] Deposition of George Man and Robert Willies, 31 March 1643, TCD, Ms f. 346r.
[355] Deposition of Richard White, 13 Oct. 1642, TCD, Ms 825, f. 017r.
[356] Oxford English dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/167961?redirectedFrom=roundhead#eid, accessed 1 July 2020.
[357] Deposition of Martha Piggot, 31 Oct. 1646, TCD, Ms 815, f. 376v; Deposition of Elizabeth Danuers, 14 Aug. 1645, TCD, Ms 820, f. 319r; Examination of Thomas Danvers, 14 Aug. 1645, TCD, Ms 826, f. 299r.
[358] Deposition of Walter Baldwin, 22 October 1642, TCD, Ms 823, f. 167r.
[359] Examination of Anthony Shernol, 28 September 1642, TCD, Ms 826, f. 233r.

name'.[360] This connection to religion also appeared in several depositions that reported 'puritan'. In fact, Grace Lovett reported in 1641 that a friar claimed that puritans caused the rebellion because they would 'not let us Enjoy our Religion quietly'.[361] However, this example still carried political meaning and motivation, and other depositions emphasised the link to parliament over the difference in religion.

In fact, several depositions clearly differentiated between a Protestant and a puritan. In Robert Browne's account, the Irish rebels spoke of puritans and Protestants separately, saying 'that the papistes in England wer Joyned with the protestants were up in armes to goe against the puritans, and the Scottes whom they sayd deteaned the king prisoner'.[362] The deponent Nathaniel Wood also reported how Irish rebels favoured Protestants but targeted those they perceived as puritans. Wood had survived the 1642 siege of Limerick, and he recounted how the Irish killed 280 men, women, and children during that time. After the siege, he told commissioners how he 'came out of the Castle' and heard the general Garrett Barry

> tell capteine George Courtney I will assure yow Mr Courtny quoth he whatsoeuer I doe I haue the kings Maiesties hand to shewe for it & vpon my faith I loue a protestant as well as a Roman Catholicke but the puritants of England haue mightily abused the kinge & if his Maiesty ~~had~~ come ouer into this kingdome City of Limerick.[363]

Once again, the distinction between a Protestant and a puritan was clear, and the differences between the Catholic and Protestant religion were de-emphasised as Barry focused on the puritans' the traiterous behaviour and the threat they posed to the king and to Limerick. Francis Sacheverell's deposition similarly reported how Irish rebels prioritised the puritans over Protestants. Sacheverell was taken captive by Irish rebels and

[360] Deposition of Symon Bridges, 31 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 823, f.171v.
[361] Deposition of Grace Lovett, 5 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 835, f. 133v.
[362] Deposition of Robert Browne, 5 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 103r.
[363] Deposition of Nathaniel Wood, 9 November 1642, TCD, Ms 829, f. 193v.

brought to Charlemont where he 'lay a fortnight vppon the boards without either strawe or beddeing'.[364] When Owen Roe O'Neill discovered he was a prisoner, he asked Sacheverell's captors 'whether the deponent was a puritane or noe and Sir Phelim o Neale being present answered that he was none of them'. In response to this, Owen O'Neill reprimanded them and 'much blamed them for keepeing the deponent in such base manner and not sendeing him to his native Countrey'.[365] Here, O'Neill clearly recognized puritans as the true enemy, and Protestants and puritans were to be treated differently.

However, the deposition of Luce Spell contradicted the examples given by deponents like Browne, Wood, and Sacheverell. In Spell's account, Catholic friars identified both Protestants and puritans as their enemies, and they told their English prisoners that they would 'goe all into England' and 'putt all the puritants and protestants to the sword'.[366] These contradicting depositions were unsurprising in the 1641 depositions, which often contained conflicting information about events and words in general. The complexities of 'puritan', unlike 'rebel' or 'traitor', provided an opportunity to recognise the existing contradictions in many accounts. While general themes existed throughout the 1641 depositions, it is important to realise that exceptions always exist.

In many cases, the specific meaning of this word remained unclear, and this uncertainty was articulated by an English victim in two 1645 depositions from Cork. Both accounts recounted the same episode in which the deponents, Elizabeth and Thomas Danvers, reported

> that the said deane ~~worth~~ a little before he was putt to death asked the Rebells why he must suffer death, ~~that~~ they Answered becawse he was a puritant and a rownd head, he replied I take it vpon my death I know not what those words meanes but I am of that religion that both the kings Maiesty & the Lord Liuetennant generall of

[364] Deposition of Frauncis Sacheverell, 21 July 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 107r.
[365] Deposition of Frauncis Sacheverell, 21 July 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 107r.
[366] Deposition of Luce Spell, 5 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 006v.

Ireland professe, which is the true protestant religion & if I suffer I know not what I die for or to that effecte.[367]

The victim's words suggested that while the rebels used specific terms to justify their actions, he was unaware of the accusations he faced. Despite not understanding the individual words, his clarification of his religion and loyalty to the king and the lord lieutenant of Ireland suggested that he had some general understanding of what 'puritan' meant. This example also emphasised the difficulty of accepting reports in the depositions on face value. While Deane claimed he did not understand the meaning of 'puritan', his response suggested the opposite. 'Puritan' was often a synonym for rebel against the king in the depositions, and Deane emphasised his loyalty to the crown. He clearly denies being a puritan through his statement. Therefore, an individual statement like 'I know not what those words meanes' cannot be separated from the supporting context of the rest of a deposition. Deane's denial may bot have been borne of ignorance but rather a strong desire to be very clear about what he was and what he was not.

The confusion over this word reflected the unclarity of the term 'puritan' in the 1641 depositions, but also within early modern historiography. Puritanism, in general, has been widely debated in the early modern period, and the debates surrounding puritanism and its definition exist throughout historiography.[368] 'Puritan' was a term with an unclear and nuanced definition, and many historians might relate to 'the said Deane' and his perplexity about its meaning. Additionally, this deposition demonstrated that despite some individuals' awareness of laws and the harm of words, others might not have

---

[367] Deposition of Elizabeth Danuers, 14 Aug. 1645, TCD, Ms 820, f. 319r; Examination of Thomas Danvers, 14 Aug. 1645, TCD, Ms 826, f. 299r.
[368] Crawford Gribben, 'Defining the puritans? The baptism debate in Cromwellian Ireland, 1654-56' in *Church History*, lxxiii, 1 (2004), pp 63-89; Crawford Gribben and Scott Spurlock (eds.), *Puritans and Catholics in the Trans-Atlantic world, 1600-1800* (Basingstoke, 2015; Coffey and Lim, *The Cambridge companion to puritanism;* Crawford Gribben, *The Irish puritans: James Ussher and the reformation of the Church* (Darlington, 2003); Spurr, *English puritanism;* John D. Seymour, *The puritans in Ireland, 1647-1661* (Oxford, 1969).

understood the full meaning or implications of words used against them. It signalled that an individual did not need to fully understand the insult or language used against them to recognise that it was dangerous. Rather, the very act of facing accusatory or name-calling words was enough, and this further highlighted the power of words.

Hunt claimed that however uncertain historians might be about the exact definitions and distinctions of a typical puritan, the use of this term inevitably signalled conflict between the so-called 'puritans' and those who labelled them as such.[369] Such a violent relationship appeared in the 1641 depositions. In fact, Elizabeth Danvers's account showed both the victim's confusion about the meaning of 'puritan' as well as the violence of this word. First, Irish rebels killed the English victim Deane because he was a 'puritan' and a 'roundhead'. As well, Deane's denial of their accusation suggested his recognition of the danger attached to that label. Although he did not understand the precise meaning, he attempted to remove himself from a word that Irish rebels used to justify violence against him. In this way, the violent meaning of an insult was not reliant on the victim or even the perpetrators knowing its exact meaning.

Violence was also perpetrated against so-called 'puritans' in the deposition of William Domville and George Clapham, which recalled how Irish rebels attacked the deponents as they 'were flying to Waterford, grievously wounding the said Marmaduke and reviling us with the names of Puritans, English Rogues and the like'.[370] As well, Ann Butler reported how her captors 'did vse all means possible to moue the said lo: to put ~~her~~ this deponent her husband and ffamily to death and torture alleadging that they weare ranke puritan protestants'.[371] John Cliffe also faced the Irish rebels' mistreatment and threats after they identified him as 'a damned Puritan', which they considered

---

[369] Spurr, *English puritanism,* p. 27; William Hunt, *The puritan moment—the coming of the revolution in an English county* (Massachusetts, 1979), p. 145.
[370] Deposition of William Domvill and George Clapham, 16 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 814, f. 121r.
[371] Deposition of Ann Butler, 7 September 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 069r.

'vnworhty of any thinge to Liue'.[372] He was held captive in his home for two weeks and then threatened by two Irishmaen who 'bringinge a Rope with them threatning to hange this deponent'.[373] They then robbed, stripped, and forced him out of his home with his wife and their new-born child while the Irish 'threatned them all to hange them if they Contynued there but the nexte daye'.[374] This violent theme aligned with the broader understanding of puritans as traitors to the king. By identifying an individual as a 'puritans', the speaker justified their actions against them by placing them in direct opposition to the king and the Irish Catholics. This word could decisively place the labelled individual or group outside of the king's support and in opposition to his power and political authority. By doing so, it placed the speaker in a position of power.

Conclusion

Overall, this chapter explored the relationship between power and words in the 1641 depositions. This chapter explored and validated Greengrass's suggestion that the existence of a law did not indicate its success, and authorities struggled and failed to control speech in the context of the 1641 depositions.[375] The official concern for language inadvertently enhanced the power of words during the 1641 rebellion. The existence of laws against speech created an environment in which an individual's words carried greater meaning and threat. It became clear that individuals across society understood and used the laws that existed in Ireland to exert or extend their power over others in the many depositions that recorded words and speeches.

In the midst of a rebellion, individuals still recognised the danger of their and other's words. Commissioners, military officers, tradesmen, widows, servants, and Irish rebels all either reported, engaged with, and/or spoke both treasonous and unfitting words

---

[372] Deposition of John Cliffe, 28 June 1642, TCD, Ms 818, ff. 107v-108r.
[373] Deposition of John Cliffe, 28 June 1642, TCD, Ms 818, ff. 107v-108r.
[374] Deposition of John Cliffe, 28 June 1642, TCD, Ms 818, ff. 107v-108r.
[375] Greengrass, 'Language and conflict', p. 198.

during the 1641 rebellion. This showed the importance of words across society. Furthermore, many individuals in the depositions clearly understood the consequences of words. There were serious punishments and investigations that followed speech. Others understood the danger of being the target of words, accusations, or insults. This awareness and use of the power of words indicated the seriousness in which deponents viewed the words they encountered.

Deponents reported words for various reasons. Some did so in response to the commissioners' direct questions, while other may have actively reported in order to avoid punishments like that of Nicholas Ardagh.[376] Others reported words in order to gain or show their power over the speaker as in the case of Ridgely Hatfield, who accused his debt collector of insulting and name-calling himself and fellow Irish merchants.[377] As well, social subordinates and Irish rebels could use their words to accuse a superior or a victim of treason or disloyalty by labelling them 'traitors', 'rebels', or 'puritan'. Ultimately, there was no single way or reason why people reported or used words in the 1641 depositions. This in itself was a critical point to make in relation to the 1641 depositions. Historians often debate the nature of these accounts. However, it became increasingly clear that while there were overarching themes in these accounts, each deponent, speaker, or accuser had their own reasons for how they spoke and reported others' speech.

---

[376] Petition of Nicholas Ardagh, 18 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 226r.
[377] Examination of William Bridgham, 25 Aug. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 278v.

Chapter four: Rogues, whores, villains, and viragos

The two previous chapters focused on the legal implications and consequences of speech. They emphasised the laws in place and the use of these across society. Chapter three analysed the use of laws from a social perspective, but it remained closely linked to ideas of laws, punishments, politics, and treason. While the legal context remains relevant, words were significant for many other reasons. Therefore, this chapter will explore another aspect and role of words by asking what language can reveal about concepts of honour and gender. This chapter will begin with a survey the historiography of honour in the early modern period, specifically in England and Ireland, and it will consider the unique complexities of understanding honour in seventeenth-century Ireland. Honour, reputation, and social standing were essential both in an early modern English and Irish context. This chapter will place insults and name-calling in the 1641 depositions into this discussion.

The second part of this chapter will consider four specific insults and labels used in the 1641 depositions: 'rogue', 'whore', 'villain', and 'virago'. It can be challenging to understand honour and reputation because of the many areas that impact and affect it. Therefore, this chapter will concentrate on two main topics related to these four terms: gender and the portrayal of the Irish as slanderous and dishonest. First, this second part will explore the most common terms used against men and women in the 1641 depositions: 'rogue' and 'whore'. It will analyse the gender divide and ask how these words showed the different (as well as similar) ways men and women were targeted. While women have been included throughout this entire thesis, having a specific consideration of them can uncover a more profound understanding of social expectations and gender relations. By analysing 'rogue' and 'whore', this chapter will also consider the collective impact of words and ask how insults against a specific individual indirectly

attacked those in relationship with the victim, be it men, women, or even children.

Second, this chapter will consider a distinction between words used by the Irish rebels

and the English deponents and commissioners. There was a difference between when an

Irish rebel used 'unfitting words'[378] against English victims and when English deponents

and commissioners insulted the Irish rebels, which this chapter will explore. Both the

Irish and the English used derogatory terms against one another, however, the 1641

depositions presented them in different ways. Therefore, the distinction between

honourable, legitimate speech and 'unfitting'[379] words will be considered. More

specifically, this chapter will examine two words used uniquely by the commissioners

and deponents against the Irish rebels: 'villain' and 'virago' to answer these questions.

Complexities of early modern English and Irish honour

Most significantly, Brendan Kane's book *The politics and culture of honour in Britain*

and Ireland, 1541-1641 contributed a much-needed discussion on honour in Ireland. It

provided an in-depth analysis of its influential role in shaping politics and society. Kane's

work focused on noble honour among the elites, as it was the social glue of early modern

societies due to its political importance and impact on hierarchy.[380] It also highlighted the

importance of understanding honour in terms of Anglo-Irish relations and the English

presence, while acknowledging the unique challenges of understanding the honour culture

in Ireland. Overall, his work demonstrated the complexity of honour in early modern

Ireland. [381]

---

[378] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[379] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[380] Brendan Kane, *The politics and culture of honour in Britain and Ireland, 1541-1641* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 271.
[381] Brendan Kane, *The politics and culture of honour in Britain and Ireland, 1541-1641* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 271.

Various factors influenced this complexity, including the presence of English settlers. For instance, William Palmer noted that in the sixteenth century, the Irish and the English had distinct concepts of honour. The English emphasised dominance in Ireland and loyalty to the crown, while the Irish emphasis was less clear and stressed individualism and defiance of authority.[382] However, Kane argued that by the seventeenth century and in the years leading to the 1641 rebellion, Ireland saw a 'shift away from culturally (Gaelic) specific honour notions to more broadly negotiated one in which 'the honour bond between king and subject was now made explicit'.[383] He argued that Irish intellectuals reworked Gaelic notions of honour to fit the rapid and radical social, cultural, political, and religious changes. Moreover, it seemed that by the mid-seventeenth century, there was an anglicised 'British' honour that predominated.[384]

Alternatively, other historians argued that there was no clear shift from one set of values to another. Instead, new ideas added to already existing ones, which altered concepts of honour in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For example, Ohlmeyer argued that lineage remained very important, especially for Catholics denied office because of their faith. However, concepts of honour were also increasingly linked to service.[385]

Despite the complexities of honour, Raymond Gillespie argued that a lot of the conflict in Ireland was between people who held similar values and ideas of society and about how it should work. Furthermore, he argued that their ideas of God, hierarchy, deference, and honour were not so far apart from one another.[386] Additionally, Joep

---

[382] William Palmer, 'That "insolent liberty" honor, rites of power, and persuasion in sixteenth-century Ireland' in *Renaissance quarterly*, xlvi, 2 (Summer 1993), p. 71.
[383] Palmer, 'That "insolent liberty", p. 72 (footnote 41); Brendan Kane, 'From Irish *Eineach* to British Honor? Noble Honor and High Politics in Early Modern Ireland, 1500–1650' in *History compass,* vii, 2 (2009), pp 415, 419.
[384] Kane, 'From Irish *Eineach* to British Honor?', p. 415.
[385] Jane Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English: the Irish aristocracy in the seventeenth century* (Yale, 2012), p. 73.
[386] Raymond Gillespie, *Seventeenth century Ireland* (Dublin, 2006), p. 2.

Leerssen's article, 'Wildness, wilderness, and Ireland: medieval and early-modern patterns in the demarcation of civility', showed the parallels between seventeenth-century Irish and English discourses concerning civility. He noted that both discourses demarcated civility through the negative denigration of an 'other'. However, they did this in different ways and depending on their political needs.[387] By studying speech in the 1641 depositions, Leerssen's point was evident. Both the Irish and the English used words to denigrate an 'other' negatively. This point will become increasingly apparent throughout this and the following chapters.[388]

Despite the many discussions on honour in Ireland, what *was* clear was that honour extended across many areas of life. It was nuanced, fragile, and complicated, and both the public or the private, the individual or the community could influence it. It was, as Cynthia Herrup wrote, 'a medley of values', both earned and inherited. It was given and taken based on royal favour as well as the community's approval.[389] Both English and Gaelic ideas impacted it, and it was shifting and changing throughout the seventeenth century. This chapter will consider what words and speeches in the 1641 depositions reveal about ideas of honour and civility.

Kane's research also demonstrated that there was much more to explore, and his work was not a comprehensive study. For example, it did not include women, and the emphasis remained upon the elite. Nevertheless, honour was highly gendered as shown by historians such as Alexandra Shepard and Linda Pollock.[390] More specifically in early modern England, female honour directly linked to chastity, obedience, and sexual purity,

---

[387] Leerssen, 'Wildness, wilderness', pp 30, 38.

[388] Macleod, 'Rogues, villaines', p. 124.

[389] Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland*, p. 73; Cynthia Herrup, 'To pluck bright honour from the pale-faced moon': gender and honour in the Castlehaven story' in *Transactions of the royal historical society,* vi, 6 (1996), p. 139.

[390] Alexandra Shepard, 'Manhood, credit and patriarchy in early modern England c. 1580-1649' in *Past and Present*, clxvii (2000), pp 73, 75; Linda Pollock*, 'Honor, gender, and reconciliation in elite culture, 1570-1700, in Journal of British studies,* xlviii (2007), pp 3-29.

as argued by Alexander Shepard in her article 'Manhood, credit and patriarchy in early modern England c. 1580-1649'.[391] Linda Pollock raised an important point and argued against the overwhelming historical focus on women's sexual purity in discussions of honour. She argued that this emphasis overlooked the women's wider contribution to the honour culture in early modern England.[392]

Specifically, regarding the study of women in seventeenth-century Ireland, Margaret MacCurtain and Mary O'Dowd have contributed extensively through their research. Their co-edited book, *Women in early modern Ireland,* provided an invaluable addition to the study of women. In *The history of women in Ireland, 1500-1800*, O'Dowd pointed out the difficulty of studying women due to their frequent 'invisibility' in early modern Ireland sources, which were primarily male oriented. Due to these limitations, historians needed to utilise imagination and creativity to uncover the many other aspects of women's lives that remained unexplored. Furthermore, she argued that historians need to take the time to specifically identify women in sources in which men may dominate the foreground. The 1641 depositions provided this opportunity, and the insults used against them will add a piece to the history of women in Ireland.[393]

Historians cannot overlook the experience of women or view it as a secondary topic, and 'unfitting words' in the 1641 depositions impacted both women and men. Early modern English legal cases revealed women's active participation in the courts regarding insult. Garthine Walker and Jennifer Kermode's work showed that 70% of legal cases concerned defamation in London, and in the seventeenth century alone, about 230 women in London sued and defended themselves in such cases.[394] There was no evidence found

---

[391] Shepard, 'Manhood, credit', pp 76,106.
[392] Linda Pollock, 'Honor, gender', p. 8.
[393] Margaret MacCurtain and Mary O'Dowd (eds.), *Women in early modern Ireland* (Edinburgh, 1991); O'Dowd, *A history of women in Ireland, 1500-1800* (New York, 2014), p. 3- 4.
[394] Jennifer Kermode and Garthine Walker, *Women, crime and the courts in early modern England* (Chapel Hill, 1994), p. 27.

in the 1641 depositions which a woman was punished for or extensively investigated for misspoken words. However, they actively engaged with words. They reported speech used against their husbands, families, neighbours, and themselves. They also recounted insults against themselves during the 1641 rebellion. Therefore, the limited focus on women must be corrected because it was a fundamental component of understanding society and the language that challenged honour.

Words and honour

Scholars across various disciplines recognised the deep connection between words and social expectations and structures. Pierre Bourdieu portrayed everyday verbal exchanges as encounters between individuals that draw upon social understandings and resources. In this way, each linguistic interaction 'bears the traces of the social structure that it both expresses and helps to reproduce'.[395] With potential social ramifications, it was no surprise that throughout the early modern period, defamation cases filled English courts, as well as those in New England's colonies.[396] The very act of defamation aimed to 'dishonour, disgrace, shame, damage to one's reputation, disrepute, and the action of impugning a person's good name or reputation; the action or fact of denigrating or disparaging someone'.[397] Ultimately, defamation acted as the 'the negative fashioning of others', and a 'mode of social exchange which operates on the basis of the spoken word'.[398]

In 1980, the historian James Sharpe published his work on defamation and sexual slander in the early modern church courts in York and emphasised the close connection between defamation and insult and early modern ideas of reputation. Sharpe argued that

---

[395] Pierre Bourdieu and John Thompson (eds.), Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (trans), *Language and symbolic power* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 308.
[396] Thompson, 'Holy watchfulness', p. 504.
[397] Oxford English Dictionary, https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/48703?redirectedFrom=defamation#eid, accessed 28 Feb. 2020.
[398] Ina Haberman, *Staging slander and gender in early modern England* (Ashgate, 2003), p. 1.

the church courts were one way to respond to an attack on one's honour in a time that necessitated a response to defamers and slanderers.[399] Laura Gowing noted that through insults, an individual could exert social power or control over another through the suggestion that this person did not fit the expectations and rules to which society adhered.[400]

Lawrence McNamara's *Reputation and defamation* made a similar claim. He noted that a pattern of response to accusations, insults, slander, and libel stemmed from a society in which one's reputation was central to one's life, and the very goal of defamation law was to protect reputation.[401] One's reputation could be challenged by verbal attacks and refuted and defended through legal action, and early modern defamation courts actively worked to correct and redeem the wrongly accused and insulted.[402]

The previous chapter focused primarily on the power of an insult based on its use as a treasonous accusation, but there was power in words that placed a person outside of social expectations. If defamation targeted honour and verbal exchanges reflected social expectations, then insults highlighted critical components of reputation and could reveal what specific topics were essential to it. In an Irish context, the two existing articles on Irish slander and insult by John McCafferty and Dianne Hall demonstrated this to an extent. Both studies focused on reputation and recognised that slander could have serious social repercussions by damaging one's reputation and character. However, these articles were limited in detail and scope and only provided a starting point.[403]

---

[399] Sharpe, *Defamation and sexual slander,* p. 23.
[400] Laura Gowing, *Domestic dangers: women, words, and sex in early modern London* (Oxford, 1996), p. 111.
[401] Lawrence McNamara, *Reputation and defamation* (Oxford, 2007), p. 1.
[402] Foster, *Church of England,* p. 61; Norton, 'Gender and defamation', p. 6.
[403] Hall, 'Words as weapons', p. 122-141; McCafferty, 'Defamation', pp 88-99.

Slander and defamation played a role in honour and reputation; however, insults and name-calling also provide insight into these ideas. On the one hand, Martin Ingram wrote of the link between laws, slander, and honour, however, he warned against conflating or overemphasising the importance of offensive words. Garthine Walker also argued that opprobrious words, and their specific meanings, do not always challenge reputation. Often, they acted as simple terms of abuse and substituted or accompanied physical hurt or gesturing. Moreover, the subtleties of their meaning do not necessarily reveal deep insights into the larger concepts of honour or reputation.[404] Therefore, historians need to cautiously consider these words and recognise that the precise meaning of each word was not always the most relevant part. It is also important to state that individual insults in the 1641 depositions do not necessarily add to the understanding of the noble honour focused on in Brendan Kane's work.

However, engaging with specific terms spoken against another provided a different focus. While Ingram warned against conflating the importance of insults, he also wrote that while 'rude or contemptuous words and actions, which cannot in any strict sense be seen as defamatory, may nonetheless offer extraordinarily powerful means of ridiculing, disgracing or humiliating their target'.[405] This role, in itself, holds great value. In the 1641 depositions, the presence of insults added a piece to the humiliation and ridicule that deponents experienced. While an insult may78 not have directly related to the concept of noble honour in Ireland, that did not mean it provided no value or never attacked reputation, which is one part to the definition of honour. In fact, Ingram used anthropologist Julian Pitt-Rivers's two-part definition for honour, which argued that honour is both a person's perceived value of him or herself and the value society gives to

---

[404] Ingram, 'Law, litigants', p. 144; Garthine Walker, 'Expanding the boundaries of female honour in early modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* vi (1996), p. 239.
[405] Ingram, 'Law, litigants', p. 139.

that same individual. Therefore, there are two crucial components of honour: both one's estimation of one's worth and society's acceptance and recognition of that worth.[406]

These two parts correlated with anthropologists and social historians who have shown that reputation within society is a result of a complex mixture of 'judgements and evaluations'.[407] Specifically, in an early modern Irish context, historian Brendan Kane used a similar definition, referring to honour as a 'dynamic two-part claim right'.[408] Clodagh Tait also suggested the importance of this definition when she argued that in Ireland, serious problems could arise when a person's idea of himself or herself did not always match with that of society.[409]

Insults targeted the second fundamental part of honour: the value another or society gives a person, which might also be called reputation. In many early modern societies, insults helped maintain and change social order by raising awareness of a particular person or group's failure to adhere to social rules. Deponents and victims in the 1641 depositions recognised the need to report treasonous words as a legal breach, as seen in chapter two and three. However, it was equally important to report words that were a personal offence that required legal acknowledgement or correction in order to protect one's reputation and social standing. Moreover, this concern may be another reason the official second and third commissions added the instruction to investigate 'unfitting' words.[410]

While punishment or treasonous accusation motivated some reports, protecting reputation motivated others. Chapter five will consider how this contributed to the violent

---

[406] Ingram, 'Law, litigants', p. 135.
[407] Richard Cust, 'Honour and politics in early Stuart England: the case of Beaumont v. Hastings' in *Past and Present,* cxlix (Nov. 1995), p. 61.
[408] Kane, *The politics and culture of honour,* p. 14.
[409] Tait, 'Society', pp 275-6.
[410] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.

experience of the rebellion, but this chapter will first indicate that words of ridicule and humiliation were different from those based on treasonous accusation as seen in chapter three. Furthermore, the very recording of insults and name-calling demonstrated the value placed on them by the original speaker, the deponents and the commissioners.

This chapter will also address the question of manipulation. Commissioners actively added and omitted certain details in the depositions, and this chapter will consider if this was also the case for unfitting words. However, despite this possibility, the importance of a reported insult remained. In some way, a commissioner's manipulation also emphasised that particular word. Many accounts reported a specific insult while also recording unspecified words spoken by Irish rebels . For example, the deposition of John Naughtyn documented the use of 'English dogg and many other opprobrious names'[411] against the deponent. Similarly, in the examination of Daniel Berwick, Irish rebels used the insults 'damned whore and other mixious words.'[412] The decision to include 'English dogg' and 'whore' in these accounts while omitting other words placed some higher value on these terms. Historians must ask why deponents reported, or commissioners chose to include these precise words.

Rogues

'Rogue' was one of the most common insults found in the 1641 depositions. It outnumbered any other word used against men or women, which was unsurprising as 'rogue' was a common term applied across early modern sources, and it was by no means a unique word used in the context of 1640s Ireland. It commonly appeared throughout legal cases, the literature of the time, and it was used by and against many individuals and groups. For example, Alexandra Shepard argued in *Meanings of manhood in early*

---

[411] Deposition of John Naughtynn, 15 July 1645, TCD, Ms 817, f. 072r.
[412] Part of the Examination of Daniel Berwick, 21 May 1642, TCD, Ms 810, f. 112r.

modern England that in defamation suits in Cambridge between 1581 and 1640, the word 'rogue' appeared and was the most common term referenced, tried, and witnessed.[413]

In general, 'rogue', 'knave', and 'rascal' were favourite English insults directed towards men in the seventeenth century.[414] 'Knave' and 'rascal' did appear in the 1641 depositions. However, 'knave' was only recorded four times, and while 'rascal' was a common term, it was never used on its own but always appeared within a group of insults alongside others like 'rogue', 'traitors' or 'puritans'. For example, Ann Sellers reported how Richard Hungerford, the governor of Dundeady Castle in Cork was named a 'rogue & rascall' when Irish rebels led by John Barry besieged the castle.[415] In the deposition of George Man and Robert Willis, English Protestants were called 'rebells and Traytors' and 'rogues and puritanical rascalls'.[416]

Generally, 'rogue' could suggest a dishonourable man filled with deceit, disloyalty, or treason. In the previous chapter, 'puritan' demonstrated how one word could hold various meanings, and 'rogue' showed this on a broader scale. This insult could stand alone; however, it was also one that was frequently accompanied by additional insults or adjectives. In the numerous depositions that included 'rogue', nineteen various adjectives appeared alongside it. These included: base, castle, con stealing, devilish, English, loose wandering, lusty, old, parliament, pottage bellied, Protestant, puritanical, rebellious, round head, sturdy, sullen, traitorous, treacherous, and young. With the presence of these descriptors, the meaning of 'rogue' could shift, sometimes focusing on religion or politics, personal attacks, or seditious suggestions. For instance, the words 'puritanical' and 'parliament' denoted a religious or political insult, while words such as 'con stealing', 'devilish', and 'base' focused on topics of economic dishonesty, religion, or

---

[413] Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of manhood in early modern England* (Oxford, 2003), p. 162.
[414] Thomas Hitchcock and Michelle Cohen, *English masculinities, 1660-1800* (London, 1999), p. 141.
[415] Deposition of Ann Sellers, 4 Oct. 1642, TCD, Ms 822, f. 177r.
[416] Deposition of George Man and Robert Willis, 31 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 829, f. 346r.

perhaps even dehumanisation. With just this one insult, the diverse topics targeted by speech could be discovered. Through these adjectives, other insults were discovered in the depositions. For example, 'puritanical' could become 'puritan', 'devilish' could become 'devil'.

Interestingly, 'rogue' applied to various groups and individuals in the depositions. It was a label that seemed to cross the divide between Protestants and Catholics, superiors and subordinates, Irish and English, and it was clearly a general insult used frequently to denigrate an individual or group. Deponents often referred to Irish rebels as 'rogues'. For example, in 1642 John Cardiff, a rector from Tyrone referred to the Irish rebels as 'rogues',[417] while similarly, Suzanna Stockdale's undated Dublin deposition named an Irish rebel a 'divellish Roague'.[418] In 1642, Thomas Forde referred to his Irish servant who robbed him of his cattle as a 'young rebell' and a 'rogue'. He also referred to other 'stronger rogues' who then took the cattle from his servant from themselves.[419]

Many other accounts documented the Irish rebels using this term against their English victims. For example, in the deposition of Christian Stanhawe and Owen Frankland, an Irish rebel called both his English victims and his fellow Irish 'rogues'. In 1643, the two deponents reported how they heard an Irishman:

> in a boasting and braveing manner say to some of the Rebells his Companions theis words vizt Come yow Roagues what have you been doeing att home all this day I have beene abroad & killed xvj of the Englishe roagues: & then putting his hands into his pockett shewed them a good quantity of money that he had taken from these English.[420]

In this deposition, 'rogue' referred to fellow perpetrators as well as past victims. He labelled his victims 'rogues' and connected it to his violence. He also used it against his fellow Irish who had not participated in the killings. By naming them 'rogues' for their

---

[417] Deposition of John Kerdiff, 28 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 839, f. 014v.
[418] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093v.
[419] Deposition of Thomas Forde, 16 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 835, f. 107r.
[420] Deposition of Christian Stanhawe and Owen Frankland, 23 July 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 076v.

inaction, he indirectly implied his own honour. His was a noble and justified cause, and those who did not aid him or participate were dishonourable Irishmen or 'rogues'.[421]

The legal concern for this particular word was also evident. The information of a cook named Owen Kelly from an unknown county showed that the use of this word was followed up and investigated. In November 1641, Kelly defended himself, saying

> That last night about eight of the clock hee came into the howse of Samuell English in Hamon lane But denyethe that hee did abuse or miscall any of the company there or called them Rogues or Rascalls and denyeth that hee said that hee hoped to see the confusion of then or any words to that effect.[422]

While 'rogue' was a malleable and general term, it was still the focus of legal investigations. It was a serious verbal affront that challenged individuals and society, and it also placed a person accused of using it in danger of punishment. As well, English authorities prioritised a word targeting broader ideas of honour and honesty. This was an important point because the frequent use and vague definition of 'rogue' risked insinuating that it was not as dangerous as other words. But it was, and when historians read it in the 1641 depositions, they encounter a word that was offensive and powerful.

Whores

Despite 'rogue' being a malleable word, this term never applied specifically or individually to a woman in any of the cases found. Women were less frequently the target of insults compared to men in the 1641 depositions; however, it remained an important part of this study. In the 1641 depositions, other commonly used terms included: 'traitor', 'dog', 'churl', 'rebel', 'rascal', 'heretic', and 'whore'. The majority of these targeted men in most accounts, and only one was a term specifically directed towards a woman: 'whore'. There were additional terms that uniquely targeted women, including 'trull', 'jade', and 'witch'; however, the number of accounts in which they appeared was minimal. For

---

[421] Deposition of Christian Stanhawe and Owen Frankland, 23 July 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 076v.
[422] Information of Owen Kelly, 22 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 809, f. 200r.

instance, among these terms, 'whore' was the most common but still was only found in fourteen accounts.

Despite the limited number of examples in the 1641 depositions, 'whore' was a word that was used and had legal consequences in Ireland before the 1640s. For example, in Marsh's Library in Dublin, one manuscript included legal articles taken in 1636 against James Lynch. According to this report, Lynch had abused his wife, the daughter of Sir John Mc Coghlan of Castlejordan in Kings County for many years in county Galway. In one particular incident, Lynch 'miscalled and abused' his wife and 'behaved and demeaned' himself 'toward her in a very harsh and intolerable manner' calling her a 'whore base whore, and divers other scandalous names'.[423] This name-calling was part of additional abuse, as Lynch beat and struck her head and body many times with his hands and fist while in bed with her. Furthermore, the article claimed that this abuse and name-calling became public knowledge.

This one example revealed several essential points. First, 'whore' was a serious accusation and insult against a woman. Second, men were, in at least some cases, investigated for their use of this word and other abuses against their wives. However, the status of Lynch's wife as the daughter of Mc Coghlan may have played a role in this investigation and the attempt to protect her and his reputation after it became known publicly. Third, 'whore' was an insult that carried sexual implications and meaning, and it was also associated with additional abuse, including physical.[424]

Within the fourteen depositions, 'whore' targeted Irish and English women. Nine English women and five Irish women were called or labelled with this word. It is important to distinguish between these two groups. Irish rebels insulted and verbally

---

[423] Articles against James Lynch (Marsh's library, Ms. 24. 2. 1).
[424] Articles against James Lynch (Marsh's library, Ms. 24. 2. 1).

attacked the English women according to the deponents' testimony. In 1653, Isaac

Philpott reported how his sister was called a 'whore'.[425] As well, Daniel Berwick reported

how an Irishman 'sayd to this examinant that he doth wonder that the Church of England

should Canonise Queen Elizabeth for a Saynt she being a damned whore'.[426]

Alternatively, Irish women were labelled 'whores' by the deponents and

commissioners in the official accounts. They were not directly insulted during the

rebellion: an important distinction from a direct act of name-calling. For example, John

Murghlan reported how an Irishman named McKay murdered a man called Thomas

Robinsons. Having killed him, McKay wore the victim's doublet, and gave Robinsons's

breeches to 'his whore' who made a waistcoat from the material which 'this Examinante

afterwards saw vpon his whore'.[427] In this context, the word 'whore' was not used as

name-calling but rather as a later label for the woman. The deposition of Joseph Wheeler

and six other witnesses also referred to an Irish woman as a 'whore'.[428] In 1652, Edmond

Realy reported how the Irish killed an Irish woman named Anne Byrne because she was a

'whore'. Luke Tooles hanged Byrne when he learned that 'she was one Wilson a butchers

whore and was a spy and gave intelligence to the said Butler'.[429] This example intensified

the meaning of 'whore'. It was a humiliating term but also a threat that could lead to

death.

Although no depositions reported that Irish rebels hanged an English 'whore', it

still carried violent undertones. Catherine Edwards's examination showed how English

women faced similar dangers because of 'whore'. Edwards's sister was seriously

wounded by Irish rebels but survived. One of the Irish perpetrators said that 'he was sorry

---

[425] Examination of Isaac Philpott, 11 Aug. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 237v.
[426] Part of the Examination of Daniel Berwicke, 21 May 1642, TCD, Ms 810, f. 112r.
[427] Examination of John Murghlan, 28 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 838, f. 047v.
[428] Deposition of Joseph Wheeler, Elizabeth Gilbert, Rebecca Hill, Thomas Lewis, Jonas Wheeler, Patrick Maxwell, and John Kevan, 5 July 1643, TCD, Ms 812, f. 203r.
[429] Deposition of Edmond Realy, 8 Sept. 1652, TCD, Ms 811, f. 220r.

for nothing that he had don that day but that he had not made an end of that English whore'.[430] Similarly, Eleanor Stinger told commissioners that the Irish called her a 'whore' as they attempted to hang her.[431]

In chapter three, it was clear that the record of the word 'puritan' did not necessarily indicate the presence of an actual puritan. Similarly, one cannot assume those calling a woman 'whore' spoke in the literal sense. In the depositions, the use of it never clearly referred to an actual prostitute. This idea was most apparent in a deposition that named Elice Butler, the daughter of Lord Mountgarret, as a 'whore'. In the original deposition, 'whore' was crossed out and replaced by 'mother of several bastards'. Perhaps the commissioners considered this a more believable term against Elice Butler, who as the daughter of Mountgarret was undoubtedly not a prostitute. Both insults were used as a form of insult and denigration, applied as a general attempt to attack, undermine, and offend a woman, not to identify prostitutes.[432]

'Whore' was a powerful word that needed little clarification. While adjectives paired with 'rogue' transformed or clarified its purpose in specific accounts and connected it to politics, religion, economics, or reputation, 'whore' did not have an equivalent variety of topics attached to it. In the 1641 depositions, only three adjectives described 'whore': English, old, and damned. However, they were not frequent. 'English' and 'old' only appeared twice in the depositions, while 'damned' appeared once.[433] As well, they did not add the same range of meaning as the adjectives used alongside 'rogue' such as 'parliamentary', 'puritanical', 'roundhead', or 'devilish'. However, this may be due to the

---

[430] Examination of Catherine Edwards, 17 Sept. 0, TCD, Ms 815, f. 138r.
[431] Deposition of Ellenor Stringer, 9 Aug. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 244r.
[432] Deposition of Joseph Wheeler, Elizabeth Gilbert, Rebecca Hill, Thomas Lewis, Jonas Wheeler, Patrick Maxwell, and John Kevan, 5 July 1643, TCD, Ms 812, f. 203r.
[433] Examination of Joice Deane, 9 Sept. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 182v; Examination of Joyce Deane, 15 Aug.1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 251r; Deposition of Edmond Realy, 8 Sept. 1652, TCD, Ms 811, f. 220r.

precise meaning and harm of calling a woman a 'whore'. Unlike 'rogue', naming a woman a 'whore' directly accused her of sexual misbehaviour, impurity, or immorality.

Although 'whore' was the most common insult against women, other sexually charged words were found: 'jade' and 'trull'. To name a woman, a 'trull' was similar to calling her a prostitute,[434] while the insult 'jade' also denoted 'a term of reprobation applied to women with strong sexual undertones'.[435] In the depositions, both of these terms appeared in reports alongside 'whore'. For example, in his examination from 1653, Isaac Philpott reported being 'kept him prisoner for about a month' during which time 'his said sister oftentimes brought him relief until that at length she was forbidden by the said carthy (calling her old whore & Jade) & bidding her come no more'.[436] As well, Alice Gregg's deposition from 1643 further emphasised the focus on a woman's sexuality by naming English women 'base trulls', 'lewd women', and 'whores'.[437]

While 'whore' appeared fourteen times, this insult was very infrequent compared to 'rogue', which was used against men hundreds of times. Such a disparity may simply reflect the reality that reports about women appeared significantly less than those about men in the 1641 depositions overall. As well, the majority of deponents were men. While women were actively involved and did report, the numbers are far less than their male counterparts. As well, women who testified often reported what had happened to their husbands, fathers, sons, not necessarily to themselves or other women. However, there may be additional reasons for this smaller representation of words like 'whore'. In chapter three, it was clear that some individuals chose not to report certain words 'not fitt to be repeated'.[438] While it was unclear how many deponents omitted words or would not

---

[434] Oxford English dictionary, https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/206916?redirectedFrom=trull#eid, accessed 19 Feb. 2020.
[435] Thompson, 'Holy watchfulness', p. 507.
[436] Examination of Isaac Philpott, 11 Aug. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 237v.
[437] Deposition of Alice Gregg, 21 July 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 096r.
[438] Deposition of William Reinolds, 12 July 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 258r.

repeat them, there was a possibility that perhaps 'whore' was one of the words individuals left unmentioned. One reason for this silence may have been the sexual nature of the insults directed uniquely at women. A link between sexual insults and sexual assault appeared in one 1642 deposition, in which Gilbert Pemberton reported that 'he hath credibly heard, his said Neece being a pretty woman they tooke to themselues ~~and~~ to keepe and to vse or rather abuse her as a whore'.[439] Here, 'whore' was tied to sexual abuse against the woman.

Mary O'Dowd suggested that rape and other violent attacks on women must have occurred in the 1641 rebellion despite the limited reports found in the 1641 depositions. She argued that people might have been reluctant to speak of these events, especially if the woman was still alive or of high social status.[440] In the 1641 depositions, some witnesses hesitated to speak of certain events, as indicated in the deposition of Robert Maxwell. In his account, Maxwell reported many forms of violence in detail. In one particular moment, he recounted the mistreatment and abuse of the bodies of English victims. These reported actions carried a sexual element. Rebel children mutilated Englishmen's dead bodies by beating them 'about theire privy members vntill they beate *or rather threshed* them off'.[441]

Moreover, they also abused women's bodies when they found them dead 'lying with theire faces Downwar{ds}'.[442] Maxwell then reported how the Irish children 'would turne them vpon theire backes, and in great flockes vnto them censuring all partes of theire bodies'.[443] Beyond this, Maxwell provided no further details about what was done

---

[439] Deposition of Gilbert Pemerton ex parte Thomas and Elizabeth Powell, 1 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 008r.
[440] Mary O'Dowd 'Women and war in Ireland in the 1640s' in Margaret MacCurtain and Mary O'Dowd (eds.), *Women in early modern Ireland* (Edinburgh, 1991), p. 101.
[441] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 010r.
[442] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 010r.
[443] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 010r.

to the women's bodies. Instead, he stated that the abuses against them 'are not to be named' because the Irish children abused the women in 'so many wayes so filthyly as chast eares would not endure the very nameing thereof'.[444] This particular example implied the presence of sexual assault, and it also signalled a hesitancy to provide further precise detail about such atrocities. This point was also relevant for analysing the sexual insults in the 1641 depositions. If deponents avoided the subject of rape or sexual abuse and withheld information that included it, perhaps insults of a sexual nature were also considered unfit to repeat, and therefore not reported as frequently as they were said.[445]

Each report in which an English woman was named a 'whore' was taken in the 1650s except for one account. Although it was difficult to know precisely why this direct insult appeared most often in the Commonwealth accounts, there were several possibilities. The formal and intimidating setting of Dublin Castle and the courts may not have provided an environment in which women felt ready to share such a personal and intimate accusation. In the 1640s depositions, witnesses reported to men they did not know. Commissioners and clerks were often the witness' social superiors, and they questioned the deponents in a formal and imposing place like Dublin Castle or the courts.[446] Just as O'Dowd suggested that experiences of rape and sexual assault may have been left unsaid due to shame or humiliation, this may also be a reason why women omitted sexual accusations made against them or another woman.[447]

Alternatively, the Commonwealth examinations were taken across Ireland and typically near the woman's home. They were also taken during a time of greater stability and peace in Ireland. Additionally, they focused more precisely on the conviction of the

---

[444] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 010r.
[445] O'Dowd 'Women and war', p. 101.
[446] McAreavey, 'Portadown 1641', p. 18.
[447] O'Dowd 'Women and war', p. 101.

perpetrators of violence and robberies.[448] Therefore perhaps the context of the Commonwealth encouraged women to report and share these more intimate accusations more than the earlier depositions taken in the 1640s.

'Whore' appeared in depositions from both the 1640s and 1650s when it described an Irish woman, or it targeted the English queen. Therefore, this word was used across the two decades. However, there was an important distinction to make here. Depositions that labelled Irish women as 'whores' were different from those that reported this word as an insult used against English women. Deponents and commissioners described Irish women as 'whores', and their depositions did not document any occasion where the English called the Irish 'whores' as an insult spoken directly to that woman. Alternatively, the depositions that reported an English woman being called a 'whore' documented how the Irish rebels used it as an insult spoken to the woman.

According to the depositions, the English women were called 'whores' directly and alongside other atrocities in the 1641 rebellion. This changed the context. Deponents and commissioners chose to label the Irish women 'whores', which supported a negative portrayal of the Irish. These depositions also presented this label as an accurate description of the Irish woman; therefore, it did not fit into the category of 'unfitting words' because it was not an insult but rather a correct label. This chapter will explore this distinction between 'unfitting words' and accurate labels later in reference to terms like 'villain' and virago. However, this distinction was important in regard to 'whore' as well. There was no evidence that an English deponent insulted or name-called an Irish woman with this label in the moment. As well, there was a distinction between depositions in which Irish rebels called an English woman a 'whore' directly, and ones in which they labelled the English queen as one. A statement like this against the queen was

---

[448] McAreavey, 'Portadown 1641', p. 18.

different from a personal insult on a woman who was present and living in that area. It targeted a woman who was absent from that attack, and furthermore, 'whore' challenged the English monarchy when it was used against the queen. It targeted the king, his authority, his wife, and the legitimacy of his heir. This use of 'whore' was, in some way, a treasonous claim when used against the queen, and therefore deponents needed to report this word, and they may have done so when commissioners asked them about 'traiterous' speech.

Gender differences and similarities

Sexual behaviour was clearly at the forefront of a woman's reputation and social standing in the 1641 depositions. However, historians must understand these words in comparison to word's used against men. In each of the examples of 'whore', 'trull', and 'jade', these words never targeted a group or an individual man. They always targeted a woman. These particular insults were gendered and divided and seemed to correlate with research on early modern England in which the focus on a woman's reputation centred on virtue while men often faced accusations referring to their trade or economics.[449] It was also important to ask if the 1641 depositions included insults used against both men and women.

To consider the nature of unique women's insults was not enough without also exploring if men experienced similar attacks based on their sexual behaviour or reputation. There was no clear evidence of this discovered in the 1641 depositions. Not only were particular words only used against women, but it also appeared that the topic of sexuality was mainly reserved for them as well. Historian Laura Gowing suggested that in early modern England the insult ''whore' did not equate to any male insult and that it was unique to the female experience. In the 1641 depositions, this seemed to be the case as well. Gowing explained how the insults directed towards women reflected an honour

---

[449] Hitchcock and Cohen, *English masculinities,* p. 148.

code based on sexual morality, while men experienced insult targeting many aspects of their lives.[450] This division seemed to exist between the most common insult, 'rogue', and the most common for women, 'whore'. However, there were nuances to 'rogue' unlike 'whore'. 'Rogue' targeted a man's honour based on politics, economics, and religion, but sexual behaviour was not necessarily excluded. Interestingly, a rare report of rape appeared in the examination of Samson Moore, which included the term 'rogue'. Moore reported that

> he heard it credibly spoken amongst the Irish, then, that ~~then~~ the Rogues Ravished 2 of the said Scotts Daughters before they murdered them and that Scotts wife being a lusty woman & passionately moued, with these outrages towards her husband & daughters, Stroue & fought with the~~m~~, ~~to~~ murderers for the preservacion of them, but therein shee was wounded by them, & therewith falling downe, before shee was dead, they threw her & the rest, into a saw pitt, and Scotts wife yet aliue they threw earth vpon her, & buried her.[451]

Here, 'rogue' was linked to sexual violence. Although this account was based on hearsay, it suggested that perhaps a word such a 'rogue' also referred to a person capable of violent and demeaning actions, including that of rape or sexual assault. Although there were very few indications of this aspect in the 1641 depositions, this account suggested that sexual behaviour had some small impact on a man's reputation.

In contrast, the majority of insults against women related to her sexual behaviour; however, it was also important to ask if words targeted women in any other way. In early modern England, historians have warned against a complete focus on women and sexuality. While the emphasis on a woman's sexual behaviour was prevalent, Martin Ingram suggested that such views might not encompass the entirety of public attitudes towards such a topic.[452] Alex Shepard in *Meanings of manhood in early modern England* suggested that historians revise this seeming gender polarity to include and recognise the

---

[450] Gowing, *Domestic dangers*, pp 107, 109.
[451] Examination of Samson Moore, 11 Sept. 1652, TCD, Ms 826, ff. 239r-239v.
[452] Ingram, 'Law, litigants', p. 151.

more diverse and varying insults towards women. She argued that insults extended beyond sexual focus and could include economic and other social factors.[453]

Likewise, Garthine Walker suggested that beyond sex and morality, a woman's honour was dependent on other factors. The extent of a woman's reputation in early modern England related to her deeds, specifically her labours as an honest housewife. She suggested that women's work within the household was an essential part of the feminine code of honour.[454] Furthermore, from a legal perspective, Ingram's work on defamation suits showed that women regularly complained not only about sexual insults against them but also about accusations of theft and other crimes.[455]

Ingram proposed that the word 'witch' targeted these additional parts of a woman's reputation. According to the OED, a 'witch' in the seventeenth century referred to a 'female magician, sorceress; in later use *esp.* a woman supposed to have dealings with the devil or evil spirits and to be able by their co-operation to perform supernatural acts'.[456] This definition did not have the same overt link to sex as that of 'whore', but other historians of early modern England challenged the idea that 'witch' was a non-sexual term. Charlotte-Rose Millar, who wrote of the 'sexual witch' in Marcus K. Harmes and Victoria Bladen's *Supernatural and secular power in early modern England,* argued that being a witch was often linked to a woman's sexual misbehaviour during the seventeenth century in England.

Unfortunately, this was difficult to assess in the 1641 depositions, which contained only a few reports of the insult 'witch'. As well, several of these depositions did not provide a lot of detail surrounding the use of this word. For example, two Armagh

---

[453] Shepard, *Meanings of manhood*, pp 153-4.
[454] Kermode and Walker, *Women, crime,* p. 49.
[455] Ingram, 'Law, litigants', p. 151.
[456] Oxford English dictionary, https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/229575?rskey=xtIE3O&result=2&isAdvanced=false#eid, accessed 28 Feb. 2020.

examinations taken in 1653 recorded how a woman named Jennet Dilliston was called a 'witch' or an 'old witch'.[457] Both accounts did not provide additional context. However, the connection between 'witch' and a woman's sexual behaviour did appear in other reports. In the examination of Anne Dawson in 1653, there was an underlying association with sexual or physical behaviour. Dawson reported how she had heard Edmond O'Donnelly tell his wife that he had drowned James Maxwell's wife. In response, O'Donnelly's wife asked him why he had done this, and he 'answered that Sir Felim o Neile told him that the said mr Maxwells wife was a Witch & that he never had good luck after he once kissed her, & more says not'.[458] Here, the physical touch of the woman linked to her status as a 'witch'.

There were also three accounts in the 1641 depositions, which referred to witchcraft and bewitchment. Two of the depositions suggested that witchcraft was one cause of the atrocities without mentioning a woman directly.[459] However, the third example explicitly linked witchcraft to a woman, who was also named a 'whore'. Eleanor Stringer reported her story as a prisoner in a deposition from 1653 and reported how 'before shee was released shee was much threatened by divers of his souldjers to be killd, called English whore & told that shee bewitched the English vnto them'.[460] Here, a woman linked with witchcraft was also targeted for her sexual behaviour, emphasising the sexual meaning of 'witch'.

Beyond individual insults, women could be name-called as part of a group of people. In this context, women faced insults outside of a sexual focus. For example, individuals called specific men 'puritans', but more often, they used it against groups of

---

[457] Examination of John McCart, 15 Mar. 1653, TCD, Ms 838, f. 079r; Examination of Allen McRee, 9 Mar. 1653, TCD, Ms 838, f. 73v.
[458] Examination of Anne Dawson, 26 Apr. 1653, TCD, Ms 836, f. 228r.
[459] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 010v; Deposition of George Creighton, 15 Apr. 1643, TCD, MS 833, f. 232v.
[460] Deposition of Ellenor Stringer, 9 Aug. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 244r.

English settlers that included both men and women.[461] In one account, a deposition included the widow Francis Bridgman as a victim of the Irish rebels' name-calling. Bridgman had tried to defend herself and other English victims from the Irish rebels by appealing to their shared loyalty to the king. However, the Irishman Dermot O'Brian rejected her defence and instead said to her that this was not true as 'they were puritans'.[462] Interestingly in the manuscript, the original word 'they' was crossed out and replaced with 'we', reading: 'Dermod o Bryen answering that ~~they~~ *wee* were Puritants'.[463] The change from 'they' to 'we' directly included Francis Bridgamn in this category. It remained unclear why this word was changed, but it made the insult 'puritan' a clear, direct insult against Francis Bridgman.

One might argue that the inclusion of women in a group did not mean that the speaker intended for their words to insult the women as well. This possibility appeared in the deposition of William Domvill and George Clapham. This account listed men whom the Irish named 'puritans'. Originally, Domvill's wife was included on the list but then crossed out. The reason for this correction was left unclear. However, it indicated that the deponents included herself as a victim of the word at least in the initial report. It also signalled that she was not completely untouched by this word.

Similarly, Irish rebels called both men and women 'English dogs'. The examination of a captain reported how rebels killed a man because he was 'an English dog',[464] and the deponents, John and Jane Sheeley and Margret Rowleright, reported how two women were named 'dogs'.[465] Additionally, Irish rebels used this insult against an entire group as, for example, in John Adis's report in which the Irish called him and his

---

[461] Deposition of Arthur Ahgmoty and Martin Johnston, 13 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 178v.
[462] Deposition of ffrancis Bridgman, 21 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 829, f. 018r.
[463] Deposition of ffrancis Bridgman, 21 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 829, f. 018r.
[464] Examination of Captain John Sweet, 9 Sept. 1652, TCD, Ms 826, f. 195.
[465] Deposition of John and Jane Sheeley and Margret Rowleright, 25 Apr. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 169r.

family 'English doggs and Roagues'.[466] Women were present within groups named 'puritans' and 'rogues', and they were individually called 'dogs'. This made them victims of these words as well as men.

Even when a distinction was clear, there was still a connection between men, women, and children. In another example, Timothy Pate from Wicklow recounted how Irish rebels encouraged one another to kill Pate by saying 'take of the head of the Traytor (meaneing the Deponent) & give the whore his wiffe his bloud to drinck'.[467] In Pate's deposition, the insults used against a husband and wife showed the different focus of insults against men and women; the term used upon the husband referenced political loyalty, while the word directed at the wife targeted her sexual behaviour. This particular contrast suggested that while religious differences and politics created the central theme of male insults, the accusation of adultery or sexual misbehaviour left women vulnerable to verbal insult and injured honour through the societal expectations of women.[468] However, it was also important to recognise that the effects of a word against one person were not limited to them. When a woman was called a 'whore' or a man called a 'traitor', their family was also insulted. Having a 'whore' for a wife reflected poorly on a man, as would having a 'traitor' as a husband. Therefore, despite these individual terms, both insults targeted the man and the woman whether directly or indirectly.[469]

Furthermore, an insult directed at a man could indirectly target and harm his wife or children, which may be one reason women often reported words spoken against their husbands and fathers. They were protecting their husband's reputation but also their own.

---

[466] Deposition of John Adis, 11 July 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 047r; John Temple, *The Irish rebellion: or, An history of the beginnings and first progresse of the general rebellion raised within the kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of Oct., in the year, 1641. Together vvith the barbarous cruelties and bloody massacres which ensued thereupon. / By Sir Iohn Temple Knight. Master of the Rolles, and one of his Majesties most honourable Privie Councell within the kingdom of Ireland* (London, 1646), p. 85.
[467] Deposition of Timothy Pate, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 811, f. 170r.
[468] Gowing, *Domestic dangers,* p. 112.
[469] Deposition of Ann Butler, 7 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 069r.

For example, Margaret Magwire from Down reported in 1653 that her father, 'the sayd Cormicke' was called a 'rogue'. Upon hearing this, her father immediately countered this, saying that 'I am not a Rogue'.[470] In this example, this direct rebuttal heightened the potency of the accusation. However, it also drew more violence from the Irish rebels who then drew their swords and struck him in the head. He endured a severe wound and fled from them; however, they pursued him, killed him, and mutilated his body in front of Magwire. In one way, Magwire's report may have been motivated by the desire to restore or protect her father's reputation. However, she may also have recognised the need to protect her own. Being the daughter of a dishonest and dishonourable man would challenge her place in society as well. The relationship between insults and violence will be discussed thoroughly in chapter five, and this examination was just one of many accounts that signalled the need to consider this aspect.

Other depositions directly stated that words against a husband also targeted his family and wife. In 1646, the widow Martha Piggot reported an insult used against her husband, but she also suggested this same insult affected his family. The killers named him a 'puritan' and a 'roundhead' after brutally murdering him. However, Piggot reported that this name-calling targeted not just her husband but also the entire family by using 'spitefull & malitious words against himself and his family'.[471] Likewise, Anthony Huibert's deposition recorded how a woman was insulted through her association with her husband a 'traitor'. Anthony Huibert's wife attempted to escape with their five children from the Irish rebels. During her flight, she faced violent threats to her life. During this time, the rebels insulted her by 'sayeing she was the wife of a Traytor'.[472] This deposition showed that while an insult might target one person, its power extended beyond them. To

---

[470] Examination of Margerett Nee Magwire, 25 May 1653, TCD, Ms 837 f. 146r.
[471] Deposition of Martha Piggot, 31 Oct. 1646, TCD, Ms 815, f. 376v.
[472] Deposition of Anthony Huiberts, 29 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 310r.

name a man a 'traitor' (or similarly any derogatory term) was an affront and challenge to his relations.

Different words used against a man and woman again appeared in depositions that referred to the king and queen. For example, the deposition of Samuel Franck reported how the Irish rebels said 'that the Parliament of England had proclaimed his Majesty King Charles to be a traytor, his Queene to bee a whore & their children bastardes'.[473] Here, Charles I was attacked for his politics, while the Irish rebels attacked the queen's sexual behaviour. However, the attack on the queen also targeted this king, as it implied and contributed to the additional accusation that their children were 'bastards'. When children were called 'bastards', this implied an illegitimate child born of a 'whore' and a challenge to the father as well.[474]

In the 1641 depositions, 'bastard' appeared in only six depositions, and in five of those accounts, it was directly connected to a woman or 'whore', including the queen. For example in 1642, Elizabeth Gough reported her interaction with an Irish rebel name Cahill O'Reilly. Interestingly, this account documented a rumour about the English mistreating the queen and naming her a 'whore' and her children 'bastards'. Gough asked O'Reilly to give his reason for the 'outrages against the English'. O'Reilly claimed that this was done under the queen's orders after her mistreatment by the English. The rumour claimed that English had hanged drawn and quartered the queen's priest 'in her presence & had put gunpowder in her saddle to blow her up the said English calling her whore & her children bastards: whereupon she was glad laboured to flee to her brother'.[475] In this account, 'whore' and 'bastard' were words of sedition, not just personal insult. O'Reilly supported his and the other Irish rebels' actions by claiming the

---

[473] Deposition of Samuell Franck, 1 Feb. 1643, TCD, Ms 815, f. 326r-v.
[474] Oxford English dictionary, https://www.oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/16044?rskey=Pt4fXT&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid, accessed 29 Feb. 2020
[475] Deposition of Elizabeth Gough, 8 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 833, f. 002r.

queen had been mistreated and seditiously and verbally attacked. Naming someone a bastard indirectly insulted the queen by implying her children were born out of marriage, but it also challenged the line of succession and the king himself.

As well, two occurrences of the word, 'bastard', specifically addressed a woman, and labelled her a 'protestant bastard'. On 18 October 1652, Winyfrid Field reported how a man named Patrick Begg, who had robbed her and killed her father, called her a 'protestant bastard' and turned her away from her home with 'threats and evill language', saying that 'if she would not leave trubling him, he would have her head cut of, as her had her fathers head cut of'.[476] Martin Nangle, who Field reported had helped her to appeal to Begg for mercy, confirmed her 'evil language' less than a month later in his examination from 9 November 1652.[477] In this case, Field was the victim of the insult, however, Begg's words also attached her father by claiming his daughter was not truly his and illegitimate. 'Whore', 'mother of bastards', 'wife of traitor' and other sexual terms specifically attacked a woman but also challenged those associated with her, her husband and children and implied intergenerational dishonesty.

Children also faced consequences and risks when their family members were labelled or insulted. Magdalen Guillaume's 1653 examination, for example, connected a man's status and a child's safety. Guillaume reported how her husband had barely escaped with his life and fled, leaving her and their child behind. The child's nursemaid was with him when Irish rebels arrived. They threatened to kill the child 'because it was the child of an English Churle'.[478] Therefore, an insult had an impact beyond the individual labelled; words impacted communal and collective reputation and safety.

---

[476] Examination of Winyfrid Field, 18 Oct. 1652, TCD, Ms 816, ff. 241r-v.
[477] Examination of Martin Nangle, 9 Nov. 1652, TCD, Ms 816, f. 246r.

[478] Examination of Magdalen Guillyme, 8 May 1653, TCD, Ms 838, f. 145v.

Furthermore, the connection between men and woman also existed in their most common insults: 'rogue' and 'whore'. While their meaning and use were very different, they shared a focus on dishonesty. Honesty, in general, was an important topic within the 1641 depositions as well as more broadly in England and Ireland. Although honesty was not an all-embracing category like 'honour', it was an important component in early modern England as argued by Martin Ingram'.[479] In the 1641 depositions, the Irish and English shared a common focus on honesty. The English concern appeared in depositions through labels such as 'honest English man'[480] or 'honest woman'.[481] Deponents specifically corrected challenges to an English man or woman's honesty in several accounts. For example, Robert Branthwaite questioned the mistreatment of an English man by saying: 'what offence the Rebells found in them I canott well imagin, because they were all of them honest men yet perhapps it was inough to be Englishe and able of body to beare Armes against them'.[482] This deposition presented the idea that those deemed 'honest men' were not deserving of violence. With this came the inverse suggestion that those considered dishonest were worthy of mistreatment. Such an idea also placed words such as 'rogue' and 'whore' into a violent context.

Ultimately, while women and men could be targeted, the main emphasis may not have been so different. Accusations of dishonesty simply manifested and expressed itself through different gendered words and topics. Of course, the nature of the 1641 depositions remained important. The commissioners and deponents impacted how the Irish rebel's words appeared. Therefore, historians cannot assume that all reports of the Irish use of 'rogue' and 'whore' were accurate. Nonetheless, the decision to include these

---

[479] Ingram, 'Law, litigants', p. 139.
[480] Deposition of Anthony Stephens, 25 June 1646, TCD, Ms 830, f. 042v.
[481] Deposition of Elizabeth Hooper, 1 Feb. 1643, TCD, Ms 820, f. 050v.
[482] Deposition of Robert Branthwaite, 30 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, ff. 153r-153v.

terms in the depositions demonstrated the meaning deponents and commissioners attached to it and its significance.

Dishonourable words vs legitimate speech

The importance of honesty translated beyond these personal insults of 'rogue' and 'whore'. The very problem of 'unfitting words'[483] was predicated on their dishonest nature as this next section will explore. Robert Branthwaite's deposition above defended the honesty of Englishmen, and it stated that he was not deserving of violence, but other accounts frequently emphasised the dishonesty of the Irish by reporting how they spoke false words and broken their oaths and promises. [484] Therefore, while the accusation of dishonesty was an insult to an honourable man or woman, the person who spoke these 'unfitting' terms also identified himself or herself as false and dishonourable.

Overall, seventeenth-century English sources frequently depicted the Irish as barbaric, as shown in Kathleen Noonan's article. Noonan explored how earlier writers, particularly Edmund Spenser and Sir John Davis, shaped English attitudes towards the Irish and presented them as savage, predatory, brutal, crafty, and stealthy.[485] This negative depiction of the Irish dated back to as early as the 1170s, and it remained constant but also adaptable, functioning differently throughout Ireland's history.[486]

In the 1641 depositions, the portrayal appeared again. Linguist Nicola MacLeod considered how the use of language in the 1641 depositions helped shape a negative image of the Irish, and this section will address this as well. MacLeod focused on the terms that the deponents and commissioners used to describe the Irish, such as 'rebel' or 'villain'. Here, she suggested that the use of particular terms about the Irish, such as

---

[483] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[484] Deposition of Robert Branthwaite, 30 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, ff. 153r-153v.
[485] Kathleen Noonan, The cruell pressure of an enraged, barbarous people': Irish and English identity in seventeenth-century policy and propaganda' in *The Historical Journal,* xli, 1 (Mar. 1998), p. 155.
[486] Leerssen, 'Wildness, wilderness', p. 34.

'traitorous rebel' or 'villain' served to portray the Irish as false and dishonourable. She argued that such a portrayal emphasised the 'otherness' of the Irish and their lack of civility.[487]

MacLeod also argued that commissioners directly manipulated some accounts recording terms used against the Irish. Commissioners seemed to transfer the word 'villain' from one document to the next. In five depositions taken by the same commissioner in the same year (1642) and county (Cavan), MacLeod found evidence that 'given the high degree of similarity between the texts it is likely that details were transferred word-for-word from document to document'.[488] Furthermore, deponents did not always choose the term 'traitorous rebells', but rather it was an institutionally favoured label that portrayed the Irish rebels as criminals.[489]

Although her analysis provided insight into the 1641 depositions' use of labels, she did not explore how records of Irish rebels speaking 'unfitting words' or insults against the English victims also portrayed them in a negative light. Those who broke the laws and spoke 'unfitting' words lowered and degraded themselves. This degeneration of the speaker existed outside of the 1641 depositions as well. For example, in 1620, a gentleman named Christopher Draycott was found guilty for speaking 'outrageously and scandalously' to Sir Francis Roe the mayor of Drogheda. It was 'a great grief to the court that a gentleman of good descent should degenerate' by 'fastening so unworthy imputations upon so worthy a person' and 'vilifying his Majesty's lieutenant'.[490] As well, when James Lynch called his wife a 'whore' according to a legal article in Marsh's library, he dishonoured her but also behaved dishonourably and demeaned himself'.[491]

---

[487] Macleod, 'Rogues, villaines', p. 124.
[488] Macleod, 'Rogues, villaines', p. 126.
[489] MacLeod, 'Rogues, villaines', p. 127.
[490] HMC, *Report on the manuscripts of the earl of Egmont*, pp 58-9.
[491] Articles against James Lynch (Marsh's library, Ms. 24. 2. 1).

Words against an honourable person dishonoured the speaker. Therefore, this section will consider how records of words and speeches helped create an image of the Irish rebels as dishonest and dishonourable. It will also consider the depositions that recorded the English speaking offensively towards the Irish, and it will argue that there was a distinction between 'unfitting' words and 'appropriate' or 'truthful' words.

The 1641 depositions often depicted the Irish rebels as untrustworthy, as in the deposition of Peter Gates. This account spoke of an Irishman named Manus O'Cane who guarded the castle of Dungiven in Derry. However, O'Cane 'not long after falsifyed and betrayed that trust & turned Rebell~~s~~ & became the most bloudie and cruell ~~and bloudie~~ villaine of all the rest'.[492] Depositions often depicted the Irish rebels in this way, evident again in accounts like that of John Morris. In his 1653 examination, Morris reported the 'bitter oaths' and the false promises of the Irishman Patrick McCaul. A group of Englishmen were escaping in boats with McCawell, whom they had apprehended and intended to take with them. However, McCaul begged to be set free, and he promised and swore that there were no boats left on the shore that could be used by himself or other Irish rebels to pursue the group once he was free. One of the Englishmen, Mr Hastings, agreed to this, saying that he would not murder a man even if the Irish would, and he released McCaul. However, no sooner had the Irishman landed onshore than he procured another boat and pursued the English with seven other Irish men and imprisoned them all. This account emphasised his lies, and further emphasised McCawell's dishonourable and dishonest behaviour by comparing it to the trusting and noble nature of the Englishman.[493]

---

[492] Deposition of Peter Gates, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 839, f. 107r.
[493] Examination of John Morris, 27 May 1653, TCD, Ms 838, f. 296r.

Despite this common depiction, the 1641 depositions also included some examples of Irish individuals who recognised and countered unfitting words spoken by fellow Irish. For example, John Holmsted told commissioners about an Irishman named John McRory Carroll who spoke 'disgracefull speeches against the English nation' and called the English settlers 'base English Churles and traiters'.[494] However, he also reported that Carroll's brother Charles Carroll of Ballidungrir 'did sharpely reprove' him 'for speakeing so basely of those that were absent and farr distant from him: and none present there of equal powre or force to reply vnto or contradict him'.[495] This deposition was important to acknowledge because it demonstrated the complexities of the 1641 depositions. Among the thousands of accounts, one theme may exist alongside contradictory examples. However, the value of each example remains, and it demonstrated the complexities of the 1641 depositions and the individuals who spoke words, reported words, rebuked words, and recorded them.

Still, the 1641 deposition often presented the English as civil and honest. In regard to speech, very few depositions featured the deponent or another English or Protestant individual slandering, insulting, defaming, or cursing the Irish. Clodagh Tait noted this and wrote that 'surprisingly, Protestant victims do not engage in ritual cursing, the typical response of the powerless to the misdeeds and violence of the powerful. Instead, the peaceableness of the settlers is usually stressed'.[496] In fact, reports existed that instead reported a deponent's hesitation to even repeat the 'unfitting words'[497] said by the Irish rebels. For instance, in 1642, Marmaduke Clapham deposed of words spoken, but he

---

[494] Deposition of John Holmsted, 9 May 1643, TCD, Ms 814, f. 246r.
[495] Deposition of John Holmsted, 9 May 1643, TCD, Ms 814, f. 246v.
[496] Clodagh Tait, '"Whereat his wife tooke great greef & died": dying of sorrow and killing in anger in seventeenth-century Ireland' in Michael J. Braddick, Phil Withington (eds.), *Popular culture and political agency in early modern England and Ireland: essays in honour of John Walter* (Woodbridge, 2017), p. 273.
[497] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.

would not repeat the specific terms used by Irish rebels, merely saying that it was 'not fit

to be related'.[498] In 1643, William Reinolds deposed how 'they vsed many

other tr~~each~~*ayt*erous false & scandelous words & *threats* against his Maiesty not fitt to be

repeated'.[499]

This hesitation to repeat words appeared in additional seventeenth-century sources

from the very start of the century. In a letter from June 1600 written to Robert Cecil,

captain Lionel Ghest reported the governor of Connaught Sir Oliver Lambert's 'odious

and disgraceful speeches' and wrote that there was no one who 'with more virulence of

his tongue, hath uttered towards you the venom of his heart' than Lambert.[500] Despite his

letter, he did not detail Lambert's exact words. Instead, he wrote that 'it was folly, and

could not but be offensive, to repeat his odious and disgraceful speeches'.[501] This

example reflected chapter three's argument that reporting was important and necessary.

However, it also indicated that individuals in the 1641 depositions sometimes recognised

that the specific words were too terrible or dangerous to repeat in detail. As well, in the

1641 depositions, the appearance of general phrases in additional depositions such as

'opprobrious words', 'evil terms', and 'vile language' denoted the presence of speech but

did not the specify the precise words or content. Perhaps this was due to a deponent's

reluctance to speak or repeat such dishonourable speech.

Despite these hesitations, several depositions still existed in which English

deponents used derogatory terms against the Irish rebels. As seen earlier, the rector John

Cardiff and Suzanna Stockdale each used 'rogue' to refer to the Irish rebels.[502] These

types of accounts challenged the idea that the recording of insults was meant to create a

---

[498] Deposition of Marmaduke Clapham, 13 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 814, f. 162v.
[499] Deposition of William Reinolds, 12 July 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 258r.
[500] Captain Lionel Ghest to [Sir Robert Cecil], June 1600 (Cal. S.P. Ire., 1509-1603, p. 283).
[501] Captain Lionel Ghest to [Sir Robert Cecil], June 1600 (Cal. S.P. Ire., 1509-1603, p. 283).
[502] Deposition of John Kerdiff, 28 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 839, f. 014v.

dishonourable image of the person saying them. If all insults dishonoured the speaker, it would have been very unlikely for Stockdale to report her use of 'rogue'. Instead, she reported them because her words could be considered appropriate or legitimate while others were viewed as 'unfitting'. When considering this distinction in the 1641 depositions, the context was once again crucial. These accounts were taken with a particular purpose, as well as with a bias that favoured the English settler.

Just as many seventeenth-century English sources portrayed the Irish as barbaric, violent, and dishonourable, many also used derogatory words to label them. Such words appeared, especially in literary sources speaking of the Irish and Ireland. For example, Alan Bliss's *Spoken English in Ireland, 1600-1740: Twenty-seven representative texts* included excerpts from William Shakespeare's *Henry V* that referred to an Irishman as a 'villiane', 'basterd', 'knave', 'foole' and 'rascall'. Ben Jonson's *The Irish masque (*1613-1616) labelled the Irish as 'villainous wild Irish' and called them 'rebels' and 'knaves'.[503] *The Welsh embassador* from 1623 depicted a character who pretended to be Irish footman, and therefore, named himself a 'rascall sonne of whores' and an 'asse'.[504] There was no hesitation to refer to the Irish with derogatory terms in these literary sources. Other excerpts referenced the dishonesty of the Irish appeared[505] or labelled them 'Irish villaines', 'damned rogues', and 'whorson Irish dogges'.[506] These literary sources were written from an English perspective, similar to the 1641 depositions. However, an additional reason validated their words or use of offensive language against the Irish. The Irish characters in these literary sources behaviour matched how they were labelled.

---

[503] Alan Bliss, *Spoken English in Ireland, 1600-1740: Twenty-seven Representative Texts* (Michigan, 1979), pp 94-95.
[504] Bliss, *Spoken English*, pp 99, 102.
[505] Bliss, *Spoken English*, pp 86-7, 89, 90.
[506] Bliss, *Spoken English*, p. 79.

When a character was called a 'villain', the poem or play portrayed them in this way.

Therefore, the label was an accurate description according to that source.

Similarly, the 1641 deposition often portrayed the Irish as they were labelled. The term was legitimate because it was true, and therefore, English deponents or victims could speak seemingly derogatory terms legitimately and honourably, while the words spoken by the Irish portrayed the rebels as dishonourable. For example, in the deposition of William Reinolds, the wife of a Protestant minister called an Irishman a 'roague'.[507] However, Reinolds justified the woman's words and said that she 'could not forbeare but called him Roague'[508] because the Irish rebel was openly and publicly speaking against the king. This 'roague' had wished 'that he had the Kings head'.[509] By reporting the Irish rebels' words, Reinolds justified the English woman's use of 'rogue'. First, the Irishman's words against the king signalled his dishonour and treason, which re-enforced that he was, in fact, a 'rogue'. Second, the woman needed to respond to his words and this open attack on the king, as was demonstrated in other depositions analysed in chapter three. Therefore, words or terms against individuals were not always considered 'unfitting' in the 1641 depositions and could even serve as a valid response to truly 'traiterous'[510] words.

All words and speeches in the 1641 depositions were not equal, and some words were justifiable. The woman's response was honourable, and her words truthful as they accurately described a man who spoke against the king. It was also significant that this deposition justified the words of a Protestant minister's wife. Her connection to the Protestant religion raised additional questions about the religious, Christian influence on

---

[507] Deposition of William Reinolds, 12 July 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 258r.
[508] Deposition of William Reinolds, 12 July 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 258r.
[509] Deposition of William Reinolds, 12 July 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 258r.
[510] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r; Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.

what words were considered unhonourable or 'unfitting'. In general, historians cannot overlook Christianity's significance in a period deeply influenced by religious themes and beliefs. Similarly, the role of Christianity was apparent in the 1641 depositions, which contained references to Christian scripture. Historians have noted the link between 1640s Ireland and the Old Testament. For example, in Darcy's *The Irish rebellion of 1641 and the wars of the three kingdoms* linked accounts in the depositions to the Old Testament theme of being left unburied during times of conflict.[511] Within the 1641 depositions themselves, there were several references to the Old Testament, as in the deposition of George Burne, which referenced the story of Judith and Holofernes.[512]

As well, hundreds of references to the four evangelists of the New Testament also appeared in the 1641 depositions. Deponents swore upon a bible 'vppon the holly Evangelist'[513] before giving their testimony as in the deposition of Valentin Payne and the deposition of Gabriel Marley.[514] Beyond these influences, eight Church of Ireland clergymen served as commissioners, and Henry Jones, the head commissioner, was a Doctor of Divinity and the dean of Kilmore and the son of Lewis Jones, the bishop of Killaloe.[515] Each of these details illustrated Christianity's influence on the recording of the 1641 depositions. Just as Darcy identified Old Testament themes in accounts related to violence, Christian themes may also underline other depositions, including those that reported words. As seen in chapter two, religion clearly played a role in the laws and punishment of words. Likewise, Christian teaching may have also impacted how deponents and commissioners perceived and recorded words.

---

[511] Darcy, *The Irish rebellion*, pp 73, 144.
[512] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 134; Deposition of George Burne, 12 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 839, f. 038v.
[513] Examination of Edmond English, 8 February 1642, TCD, Ms 813, f. 008r.
[514] Deposition of Valentin Payne, 9 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 837, f. 019r; Deposition of Gabriell Maureley, 7 Dec. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 023r.
[515] TCD 1641 project website, (http://1641.tcd.ie/index.php).

The distinction between words considered 'unfitting' and those considered appropriate and even honourable in the 1641 depositions reflected a similar theme in Christian scripture. In the biblical world, the appropriateness of an insult or curse depended primarily on the truth of the words spoken. In the Old Testament, language was valid if spoken with God's authority and therefore spoken truthfully.[516] Moreover, the Gospels of the New Testament reflected this same idea. Jesus, himself, often used strong terms and name-calling. For example, in the Gospel of Matthew, the apostle Peter objected to Jesus's decision to go to Jerusalem to be crucified. To this, Christ reprimanded him and called him 'Satan', the name of the devil.[517] As well, Jesus frequently name-called the Pharisees, the spiritual leaders of the time. In one example, he called them 'ye serpents, ye generation of vipers'.[518] However, Jesus also taught that anyone who spoke against another was liable to the council in the book of Matthew. He stated that those who murder 'shall be liable to judgment', but he also added that those with anger towards others will also be liable as will those who speak words against them. He demanded an end to hateful speech, and he continued by stating that 'whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire'.[519] Thus, Jesus seemed to directly teach that insults and name-calling were against the law. However, later in the book of Matthew, Jesus himself labelled the Pharisees 'you blind fools!'[520] Michal Bar-Asher Siegal's article 'Matthew 5:22: the insult 'fool' and the interpretation of the law in Christian and Rabbinic sources' argued that the seeming hypocrisy of Jesus's laws and his own words was not, in reality, a contradiction. [521]

---

[516] John Pilch, 'Insults and face work in the bible' in *HTS teologiese studies/theological studies,* lxx, 1 (2014), p. 4.
[517] Matthew 16: 22-23 (Authorised version).
[518] Matthew 23:33(Authorised version).
[519] Matthew 5:22 (Authorised version); Michal Bar-Asher Siegal, 'Matthew 5:22 : the insult "fool" and the interpretation of the law in Christian and Rabbinic sources' in *Revue de L'histoire des Religions,* ccxxxiv (2017),
[520] Pilch, 'Insults and face work', p. 5.
[521] Siegal, 'Matthew 5:22', pp 8-9.

Biblical scholar Don Garlington argued that when someone called another a 'fool', they unjustly condemned him or her. It was similar to calling him or her a 'heretic', 'apostate', or 'unbeliever', who was outside of Christian salvation. Garlington further argued that this verse did not prohibit generic use of name-calling or standard terms of abuse. Instead, it prohibited a person from judging another's place in the kingdom of God. The illegitimacy or legitimacy of using the word 'fool' was based upon the person speaking it and their ability speak it truthfully or accurately.[522]

Therefore, in the context of Christian scripture, only God or one who represented him could determine an individual's place in heaven; therefore, when Jesus used it in the context, he used it legitimately- as being the Son of God – he was able to judge and do so legitimately with the truth on his side. Laws punished those who called another a 'fool' because anyone other than God could not legitimately act as a 'judge' and speak that word truthfully. Therefore, this law did not contradict with the depiction of Jesus's use of this slur against the Pharisees because, according to scripture, he, as the Son of God, could legitimately judge and speak in truth when he labelled the Pharisees 'unbelievers'. Similarly, Jesus called Peter 'Satan' when the apostle acted against God's will, and therefore, this term was an accurate description of his actions. In Christian scripture, the importance of truth was central. It determined when this word was against the law or in line with God's will.

Ultimately, the material in the 1641 depositions provided no clear evidence that the scriptural understanding of words impacted how commissioners and deponents engaged with and reported words. However, it was important to recognise that the religious and spiritual element was present in the 1641 depositions, and that how words were documented often reflected the concern for truth in Christian scripture. The

---

[522] Don Garlington, '"You fool!": Matthew 5:22' in *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, xx, 1 (2010), p. 61.

distinction between hateful words and legitimate ones related closely to the theme of truth, and in the 1641 depositions, words used by English deponents and commissioners were presented as accurate descriptions of the person named, which the following section with consider.

However, there was also the role of social status and its potential impact on what words were believed and considered legitimate. The previous chapter demonstrated that words had power regardless of the speaker's social standing, and it seemed that the reason behind the words was more important than the speaker's status. For instance, the commissioner Randall Adams included reports of words and speech in his deposition. Adams reported how in November of 1641, he was in the company of some chief gentlemen of Westmeath and a group of friars. Adams heard some of the gentlemen accuse the friars of being the cause of this 'great and mischeeveous Rebellion'.[523] The gentlemen

> most bitterly cursed them [the friars] to their teethe & *Sayeing* that they hoped God would bring that vengeance home to them that they by their cursed plotts laboured so wickedly to bring upon others. the gentle [-] men the forenamed that spoke those very same words, (or words th to the verry like purpose) were Sir Oliuer Tuite: Knight Barronette: Eduard Tuite Esquire: a Justice of the peace: and Andrew: Tuite Esquire another a Justice of the peace.[524]

One could argue that the status of the gentlemen gave them the power to say these words; however, social superiors were not immune to punishment for words as the previous chapter explored. The reason for their words was far more important. The gentlemen's cursed against the friars who acted against the king, and therefore, their words were honourable in defence of the monarch. Furthermore, this distinction between honourable and 'unfitting' words added nuance to chapter three's analysis of 'traitor', 'rebel', and 'puritan'. These terms were not always 'unfitting' depending on the context and truth of

---

[523] Deposition of Randall Adams, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 045r.
[524] Deposition of Randall Adams, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 045r.

them. Ultimately, truthful and justifiable words, as understood by the commissioners, were valid regardless of one's status.

Irish villains and viragos

In the 1641 depositions, one word appeared which the English deponents or commissioners specifically used that to describe the Irish: 'villain'. The term 'villain' appeared within at least forty individual depositions, and it always referred to the Irish rebels.[525] In the 1641 depositions in particular, 'villain' often referred to those who engaged in criminal activity or inflicted physical violence upon the English. It, therefore, portrayed the Irish rebels' behaviour as illegal and uncivil as MacLeod argued. MacLeod also noted that the depositions that recorded 'villain' did so in a formulaic and patterned way, which suggested that the commissioners chose to include this word in order to depict the Irish as violent and dishonest criminals.[526]

It referred to a person's incivility, dishonesty, criminality, and especially their violence. For example, Ann Dudd called the Irish who hanged her husband and killed other Protestants a 'company of barbarous villaines of the Irish'.[527] Similarly, John Crewes's deposition labelled violent Irish rebels as 'villaines'. Crewes reported how these 'villaines' frequently hanged 'any English man married to an Irish woman or any Irish man married to an English woman' in Tipperary.[528] In these examples, 'villain' was not an insult or an 'unfitting' word because it was an 'honest' or accurate label based on the violent behaviour of those labelled as such. The English use of this term was legitimate because the Irish rebels acted as villains, as reported by the depositions. Other violent references to this word appeared, including: 'some bloudie Irish villaines',[529] 'a most

---

[525] MacLeod, 'Rogues, villaines', p. 127.
[526] MacLeod, 'Rogues, villaines', pp 125-6.
[527] Deposition of Ann Dudd, 24 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 831, f. 030r.
[528] Deposition of John Crewes, 1 Sept. 1653, TCD, Ms 829, f. 454r.
[529] Examination of Mary Austin, 19 Aug. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, ff. 249r-249v.

bloudy villaine',[530] 'wicked villaines',[531] 'merciles villaines',[532] 'rebellious villaine'[533],

'seuerall other Traiterous villaines',[534] or 'most cunning and bloody villaine'.[535]

This violent association with 'villain' also appeared in the deposition of Suzanna

Stockdale. During the rebellion, Stockdale encountered a group of Irish rebels, who

threatened to hang her. However, some Irish argued against killing her until one man,

described in the document as 'one covetous wicked & bloodie villaine', stepped forward

and 'said, that shee meaneing this deponent hadd a newe gowne, & why might not hee

have it'.[536] The Irishman then 'offered to be her Executioner for her clothes'.[537] This detail

portrayed him as a violent man, needing only the motivation of a dress to kill her.

Stockdale also further highlighted the Irishman's dishonour by reporting how her husband

had previously saved him from hanging, and yet the Irishman continued to act violently

towards her. This detail showed his lack of gratitude and legitimised another term she

called him: 'vngrateful & divellish Roague'.[538]

Interestingly, these details also validated the words of another Irishman from

Ballymone named Daniel Carroll, who challenged the Irish rebel and 'villain'. Stockdale

stated that Carroll 'had nothing to doe amongst them [the Irish rebels] but came onely to

save this deponents life' when he heard the 'Roagues speeches & offers'.[539] Carroll 'drew

his sword & cutt off his arme vttering theis wordes to that maimed villaine, If thou

shouldest hang her, then the ould Proverb would be verefied vizt Saue a theefe from the

[530] Deposition of Gartrude Carlile, 13 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 839, f. 032r.
[531] Deposition of Ann Frere, 8 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 032v; Deposition of Anthony Stephens, 25 June 1646, TCD, Ms 830, f. 043r.
[532] Deposition of Amy Hawkesworth, 12 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 040v; Deposition of Martha Mosley, 29 Oct. 1643, TCD, Ms 812, f. 090r.
[533] Deposition of Marmaduke Batemanson, 13 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 832, f. 080r.
[534] Deposition of John Sharpe, 9 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 833, f. 183r.
[535] Deposition of William Timmes, 5 Mar. 1646, TCD, Ms 821, ff. 193v-194r.
[536] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093v.
[537] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093v.
[538] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093v.
[539] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093v.

gallowes & hee wilbe first to hang yow.[540] Here, Carroll's words against the Irish rebel, including his label 'theefe' which matched well with Stockdale's words 'villain' and 'rogue', were justified as was his violence against him because he spoke accurately and in Stockdale's defence.

This detail once again illustrated how the accuracy of an individual's words was more important than that individual's status. An Irishman's words and actions could be justified when used to defend against an individual whose actions clearly identified them as a 'villain' or a 'rogue'. Overall, Stockdale's deposition provided clear evidence that the labels 'villain', 'rogue', and 'theefe' were valid and accurate. The Irishman's violent words and intention, his ungrateful nature, and his past criminal record portrayed him as a true villain. Consequently, Carroll's threats against this 'villain' were honourable and legitimate words.

The majority of depositions that included 'villain' used it to describe Irish rebels, but it rarely appeared as an insult spoken directly to Irish rebels in the moment. However, there were two exceptions to this. First, the deponent Thomas Downing reported how his mother Catherine Downing called the rebel Tibbot Butler and those with him 'you villaines'.[541] However, he also recounted how Butler and the others 'foricibly entered and pillage' her house. Catherine Downing reprimanded them saying 'you villaines why do you not do your work wherevpon they pillaged the said Catherin & her house' and killed her.[542] Once again, the English use of 'villain' reflected an Irish rebel's violent behaviour. Second, Thomas Clarke reported how a man named Captain Walter Chambers was held prisoner with his and was treated 'with great violence' by a 'rabble' lead by Robert

---

[540] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093v.
[541] Deposition of Thomas Downing, 24 Nov. 1652, TCD, Ms 820, f. 324r.
[542] Deposition of Thomas Downing, 24 Nov. 1652, TCD, Ms 820, f. 324r.

Harpoole and Thomas Davill. Chambers was taken from the prison, and Clarke sent his

servant James Wall to follow them and see what happened. Wall reported to Clarke

> That they had tyed a Rope about the said Chambre his necke and drawen him vp
> ouer a gate and imediatly after his being drawen vp The said Davills called to a
> ffoster brother of one of the Harpooles commanding him with his skeine to cutt
> the said Chambre his necke which was accordingly done wherby the head and the
> body ware ~~soone~~ suddainly seperated.[543]

After his murder, Harpoole and Davill returned to the prison three days later and spoke

with Clarke 'ranting how they ware auenged of the said Chambre that Roundheaded

Rogue or words to that effect'.[544] A few days later, they returned again to the prison.

There, they encountered the Foster brother who had killed Chambers. When they saw

him, they 'with indignation said yow villaine why doe yow say that yow neuer had your

health since I bade yow cutt of Chambre his head'. [545] This examination recorded an

accurate use of the term 'villain', but in this case the speakers were perpetrators

themselves. Evidently, 'villain' was used by deponents and commissioners as well as

fellow perpetrators to describe the Irish rebels. As well, 'villain' was an accurate label in

this deposition just as the other examples. The term applied to a violent and criminal man,

and regardless of who spoke this label (although they acted villainously as well), it was

not necessarily an 'unfitting' word. The speakers previously insulted the victim,

Chambers, by calling him a 'roundheaded rogue', but this use was different from

'villain', which targeted the killer.

'Villain' targeted Irish men, but Irish women faced a similar word. 'Virago' was a

term specifically used against Irish women, and it served a similar purpose like 'villain'

and labelled the Irish rebels as violent and cruel. This term only appeared in four

depositions, a significantly lower number of times than the male-term 'villain'. However,

---

[543] Examination of Thomas Clarke, 20 Oct. 1652, TCD, Ms 818, f. 197r.
[544] Examination of Thomas Clarke, 20 Oct. 1652, TCD, Ms 818, f. 197r.
[545] Examination of Thomas Clarke, 20 Oct. 1652, TCD, Ms 818, f. 197r.

this term served a similar role as that of 'villain': identifying Irish women as violent and bloody. Marmaduke Batemanson reported that one 'bloudy viragoe (harbouring the Envy & traitors mynd of her ancestors and kinred) was the principall cawser & instigator of the drowning of fifty Protestants men, women, and Children',[546] while Joan Constable reported that 'bloudie virago' set fire to several places in Armagh and killed those locked inside their homes.[547]

In general, the portrayal of an Irish woman was often associated with cruelty and particularly violent behaviour, and in several accounts the Irish woman's reported words supported this depiction. For example, in 1643, Elizabeth Crooker reported that the women, in general, were known to be 'more scornfull and cruell then the men: swearing & vowing they would kill them becawse they were of English kind'.[548] Depositions like Crooker's demonstrated how 'unfitting words' could heighten the offences and the dishonourable behaviour of the Irish. Similarly, the examination of Hiber Scott from 1653 provided an example of a specific Irish woman behaving the way Crooker claimed. He emphasised how a woman expressed her violent intent with her words. As Scott hid from the rebels all night in the cold, he reported that an Irish woman 'maliciously sought & searched after him, saying (in Irish) where is this English dogg'.[549] The use of speech heightened the violence, but also the dishonour of these women. These examples played into persistent stereotypes of the Irish, as uncivil, wild, and other, which the disproportionate records of 'unfitting' words spoken by the Irish helped perpetuate.[550] However, numerous accounts highlighted the particularly violent behaviour of Irish women even more than Irishmen. Some of the accounts that recorded 'virago' supported

---

[546] Deposition of Marmaduke Batemanson, 13 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 832, f. 080r.
[547] Deposition of Joane Constable, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 087r.
[548] Deposition of Elizabeth Crooker, 15 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 837, f. 004v.
[549] Examination of Hiber Scott, 23 Dec. 1653, TCD, Ms 839, ff. 226v.
[550] Leerssen, 'Wildness, wilderness', p. 34.

this idea. For example, in the deposition of Marmaduke Batesman, an Irishman attempted

to stop his wife, who the deposition labelled as a 'bloody virago', from killing English

and Scottish prisoners. The

> said Rose (out of divellish and base spite & mallice to the English & Scottish
> endeavoured much to *have them all* putt ~~them all~~ to death: & would haue effected
> it had not her husband denyed to suffer it *he* Saying the day will come when thou
> [~~w~~] maist be behoulding to the poorest amongst them. ffurther saying vnto her
> That she might putt all the English & Scotts there to death if she would: But if she
> did, hee would forsake, & never come nere her.[551]

And Batesman was convinced that if she 'had not beene restrained by the said Phillip mc

Hugh mc Shane o Rely the Colonell ~~neither~~ this deponent [~~nor any of~~] *&* the rest of the

protestants (that escaped)' would have been murdered.[552] Rose's murderous intentions

validated the label of 'bloody virago' applied to her, and her husband's opposition

heightened her violent intentions and actions. Once again, 'virago' was an accurate and

truthful descriptor of a violent Irish woman according to the 1641 depositions.

Overall, terms used against the Irish did not fit into the category of 'unfitting

words'.[553] There was a distinction between insults and legitimate speech. Unlike

treasonous words that were always problematic and illegal, the 'unfitting' nature of name-

calling or insulting was malleable and dependent on the context. Thus, words were

unfitting if they were false, and the speaker was perceived as dishonourable. From the

English deponent and commissioner's perspective, words like 'villain' and 'virago' were

accurate descriptions of the Irish rebels. And alternatively, references to the Irish in the

1641 depositions as 'wretches'[554], 'papists' or 'heretics' were different from when an

Irish rebel name-called the English deponent. When commissioners and deponents

labelled the Irish as 'rebels' in a deposition, it differed from accounts in which the Irish

---

[551] Deposition of Marmaduke Batesman, 13 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 215r.
[552] Deposition of Marmaduke Batesman, 13 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 215v.
[553] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[554] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 010r.

named the English as 'rebels' or even 'traitors' or 'puritans'. Similarly, references to the

Irish as 'papists' or followers of 'popery'[555] were different from reports of the Irish

attacking the English and their religion by calling them 'heretics',[556] or 'noe Christians'[557]

as 'was common speech amoung the Rebells'.[558] From the English perspective, these

claims against Protestants were false. Therefore, the Irish rebels' words were 'unfitting'

and unjust in contrast to words applied by the English onto the Irish rebels.

However, it is important to recognise that contemporaries may have still viewed

English deponents' words as problematic. They may have considered any report of

questionable language in the 1641 depositions as outside of the details they wanted to

document as part of the 1641 rebellion. This decision to edit language was clear in John

Temple's *The Irish rebellion.* In general, Temple heavily edited this publication, and he

exaggerated, edited, and even fabricated many of his reports of the 1641 rebellion. For

example, he provided details from Thomas Fleetwood's original 1643 deposition.

However, he also reported events and atrocities under Fleetwood's name that did not

appear in the official deposition. Temple claimed that Fleetwood reported how Irish

women from Athlone stoned an Englishwoman to death; however, this detail was not in

his original deposition.[559]

Temple also omitted details from other depositions. In regard to language, Temple

removed and replaced several words used by the English about the Irish. For instance,

Ann Read's deposition referred to Irish children as 'theis wicked yong impes'. Temple's

published section replaced this phrase with the more neutral 'those children'.[560] As well,

---

[555] Deposition of Ann Frere, 8 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 032v.
[556] Examination of Michaell Harrison, 11 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 836, f. 136v.
[557] Examination of Michaell Harrison, 11 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 836, f. 136v.
[558] Deposition of William Watte, 12 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 833, f. 200v.
[559] Sarah Covington, '"Realms so barbarous and cruel": writing violence in early modern Ireland and England', *History,* xcix (2014), p. 60; Deposition of Thomas Fleetwood, 22 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 039r-039v.
[560] Temple, *Irish rebellion,* p. 176; Deposition of Ann Read, 12 July 1642, TCD, Ms 831, f. 039r;

in the original deposition of Joseph Wheeler and others from 1643, the deponents

reported of the violent behaviour of Ellice Butler, the daughter of Lord Mountgarret and

referred to her as 'a reputed house whore mother of several bastards'.[561] In the *Irish*

rebellion, Temple chose to omit this phrase. Instead, he replaced it with the simple label

'woman'. In this particular example, the elimination of this term may have been due to its

clear dishonesty. Ellice Butler, the daughter of Lord Mountgarret, was clearly mislabelled

as a 'whore' in the original deposition, and the English deponent's dishonesty or insulting

words would have been clear. Its presence would have possibly portrayed the speaker as

deceptive, slanderous, and dishonourable. Therefore, Temple may have replaced it

because the speaker was an English deponent, and the depiction of a dishonest deponent

contradicted the depiction of the blameless victim, which he presented in his publication.

In general, Temple presented the victims as passive blank screens 'onto which the

inflictors project[ed] their acts of wickedness'.[562]

Temple also replaced two additional instances in which the English deponents

labelled Irish women as 'virago'. Temple edited out this word and replaced it simply with

'woman'.[563] Although the commissioners and the deponents may have considered the

terms 'villain' and 'virago' legitimate, John Temple still chose to remove 'virago' as used

by the English in 1641 depositions out his publication. This decision once again reflected

The Irish rebellion's overall depiction of English Protestants as blameless victims, who

were frequently silent and passive. To publish excerpts in which the English used harsh

language did not match the narrative of the barbaric Irish against helpless English

victims. Temple eliminated any sign the English may have responded in even a slightly

questionable manner.

---

[561] Deposition of Joseph Wheeler, Elizabeth Gilbert, Rebecca Hill, Thomas Lewis, Jonas Wheeler, Patrick Maxwell, and John Kevan, 5 July 1643, TCD, Ms 812, f. 203r.
[562] Covington, 'Realms so barbarous and cruel', p. 60.
[563] Temple, *Irish rebellion,* pp 91,121.

Conclusion

Overall, this chapter explored the relationship between words, honour, and reputation. By recognising honour as an essential and fundamental feature of life, the impact of insults became even more apparent. Insults, in their very nature, challenged an individual's sense of worth, while revealing the rejection of that by another. Thus, the specific terminology used as an insult revealed that honour was composed of a variety of areas of an individual's life.[564] This chapter also demonstrated that while individuals were concerned with being called a 'traitor' or a 'rebel' (as seen in the chapter two), they were equally concerned with insults like 'rogue' and 'whore' that focused on topics beyond treason. The different focuses of these insults highlighted the importance of sexuality to a woman's reputation, which was only a small piece of men's in comparison to economics, politics, religion, and occupation.

In the context of the 1641 depositions, historians have only started to engage with topics of sexual abuse and assault in these accounts, and much work remains. However, the reports of 'whore' revealed that both deponents and commissioners engaged with this topic and chose to include references to a woman's sexuality in some accounts. This emphasised the importance of sexual reputation and behaviour to women, and it added to O'Dowd's argument that sexual assault or abuse occurred in the 1641 rebellion although its appearance was rare in the depositions.[565]

The limited number of accounts that documented 'whore' also suggested that commissioners omitted some references to this topic in order to protect the reputation of the woman as they likely did in other reports that may have included. In this way, it is important to recognise that the words recorded in the 1641 depositions do not represent

---

[564] Norton, 'Gender and defamation', p. 9.
[565] O'Dowd 'Women and war', p. 101.

all speech and insults that may have been spoken in the 1641 rebellion. On the one hand, the repetitive reports of a particular insult like 'rogue' or 'whore' revealed their importance to commissioners and deponents and even other contemporaries like Temple. On the other hand, historians cannot know if other words were omitted or why. There was certainly evidence that words were manipulated and added such as 'villain' and 'virago'; therefore, the commissioners may have excluded some words that carried meaning unsuited for the image they wanted to portray.

This chapter also demonstrated how words affected both the individual and their family, which showed the communal impact of insults and name-calling. A word carried meaning and impact beyond one isolated person. As well, the underlining themes of dishonesty was an attack on reputation regardless of a person's gender. Trustworthy was a central factor in one's social standing and perception regardless of gender. This contributed to the 1641 depositions' negative depiction of the Irish rebel, and this chapter argued that those who spoke revealed themselves to be uncivil, dishonourable, dishonest and outside of social expectations. Speaking 'unfitting' words harmed both the speaker's and the victim's social reputation.

Chapter five: Violent speech in the 1641 depositions

In 1646, Martha Piggot arrived in Dublin after having survived the 1641 rebellion. She brought with her a story of violence and loss. Sitting before commissioners, she told of arsons, assaults, desecrations of sacred objects, robberies, stripping, and spoken words. Piggot began her story by recounting a siege upon her castle in Queen's County. According to her testimony, after taking the castle, the rebels stripped Piggot and her family in an upper room, where they in a 'most barbarously and inhumaine maner…butchered & murthered'[566] her husband and son. She then detailed the aftermath of these killings and reported how they disfigured her husband's body as 'lying dead & breathles vppon the grounde some of those cruell execucioners slitted & scarred his priuate partes in many peeces'.[567] The rebels then 'pitifully mangled' the rest of his body and sitting him 'in one of his owne chaires' they celebrated their actions 'triumphing ouer his dead Corps with spitefull & malitious words against himself and his family calling him puritan & round head'.[568]

The 1641 depositions contained many similar accounts of abuse and attacks, ranging from the stripping of victims to the most gruesome of murders and killings. To the historian, the use of verbal insults, at first, may appear subtle, limited, secondary, and perhaps of little significance alongside incredibly graphic descriptions of physical violence. Yet, victims, like Piggot, included these words in their reports. While her husband's body was mangled and disfigured, Piggot specifically remembered him being called a puritan and a roundhead. Similarly, John Naughtyn reported the extreme physical violence he encountered alongside the insults used against him. However, the rebels 'calling him English dog and many other opprobrious names' may not immediately draw

---

[566] Deposition of Martha Piggot, 31 Oct. 1646, TCD, Ms 815, f. 376v.
[567] Deposition of Martha Piggot, 31 Oct. 1646, TCD, Ms 815, f. 376v.
[568] Deposition of Martha Piggot, 31 Oct. 1646, TCD, Ms 815, f. 376v.

the same attention as the earlier sentence in which 'they bound his head & heeles together & his hands vpon his back then they prickt & stabbed him with their skeanes kicked spurned him pissed in his mowth threw dirt & myre in his face, & soe barbarously vsed him that it ~~is almost~~ *may seeme* incredible to relate'.[569]

The insult 'English dog' in comparison to the violent actions may appear secondary at first. Undoubtedly, the physical abuse dominated the focus and horror of the deponents, the commissioners, and contemporaries of the time. However, Naughtyn included the insult 'English dog' as part of his experience and reported how it contributed to an event which he considered too 'incredible to relate'.[570] The very fact that specific insults were delineated and specified within reports of extreme physical abuse signalled their importance and relation to the physical acts. Therefore, while the gruesome details of mutilation and murder can initially distract from the rebels' words, this chapter will focus on them. It will ask why deponents like Piggot and Naughtyn remembered and reported the specific words they and other victims of great physical violence faced. What role did words play in such a bloody account and amid the violence of the 1641 rebellion?

Overall, this chapter will argue that speech was a particular form of violence perpetrated in the 1641 depositions. It contributed to the violent environment and experience, and it also served to justify or motivate additional acts of violence. In order to illustrate these ideas, this chapter will consider the relevant historiography on early modern violence specific to Europe and more precisely to seventeenth-century Ireland. It will also define violence, and it will explore the complexities and varying forms of violence through the work and questions of anthropologists, sociologists, and philosophers. This chapter will address the many facets of violence and argue that words

---

[569] Deposition of John Naughtynn, 15 July 1645, TCD, Ms 817, f. 072r.
[570] Deposition of John Naughtynn, 15 July 1645, TCD, Ms 817, f. 072r.

were a part of it, dependent on the context and society in which they existed and were spoken. Here, the context of the 1641 depositions will also be considered, and the official commission will be revisited to consider if words were included in its instruction to record 'violence or other lewd Acctions'?[571]

Beyond this legal perspective, this chapter will also evaluate the prevalent eyewitness testimony in order to analyse how those present (both victims and witnesses) experienced verbal violence. Finally, this will conclude by exploring direct interactions between words and physical harm. It will note that speech could counter and defend against physical attacks, and words could also act as agents of violence, motivating and justifying the perpetrators' deeds.

Historiography and the definitions of violence

Violence in early modern Ireland was complex, and historians have only begun to expand their understanding of it. In the book *Age of atrocity,* a collection of essays on violence and conflict in Ireland, different forms of violence, including physical and symbolic acts, were analysed. This work effectively represented a variety of atrocities prevalent in early modern Ireland. It also showed a need for further research of this topic, asking what the role of violence was and what was considered violence in early modern Ireland. It also drew upon other disciplines, including archaeology and literature, which exemplified the importance of interdisciplinary work on such topics.[572] Similarly, historian Ethan Shagan emphasised the need for more in-depth analyses of violence in his chapter in *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions*. He presented numerous questions about Ireland's past violence, and his chapter aimed to provoke further studies of this. In particular, he wrote

---

[571] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.
[572] David Edwards, Pádraig Lenihan, and Clodagh Tait, *Age of atrocity: violence and political conflict in early modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2007).

that if historians today cannot make sense of past atrocities, then they must ask how and why it made sense to contemporaries.[573]

To prompt additional research, Shagan suggested a possible model for analysing violence. This model aims to study violence on its own terms. This method accepts violence as a 'rational or at least comprehensible consequence of the perpetrator's worldview' and therefore 'looks or its causes in the minds, experiences, and cultural assumptions of those who commit violent acts'.[574] This method developed from the work of historians and cultural anthropologists, such as E.P. Thompson and George Rudé, who studied the rationale of crowds and especially Natalie Davis, who focused on the rioters in a sixteenth-century French riot. Rudé claimed that crowds in the French Revolution had clear objectives and reason behind their actions. His work raised important questions for the 1641 depositions, and this chapter will argue that some perpetrators had clear ideas or explanations for why they committed acts of violence and some communicated this through their words.[575] In one way, the portrayal of the Irish as speakers of scandalous and unfitting language served the narrative of a rebellion instigated and carried out by a violent and dishonourable people as argued in chapter four. However, it also opened the possibility for deeper insights into the rebel mind. Such an analysis can respond to Shagan's call to 'understand violence on its own terms.[576]

This point, in particular, resonated with the 1641 depositions. Scholars have often understood the violence in its accounts as spontaneous and uncontrolled. However, recently historians, specifically John Walter, have challenged this understanding.

---

[573] Ethan Shagan, 'Early modern violence from memory to history: a historiographical essay' in Micheál Ó Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer, *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions* (Manchester, 2013), pp 18-9, 24-25.
[574] Shagan, 'Early modern violence', p. 25.
[575] George Rudé, *The crowd history: a study of popular disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848* (London, 2005), pp 3, 9, 13, 198-199, 237, 247-257, 266l; E.P. Thompson *The making of the English working class* (London, 1963); Natalie Davis, 'The rites of violence: religious riot in sixteenth-century France' in *Past & Present,* lix (May 1973),), pp 51-91.
[576] Shagan, 'Early modern violence', pp 25, 28.

Through reading the depositions, the idea that popular fury primarily drove the violence in the 1641 depositions and the rebellion 'does not seem to hold up'.[577] Walter argued this point primarily through the performative violence evident in the depositions. However, he also acknowledged the importance of political statements spoken by the Irish rebels, and he noted the need for further research in order to understand 'the social depth to the politics of the popular violence that took place in 1641'.[578] This chapter will contribute to this discussion by analysing how words often acted as a justification or motivation for physical violence. And it will demonstrate that the study of what people were saying can provide insight into how participants in and contemporaries of the 1641 rebellion made sense of its violence.

Questions raised by material in the 1641 depositions will remain relevant. Violence, both physical and verbal, could be greatly exaggerated and manipulated by both the commissioners and the deponents. The 1641 depositions may not always provide a straightforward record of the actual events of the 1641 rebellion; however, it still held small, but significant, indications of how Irish rebels justified their actions. Andy Wood argued a similar point concerning speech and the 1549 English rebellions. He claimed that even small pieces of rebel speech represented in reports and texts provided 'a key to the rebels' understanding their own actions. Within the 1641 depositions, it was clear that paying attention to the speech said during moments of violence can uncover reported aspects of the rebel voice, indicating their motivations and justifications for violence.[579]

It was important to first establish the relationship between language and violence and ask if words themselves were violent. To answer this question, the different definitions of violence need consideration. Randall Collins, David Riches and David

---

[577] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 146.
[578] Walter, 'Performative violence', pp 146-7.
[579] Wood, *1549 Rebellions,* p. 95, 97, 98.

Parkin, all of whom wrote on the nature of violence from a sociological or anthropological perspective, assessed the complexity of violence and the various forms it can take. Collins, a sociologist who wrote *Violence: a micro-sociological theory,* argued for the 'vast array of types of violence'.[580] Similarly, anthropologist David Parkin reflected on the many ways that violence can be defined. For example, he argued that the Anglo-Saxon usage of 'violence' connoted unlawful physical force, but it could also refer to harming one's reputation through metaphorical extension.[581] Violence was more than solely physical acts. Emotion or passions and symbolic violence played a role in this as well. The existence of passion in relation to physical and verbal harm was significant, and the link between emotion and violence needed to be also considered. However, such a topic will be explored specifically in the following chapter specifically. For this chapter, the most important note was that violence can be more than physical action against another person. In the same definition that indicated emotion as violence, intensity of language was also included as a form of violence.

Additional scholarship supported this. In fact, cultural anthropologist, Anton Blok, acknowledged insults as an act in itself and stated that 'offending is a speech act *par excellence*'.[582] He further argued that speaking an offence is not only an act of saying something but is instead a 'per formative act' that quite literally hurts.[583] Riches argued that conceptions and understandings of violence could extend beyond the physical to the symbolic or the verbal. He also added that its definition was always dependent on each society and culture, and that what one group in a particular period deemed as violent may not be the same as another. Riches's point was critical; scholars cannot assume that all

---

[580] Randall Collins, *Violence: A micro-sociological theory* (Princeton, 2008), p. 1.
[581] David Parkin, 'Violence and will' in Riches (ed.), *The anthropology of violence* (Oxford, 1986)*,* pp 205-6.
[582] Anton Blok, *Honour and violence* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 159.
[583] Blok, *Honour and violence,* p. 159.

words in all contexts and times were or are automatically violent. Historians cannot apply a general all-encompassing definition across history, across societies, and across different times, peoples, and event.[584]

It was clear that violence was more than physical harm against a person. For instance, in the 1641 depositions, several individual depositions contained references to harm or assault upon a holy book or a symbolic place. This form of symbolic violence existed in the eyewitness deposition of Thomas Ricroft from Wexford in 1642. Ricroft testified that Irish rebels 'burnt all the bibles they cold meete with saying w̶ ̶h̶a̶t̶ in disgrace & contempt of religion, what will yow doe now yor bibles are burnt'.[585] Although no one was harmed physically, the destruction of the bibles was an act of violence that had great significance. Moreover, witnesses may have considered this action to be even more violent than any bodily harm done, just as David Parkin argued that some societies consider symbolic acts the most violent actions. The Irish destruction of Protestant bibles was a clear attack on their religion and the authority of the Church and the king of England, and the English victims and the commissioners likely viewed it as a violent act in itself.[586]

In that same event, Ricroft reported how the Irish told the English 'that they wold not suffer english man woman or Child nor beast or dog of English breed, or *any thing that was English to remayne aliue* & before the faces of severall protestants'.[587] And later, Ricroft testified that 'all the weomen *wer* most mischeivous violent & cruell in expression *of* all hatred & practising all cruelty as robbing *&* stripping naked *man & weomen* of the distressed english'.[588] Here, he directly referred to the expression of hatred

---

[584] David Riches, 'The phenomenon of violence' in Riches, David (ed.), *The anthropology of violence* (Oxford, 1986), p. 1.
[585] Deposition of Thomas Ricroft, 10 June 1642, TCD, Ms 818, f. 124r.
[586] Parkin, 'Violence and will', pp 205-6.
[587] Deposition of Thomas Ricroft, 10 June 1642, TCD, Ms 818, f. 124r.
[588] Deposition of Thomas Ricroft, 10 June 1642, TCD, Ms 818, f. 124r.

as violent and cruel. Symbolic violence upon the Bible, threats, and violent and cruel

expressions created an experience of disgrace and attack absent of physical bodily harm,

but nonetheless violent in Ricroft's understanding. In this depositions, the rebels'

expressions contributed to the deponent's full experience of violence. Furthermore, the

act of attacking the Bible could serve as an insult to the victim by targeting their beliefs

and demeaning their faith. There were many depositions that reported various forms of

violence in the 1641 depositions.

In order to place the 1641 depositions into a broader context, violence and speech

in the early modern period and seventeenth-century Ireland needed consideration. In the

broader early modern period, verbal violence clearly existed and had an impact.

Historians and literary scholars have explored the relationship between violence and

words. Helen Solterer and Kirilka Stavreva both wrote of verbal violence in different

contexts. Solterer investigated 'flaming words' in Paris, while Stavreva analysed the

'word like daggers' in early modern England from a literary perspective.[589] Furthermore,

Martin Ingram argued that honour and reputation cannot always explain the motivation

behind words and speech. He acknowledged the importance of honour, but he argued that

words did not always attack social status or reputation. Instead, he argued that frequently

words were straightforward abuse. They acted as substitutes or complements of physical

violence, and this may have been the primary or only motivating force in many cases.[590]

Ingram further noted that despite its violent component, historians often overlook

language. Early modern sources did not always record the specific words spoken, and this

---

[589] Helen Solterer, 'Flaming words: verbal violence and gender in premodern Paris' in *Romanic Review,* lxxxvi (Mar. 1995), pp 355-78; Kirilka Stavreva, *Words like daggers: Violent female speech in early modern England* (Nebraska, 2015).
[590] Ingram, 'Law, litigants', p. 139.

may be a central factor for why historians have underestimated the relationship between verbal violence and physical violence.[591]

More specifically, several historians have acknowledged the existence of verbal violence in early modern Ireland. *Age of atrocity* hinted at this particular aspect of speech by briefly mentioning Dianne Hal's claim that verbal abuse could be as devastating as physical attacks in late medieval Ireland.[592] She argued that speech was a violent act, and words could stand-alone as a powerful attack upon a person and impact them equally, if not more than physical violence. Hall further stated that insult and verbal abuse provided insights into how medieval societies interpreted violence. In order to fully understand the conceptualisation and manifestation of violence in both medieval and early modern Ireland, speech was a crucial component.[593]

In his chapter in *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions*, Mark Greengrass specifically noted the absence of verbal violence in the current historiography around the 1641 depositions. He argued that 'the depositions for the Irish troubles of 1641 provide testimonies for the significance of verbal violence as an integral component within the rebellion, a verbal violence with its own logic and dynamics'.[594] Greengrass did not provide a specific analysis of the verbal violence in 1640s Ireland; however, his work on testimonies from a 1561 French religious riot highlighted the need for similar work on language in the 1641 depositions. Beyond Greengrass's promptings, sociologist Randall Collins also argued the need to consider sources similar to the 1641 depositions in studies of violence. He argued victim surveys and reports are often an excellent starting point for obtaining direct observation of the violent act. By asking how victims experienced and perceived violence, historians can begin to uncover the full scope of atrocities. And

---

591 Ingram, 'Law, litigants', pp 141-2.
592 Edwards, *Age of atrocity*, p. 33.
593 Hall, 'Words as weapons', pp 123-4.
594 Greengrass, 'Language and conflict', p. 201.

therefore, the 1641 depositions were crucial to the exploration of these questions concerning the 1641 rebellion.

It is essential to place the violence of the 1641 depositions into a broader perspective. Extreme accounts of atrocities can overemphasis the violence and overlook the more common reports of robberies and lost property evident throughout thousands of accounts. Historians must avoid overanalysing violence and thus exaggerating its role in the broader context of the rebellion and the depositions. Many accounts focused on the loss of property and did not include detailed reports of extreme violence.[595] It is also important to remember that the 1641 depositions primarily emphasised the atrocities of the Irish rebels. Therefore, many reports did not include the full scope of physical, symbolic and verbal violence perpetrated throughout Ireland's 1640s and 1650s.

Furthermore, Erin Peters argued that witnesses of violent events were not typically good observers of the precise details and facts of their experience, and this argument was particularly relevant to the 1641 depositions as argued in chapter one.[596] As well, these accounts were given by various deponents across society and throughout the years. There were many possible influences on how and what a deponent reported be it exaggeration or omission of certain facts. For example, John Walter argued that masculinity and gender roles may have influenced how some men reported the violence of which they became victims. The expectation and value of men's ability to defend their families and themselves may have encouraged some deponents to overemphasise the violence they faced. They may have provided extreme details of supposedly overwhelming violence to excuse or explain their failure to protect and perform their role as defender of others.[597]

---

[595] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 138
[596] Peters, 'Trauma narratives', p. 80.
[597] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 136

Each of these nuances cannot be overlooked, however, despite these complexities, the study of violence in the 1641 depositions remained important. These reports communicated how victims and witnesses understood and remembered violence. And the inclusion of words and speeches in that study can further expand historians' understanding of how individuals and society experienced this violence.

Ireland's violent terminology

Beyond the broad historiography and various definitions of violence, Irish sources clearly connected violence and language. Early Irish society acknowledged the damage words could inflict upon honour but also believed that 'words had force' and could physically injure, deform, and maim. In late medieval Ireland, Brehon Law still punished satire and the 'wounding power of words'[598] and could even consider 'tongues…worse than swords'.[599] In these early laws, it was clear that words were viewed as violent and powerful and capable of wounding and injuring a person. In Ireland's seventeenth century, a wide range of sources connected words and violent terminology throughout the period. It was not uncommon for them to refer to language as violent, bloody, or injurious. At the start of the century in 1600, Florence McCarthy wrote of a 'bastardly rascal' who came and 'abused' him with villainous words, calling [him] always a treacherous, deceitful Englishman',[600] and in 1601, Sir Ralph Lane wrote to Robert Cecil of 'paper bullets of reproachful slanders at random shot at me by my injurious competitors'.[601]

Similarly, in a letter from the Earl of Cork reported to Lord Conway in 1626 wrote that a Mr Street 'used violent language'.[602] The state papers referred to as 'spiteful

---

[598] Kelly, *Guide to early Irish law,* p. 137
[599] Hall, 'Words as weapons', pp 123-4, 129.
[600] Florence McCarthy to Sir Robert Cecil, 6 May 1600 (SP 63/207/3 f.52).
[601] Sir Ralph Lane to Sir Robert Cecil, 30 May 1601 (SP 63/208/2 f.0276).
[602] The Earl of Cork to Lord Conway, 15 May 1626 (SP63 242 f. 272).

and injurious', abusive and villainous, and sharper than swords.[603] Each of these sources existed at different points of the century, and therefore, their content cannot translate directly to the 1641 depositions where the existence of verbal violence was heavily impacted and shaped by a context of unrest, war and rebellion. However, there was an indication throughout a broader range of sources in the seventeenth century that the violent nature of words may hold relevance beyond a time of outright unrest and rebellion.

In the 1641 depositions, deponents and commissioners used similar terminology to reference words and language. For example, eyewitnesses such as John Robinson of King's County reported in June of 1643 how the Irish inflicted 'all vyolence and cruelty and bitternes in speeches and actions towards the Englishe', and used language such as 'traitors', 'rebels', and 'puritans'.[604] Here, the deponent and the commissioners did not separate speech and action when reporting violence. A year later in 1644, another eyewitness James Dowdall from King's County recounted how Irish rebels robbed his three cows, his sword and pistols, and took him as their prisoner during which time he faced their 'spitefull bloudy languages'.[605] In 1642, Daniel Curren recalled how Irish rebels called his brother Cornelius and him 'clownes and dogges' and used 'fowle words' against them,[606] while in 1644, James Bowler of Cork, deposed of 'hot words',[607] and in 1652, the examination of Winyfried Field of Meath referred to words as 'evill language'.[608] Another deponent, Elizabeth Price from Armagh, spoke of 'bitter words'.[609]

---

[603] Memorandum of gentlemen of good rank, 1602 (SP 63/212 f.229); Florence McCarthy to Sir Robert Cecil, 6 May 1600 (SP 63/207/3 f.52); Sir Winston Churchill to Secretary Arlington, 27 Dec 1665, (SP 63/319 f.491); [Copy of the Mayor of Limerick] to Prince Rupert, undated 1650 (SP 63/282 f.46).
[604] Deposition of John Robinson, 27 June 1643, TCD, Ms 814, f. 190r.
[605] Deposition of James Dowdall, 9 Mar. 1644, TCD, Ms 814, f. 228r.
[606] Examination of Daniell Curren, 29 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 820, f. 021r.
[607] Examination of James Bowler, 15 Feb. 1654, TCD, Ms 827, f. 001r.
[608] Examination of Winyfrid Field, 18 Oct. 1652, TCD, Ms 816, f. 241v.
[609] Deposition of Elizabeth Price, 26 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 102v.

Furthermore, an insult's connection to abuse can also reveal its violent association. This relationship reflected Ingram's argument that sometimes words were used for the sole purpose of abusing another or acting as a replacement or substitute for physical violence.[610] Individuals often described insults against them as a form of abuse in the 1641 depositions. For example, in Kilkenny in 1643, Ann Mawdesley referenced the mistreatment and oppression of the English who the Irish rebels 'would commonly call them English dogs'.[611] William Higges of Queen's County reported in 1642 how the 'said Sir John [who] was pleased to call this deponent Rogue & Rascall and Traytor and to abuse him with manye opprobrious speeches'.[612] In Cork 1642, Elizabeth Shore and Ellen Burden reported that one James Goggin did 'abuse the said Elizabeth with vile language',[613] and in Kilkenny in 1642, Thomas Durant deposed of the Irish 'abuseing them, bidding them away Roagues, out Roagues begone'.[614] These examples suggested that a relationship between words and violence existed. However, the violence of speech became increasingly evident through additional examples in the 1641 depositions.

Among some of the most graphic descriptions of violence, victims like Piggot and Naughtynn reported words as a part of their violent experience.[615] Other deponents also reported the use of language against themselves and others. In a short one-paragraph manuscript from Dublin 1643, Simon Swayen detailed violence perpetrated by Irish rebels as they attacked and burned the castle of Loughlinstown. This Irish killed five of his companions, and Swayen barely escaped with his life. He reported how the fire 'burned one of his eyes out of his head, *and alsoe* being fearfully burned his hands

---

[610] Ingram, 'Law, litigants', p. 139.
[611] Deposition of Ann Mawdesley, 28 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 812, ff. 221r-221v.
[612] Deposition of William Higges, 7 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, f. 035v.
[613] Deposition of Elizabeth Shore and Ellen Burden, 5 May 1642, TCD, Ms 823, f. 182r.
[614] Deposition of Thomas Durant 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 230r.
[615] Deposition of Martha Piggot, 31 Oct. 1646, TCD, Ms 815, f. 376v; Deposition of John Naughtynn, 15 July 1645, TCD, Ms 817, f. 072r.

hanches and leggs in soe much as he was almost burned to death'.[616] Alongside the experience of these violent physical acts, Swayen also recounted how he and others were 'opprobriously reviled' and 'called parliament Rogues'.[617] Swayne also reported how rebels threatened him and called for 'his hearts bloud'. [618]

Swayne's deposition was short and succinct, only a paragraph in length. It entirely focused on acts committed by a hundred rebels during the siege, and yet in this violence, Swayen and the commissioners included insults and threats as a component of the atrocities experienced and witnessed. Similarly, in Cavan in 1642, Adam Glover reported threats used against English victims, who were attacked by Irish rebels at a church. The Irish rebels dragged the victims by their hair into a church where they were stripped, robbed, and whipped them. Amid these violent acts, the English victims were threatened and told not to return to the church tomorrow if they wanted to avoid similar treatment. The Irish rebels further abused them with 'other scornfull and opprobrious words'.[619] Once again, among extreme physical violence, insults were included as a part of this experience alongside murder, mutilation, threats, stripping, and robbery. Such graphic reports of physical harm, atrocities, killing, and mutilation did not negate the existence, memory of, or reaction to verbal harm and abuse. Words remained a concern and vital element within horrific and physically violent events.

Official concern for verbal violence in the 1641 depositions

Beyond individual deponents' referral to words, the official commission of the 1641 depositions may have included words under the category of violence, providing specific legal recognition of the violent nature of speech. As discussed in chapter two, the official first commission charged commissioners with investigating robberies, treason, and

---

[616] Deposition of Simon Swayen 9 Feb. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 183r.
[617] Deposition of Simon Swayen 9 Feb. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 183r.
[618] Deposition of Simon Swayen 9 Feb. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 183r.
[619] Deposition of Adam Glouer, 1 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 833, ff. 001r-001v.

violence in the 1641 rebellion. The first commission explicitly instructed the investigation of 'traiterous and disloyal words'.[620] This specific mention at first suggested the exclusion of words from the categories of robberies and violence. Yet as noted in chapter two, the second and third commission soon added the broader category of 'unfitting words'.[621]

This addition expanded the investigation of language beyond treason. Perhaps, it also clarified that commissioners should document violent words. Evidence of this was found within the depositions. Witnesses deposed of disloyal speech, but deponents and commissioners also included words that were not seditious or traitorous but rather personal and insulting as explored in the previous chapters. This instruction opened a space for words outside of the realm of treason to be documented. However, it was also possible that the commission intended for words to be included in another category. It instructed the investigation of robberies, treasonous words and actions, and 'violence and lewd actions'.[622] The final category did not necessarily refer only to lewd *physical* actions. One might argue that because the commission explicitly included words and speeches in treason, it would have also included this detail in the other categories if words were to be a part of them. However, as discussed in chapter two, the treasonous nature of words was debated and questionable. Therefore, it was necessary to instruct that the commission looked for both treasonous actions and speeches.

This confusion did not exist with the instruction 'violence and lewd actions'. Instead, words and speeches were very likely a part of this category. In the seventeenth century, 'lewd' was a word also used when referencing language. For example, in 1600, the earl of Ormond wrote to the privy council of a man's 'lewd and intemperate words'

---

[620] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r.
[621] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r; Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, ff. 003r.
[622] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r; Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.

towards him.[623] In 1618, the privy council defended a member against calumnies in Ireland and wrote to the Irish council to condemn such a 'lewd and slanderous report',[624] and libellers and spreaders of tales could be referred to as 'lewd and malicious persons'.[625]

The inclusion of language and words among other lewd actions also appeared in contemporary publications about the 1641 rebellion. In Thomas Morley's 1644 publication on the 1641 rebellion, *A remonstrance of the barbarous cruelties and bloody murders committed by the Irish rebels…collected out of the records at Dublin,* the last pages detailed 'the impious, wicked, and leud actions of the papists, against the Protestants, and their religion'.[626] Under this heading, Morley recorded the destruction of Bibles and churches, the cutting of throats, and words, threats, taunts, and name-calling used by the Irish rebels.[627] Therefore in the context of commission, spoken language could fall under both categories of treason and violence.

Words and speeches in the Portadown and Belturbet accounts

While the official concern for violent words was significant, historians must consider the specific experience of the victim in order to fully understand how they experienced and perceived violence. Therefore, eyewitness testimony was essential, and interestingly, the majority of deponents gave their eyewitness testimony when they reported of speech in the 1641 deposition. However, there were also many based on hearsay. This section will assess the possible distinction between words reported based on eyewitness testimony and those based on hearsay by comparing accounts from two similar events: the Portadown and Belturbet drownings.

---

[623] The earl of Ormonde to the privy council, 1600 (SP 63/207/2 f.14).
[624] Crawford, *A star chamber,* p. 70; BL, Add. MS 47, 172, f. 270.
[625] Clayton, *Council book,* p. 255.
[626] Thomas Morley, *A remonstrance of the barbarous cruelties and bloody murders committed by the Irish rebels…collected out of the records at Dublin* (Dublin, 1644), pp 12-3.
[627] Morley, *A remonstrance,* pp 12-3.

Numerous deponents reported of the Portadown massacre, which took place in the early months of the 1641 rebellion. Accounts documented how Irish rebels killed a large number of English Protestants in a mass drowning in the River Bann. According to Naomi McAreavey's article 'Portadown 1641: memory and the 1641 depositions', forty-four items within the 1641 depositions documented the mass drowning at Portadown bridge. The majority of these accounts came from Armagh while Monaghan, Down, Tyrone, and Antrim each contained between one to five Portadown depositions. This event lived on and continues to hold deep significance to the memory of the 1641 rebellion.[628]

These depositions recorded many atrocities. Individuals testified of their imprisonment in and eventual release from Loughgall church. They also documented their journey towards Portadown during which time the murder of a parson occurred. Finally, the accounts described the mass drowning at the bridge at Portadown and the escape and survival of several victims. Among these reports, individuals testified to witnessing strange events, even including supernatural happenings after the mass drowning occurred.[629]

Similarly, several depositions referred to another mass drowning that took place on the Belturbet bridge in the early 1640s in the county of Cavan. Around thirty Belturbet residents reported stories of the alleged drowning. Many accounts described how Irish rebels drove residents to the bridge and threw them over it into the river where they drowned.[630] Similar to the Portadown reports, deponents also reported supernatural occurrences and sightings at the Belturbet bridge after the massacre. For example, Henry Baxter told commissioners that

---

[628] McAreavey, 'Portadown 1641, pp 15,17.
[629] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 10v.
[630] Annaleigh Margey, '1641 and the Ulster Plantation', in Annaleigh Margey, and Elaine Murphy, *The 1641 depositions and the Irish rebellion* (London, 2012), p 91.

> A yere after the English were drowned there sometimes the dead corp ses or apparitions therof long after theyr drowneing appeared on the water and that besides those visions strang sowndes & often a strong noise was heard there as it were of the waters suddaine riseing & clapping together and much scriching & howleing in the night and strange lights seene in the castle & divers voics heard as it were singing of Psalmes[631]

Both events remained in the minds and experiences of deponents, who recalled harrowing violent events that held significance well beyond the massacres. Beyond memory, records of these two events also provided insights into the verbal violence in the 1641 depositions.

While both the Portadown and Belturbet reports described a mass drowning, there was a significant distinction between these two sets of depositions. The Portadown depositions were overwhelmingly based on eyewitness testimony, as shown by McAreavey. [632] Unlike the reports of Portadown, the majority of Belturbet depositions contained information based on hearsay, and various inconsistencies and contradictions existed within these depositions. These complexities created even more uncertainties about the event itself. Even the date of the Belturbet drowning was unclear, as multiple deponents provided varying timelines. Furthermore, only a handful of deponents provided their eyewitness testimony of this event, which included William Gibbs, Elizabeth Pole, Richard Bennet, and John Whitson.[633]

Several other deponents directly witnessed the aftermath of the massacre but not the actual killings. For example, one deponent testified that he had pulled the bodies from the river in order to properly bury them, while two others alluded to similarly being forced as English prisoners to recover and bury the drowned bodies.[634] Overall, the

---

[631] Deposition of Henry Baxter, 12 June 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 217v

[632] McAreavey, 'Portadown 1641, p. 17.

[633] Deposition of William Gibbs, 31 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 833, ff. 249r-250v; Deposition of Elizabeth Pole, 26 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 833, ff. 256r-v; Deposition of Richard Bennett, 4 Aug. 1644, TCD, Ms 833, ff. 220r-v; Deposition of John Whitson, 22 February 1642, TCD, Ms 833, ff. 207r-v.

[634] Deposition of Richard Bennett, 4 Aug. 1644, TCD, Ms 833, ff. 220r-220v; Deposition of Thomas Smith and Joane Killin, 2 Feb. 1644, TCD, Ms 833, f. 266r.

Portadown and Belturbet depositions documented similar violent mass drownings. However, these two events were reported very differently. One was largely based on eyewitness testimony and the other on hearsay. This distinction provided an opportunity to consider if and how depositions based on eyewitness testimony reported words said in similar events differently from accounts based on hearsay.

In the Portadown reports, it was clear that verbal violence played an essential role in the atrocities perpetrated. In the summer of 1642, eight deponents provided their eyewitness testimony of the events at Portadown, and they testified of both disloyal and insulting speech. For example, in June of 1642, Joan Constable reported words of threats and mockery in her account of the drowning of numerous English victims and the 'braggs' of the 'devilish rebels'. [635] She also spoke of defiant, albeit flavourful, speech against the king said by a rebel who stated that he cared 'not a fart for the King nor his laws'.[636] In that same month and year, Bridget Drewrie reported how she witnessed rebels publicly speak words against the English victims and label them as dogs.[637] In another case, the deponent Elizabeth Price recalled the words spoken by the rebels as they killed the English victims.[638] Francis Sacheverell testified how the Irish called English children 'hereticques',[639] while in August 1642, Robert Maxwell deposed of rebels' distempered speechs' and how they named their victims 'English base degenerate cowards'.[640] Margret Bromley reported how Irish rebels called their Protestant victims 'worse than dogs'.[641] Later in September, Eleanor Fullerton recalled the murder of her husband a minister at the bridge of Portadown, and she also testified that the rebels attacked her with

---

[635] Deposition of Joane Constable, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, ff. 87v, 89v.
[636] Deposition of Joane Constable, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 89v.
[637] Deposition of Briggett Drewrie, 30 June 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 046v.
[638] Deposition of Elizabeth Price, 26 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 102v.
[639] Deposition of Frauncis Sacheverell, 21 July 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 109r.
[640] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 05r.
[641] Deposition of Margret Bromley, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, ff. 040r-041v.

words as they 'publiquely gave out and affirmed' the killing of Protestants in a bog and called her 'fowle & disgracefull names'.[642] Within these examples, each deponent directly heard and witnessed these words and speeches.

It was essential to realise the diversity of words reported by eyewitnesses in contrast to those based on hearsay among the Belturbet accounts. In the Belturbet depositions, reports of words spoken during the massacre rarely appeared, but when they did, they were reported by a direct eyewitness. Elizabeth Pole was a direct witness to the drowning of at least forty English and Scottish Protestants at the Beltrubet bridge and the hanging of two Protestants in the town. In the midst of this experience, Pole remembered and reported words spoken against her as she was 'halled, pulld, & tost vpp and downe amongst the Rebells' and threatened with hanging and drowning. These violent threats contributed to her own violent experience. As well, Pole reported of the anger and violence of an Irish woman who spoke threats against the English. The Irishwoman prayed 'to god that this skeane which I have in my hands: were in the harts of all the Noblemen of England'.[643]

Pole's memory of these words indicated that amid all the drownings and hangings, these threats remained an essential part of her violent experience. Interestingly, Pole also reported how she was credibly informed of rebel soldiers speaking maliciously against the king as they entered a church and pulled down the king's arms 'saying they would doe as much or the like to his Maiestie of England'.[644] This detail was distinctly different from her own violent experience, and it was significant that this report of treasonous words was not based on eyewitness testimony.

---

[642] Deposition of Ellenor Fullerton, 16 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, fols 050v.
[643] Deposition of Elizabeth Pole, 26 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 833, ff. 256r-256v.
[644] Deposition of Elizabeth Pole, 26 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 256r.

In both the Portadown and Belturbet depositions, eyewitnesses remembered and reported personal, insulting words spoken against them and others. This point suggested that victims of violence often recognised verbal abuse as an important, memorable part of their violent experience. Alternatively, few deponents reported insults they did not hear themselves. In 1641, Richard Parsons reported an insult against the English. Parson reported that he was informed by others of a conflict between the northern Irish and Irish Catholics in Cavan. During this encounter, the northern Irish justified their mistreatment towards Cavan's Catholics, saying that it was better that they should rob them then 'anie stincking English Churle with great Breeches'.[645] This information was based on hearsay, yet, it still contained a record of this derogatory label. Perhaps this was because Parsons still considered this insult as one directed against himself. Although the northern Irish did not speak these words about him directly, their words inadvertently insulted him and his fellow English Protestants as a group by insinuating that they would behave in this criminal and dishonest way. In some ways, these words were still a violent and personal affront against him.

Other hearsay reports in the 1641 depositions documented insults and name-calling but less frequently than eyewitness reports. Memory of language seemed to remain more often in the minds of those who had been spoken to, personally insulted, or direct witnesses of verbal violence. Perhaps those who did not personally experience the insults or threats did not remember them as often as an eyewitness, who directly experienced this violence. When they were removed from the personal affront of the words, they may have prioritised and felt the impact of the physical harm more than words.

---

[645] Deposition of Richard Parsons, 24 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 833, f. 279v.

This idea was reflected by Belturbet residents whose reports were largely based on hearsay and who often only reported details of the physical violence and the drowning. However, it is important to recognise that the focus of commissioners who documented this event also would have played a role. It is unclear what questions commissioners asked Belturbet witnesses or the Portadown deponents. The commissioners' questions also may explain why treasonous words often appeared in accounts based on eyewitness testimony and hearsay. As chapter two explored, commissioners directly asked witnesses what 'traiterous or disloyal' speech was said and therefore may have encouraged deponents to report this specific form of language over personal insults or verbal violence. On a broad level, this comparison between these two sets of reports could not provide specific answers to the question of the reliability of eyewitness or hearsay testimony. But for this chapter, it demonstrated that those who personally felt and experienced the impact of insults or threats reported them even when witnessing or experiencing other extreme forms of physical violence.

Agents of violence: Justifying and motivating physical acts

While the victim's perspective was essential in order to define violence, historians must also explore the perpetrator's perspective and their reasons for violence. According to sociologist Randall Collins, violence cannot occur without reason or some form of legitimacy in the minds of perpetrators.[646] Collins challenged any perception that violence is a natural and easy human act, and he stated that in order for it to occur, perpetrators need both a way and a reason. While historians cannot directly apply this idea to the motivations of the Irish rebels in 1640s Ireland, it raised important questions about

---

[646] Collins, *Violence*, pp 22, 26-7.

motivation and prompted further questions about what motivated individuals to participate in the violence recorded in the 1641 depositions.[647]

Often the violence in the 1641 depositions was depicted as irrational or driven by 'popular fury',[648] however, as noted earlier, historians are beginning to challenge this idea. Furthermore, the anthropologist David Riches argued that the perception of violence changes dependent on the person experiencing or reporting it. What a victim or witness considers violent may differ from the perpetrator's perceptions. The victim argues for an act's illegitimacy, while the performer justifies it. As well, each will view their own behaviour as heroic while viewing the others as barbaric.[649] Therefore, the Irish rebels' speech may reveal how they legitimised their actions. As well, Wood suggested in his work on the English 1549 rebellion that the inclusion of rebels' speeches in reports made the rebels seem less 'crazy', which is also an important aspect to consider in the depositions.[650]

John Walter discussed the prevalence of justification in the 1641 depositions. He noted that just as in early modern protests in England, the Irish in the rebellion looked to establish legitimacy. They did so by claiming the support of the king by a royal commission.[651] Nicholas Canny outlined various motivations for the 1641 rebellion, specifically in the closing months of 1641 in Ulster. He identified how longstanding grievances generally motivated the acts of humiliation, expulsion, killing, and robbery. He also noted the role of the Catholic clergy, whose counter-reformation preaching encouraged animosity towards Protestants.[652] As well, language played an important role in the justifying the rebellion. The words and speeches in the depositions also illuminated

---

[647] Collins, *Violence*, p. 22.
[648] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 146.
[649] Riches, 'The phenomenon of violence', pp 1, 5.
[650] Wood, *1549 Rebellions,* pp 95, 97, 98; Shagan, Early modern violence, p. 24.
[651] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 137; Darcy, *The Irish rebellion*, p. 59.
[652] Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford, 2003), p. 518.

various individual motives at different points in the rebellion. In fact, Irish rebels claimed that words, false claims, and libels had even affected the king and impacted his decision to turn against Protestants and support the Irish and the rebellion. This was clear from an Irish rebel's words as reported in the deposition of Henry Palmer.

In 1642 in Wexford, Palmer recalled how 'one Welsh of Kilcullen bridge' in Kildare 'justified his and others' actions by claiming the king's support for their cause and said that 'the King was as much against the protestants as he himself & the rebells were: ffor that the puritans in the Parliament of England threw lybells in disparagement of the Kings Maiesty: making a question whether a King or noe King'.[653] Here, Welsh believed that the libels and treasonous words prompted the king to support the Irish and the 1641 rebellion. In many ways, it was irrelevant if libels and disparagements were indeed the central motivation for the alleged actions of the king. The Irish rebel's claim that words against the king caused him to support their actions indicated that they considered language and speech valid reasons for even a king to encourage and support violence. Furthermore, they also inadvertently helped Welsh justified words 'he spoke disgracefully'[654] about all Protestants by claiming that their religion was the same as the puritans in parliament who spoke and acted against the king.

In the 1641 depositions, language could justify violence in two clear ways. First, words said by an individual could be the precise reason why another inflicted harm and abuse upon them. Second, insults said by individuals towards their victims provided a way for the perpetrators to justify their actions. Words, themselves, were given as sufficient reason and justifications for inflicting physical harm upon another. They could even be reason enough to kill the said insulter or speaker of ill words.

---

[653] Deposition of Henry Palmer, 12 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 818, ff. 088r-088v.
[654] Deposition of Henry Palmer, 12 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 818, ff. 088r-088v.

For example, in June 1653, Nicholas Combe reported 'that he hath often heard one Turlogh groome O Quin of Monynegore in the County of Tyrone' confess that he 'tooke the Castle of Crewe'. During this siege, 'there was one Williams and Margery his wife with old Sargeant Roe killd, not in the towne or Garrison but led forth by them and then massacred'.[655] Combe recounted how O Quin explained the validity of such killings, by 'justifying the fact, and alledging it was well done because they gave ill language of Sir Phelim O Neyle'.[656] Here, while Combe was not an eyewitness to the 'ill language' referenced by O Quin, he nonetheless gave eyewitness testimony of a crucial element: the excusing or justifying of violence because of words that the victim said. Therefore, this example clearly demonstrated that physical response, even as far as the killing of a person, could be an appropriate response against those who said or were accused of speaking offensive language. Perhaps the victims did or did not speak ill of O'Neill as claimed in Combe's account. Whether such was the case cannot be traced within this account or additional depositions. However, the importance of Combe's account for this study was the centrality of language as a motivator and appropriate rationale for the killing of three people.

Beyond being the direct reason for actions, insults or name-calling justified actions through the labelling of victims with names such as 'traitor', churl, 'heretic', and 'dog'. Various forms of insults and speeches revealed a variety of motivations for violence. For example, to name someone a 'traitor' had a particular meaning different from labelling a person a 'churl' or a 'heretic'. Specific terms that could lead to severe punishment or investigation provided a seeming rationale or a justified incentive to harm the person physically. As explored in chapter two, to be named a 'traitor' carried with it a

---

[655] Examination of Nicholas Combe, 4 June 1653, TCD, Ms 839, f. 062r.
[656] Examination of Nicholas Combe, 4 June 1653, TCD, Ms 839, f. 062r.

particular weight, and such an accusation could result in imprisonment. This label, and similarly the word 'rebel', positioned the named in opposition to the established political order and was a statement against their loyalty to the king. It also helped the perpetrators claim that their actions supported the king and therefore, justify their violent behaviour against the so-called 'traitor' or 'rebel'.

For instance, in two Longford depositions naming and labelling a group as traitors justified the taking away of an Englishman's goods. In 1642, Samuel Price deposed that he heard the sheriff claim that he held a warrant from the king, which named the English as 'traitors', thus justifying the taking of English goods.[657] Similarly, in the deposition of John Steele in 1642, another Irish man claimed to have a commission from the king to seize all English goods and property. Alongside this commission, Irish rebels also justified their robbery by labelling their victims as the very 'traitors' of the king.[658]

In Walter Cusack's 1653 Dublin examination, the direct connection between a label and physical violence existed. Cusack reported a conversation he heard between Irish servants and their master. The servants recounted how they had murdered an English soldier and had taken his coat as a token to sell to a gentleman named Garrett Weisley, their master. In response to their actions, 'the said Garrett Weisley said they were Roagues & deserved hanging for the fact'.[659] This line was very telling. Weisley equated being a 'rogue' to deserving death. This example also reflected John Walter's argument that name-calling could be a prelude to physical violence and that derogatory language could prove to be threatening, dangerous, and ominous.[660] It also signalled that other reports of 'rogue' in the depositions potentially played a role in justifying physical violence perpetrated against that 'rogue'.

---

[657] Deposition of Samuell Price, 25 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 156r-158v.
[658] Deposition of John Steele, 19 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 161r-161v.
[659] Examination of Walter Cusack, 2 Nov. 1653, TCD, Ms 816, f. 310r.
[660] Walter, 'Performative violence', pp 137-8.

In 1653, Margaret Yong reported the death of her husband, James Yong. She testified that an Irish rebel named James McVagh killed him and that he 'did with his owne hands (after the said James Yonge was fallen to the ground with severall strokes) cutt off his head from his boddy haveing first kickt him, saying, this Rogue is not yet dead'.[661] Yong stated that Irish rebels labelled her husband a 'rogue', a term that challenged an individual's honour and reputation as an honest man as considered in chapter four. However, in Yong's deposition, this insult takes on a violent nature alongside the physical harm done upon the so-called 'rogue'. Here, a term like 'rogue' which threatened a person's social reputation, simultaneously acted as a helpful justification for the perpetrator to inflict physical pain.

Other words that challenge the victims' social position appeared alongside extreme reports of physical violence. In fact, Clodagh Tait demonstrated this. She recognised how the act of 'social lowering' and the undermining of one's enemies occurred through various methods, including name-calling, and this often led to the perpetuation of physical acts. She cited a case from 1617 in which William and Nicholas Walshe of Wicklow attacked John Wolverston physically and verbally, referring to his inferiority of 'bloud and byrth'.[662] Here, the insult 'churl' played a part in the attack. It was 'used as a term of disparagement and contempt', and an indication of a 'man with noe rank'[663] that referred to one's low standing in society and associated the person with a behaviour lacking grace and dignity.

This 'social lowering' word appeared in several depositions, most frequently accompanying violence in the form of killings, attempted murders, threats of hanging, calls for the death of churls, the cutting of throats, the running through with swords, and

[661] Deposition of Margarett Yong, 13 Apr. 1653, TCD, Ms 839, f. 070r.
[662] Tait, 'Society, 1550-1730', p. 296.
[663] Oxford English dictionary, http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/223638?rskey=Dd1U5z&result=1, accessed Apr. 9, 2019.

the threatening with pikes. For example, the term 'churl' appeared alongside harrowing and violent actions in the Cork examination of Richard Phepps in 1653. Phepps told how he was present at the High Court of Justice at Cork when an officer named John Nagle testified against Irish rebels who abused an Englishman's dead body. Nagle reported that the man's

> Exexutioners fynding some Biskttt & cheese in his pockett, tooke peecs thereof, & crammed them in his mowth when he was dead calling him English Churle, & asking him if then he would eat any bisket & cheese or to that effect to the best of this deponents remembrance: And further saith that he this deponent very well knew him the said John Nagle, & still thought him to be an honest man.[664]

In this examination, Phepps recalled that Nagle reported such a horrific event and such actions as well as the term 'English Churle', but he also corrected the attack by naming Nagle an honest man. This correction further suggested that the violence in this event encompassed more than the bodily and physical harm. This particular incidence also appeared in the examination of William Cary taken on the same day as that of Richard Phepps, further relating the presence of this term 'churl' within Nagle's reports.[665] 'Churl' was just one example of the many ways that insults played a role in the social lowering of victims and the perpetuation of physical harm. The effect of this term, which targeted one's reputation, impacted more than social consequences.

The three preceding chapters demonstrated the seriousness of words both legally and social, and this added a violent component to speeches. Chapter two explored how laws and the official commission legally recognised words as dangerous and worthy of punishments. In many ways, the legal investigation of language heightened words violent impact. The spoken word could have effects as devastating as some forms of physical assault. Chapter three and four showed the social impact of words in the context of 1640s

---

[664] Examination of Richard Phepps, 12 Aug. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 242v.
[665] Examination of William Cary, 12 Aug. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 267v.

Ireland, which has severe consequences upon an individuals' life and social standing. For instance, chapter three demonstrated the power of words and analysed the 'wounding power of words'.[666] One word of accusation from a subordinate contained the potential power to result in a superior's power. Likewise, in chapter four illustrated the control over honour and reputation. While these chapters focused on the social implications, this was not separate from the violence of spoken words. Affecting a person's place in society could be viewed as a violent act in itself. Through the physical, perpetrators threatened individuals with the bodily harm, while through verbal violence, they perpetrator claimed control over laws, power, and honour and reputation.[667]

Therefore, beyond individual examples of words linked to abuse or violence, the legal and social context of the 1641 depositions was central. This idea also raised an important point related to anthropologist David Parkin's argument that a particular society may not always deem physical assault the highest form of violence. Parkins argued that violence could refer to physical harm but also harm upon a person's reputation in some circumstances, societies, or environments. In the 1641 depositions, words were violent because they related to physical violence, but they were also violent because they challenged a person's reputation and consequently their life beyond that specific event. They did not just impact someone at the moment, but words could have severe legal and social ramifications long after they were spoken. An insult like 'rogue' in the 1641 depositions was violent even when spoken in an environment absent of physical harm or killing. Words like 'Rogue' or 'whore' could damage a person's social reputation and therefore be considered a violent act.[668]

---

[666] Kelly, *Guide to early Irish law,* p. 137.
[667] Edwards, *Age of atrocity*, p. 33.
[668] Parkin, 'Violence and will', pp 205-6.

Danger to the Christian community was also a motivation for violence in the 1641 depositions. Interestingly, Nicola MacLeod claimed that the limited use of the term 'Catholics' suggested religious differences were not a priority for the deponents. She argued that the term 'catholic' when searched for through a word search available on the online 1641 depositions project only brought forward forty-two results. However, this number alone is significant. As well, the modern spelling of 'catholic' did not account for the various spellings used in the 1641 depositions including 'catholik' and 'catholique', which together brought at least an additional fifty-one depositions forward. As well, by expanding the term 'Catholic' to include other words such as 'popish', 'papal', 'heretic', 'devil', and 'Romish', it was clear that deponents and Irish rebels often considered religion. Priests were often referred to as 'popish' as in the information of Patrick Jordan and the deposition of William Fraser.[669] Similarly, 'romish' was a common term used to describe Catholic priests and the Catholic religion.[670]

It was true that these terms appeared less frequently then clear political words such as 'traitor' or 'rebel', however, many words held a political, religious, and social meaning as shown in chapter three through the label 'puritan'. As well, English Protestants were named 'hereticks' and 'divells'. For example, William Stewart recalled how Irish rebels explained their actions and said that they would roote ~~out~~ all the ~~scott~~ English and Scotts (whom they called Hereticks) out of Ireland, and not Leave one of them there'. [671] As well, Irish Catholics tore up bibles, and in the deposition of William Duffield, they did so while saying that 'the Protestants were divells and served the divell'.[672] In 1642, James Stewart witnessed Irish rebels interrupt a Protestant service

[669] Information of Patrick Jordan, 7 July 1642, TCD, Ms 813, f. 053v; Deposition of William Fraser, 12 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 831, f. 035r.
[670] See for example: Deposition of James Shawe, 8 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 812, f. 051r; Deposition of John Peirce, 8 Mar. 1644, TCD, Ms 811, ff. 120r-v.
[671] Deposition of William Stewart, 16 Jan. 1643, TCD, Ms 817, f. 202r.
[672] Deposition of William Duffeild, 9 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 049r.

and say that they were at the devills service, & it were a good deed to burne the howse over their heads.'[673]

There was an important point to make when working with the 1641 depositions through the 1641 online project or additional databases or technologies.[674] Although the use of technology has an important role to play in historical research, it cannot be relied upon entirely. Therefore, the absence of a particular insult, term, or topic cannot be immediately determined in the entirety of the 1641 depositions, and it must be investigated thoroughly, including through searches for variant spellings and reading the depositions.

For this chapter, the existence of words related to religion and Christianity continued to signal ways speech motivated and encouraged extreme physical abuse against another human being. These words suggested that perpetrators viewed their victims as dangers to the community.[675] By indicating a victim's removal from the Christian community through the employment of such as 'heretic' 'devil' and 'no Christians', perpetrators attempted to remove a moral responsibility for their abuses and killings. Irish rebels explicitly stated this according to the deponent Andrew Adaire, who reported that over six hundred English settlers were killed by Irish rebels who considered it 'noe breach of Conscience to breake their oath to a Protestant' and an act of 'good service to go' to kill a 'heretick'.[676] This label removed moral responsibility for the abuses and killing of fellow Christians while perpetrators also justified the taking of human life by using dehumanising words.

These religiously charged words, 'heretic' and even 'no Christian', prompted further questions, and the following two chapters will examine their use in more depth.

---

[673] Deposition of James Stewart, 12 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 833, f. 196v.
[674] TCD 1641 project website, (http://1641.tcd.ie/index.php).
[675] McLeod, 'Rogues, villains', p. 123.
[676] Deposition of Andrew Adaire, 9 Jan. 1643, TCD. Ms 831, f. 176r.

As well, words such as 'ethnic' or 'dog' identified victims as 'other' and reduced them to something less than humans; two effective tools often utilised in conflict and ethnic violence across various social contexts and times periods, which chapter seven will explore more closely.[677] Both 'dog' and 'ethnic' could distance the perpetrator from the victim's humanity and thus eliminate the responsibility to behave humanely towards the targeted or attacked individual or group of people. Chapter seven will address this particular role of insults further. Overall, a deadly combination of religious, economic, political, and ethnic concerns and conflicts existed in the 1641 depositions, and there was no 'straightforward explanation for the motives that drove the perpetrators'.[678] The diversity of insults found in these accounts confirmed that individuals inflicted violence when inflicting violence.

More than agents of physical violence

Perhaps one of the most persuasive arguments for the violent nature of words comes from its use as a weapon or defence against physical attack or threat. Such an idea existed in medieval and early modern Ireland. These societies considered 'tongues being worse than swords', and verbal attacks to have just as severe consequences as the physical ones. Another argument for this appeared in Hall's article on words as weapons. It was clear that physical action was a legitimate response to words. The article spoke of a legal case in the sixteenth-century Armagh church courts, in which a man insulted a woman. In response, her husband killed the man, which the courts considered a justifiable form of defence.[679] If physical violence was a legitimate defence against words, then perhaps speech was conversely a legitimate and effective defence against the physical.

---

[677] David L. Smith, *Less than human: why we demean, enslave, and exterminate others* (New York, 2011), p. 251.
[678] Inga Jones, '"Holy war"? Religion, ethnicity and massacre during the Irish rebellion 1641-2' in E. Darcy, Annaleigh Margey and Elaine Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 depositions and the Irish rebellion (*London, 2012), p. 141.
[679] Hall, 'Words as weapons', p. 131.

In the 1641 depositions, several accounts reported the use of the verbal in response to or defence against the physical. For example, in the 1642 Dublin examination of Oliver Symms, the commissioners 'asked whether anie of the said Rebels were killed or wounded by the said Sir John or any of his companie'.[680] Symms reported that the Englishman employed speech to defend English victims from the Irish rebels, saying that the 'saide Sir John spake sharpe language unto them with his pistoll cockt & that one of his the saide Sir Johns sonnes strake two or three of the said Rebells with a halfe pike'.[681] The use of language as a defensive tool appeared again in the undated information of William Pilsworth from Kildare in the form of curses. Pilsworth stood upon the gallows, prepared to die after he had been asked to go with the Irish to Mass and had refused by saying that he would not destroy his soul to save his life. One of the Irishmen 'swore a great oath' that Pilsworth should hang, and thus the deponent stood ready to die as he was further taunted and reviled by would-be killers. A priest, however, defended his life, making a long speech arguing that Pilsworth's father 'whoe lived for longe amongst them did not deserve his Child should bee soe miserably vsed'.[682] He continued to defend Pilsworth by placing a curse upon any who would have a hand in the deponent's blood, calling 'gods vengeance on them'.[683] Thus, a curse and spoken words served in opposition to intended physical violence.

Perhaps, words could prevent physical harm in certain situations and the broader context of the seventeenth century because it was understood as a violent act. As well, members of society recognised its immense power to harm in a similarly devastating way as physical violence. This challenged any idea that speech was simply a part of violence or only supported or justified more extreme or harmful violence. In these examples, they

---

[680] Examination of Oliver Symms, 29 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 810, f. 206v.
[681] Examination of Oliver Symms, 29 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 810, f. 206v.
[682] Information of William Pilsworth, undated, TCD, Ms 813, f. 001v.
[683] Information of William Pilsworth, undated, TCD, Ms 813, f. 001v.

held enough meaning and power to act as a weapon against physical acts and be a form of violence themselves.

However, it was important not to conflate the two forms: physical and verbal. One cannot immediately equate all words and speeches in the 1641 depositions with physical violence. The caveat to verbal violence was that speech could have adverse effects, but not always immediately, and in the same way as the physical. Unlike physical action, which when perpetuated caused direct and immediate harm, words and speeches did not always cause harm. The harm done was often based on the meaning individuals gave to it. Therefore, words that were violent themselves existed, and words that helped perpetrators justify violence appeared in the 1641 depositions. But perhaps words could also prevent further violence or de-escalate a tense moment, unlike physical violence which always caused some degree of hurt or pain.

Conclusion

All components of violence, however frequent or infrequent, subtle or gruesome, must be considered in order to understand the full spectrum of violence and atrocities recorded in the 1641 depositions. In determining the relationship between violence and words, the very inclusion of speech alongside reports of physical atrocities highlighted their importance even in such horrific environments and stories. Despite the presence of more shocking and brutal actions, words added to the atrocities perpetrated. Words in the 1641 depositions served as a motivation for robbery and physical abuse. They acted as a form of lowering the social status of victims, a method for labelling individuals as traitors, an indication of their removal from the Christian community, and a way to identify them as 'other' and dehumanise them. They also were more than agents of violence; they defended against and prevented acts of physical harm.

Beyond the events of the 1641 rebellion, there is still much space and need to consider the violent nature of language and words in the context of the seventeenth century and the broader early modern period in Ireland. However, there is an argument to make that the laws explored in chapter two showed that the perception of words as violent existed in Ireland prior to 1641. The 1641 rebellion simply heightened and intensified it, as it did all other forms of violence. Ultimately, 'atrocities differ in scale',[684] and although the physical may bring more immediate pain and devastation, other forms of abuse and violence, particularly words and speeches, cannot be overlooked.

---

[684] Edwards, *Age of atrocity,* p. 20.

Chapter six: Words, emotions and passions in the 1641 depositions

This chapter will examine the relationship between words and emotions in the 1641 depositions. Language impacted laws, punishments, power dynamics, honour, and violence. This chapter will argue that emotion played a part in this as well. Accounts in the 1641 depositions sometimes indicated an emotional element of the rebellion, and although this can be difficult to uncover, the speech recorded in these accounts provide a new way to discover these feelings and emotions. The history of emotions is a relatively new area of research. It presents many complexities, and historians have presented various methodologies for this focus. This chapter will explore how historans can use the 1641 depositions as a source for emotions. It will also consider how historians can use a legal source like the 1641 depositions to explore and discover emotions. Here, the importance of language will become evident. This chapter will argue that language is a fundamental part of identifying emotions or, at least, the *expression* of emotion. This chapter will also consider how the seventeenth century understood emotions, although the word 'emotion' rarely appeared. Instead, words such as 'passion' or 'sentiment' appeared more commonly in the early modern period. This chapter will explore the different terminology and vocabulary that referred to feelings in the 1641 depositions with a particular focus on 'passions'.

The final sections of this chapter will engage directly with the relationship between emotions, passions, violence and words. First, it will demonstrate how spoken words directly expressed and caused what the 1641 depositions referred to as 'passions'. Second, it will expand upon this argument and demonstrate how words and 'passions' could impact and drive violence. Third, it will focus specifically on name-calling and investigate how words contained 'traces'[685] of emotions in particularly violent accounts in

---

[685] Barbara Rosenwein and Riccardo Cristiani, *What is the history of emotion?* (Cambridge, 2018), pp 34-5.

the 1641 depositions. Finally, this chapter will address the role and existence of fear, resentment, and hatred in the 1641 depositions in relation to words and the legal and social attempt to control speech. It will argue that the control and concern for language and speech in the seventeenth century and the 1641 depositions created an environment that fostered these emotions.

The 1641 depositions as a source for emotions

Overall, the history of emotion aims to establish a historical understanding of the development, expression, and role of emotions in past events. It asks questions about how individuals experienced emotions, what caused them, and what impact they had upon people, communities, society, and history in general. Beginning to engage with the history of emotion can be difficult as there are many questions to address and methodologies to consider. Regardless of these challenges, Barbara Rosenwein, one of the leading scholars of the history of emotion, argued that historians need to embrace emotions despite their common hesitations. She argued that the analysis of emotions and passions should not exist separately from other historical topics, but rather, should inform and contribute to them.[686] While the history of emotions 'has flourished in the last several decades', there are a 'bewildering variety of ways' historians approach it.[687] Various methodologies, assumptions, and expectations exist; therefore, this chapter will draw upon those most relevant to the words and speech in the 1641 depositions.

Historian Katie Barclay has worked extensively on emotions in Ireland in both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Her work demonstrated the many topics that a focus on emotion can engage with in an Irish context. She has explored emotion's relationship

---

[686] Barbara Rosenwein, 'Worrying about emotions in history' in *American Historical Review,* cvii, 3 (2002), p. 821-43.
[687] Rosenwein and Cristiani, *What is the history of emotion?,* p. 1.

with sedition, music, law, gender, and the performance of those emotions.[688] In regard to

1640s Ireland, Nicholas Canny expressly stated that the 1641 depositions are 'a body of

material which is emotional'.[689] Here, Canny was speaking of the overall emotional

impact of the rebellion on the ensuing accounts that depicted the Irish Catholics 'in the

worst possible light'.[690] He suggested that the English Protestant's experiences and

emotional reactions to the rebellion impact their reports and the apparent biases with the

depositions. According to the philosopher Aaron Ben-Ze'ev, emotions arise from change,

and they are created on a personal level when one perceives a positive or negative change

to their situation.[691] If emotions arise from both positive and negative change, then those

participating in the events as both perpetrators and victims would have experienced and

expressed emotion in some way. In this way, deponents emotionally reacted to the

changes in Ireland during the 1640s and 1650s as they reported during a time of great

societal and personal upheaval. However, if Ben-Ze'ev's argument applied to the

deponents that it also applied to the Irish who experienced these changes as well,

although how they did was different. Therefore, the role of emotion in the 1641

depositions extended beyond Canny's specific focus on the bias representation of the

Irish rebels.

Clodagh Tait considered emotion in the 1641 depositions more closely. She

showed how emotion could be found in these accounts despite it not being the primary

focus of the depositions. Unlike Canny's focus on a general emotional experience, Tait's

---

[688] Katie Barclay, 'Sounds of sedition: music and emotion in Ireland, 1780–1845' in *Cultural History*, vol. 3:1 (2014), pp. 54-80; Katie Barclay, 'Narrative, law and emotion: husband killers in early nineteenth-century Ireland' in *Journal of Legal History*, vol. 38:2 (2017), pp.203-227; Katie Barclay, 'Performing emotion and reading the male body in the Irish court, c. 1800-1845' in *Journal of Social History,* vol. 51:2 (2017), pp. 293-312; Katie Barclay, *Men on trial: performing emotion, embodiment and identity in Ireland, 1800-4* (Manchester, 2019).
[689] Nicholas Canny, 'What really happened in 1642' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.), *Ireland from independence to occupation, 1641-1660* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 27.
[690] Canny, 'What really happened', p. 27.
[691] Aaron Ben-Ze'ev, *The subtlety of emotions* (Massachusetts, 2000), p. 219.

study looked at the specific emotions of grief and sorrow. Words such as 'anger', 'grief', 'joy', 'sorrow' and 'fear' appeared alongside reports of atrocities and violence. However, Tait also claimed that the 1641 depositions did not have a lot to reveal about emotion directly because it was a legal source in which the primary concern was the establishment of losses and the reporting of crimes. Therefore, records and probing of trauma and emotional experience or expression was not the primary aim. Both the commissioners and the deponents were much more concerned about proving their reliability and defending their reputation and respectability.[692]

However, its legal nature did not mean that the 1641 depositions does not reveal anything about emotions. Numerous historians, especially those seeking to move legal history away from a strict rational reading of doctrine and rule, have argued for the study of emotion in legal sources, particularly the feelings of anger or hatred. For example, Merridee Bailey and Kimberley–Joy Knight, argued in their article 'Writing histories of law and emotion' that legal sources offer historians the opportunity to discover the relationship between rationale and emotion, and thus uncover the intricacies of the law. Despite the long-standing idea that reason and emotions are separate, Bailey and Knight argued that 'law has always been involved with emotions, with fear, grief, remorse, anger, love, compassion and empathy'[693] because legal systems are dependent on human judgment which cannot be entirely separated from an emotional element.

As well, early modern historiography suggested that legal sources (like the 1641 depositions) could reveal the role of individual emotions although it did not specifically focus on emotion or trauma. Despite some legal historians' hesitation in incorporating emotion into their work, social historians, including Natalie Zemon Davis and Laura

---

[692] Tait, 'Whereat his wife tooke great greef'. p. 269.
[693] Bailey and Knight, 'Writing histories, pp 121-2.

Gowing, clearly demonstrated the importance of legal records in the medieval and early

modern periods. They explicitly focused on testimony in order to unveil 'mental

habitus'.[694]

Furthermore, historians have engaged with legal sources to uncover emotion and

its relationship with words and speech. For example, Fay Bound considered the

relationship between insult and anger through a critique of slander litigation. She

observed that the angry manner of words was a pivotal component to the legal definition

of slander in the church courts of York. [695] As well, David Peacock showed how English

depositions from the diocese of Norwich often reported angry words uttered in 'railing

passion'.[696] Therefore, the legal nature of the 1641 depositions does not complicate an

investigation of emotions.

Furthermore, while there was no overarching concern for emotions evident in the

official commission or the questions of the commissioners, there was one account that

signalled an official interest in feelings. In 1653, they directly asked Edward Butler about

his feelings. Commissioners questioned him about an encounter with Sergeant Williams

and Jeremy Weaver, who had apprehended and 'misused him'.[697] As he recounted this

event, the commissioners directly asked him how he responded to this mistreatment and

if, during the encounter, 'hee did not desire them to shoote him being sure that hee should

be hanged if he came to Kilkenny.'[698] This question implied that the commissioners, to

some extent, recognised the role of fear in Butler's experience. Butler responded that

Williams and Weaver were 'so violent and inciuill towards him' that 'in passion hee

---

[694] Bailey and Knight, 'Writing histories', p. 123.

[695] Fay Bound, 'An angry and malicious mind'? Narratives of slander at the church courts of York, c. 1660-c. 1760' in *History workshop journal,* lvi, 1 (Autumn 2003), p. 61.

[696] Dave Peacock, 'Morals, rituals and gender: aspects of social relations in the diocese of Norwich, 1660-1703' (D. Phil., University of York, 1996), p. 81.

[697] Examination of Edward Butler, 16 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 812, f. 328r.

[698] Examination of Edward Butler, 16 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 812, f. 328r.

desired them to shoote him rather then to vse him so'.[699] However, he denied that he

feared being brought to Kilkenny to be hanged.[700] Here, commissioners showed concern

for what happened but also for its effect on the victim and his emotional response.

Perhaps their interest aimed at emphasising the violence and abuse of the perpetrators, but

it was a small indication that officials did not entirely ignore feelings.

Additionally, this reference to 'fear' indicated the need to consider this particular

emotion further. In the context of the violence and atrocities recorded in the 1641

depositions and the dangerous and threatening environment of the 1641 rebellion, fear

was most likely a frequent emotion. More generally, scholars have argued that fear is and

was one of the most common and recurring emotions, and it existed throughout different

cultures and contexts. For instance, Joanna Bourke argued that it was the most powerful

and primary emotion in *Fear: a cultural history.*[701] She wrote that 'history is saturated

with emotions, of which fear may be one of the most relentless'.[702]

More specifically, the early modern period was categorised as a time of fear, as

historians William Naphy and Penny Roberts argued in their book, *Fear in early modern

society*. During the fourteenth to eighteenth centuries, Europe experienced moments of

extreme change and, therefore, unprecedented levels of anxiety, which created a 'climate

of fear'.[703] Experiences or ideas of plague, death, witchcraft, the infidel, the heretic, or the

afterlife all contributed to this environment.

In many ways, early modern Ireland experienced these fears as well. Dianne

Hall's chapter in *Understanding emotions in early Europe*, 'Fear, gender, and violence in

early modern Ireland' specifically focused on this topic. She wrote that the 1641

---

[699] Examination of Edward Butler, 16 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 812, f. 328r.
[700] Examination of Edward Butler, 16 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 812, f. 328r.
[701] Joanna Bourke, *Fear: a cultural history* (Great Britain, 2005), p. 390.
[702] Joanna Bourke, 'Fear and anxiety: writing about emotion in modern history', *History workshop journal,* lv (2003), p. 129.
[703] William Naphy and Penny Roberts (eds.), *Fear in early modern society* (Manchester, 1997), p. 1.

depositions provided an emotional vocabulary of fear and threats, although she mainly focused on the aftermath of the rebellion. Her analysis also spanned across the century using examples from 1610 and the late 1680s, and therefore, Hall's chapter only provided a broad sweep of the century and a general assumption of the presence of fear. More direct evidence was needed.[704] David Lederer's chapter in *Facing fear: the history of an emotion in global perspective* also provided relevant context for the 1641 rebellion and the depositions. Lederer considered the Thirty Years War and explored the way contemporaries understood this event through fear and horror. It was particularly relevant because he used eyewitness accounts of the war in order to consider how personal fear related to the factual events of the time. In the 1641 depositions, many events and atrocities pointed towards an environment of fear, but historians must not assume this. Instead, fear, like any other relevant emotion, must be studied carefully. In its final section, this chapter will investigate how the punishment and control of words created an environment of fear.[705]

The vocabulary in the 1641 depositions: emotions, affections or passions

Historians must first identify a society's or source's language of emotion in order to find and analyse emotion. Therefore, this chapter must establish how the 1641 depositions wrote about emotions or feelings, and how deponents spoke about and reported emotion. No results appeared when searching for the term 'emotion' in the 1641 depositions. This finding was unsurprising as the term was rarely used in the seventeenth century, and even when it did appear, its meaning remained unclear. In general, the definition of 'emotion' was constantly in flux in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[706] It could refer to

---

[704] Dianne Hall, 'Fear, gender, and violence in early modern Ireland' in Michael Champion and Andrew Lynch (eds.), *Understanding emotions in early Europe*, (Brepols, 2015), pp 215-32.
[705] David Lederer, 'Fear of the thirty years war' in Michael Laffan and Max Weiss, *Facing fear: the history of an emotion in global perspective* (Princeton, 2012), pp 10-30.
[706] David Thorley, 'Towards a history of emotion, 1562-1660' in *The Seventeenth Century*, xxviii, 1, (2013), p. 4.

political civil unrest, public uprising or commotion, as well as an excited mental state or any strong feeling such as fear, hope, grief, or pleasure.[707]

Several other terms related to feelings appeared more regularly in the early modern period. Scholars of the history of emotion tend to investigate feeling through individual concepts such as 'sentiments', 'affections', or 'passions'.[708] In the medieval and early modern periods, each of these words held different and subtle meanings and meant something different from 'emotion'.[709] Therefore, historians must engage with each individually rather than emotion as a whole, as Thomas Dixon argued.[710] Ute Frevert also analysed the changing vocabulary of emotion from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the twenty-first century, and she noted how the shifting vocabulary used to describe feelings. These changes complicated research of emotions in years before the eighteenth century, which was an important point when considering emotion in the 1641 depositions or other seventeenth-century or early modern Irish sources.[711]

Of the many early modern terms used to refer to feeling or some emotions, two appeared multiple times in the 1641 depositions: 'affection' and 'passion'. Nineteen depositions contained the word 'affection', while the term 'affected' appeared in over forty depositions This numbers did not account for misspellings of the word, and there are likely other examples to find. According to the OED, several definitions for 'affection' existed in the seventeenth century. It was sometimes a word that represented a feeling in

---

The historian David Thorley, in his article 'Towards a history of emotion, 1562-1660', proposed that the meaning of this term was in flux beginning in the sixteenth century and certainly in the seventeenth, reflected by the numerous definitions in the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

[707] *Oxford English dictionary*, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/61249?rskey=Rf9CAO&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid, accessed 17 Nov. 2020.

[708] John Dryden, 'Passions, affections, and emotions: methodological difficulties in reconstructing Aquinas's philosophical psychology in *Literature compass*, xiii, 6 (2016), p. 343.

[709] Dryden, 'Passions, affections', p. 343.

[710] Thomas Dixon, *From passions to emotions: the creation of a secular psychological category* (Cambridge, 2003), pp 1-2.

[711] Frevert, *Emotional lexicons*, p. 10.

general, but it could also mean tenderness and fondness. In other cases, it could denote a strong love for another.[712] The 1641 depositions reflected this diversity of definitions. The word 'affection' sometimes referred to a person's loyalty towards a political figure or a cause. For example, the examination of Richard Shortall reported of Pierce Butler's 'zeale & affection to the said Nuntius & ~~the~~ his faction'.[713] In 1643, George Stockdale reported how he survived by riding with the Irish rebels 'vnder colour of affection and love' to Brandan Connor and his cause.[714] Similarly, the term 'affected' also could refer to loyalty to a person or political movement as in the examination of Jonas Rushworth, who reported of a man who was 'well affected to the Irish cause' and took the oath of association.[715] In these, 'affection' suggested loyalty (real or otherwise) rather than an emotion.

However, there was a relationship between the emotion fear and 'affection' in the deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, which interestingly recorded how Irish rebels hesitated to harm a woman 'becawse of the feare or affection they bare to some of her frends'.[716] Thus, the term, 'affection' had multiple meaning, and these may be an excellent place to analyse feeling and the role of emotion further. The use of 'disaffection' appeared in numerous accounts such as in Theophilus Cary's examination, which detailed how a 'bloodie man & a distroyer of the English' named Charles McCarty Reagh 'manifested his disaffection' and therefore 'greatly vexed and oppressed' his English neighbours.[717] Furthermore, in 1642, Epenetus Bellewe and Turlagh O'Donnell reported Lord Courcy of Kinsale's 'ill affection to the English'.[718]

---

[712] Oxford English dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/3344?rskey=5dxOWo&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid, accessed 12 Feb. 2020.
[713] Examination of Richard Shortall regarding Peirce Butler, 16 Jan. 1654, TCD, Ms 818, f. 313r.
[714] Deposition of George Stockdalle, 0 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 091v.
[715] Examination of Jonas Rushworth, 16 Feb. 1654, TCD, Ms 819, f. 129v.
[716] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093v.
[717] Examination of Theophilus Cary, 11 Aug. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 274r.
[718] Examination of Epenetus Bellewe and Turlagh O'Donnell, 10 Oct. 1642, TCD, Ms 822, ff. 018v-19r.

However, the most relevant term for the 1641 depositions and this study was 'passion'. Twenty individual depositions appeared when searching for the term. Passion differed from a modern understanding of emotion. Emotion 'has tended to be defined in an amoral way as an autonomous physical or mental state characterised by vivid feeling and physical agitation',[719] whereas passion related more towards the negative side of feeling 'being defined in more morally and theologically engaged ways as a disobedient and morally dangerous movement of the soul (as well as often being used in a vague and a general way to refer to a variety of lively mental states)'.[720] Therefore, historians must be wary of analysing passion and conflating it with emotion.

'Passion' could a be personified through 'intense anger; rage; temper', and it often appeared in a phrase such as 'to fly (also fall) into a passion' or to be 'violently angry'.[721] However, it was distinctly different from anger or vexation, although related. The 1641 depositions most often recorded 'passion' in relation to this connection with anger and action as in the testimony of John Morgan from Galway in 1653. Morgan reported how an Englishman became angry and vexed when Irish rebels stole cattle. These feelings of anger and vexation drove him into a passion, and he requested permission to gather forces against the rebels and to recover the stolen property.[722] This example revealed a distinction between anger and the force of passion.

Anger and vexation were emotions that created passion, which then led to action. This result related to the above definitions, which linked passion to lively and violent action, intense responses, and agitation and suffering. In 1643, passion and rage caused an Irish rebel named Hugh O Kennedy to drown himself. Henry Hughes reported how

---

[719] Dixon, *From passions to emotions*, p. 18; Thorley, 'Towards a history', p. 3.
[720] Dixon, *From passions to emotions*, p. 18
[721] Oxford English dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/138504?rskey=dOTu0M&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid, accessed 10 Feb. 2020,
[722] Testimony of John Morgan, 18 June 1653, TCD, Ms 830, f. 265r.

Kennedy participated in the siege of a castle. After the rebels successfully took the castle, O Kennedy 'desired that he might putt all the English there to death'.[723] However, his authorities stopped him from doing so, which Hughes reported caused him to fall 'into that rage and desperate passion, that he drowned himself'.[724] While anger was an internal feeling, passion was action and often violence. It was similar to 'affection' in this way, which was generally an 'external manifestation or representation of a feeling or emotion'.[725] However, passion was associated with violent behaviour, while affection often referred to a favourable manifestation of emotion. However, both words were an active expression of an inward emotion.

Therefore, passion in the 1641 depositions was not an emotion. Rather, it signalled the presence of individual feelings that generated an outward response. Here, the study of words and speech became important. Passion was action, and it was sometimes a speech act. Numerous accounts linked 'passion' and language. Edward Aston referred to words and curses spoken 'in a passionate manner'[726] in his 1654 examination, and John Goldsmith from Mayo reported in 1643 of rebels breaking 'forth into theis passionate speeches against the people in the Castle'.[727] In Aston's report, a man named James reported how a man named James Lewes threatened to shoot him. However, his weapon failed to fire which caused Lewes to react 'in a passionate manner' and curse.[728] In this moment, his passionate reaction was his words and spoken curses. Passion could lead to or be expressed through 'unfitting' words.

---

[723] Deposition of Henry Hughes, 13 July 1643, TCD, Ms 829, f. 352v.
[724] Deposition of Henry Hughes, 13 July 1643, TCD, Ms 829, f. 352v.
[725] Oxford English dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/3344?rskey=5dxOWo&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid, accessed 12 Feb. 2020.
[726] Examination of Edward Aston re James Lewes, 3 Feb. 1654, TCD, Ms 818, f. 221r.
[727] Deposition of John Gouldsmith, 30 Dec. 1643, TCD, Ms 831, f. 195r.
[728] Examination of Edward Aston re James Lewes, 3 Feb. 1654, TCD, Ms 818, f. 221v.

Passions, words, and violence

If passion was an outward, active expression of overpowering emotions such as fear, anger, hate, or desire, then it was unsurprising that the term 'passions' appeared regularly alongside acts of violence. At least twenty depositions recorded the specific term 'passion' alongside verbal, symbolic, and/or physical violence, be it outright physical harm or a call to violence. In these depositions, passion and words could play a crucial role in driving and justifying physical violence, while words could both express and create the very feelings and emotions that created passion.[729]

This relationship signalled another way to approach the study of feelings in the 1641 depositions: through the connection of passion, speech, and violence. Numerous depositions included a reference to passionate words alongside violence or acts of robbery or deamination. Historians cannot overlook the emotional side of violence in the 1641 depositions. Although the study of words provided a look into the rational side of violence, it can also illuminate the emotional side of both physical and verbal violence. Emotion could perhaps incite or lead to violence, and alternatively, words could generate an emotional reaction that then led to physical harm or assault.

Chapter five illustrated how language provided evidence of motivation and justification for violent acts. However, this risked depicting perpetrators as individuals purely driven by reason and well-thought-out motivations. Instead, historians cannot entirely dismiss the importance of human emotions when examining cases and occurrences of abuse and attack. In fact, Clodagh Tait suggested that historians need to consider the active role of emotion within episodes of violence. Furthermore, she argued the importance of Randall Collins's work on the sociology of violence, which held valuable insights for this research. Although Collins argued that violence always takes

---

[729] Examination of John Burroughs, 9 Sept. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 041r.

place due to some rationale or motivation, he did not discount the role of emotion in this. Tait asked what this component might reveal about the emotional state of individuals and their patterns of violence in the 1640s.[730]

It may seem contradictory to argue that emotion played a role in the violence perpetrated in the 1641 depositions after chapter five argued that violence needed a rational justification in order to take place. However, the complexities of violence cannot be overlooked, and to make a broad claim that all moments of violence were purely rational (or purely emotional) risks a reduction of the reality of human behaviour and response to change, trauma, and upheaval. In order to better understand the violence of the 1641 rebellion, the complexities must be engaged, and historians must acknowledge that conflicting motivations and experiences may (and often do) exist simultaneously. These various motivations and reasons appeared frequently in these accounts.

Individuals who spoke passionate words could incite violence. This signalled that an emotion, which had created the passionate reaction, also generated or encouraged the physical violence. The examination of John Burroughs from Cork in 1652 provided an example of this idea. Here, a perpetrator claimed that passion and vexation caused him to speak words that resulted in the violent hanging of English victims. During the rebellion, an Irishman named McCarthy Reagh ordered the hanging of Burroughs's father, mother and two brothers. Two years after this, Burroughs encountered McCarthy in Timoleague where he 'taxed McCarty Reagh, for the death of his father and mother'.[731] The Irishman confirmed his role in their deaths and gave his reasons. He told Burroughs that at the time he had just learned that the English had taken Kilbrittain Castle when another Irish man named Mc Ne Crimen told him that the Burroughs were now his prisoners. When Mc Ne

---

[730] Tait, 'Whereat his wife', pp 276-7.
[731] Examination of John Burroughs, 9 Sept. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 041r.

Crimen asked what he should do with them, McCarthy responded, 'doe with them what you please',[732] and they hanged them. McCarthy used emotion and passion as an excuse for his words saying 'that indeed he was at that time passionate, & ~~v x t~~ vext, for the losse, of his Castle & therevpon he said those words!'[733] Such a statement indicated that McCarthy's words were not the outcome of deliberate well thought out reasoning, but rather a passionate response to the emotions he felt after learning of the Irish violence against the English in the castle.

Alternatively, violence could create a passionate reaction that manifested in words. Another deposition showed this different relationship between passionate words and violence. In this case, violence created a passionate reaction and words spoken 'in greate passion'[734] then generated more physical violence. In 1642, William Whalley reported how Irish rebels held him and other English settlers as prisoners. Initially, the rebels did not mistreat them; however, an Irish woman's words changed their behaviour towards the prisoners. When she saw the English prisoners, she spoke against them 'in greate passion' and claimed that 'her mother was stript and hanged in Dublin by the Lords Justices and Counsells direccion'.[735] This past violence motivated her passionate words, which continued as she then swore at the prisoners. Her words also incited new violence as Whalley reported how her 'clamors and expressions turned the harts of those there (that formerly favoured the Prisoners) vtterly against them: Soe as they were putt to great wante'.[736]

Her passionate words shifted the entire atmosphere of this situation. Her words both expressed her anger because of her mother's death, and also had the power to

[732] Examination of John Burroughs, 9 Sept. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 041r.
[733] Examination of John Burroughs, 9 Sept. 1653, TCD, Ms 826, f. 041r.
[734] Deposition of William Whalley, 5 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 818, f. 025v.
[735] Deposition of William Whalley, 5 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 818, f. 054v.
[736] Deposition of William Whalley, 5 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 818, f. 025v.

provoke new violence against Whalley and the prisoners. Here, a relationship between violence, passion, and words directly guided the words of the Irish woman and the experiences of Whalley and his fellow prisoners. Alleged violence against her mother by the lord justices incited emotions possibly of anger and fear, which translated into the driving force of passion. Furthermore, this reaction was showed in her swears and clamours against the prisoners. Finally, her words prompted mistreatment and physical threats against the English.

Additionally, all three elements successfully changed the disposition of the Irish captives. They had 'formerly favoured the Prisoners', but after hearing her words, they mistreated the English. Passion and language created from past violence could drive an individual's actions, but also encourage others to act against the accused. Therefore, expressed emotion through passion and words could also create new passionate reactions and violence in others.

It was important to recognise that while 'passion' often led to violence, other indicators of emotion or feeling played different roles. For example, 'affection' and fear stopped the violence in the deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, as mentioned earlier. An English woman was spared specifically because of the 'feare and affection' they had for 'some of her frends'.[737] Therefore, while the focus on 'passion' highlighted the harmful effects of emotions, historians must recognise this as only one part of the study of emotion.

Several depositions referred to words as 'passionate'. However, words also existed in additional moments of feeling or emotion separate from 'passions'. There were various other ways that individuals could express a feeling or an emotion or act in passion through gestures such as weeping, laughing, smiling, or trembling. By paying attention to

---

[737] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093v.

the words that accompanied these other expressions, historians can uncover deeper insights into the precise feelings underneath these reported expressions. The 1642 deposition of Robert Maxwell presented several examples of this and contained several 'traces'[738] and expressions of emotion. Maxwell reported how an Irishman named Alexander Hovenden, the half-brother to Sir Phelim O'Neill, expressed his emotions through gestures and words. Hovenden saved a large number of the English settlers from Irish rebels, who intended to murder them. As he led them safely out of Armagh, Hovenden witnessed the destruction of the county, and when he beheld the ruins 'especially of the Church (it is sayd) he wept bitterly'.[739]

Maxwell reported that as Hovenden wept, he lamented the fact that no one would ever trust the Irish again because they 'had neither kept theire promisses to god nor proteccions to men'.[740] In this moment, the Irishman's words further emphasised and heightened his reaction. His tears suggested the emotions of sorrow or grief. However, his words revealed other potential emotions, such as regret or fear. His words expressed regret for what had happened and fear for the future of the Irish (which included himself). He feared how they would be viewed and treated differently now because of these atrocities. He also expressed regret, or perhaps a feeling of guilt, when he swore that he would never again fight for or join O'Neill's causes. This slight indication of guilt was another important emotion that can easily be overlooked in the 1641 depositions. However, there were other 'traces' of this emotion found in the depositions.

For example, Thomas Clarke's 1652 examination, which chapter four explored earlier in the context of the word 'villain', also provided an example of possible guilt. Clarke reported how a man named Foster killed a man named Captain Chambers under

---

[738] Rosenwein and Cristiani, *What is the history of emotion?*, pp 34-5.
[739] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 09v.
[740] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 09v.

the orders of two men named Robert Harpoole and Thomas. Davill. A few days, Harpoole and Davill asked Foster why he claimed to be unwell ever since they told him to kill Chambers. He replied and said that killing Chambers caused 'his pininge', and he asked Clarke to confirm to Harpoole and Davill that his complexion and his health had been different before Harpool and Davills made him killed the captain.[741] Here, Foster acknowledged the physical effects his actions had upon him, which may indicate the physical effects of his guilt. There remains much more to explore of guilt in the 1641 depositions, and this deposition was only one example of its potential role and the emotional toll of both vicitms and perpetrators.

Beyond a feeling of guilt, Maxwell also reported how Hovenden then drew his sword and cursed '(in his passion) the brittish if ever they spared Irish man woman or child'.[742] Anger was expressed in these curses he then spoke 'in his passion'.[743] In this example, several emotions, including fear, guilt, anger, and grief, seemed to co-exist, and each played a role in Hovenden's actions or words. As well, Robert Maxwell later recounted the emotional expressions of the Irish rebels. In contrast to Hovenden's tears, grief, and regret, Maxwell witnessed some rebels 'laugh[ed] and wonder[ed] at the English for keeping theire words or proteccions given to the Irish'.[744] They then mocked their English victims, saying that Protestants secretly believed that 'papists were not heretiques'.[745] This deposition was a reminder that historians need to consider the full expressions of emotion in an account. The rebels' words alone provided only an element of the full emotions experienced and present. With the additional detail of laughter and mockery, the emotional tone of their words against the English shifted. They contained a

---

[741] Examination of Thomas Clarke, 20 Oct. 1652, TCD, Ms 818, f. 197r.
[742] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 09v.
[743] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 09v.
[744] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 009r.
[745] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 009r.

trace of seemingly perverse humour at the expense of the English. Therefore, while words were important, the context of this speech and the additional details when available must be considered.

Just as Hovenden's weeping did not reflect all emotions of present without his words, the Irish rebels' speech could not express the full emotion present without the detail of laughter and mockery. Furthermore, pleasure was linked to speech as well, when Maxwell's deposition reported how Irish rebels buried the English victims alive, all the while taking 'greate pleasure' to hear the words the English said to them.[746] This deposition did not detail the English victim's words. However, their words were likely cries for help or mercy amid the Irish rebels' reported killing and brutal behaviour. Nonetheless, this detail suggested speech could incite pleasure as well as express anger or regret.

Name-calling and emotion

Name-calling hurt an individual in a specific, targeted way, and insults existed in numerous depositions that specifically spoke of passion. This connection suggested that emotion caused some individuals to speak 'unfitting' words. Chapter five explored how words played a role in perpetrators' rationalisations of their violence in the depositions; however, it was also essential to examine if rational justification co-existed with emotional motivation just as Randall Collins did not discount the role of emotion. Tait suggested that 'by combining Collins's insights with case studies from the deposition, it is possible to begin to understand how and why people transformed their feelings of anger, betrayal, fear, and so on, into actual attacks on other human beings'.[747]

---

[746] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 09v.
[747] Tait, 'Whereat his wife', pp 270-1; 276-7.

As discussed above, Maxwell's deposition documented Hovenden's grief and anger and other violent Irish rebels' humour and pleasure. However, it also contained various examples of physical violence, in the form of drownings, hangings, whippings, beatings and death by the sword. In fact, Maxwell was one of the eyewitnesses to the mass drowning at Portadown. Furthermore, he recalled several moments of verbal violence used by the Irish rebels, including Sir Phelim O'Neill. He reported of 'distempered speeches as euerywhere riffe in those daies and as proceeding from Bankrupt and discontented gentlemen',[748] and the name-calling of victims as 'English base degenerate cowards and the Scotts dishonorabl{e} Bragadochioes who came into England not to fight but to scrap vpp wealth marchandizing theire honors for a sume of money'.[749] 'Bragadochioes' was a misspelling of 'braggadocio' and an insult, which according to the OED referred to 'an empty, idle boaster; a swaggerer' although the precise meaning in the depositions remained unclear because it only appeared once and with little context surrounding it.[750]

These 'distempered speeches' and the individual insults could hint at the presence of passions or even emotions. Irish rebels may have name-called their victims because of their keen awareness of the legal and social ramifications that named individual could face. However, at other times, emotion may have also impacted why Irish rebels used strong words. In some cases, a rationale or an overarching purpose did not motivate the events that unfolded. Instead, the actions perpetrated were an emotional response driven by passion. For instance, in 1644, in the deposition of John Sheeley, Jane Sheeley and Margret Rowleright witnessed how Irish rebels 'fell into this passion' speaking words to

---

[748] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 005r.
[749] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 005r.
[750] Oxford English dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/22482?redirectedFrom=braggadocio#eid, accessed 12 Dec. 2020.

the English Protestants that God had hired them to be their 'butchers to kill the english'.[751]

Earlier in this same deposition, words of insult, namely the specific terms of 'English jades' and 'dogs' appeared, and the deponents reported how they had to 'endure their base and almost intolerable provocacions' and additional threats.[752] The reference to 'passion' suggested these insults were not a product of reason but were an active reaction to some emotion or feeling. This deposition was just the beginning of a full exploration into the insult of 'English dog' and also only a small indication of the possibility of deciphering or finding emotion through personal insults. Chapter seven will consider the fear of dogs more deeply in the early modern period, an essential element of discovering why this specific term was used and directed at the English victims.

In 1652, Dame Mary Brown of Longford, who was Old English and related to lords Killeen and Fingal, reported how her husband Sir Silvester Brown asked a company of forty or fifty Irishmen why they murdered the English. The Irish rebels responded that they did it for 'noe other reason but that they were English men'.[753] These words Irish generated emotions in Silvester Browne that became passionate speech act, which was expressed through his insults against them. He 'fell into a Passion' and responded by calling the Irish 'You traiter[ous]y Rogues'.[754] It was curious that Mary would willing report how her husband succumbed to his 'passions', however, his reaction was caused by his resistance to the Irish violence against the English. In this way, Mary excused his insults because they were directed against the killers of the English. It also aligned Browne with the English and thus the king. Browne was Old English, and he often had difficulty reconciling his loyalty to the king with other demands on him in Ireland.

---

[751] Deposition of John and Jane Sheeley and Margret Rowleright, 25 Apr. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 169v.
[752] Deposition of John and Jane Sheeley and Margret Rowleright, 25 Apr. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 169v.
[753] Deposition of Dame Mary Browne, 9 Dec. 1652, TCD, Ms 817, f. 220r.
[754] Deposition of Dame Mary Browne, 9 Dec. 1652, TCD, Ms 817, f. 220r.

The deposition of John Stibbs documented the tension Browne faced between English and Irish loyalties. Stibbs reported how 'the Rebells and their *cabinett* Counsell & Counsill of warr' sent Browne to take Stibbs and his wife and children 'to Longford gaole'. During this time, Browne cared for Stibbs and his family, offering them food and lodge. In his deposition, Stibbs clearly stated that 'Silvester Browne did not favor nor partake with the Rebells, but behaved himself well and as became a dutifull subiecte'.[755] However, it also reported that Browne had recently wrote him a letter, stating that 'he was forced to turne to the Rebells, and to serve them' although he had saved as many English as he could.[756] The content of this letter was also documented in Stibbs's deposition, and Browne informed Stibbs of his brother's death at the hands of the rebels while he was absent. He emphasised that he was forced to join them but prays for peace, and he acknowledge that he was caught between his English and Irish loyalties, saying in one line: 'I feare I shall fall twixt twoe stooles'.[757] These conflicting loyalties reported by John Stibbs may be the reasons that Mary Browne detailed her husband's words against the Irish rebels. By claiming that her husband 'fell into a Passion' and called them 'You traiter[ous]y Rogues'[758], she affirmed her husband's loyalties to the king and before the commissioners.

In regard to emotions or feelings, this example also signalled once again that passion was considered an uncontrollable reaction in the 1641 depositions. In most the events that Stibbs documented, Browne was presented as someone who helped the English secretly while also maintaining a positive reputation with the Irish rebels. However, in this particular case, his words strongly opposed the Irish, and he clearly

---

[755] Deposition of John Stibbs, 21 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 204r.
[756] Deposition of John Stibbs, 21 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 204r.
[757] Deposition of John Stibbs, 21 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 204v-205r; For more on Browne see: G.D. Burtachaell, 'Tinnehinch Castle, Co. Carlow' in *The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, fifth series, vol. 2, no. 4 (Dec., 1892), p. 443.
[758] Deposition of Dame Mary Browne, 9 Dec. 1652, TCD, Ms 817, f. 220r.

expressed his disdain for them because he 'fell into a passion'. [759] Here passions seemed to override his attempt to hide his true feelings toward the English and the Irish.

If this deposition had omitted the term 'passion', the emotional aspect of Silvester's verbal response and his name-calling might have gone undetected. Therefore, other depositions containing name-calling may have more to reveal about emotions than at first consideration, even without the presence of a term like 'passion' or 'affection'. However, it was possible that an insult was enough to suggest the presence of an emotion or indicate that actions in that depositions were a passionate reaction, even if it did not record the specific word 'passion'. John Homes recounted in 1642 in Longford in which Irish rebels robbed him, threatened his life by drawing their skeins and setting them against his breast, and further 'beate his wife and spurned her'. [760] Witnessing these events, Homes questioned the rebels' authority and their reasons for such actions, to which they responded 'that they did it by the Kings authoritie, and had the Kings broade seale for soe doeinge'. [761] The rebels claimed the king's support, but alongside this report, Homes then recounted how the same rebels whipped him out of town, continuing to affirm that they were justified, as 'they were the Kings subiects' and that Homes and those with him 'were rogues'. [762]

In Home's deposition, perpetrators offered a formal or official justification or rational claiming the king's support, but during the actual act of physical violence, they used the insult 'rogue' as they drove the deponent out of town with whips. The inclusion of insults in Homes's account and the use of the rebels suggested the potential existence of an emotion, although there was no direct evidence of how Homes or the Irish rebels felt. This term may reflect the Irish rebels' fear, but perhaps, it represented their

---

[759] Deposition of Dame Mary Browne, 9 Dec. 1652, TCD, Ms 817, f. 220r.
[760] Deposition of John Homes, 31 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 150r.
[761] Deposition of John Homes, 31 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 150v.
[762] Deposition of John Homes, 31 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 150v.

resentment or hatred of the English. If this was the case, reports of speech found in the 1641 depositions could indicate an emotional component in an individual account. Just as Rosenwein argued the need to read 'between the lines' when studying emotion, the use of specific words or labels may be a trace or hint of an emotional component. While insults can communicate how people justified acts through politics, religion, and dehumanisation, perpetrators of verbal violence did not always speak because of a clear rationale and judgment. Instead, it was also driven by emotion.[763]

It was also possible that reason and emotion co-existed. For example, Martha Piggot's deposition referenced in chapter five documented how Irish rebels brutally murdered Piggot's husband. There appeared to be an element of reason behind this specific performance of violence. During a siege of the castle, Piggot's husband led the defence and therefore, after their victory, they targeted him specifically and purposefully. In one way, their violence against him signalled a clear change in power as they took control of his castle. Rebels also vocalised their view of him as outside of social, religious, and political expectations when they called him a 'puritan and a roundhead', two words that could justify violence by placing the victim in clear opposition to the king.[764] In this way, it labelled the victim a traitor and created a space for perpetrators to treat him like one.

However, in Piggot's deposition, this rational justification or motivation did not negate a possible emotional component. Perpetrators used the words 'puritan' and 'roundhead' in a highly emotional, or perhaps rather in a passionate way. The rebels celebrated and triumphed over the victim's dead body and continued to mutilate him as they rejoiced in their violence and his defeat. Their triumphing and celebration signalled

---

[763] Roger Petersen, *Understanding ethnic violence: fear, hatred, and resentment in twentieth-century eastern Europe* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 38.
[764] Deposition of Martha Piggot, 31 Oct. 1646, TCD, Ms 815, f. 376v.

that emotion played a part in their actions. His active leadership resistance to them during the siege may have rationally motivated their violence, but it did not negate the existence of emotion. In his work om ethnic conflict, David Horowitz argued that perpetrators could often act in 'lucid madness [rather] that as blind fury'.[765] Similarly, Piggot's death and subsequent mutilation was an act of reason paired with emotion. It was both a 'lucid' act with reasons and motivations behind it and was what might be considered a passionate reaction or 'madness'.

Fear, resentment, and hatred

According to Joanna Bourke, fear saturated history and was the most relentless emotion. This claim, along with David Lederer's analysis of fear within eyewitness testimonies from the Thirty Years War, suggested a need to explore fear in the 1641 depositions. The presence of fear became increasingly evident throughout the overall research of the words and speech in the 1641 depositions. The specific term 'fear' existed throughout the 1641 depositions; hundreds of individual accounts contained this word. The word 'afraid' also appeared in depositions and other words like 'fright', 'feared', 'overfrighted', and many others that need exploration. Various spellings of these terms will invariably expand the depositions that refer to these emotions and expressions. Specific focus on these depositions might reveal even deeper insight into individual concerns and driving factors of the 1641 rebellion. However, the study of language suggested that the emotion 'fear' was impactful on a broader level as well.[766]

The role and impact of fear is unclear, and some scholars have questioned if it acts as a generator of a crisis or if an already pre-existing crisis triggers it.[767] In the context of the outbreak of the 1641 rebellion, the overarching crisis may have created a heightened

---

[765] Donald Horowitz, *The deadly ethnic riot* (London, 2001), p. 124.
[766] TCD 1641 project website, (http://1641.tcd.ie/index.php).
[767] David Lederer, 'Fear of the Thirty Years War', p. 10.

fear of treasonous words. However, the laws in place prior to 1641 indicated that this fear already existed on some level. According to the political scientist Roger Petersen, fear, in general, is an instrumental emotion, as it prepares an individual to respond to a safety concern. It, therefore, produces actions that directly meet a pressing concern in the form of a threat.[768] With this in mind, fear may have been a central motivation for the regulation, reporting, and speaking of 'traitorous' and 'unfitting words'.[769] The commission's very instruction to record 'traiterous speech' reflected the fear of treason and the loss of power and authority.[770] Treasonous words presented a threat, particularly present due to the ensuing 1641 rebellion. Thus, fear played a motivating role in the specific instructions of the commission, as authorities recognised the power of words and feared their impact and further instigation of additional treasonous acts.

Fear also related to the discoveries in chapter three. Individuals across society understood the laws and punishments for speech. This awareness could create a fear of saying the wrong thing or even failing to properly report 'unfitting' words, as seen in chapter four's analysis of Nicholas Ardagh's case. Thus, staying quiet and not speaking 'traitorous' or 'unfitting words' may have been one way individual responded to the fear of words. As well, the active reporting of words also responded to fear of potential imprisonment, as those who failed to report could face the same fate as men like Nicholas Ardagh.[771]

Additionally, words of accusation presented an additional threat to the safety of an individual. Those targeted by words that accused them treasonous accusations through insults such as 'rebel', 'traitor', or even 'puritan', were likely frightened of the

---

[768] Petersen, *Understanding ethnic violence,* p. 19.
[769] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[770] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r; Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[771] Petersen, *Understanding ethnic violence,* p. 19.

consequences of being falsely accused.[772] This fear permeated all levels of society as even social superiors were threatened and harmed. The deposition of Henry Hones touched on this aspect and showed that the fear of the law was greater than social position or power. Henry Jones recorded the content of a book published that reported several instances of language and speech. In one part it reports how in Meath a man named Walter Nugent, 'vpbraiding an Irish protestant' about his religion, threatened him by saying that Protestants would soon hang upon crosses for their diabolical religion.[773] These threatening words spoke against the Protestant faith and suggested an overthrow of their power in Ireland. The deposition reported that

> The party to which this was spoken, fearing the power of the man durst not speake of it, only in private, yet being called vpon & examined Juridically vpon his oath, he deposed theis wordes & being demanded whether the words were in Hiberniam or in Hibernia.[774]

The witness hesitated to report Nugent's speech, and the deposition explicitly cited his fear of Nugent because of his social status. Nugent was the eldest son of Walter Nugent Esquire, who was a 'man of great fortunes'.[775] However, the witness's fear of the law overrode his concern for Nugent's power. When called upon to testify under legal examination, he reported Nugent's words. Eventually, 'Nugent was sent for & Committed to the Castle & remained in long durance'.[776] His social standing could not permanently deter this man from reporting him. In this way, the laws against speech generated anxiety among all levels of society and for various reasons. Thus, the control, reporting, and punishment of words and speeches created an environment of fear.

---

[772] See Chapter three, pp 86-93; Petition of Nicholas Ardagh, 18 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 226r.
[773] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 001v.
[774] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 001v.
[775] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 001v.
[776] Deposition of Henry Jones, 3 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 001v.

Outside of legal consequences, words challenged honour and reputation, a central component of society evident in chapter four. A spoken word challenged the status of individuals and their families, which in turn could generate the fear of speech due to its potential harm on status and reputation. The importance of reputation, as seen earlier, emphasised the potential for heightened emotions at play. In fact, Tait argued that the attribution of status created a common anxiety in Ireland's seventeenth century.[777] Therefore, being named a 'whore' or a 'rogue' carried an element of fear; one of being a victim of detraction and unfavourable representation.[778]

Finally, while fear acted as a response to a threat, there were different emotions created by the suppression, punishment, and social ramifications surrounding speech. Being forced to remain silent both by the law and society could generate feelings derived from domination, resistance, and subordination. Such an argument appeared in Andy Wood's article in which he argued that limited freedoms could create feelings of anger, humiliation, repression, and frustration. When forced into subordination or oppression due to social structures, people experienced an emotional reaction. In regard to language or speech, Wood argued that being forced to stay silent or 'bite one's lip' could foster resentment and frustration.[779] This idea resonated with the environment of seventeenth-century Ireland; the control of words by various laws and social expectations suppressed an individual or particular group's ability to express thoughts or emotions, and therefore, forced them to keep silent. While fear may have encouraged one to remain silent to avoid punishment or social repercussions, this forced silence may have generated other emotions later brought forward in the 1641 rebellion when individuals could now speak

---

[777] Tait, 'Society', p. 273.
[778] Haberman, *Staging slander,* p. 1.
[779] Andy Wood, 'Fear, hatred and the hidden injuries of class in early modern England' in *Journal of Social History*, xxxix, 3, (Spring, 2006), pp 807-8.

the 'passionate words' or 'distempered speeches'[780] that they had been unable to vocalise previously. This was most evident in the deposition of Stephen Love. While chapter three considered this deposition from a perspective of power, an emotional element also existed in it. Here, the deponent reported how Irish rebels dared to name their English victims as 'traitors'.

In this account, the Irish rebels explained to the English why they spoke these words by saying that 'you formerly called vs rebells but nowe we may be bould to call you traitors'.[781] They remembered the words previously used against them by their now-victims, and due to a shift in power, they could now respond. According to Roger Petersen, hatred is an emotion that responds to a historical grievance, while resentment addresses discrepancies of status or self-esteem.[782] In this deposition, resentment and hatred may have encouraged the Irish rebels' words. Their memory of past grievances suggested the existence of hatred, whereas the focus on the specific term 'rebel' which challenged their status as loyal subjects to the king hinted at resentment. Furthermore, the rebels specifically remembered a time when they could not respond to verbal abuse against them. They carried this offence within their minds, unable to reciprocate until a power shift occurred. Now with power, the rebels released their suppressed feelings and returned the offence.

Conclusion

Overall, emotions played a crucial role in the events as recorded in the 1641 depositions. This chapter added a component and nuance to the argument of chapter five concerning motivations for violence. Insults could help rationalise physical abuse, but they also pointed towards an emotional or passionate reaction. It also argued that individual insults

---

[780] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 005r.
[781] Deposition of Stephen Love, 3 Feb. 1644, TCD, Ms 828, f. 127r.
[782] Petersen, *Understanding ethnic violence,* p. 19.

might reveal more about emotion than historians may recognise immediately, which the following chapter will expand. However, this chapter only touched upon emotion in the 1641 depositions, and there is more work to be done. Rosenwein proposed that people live in 'emotional communities', and each community has its own particular method or understanding of emotions and their expression and value.

The 1641 depositions were just one piece to uncovering these emotions in Ireland. As well, the complexities of seventeenth-century Ireland reflected Rosenwein's additional argument that different communities can exist within the same time and place, and that the complexities of emotional communities are vast, as individuals can move 'continually from one such community to another'.[783] Therefore, the intricacies of seventeenth-century Irish society has much more to explore, considering the emotional communities of the Irish, the English, Catholics, Protestants individually, but also interlinked. As well, there are potentially many more individual emotions to consider in greater detail, including grief, joy, love, loyalty, and surprise. Beyond language, there were the physical expressions of emotion that hinted at these emotions. It was clear the 1641 depositions have more to say about feeling, emotion, and passions, and it is hoped that this chapter provided not only a consideration of words and emotions in the 1641 depositions but also some helpful insights for further research and discussions concerning Ireland's history of emotion.

---

[783] Rosenwein, 'Worrying about emotions', p. 842.

Chapter seven: 'English dog' and making-animal in the 1641 depositions

On 22 April 1642, Richard Hooke of Queen's County reported how Irish rebels robbed and murdered English men and women and how 'their common language was English doggs'.[784] On that same day in 1642, David Buck testified that Irish rebels used this insult against himself and others three separate times during a violent and threatening episode.[785] Similarly in 1643, Thomas Fleetwood of Westmeath noted the frequent use of the insult 'dog' by the Irish rebels. He reported that 'the vsuall terme or title theis Rebells in generall gave vs, Being base English doggs Parliament Rogues & pottage bellied rogues'.[786] These three accounts suggested that 'dog' was a common term in the 1641 depositions, and this chapter will explore this indication in-depth. It will address the reason why it was such a common insult and its role in the events of Ireland's 1641 rebellion.

This chapter will begin with an analysis of the relevant scholarship concerning animal studies and the human-animal relationship. This chapter will then analyse the insult 'dog' and other 'making-animal'[787] terms in the 1641 depositions. The term 'dog' was by far the most common 'making-animal' insult used in the 1641 depositions; therefore, this chapter will look at its frequency, uses, and victims across the years and the counties of Ireland. This chapter will then explore the specific relationship between animals and violence in the 1641 depositions. It will also address the different and similar ways animals and humans faced violence. Additionally, it will compare 'dog ' to the other 'making-animal' terms in the depositions, and it will ask if perpetrators similarly used the insults 'cattle' and 'pig' to justify or excuse their violence toward their victims.

---

[784] Deposition of Richard Hooke, 12 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, f. 214r.
[785] Deposition of Dauid Buck, 12 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, f. 217r.
[786] Deposition of Thomas Fleetwood, 22 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 039r-039v.
[787] Erica Fudge, *Brutal reasoning: animals, rationality, and humanity in early modern England* (Cornell, 2006), p. 70.

Furthermore, 'dog' was the most common animal insult used against English victims despite violence against multiple animals. Therefore, this chapter will also analyse the particular meaning and depiction of 'dog' in the 1641 depositions, and it will place this into a broader early modern and biblical context. This chapter will also explore why Irish rebels used 'dog' against their victims, but the deponents and commissioners never labelled the Irish as 'dogs' in the depositions. Here, this chapter will consider how the use of 'dog' reflected perpetrators' attempts to justify their violence, but also how it revealed the emotions of the Irish rebels during the events recorded in the 1641 depositions.

Finally, this chapter will demonstrate that despite the violent and emotional use of 'dog', there were worse things one could be called in the 1641 depositions, including 'heretics' and 'Irish women'. Overall, this chapter will specifically consider the significance of the insult 'dog', and it will investigate its role as a tool used to dehumanise victims and justify violence. As well, this analysis will demonstrate the need to explore individual words and insults in depth. An analysis of even a single word or phrase can open new questions for research. Furthermore, this analysis will also reveal the interconnectivity of previous chapters' topics. Law, power, honour, gender, violence, and emotion all played a role in the use and meaning of 'dog'. With one insult, each of these topics emerged, some more prevalent than others, but all present.

The importance of studying animals in the 1641 depositions

Animal studies encompasses many topics and draws upon several disciplines. In general, this field evaluates ideas and concepts through the lens of human-animal relationships. Animal studies asks what it means to be human through the polarisation of what it means to be animal. This was precisely the aim of Joanna Bourke's *What it means to be human: historical reflections from the 1800s to the present*, which explored concepts of humanity

and animality. It showed how these concepts changed dependent on circumstance and the current legal and political concepts of personhood. Such broad ideas also appeared in Linda Kalof's *Looking at animals in human history,* which provided a comprehensive analysis of animals and explored how gender, race, and class shaped cultural representations of animals and humans.[788]

Concerning early modern historiography, research has focused heavily on cattle, an animal that directly related to major historical ideas of colonisation, culture, economics, politics, and extensive Atlantic history. This focus on cattle and livestock appeared throughout various historiographies.[789] Irish historiography has engaged with this topic from an economic perspective. For example, Michael O'Connell, Fergus Kelly and James McAdam published a collection of thirteen chapters on ancient and modern Irish cattle. This book analysed cattle's significant role in many aspects of Ireland's history, which started almost six thousand years ago and lasts to this day.[790] However, this work did not engage with questions of the human-animal relationship, and the need to explore cattle as well as other animals in Irish history remains.

Additionally, historians argued the importance of cattle but also other animals. Abel Alves showed this in his research on human and animal interaction in Spain across five centuries.[791] Similarly, Donna Haraway's *The companion species manifesto: dogs, people, and significant otherness* demonstrated the importance of studying animals

---

[788] Joanna Bourke, *What it means to be human: historical reflections from the 1800s to the present* (Berkeley, 2011); Linda Kalof, *Looking at animals in human history* (London, 2007).

[789] Martha Few and Tortorici Zeb (eds.) *Centering animals in Latin American history* (Duke, 2013); Pierre Serna, *Comme des bêtes: Histoire politique de l'animal en révolution* (Paris, 2017); Virginia Anderson, *Creatures of empire: how domestic animals transformed early America* (New York, 2004).

[790] Michael O'Connell, Fergus Kelly and James H. McAdam (eds.) *Cattle in ancient and modern Ireland: farming practices, environment and economy* (Cambridge, 2016); See also: Donald Woodward, 'A comparative study of the Irish and Scottish livestock trades in the seventeenth century' in L. M. Cullen and Thomas Christopher Smout (eds.) *Comparative aspects of Scottish and Irish economic and social history, 1600-1900* (Edinburgh**, 1977),** pp 147-64; Donald Woodward, 'The Anglo-Irish livestock trade of the seventeenth century' in *Irish Historical Studies*, xviii, 72 (**1973),** pp 489-523.

[791] Abel Alves, *The animals of Spain: an introduction to imperial perceptions and human interaction with other animals, 1492–1826.* (Boston, 2011).

beyond a focus on their economic value. Haraway argued that beyond economics, the study of animals can help historians better understand how a society perceived humanity and personhood. For instance, according to Haraway, the adjacency of cattle trade and the commodification of slaves was central to Atlantic economies, but it also raised questions about concepts of property, race, gender, species, and humanity.[792]

In her chapter, 'What was it like to be a cow? history and animal studies', Erica Fudge argued that although most studies within this field focused on cattle, scholars must also consider other animals. Furthermore, historians also must view animals as active historical agents rather than passive subjects and explore what active role animals played in shaping history.[793] Thus, studying animals for economics or trade differed from the purpose of the particular field of animal studies, which specifically considers questions of animality and humanity. Animals appeared throughout the 1641 depositions, and deponents often included them in a list of lost property, particularly cattle. However, historians like Haraway, Alves, and Fudge encouraged deeper research of animals beyond their value as property. The presence of animals in the 1641 depositions indicated that they may hold value to our understanding of the 1641 rebellion beyond their role as property. To understand this, there remains much work to be done. However, this chapter will begin to answer this question while focusing on how individuals used animals, particularly dogs, to insult or speak 'unfitting words'.

According to philosopher David Smith, societies often view dogs in one of two opposing ways: as friends or as disgusting creatures.[794] More specifically, in the early modern period, dogs could be viewed as both a source of affection or affliction, nobility

---

[792] Donna Haraway, *The companion species manifesto: dogs, people, and significant otherness* (Chicago, 2003).

[793] Erica Fudge, 'What was it like to be a cow? History and animal studies' in Linda Kalof (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of animal studies* (Oxford, 2017), p. 260.

[794] Smith, *Less than human,* p. 253.

or degradation.[795] Lucinda Cole wrote of the vital role canines played in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and she argued that historians must place dogs into analyses of early modern societies. Early modern societies believed that dogs could quickly turn against humans, changing from companion to carnivore. Dogs could be seen as noble and helpful to humans, but also as dangerous and unclean. Also, societies believed that dogs and humans shared common traits and similar appetites in the late seventeenth century and similar forms of affectionate expression and intellectual capabilities. Through this similarity, dogs, in some way, represented the dangerous capability of humanity to shift from noble actions to dishonourable or violent ones.[796]

Early modern England, in particular, had a complex history and relationship with dogs. By the end of the sixteenth century, England had a unique relationship with dogs, and as England's national identity formed, it was deeply connected to dogs, something it was famous for across Europe.[797] Keith Thomas explored the complexities of early modern England's view of dogs. Lapdogs and hounds were the most favoured of animals and were highly prized gifts, and working dogs were highly valuable for work and acted as sheepdogs, security from thieves, or as labourers pulling carts and sleds. Thomas also argued that different dogs held different social status dependent on their owners, and the view of a dog also varied depending on the breed and classification. A hound was presented as noble and faithful, while mongrels (or curs) were portrayed as filthy, lecherous and incestuous. John Caius's late sixteenth-century book, *Of Englishe dogges* classified each type of dog into three groups: 'gentle', 'homely', and 'currish' dogs. These groups directly represented class distinctions. Aristocrats owned 'gentle' dogs,

---

[795] Lucinda Cole, *Imperfect creatures: vermin, literature, and the sciences of life, 1600-1740* (Michigan, 2016), p. 114.
[796] Cole, *Imperfect creatures,* p. 114.
[797] Ian MacInnes, '*Mastiffs and spaniels: gender and nation in the English dog' in Textual Practice,* xvii, 1 (2003), p. 21.

while 'homely' dogs were for work and practical use. 'Currish' dogs were the lowest

form and were 'mean-spirited, base, ignoble' animals.[798] While 'gentle' dogs were

respected, there was no affection for working dogs, which the English considered them

uncontrollable and unpredictable creatures, especially when they roamed free and became

a notorious hazard and threat to humans.[799]

The one exception to the negative perception of a 'working dog' was the mastiff.

Mastiffs were one of two kinds of dogs particularly celebrated by the English. In the

sixteenth and seventeenth century, the aristocracy cultivated this breed, which had once

been considered a cur or mongrel. By the seventeenth century, the mastiff's strength and

courage were evident and celebrated as a product of English soil. However, it could still

be seen as lazy or stupid, and it was considered a 'homely' dog as opposed to spaniels, a

celebrated 'gentle' breed in England.[800] England also celebrated spaniels in particular;

however, they did not appear in the 1641 depositions, and therefore, this chapter will not

address this particular breed of dog. Thus, in each source and context, the specific type of

dog held relevance, as well as the dog's social position in relation to their master, or lack

thereof. The 1641 depositions rarely documented the specific breed or classification of

the dogs recorded. However, mastiffs appeared several times, and this chapter will

consider this later.[801]

Dogs also had a reputation of being unclean, greedy, and barbaric animals that

existed outside Christianity.[802] They were viewed as enemies of God and the Christian

community and represented gluttony, death, and sin. In the context of Christian

---

[798] MacInnes, 'Mastiffs and spaniels', p. 31; Oxford English Dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/46114?redirectedFrom=currish#eid, accessed 22 Dec. 2020.

[799] Keith Thomas, *Man and the natural world: changing attitudes in England, 1500-1800* (London, 1984), pp 102, 105.

[800] MacInnes, 'Mastiffs and spaniels', p. 31.

[801] Thomas, *Man and the natural world,* pp 102, 105.

[802] Smith, *Less than human,* p. 253.

scriptures, a dog metaphorically represented worthlessness and offence. This Christian

element was clear throughout scripture, which referred to the danger and impurity of

dogs. The writings of Paul depicted them as creatures to fear and labelled evil doers as

dogs. For instance, Paul instructed Christians in Philippi to 'beware of the dogs, beware

of the evildoers! Beware of the mutilation!'[803]

This insult 'dog' was a particularly extreme verbal attack or label used against

another person, and individuals even used it to label themselves and articulate their

humility and unworthiness before God as in the scripture verse: 'what is your servant, that

you should notice a dead dog like me'.[804] Furthermore, the Book of Revelation

specifically stated that dogs would be excluded from Christian salvation and the New

Jerusalem at the New Resurrection.[805]

In the early modern period, dogs were often considered scavengers feeding upon

carrion, human corpses, and their own vomit. Therefore, they were 'beasts [that] existed

outside the terms of moral reference'.[806] John Walter acknowledged this scriptural

element as well. He wrote that early modern society viewed dogs as outside of

Christianity, and he suggested that the use of the insult 'dog' in the 1641 depositions

reflected this idea. The link with Christianity and morality played a part in the use of this

particular insult, and this chapter will explore this idea more deeply and analyse several

depositions which presented dogs as unclean and non-Christian.[807]

Furthermore, dogs were counted among the most dangerous animals in the early

modern period and perhaps were also the most feared of all. Much of this fear was the

result of a dog's common association with death and plague. For instance, during the

---

[803] Philippians 3:2; Hartdegen and Ceroke, *The new American bible,* p. 1289.
[804] Berković, 'Beware of dogs', p. 79.
[805] Thomas, *Man and the natural,* pp 104-5.
[806] Thomas, *Man and the Natural World,* p. 148.
[807] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 138.

English plague of 1665, over 40,000 dogs were executed to eliminate the spread of the disease.[808] Beyond their association with plague, fear of dogs in the early modern period stemmed from this animal's nature, untrustworthiness, complexity, and unpredictability. As well, Mark Jenner argued that English society was acutely aware of the danger of free-roaming dogs. For example, in May 1636 in London, almost 4,000 dogs were exterminated because society viewed them as 'visible sources of disorder, out of control and unsanitary…without a master and not visibly and physically fixed in a social relationship'.[809] Therefore, fear was another element that this chapter will consider.

The study of this insult, in particular, can also reveal how deponents and commissioners viewed the animal and how perpetrators used it to dehumanise and victimise the English settlers. Interestingly, Erica Fudge argued that the nature of the human-animal relationship can sometimes allow perpetrators to dehumanise their victims and reduce them to animals. Fudge referred to this as 'making-animal' of a person. Perpetrators could dehumanise them and justify violence against them by equating a person to an animal. In particular, the work of philosopher David Smith informed Fudge's arguments. [810]

According to Smith's work, *Less than human*, acts of dehumanisation serve as a signal of a victim's exclusion from humanity. In this way, it can provide perpetrators with the opportunity to overcome or negate any moral hesitation concerning violence upon another person or group of people. Dehumanisation was common throughout the 1641 depositions, and John Walter and Nicholas Canny argued this prevalence. For example, they considered how the act of stripping dehumanised victims. Degrading acts such as

---

[808] Cole, *Imperfect creatures,* pp 21-2.

[809] Mark Jenner, 'The great dog massacre' in William Naphy and Penny Roberts, *Fear in early modern society* (Manchester, 1997), p. 56.

[810] Fudge, *Brutal reasoning,* p. 70.

stripping, treating humans as animals, and the naming individuals as animals degraded and dehumanised victims in the violent acts perpetrated during the 1641 rebellion.[811]

Smith noted the particular use of insults and name-calling as a form of dehumanising another group. More specifically, across cultures, animal insults, such as 'dogs' and 'cockroaches', could exclude them from humanity and therefore from humane treatment. Smith argued that such language was commonly used throughout various periods and societies, often associated with genocide.[812]

Anthropologist Anton Blok argued a similar point. He claimed that perpetrators could attempt to remove the immorality of killing another through their words, which stripped them of their humanity. He explored the universality of this method across many cultures and societies. Words can reduce individuals and groups to something less than human and worthy of harm, enslavement, or even extermination. Ultimately, the ideas of animal studies, historians, philosophers, and anthropologists only suggested potential ways animal insults may have been used in the 1641 depositions and the harm of individuals in the rebellion. The insult 'dog' frequently appeared in moments of extreme violence as reported by deponents. Therefore, this chapter will explore how the relationship between animals, specifically dogs, helped perpetrators in the 1641 rebellion justify their violent acts.[813]

The insult 'dog' in the 1641 depositions

'Dog' was the most common animal insult found in the 1641 depositions, and it was used across the counties and years of Ireland during the 1641 rebellion. 'Dog' appeared in at least twenty-two counties and across the years spanning from the early 1640s in the 1650s. However, 'dog' was not the only 'making-animal' insult. Occasionally, other

---

[811] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 137; Canny, *Making Ireland British*, pp 542– 3; Canny, 'What really happened', p. 32.
[812] Smith, *Less than human*, p. 251.
[813] Blok, *Honour and violence*, p. 109.

animal terms were used to name-call or label people. For instance, Irish rebels occasionally called the English pigs as in the 1645 deposition of Richard Tailor from Kings County. Tailor reported how a priest called a dead English woman an 'English Sowe' as he ordered a young boy to remove her stockings and leave her body and others to be devoured by 'Crowes & Ravenous creatures'.[814]

However, such examples were rare in the 1641 depositions. The insult 'fox' was even rarer, and only the 1644 deposition of Captain John Perkins recorded it. According to this account, Phelim O'Neill came to Perkins's house searching for him, and when he found him, O'Neill 'smileinge saide, a yow old foxe haue I caught yow I am glader to haue yow then my Lo: Cawlfield, whome I haue left safe enough att Charelemount'.[815] Although no other account of 'fox' appeared in the 1641 depositions, this example suggested that how society viewed the actual animal influenced how an individual used it as an insult. In some way, his search for Perkins might be understood as a hunt, and his use of 'fox' perhaps reflected how the actual animal was a hunted animal.

The use of 'wolf' was also considered. In the 1641 depositions, 'wolf' labelled a person in only two accounts, and in both cases, the English deponents (not the Irish rebels) used this word to describe the Irish rebels in their reports and not as a direct insult. In Armagh 1643, Joan Constable referred to the rebels as 'merciles wolves' drowning women and children after murdering 'their respective husbands & fathers & all their male frends'.[816] While in 1642, John Stibbs referred to his 'roguish enemy' as a 'turke and wolfe'.[817]

These depositions reflected how the image of the wolf was often associated with Ireland and the Irish people. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this association

---

[814] Deposition of Richard Tailor, 21 Oct. 1645, TCD, Ms 814, f. 260v.
[815] Information of Captain John Perkins, 8 Mar. 1644, TCD, Ms 839, f. 040r.
[816] Deposition of Joane Constable, 6 June 1643, TCD, Ms 836, f. 88r.
[817] Deposition of John Stibbs, 21 Nov. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 204v.

appeared in English writings, poetry, and verse about Ireland. For example, Edmund
Spenser referred to Ireland as a land that 'this day with Wolves and Thieves abound' in
The faerie queen. As well, the 1600 verse England's *Hope against Irish hate*, denigrated
and ridiculed the Irish and called them venomous toads, insinuating serpents, traitorous
outlaws, blind reprobates, dunghill gnats, and ravening wolves.[818] Gervase Markham in
The new metamorphosis also referred to the Irish kern or fighting man as wolves, which
was prevalent in English verse. Markham's poem described a brutal Ireland, and his poem
told the story of an Irish town so wicked and immoral that it was considered an Irish
Sodom. This town became submerged in a lake's waters, and all its inhabitants were
transformed into wolves. In Markham's version of the story, these wolves could transform
back into humans (as kern) when they wanted to prey upon the English settlers in
Ireland.[819]

Ultimately, the two examples of 'wolf' found in the 1641 depositions labelled the
Irish rebels in the 1641 depositions, which reflected the wider image of the Irish from an
English perspective. This terminology differed from 'making-animal' insults that the Irish
used against their English victims. It was a term deponents and commissioners used to
label the Irish in the reports, not one that was used to insult a person directly in the
moment. This was similar to the English deponents who labelled the Irish 'villains' or
'viragos' as explored in chapter four.

Ultimately, 'dog' was by far the most common and versatile although other
'making-animals' insults existed in the depositions. In some accounts, the label 'dog'
stood alone as the single insult recorded in an individual manuscript. It also appeared
alongside general reports of other words and speeches such as 'scandalls and opprobrious

---

[818] Andrew Carpenter, *Verse in English from Tudor and Stuart Ireland* (Cork, 2003), pp 14, 96.
[819] Carpenter, *Verse in English,* p. 109.

language'[820] or 'vile language'.[821] Other words and insults were only generally reported in categories like 'ill tearmes'[822], but deponents specifically remembered, and commissioners explicitly included 'dog'. This specific record of 'dog' signified its importance and heightened its meaning. This insult was also recorded alongside a range of other specific insults, which attached some political, religious, and social significance to the word. Some of these words included 'parliament', 'puritan', 'rascal', 'rogue', 'jade', 'heretic', and 'no Christian'.

The insult 'dog' targeted individuals as well as small and large groups of people. It could be directed towards men, women, or children, although the majority of instances targeted men or whole groups of people. However, despite this majority, Irish rebels also called women 'dogs'. For example, in the deposition of Elizabeth Shore & Ellen Burden of Cork in 1641, women reported of an Irish footboy named John O'Daly. He 'reproachfully vsed the said Elizabeth calling her (amonge many other vile speeches) *English dogg* & shee further deposeth vpon oath that James Goggin a retainer to the said Castle where Tirry lay, did abuse the said Elizabeth with vile language'.[823] Likewise, Ellen Burden deposed that 'William Tirry (amonge other ill Tearmes) called the said Elizabeth & all her children English dogs'.[824] Additionally, the particularly gendered term of 'dog', 'bitch', appeared in one deposition. In the 1646 deposition of Anthony Stephens, the deponent recounted how Irish rebels named men 'yong English dogs' and the women as 'the Bitches their mothers'.[825]

'Dog' was also used against English women in the 1644 deposition of John and Jane Sheeley and Margret Rollright. In this report, the deponents recounted how English

---

[820] Deposition of John and Jane Sheeley and Margret Rowleright, 25 Apr. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 169r.
[821] Deposition of Elizabeth Shore and Ellen Burden, 5 May 1642, TCD, Ms 823, f. 182r.
[822]
[823] Deposition of Elizabeth Shore and Ellen Burden, 5 May 1642, TCD, Ms 823, f. 182r.
[824] Deposition of Elizabeth Shore and Ellen Burden, 5 May 1642, TCD, Ms 823, f. 182r.
[825] Deposition of Anthony Stephens, 25 June 1646, TCD, Ms 830, f. 43r.

Protestants were 'subiect euery day to their scandalls and oprobrious words as English dogs'.[826] The English were called 'English dogs' three separate times in this deposition (once again illustrating its frequent use). On one occasion, it was specifically used against English women, when an Irish rebel threatened them by saying 'you English Jades and dogs I will cut your throats'.[827]

In the depositions, the word 'jade' also appeared alongside particularly violent moments. For example, in the 1644 deposition of Julian Johnson, the deponent recalled how a woman was named an 'English jade' as she was burned alive.[828] However, 'jade' was an uncommon term and only appeared five times in the 1641 depositions. It was paired with 'English dog' twice; therefore, this connection was interesting. Although it was a rare insult, it re-enforced the sexual focus of insults against women as seen in chapter four. 'Jade' was 'applied to a woman similar to terms such as minx which referenced 'a lewd or wanton woman; (also) a prostitute; a mistress'.[829]

Therefore, the use of these two insults together (in Rollright's deposition) dehumanised the women while also attacking them based on sexual morality. Interestingly, 'jade' was also associated with ill-tempered horses in the seventeenth century; however, this word was only used as a label for English women in the 1641 depositions.[830] Still, it was interesting that a word which also referred to horses in other contexts was paired with a clear 'making-animal' insult. In some way, it may have also emphasised the 'animality' of the victim. Overall, men and women, young and old, faced

---

[826] Deposition of John and Jane Sheeley and Margret Rowleright, 25 Apr. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 169r.
[827] Deposition of John and Jane Sheeley and Margret Rowleright, 25 Apr. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 169r.
[828] Deposition of Julian Johnson, 8 Feb. 1644, TCD, Ms 30, f. 140v.
[829] Oxford English dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/100606?rskey=6fonZP&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid, accessed 3 July 2020.
[830] Oxford English dictionary, https://www-oed-com.elib.tcd.ie/view/Entry/100606?rskey=6fonZP&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid, accessed 3 July 2020.

dehumanising language and 'making-animal' insults, particularly 'dog', in the 1641 depositions.

View and treatment of animals in the 1641 depositions

'Dog' was the most common 'making-animal' insult in the 1641 depositions over any other animal, and to explain this, the view of animals and the human-animal relationships in the 1641 depositions needed consideration. According to anthropologist Mary Douglas, scholars must explore 'the animal' through the specific culture and society in which it existed, and in the 1641 depositions, dogs, pigs, and cattle, all faced various forms of mistreatment, physical harm, and violent death.[831] Numerous depositions referred to the killing of beasts and animals. For instance, the 1642 deposition of Robert Maxwell from Armagh documented particularly cruel treatment of animals. Maxwell recounted how

> Att the seige of Augher they would not kill any English beast, and then eate it but they cut Collops out of them being alive, letting them there roare till they had noe more flesh vpon theire backs so that sometimes a beast, would live or 2 or 3 days togeather in that torment The like they did.[832]

Beyond such a graphic account, many other depositions reported the killing of animals. The 1652 deposition of Robert Clay documented how an Irish rebel named James Mc Thomas and his company violently killed an 'English heiffer'.[833]

In numerous reports, Irish rebels mistreated animals because of their relationship with people, specifically the English. For example, Walter Bourke and Richard Cleybrooke both reported how rebels targeted 'English beasts' and those of 'English breed'.[834] An emotional element was also present. Their hatred towards the animal was

---

[831] Mary Douglas, *Implicit meanings: Essays in anthropology* (Routledge, 1975)*,* p. 5*;* Thomas, *Man and the natural world,* p. 41; Leerssen, 'Wildness, wilderness', p. 26.
[832] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 09r.
[833] Deposition of Robert Clay, 22 June 1642, TCD, Ms 820, f. 132r.
[834] Deposition of Walter Bourke, undated, TCD, MS 831, f. 169r; Examination of Richard Cleybrooke, 22 Nov. 1641, TCD, Ms 818, f. 059r.

paralleled with their contempt for the English. In Walter Bourke's undated deposition from Mayo, Bourke stated 'that such was the hatred of the Irish of the County of Mayo unto the English that they could not endure to see a beast of English breed to live amongst them'.[835] Therefore, they killed the cattle and left no 'beast liveing that they took from English or Protestant'.[836] Through these moments in the 1641 depositions, historians can ask many questions about the human-animal relationship in 1640s Ireland.

Similarly, the deposition of Andrew Adaire from Mayo in 1643 recorded how Irish rebels killed every person they encountered and killed 'all the English breed of cattle'.[837] Adaire also recalled how they would sometimes 'jeeringly' say that they killed the cattle because they spoke English.[838] Here, this statement highlighted a contempt for the English language and the animals associated with this language. This contempt for animals 'speaking English' was more than a light jest. It carried serious consequences. For instance, in Mayo in 1644, Thomas Johnson reported how Irish rebels 'in meere hatred and derision of the English & their very Cattle, & contempt *& derision* of the English Lawes' brought 'the English breed of Cattle' before a scornful judge who condemned them because they looked 'as if they could speake English'.[839] This statement threatened the cattle, but it also degraded or ridiculed the English people, their laws, and their language. The animals were then given a book to read and when 'they stood mute & could not read *hee* would *& did* pronounce Judgment and Centence of death against them'.[840] The deponent Walter Bourke reported a similar trial from which 'with all derision and scoffing, cattle and sheep of English straine' were tried and slaughtered.[841]

---

[835] Deposition of Walter Bourke, undated, TCD, MS 831, f. 169r.
[836] Deposition of Walter Bourke, undated, TCD, MS 831, f. 169r.
[837] Deposition of Andrew Adaire, 9 Jan. 1643, TCD, Ms 831, f. 174v.
[838] Deposition of Andrew Adaire, 9 Jan. 1643, TCD, Ms 831, f. 174v.
[839] Deposition of Thomas Johnson, 14 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 831, f. 190v.
[840] Deposition of Thomas Johnson, 14 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 831 ff. 190v-191r.
[841] Deposition of Walter Bourke, undated, TCD, MS 831, f. 169r.

In these depositions, animals were victims of violence due to human relationships and structure, but more importantly, the lines between human and animal were blurred in these accounts.

Animals faced violence because of their relationship with humans, and likewise, people suffered because they were treated like animals. In the 1641 depositions, victims and witnesses often spoke of the violence they or others faced as that worthy of animals. In his 1642 deposition, Robert Maxwell told how English settlers found a young man in a field where Irish rebels had left him after breaking his back. They found him suffering and 'haveing like a beast eaten all the grasse round about him'.[842] Maxwell also observed how the Irish rebels did not kill him but instead 'removed him to a place of better pasture'.[843]

Other deponents reported how people were driven like cattle, sheep, and pigs, tied up as dogs, and abused, as one would treat an animal. In 1642, Ellen Matchet reported how 'great numbers of poore protestants were by the Rebells driuen like heardes of sheepe'[844] and killed, while Mary Corne in 1643 in Kilkenny reported how her husband and others were driven 'like a herd of Cattle through a River'.[845] Significantly, John Temple chose to publish Corne's report and wrote 'that Mary the wiffe of Raph Corne deposeth, that 180 English were taken by the Irish, and driven like Cattle from Castle-Cumber to Athy'.[846] The very act of treating victims as animals, by herding people as one does cattle or drives hogs or sheep, distanced the victim from the perpetrator and 'allowed' for greater aggression towards them as argued by John Walter.[847]

---

[842] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 010r.
[843] Deposition of Robert Maxwell, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, f. 010r.
[844] Deposition of Ellen Matchett, 3 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 059r.
[845] Deposition of Mary Corne, 26 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 812, f. 212r.
[846] Temple, *The Irish rebellion,* p. 162.
[847] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 138.

The specific treatment of victims as dogs appeared in the undated deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, which reported how Irish rebels stripped Stockdale of her clothes despite 'it being frosty weather'.[848] They drove her through a deep river and 'soe vyolently, & in most disgracefull manner carried her' to her own house in Breaghmore. Once there, they 'tied her in noe better a place then a dogkennell or outhowse, where shee & her husband before vsually kept their dogs'.[849] Stockdale reported how her suffering continued for fifteen days during which time 'they gave her onely course bread & water'[850] and frequently took her before the gallows threatening to hang her. Similarly, Robert Branthwaite referred to the mistreatment of English victims as behaviour that was typically reserved for dogs. He reported that all victims who had been hanged and stabbed were 'throwne like doggs, into pitts and ditches'.[851] And in 1652, Elizabeth Lawless recounted how '*hempen Cord* from a grey hownds neck'[852] was tied around Englishman before he was dragged by the Irish and hanged.

Beyond the victims' or deponents' perspectives, perpetrators also consciously considered the human-animal relationship when performing violence against another person. In Thomas Johnson's deposition, an Irish rebel argued that 'it was *as* lawfull for them to kill this deponent as to kill a sheepe or a dogg'.[853] This was one indication that both victims and perpetrators understood the kind of violence reserved for animals as different from human violence. More specifically, perpetrators drew upon the value of a dog to denote their feelings towards victims and to communicate an indifference towards another human being's suffering.

---

[848] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093r.
[849] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093r.
[850] Deposition of Suzanna Stockdale, undated, TCD, Ms 810, f. 093r.
[851] Deposition of Robert Branthwaite, 30 Mar. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, ff. 153r-153v.
[852] Examination of Elizabeth Lawles, 29 Apr. 1652, TCD, Ms 812, f. 318r.
[853] Deposition of Thomas Johnson, 14 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 831 f. 191r; Temple, *Irish rebellion,* p. 85.

For example, John Glencorse reported in 1653 how an Irish man named Bryan McElhinny verbally threatened him saying that he 'would not care more to kill you then a dogge, to which this examinat sayeth he replyed It may be you haue killed ~~more~~ many of my Country'.[854] This indifference could be used to validate or excuse cruelty towards women and children as well. For example, the rebels compared the killing of children to the killing of puppies, seen in Margrett Erwin's 1653 examination in Antrim, where one Irish man swore that 'he did not care for the killing of any Englishmen or children more then whelpes'.[855]

It was important to acknowledge a distinction between dogs and cattle, two animals that frequently appeared in the depositions. There were clear distinctions between these animals. First, only cattle or sheep stood trial in the 1641 depositions. No evidence existed of other animals (including dogs) being placed on trial. Second, cattle faced more violence from Irish rebels than any other animal. The Irish rebels' particular focus on cattle was likely related to their economic value. Most references to cattle in the 1641 depositions referred to them as lost property and to their economic value. They represented wealth and land, and therefore, they personified English dominance, plantation, agriculture, and even greed to the Irish rebels. In this way, Irish rebels' violence against cattle reflected their deeper frustrations towards English settlers. Dogs did not face violence at a higher rate than other animals in the 1641 depositions. Also, depositions rarely reported humans harming the animal dog because of its relation to the English, whereas cattle frequently faced violence due to their relationship with English people and laws. According to the depositions, Irish rebels often referred to as 'English

---

[854] Deposition of John Glencorse, 3 May 1653, TCD MS 837, f. 131r.
[855] Examination of Margret Erwin, 3 May 1653, TCD, Ms 838, ff. 273r-275v.

cattle' or cattle of 'English breed', whereas the actual animal dog was rarely labelled an 'English dog' or an animal of 'English breed'.

Third, the overwhelming majority of depositions that included 'English dog' reported it as an insult against human victims. Alternatively, Irish rebels and the English rarely used 'cattle' as a derogatory term. This was unsurprising considering the value of cattle. These various distinctions between cattle and dogs showed that violence against an animal in the depositions did not automatically translate into a 'making-animal' insult. Cattle faced violence often, and Irish rebels rarely equated to their victims to them. On the other hand, dogs faced far less violence in the 1641 depositions, but Irish rebels frequently used them when 'making-animal' of the English. Clearly, more factors, beyond violence, influenced which animals translated into a dehumanising insult.

'English dogs'

Various insults were used to name-call the English, Irish, and Scots as specific individuals and in groups in the 1641 depositions. As demonstrated in earlier chapters, words such as 'rogue', 'rascal', and 'traitor' could label individuals from varying groups: Irish, English, Catholic, and Protestant. The most common insult, 'rogue', could appear in a single deposition in multiple ways and directed towards multiple people and groups. Even within that same deposition 'rogue' could label both an Irishman and an Englishman (as explored in chapter four). Importantly, this insult's malleability did not apply to all derogatory terms, including 'dog'.

Each time 'dog' appeared in the depositions as an insult, it was almost always directed at the English victim, and the full insult reported was often 'English dog'. For instance, in 1642 in Waterford, James Curry reported being named 'trayterous english doggs'[856] alongside fellow Protestants. In that same year in Westmeath, Irish rebels

---

[856] Deposition of James Curry, 15 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 820, f. 178r.

entered John Addis's house at midnight, robbed him and threatened to kill him and his family and called them all 'English doggs and Roagues'.[857] The 1653 deposition of John Glencorse was the only account to record the term 'Scotts dog'. [858] There was no evidence that English deponents, commissioners, or victims used the term 'Irish dog'; however, this did not necessarily prove that the English never called the Irish 'dogs' during the 1641 rebellion.

It was important to remember that many depositions did not accurately report or include all violence performed during the rebellion or within a particular moment. This included verbal violence. The English may have used 'dog' against the Irish, but perhaps the commissioners chose to omit this detail. In general, the violence and atrocities depicted in the 1641 depositions focused primarily on the atrocities and actions by Irish rebels against the English. And the use of 'English dog' emphasised Irish violence. Nicola MacLeod suggested that the 1641 depositions only reported Irish rebels using this particular insult because the commissioners and deponents wanted to depict an image of the barbaric Irish rebels against innocent and honourable victims.[859]

This argument did have some substance to it, especially considering the earlier analysis in chapter four, which showed how speaking 'unfitting words' portrayed the speaker as dishonourable and uncivil. Therefore, reports of the Irish using the insult 'dog' would have emphasised the victimhood of the English and their own cruel nature and barbaric behaviour. Furthermore, Leerssen wrote that the distinction between being a member of society often links to the person's adherence to that particular time's social standards. Adhering to societal expectations of civility and reputation singled one's inclusion as a member of human society.[860]

---

[857] Deposition of John Adis, 11 July 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 47r; Temple, *Irish rebellion*, p. 85.
[858] Deposition of John Glencorse, 3 May 1653, TCD, Ms 837, f. 131r; Macleod, 'Rogues, Villaines', p. 124.
[859] Macleod, "Rogues, villaines', p. 124.
[860] Leerssen, 'Wildness, wilderness', p. 26.

In seventeenth-century Ireland, speaking false and 'unfitting words' showed a person's incivility and rejection of societal rules. In this way, the previous chapters on laws, power, honour, and violence encompassed many of the elements that distinguished a person from an uncivil barbarian or even an animal in Ireland's 1640s and 1650s. 'Unfitting' words like 'dog' placed the speaker outside of the law, and it signalled their denial of the established power dynamics. It also demonstrated their active attack upon another's reputation, while exemplifying their dishonesty and dishonour. And, it added to the scope and extremity of their violence. In the depositions, the Irish rebels called their victims animals, but their words emphasised their own exclusion from civil human society. Although the Irish rebels named their victims 'English dogs', their use of insults and name-calling would have emphasised their uncivil reputation and their 'animality'. Therefore, the absence of 'Irish dog' corresponded with the 1641 depositions overall portrayal of English victims and deponents as innocent and civil. It did not prove that this insult was never spoken against the Irish during the 1641 rebellion.

Similarly, historians cannot immediately accept that all reports of 'English dog' were accurate. Commissioners could have added these insults in order to emphasise the negative portrayal of Irish rebels, although Irish may have truly called their victims 'dogs'. Unfortunately, the 1641 depositions rarely provided clear evidence needed to answer these questions about words in general. Overall, it was likely a mixture. Some accounts may have included an accurate report of Irish rebels using insults, while other falsely reported or exaggerated their words. However, there were several indications that Irish rebels truly used this particular insult during the 1641 rebellion.

First, it was significant that several accounts specifically reported how Irish rebels originally spoke the term 'English dog' in their Irish language. For example, in the examination of Hiber Scott from Kings County in 1653, Scott reported how he hid from

the rebels 'all night in the cold' as an Irish woman, 'the daughter of the said Martin Linck Provost maliciously sought & searched after him, saying (in Irish) where is this English dogg'.[861] Similarly, Thomas Fleetwood's deposition from 1643 described how the rebels burned the Englishmen's corpses 'saying in Irish ffling the English doggs into the fyre & burne them'.[862]

Regarding the insult 'dog', Terence McCaughey's article 'Bards, beasts and men' provided evidence that the Irish, specifically Gaelic bards, used 'making-animal' insults including 'dog' beyond the 1641 depositions. McCaughey argued that this form of insult was reserved for those considered immediate foes. In the later seventeenth century, Gaelic bards only used such terms against fellow-Gaels, not alien landholders. He argued this was because fellow Gaels were the more immediate foes to other clans and bards at the end of the century. In contrast, the English settler was the immediate foe of in the 1641 rebellion. Therefore, it was unsurprising that Irish perpetrators often used the term 'dog' alongside violence against the English in the 1640s.[863] Ultimately, Gaelic's words differed in context from the words of Irish in the 1641 rebellion and the depositions. However, the indication that the Irish also spoke this insult in a different context increased the possibility that they truly used it in the 1641 rebellion.

Second, the philosopher David Smith argued that, in general, perpetrators often use dehumanising terms in genocides or ethnic conflict that focus on three categories of animals: those viewed as prey, those considered dangerous, and those seen as unclean.[864] Smith's work prompted further research about the insult 'dog' in the depositions. The view of dogs and its equivalent 'making-animal' insult in the 1641 depositions often reflected his arguments about the universal use of animals and speech, and these next

---

[861] Examination of Hiber Scott, 23 Dec. 1653, TCD, Ms 839, ff. 226v.
[862] Deposition of Thomas Fleetwood, 22 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 817, ff. 039r-039v.
[863] McCaughey, 'Bards beasts and men', p. 108.
[864] Smith, *Less than human,* p. 252.

sections will explore how dogs in the depositions fit into two of Smith's categories, which may also be an indication that Irish rebels actually used this insult.

And, if Irish rebels truly used this word as the depositions reported, it could then provide a small window into the Irish rebels' feelings about their English victims. As chapter five noted, Andy Wood argued that the inclusion of rebels' speeches in reports of the English 1549 rebellion in some way made them appear less 'crazy'. Similarly, the records of Irish rebels using 'English dog' may provide a more nuanced understanding of their motivations and feelings.[865]

Dangerous creatures: The animal dog in the 1641 depositions

Just as early modern England linked dogs with plague and danger, a similar association with this animal and death was found throughout the 1641 depositions.[866] Not only were dogs animals, which placed them in a different category from the English and Irish people, but also throughout the depositions, dogs were dangerous creatures who actively engaged in the atrocities during the 1641 rebellion. William Holland of Monaghan in 1642, Richard Swinfenn of Dublin in 1645, and Robert Neale of Dublin in 1652 all identified dogs as ravenous creatures devouring flesh and bone.[867] Neale reported how Irish rebels hanged several English victims and left their bodies unburied to be 'eaten and devoured by doggs wolves Crowes and other Ravenous birds'.[868] Similarly in 1643, Andrew Chaplin of Clare reported how bodies laid in the open 'vntill the dogges & crowes did picke and eate vp their carkasses'.[869]

Images of violent dogs appeared in 1644 Roscommon in the deposition of Ann Frere, which reported of rebels, who rushed upon the Protestants and violently hacked

---

[865] Wood, *1549 Rebellions,* pp 95, 97, 98; Shagan, 'Early modern violence', p. 24.
[866] Cole, *Imperfect creatures,* pp 21-2.
[867] Deposition of William Holland, 13 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 160r; Deposition of Richard Swinfenn, 28 July 1645, TCD, Ms 810, f. 325r; Examination of Robert Neale, 14 Sept. 1652, TCD, Ms 811, f. 191v.
[868] Examination of Robert Neale, 14 Sept. 1652, TCD, Ms 811, f. 191v.
[869] Deposition of Andrew Chaplin, 12 May 1643, TCD, Ms 829, f. 097v.

and cut them 'all in peeces & then and there left them aboue ground soe as the very doggs

of the howse afterwards brought & carried away towards the howse some of their lymbes

& mangled parts of their bodyes cutt off'.[870] One deposition reported how a ravenous sow

fed upon a dead child after the rebels had killed his or her mother, but this account was

the only example found that portrayed a pig acting in this violent way[871] In 1642, John

Montgomery told of a woman whose husband and father-in-law were killed. She had

recently delivered a child, but the rebels still 'kild her alsoe & 2 of her children and

suffered their doggs to eate vpp & devowre her said new borne chyld which they fownd

with her in that place'.[872] Montgomery reported this practice of leaving bodies to the dogs

three separate times in his deposition and further reported the murder of servants and how

the Irish rebels 'would not suffer the greater part of them to bee buried but to ly vpon the

grownd & be devowred by doggs Crowes & ravenous creatures'.[873] Montgomery then

added that such practice was 'done by the rebells [-] since this Rebellion began within the

County of Monoghan to divers others protestants that they had murthered'.[874] Although

this report was based on hearsay, it still illustrates how commissioners and deponents

viewed dogs' role in the 1641 rebellion.

Violent dogs were also included in publications about the 1641 rebellion. For

example, Henry Jones's 1642 *A remonstrance of divers remarkeable passages concerning*

the church and kingdome of Ireland published an excerpt of dogs devouring the English

as the Irish rebels rejoiced over it.[875] Jones also included the deposition of Rebecca Collis

from Kildare, who deposed that 'the dead bodies of divers deceased Protestants were

digged out of the Church of Kildare, and cast into a filthy ditch, to be devoured by beasts

---

[870] Deposition of Ann Frere, 8 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 830, f. 032v.
[871] Deposition of Phillip Taylor, 8 Feb. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 007r.
[872] Deposition of John Mountgomery, 26 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, ff. 135r-135v.
[873] Deposition of John Mountgomery, 26 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 135v.
[874] Deposition of John Mountgomery, 26 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 834, f. 135v.
[875] Jones, *A remonstrance,* p. 9.

and dogs'.[876] Temple also included this themes by writing how Irish rebels sometimes 'gave their Children to Swine, Some the Doggs eat; and some taken alive out of their Mothers bellies, they cast into ditches'.[877]

The 1641 depositions contained similar evidence also contained evidence that perpetrators used this word against their victim. This reflected Smith's argument that perpetrators often used (and still use) an insult such as 'dog' against victims in moments of extreme violence, genocides, wars, and ethnic conflicts.[878] In many reports, the insult 'dog' appeared alongside killings and mutilations. In fact, John Walter argued that name-calling, specifically through the insult 'dog', could prompt acts of 'pre-emptive' violence against the 'dangerous' victims. The dangerous perception of the animal led to violent action against those made into dogs.[879] After being 'robed and disspoyled of his goodes by fflorence Fitzpatrick [and] his Rebells',[880] Richard Hooke of Queen's County in 1642 reported that 'Thomas Whitton was cruely slaine by Teig O Laughlin, and his son. John Harding slew most cruelly Mr Nicholson and his wife. Their common language was English doggs'.[881] In this moment, the common use of this term was connected to killings and atrocities. Likewise, another deponent named Thomas Leysance recalled how victims were murdered 'moste woeffoollye with shourd and skeines', while perpetrators' called them English dogge'.[882]

Such language was also recorded alongside physical violence in the later 1650s examinations. In 1652, John Colethirst from Cork reported being told 'that his said fathers eyes were then pluckt out, the rebells saying, you English dogg can you now se

---

[876] Jones, *A remonstrance*, p. 67.
[877] Temple, *Irish rebellion*, p. 97.
[878] Smith, *Less than human,* p. 252.
[879] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 137.
[880] Deposition of Richard Hooke, 12 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, ff. 214r.
[881] Deposition of Richard Hooke, 12 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, ff. 214r.
[882] Deposition of Thomas Leysance, 13 June 1642, TCD, Ms 835, ff. 208v.

Irish mans cowes & be a guide for English rogues'.[883] And in 1654, Ann Hayles recounted how Irish rebels in Galway murdered numerous individuals, and then paraded one man's head 'vp & Downe the streets of Gallway on the head of a Pyke, and the People cryed there was the head of an English Dogg'.[884] Additionally, the 1652 examination of Captain John Sweet reported how the Irish rebels directly compared the English to dogs. The captain reported that Irish rebels hanged an Englishman in Cork, and the victim's wife asked why her husband was being hanged. The rebels responded 'that hee was an Englishman or an English dog, & therefore he would hang him'.[885] In this particular moment, to be an Englishman was equated directly with being a dog. This type of relationship lowered the victim and placed them in a violent context and relationship with the perpetrator.

Throughout these examples, the animal was simply referred to as a 'dog'. The particular breed was rarely mentioned. As well, these 'dogs' largely behaved as the 'currish' kind in the depositions. However, a small number of deponents spoke specifically of mastiffs including Ellen Matchet, John Lukey, Pierce Lynagh, Walter Aspoll, and Owen McGuyre.[886] A mastiff's appearance was unsurprising, as the English often brought mastiffs with them abroad and to Ireland. The number of mastiffs in Ireland remains unclear; however, their presence and impact were noted throughout the early modern period.[887]

However, mastiffs in these accounts acted very differently from the general 'dogs' in the 1641 depositions. While a 'dog' participated in violence against the English

---

[883] Examination of John Colethirst, 11 Sept. 1652, TCD, Ms 826, f. 099r.
[884] Examination of Ann Hayles, 13 Jan. 1654, TCD, Ms 830, f. 233v.
[885] Examination of Captain John Sweet, 9 Sept. 1652, TCD, Ms 826, f. 195.
[886] Deposition of Ellen Matchett, 3 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 059r; Deposition of John Lukey, 2 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 168r; Examination of Peirce Lynagh, 14 Feb. 1654, TCD, Ms 816, ff. 333v-334r; Examination of Walter Aspoll, 14 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 816, f. 333r; Examination of Owen McGuyre, 14 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 816, f. 327r.
[887] MacInnes, 'Mastiffs and spaniels', pp 7-9.

victims, some mastiffs protected the deponent or acted against the Irish. For example, Ellen Matchett reported in 1642 how she and her daughter were 'miraculously rescowed by a mastive dogg that sett vpon the slaughtering & blowdy Rebells'.[888] Only the minister John Lukey spoke of a violent mastiff dog. He recalled how an Irish rebel and his son

> sett some mastive doggs vpon this deponent out of the Church: Where his father have placed them (as this deponent was credibly informed by his neighbours) which doggs fastned their teeth on this deponents Cloake: But this deponent rescowing himself by a knife & a small cudgell fledd into the towne, the doggs still feircly pursueing him and the deponent crying out & endevoured, for succour to fly first into the howse of one Richard Hoorish of the Grange & desireing him to save his Liffe: hee ~~denyed~~ *refused* to helpe him but contrarywise shutt his doores against him: Then the deponent attempted to goe into the howse of one Nicholas Goulden there: But his family shutt his doores alsoe against the deponent, & at the length when as *he* ~~this deponent~~ had with his kniffe hurt one of the doggs in the head they both Left him[889]

Here, mastiffs acted in opposition to an English settler and reflected the broader violent, aggressive depiction of dogs in the 1641 rebellion. Overall, the conflicting examples of mastiffs reflected dogs' unpredictable nature. Some acted with noblity while others were dangerous and untrustworthy. However, the 1641 depositions overwhelming emphasised the dangerous dog.

Unclean creatures

Dogs in the 1641 depositions also fit into a second of Smith's categories. From a religious and moral perspective, Smith discussed how many cultures and societies viewed dogs as unclean creatures in a spiritual context and used the insult 'dog' in this way.[890] As discussed earlier, the biblical view of dogs as unclean beasts outside of Christian salvation influenced early modern ideas about the animal, and this also appeared specifically in the 1641 depositions. For example, George Creighton's 1643 deposition

---

[888] Deposition of Ellen Matchett, 3 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 089r.
[889] Deposition of John Lukey, 2 Mar. 1643, TCD, Ms 810, f. 168r.
[890] Smith, *Less than human*, p. 251.

reported how a priest equated being a dog with being outside of Christianity and 'said vnto the people' that Creighton and his fellow English settlers 'were not christians', 'were noe better then dogs', and 'were altogether vnworthy'.[891]

A connection between religion and dogs also appeared in Hannah Farrell's 1642 deposition. A man named Mr Welch searched her home looking for weapons with his two sons 'one of them a preist and another a ffryer'.[892] Welch's two sons told Farrell that they fought against Sir Charles Coote, who 'was in battle with them for their religion'.[893] They continued to speak against Coote and all the English, calling them 'doggs and Trayters' and saying that Coote was 'a Diuell or the sonne of a Diuill'.[894] Here, the rebels' speech clearly emphasised the importance of religion in motivating their actions, and the use of 'doggs' re-enforced how they viewed the English as enemies of Christianity.

Henry Palmer's deposition also suggested a connection between 'dog' and religion. Palmer reported how Irish rebels entered a church and 'cut the Pulpit Cloth & the ministers books in peeces, & strewed them about the Church yard, & caused the Piper to play while they daunces & trampled them vnder their feete'. During the church's destruction, they also 'called the minister dogg and stript him of his Cloths'.[895] The choice of 'dog' when attacking a church and a minister heightened this word's religious meaning. Even beyond the 1641 depositions to published works such as Henry Jones's *Remonstrance*, which supported this idea of dogs as the enemy of Christians. He noted how 'Christians have been eaten by Dogs, and Dogs tearing Children out of the wombe; the bloudy beholders relating such things with boasting and great rejoicing'.[896] Jones

---

[891] Deposition of George Creighton, 15 Apr. 1643, TCD, Ms 833, f. 235r.
[892] Deposition of Hannagh Farrell, 29 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 813, f. 148r.
[893] Deposition of Hannagh Farrell, 29 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 813, f. 148r.
[894] Deposition of Hannagh Farrell, 29 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 813, f. 148r.
[895] Deposition of Henry Palmer, 12 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 818, f. 88r.
[896] Jones, *A remonstrance,* p. 9.

emphasised the victims' Christianity in this excerpt, which reinforced dogs' image as spiritually deprived creatures.

In general, Irish rebels validated their actions by comparing them to treatment against animals in numerous depositions, and spiritual justification played a role. Perpetrators in the 1641 depositions directly cleared their consciences by drawing upon animals. For example, Thomas Johnson reported how Irish rebels told him that they would make noe more conscience nor care to kill him then they would doe of a pigg or a sheepe'.[897] Dogs were frequently used in this way as well. In 1642, John Addis recalled how Irish rebels robbed him and other English settlers. Addis encountered a priest and 'demanded *of him* what the reason of this trouble was'.[898] The priest replied by saying 'it was for Religion'.[899] Addis questioned him further and asked him 'what religion could itt be to take Innocent mens goods from them, he made answere that *itt was* noe *more* pitty or Conscience to take English mens liues *& goods* from them, then to take a bone out of a doggs Mouth'.[900] As well, Irish rebels' words in Brigit Drewrie's deposition linked dogs and heretics together and used both to justify violence against 'gods enimyes'. Drewrie reported how 'the rebells would comonlie & publiquely say that it was noe more pittie to kill the English then to kill doggs calling the englishe heretiques and saying they were gods enimyes'.[901]

This comparison between violence towards humans and dogs in the 1641 rebellion existed outside the 1641 depositions. John Temple's *Irish rebellion* documented how priests, friars, and Jesuits called Protestants 'heretics' and confirmed that it was not a sin to kill an Englishman any more than it was a sin to kill a dog. Instead, it was 'a most

---

[897] Deposition of Thomas Johnson, 14 Jan. 1644, TCD, Ms 831, f. 191r.
[898] Deposition of John Adis, 11 July 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 047v; Temple, *Irish rebellion,* p. 85.
[899] Deposition of John Adis, 11 July 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 047v; Temple, *Irish rebellion,* p. 85.
[900] Deposition of John Adis, 11 July 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 047v; Temple, *Irish rebellion,* p. 85.
[901] Deposition of Briggett Drewrie, 30 June 1642, TCD, Ms 836, f. 046v.

mortall and unpardonable sinne to relieve or protect any of them'.[902] The comparison to dogs alongside the label 'heretic' and references to sin again highlighted this animal's specific spiritual meaning and threat. Furthermore, this comparison contributed to the Irish rebels' justification for their violence upon the English. Priests removed any hesitation because of sin and even emphasised the sinfulness of sparing the English. This was an interesting point to consider when looking to understand the religious concerns of individuals and society in seventeenth-century Ireland.

On the one hand, Temple choice to publish this example certainly reflected a strategy to depict Catholic clergy in a negative light. But on the other hand, it also inadvertently showed how some individuals needed to be convinced or reassured that their actions were in line with their beliefs and codes of morality before committing violence. This revealed more about the personal impact of religious belief. Both the 1641 depositions and Temple occasionally, and unintentionally, depicted the Irish rebels as individuals concerned with their own moral standing and sinfulness.

The specific insult 'dog' in the 1641 depositions also reflected the image of an unclean creature outside of Christianity, and it contributed to the violence found in numerous accounts. Both David Smith and Anton Blok noted that references to unclean animals allowed perpetrators to overcome hesitation due to the immorality of harming another human. The power of naming an individual a dog could eliminate, or at least attempt to, any Christian moral responsibility that would come from inflicting harm upon another person, especially a fellow Christian.[903]

This was true in the 1641 depositions. The deponent Joan Flavan reported how she and others with her were labelled 'English dogs' and told that they had no king and

---

[902] Temple, *Irish rebellion*, p. 78.
[903] Smith, *Less than human*, p. 251; Blok, *Honour and violence*, p. 109.

no god any more than dogs have.[904] In the 1642 deposition of Robert Flacke, an Irish

priest directly called the English 'heretics' and 'doggs'. He encouraged and justified the

killing of English Protestants by saying that 'he wold pardon and forgive them for killing

of heretickes meaneing the protestantes calling them English doggs'.[905] Here, the priest

directly eliminated any fear of moral consequences by labelling them as enemies of God.

In the 1642 deposition of John Muskett, the deponent reported how Irish rebels told the

English 'that wee were English dogs and that wee weare no Christians'. After speaking

these words, 'they cast an English mans bones up & threw them out of the

Churchyard'.[906] Similarly, Dennis O'Brennan testified how he 'saw the Rebells teare in

peeces 2 Bibles with the most indignation telling the English dogges as they called them

should neuer come to howle there more'.[907] In these examples, the spiritual meaning of

'dog' helped justify different forms of violence, demonstrating the importance and role of

words and religion.

      In numerous depositions, Irish rebels also used the insult 'English dogs' alongside

other labels that also excluded the victim from salvation and membership in the Christian

world. These terms included words such as 'no Christians', 'devils', 'heretics', and 'gods

enimys'. In one account, rebels equated the victims to dogs again by calling the

Protestants of the Castle 'puritant doggs and hereticks, traytors to god & the King'.[908]

This deposition demonstrated that while 'dog' referenced a vicious creature, it could also

be associated with other words that targeted a person for their opposition to Christianity,

God, and the king.

---

[904] Deposition of Joane fflavan, 7 July 1642, TCD, Ms 820, f. 046v.
[905] Deposition of Robert fflacke, 12 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 835, f. 202r.
[906] Deposition of John Muskett, 6 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 813, ff. 256r.
[907] Deposition of Dennis O'Brennan, 12 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, ff. 217r-217v.
[908] Deposition of Arthur Ahgmoty and Martin Johnston, 13 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 177r; Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 137.

In this particular example, 'dog' was directly linked with the adjective 'puritan', which could have both political and religious meanings as explored in chapter three. The inclusion of the additional insults of 'heretics' and 'traitors 'did not reduce the importance of 'dog'. Rather it emphasised its severity. 'Heretic' and 'traitor' were strong forms of name-calling that brought their own meanings, but all three labelled the English Protestants as enemies in some form: first in comparison to vicious creatures, second, as enemies to God, and third, as enemies to the king.

Overall, these insults could help perpetrators harm their victims without feeling any moral responsibility for their violent actions. The animal dog clearly fit into Smith's two categories of dangerous and unclean animals. Therefore, when the Irish named the English 'dogs', they identified their victims as dangerous creatures both physically and spiritually. The presence of these two categories also strongly suggested that Irish rebels truly used this insult throughout the 1641 rebellion.

Irish fear and hatred

As explored in chapter six, speech in the 1641 depositions could leave 'traces'[909] of emotion. Words such as 'passion' or 'fear' sometimes accompanied terms of name-calling. As well, a specific insult could signal the presence of an emotion in a specific moment. The use of 'dog' provided several insights into Irish rebels' feelings toward their English victims. The insult clearly drew upon the broader image of the dangerous animal in the depositions. In fact, Arthur Ahgmoty and Martin Johnston's depositions in 1642 reported both the vicious animal and how Irish rebels used the insult 'English dog'. The Irish rebels laid siege to the Castle Forbes in Longford. There, Ahgmoty and Johnston reported how they hanged an Englishman and mutilated his body 'ripping vp his belly'

---

[909] Rosenwein and Cristiani, *What is the history of emotion?*, pp 34-5.

they 'threw him into the well where he lay vntill the doggs devowred him'.[910] The next sentence reported similar treatment towards other victims, who were murdered and left by the rebels 'to be devowred by doggs or fowle'.[911]

Immediately following these two sentences, the deponents also recalled how the rebels 'called the protestants of the castle puritant dogs'.[912] The three consecutive sentences demonstrated a connection between the witnessing of the dangerous animal and the choice to then use it to name a human. Therefore, it indicated that the Irish rebels viewed their victims as dangerous, which, in turn, suggested that they may have felt strong emotions in the presence of these dangerous 'dogs'?

Fear was a clear possibility. In fact, Smith argued that unclean and dangerous animals often created feelings of fear and disgust that could evoke the desire or urge to eliminate them, similar to the response associated with creatures such as rats, worms, and maggots.[913] Therefore, the use of 'English dog', in some way, communicated their own fear of their English victims, as well as their disgust. Early modern societies often feared dogs because of their connection to death, plague, sinfulness, and violence.[914] Their impulsive and unpredictable behaviour could then be projected onto members of society, who were labelled as 'dogs' themselves. Therefore, the Irish rebels' choice of 'English dog' may communicate both their violence as well as their own fear towards the English settlers.

The biblical view of dogs as greedy and gluttonous was also relevant. The reports of dogs eating corpses and devouring new-borns in the 1641 depositions reflected this gluttonous nature, and scripture often portrayed dogs as scavengers, devourers, and

---

[910] Deposition of Arthur Ahgmoty and Martin Johnston, 13 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 178v.
[911] Deposition of Arthur Ahgmoty and Martin Johnston, 13 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 178v.
[912] Deposition of Arthur Ahgmoty and Martin Johnston, 13 Sept. 1642, TCD, Ms 817, f. 178v.
[913] Smith, *Less than human*, p. 251.
[914] Cole, *Imperfect creatures,* pp 21-2; Jenner, 'The great dog massacre', p. 56.

creatures of other dirty habits, and therefore, a dog could also embody the sin of gluttony.[915] In the depositions, dogs roamed free and exploited the land and the people living there. Similarly, 'English dog' may indicate the Irish view of the English settlers as exploitive and greedy in Ireland, taking land and power from them. This may be perhaps another reason that this particular term was so often used in violent moments. It was a reflection of their fear.

Hatred and anger may be some additional emotions, which led to the Irish rebels using 'dog'. References to hatred and contempt appeared in several depositions that referenced the animal dog. In Marmaduke Clapham's deposition from 1642, the Irish hatred against English Protestants connected to the killing of animals, particularly 'the very dogs that were english breed'. The deponent told of companies of Irish rebels assaulting the English victims, and he reported that they were 'pulling & beating vs somtimes as if we had been dogs with such ignominious tearmes, not fitt to be related calling vs puritans rogues English dogges rascals'.[916]

As this was happening, the Irish also expressly stated their detest for 'the ground whereon the English & Protestants did treade', and killed their cattle, sheep, and hogs. The account then specifically stated that the Irish rebels also killed the dogs, but only those of English breed, and it also attributed this action to the rebels' 'infestiue & inveterate malice to extirpate the very memory of our nation'. [917] This emotional behaviour towards dogs suggested that perhaps the Irish also identified their victims as 'dogs' in moments where they felt hatred towards them.

However, it was important to recognise the difficulty of pinpointing one specific emotion attached to this word. In some accounts with 'dog', multiple emotions appeared

---

[915] Berković, 'Beware of dogs', p. 82-83.
[916] Deposition of Marmaduke Clapham, 13 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 814, f. 162v.
[917] Deposition of Marmaduke Clapham, 13 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 814, f. 162v.

to be present at the same time or evoked or expressed through similar means and words. This was evident in numerous depositions and examinations, including that of Susan Steele of Longford from 1645. Steele witnessed the hanging of her husband and another Englishman, who Irish rebels placed in the middle of a ring and repeatedly stabbed for sport until

> one bloody villaine named Patrick…came with his billhooke & said to the rest of the murtherers yow have had sport enough with the English dogg & therewith cleft the said Henry Mead downe the shoulder & breast & alsoe almost cutt of his neck and gave him many other wounds whereof he then and there died.[918]

Here, their actions may have been motivated by malice and hatred, but there was an indication that they were enjoying their actions, having sport. It is possible that this one account contained traces of both hate and joy.

Worse than dogs: 'No Christians' and Irish women

With an image of violent and barbaric dogs, eating flesh and bone, inducing fear, and act as enemies of God, it seemed impossible that there could something considered worse than dogs in the depositions. However, evidence existed for this. In the 1641 depositions, two categories were considered worse than this violent, unclean animal. First, several depositions recalled how the Irish considered Protestants worse than dogs. In 1642, Margret Bromley reported how 'the Rebells alsoe vsually sayd that the Protestants were worse than doggs, and were noe Christians', saying they knew 'that if they themselves shold dy the next morning their sowles sholde goe to god & they were very gladd of the Revenge which they had taken of the English'.[919] This was also seen in Temple's *Irish rebellion*. Temple published an excerpt of priests encouraging people to 'rise up and destroy all the Protestants', who they said 'were worse than Dogs' and 'were Devils and

---

[918] Deposition of Suzan Steele, 14 July 1645, TCD, Ms 817, f. 213v.
[919] Deposition of Margret Bromley, 22 Aug. 1642, TCD, Ms 836, ff. 040r-041v.

served the Devil; assuring them the killing of such was a meritorious Act, and a rare preservative against the pains of Purgatory'.[920]

Second, amid all the terrible things of a person could be, one account suggested that an Irish woman was even lower than a dog. The 1654 examination of Peirce Lynagh told a story of a mastiff dog and a murderous Irish woman. In this report, gender became essential, and the image of a 'bloody Irish woman', as addressed earlier in chapter four, was emphasised by a dog's actions. Lynagh recounted a strange story of an Irish woman, who had lived in adultery with an Irish man named Tirlough O'Doran, Their adulterous relationship produced three children. However, Lynagh told how the first two children had disappeared with no account given. However, the Irish woman murdered and secretly buried her third infant. A dog, who was known to feed upon the dead bodies of English victims during the 1641 rebellion, became the reason for the revelation of this woman's infanticide:

> The child was digged vp by a mastive dogg belonging to one Rochford a Tanner in Castle Jordan & carryed In his mouth to the dooer of the howse where nigilwey the mother then lived, & as it was observed by Certaine souilders of Capt Barnaby Dempsy who tould it vnto this examinat that the said Mastife would not permitt any swine or any other dogges to medle with the chyld although it was generally observed & known in those partes that that Mastife did vse comonly to digg dead Corpes out of thier graves, & feed vpon them, but it was noted by all the neighboures theraboutes that the said dogge, ~~had~~ had carried the child with that tenderness, that not as much as the Impression of his teeth was left in his body.[921]

When considering the levels of depravity and evil associated with different groups of people or creatures in general, even an animal known to feed upon dead bodies was not portrayed as heartless as the Irish woman in this examination. While dogs were vicious

---

[920] Temple, *Irish rebellion,* p. 87.
[921] Examination of Peirce Lynagh, 14 Feb. 1654, TCD, Ms 816, ff. 333v-334r.

and bloody, Irish women were portrayed even more compassionless and dangerous. However, it is important to recognise that this particular dog was a mastiff. And as mentioned at the start of this chapter, mastiffs were favoured by the English. According to Caius, mastiffs were a second class 'homely' dog.[922] Therefore, this particular account did not necessarily depict an Irish woman as beneath all dogs, including the lower 'currish' group. However, it still placed an animal above this woman. Despite it being a 'second class' dog, the mastiff was still better than a violent, adulterous Irish woman.

This account was also very interesting as it reflected the seventeenth-century English desire to depict mastiffs as honourable and valiant creatures. MacInnes argued that when English ambassadors went abroad, they emphasised the valiant nature of the mastiff whenever possible.[923] In this way, this account suggested that the 1641 depositions existed as part of the English concern to portray their English bred dogs as more valiant, honourable, and stronger than the animals and people they encountered outside of England.

Two additional examinations were taken on the same day as Pierce Lynagh's account, and they recounted the same story. Walter Aspoll's examination wrote how the dog's behaviour 'was accounted a miracle amongst the people in those partes as conceiving it to be the handy worke of God, in causing that murder to be soe revealed & brought to light'.[924] Here, God and religion clearly played an important role. Despite dogs, existing outside of Christian salvation, God still used one of these animals as part of a miracle, reinforcing that even a dog was higher than an Irish woman. Officials also recognised this; when Ni Gilway confessed to the murder of her child, Captain George Cusak, the Governor of Techroghan in County Meath, ordered her execution and 'the said

---

[922] MacInnes, 'Mastiffs and spaniels', p. 31.
[923] MacInnes, 'Mastiffs and spaniels', p. 8.
[924] Examination of Walter Aspoll, 14 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 816, f. 333r; Examination of Owen McGuyre, 14 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 816, f. 327r.

woeman was burnt (as he is very Confident & doth beleeve)'.[925] Owen McGuyre and

Walter Aspoll were both eyewitnesses of her execution.[926]

Ultimately, the 1641 depositions portrayed dogs as some of the worst creatures

that existed in Ireland. Despite their comparison with Protestants and Irish women in

some accounts, their presence heightened the violence and atrocities of the 1641

rebellion, and this translated into the most dangerous 'making-animal' insult in the 1641

depositions.

Conclusion

Historians might easily discount the significance of a single word as innocuous or

secondary; however, by doing so, the insights and topics it might bring to light remain

hidden. The frequent use of 'dog' called for a deeper analysis, which then raised new

questions and topics. All of this illustrated that 'dog' was not a simple insult but rather one

that held great significance for those speaking it and those facing it. Through this one

word, scholars can begin to understand the view of dogs and the relationship between

violence, animals, and human beings in Ireland's 1640s and 1650s and in the broader

seventeenth century. It demonstrated the importance of recognising and considering

animals in Ireland's history. It showed how perpetrators held animals to human standards,

while also reducing humans to the status of an animal. Furthermore, it illustrated how

individuals could easily dehumanise another and remove the distinctions between an

animal and a human through a single insult.

However, it also signalled that other research areas can be opened if historians

consider the many nuances and details provided in the 1641 depositions. The 1641

depositions hold so many more insights that historians can uncover. And it is hoped that

---

[925] Examination of Peirce Lynagh, 14 Feb. 1654, TCD, Ms 816, f. 334v.
[926] Examination of Walter Aspoll, 14 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 816, f. 333v; Examination of Owen McGuyre, 14 Feb. 1653, TCD, Ms 816, f. 327r.

this chapter provided a clear example of how asking one question, or exploring one word, can generate many more. Beyond historical questions, this chapter also illustrated how themes in the 1641 deposition can compare to those found in English history but also in anthropological and sociological studies of conflict, ethnic violence, massacre, and genocide. 'Dog' reflected many of the arguments made by sociologist Randall Collins, which indicated that the 1641 depositions may have more to contribute beyond the development of seventeenth-century Irish history. The 1641 depositions can inform and contribute to the wider study of human conflict and interactions, and the perceptions and presentation of violence and unrest. Finally, this chapter showed the interconnectivity of each of the previous chapters. The importance of law, power, honour, gender, and emotion all played some role in the use, meaning, and impact of 'dog'. With one insult, each of these topics emerged, some more prevalent than others, but all present.

Conclusion

This conclusion will address several important topics regarding the 1641 depositions, the nature of the rebellion, and the possibility for future research regarding spoken words in Ireland. First, it will consider depositions and examinations taken in the 1640s and 1650s. Second, it will explore how the study of words contributed to the question of reliability in the 1641 depositions, addressing if there was any indication that particular words were more accurate than others. Third, it will address what this thesis can contribute to historians' understanding of the nature of the 1641 rebellion itself, and it will explore what a focus on words contributed to the debates surrounding popular violence and popular rebellion. And finally, this conclusion will indicate that there is more research that can done within and beyond the 1641 depositions and in Ireland's wider seventeenth century and early modern period.

Accounts taken in the 1640s and 1650s

The purpose of this study was to explore the many insights speech in the 1641 depositions provided. It was less concerned with lists of depositions and statistics and more with themes and new questions. However, this research brought forward hundreds of depositions and individual words, which provided the opportunity to examine documents from the 1640s and the 1650s. Most depositions used in this thesis were taken in 1640s. However, many examples were found in the 1650s examinations as well. In fact, this thesis used forty-eight accounts taken in the later decade and 169 depositions from the 1640s.

As noted in the introduction, the context and focus on the 1640s and 1650s documents were different. The 1650s accounts looked to convict Irish rebels for their crimes, while the 1640s accounts focused on victims' suffering and the loss of

property.[927] Therefore, the presence of words in both the 1640s and 1650s revealed that within different contexts, words remained a concern throughout the two decades and the changing environment and context in Ireland. Language was about the experience of the victim and the threat to authority, but it was also about the speakers' guilt and their need to answer for their crimes.

The 1650s also indicated that some deponents and commissioners remembered and cared about language long after the initial events had occurred. In fact, some 1650s examinations revisited words first reported in a deposition from the 1640s. For example, Daniel Berwick originally reported in 1642 about disloyal words spoken. Over ten years later in 1653, Berwick was further questioned about this speech.[928] Here, a continuity existed between words first investigated by the original commissioners and those re-investigating in the 1650s. Overall, the types of words recorded in the 1641 depositions ranged from treasonous speech to personal attacks as evident throughout this thesis. Examinations taken in the 1650s contained almost every form of language evaluated throughout this study, as did depositions from the 1640s.

The question of reliability

The introduction noted the difficulties of working with the 1641 depositions due to the complex nature of many of its accounts. Reports were based on eyewitness testimony and hearsay, and in fact, most depositions contained a mixture of both. However, this distinction cannot be relied upon entirely to gauge whether a deposition contained accurate information. Even some eyewitness material raised questions of accuracy. In this thesis, this complexity also appeared throughout numerous accounts that recorded speech. It must also be briefly restated that even reports that contained the exact words spoken by

---

[927] McAreavey, 'Portadown 1641', p. 18.
[928] Part of the Examination of Daniel Berwicke, 21 May 1642, TCD, Ms 810, f. 112r; Deposition of Daniell Barwick, 23 May 1653, TCD, Ms 810, f. 115r.

the Irish rebels may not have presented the full exchange of words. Although there were a few examples in which English deponents or victims responded to words or name-called the Irish unprovoked, it was far less common.

Therefore, historians need to always remember that when a deposition reported the Irish rebels' 'unfitting words', it may have also excluded or omitted similar words used by the English in that same moment. And as noted previously, linguist Nicola MacLeod showed that words like 'villain' and 'traitorous rebels' used to label the Irish were often manipulated.[929] It was clear that the 1641 depositions repeated general terms referencing the Irish rebels, but it was clear if reports of words used against the English victims were similarly manipulated. Furthermore, a straightforward way to discern the accuracy of reported words across the depositions did not exist.

Overall, the uncertainty of material recorded in the 1641 depositions remained present when considering language, and no definitive method for answering these questions emerged from a focused study on speech. However, there were indications of some possible themes. To start, a distinction between reports of treasonous words versus personal offensive speech may be helpful to an extent. The instruction to investigate treasonous words was clear in the official commission as noted in chapter two.[930] There was also direct evidence in some depositions that commissioners directly asked some deponents if they had heard any disloyal words. As well, the recording of treasonous words tended to be very formulaic.

Evidence of direct questioning for treasonous words raised the question of accuracy again. Perhaps prompted by a commissioner's question, deponents were more likely to make up reports of treasonous words. Unfortunately, this only raised the

---

[929] MacLeod, 'Rogues, villaines', p. 127.
[930] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r; Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.

possibility that disloyal words were more commonly fabricated. It did not provide direct evidence of this idea. However, there was no definitive evidence that commissioners specifically asked about 'unfitting words' in the same way they asked about disloyal speech.[931] Therefore, it was perhaps less likely that some deponents fabricated the personal or 'unfitting' words in the 1641 depositions in order to respond to the commissioners' promptings.

More narrowly, many different insults and terms appeared within the 1641 depositions, and some were more unique than others, appearing in only one or two documents. For example, an insult such as 'clamperinge knave' found in the deposition of Matthew Morris from Queen's County in 1642 was only recorded once.[932] The uniqueness of this insult seemed to reduce the chance that it was part of a wider effort to depict the Irish as slanderous and offensive in their speech. 'Clamperinge knave' was less likely manipulated or exaggerated by the deponent or the commissioners than those common and frequent terms like 'traitor' or 'English dog' that may well have been added to some accounts as a standard 'unfitting' word used by the Irish. With this line of reasoning, insults against women, such as 'whore', may in fact be more accurate and less likely manipulated. The insults that uniquely targeted women only appeared a few times, and because there was a limited number reported it was clearly not part of a wide effort to manipulate or standardise certain words of insult.

Finally, there was no straightforward correlation between the types of words (treasonous or unfitting) and the types of accounts (those based on eyewitness testimony versus hearsay). Chapter five touched upon this question through a small case study comparing reports from the Portadown and Belturbet drownings. It suggested that

---

[931] Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[932] Deposition of Matthew Moris, 12 Apr. 1642, TCD, Ms 815, f. 236v.

accounts based on hearsay contained fewer personal insults and were more likely to instead report treasonous speech. This distinction, however, was not definitive across the 1641 depositions. There were examples of personal words reported through hearsay, and 'traiterous words'[933] appeared in accounts based on both eyewitness and hearsay testimony. Ultimately, there was no clear way to determine the accuracy of language in the 1641 depositions. Paired with all of these questions as well as additional problems related to translation from the Irish to the English language, each account raised some question of accuracy.

The nature of the violence and events of the 1641 rebellion

In John Walter's chapter on 'Performative violence', the need to revisit and perhaps revise the historiographical understanding of the 1641 rebellion was clear. For a long time, historians have viewed it as a rebellion that turned into a popular movement 'beyond the control of the elite'.[934] While this was not the primary focus of this thesis, the study of speech, however, provided some insight on this topic. Several chapters resonated with recent work in early modern England, which argued that crowd actions 'reflected a claim to a popular agency' and were, in fact, political.[935] While the context in Ireland was very different from England, such studies nonetheless suggested that historians need to re-evaluate the understanding of crowds and popular awareness in the 1641 rebellion.[936]

In depositions that reported words, it became clear that many of the speakers held a degree of political, religious, or social awareness. Many of their words signalled their understanding of many topics including politics, religion, and social expectations. Just as English historians have argued a larger political awareness in England than what was

---

[933] First commission, 23 Dec. 1641, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001r; Second commission, 8 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 001v; Third commission, 11 June 1642, TCD, Ms 812, f. 003r.
[934] Walter, 'Performative violence', pp 146-7.
[935] Walter, 'Performative violence', pp 146-7.
[936] Walter, 'Performative violence', pp 146-7.

once thought, the very speech in the 1641 depositions suggested this possibility in Ireland as well. While the commissioners had a particular interest in treasonous words (and potential manipulation cannot be discounted entirely), the plethora of reports made it unlikely that all cases were manipulated. Therefore, the depositions presented an image of Irish rebels who often understood the important political topics and concerns. They often referenced the king and the support of other authority figures. They used political terms like 'parliamentary rogue', 'puritan', and 'roundhead'. There were even several occasions where references to past monarchs were included, particularly against Elizabeth I.[937] The choice of these words indicated that the speaker understood, and drew upon, many of the main driving forces of the rebellion as well as Ireland's history with England.

More specifically, an awareness of laws and punishments for speech and language was clear. Those in authority, such as the commissioners, recognised the danger of words but so also did those in other various social positions. Tradesmen, servants, men, women, superiors and subordinates all reported and engaged with words, and many had an awareness of potential punishment and consequences for language. This awareness all pointed towards a wider understanding of the legal and social importance of one's words. As well, some individuals were conscious of what could threaten and hurt themselves and other across different social positions. This awareness indicated that decisions to speak and report words were sometimes based on reason and understanding, which challenged the wider idea that those participating in the rebellion were driven largely by 'popular fury'.[938]

The use of insults and name-calling to justify atrocities, as seen in chapter five, also indicated that violence was not mindless or without purpose. Violence, in its verbal

---

[937] Deposition of Daniell Barwick, 23 May 1653, TCD, Ms 810, f. 115r.
[938] Walter, 'Performative violence', p. 146.

and physical form, was driven, justified, and perpetrated for a variety of reasons. In numerous depositions, insults provided a rationale (in the perpetrators' minds) that reflected wider themes of the rebellion including political insults like 'traitor', 'rebel', or 'puritan' as well as religious labels like 'heretic' or 'no Christian'. However, despite such words, historians should not assume that perpetrators were always driven by over-arching themes like politics or religion. Emotion played a role as well. Fear, resentment, and anger were evident in the recorded speech of the Irish rebels. And in some cases, their speech responded to past hurt or insult, and this memory and retribution pointed towards violence that was calculated and part of a wider understanding of the hurt of words.

Furthermore, the violent words in the 1641 depositions were clearly part of broader understanding of speech as a violent act that existed in the early seventeenth century. This finding resonated with Walter's suggestion 'that violence in 1641 may be better understood when seen less as a climacteric event and more in the context of a continuum of political and social violence'.[939] The verbal violence in the 1641 depositions was part a continuation of verbal violence that happened in Ireland prior to the rebellion, although perhaps to a lesser extent outside of the context of open rebellion. As well, who the perpetrators of such violence were may have shifted as power dynamics changed with the outbreak of the 1641 rebellion. Prior to the rebellion, they may have remained silent while the English settlers had more power to use their words against them in earlier years. But now, the Irish had the opportunity to inflict both verbal and physical violence upon English Protestant settlers.

New research opportunities

It is hoped that this thesis will serve as a starting point for further academic research into the historical role of words in Ireland. This thesis focused primarily on the 1641

---

[939] Walter, 'Performative violence', pp 146-7.

depositions, and there remains further work to be done with the 1641 depositions, which is vast and complex. While this thesis engaged with hundreds of examples, it did not directly analyse each and every deposition that contained reports of language. Furthermore, questions of insults and offence can expand beyond words to include gestures and non-verbal insults.

Beyond the 1641 depositions, this study of language can expand and explore how sources that published about the 1641 depositions engaged with, or failed to include, the words spoken the 1641 depositions. This thesis touched upon some examples from Thomas Morley's, *A remonstrance* and John Temple's *Irish rebellion,* but many other sources such as pamphlets and newsbooks were printed in England concerning the Irish rebellion and they may contribute to later studies of the importance of words following the 1641 rebellion. Furthermore, sources in Ireland that did not directly related to the 1641 depositions or rebellion also provide evidence of the importance of words. Although references to other sources were important in chapter two and mentioned through other chapters, many were not directly compatible with evidence found in the 1641 depositions. This was specifically relevant for questions of the violent nature of words as well as the emotional weight these words carried. Therefore, there is much space to consider language and expand the study of it in Ireland's additional early modern sources. Almost every source explored, prior to this narrower focus, contained some indication of the importance and role of language. It became clear that slander, libel, rumour, or verbal abuse were prevalent throughout many early to mid-seventeenth-century sources. Examples found in sources such as the state papers or legal material, which this thesis briefly touched on, clearly suggested the importance and relevance of this topic existed prior to the depositions and the 1640s and 1650s.

There was also evidence that concern for words continued beyond Ireland's 1640s and 1650s into its later decades. For instance, sources such as the state papers illustrated this continuation, albeit in a different historical context. Therefore, the changing or continuing concern for words in Ireland's later seventeenth century would also be a valuable consideration. For example, on 3 December 1660, the state papers included a letter written by Richard Myers, mayor of Youghal in County Cork to the commissioners for the management of the affairs of Ireland. It concerned Captain George Codd and stated that he 'did fall into reproachful words against the English Protestants and their interests in this Kingdom'.[940] This letter also discussed how his words tended to 'revive the memory of the late differences or the occasions thereof, maliciously using names of reproach against the English, as may more largely appear by these enclosed depositions contrary to his Majesty's act of free and general pardon, indemnity and oblivion'.[941] Here, once again in 1660, the power and danger of words was present, and even questions of memory may be relevant.[942]

Beyond memory and power, the legality of words was also present. Following Codd's reproaches, some men of the town 'impleaded the said Captain George Codd in the theological court of record', and for want of bail he remained committed to the jail until the commissioners for the management of the affairs of Ireland provided further instructions.[943] This legal concern was also present in additional sources from the 1660s. For example, in an examination from June 1663, a soldier named Thomas Little was investigated for seditious words spoken in Clonmel. This examination was taken before

---

[940] TNA, SP 63/305 f.12- Richard Myers, Mayor of Youghal, to the commissioners for the management of the affairs of Ireland.
[941] TNA, SP 63/305 f.12- Richard Myers, Mayor of Youghal, to the commissioners for the management of the affairs of Ireland.
[942] Peters, 'Trauma narratives', pp 78-93.
[943] Richard Myers, Mayor of Youghal, to the commissioners for the management of the affairs of Ireland (TNA, SP 63/305 f.12).

three justices of the peace of the count of Tipperary.[944] The sources available from the 1660s may reveal if and how the punishment and investigation of words shift in the decades following the 1641 rebellion.

The Carte manuscripts, which holds sources related to both England and Ireland, also contained numerous references to words in the 1660s and 1670s. This may provide another opportunity to expand this topic into later decades of the seventeenth century. It may also demonstrate that this concern for Irish words existed outside of Ireland. For example, in an examination from 1670, a man in London named Richard Session was questioned regarding the words of an Irishman who spoke against the duke of Ormond. In this examination, Session testified against Jones, who said that Ormond 'is as grand a rebel as ever came out of Ireland, & deserves to be hanged'.[945] This example reflected Ormond's particular concern for words and rumours about him that appeared in the 1641 depositions, as in case of Nicholas Ardagh who was punished for failing to report Robert Worrell's words against the earl.[946] In Jane Ohlmeyer and Steven Zwicker's article 'John Dryden, the house of Ormond, and the politics of Anglo-Irish patronage', Ormond's continued obsession with words in the 1660s, 1670s, and 1680s was clear. His concern for his reputation and his posterity increased and reached a high point in the later 1670s when his role and decisions in the 1640s was questioned and attacked publicly.[947]

Gossip and private correspondence about him turned into discussions as 'public as coffee-house discourse'.[948] Pamphlets published 'malicious reflections' on Ormond and libels accused him of proclaiming loyalty to the king while enriching himself by offering

---

[944] The Examination of Thomas Little of Clonmel, a soldier [in relation to seditious words spoken in that town] (Bodl., Ms Carte 32, f. 529).
[945] An Examination of Richard Session, of Eastcheap in the city of London, concerning words [""]; spoken of the Duke of Ormond, by one Jones (Bodl., Ms Carte 37, f. 551).
[946] Petition of Nicholas Ardagh, 18 Jan. 1642, TCD, Ms 809, ff. 226r-227v.
[947] Jane Ohlmeyer and Steven Zwicker, 'John Dryden, the house of Ormond, and the politics of Anglo-Irish patronage' in *The Historical Journal,* xlix, 3 (2006), pp 680-2.
[948] Ohlmeyer and Zwicker, 'John Dryden', p. 683.

his service to parliament during the 1650s and the Restoration. John Dryden sought to re-establish Ormond's loyalty, contrasting him with the behaviour of Irish rebels in the 1640s. Ormond's continued concern for words, and their impact on him was just one indication of the continued importance of language in the later decades and the need for further study of words and speeches in seventeenth-century Ireland.[949]

Finally, the references to other legal sources throughout this thesis only touched upon the potential information to be found in Irish legal records concerning language and speech. Outside of the 1641 depositions, chapter two focused primarily on legal examples from before the 1641 rebellion. However, it is hoped that this chapter will encourage further analysis of the legal records with a particular focus on language and its role across Ireland's seventeenth century. Additionally, English legal records may reveal more about Irish interaction with words. English historians have vast legal records, and it would be valuable to look into these with a specific focus on language and the Irish. In fact, in the English high court of chivalry records from 1634 to 1640, one case mentioned the involvement of an Irishman and his words. In the case of Bagot v. Fitzgarret, John Bagot accused Fitzgarret of false claims. Allegedly, he had lied and assaulted Bagot by claiming that he was a maimed man.[950] This source and this specific case is just one English source to be considered.

When working with additional sources, words can be easily overlooked for many reasons, including the various terminology used to refer to language, words, or insults. The 1641 depositions can serve as an indication of the potential span of language in a single source. For example, the absence or infrequency of the key words such as 'insult', 'slander', 'defamation', 'libel', does not eliminate a source's potential to provide plenty

---

[949] Ohlmeyer and Zwicker, 'John Dryden', p. 685.
[950] Richard Cust and Andrew Hopper (eds.), *Cases in the high court of chivalry, 1634-1640* (London, 2006), p. 10.

of such material. It is important to consider the various terms that could be used to refer to the same or similar topic. For example, primary sources may refer to slanderous speeches, opprobrious language, ignominious terms, false and foul words, vile speeches, malediction, 'unbeseeming' words, or scandalous and false language.

In the 1641 depositions, commissioners, deponents, and Irish rebels all recognised the danger and power of words. Prior to the 1641 rebellion, they were illegal and monitored by authorities, and saying or hearing the wrong thing could lead to prison. And this legal concern continued in the 1641 depositions, as even the extreme violence and unrest of the rebellion did not eliminate the concern and focus on words and speech. As well, authorities investigated and inquired after speech, while individuals across society participated in the response to and reporting of words. Throughout the 1641 depositions, individuals could both challenge and shift power dynamics through their words, although the presence of an insult could also reflect a power shift that had already occurred as a result of the rebellion.

Beyond laws and authority, words also reflected society's dominant value systems, and they could destroy an individual's place in society. They targeted men, women, and children individually but also communally. This revealed both the distinctions between men and women while also highlighting the importance of family and community. Insults and name-calling encouraged, furthered, and justified acts of physical violence. But they were also acts of violence themselves, and they could be considered extremely harmful. Words carried emotional hints and traces. They expressed passions, but also instigated them. Potential legal and social consequences could foster an environment of fear of speech. The power of words generated a specific fear of language created by the legal, social, and violent implications of speech. Words contained threats of legal punishment for speaking or failing to report language. It also created social

concerns for saying the wrong thing or being made a social outcast, through attacks on honour and reputation. Furthermore, this fear, in turn, fostered resentment or hatred linked closely to social control, suppression, and use of words. Although subtle at first glance, words in the 1641 depositions carried the weight of laws, authority, social standing, violence, and emotions.

Online sources

1641 Depositions Project Online Project (http://1641.tcd.ie/index.php)

Oxford English Dictionary, OED Online (http://www.oed.com/)

State Papers Online, 1509-1714
(http://go.gale.com.elib.tcd.ie/mss/start.do?p=SPOL&u=tcd&authCount=1)

Manuscripts

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Carte Ms 32, 37, 45, 46, 143- 1662-3, 1666-7, 1669-70, 1679, 1683, 1685

Marsh's Library, Dublin

MS Z4.2.1 (Extract) Articles against J. Lynch of Ballicone, 1636; articles against J. Arthur, merchant of Limerick, for defaming G. Webb, 1637; libel of H. Savadge, skinner, of Dublin against Matilda Carlile for defamation, 1645

The National Archives, London

SP 63/207, 208, 211, 212 - State Papers Ireland, 1509-1603

SP 63/225, 227, 235 - State Papers Ireland, 1608-1610

SP 63/242, 247, 254, 282, 305, 319, 329-- State Papers Ireland, 1626-1683

Trinity College Dublin

TCD, Ms 809-841 -The 1641 depositions; I have consulted these original manuscripts through the online database.

Printed sources

Burn, Richard, Joseph Chitty, Thomas Chitty, *The justice of the peace and parish officer* (4 vols., Oxford, 1785)

Caius, John, *Of englishe dogges the diuersities, the names, the natures, and the properties. A short treatise written in latine by iohannes caius of late memorie, doctor of phisicke in the vniuersitie of cambridge; and newly drawne into englishe by abraham fleming student. seene and allowed* London, By John Charlewood for] Rychard Iohnes, and are to be solde ouer against S. Sepulchres Church without Newgate (London, 1576). Clarke, Aidan (ed.), *1641 depositions* (12 vols., IMC, 2014)

Clayton, Margaret Curtis (ed.), *Council book for the province of Munster, c. 1599-1649* (IMC, Dublin, 2008)

Crawford, Jon G., *A star chamber court in Ireland: the court of castle chamber, 1571-1641* (Dublin, 2005)

Grierson, George, *The statutes at large, passed in the parliaments held in Ireland: from the third year of Edward the Second, A.D. 1310 to the twenty sixth year of George the Third, A.D. 1786 inclusive : with marginal notes, and a complete index to the whole : published by authority in thirteen volumes. Vol.2, Containing from the tenth year of Charles the First, A.D. 1634, to the fourteenth and fifteenth years of Charles the Second, A.D. 1662 inclusive* (Dublin, 1786)

HMC, *Calendar of the manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, K. P.: preserved at Kilkenny castle* (2 vols., London, 1902-20)

HMC, *Report on the manuscripts of the earl of Egmont* (2 vols., London, 1905-09)

Gilbert, J.T. (ed.), 'Archives of the municipal corporation of Waterford, in the manuscripts of the marquis of Ormonde, the earl of Fingall, the corporations of Waterford, Galway' in HMC, Rep. 10, Appendix, 5 (London, 1885), pp 265-339

Jones, Henry, *A perfect relation of the beginning and continuation of the Irish-rebellion, from May last, to this present 12th , of January, 1641 with the place where and persons who did plot, contrive, and put in execution that Romish damnable designe : as also their inhumane cruelties which they have and still execute with divellish hatred upon the Protestants / written by a worthy Gentleman and sent over by a merchant now dwelling in Dublin ; whereunto is annexed the merchants letter who sent the copy of this relation : with another letter wherein is truely related the battell fought betwixt our English and the Rebels on the tenth of January as a town called Swords eight miles from Dublin* (1642)

Jones, Henry, *A remonstrance of divers remarkeable passages concerning the church and kingdome of Ireland* (Dublin, 1642)

Jones, Henry, *An Abstract of some few of those barbarous, cruell massacres and murthers of the Protestants and English in some parts of Ireland, committed since the 23 of October 1641 collected out of the examinations taken upon oath by persons of trust in the beginning of the rebellion, by vertue of severall commissions under the Great Seal of Ireland* (London, 1652)

Mahaffy, Robert (ed.), *Calendar of the state papers relating to Ireland of the Reign of Charles I, 1633-1647: preserved in the Public record office* (London, 1901)

McGrath, Bríd (ed.), *The minute book of the corporation of Clonmel, 1608-1649* (IMC, Dublin, 2006)

Morley, Thomas, *A remonstrance of the barbarous cruelties and bloody murders committed by the Irish rebels…collected out of the records at Dublin* (London, 1644)

Morrin, James, *Calendar of patent and close rolls of chancery in Ireland, Charles I* (3 vols., London, 1863)

Temple, John, *The Irish rebellion: or, an history of the beginnings and first progresse of*

the general rebellion raised within the kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October, in the year, 1641. Together vvith the barbarous cruelties and bloody massacres which ensued thereupon. / By Sir Iohn Temple Knight. Master of the Rolles, and one of his Majesties most honourable Privie Councell within the kingdom of Ireland (London, 1646)

Somerset, Richard, *Parliamentary memoirs of Fermanagh and Tyrone, from 1613 to 1885* (Fermanagh, 1887)

Secondary works

Allan, Keith, *The Oxford handbook of taboo words and language* (Oxford, 2019)

Alves, Abel, *The animals of Spain: An introduction to imperial perceptions and human interaction with other animals, 1492–1826* (Boston, 2011)

Anderson, Virginia DeJohn, *Creatures of empire: how domestic animals transformed early America* (New York, 2004)

Armstrong, Robert, 'Establishing a confessional Ireland, 1641-91' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Ireland, volume 2:1550-1730* (Cambridge, 2018), pp 220-45

Armstrong, Robert, 'Thinking like a presbyterian in 1690s Ireland' in Crawford Gribben and Scott Spurlock (eds.), *Puritans and Catholics in the Trans-Atlantic world, 1600-1800* (Basingstoke, 2015), pp 195-216

Bailey, Merridee and Kimberley–Joy Knight, 'Writing histories of law and emotion' in *The Journal of Legal History,* xxxvii, 2 (2017), pp 117-29

Barclay, Katie, *Men on trial: performing emotion, embodiment and identity in Ireland, 1800-4* (Manchester, 2019).

Barclay, Katie, 'Narrative, law and emotion: husband killers in early nineteenth-century Ireland' in *Journal of Legal History*, vol. 38:2 (2017), pp.203-227

Barclay, Katie, 'Performing emotion and reading the male body in the Irish court, c. 1800-1845' in *Journal of Social History,* vol. 51:2 (2017), pp. 293-312

Barclay, Katie, 'Sounds of sedition: music and emotion in Ireland, 1780–1845' in *Cultural History*, vol. 3:1 (2014), pp. 54-80

Barnard, Toby, 'Lawyers and the law in later seventeenth-century Ireland' in *Irish historical studies,* xxviii, 11 (May 1993), pp 256-82

Barnard, Toby, *A new anatomy of Ireland: The Irish protestants, 1649-1770* (Yale, 2003)

Barnard, Toby, *Brought to book: print in Ireland, 1680–1784* (Dublin, 2017)

Barry, Johnathan and Brooks, Christopher (eds.), *The middling sort of people: culture, society and politics in England, 1500-1800* (London, 1994)

Beiner, Guy, *Forgetful remembrance: social forgetting and vernacular historiography of a rebellion in Ulster* (Oxford, 2018)

Beirne, Piers 'Animal abuse and criminology: introduction to a special issue' in *Crime Law and Social Change,* lv, 5 (June 2011), pp 349-57

Bellamy, John, *The Tudor law of treason: an introduction* (Cambridge, 1979)

Bellany, Alastair, '"Railing rhymes and vaunting verse": libellous politics in early Stuart England, 1603-1628' in Sharpe, Kevin and Peter Lake (ed.), *Culture and politics in early Stuart England* (London, 1994), pp 285-310

Bellany, Alastair, 'Railing rhymes revisited: libels, scandals, and early Stuart politics' in *History Compass*, iv (2007), pp 1136–79

Bellany, Alastair, 'Singing libel in Stuart England: the case of the Staines Fiddlers, 1627' in *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, lxix, 1 (2006), pp 177–93

Bellany, Alastair, 'The embarrassment of libels: perceptions and representations of verse libelling in early Stuart England' in Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (eds.), *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England* (Manchester, 2009), pp 144–67

Ben-Ze'ev, Aaron, *The subtlety of emotions* (Massachusetts, 2000)

Bergin, Osborn, *Irish bardic poetry* (Dublin, 1970)

Berković, Daniel, 'Beware of dogs: the position and role of dogs in biblical discourse' in *Kairos: Evangelical Journal of Theology*, viii, 1 (2014), pp 75-84

Bliss, Alan (ed.), *Spoken English in Ireland, 1600-1740: Twenty-seven representative texts* (Michigan, 1979)

Bliss, Alan, 'The English language in early modern Ireland' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin, and F.J. Byrne (eds.), *A new history of Ireland, iii: early modern Ireland 1534-1691* (Oxford, 1993), pp 546-60

Bloch, Maurice, 'Introduction' in Bloch, Maurice (ed.), *Political language and oratory in traditional society* (London, 1975), pp 1– 28

Blok, Anton, *Honour and violence* (Cambridge, 2001)

Boswell, Caroline, 'Provoking disorder: the politics of speech in protectorate Middlesex' in *Journal of British Studies,* liii, 4 (Oct. 2014), pp 885-908

Bound, Fay, 'An angry and malicious mind'? Narratives of slander at the church courts of York, c.1660-c.1760' *History Workshop Journal,* lvi, 1 (Autumn, 2003), pp 59-77

Bourdieu, Pierre and Thompson, John B. (eds.), Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (trans.), *Language and symbolic power* (Cambridge, 2011)

Bourke, Joanna, *Fear: a cultural history* (Great Britain, 2005)

Bourke, Joanna, 'Fear and anxiety: writing about emotion in modern history' in *History Workshop Journal*, lv (2003), pp 111-33

Bourke, Joanna, *What it means to be Human: historical reflections from the 1800s to the present* (Berkeley, 2011)

Bowler, Clara Ann, 'Carted whores and white shrouded apologies: slander in the county courts of seventeenth-century Virginia' in *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, lxxxv, 4 (1977), pp 411-26

Braddick, Michael and Walter, John (eds.), *Negotiating power in early modern society* (Cambridge, 2001)

Braddick, Michael and Philip Withington, *Society in early modern England* (Polity, 2010)

Bradshaw, Brendan and Andrew Hadfield, *Representing Ireland: literature and the origins of conflict, 1534-1660* (Cambridge, 2010)

Burke, Peter and Roy Porter, *Language, self, and society: a social history of language* (Cambridge, 1991)

Burke, Peter and Roy Porter, *The social history of language* (Cambridge, 1987)

Burke, Peter, 'Insult and blasphemy in early modern Italy' in Burke, Peter, *The historical anthropology of early modern Italy: essays on perceptions and communication* (Cambridge, 1987)

Burke, Peter, 'The art of insult in early modern Italy' in *Culture & History,* ii (1986)

Burtachaell, G.D., 'Tinnehinch Castle, Co. Carlow' in *The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, fifth series, vol. 2, no. 4 (Dec., 1892), pp. 443-445.

Butterworth, Emily, *Poisoned words: slander and satire in early modern France* (London, 2006)

Caball, Marc and Andrew Carpenter, *Oral and print culture in Ireland: 1600-1900* (Dublin, 2010)

Caball, Marc, 'Pairlement chloinne tomais I: a reassessment', *Eigse*, xxvii (1993), pp 47-57;

Caball, Marc, 'The Gaelic mind and the collapse of the Gaelic world: an appraisal' in *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*, xxv (Summer 1993), pp 87-96

Cambers, Andrew, 'Reading libels in early seventeenth-century Northamptonshire' in Nadine Lewycky and Adam Morton (eds.), *Getting along? Religious identities and confessional relations in early modern England: essays in honour of Professor W. J. Sheils* (Surrey, 2012), pp 115-32

Canny, Nicholas, *Making Ireland British* (Oxford, 2001)

Canny, Nicholas, 'The 1641 depositions: a source for social and cultural history' in *History Ireland,* i, 4 (Winter, 1993), pp 52-5

Canny, Nicholas, 'The 1641 depositions as a source for the writing of social history: county Cork as a case study' in Patrick O'Flanagan and Cornelius Buttimer (eds.), *Cork: History and Society* (Dublin, 1993), pp 249-308

Canny, Nicholas, 'What really happened in 1642' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.), *Ireland from independence to occupation, 1641-1660* (Cambridge, 1995), pp 24-42

Capp, Bernard, 'Jesus wept' but did the Englishman? Masculinity and emotion in early modern England' in *Past & Present,* ccxxiv, 1 (Aug. 2004), pp 75-108

Capp, Bernard, *When gossips meet: Women, family, and neighbourhood in early modern England* (Oxford, 2003)

Carpenter, Andrew, *Irish poet and the natural world: an anthology of verse in English from the Tudors to the romantics* (Cork, 2015)

Carpenter, Andrew, *Verse in English from eighteenth-century Ireland* (Cord, 1998)

Carpenter, Andrew, *Verse in English from Tudor and Stuart Ireland* (Cork, 2003)

Carter, Philip, 'Tears and the man' in Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor (eds.), *Women, gender and enlightenment* (New York, 2005), pp 156-73

Cavanagh, Dermot and Tim Kirk (ed.), *Subversion and scurrility: popular discourse in Europe from 1500 to the present* (Ashgate, 2000)

Champion, Matthew, 'The priest, the prostitute, and the slander on the walls: shifting perceptions towards historic graffiti' in *Peregrinations: Journal of Medieval Art and Architecture*, vi, 1 (Apr. 2017), pp 5-37

Champion, Michael and Lynch, Andrew (eds.), *Understanding emotions in early Europe* (Brepols, 2015)

Clark, George B., *Irish soldiers in Europe, 17th-19th century* (Cork, 2010)

Clarke, Aidan 'The 1641 depositions' in Fox, Peter (ed.), *Treasures of the library, Trinity College Dublin* (Dublin, 1986), pp 111-22

Clarke, Aidan, 'The "1641 massacres"' in Micheál Ó Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions* (Manchester, 2013), pp 37-51

Clarke, Aidan, 'The colonisation of Ulster and the rebellion of 1641: 1603-60' in T.W. Moody and F.X. Martin (eds.), *The course of Irish history* (Cork, 1967), pp 189-203

Clarke, Aidan, 'The 1641 rebellion and anti-popery in Ireland' in Brian Mac Cuarta, *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising* (Belfast, 1997)

Clarke, Aidan, 'The genesis of the Ulster rising' in Peter Roebuck (ed.), *Plantation to partition* (Belfast, 1981), pp 29-45

Coffey, John and Lim, Paul C.H. (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008)

Cogswell, Thomas, 'Underground verse and the transformation of early Stuart political culture' in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, lx, 3 (1997), pp 303-26

Cohen, Elizabeth, 'Honor and gender in the streets of early modern Rome' in *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History,* xxii, 4 (1991), pp 597-625

Colclough, David, 'Freedom of speech, libel and the law in early Stuart England' in Sheen, Erica and Lorna Hutson, *Literature, politics and law in Renaissance England* (New York, 2005), pp 170-88

Colclough, David, 'Verse Libels and the Epideictic Tradition in Early Stuart England' in *The Huntington Library Quarterly; San Marino,* lxix, 1, (2006), pp 15-30

Cole, Lucinda, *Imperfect creatures: vermin, literature, and the sciences of life, 1600-1740* (Michigan, 2016)

Collins, Randall, *Violence: a micro-sociological theory* (Princeton, 2008)

Conley, Thomas, 'Vituperation in early seventeenth century historical studies' in *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, xxii, 2 (Spring 2004), pp 169-82

Conley, Thomas, *Toward a rhetoric of insult* (Chicago, 2009)

Coolahan, Marie-Louise, *Women, writing, and language in early modern Ireland* (Oxford, 2010)

Cope, Joseph, 'Fashioning victims: Dr. Henry Jones and the plight of Irish protestants, 1642' in *Historical Research,* lxxiv, 186 (Nov. 2001), pp 370-39

Cope, Joseph, *England and the 1641 Irish rebellion* (Woodbridge, 2009)

Corish, Patrick, 'The rising of 1641 and the confederacy, 1641-5' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin, and F.J. Byrne (eds.), *A new history of Ireland, iii: early modern Ireland 1534-1691* (Oxford, 1993), pp 289-316

Costello, Kevin, 'The court of admiralty of Ireland, 1745-1756' in *The American Journal of Legal History, l,*1 (Jan. 2008-2010), pp 23-48

Covington, Sarah, '"Realms so barbarous and cruel": writing violence in early modern Ireland and England' in *History,* xcix (2014), pp 487-504

Covington, Sarah, 'Those savage days of memory: John Temple and his narrative of the 1641 uprising' in Fionnuala Dillane and Emilie Pine, and Naomi McAreavey (eds.), *The body in pain in Irish literature and culture* (Switzerland, 2016), pp 57-73

Crane, Elaine Forman *Witches, wife Beaters, and whores: common law and common folk in early America* (Cornell, 2011)

Crawford, Jon, 'The origins of the court of castle chamber; a star chamber jurisdiction in Ireland**' in** *The American journal of legal history*, vxxiv, 1 (Jan. 1980), pp 22-53

Cressy, David, *Dangerous talk: scandalous, seditious and treasonable speech in pre-modern England* (Oxford, 2010)

Croft, Pauline, 'Libel, popular literacy and public opinion in early modern England' in *Historical Research*, lxviii (1995)

Crooks, Peter, '"Hobbes", "dogs" and politics in the Ireland of Lionel of Antwerp, c. 1361-6: The Denis Bethell prize essay' in *The Haskins Society Journal*, xvi (2005), pp 117–48

Cunningham, Bernadette, 'Language, Literature and Print in Irish, 1630–1730' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Ireland, volume 2:1550-1730* (Cambridge, 2018), pp 434-57

Cunningham, Bernadette, 'Native culture and political change in Ireland, 1580-1640' in Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie (eds.), *Natives and newcomers: essays on the making of Irish colonial society, 1534-1641* (Dublin, 1986), pp 148-70

Cust, Richard and Hopper, Andrew (eds.), *Cases in the high court of chivalry, 1634-1640* (London, 2006)

Cust, Richard, 'A Rutland quarrel, the court of chivalry and the Irish peerage during Charles I's personal rule' in *Midland History*, xxxv, 2 (2010), pp 149-73

Cust, Richard, 'Honour and politics in early stuart England: the case of Beaumont v. Hastings' in *Past and Present,* cxlix (Nov. 1995), pp 57-93

Dabhioiwala, Faramerz, 'The construction of honour, reputation and status in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century England' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* vi (1996), pp 201-13

Darcy, Eamon, *The Irish rebellion of 1641 and the wars of the three kingdoms* (Suffolk, 2013)

Darcy, Eamon, 'The social order of the 1641 rebellion' in Annaleigh Margey, Eamon Darcy, and Elaine Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London, 2012), pp 97-111

Darcy, Eamon, Annaleigh Margey, and Elaine Murphy, *The 1641 depositions and the Irish rebellion* (London, 2012)

Davis, Natalie, 'The rites of violence: religious riot in sixteenth-century France' in *Past & present,* lix (May 1973), pp 51-9

Descheemaeker, Eric, 'Protecting reputation: defamation and negligence' in *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, xxix, 4 (Winter, 2009), pp 603-64

Dickenson, J.H. and J.A. Sharpe, 'Court, crime and litigation in the Isle of Man, 1580-1700' in *Historical Research,* lxxii, 178 (June 1999), pp 140-59

Dixon, Thomas, *From passions to emotions: the creation of a secular psychological category* (Cambridge, 2003)

Domańska, Ewa, 'Animal history' in *History and Theory*, lvi (June 2017), pp 267–87

Douglas, Mary, *Implicit meanings: Essays in anthropology* (Routledge, 1975).

Dryden, John, 'Passions, affections, and emotions: methodological difficulties in reconstructing Aquinas's philosophical psychology' in *Literature Compass*, xiii, 6 (2016), pp 343-50

Dunne, Tom, 'The Gaelic response to conquest and colonisation: the evidence of the poetry', *Studia Hib*., xx (1980), pp 7-30

Duszak, Anna, *Us and others: social identities across languages* (Philadelphia, 2002)
Edwards, David, Pádraig Lenihan, and Clodagh Tait, *Age of atrocity: violence and political conflict in early modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2007)

Ekman, Paul, 'Universals and Cultural Differences in Facial Expressions of Emotions' in Cole, James (ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (Nebraska, 1972), pp 207-28

Ekman, Paul, 'Universal Facial Expressions of Emotions' in *California Mental Health Research Digest,* viii, 4, pp 151-158

Empey, Mark 'The diary of John Ware, 1623-1666' in *Analecta Hibernica,* no. 45 (IMC, 2014), pp. 55-146.

Farge, Arlette, *Subversive words: public opinion in eighteenth-century France* (Pennsylvania, 1995)

Farrell, Gerrard, *The 'mere Irish' and the colonisation of Ulster, 1570-1641* (Cambridge, 2017)

Febvre, Lucien, "La sensibilite et I'histoire: Comment reconstituer la vie affective d'autrefois?" in *Annales d'histoire sociale*, iii (January-June 1941), pp 5-20

Fennell, Barbara, '"Dodgy dossiers"? Hearsay and the 1641 depositions' in *History Ireland*, xix (2011), pp 26-9

Ferguson, J.F., 'The Ulster roll of gaol delivery, 1613-1618' in *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, i, 1 (1853), pp 260-70

Few, Martha, and Zeb, Tortorici (eds.), *Centering animals in Latin American history* (Duke University, 2013)

Foster, Andrew, *The Church of England: 1570-1640* (London, 1994)

Fox, Adam, 'Ballads, libels and popular ridicule in Jacobean England' in *Past and Present*, cxlv (Nov. 1994), pp 47–83

Franz, Natalie, 'The spiteful tongue: Breton song practices and the art of the insult' in *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, xxviii (2008), pp 28-39

Frevert, Ute, *Emotions in history – lost and found* (Central European Univ. Press, 2011)

Frevert, Ute, Pascal Eitler, Christian Bailer, Benno Gammerl, Bettina Hitzer, Monique, Scheer, Margrit Pernau, Anne Schmidt, Nina Verheyan, *Emotional lexicons: continuity and change in the vocabulary of feeling 1700-2000* (Oxford, 2014)

Fudge, Erica, 'What was it like to be a cow? History and animal studies' in Linda Kalof (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of animal studies* (Oxford, 2017), pp 258–78

Fudge, Erica, *Brutal reasoning: animals, rationality, and humanity in early modern England* (Cornell, 2006)

Garlington, Don, '"You fool!": Matthew 5:22' in *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, xx, 1 (2010), pp 61-83

Garrioch, David, 'Verbal insults in eighteenth-century Paris' in Peter Burke and Roy Porter (eds.), *The social history of language* (Cambridge, 1987), pp 104-20

Gazzard, Hugh, 'An act to prevent abuses of players (1606)' in *The Review of English Studies,* New Series, lxi, 251 (Sept. 2010), pp 495-528

Gibney, John, 'Protestant interests? The 1641 rebellion and state formation in early modern Ireland' in *Historical Research,* lxxxii, 223 (Feb. 2011), pp 67-86

Gillespie, Raymond, *Seventeenth century Ireland* (Dublin 2006)

Gillespie, Raymond, "Success and failure in the Ulster Plantation," in Éamonn Ó Ciardha and Micheál Ó Siochrú (eds.), *The plantation of Ulster: ideology and practice* (Manchester, 2012), pp 98-118

Gillespie, Raymond, 'The trials of bishop Spottiswood' in *Clogher Record,* vol. 12, no, 3 (1987), pp. 320-333.

Gowing, Laura, 'Gender and the language of insult in early modern London' in *History Workshop,* xxxv (1993), pp 1-2

Gowing, Laura, 'Women, status and the popular culture of dishonour' in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vi (1996), pp 225-33

Gowing, Laura, *Domestic dangers: women, words, and sex in early modern London* (Oxford, 1996)

Greengrass, Mark, 'Language and conflict in the French wars of religion' in Micheál Ó Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions* (Manchester, 2013), pp 197-218

Gribben, Crawford, 'Defining the puritans? The baptism debate in Cromwellian Ireland, 1654-56' in *Church History*, lxxiii, 1 (2004), pp 63-89

Gribben, Crawford, 'Puritanism in Ireland and Wales' in John Coffey and Paul Chang-Ha Lim (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2008), pp 159-73

Gribben, Crawford, *The Irish puritans: James Ussher and the reformation of the Church* (Darlington, 2003)

Gribben, Crawford, *The puritan millennium: literature and theology, 1550-1682* (Dublin, 2000)

Griffiths, Paul, 'Punishing words: insults and injuries, 1525-1700,' in Angela McShane and Garthine Walker (eds.), *The ordinary and the everyday in early modern England: essays in celebration of the work of Bernard Capp* (UK, 2010), pp 66-83

Haberman, Ina, *Staging slander and gender in early modern England* (Ashgate, 2003)

Haigh, Christopher, 'Slander and the church courts in the sixteenth century' in *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society,* lxxviii (1975), pp 1-13

Hall, Dianne, 'Fear, gender, and violence in early modern Ireland' in Michael Champion and Andrew Lynch (eds.), *Understanding emotions in early Europe* (Brepols, 2015), pp 215-23

Hall, Dianne, 'Most barbarously and inhumanined manner butchered: masculinity, trauma, and memory in early modern Ireland' in Fionnuala Dillane, Naomi McAreavey, and Emilie Pine (eds.), *The body in pain in Irish literature and culture* (Dublin, 2016), pp 39-56

Hall, Dianne, 'Words as weapons: speech, violence, and gender in late medieval Ireland' in *Eire-Ireland,* xli (2006), pp 122-14

Hall, Dianne and Elizabeth Malcolm, 'The rebels Turkish tyranny': understanding sexual violence in Ireland during the 1640s' in *Gender & History*, xxii, 1 (Apr. 2010), pp 55-73

Haraway, Donna, *The companion species manifesto: dogs, people, and significant otherness* (Chicago, 2003)

Hartdegen, Stephen J. and Christian Ceroke, *The new American bible* (Canada, 1987)

Haugen, Kristine Louise, 'Imagined universities: public insult and the Terrae Filius in early modern Oxford' in *History of Universities*, xvi, 2 (2000), pp 1-31

Herrup, Cynthia, 'To pluck bright honour from the pale-faced moon': gender and honour in the Castlehaven story' in *Transactions of the royal historical society*, vi, 6 (1996), pp 137-160

Herrup, Cynthia, *A house in gross disorder: sex, law and the 2nd earl of Castlehaven* (Oxford, 1999)

Hitchcock, Tim and Michelle Cohen, *English masculinities, 1600-1800* (London, 1999)

Horowtiz, Donald, *The deadly ethnic riot* (London, 2001)

Hughes, Geoffrey, *The encyclopedia of swearing: the social history of oaths, profanity, foul language, and ethnic slurs in the English-speaking world* (New York, 2006)

Hunt, William *The puritan moment—The coming of the revolution in an English county* (Massachusetts, 1979)

Ingram, Martin, 'Ridings, rough music and mocking rhymes in early modem England' in Reay, Barry (ed.), *Popular culture in seventeenth-century England* (London, 1985)

Ingram, Martin, 'Law, litigants and the construction of 'honour': slander suits in early modern England' in Coss, Peter (ed.), *The moral world of the law* (Cambridge, 2000), pp 134-60

Ingram, Martin, *Church courts, sex and marriage in England, 1570-1640* (Cambridge, 1987)

Jacob, Katherine A.E., 'Defending blasphemy: exploring religious expression under Ireland's blasphemy law' in *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, xliv, 3 (2012), pp 803-43

James, Mervyn, 'English politics and the concept of honour, 1485-1642' in *Past and Present*, iii (1986), pp 308-413

James, Mervyn, *Society, politics and culture: studies in early modern England* (Cambridge, 1986)

Jarrick, Anne, *Back to modern reason: Johan Hjerpe and other petit bourgeois in Stockholm in the age of enlightenment* (Liverpool, 1998)

Jenner, Mark, 'The great dog massacre' in William Naphy and Penny Roberts (eds.), *Fear in early modern society* (Manchester, 1997), pp 44-6

Jones, Inga, '"Holy war"? Religion, ethnicity and massacre during the Irish rebellion 1641-2' in Eamon Darcy, Annaleigh Margey and Elaine Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 depositions and the Irish rebellion* (London, 2012), pp 129-142

Kalof, Linda (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of animal studies* (New York, 2017)

Kalof, Linda, *Looking at animals in human history* (London, 2007)

Kamensky, Jane, *Governing the tongue: the politics of speech in early New England* (Oxford, 1997)

Kane, Brendan, 'From Irish *eineach* to British honor? Noble honor and high politics in early modern Ireland, 1500–1650' *History compass,* vii, 2 (2009), pp 414-30

Kane, Brendan, 'Making the Irish European: Gaelic honor politics and its continental contexts' in *Renaissance Quarterly*, lxi, 4 (Winter 2008), pp 1139-66

Kane, Brendan, *The politics and culture of honour in Britain and Ireland, 1541-1641* (Cambridge, 2010)

Kaplan, Lindsay, *The culture of slander in early modern England* (Cambridge, 1997)

Kelly, Fergus, *Guide to Early Irish law* (Dublin, 1988)

Kermode, Jennifer and Garthine Walker, *Women, crime and the courts in early modern England* (Chapel Hill, 1994)

Labouv, William, 'Rules for ritual onsults' in Nikolas Coupland and Adam Jaworski (eds.), *Socioloinguistics: a reader* (London, 1997), pp 472-86

Laffan, Michael and Weiss, Max (eds.), *Facing fear: the history of emotion in global perspective* (Princeton, 2012)

Lederer, David, 'Fear of the thirty years war' in Michael Laffan and Max Weiss, *Facing fear: the history of an emotion in global perspective* (Princeton, 2012), pp 10-30

Leerssen, Joep, 'Wildness, wilderness, and Ireland: medieval and early-modern patterns in the demarcation of civility' in *Journal of the history of ideas,* lvi, 1 (Jan. 1995), pp 25-39

Lindley, Keith, 'Irish adventurers and godly militants in the 1640s' in *Irish Historical Studies*, xxix (1994) pp 1-12

MacCurtain, Margaret and Mary O'Dowd, *Women in early modern Ireland* (Edinburgh, 1991)

MacInnes, Ian, '*Mastiffs and spaniels*: *gender and nation in the English dog' in Textual Practice,* xvii, 1 (2003), pp 21-40

MacLeod, Nicola, '"Rogues, villains, and base trulls": constructing the "other" in the 1641 depositions' in Eamon Darcy and Annaleigh Margey, and Elaine Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 depositions and the Irish rebellion* (London, 2012), pp 113-28

Mazzio, Carla, 'Sins of the tongue in early modern England' in *Modern Language Studies*, xxviii, 3/4 (Autumn, 1998), pp 93-123

McAreavey, Naomi 'Portadown 1641: memory and the 1641 depositions' in *Irish University Review,* xlvii, 1 (Apr. 2017), pp 15-31

McCafferty, John, 'Defamation and the church courts in early sixteenth Century Armagh' in *Archivium Hibernicum: Irish Historical Records*, xlviii (Jan. 1994), pp 88-99

McCaughey, Terence, 'Bards beasts and men' in Donnchadh Ó Corráin, Liam Breatnach and Kim McCone (eds.), *Sages, saints and storytellers: Celtic studies in honour of Professor James Carney* (Maynooth, 1989), pp 102-12

McGee, C. E., 'Pocky queans and horned knaves: gender stereotypes in libelous poems' in Mary Ellen Lamb and Karen Bamford (eds.), *Oral traditions and gender in early modern literary texts* (Ashgate, 2008), pp 139-152

McNamara, Lawrence, *Reputation and defamation* (Oxford, 2007)

McRae, Andrew, 'Stigmatizing Prynne: seditious libel, political satire and the construction of opposition' in Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (eds.), *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary essays on culture and politics in the Caroline era* (Manchester, 2006), pp 171-88

McRae, Andrew, 'The verse libel: popular satire in early modern England' in Dermot Cavanagh and Time Kirk (eds.), *Subversion and scurrility: popular discourse in Europe from 1500 to present* (Ashgate, 2000), pp 58-73

McRae, Andrew, *Literature, satire, and the early Stuart state* (2004)

Montagu, Ashley, *The anatomy of swearing* (Philadelphia, 1967)

Montaño, John*, The roots of English colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011)

Moody, T.W., 'Colonial identity in early seventeenth century Ireland' in T.W. Moody, *Nationality and the pursuit of national independence: historical studies XI* (Belfast, 1978)

Naphy, William and Roberts, Penny (eds.), *Fear in early modern society* (Manchester, 1997)

Neyts, Ciska, 'Mapping the outbreak of the rebellion: robberies in county Cavan (Oct. 1641)' in Eamon Darcy, Annaleigh Margey, and Elaine Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 depositions and the Irish rebellion* (Routledge, 2016), pp 35-50

Nicholls, Ken, 'Some documents on Irish law and custom in the sixteenth century' in *Analaecta Hibernica,* (1970), pp. 27-33

Ní Mhurchadha, Maighréad, *Fingal, 1603-60: contending neighbours in North Dublin* (Dublin, 2005), pp. 185-6.

Noonan, Kathleen M.,' "The cruell pressure of an enraged, barbarous people": Irish and English identity in seventeenth-century policy and propaganda' in *The Historical Journal,* xli, 1 (Mar. 1998), pp 151-177

Norton, Mary Beth, 'Gender and defamation in seventeenth-century Maryland' in *The William and Mary quarterly,* xliv (1987), pp 4-39

Ó Cuív, Brian, 'The Irish language in the early modern period' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin, and F.J. Byrne (eds.), *A new history of Ireland, iii: early modern Ireland 1534-1691* (Oxford, 1993), pp 509-43

O'Connell, Michael, Kelly, Fergus and McAdam, James H. (eds.) *Cattle in ancient and modern Ireland: farming practices, environment and economy* (Cambridge, 2016)

O' Flanaghan, Patrick and Buttimer, Cornelius G. (eds.), *Cork: history and society: interdisciplinary essays on the history of the Irish county* (Geography Publications, 1993)

O'Dowd, Mary, 'Women and war in Ireland in the 1640s' in Mary O'Dowd and Margaret MacCurtain (eds.), *Women in early modern Ireland* (Edinburgh, 1991), pp 101-9

O'Dowd, Mary, 'Women and the Irish chancery court in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries' in *Irish historical studies,* xxxi, 124 (Nov. 1999), pp 470-87

O'Dowd, Mary, *A history of women in Ireland, 1500-1800* (Virginia, 2005)

Ohlmeyer Jane and Ó Siochru, Micheál (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions* (Manchester, 2013)

Ohlmeyer, Jane and Steven Zwicker, 'John Dryden, the house of Ormond, and the politics of Anglo-Irish patronage' in *The Historical Journal,* xlix, 3 (2006), pp 677-706

Ohlmeyer, Jane, 'Anatomy of plantation: the 1641 depositions', *History Ireland*, xvii, 6 (2009), pp 54-6

Ohlmeyer, Jane (ed.), *Ireland from independence to occupation, 1641-1660* (Cambridge, 1995)

Ohlmeyer, Jane, 'Records of the Irish chancery court: a preliminary report for 1627-1634' in Desmond Greer and Norma Dawson (eds.), *Mysteries and solutions in Irish legal history* (Dublin, 2001), pp 15-49

Ohlmeyer, Jane (ed.), *The Cambridge history of Ireland, volume 2:1550-1730* (Cambridge, 2018)

Ohlmeyer, Jane, *Making Ireland English: the Irish aristocracy in the seventeenth century* (Yale, 2012)

O Riordan, Michelle, *Irish bardic poetry and rhetorical reality* (Cork, 2007)

O Riordan, Michelle, *The Gaelic mind and the collapse of the Gaelic world* (Cork, 1990)

Palmer, Patricia, 'Interpreters and the politics of translation and traduction in sixteenth-century Ireland' in *Irish Historical Studies*, xxxiii, 131 (May 2003), pp 257-77

Palmer, Patricia *Language and conquest in early modern Ireland: English Renaissance literature and Elizabethan imperial expansion* (Cambridge, 2001)

Palmer, William, 'Gender, violence and rebellion in Tudor and early Stuart Ireland' in *Sixteenth Century Journal,* xxiii (1992), pp 699-71

Palmer, William, 'That "insolent liberty" honor, rites of power, and persuasion in sixteenth-century Ireland' in *Renaissance Quarterly*, xlvi, 2 (Summer 1993), pp 308-27

Parkin, David, 'Violence and will' in David Riches (ed.), *The anthropology of violence* (Oxford, 1986), pp 204-23

Patterson, Annabel, '"For words only": from treason trial to liberal legend in early modern England' in *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities,* v, 2 (Jan. 1993), pp 389- 416

Perry, Curtis, 'If proclamations will not serve': the late manuscript poetry of James I and the culture of libel' in Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (eds.), *Royal subjects: essays on the writings of James VI and I* (Detroit, 2002)

Peters, Erin, 'Trauma narratives of the English civil war' in *Journal for Early modern cultural studies*, xvi, 1 (Winter, 2016), pp 78-93

Petersen, Roger D., *Understanding ethnic violence: fear, hatred, and resentment in Twentieth-century Eastern Europe* (Cambridge, 2002)

Pilch, John, 'Insults and face work in the bible' in *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies,* lxx, 1 (2014), pp 1-8

Plamper, Jan and Keith Tribe (trans.), *The history of emotions: an introduction* (Oxford, 2012)

Pollock, Linda, 'Honor, gender, and reconciliation in elite culture, 1570-1700' in *Journal of British studies,* xlviii (2007), pp 3-29

Prosser, William L., 'Insult and outrage' in *California Law Review,* xliv (March 1956), pp 40-63

Reddy, William M., *The navigation of feeling: a framework for the history of emotions* (Cambridge, 2011)

Redmond, Joan, 'Memories of violence and New English identities in early modern Ireland' in *Historical Research,* lxxxix, 246 (2016), pp 708-29

Riches, David (ed.), *The anthropology of violence* (Oxford, 1986)

Robinson, Morgan T.P., 'An act 'soe fowle and grievous': contextualizing rape in the 1641 rebellion' in *Irish Historical Studies,* xxxix, 156 (Nov. 2015), pp 595-619

Rosenwein, Barbara and Cristiani, Riccardo, *What is the history of emotion?* (Cambridge, 2018)

Rosenwein, Barbara, *Emotional communities in the early middle ages* (Cornell, 2007)

Rosenwein, Barbara, *Generations of feelings: a history of emotions, 600-1700* (Cambridge, 2015)

Rosenwein, Barbara, 'Worrying about emotions in history' in *American Historical Review* cvii, 3 (2002), p. 821-43

Rudé, George *The crowd history: a study of popular disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848* (London, 2005)

Rudé, George, *The crowd in the French revolution* (Oxford, 1959)

Rushton, Peter, 'The rise and fall of seditious words, 1650 to 1750' in *Northern History*, lii, 1 (March 2015), pp 68-83

Rushworth, John, *Mr Rushworth's historical collections abridg'd and improved, volume 3* (ECCO, 2010)

Sawyer, Jeffrey K., *Printed poison: pamphlet propaganda, faction politics, and the public sphere in early seventeenth century France* (California, 1990)

Scott, James C., *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance* (Yale, 2008)

Seidel, Michael, 'Satire, lampoon, libel, slander' in Zwicker, Steven N. (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to English literature 1650-1740* (Cambridge, 1998), pp 33-57

Serna, Pierre, *Comme des bêtes: histoire politique de l'animal en revolution* (Paris, 2017)

Seymour, John D., *The puritans in Ireland, 1647-1661* (Oxford, 1969)

Shagan, Ethan H., 'Early modern violence from memory to history: a historiographical essay' in Micheál Ó Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions* (Manchester, 2013), pp 17-36

Sharpe, James, *Defamation and sexual Slander in early modern England: the church courts at York* (York, 1980)

Shepard, Alexandra and Karen Harvey, 'What have historians done with masculinity? Reflections on five centuries of British history, circa 1500-1950' in *Journal of British Studies,* xliv (2005), pp 274-80

Shepard, Alexandra, *Meanings of manhood in early modern England* (Oxford, 2003)

Shepard, Alexandra, 'Manhood, credit and patriarchy in early modern England c. 1580-1649' in *Past & Present,* clxvii (May 2000), pp 75-106

Shields, Stephanie, *Speaking from the heart: gender and the social meaning of emotion* (Cambridge, 2002)

Shoemaker, Robert B., 'The decline of public insult in London 1660-1800' in *Past & Present,* liv (1998), pp 511-39

Siegal, Michal Bar-Asher, 'Matthew 5:22 : the insult "fool" and the interpretation of the law in Christian and Rabbinic sources' in *Revue de L'histoire des Religions,* ccxxxiv (2017), pp 5-23

Smith, David Livingstone, *Less than human: why we demean, enslave, and exterminate others* (New York, 2011)

Solterer, Helen, 'Flaming words: verbal violence and gender in premodern Paris' in *Romanic Review,* lxxxvi (March 1995), pp 355-78

Spinks, Jennifer and Zika, Charles (eds.), *Disaster, death and the emotions in the shadow of the apocalypse, 1400–1700* (London, 2016)

Spurr, John, *English puritanism, 1603-1689* (London, 1998)

Stacy, Robin, *Dark speech: the performance of law in early Ireland* (Philadelphia, 2007)

Stavreva, Kirilka, *Words like daggers: violent female speech in early modern England* (Nebraska, 2015)

Stearns, Peter and Carol Stearns, 'Emotionology: clarifying the history of emotions and emotional standards' in *American Historical Review,* xc (Oct. 1985), pp 813-36

Suggett, Richard, 'Slander in early modern Wales' in *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, xxxix (1992), pp 119-49

Sweetnam, Mark, 'Sheep in the midst of wolves'?: the protestant ministry in the 1641 depositions' in *Journal of the Irish and Scottish studies*, vi, 2 (2013), pp 71-9

Tait, Clodagh, '"Whereat his wife tooke great greef & died": dying of sorrow and killing in anger in seventeenth-century Ireland' in Michael J. Braddick and Philip Withington (eds.), *Popular culture and political agency in early modern England and Ireland: essays in honour of John Walter* (Woodbridge, 2017), pp 266-86

Tait, Clodagh, 'Society, 1550-1700' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge history of*

Ireland, volume 2:1550-1730 (Cambridge, 2018), pp 273-97

Thomas, Keith, *Man and the natural world: changing attitudes in England, 1500-1800* (London, 1984)

Thompson, E.P., *The making of the English working class* (London, 1963)

Thompson, Roger, '"Holy watchfulness" and communal conformism: the functions of defamation in early New England communities' in *The New England quarterly,* lvi (Dec. 1983), pp 504-52

Thorley, David, 'Towards a history of emotion, 1562-1660' in *The Seventeenth Century,* xxviii, 1, (2013), pp 3–19

Vaught, Jennifer, *Masculinity and emotion in early modern English literature* (Ashgate, 2008)

Walker, Garthine, 'Expanding the boundaries of female honour in early modern England' in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* vi (1996), pp 235-43

Walter, John, 'Performative violence and the politics of violence in the 1641 depositions' in Micheál Ó Siochru and Jane Ohlmeyer, *Ireland: 1641 contexts and reactions* (Manchester, 2013), pp 134-52

Walter, John, 'The pooremans joy and the gentlemans plague: a Lincolnshire libel and the politics of sedition in early modern England' in *Past & Present*, ccii, 1 (2009), pp 29-67

Walter, John, *Crowds and popular politics in early modern England* (Manchester, 2006)

Walter, John, *Understanding popular violence in the English revolution: the Colchester plunderers* (Cambridge, 1999)

Wells, Jennifer, 'English law, Irish trials and Cromwellian state building in the 1650s' in *Past & Present,* ccxxvii, 1 (May 2015), pp 77-119

Withington, Philip, *Popular culture and political agency in early modern England and Ireland: essays in honour of John Walter* (Woodbridge, 2017)

Wood, Andy, 'Fear, hatred and the hidden injuries of class in early modern England' in *Journal of Social History*, xxxix, 3, (Spring, 2006), pp 803-26

Wood, Andy, 'The queen is 'a goggyll eyed hoore': gender and seditious speech in early modern England' in Tyacke, Nicholas (ed.), *The English revolution c. 1590-1720: politics, religion and communities* (Manchester, 2007), pp 81-93

Wood, Andy, *The 1549 rebellions and the making of early modern England* (Cambridge, 2007)

Woodward, Donald, 'A comparative study of the Irish and Scottish livestock trades in the seventeenth century' in Louis M. Cullen and Thomas Christopher Smout (eds.),

Comparative aspects of Scottish and Irish economic and social history, 1600-1900 (Edinburgh, 1977), pp 147-63

Woodward, Donald, 'The Anglo-Irish livestock trade of the seventeenth century' in *Irish Historical Studies*, xviii, 72 (1973), pp 489-523

Unpublished theses

Hoffman, Grace, 'Insult within the 1641 depositions: social and violent implications of spoken words' (M.Phil. thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2016)

Peacock, Dave, 'Morals, rituals and gender: aspects of social relations in the diocese of Norwich, 1660-1703' (D. Phil., York, 1996)