Landscapes of ‘Civilisation’ and ‘Barbarity’ in the 1641 Irish Rebellion

The British Museum, Museum number: 1854, 1113.100, Asset number: 250408001, A broadside with an ABC on the Irish Massacre of Protestants, by Wenceslaus Hollar (London: John Rothwell, 1642), https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1854-1113-100, accessed on: 17/2/23.

Lauren McDougall
University of Strathclyde

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
History PhD
Supervisors: Professor Alison Cathcart & Professor Erica Fudge

Registration No.: 201859367

Submission Year 5: 2023

Declaration of Authenticity and Author's Rights

This thesis is the result of the author's original research. It has been composed by the author and has not been previously submitted for examination which has led to the award of a degree.

The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author under the terms of the United Kingdom Copyright Acts as qualified by University of Strathclyde Regulation 3.50. Due acknowledgement must always be made of the use of any material contained in, or derived from, this thesis.

Signed:

Date: 11/3/24

Words, not including front cover, declaration of rights, abstract, COVID-19 impact statement, acknowledgements, or bibliography, but *including* contents, preface, and footnotes: 103,856.

Thesis Abstract

The present research is comprised of an investigation into the organisation, execution, and reportage of the 1641 Irish rebellion in relation to the early modern Anglo-Irish struggle over 'civility' and 'civilisation', specifically by examining Irish and English perspectives of the ownership, use, and representation of the physical landscape throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In doing so, this investigation has contributed towards a greater understanding of the complexity of the Irish rebellion beyond its confessional scope, and has emphasised the significance of the landed dimension in relation to the continuation and endurance of Anglo-Irish conflict, from the Desmond Rebellions, to the Nine Years' War, up until the outbreak of the Irish rebellion in 1641. By sampling individual testimonies of the Irish insurrection alongside larger contemporary accounts of the conflict, the English concern with the conquest and 'civilisation' of the physical Irish landscape and its inhabitants has been proven to extend across time, and was as much of a concern for average English and Protestant settlers seeking to 'improve' upon the land as for the colonial authorities of the crown, even after the onset of the conflict. As for the non-elite Irish population, who became the driving force behind the insurrection, given the scale of the displacement, dispossession, and devastation associated with the English conquest of Ireland, the rebellion was fought in order to reclaim their ancestral landscape, and was executed in order to restore the landscape to its former condition, use, and ownership, thus reinforcing Gaelic ties to the landscape itself. The rebellion constituted a battleground, not simply for the English conquest of the Irish landscape and its inhabitants, or even for religious denomination, but for the defence and advancement of English 'civilisation', or, from the perspective of the Irish, the restoration of Irish Gaeldom.

Covid-19 Impact Statement

Pre-pandemic research plans

Prior to the initial outbreak of COVID-19 and the escalation of the spread of the virus to the status of a pandemic, the plan for my research was based upon the qualitative examination and analysis of various English and Irish contemporary sources from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Specifically, it centred on sources that related to agriculture and land use, and the English concepts of 'civility' and 'barbarism' were also to be interrogated in order to contribute towards a greater understanding of Irish agriculture and its centrality in relation to the endurance of Anglo-Irish hostility and conflict. Though I understood that the University of Strathclyde had access to a number of valuable online resources for the undertaking of this project (such as MEMSO and Historical Texts), I had discussed with my supervisors my plans to visit various archives (namely Trinity College Dublin Archives, the Irish Agricultural Museum, the National Museum of Ireland, the British Library, and the National Archives) in order to conduct further research into these subjects by examining sources such as maps, commentaries, chronicles, correspondence, and archaeological and material evidence which were not readily accessible.

However, after undertaking a massive amount of reading and general research around my thesis over the course of my first year of my doctoral research, the onset of the pandemic quickly began to derail many of my plans. Since I had been working mostly with secondary sources and some valuable, accessible online sources in order to plan and write my literature review, based upon the history of the concept of 'civility' as much as that of Anglo-Irish relations, as well as my first chapter, which originally contextualised early modern farming practices in Ireland and England, I had not yet begun to undertake any research trips, and had

been discussing the potential for undertaking my first trip to Dublin around February 2020 with my supervisors.

Impact and disruption

Like many others, I was aware of the mounting number of cases of COVID throughout the period of January, and was becoming nervous at the prospect of travelling anywhere outwith Scotland and away from my parents, both of whom are immunocompromised as a result of a heart condition and previous treatment for breast cancer. I decided to wait until the end of February to reassess the situation while continuing my research with online resources available via Strathclyde's databases, only to watch as the situation worsened to the point of the first UK lockdown in March 2020. It was from this point onwards that my research progress began to stall to a significant extent. Unable to continue with plans for archival research, I became uncertain about the direction of my work and unsure of how to move forward. I battled with my mental health throughout this period, and was anxious about my own physical health as I suffer from chronic illness, as well as that of my parents and my partner, all of whom had no other choice than to continue to leave the house on account of their own responsibilities. During this period, I took some time to adjust to the 'new normal' and to try to organise my thoughts in terms of my thesis, but ultimately struggled both academically and personally.

In order to try to figure out a way to move forward through the confusion and uncertainty, I began to sift through any resources for early modern English and Irish history which were available online, and from these sources attempted to consider alternative lines of historical enquiry which remained relevant to my research interests. It was during this period that I discovered the 1641 Depositions online archive created by Trinity College Dublin,

designed to document and transcribe around 8,000 original witness statements, examinations, and other materials associated with the 1641 Irish rebellion. I had no prior knowledge of this rebellion, having previously studied Ireland in the sixteenth and very early seventeenth centuries as part of my undergraduate and Masters, but I began to investigate the contents of the depositions and to examine the rebellion in a more general sense in order to better understand its historical context. Around the same time, I shared with my supervisors my discovery of the depositions, and we discussed the potential for those resources to become valuable for the progression of my own research. As these sources were readily available online, and because of the long-term uncertainty regarding the pandemic, they encouraged me to continue to examine those testimonies and to report upon my opinion on their utility. Given the time to consider the depositions and the Irish rebellion in greater detail, I discovered that many of the same concerns which I had previously set out to explore — including agriculture, land use, and the English concepts of 'civility' and 'barbarism' — appeared to have coloured the violence in 1641 and seemed to have been overlooked within the historiography of the Irish rebellion.

Summary of decisions

Based upon discussions between myself and my supervisors, as well as my own findings, I decided that my research would be reconstructed and planned around the investigation of 'civility', 'barbarism', land use, and the 1641 Irish rebellion. Given the new focus of my research, I understood that it would be necessary to essentially start my reading from scratch in order to get to grips with the historiography of the rebellion itself, which was both incredibly vast and complex, having been dominated by religious and political perspectives of the seventeenth century. Accordingly, although my own research sought to examine the rebellion from a different perspective altogether, it was important to ground my work within

that historiography and to engage with those key arguments, which took around 6 months in total from the beginning of my reading. Additionally, I knew it would be necessary to redraft and even to rewrite much of the work which I had completed previously, which involved reviewing those pieces alongside my supervisors in order to draw out relevant details and arguments, to omit any irrelevant discussion, and to restructure those sections in order to ensure their logical integration as part of my thesis overall.

I also decided that, given the level of uncertainty and the time which had already been lost to the circumstances of the pandemic, the remainder of my work would be based upon my examination of a variety of resources which were accessible online, which also alleviated a lot of my anxiety related to travelling and potentially becoming grounded, unwell, or, worse, bringing illness into my home with my parents and partner. All in all, I was able to continue with my work from this period for the remainder of my degree in accordance with these adjustments and with the help of extensions, necessary to make up for lost time and other personal circumstances.

Acknowledgements

For my supervisors, Professor Alison Cathcart and Professor Erica Fudge. I don't believe that any of us quite anticipated the overall trajectory of this project at the beginning of my PhD in 2018, and I believe that we can all agree that it hasn't been smooth sailing. However, through sickness, loss, and a global pandemic, both Ali and Erica continued to offer indispensable guidance and support. Their academic advice was challenging, thorough, and encouraging throughout the duration of my research, while their personal counsel was a continuous source of comfort and relief during difficult moments. I am certain that without the kindness, expertise, and strength of you both that I would not have been able to see this through, and for that I am immeasurably grateful.

For my parents, Elizabeth Kennedy and Colin McDougall. No matter how daunting things seemed to have become just outside our front door, my Mum and Dad always maintained a safe, comforting, and loving environment within our home. Mum, thank you for all the teas, laundry, and chores you took on while I was too engrossed in my work even to look up for a second. Dad, thank you for answering the phone no matter the hour, and for showing up every single time. And to both of you, thank you for encouraging me, believing in me, and rallying around me during those moments when I did not have the strength to do so.

For my best friend, Ruth McQueeney. Having been in my life for more than a decade, Ruth has always known exactly what to do or say to help clear my mind and refocus my attention. Whether I needed a quick phone call, a huge hug, a warm cup of coffee and a long chat, or a night away from my work, Ruth was, and will always be, my first port of call. Ruth,

thank you for reminding me to rest, relax, and recuperate when it was necessary, and for lending your time, ear, and words of wisdom when I needed to look forward.

For my partner, Staci Cumming. Staci came into my life at a time when I was very uncertain about my path and my own abilities. I was preparing to finish my MSc and had been rejected for external funding for my PhD. When I was lost, Staci reminded me of my worth, intelligence, and capability, and in loving me, she has conditioned me to love, trust, and have confidence in myself, reminding me when I forget to do so. Stace, thank you for your patience, love, and constant understanding throughout this entire process.

Contents

Preface — 1

Introduction

‘Civility’: Historiography and Context — 4

1641: Historiography and Context — 34

Chapter 1: Life and the Landscape in Gaelic Ireland and Early Modern England — 92

Chapter 2: Enclosures, ‘Improvement’, and the Landscape of the 1641 Irish Rebellion — 135

Chapter 3: People, Place, and Possession: A Topography of ‘Barbarity’ and ‘Civility’ During the 1641 Irish Rebellion — 190

Chapter 4: Roving, Raiding, and Restoration in the 1641 Irish Rebellion — 246

Conclusion — 303

Bibliography — 316

Preface

At the beginning of my doctoral degree, the main focus of my research was to be quite generally based upon agriculture, 'civility', and Anglo-Irish relations throughout the early modern period. Having previously undertaken an extensive investigation into the status, position, and use of cattle in Gaelic Ireland as part of my postgraduate MSc degree, myself and my supervisor throughout that period, Professor Cathcart, had discussed my interest in the subject of the early modern English concern with 'civility', and the 'civilisation' of Ireland and its inhabitants, in combination with the contemporary contexts of agriculture and land use. Consequently, I worked alongside Professor Cathcart and, following our introduction, Professor Fudge to construct and develop my plan for a generalised, interdisciplinary study which sought to examine both literary and historical evidence in order to offer greater insight into the early modern concept of 'civility', as well as Irish farming practices and land use. However, after spending over a year undertaking extensive reading, writing, and getting to grips with the historiography of early modern Ireland and England, 'civility', and agriculture, the discovery and spread of COVID-19 rapidly began to derail my plans for my research, initially with the prevention of international travel, then with the complete lockdown of the country. Like others, I found myself anxious, upset, and unsure about the pandemic circumstances, as well as its potential impact upon my academic work, and I struggled with my research throughout this period, precluded from archival trips, library resources, and in-person support.

In an attempt to try to mitigate the negative consequences of lockdown and the uncertainty associated with the pandemic, I began to investigate accessible online archives

and resources, and came across the body of eyewitness testimonies known as the 1641 depositions, digitised and categorised by Trinity College Dublin. Pertaining to the Irish rebellion of 1641, I found the depositions to be a rich source of social, economic, religious, political, environmental, and cultural insight, both with respect to Ireland and its inhabitants as well as English and Protestant colonial settlers throughout this period. In fact, I discovered that the depositions also provided further indications as to the endurance and development of the English concern with 'civility' and the 'civilisation' of Ireland, as well as the concern with land use and ownership in Ireland throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. After several discussions with my supervisors, taking into account the various limitations which were impacting upon my research progress at this time, I decided that it was necessary to change the central focus of my thesis, and to readjust my research questions in order to allow for an examination of the 1641 Irish rebellion in relation to my original interest in the early modern Anglo-Irish experiences of 'civility', 'civilisation', and land use. From this point onwards, it became necessary to undertake further reading in order to develop my knowledge and understanding of the complex historiography of the Irish rebellion, which, although fundamentally necessary and enormously valuable, stalled my research progress to a greater extent. By exploring the academic literature alongside the depositions themselves, I was eventually able to develop a broad, nuanced understanding of the Irish rebellion, which, in turn, allowed me to identify a range of relevant concerns related to 'civility', 'civilisation', and land use within the context of the rebellion itself. As such, while my original work remained relevant, to a certain extent, all of my previous work required careful consideration and revision in order to become congruent with the new focus of my research. The introductory portion of my thesis was also extended as a direct result of the change in the focus of my research, which is now comprised of the historiography of both 'civility' and of the 1641 Irish rebellion. Finally, I was able to move forward with my research in a

productive, organised manner, planning my future endeavours around the uncertainty created by the pandemic and focusing upon those resources which were readily available and accessible, including the 1641 depositions, contemporary commentaries and chronicles, annals, state papers, surveys, correspondence, maps, and images, from both English and Irish perspectives, as far as was possible. Thus, the following investigation has been considered, reconsidered, and reconstructed throughout the duration of my degree, mostly by way of necessity, but ultimately to its present conclusion.

'Civility': Historiography and Context

Introduction

For millennia, human beings have struggled to overcome the challenges presented by the 'wilderness' of the natural, undomesticated landscape. In the Christian tradition, in accordance with the biblical instruction in the Book of Genesis, the salvation and prosperity of mankind would depend upon their toil and struggle upon the land itself, which ultimately paved the way for the development of the laborious relationship between man and the natural world. Thus, from the advancement of human existence followed the conquest of nature, and, specifically, of the physical landscape: forests were felled, animals were hunted and tamed, land was cultivated, and towns and cities were built, all of which exemplified the process of human 'civilisation' in the west which, for all intents and purposes, reinforced the divine ascendancy of humanity over the natural realm.[1] By the sixteenth century, the spirit of 'civilisation' and the focus upon the refinement of human 'civility' directed the organisation and development of European society on a comprehensive scale, and had emerged as one of the single most commanding philosophies in the early modern period. Within the English realm, the discovery of the Americas and the increase in support for overseas expansion, which had initially begun with Ireland, contributed towards the definitional evolution of 'civility' and 'civilisation', from the elevated status and development of oneself and one's society to that which could be weaponised against 'inferior' populations whose lands were perceived as both desirable and misused, or underexploited. Indeed, it was this imagined

[1] K. Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800* (London: Penguin Group, 1984), pp. 25-29.

existence of ‘civility’ and ‘civilisation’ versus ‘barbarity’ and ‘primitivity’ which pervaded much of England’s external engagement, including that of the volatile, aggressive nature of the English relationship with Gaelic Ireland.

As far back as the twelfth century, English and non-Irish commentators had condemned Ireland and its inhabitants as ‘wild and inhospitable’, while the English crown had also set its sights upon Irish territory for conquest and colonial exploitation.[2] Historically, then, Anglo-Irish relations had remained fraught, at best, and were characterised by persistent periods of hostility and armed conflict, from the Anglo-Norman arrival in Ireland, to the Desmond Rebellions, to the Nine Years’ War.[3] However, one of the bloodiest, most explosive episodes within Anglo-Irish history was that of the Irish rebellion of 1641, which took place during the Wars of the Three Kingdoms. Infamous for its enduring narrative of atrocity and massacre, the outbreak of rebellion in 1641 became widely recognised as that of a sectarian clash between the Catholic Irish and Protestant English populations, fought in order to establish both religious and political authority in the midst of a much larger civil conflict.[4] Thus, while the confessional nature of the Irish rebellion is indisputable, the background to the rebellion is undoubtedly complex and has been subject to extensive historiographical debate.

Accordingly, the main purpose of the present research is to examine the organisation, execution, and reportage of the events of 1641 from both an ideological and practical perspective in relation to the historic Anglo-Irish struggle over ‘civility’ and ‘civilisation’,

[2] G. Cambrensis, *The History and Topography of Ireland* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1982), p. 101.
[3] F. X. Martin, ‘Diarmait Mac Murchada and the Coming of the Anglo-Normans’, in A. Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Medieval Ireland 1169-1534*, Vol. II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 43.
[4] J. Gibney, *The Shadow of a Year: The 1641 Rebellion in Irish History and Memory* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2013), pp. 18-29; E. Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2013), pp. 4, 170-172.

primarily based upon the dominion over and use of the physical landscape. Beginning with a comparative discussion of the social and topographical contexts of early modern England and Ireland, the representation of these respective landscapes and environments has created a foundation from which further analyses have been undertaken in the following chapters. The imposition of English enclosures as part of a larger campaign of landed and agricultural ‘improvement’ in Ireland has been examined in relation to both Irish and English perspectives of the destructive actions of the Catholic Irish rebels throughout their rebellion campaign. Furthermore, the dominant representation of the Irish landscape and environment within the context of the Irish insurgency has also been considered in order to explore narratives of continuity and change within early modern Anglo-Irish relations. Finally, the analysis of the movement and mobility of the Catholic Irish rebels and the English and Protestant settlers across the Irish landscape has also allowed for a closer examination of the centrality of the landscape and the environment in relation to the exhibition of anti-Irish and anti-English sentiment, both within the contexts of the rebellion and of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries more comprehensively. In doing so, this investigation has sought to consider the rebellion from a perspective less dominated by historiographic debates over issues such as religious tensions and war among the three kingdoms. By employing comparative analysis of contemporary English and Irish sources, and by basing arguments and conclusions upon close readings and critical interpretation of various, and numerous, contemporary materials, this investigation has favoured a qualitative approach in order to compare and contrast fundamental early modern Anglo-Irish experiences and perspectives in relation to the 1641 Irish rebellion. Various terminology is employed throughout this work which often appears within inverted commas, such as references to ‘civility’, ‘civilisation’, ‘barbarity’, ‘savagery’, and ‘improvement’. The reason for this is because many of these terms are frequently associated with an oppressive, colonial dynamic, and, without signalling, could be interpreted

as a personal judgement of the author. It should also be noted that generalisations are also employed throughout the following investigation in order to discuss the actors involved in the rebellion, which include the Catholic Irish, English, and Protestant populations. Again, these generalisations are not to discount the experiences of other groups who were entangled within the conflict, such as the Catholic Old English or the Scottish settlers, but have been favoured in order to be able to explore the impacts of some of the larger historical contexts upon those larger populations whose experiences are predominantly represented within the reportage of the rebellion.

Reflecting upon his own research in the fields of medieval and early modern Irish history, Raymond Gillespie has commented upon the difficulty of seeking to construct an accurate representation of early modern Ireland based solely upon Irish sources, owing to major gaps in the documentary records on account of Ireland's predominantly oral and bardic traditions.[5] The scope of the present investigation has also been limited by a lack of understanding of the Gaelic language, as many of the surviving contemporary Irish documentary sources have naturally been authored in such. However, that is not to discount the value and perspective gained from those Irish documentary resources which have been included as part of the following discussion. The *Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters* have been particularly useful as sources of Gaelic society, and have offered important insight into the contemporary environmental, political, economic, religious, and cultural landscapes of Gaelic Ireland on a national basis, from climatic phenomena to military engagements.[6] Indeed, it is unfortunate that the annals themselves end with the death of Hugh O'Neill in 1616, and therefore offer very little contemporary Irish perspective of the

---

[5] R. Gillespie, 'Harvest Crises in Early Seventeenth-Century Ireland', *Irish Economic and Social History*, 11 (1984), p. 5.
[6] D. W. Dudley Edwards and M. O'Dowd, *Sources for Early Modern Irish History, 1534-1641* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 50.

wholesale expansion of English colonisation across Ireland during the decades prior to the outbreak of rebellion in 1641, or indeed of the rebellion itself. Additional insight has also been obtained from early Irish legal texts, including the *Senchus Mór* and the *Críth Gablach*. These tracts have not only contributed towards a greater understanding of the constitution and execution of Irish Brehon law and order, but have also provided further detail in relation to the historic organisation of Gaelic society and the valuation of wealth. It is important to acknowledge, however, that the Gaelic institution of Brehon law was forced into significant decline with the defeat of the Nine Years' War, unable to function within the new framework of English 'civilisation' which not only dismantled the Irish clan system, but which also quashed the status of the Gaelic nobility, the main employers of the Irish legal families.[7] There are few translated Irish chronicles pertaining to the circumstances of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in particular, but those by historians like Geoffrey Keating and Roderick O'Flaherty have been considered in order to incorporate additional early modern Irish perspectives in relation to contemporary circumstances and events. Irish archaeological studies have also been conducive to the reconstruction of Gaelic Ireland, from environmental circumstances such as the Irish topography and climate, to agricultural endeavours such as transhumance and cultivation.

Though these contemporary Irish sources have proven indispensable for the purposes of the present investigation, far more abundant were non-Irish, predominantly English, works on the condition of Ireland and its inhabitants throughout the early and pre-modern periods. Having set out to examine the continuity of early modern Anglo-Irish hostilities as well as the larger struggle over 'civility' and 'civilisation', it was necessary to interrogate these English

[7] N. Higgins, 'The Lost Legal System: Pre-Common Law Ireland and the Brehon Law', (2011), pp. 194-201; though there were a small number of Brehon law schools which remained in operation in Ireland throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, these were located in remote peripheries and struggled to continue with their curriculum against the backdrop of the totalising English conquest of Ireland and its inhabitants.

sources carefully, and to acknowledge their inherent prejudices with respect to Gaelic Ireland. However, by combining both English and Irish perspectives, the subsequent analysis has been able to contrast the English fantasy of Ireland and the Irish with the contemporary reality. For example, countless English and non-Irish 'observers' documented their descriptions, commentaries, or chronicles of the state of Ireland and its population throughout the Middle Ages and the early modern period, primarily to the detriment of Irish Gaeldom. From the infamous twelfth century account of Gerald of Wales, to the damning Elizabethan commentaries of those such as John Derricke and Edmund Spenser, these authors tended to disguise their prejudices as persuasive, almost scientific observations of the Irish landscape, people, and society, thereby constructing Gaelic Ireland in line with their own agendas. Contemporary English maps of Ireland have also conferred a similar authority, and have been incorporated as part of this investigation in order to consider the English cartographic construction of Ireland's landscape and topography in relation to their political concerns. Thus, not only have these sources offered valuable insight into the nature and development of contemporary English anti-Irish rhetoric, discernible via the critical analysis and examination of distortion within those documents, they have also contributed towards a greater understanding of both the character and organisation of the Irish environment, from the construction of housing and farms, to the social hierarchy and the dispensation of law and order.

The availability of the Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online (MEMSO) database has also allowed for greater engagement with official sources of contemporary English policy towards Ireland from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including the English State Papers and the Calendars of the Carew Manuscripts. The English State Papers Relating to Ireland, in particular, comprise bountiful sources of correspondence between

countless members of the English political elite, and encompass a range of contemporary concerns pertaining to Ireland and its population, including agricultural endeavours and outputs, internal disputes, English intervention, and military conflict and rebellion. While these records have offered further insight into the nature and organisation of Gaelic society, they have also contributed towards a greater understanding of English policies and political agendas with respect to Ireland and its inhabitants throughout the early modern period, particularly in relation to the English conquest and colonisation of Ireland. In fact, the Calendars of the Carew Manuscripts — comprising the papers of Sir George Carew, the English lord president of Munster in 1600 and member of James VI and I's privy council — have been invaluable for the investigation of the planning, organisation, execution, and development of the English policy of plantation in Ireland, particularly following the Irish defeat in the Nine Years' War almost four decades prior to the outbreak of rebellion in 1641. Specifically, the Carew Manuscripts contain various directions, plans, and surveys pertaining to the crown plantation of Ulster which, aside from their rich accounts of the Irish topography and landscape, have conferred a more detailed appreciation for the physical dimension of Anglo-Irish cultural conflict, as well as the importance of the transformation and 'improvement' of the physical landscape in relation to the English conquest and 'civilisation' of Ireland.

For comparative purposes, the following investigation has also endeavoured to explore the English conception of their own realm in relation to that of their Irish neighbours. Accordingly, descriptions and chronicles from contemporary English commentators like William Camden and Raphael Holinshed have been consulted in order to obtain a more complete view of the social, economic, political, religious, cultural, and environmental circumstances of early modern England. It is worth noting that additional insight has also

been gained from various English commentaries on the condition of Ireland and its inhabitants, particularly from those by Spenser and Sir John Davies, whose accounts often compared Ireland's relative 'barbarity' and 'inferiority' with examples of English 'civility' and 'superiority'. Crucially, however, it is also important to bear in mind that such commentaries and descriptions were routinely embellished and exaggerated, not only to the detriment of Gaelic Ireland and the Irish, but also for the benefit of England and the English themselves, a fact which has underscored the necessity of critical analysis as part of the present research methodology overall. Indeed, more reliable sources of the realities of life and the landscape in early modern England have been considered in the form of English State Papers: containing various records of correspondence, policies, petitions, proclamations, and proceedings pertaining to the English crown, parliament, and society, these documents have allowed for a different kind of assessment of the contemporary condition of England and its inhabitants, from their agricultural activities and 'improvement' of the landscape, to the experience of famine or the spread of disease. English husbandry manuals were also created in accordance with the contemporary drive towards landed, agricultural 'improvement', and therefore constitute valuable sources of English topographical, climatic, and agricultural insight throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but particularly in relation to the development of English 'civilisation', which was closely linked with their idealistic conceptions of agriculture and land use. English maps have similarly been examined and taken into consideration in order to gain a visual representation of the English construction and organisation of the physical landscape, as well as their regional topographic composition, though the inherent bias associated with contemporary cartographic endeavours for purposes of commerce and control must be recognised.[8]

[8] See B. Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 7-64.

While the discussion of the following investigation has, thus far, dealt with the location and examination of various contemporary English and Irish sources as a means to compare and contrast the two societies in relation to their struggle over the 'civilisation' of both land and people, the remainder of this methodological discussion will address the study of the events of the 1641 Irish rebellion, specifically. This will then allow for the examination of the events of 1641 to be considered alongside English conceptions of 'civility' and 'civilisation', which is effectively the foundation of this research. Initially, this investigation was based upon the body of witness testimonies, examinations, and other materials known as the 1641 Depositions. Held in 31 volumes within the Manuscripts and Archives Research Library of Trinity College Dublin, the depositions have been digitised and transcribed to allow for online access and research, which has been critical for the purposes of the present research. Originally intended to document the material losses of the predominantly Protestant and English victims of the Catholic Irish conflict, the depositions constitute a rich source for the history of rebellion and resistance in early modern Ireland. Additionally, however, these sources have offered valuable insight into the social, political, economic, religious, cultural, and environmental circumstances of Ireland and England in the mid-seventeenth century, and have offered significant indications as to the landed consequences of the English conquest and 'civilisation' of Ireland during the decades prior to the outbreak of the rebellion in 1641.

Though the depositions are effectively unmatched by any other source of European history to date, this investigation was also based upon the examination of larger, more comprehensive contemporary accounts of the Irish rebellion, which were historically dominated by both English and Protestant narrators. For example, Henry Jones described the rebellion as part of *A Remonstrance of the Beginnings and Proceedings of the Rebellion in*

the County of Cavan (1642), and offered his English and Protestant perspective on the discovery of the Irish plot and its Catholic conspiracy, as well as further detail on the campaign of the Catholic Irish rebels in terms of their exhibition of violence, destruction, and atrocity. Irish-born judge, knight, and historian Sir John Temple also created one of the most sensational, infamous accounts of the conflict with *The Irish Rebellion* (1646), describing the ancient and evil origins of the Irish conspiracy, the apparent 'treachery' and 'barbarity' of the Irish, and the innumerable offences and atrocities committed by the Catholic Irish population against the English and Protestant settler communities. By exploring chronicles and commentaries from those such as Jones and Temple, not only does the following discussion analyse the English and Protestant construction of the rebellion itself, but particularly in relation to larger issues such as Anglo-Irish relations, 'civility', 'civilisation', and the use and misuse of the landscape. Furthermore, in the relative absence of any comprehensive, contemporary Catholic commentaries on the Irish conflict, this investigation has also endeavoured to extract particular details of the Catholic Irish campaign — including specific examples of proclamations, theft, physical destruction, violence, mutilation, and various forms of human atrocities — from the depositions. Doing so facilitated consideration of the rebellion from an Irish perspective, and offered explanations as to the symbolic, purposeful nature of their actions in relation to the historic Anglo-Irish struggle over the 'civilisation' of the Irish landscape and its inhabitants.

'Civility': A Philosophical Account

In order to explore the significance of 'civility' and 'civilisation' within the context of the 1641 Irish rebellion, it is necessary, first, to account for the development of these philosophies and to establish their ideological foundations, before considering their early modern Anglo-Irish application. The term 'civility' can be traced back over 2500 years to

around 509 BCE when the Romans first founded their republic, and stems from the Latin term *civis*, meaning 'citizen', with respect to a male property owner.[9] From *civis* then came *civitas*, which referenced the responsibilities and rights of a citizen, before *civitas* then evolved into the term *civilitas*, which encompassed the science and art of 'citizenship' on a more comprehensive scale.[10] Throughout the existence of the Roman empire the rights of 'citizenship' largely remained in flux, but, generally, those considered eligible for such a privilege were: the patricians, who constituted the wealthier, hereditary ruling elite; the plebeians, comprised of the lower class, labouring individuals; and, eventually, other populations who became incorporated into the empire during its expansion.[11] By contrast, those who remained outwith the reach of Roman authority were regarded as 'inferior' and were classified as 'barbarians', who, along with slaves, were deemed to be unworthy of the rights and responsibilities of 'citizenship'.[12] For example, in recognition of their status, citizens were entrusted with the right to vote for their leadership, and were also granted the right to be governed only by the laws which they voted for, offering some degree of protection against the potential impulsivity of tyrannical leadership.[13] On the other hand, these liberties were contingent upon various obligations: citizens were required to pledge themselves for military service alongside their fellow citizens during periods of conflict, and were expected to procure their own armour and weaponry for such occasions. Thus, in accordance with the development of *civis*, *civitas*, and *civilitas*, 'civility' retained a significant association with the Roman political concern of 'citizenship' throughout the

---

[9] L. Schaefer, 'History and Civility', *NAMTA Journal*, 40:1 (2015), p. 104.
[10] Ibid.
[11] M. H. Crawford, 'citizenship, Roman', in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 4th edn.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); P. Garnsey, 'Roman Citizenship and Roman Law in the Late Empire', in S. Swain and M. Edwards (eds.), *Approaching Late Antiquity: The Transformation from Early to Late Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 137-138.
[12] Garnsey, 'Roman Citizenship', p. 141; K. Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility: Manners and Civilisation in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), p. 3.
[13] B. Davetian, *Civility: A Cultural History* (London: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2009), p. 110.

medieval period, which, in itself, was directly related to both the inclusion of 'superior' citizens and exclusion of 'inferior' 'barbarians'.[14]

Larry Schaefer has also discussed the corresponding definitional evolution of 'civility' within the realm of ancient Greece: he argued that around 500 BCE, the administration of Greek *poleis* (meaning 'city states') had begun to shift, resulting in the emergence of democratic governments, which favoured the convention of assemblies chaired by wealthier male citizens in order to discuss, debate, and vote upon public policies.[15] Aristotle maintained that the democratic nature of a 'polity' made this the most practical form of governance, and offered agency to citizens in relation to the overall development and success of their government: 'there are two parts of good government: one is the actual obedience of citizens to the laws, the other part is the goodness of the laws which they obey'.[16] Indeed, Aristotle identified three distinct levels of social organisation which he believed were crucial for the development and maintenance of a 'civilised' society, the first being the household, to provide for individual necessities including sleep, nourishment, shelter, and procreation for the citizen.[17] Next, was the 'village' or 'civil society', to provide a market for commercial buying and selling activity.[18] Indeed, throughout this period, wealth and the economy became closely linked with the development of a 'civil society' and were necessary for the maintenance of various institutions, from education to politics, which supported the growth of the society more broadly.[19] The Romans were similarly dependent upon their cities for the development of markets, from which labour could be controlled and managed while the

---

[14] A. Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 49.
[15] Schaefer, 'History and Civility', p. 104.
[16] E. B. Portis, *Reconstructing the Classics: Political Theory from Plato to Marx* (New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1998), pp. 40-42.
[17] Ibid, pp. 38-39.
[18] Ibid.
[19] C. Sarles, 'Civil Society History III: Renaissance', in K. A. Helmut and S. Toepler (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* (New York: Springer, 2010), pp. 350-353.

preparation, direction, and use of agricultural commodities and produce could take place within its epicentre.[20] Third, and finally for Aristotle, was the *polis*, or the political community, organised in order to tackle issues such as security, public ritual and morality, collective decision-making, and the construction of public facilities.[21] The concept of 'civility', then, was also bound up with the conduct and behaviours of the individual citizen, as well as with the larger structure, economy, and organisation of the polity, and was ultimately contingent upon the establishment of order and control.[22]

Given the trajectory of the advancement of human 'civilisation' and the transcendence of Greco-Roman ideologies in relation to the early modern evolution of 'civility', it is important to be able to consider the classical and subsequent variations in order to better understand their adaptation in accordance with the concerns of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[23] One of the most significant philosophical developments associated with the Renaissance period was that of the rise of Humanism. From the early thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, there was a definitive change in the values and mentality associated with the culture of western Europe, which led to the widespread redistribution, reorientation, and application of classical ideologies which characterised the development of Renaissance culture.[24] Loosely defined by Schaefer as 'an age where society focused on broad human and humanistic concerns', the Renaissance period saw the emergence of a modern Humanist intellectual movement derived from Italian city-states and republics during the fifteenth century which engendered 'an elevated sense of humanity, and celebrating human

[20] N. Purcell, 'economy, Roman', in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 4th edn.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
[21] Portis, *Reconstructing the Classics*, pp. 38-39.
[22] Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 49.
[23] Schaefer, 'History and Civility', p. 104.
[24] C. G. Nauert, Jr, *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 10-11. See also T. Herron and M. Potterton (eds.), *Ireland in the Renaissance c. 1540-1660* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007).

achievements became the central focus of communities in both a social and civil way'.[25] Made up of several core attributes, Phil Withington has explained that Renaissance Humanism was characterised by

> its fetishism for the ancients; its commitment to education and championing of the vernacular; its valorization of "society" above and beyond "the self"; its conflation of virtue with "civility" and "patriotic service"; its compatibility with evangelical, even militant, forms of Christianity (whether Catholic or Protestant).[26]

Further, Withington has argued that Renaissance Humanists were encouraged to consider the circumstances of the present, and to create plans for the future, both whilst maintaining a valuable rapport with the 'ancients'.[27] Crucially, then, the emergence of Renaissance Humanism was not simply a mimicry of classical ideology, but rather a fusion of both modern and classical thinking which allowed for the conceptual development and expansion of foundational Greco-Roman principles — 'civility' included.

Having considered the theoretical expansion of 'civility' and 'civilisation' as part of his older and more recent research, Keith Thomas has explained that the concept of 'civility' could be employed within a variety of different contexts throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and Anna Bryson has maintained that the examination of 'civility' throughout the early modern period requires a much broader conceptual discussion, on

[25] Schaefer, 'History and Civility', p. 105.
[26] P. Withington, *Society in Early Modern England: The Vernacular Origins of Some Powerful Ideas* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010), p. 12.
[27] Ibid.

account of its definitional expansion from its classical origins.[28] For example, while the Britons were commonly described as having been 'civilised' by the Romans, the contemporary English gardener was also routinely described as 'civilising' wild plants by way of landed cultivation.[29] Fundamentally, though, Thomas has also argued that the commonality between these circumstances could be observed 'one way or another' in relation to the desire to construct a well-ordered political community, comprised of courteous, obedient model citizens.[30] Having identified a number of common characteristics across the various articulations of early modern 'civility', Thomas' assertions were indicative of the existence and development of an extensive conceptual framework of 'civility', from the classical to early modern periods.[31] For instance, Dennis Peck's examination of the history of 'civility' found that both English and Scottish contemporaries utilised the terms 'civility' and 'civilisation' interchangeably at least up until the eighteenth century.[32] Bryson had similarly commented upon the increasing association between 'civility' and the early modern concept of 'civilisation', while Peck continued to explain that the concept of 'civilisation' was invariably connected with the idea of 'civility', not necessarily in relation to 'citizenship' or the individual citizen, but more comprehensively with respect to the 'civil' treatment of others.[33] In fact, 'civility' also became conflated with other notions of individual conduct throughout the seventeenth century, including 'politeness', 'gracefulnesse', 'courtesy', 'manners', 'decency', and 'good breeding'.[34] Though Bryson described this conceptual conflation as both 'loose and slippery', she also maintained that this early modern phenomenon did not constitute a shift towards the replacement or prioritisation of one

---

[28] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 6; Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 51.
[29] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 6.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid, pp. 5-7.
[32] D. L. Peck, 'Civility: A Contemporary Context for a Meaningful Historical Concept', *Sociological Enquiry*, 72:3 (2002), p. 360.
[33] Ibid; Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 51.
[34] Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 48.

particular concern with that of another, but rather ‘the gradual coloration of a set of words and values by meanings peculiarly associated with the notion of the “civil”’.[35]

One such example of this conceptual expansion may be considered in relation to the emergence of the contemporary association between ‘civility’ and ‘manners’ or ‘courtesy’. Beginning around the Middle Ages, a literary movement comprised of many of the classical Greco-Roman principles related to the maintenance of good behaviour — which included Aristotle’s golden mean and Cicero’s conception of the model *Orator* — began to materialise in the form of instructional manuals designed to offer direction on the exhibition of refined, ‘courtly’ behaviour.[36] In fact, according to Benet Davetian, this behavioural initiative effectively invited the medieval knight ‘to dismount and enter the halls of court and abide by its protocols while remaining ready to take up his sword whenever required in the name of king and God’.[37] Consequently, particular actions, qualities, and behaviours became outlawed by the virtuous literati, including drunkenness, the expression of sexual appetite, lawlessness, ‘brutishness’, and irrationality, and were thereby condemned as both immoral and repugnant for any polite human being. Significantly, however, Thomas explained that there was an important terminological shift within these behavioural manuals from the Middle Ages up until the sixteenth century, during which customary terms such as ‘courtesy’, ‘virtue’, and ‘nurture’ were replaced, or accompanied, by the term ‘civility’.[38]

For example, Desiderius Erasmus’ *De Civilitate Morum Puerilium* (1530) was arguably the first publication of its kind to establish a detailed code of manners and conduct under the banner of ‘civility’, and its influence upon the English and extended European

[35] Ibid, pp. 48-49.
[36] Davetian, *Civility: A Cultural History*, p. 63.
[37] Ibid, p. 56.
[38] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 15.

moralistic environment was both significant and enduring.[39] Furthermore, as part of his 1622 translation of Eustache de Refuge's *A Treatise of the Court* (1616), English author John Reynolds changed de Refuge's terminology meaning 'a decency, or gracefulnesse' into 'civilitie'.[40] The phrase 'common civility' also became routinely employed in relation to the physical care of one's body, particularly in order to prevent others from being exposed to any unpleasant smells or sights in the public domain.[41] For example, Norbert Elias examined perceptions of nose-blowing from the thirteenth to late eighteenth centuries, and found numerous conventions and obligations — from the use of a freshly washed handkerchief, to the disinclination towards examining the handkerchief afterwards — which ultimately sought to suppress forbidden or undesirable impulses to establish greater self-control.[42] Eventually, this definition was expanded to include a range of other concerns related to the conduct of an individual, including one's voice, gestures, general external demeanour, gracefulness, and decency, before finally accepting the designation as being agreeable and pleasant in company.[43] Having considered the relative influence of the concern with 'bodily civility' throughout the sixteenth century, Bryson explained that contemporaries believed that 'uncivilised' bodily habits resulted from a specifically animal greed and rudeness.[44] Simply put, human beings were expected to exercise control, restraint, and discipline over their physical bodies by way of the process of 'civil' refinement, thereby avoiding any connotation of 'brutishness' or 'bestiality' commonly associated with the behaviours and appearance of an animal.[45]

---

[39] Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 47.
[40] Ibid, p. 49.
[41] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 17.
[42] N. Elias, *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), pp. 121-129.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, pp. 84-85.
[45] Ibid, p. 85.

Though such concerns with 'courtesy' and 'bodily civility' may seem fairly elementary in nature, their overarching significance should not be underestimated. For example, John Darwin has posited that the concept of 'civility' was actually intended to establish greater cohesion and control within any given society in the long-term.[46] According to Peck, Aristotle claimed that true 'civility' could only be achieved among citizens who were 'civil' to one other in their agreement that their political differences were not as important as their shared 'citizenry'; 'citizenship' therefore necessitated the condition, or status, of 'civility'.[47] Aristotle's philosophy not only outlined the importance of 'civilised' conduct in order to maintain the 'civilised' status of an individual, but also in relation to the larger social and cultural advancement of 'civility': the creation of 'civilised' individuals effectively amounted to the creation of a much greater 'civil community' comprised of obedient, disciplined citizens worthy of their place within a 'civil society'.[48] Thus, it was this unmitigated drive towards the establishment of conformity and control under the shibboleth of 'civility' which was often manifest within English policy throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries — especially in relation to their Irish endeavours. This was also supplemented by a larger European trend towards the establishment of 'godly' societies within the Reformation context.[49] As Joep Leerssen appropriately suggested, the general consensus was that 'civil is as civil does'.[50]

---

[46] J. Darwin, 'Civility and Empire', in P. Burke, B Harrison, and P. Slack (eds.), *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 321.
[47] Peck, 'Civility: A Contemporary Context', p. 360.
[48] J. Gillingham, 'From *Civilitas* to Civility: Codes of Manners in Medieval and Early Modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 12 (2002), p. 268.
[49] J. Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland: Medieval and Early-Modern Patterns in the Demarcation of Civility', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 56:1 (1995), p. 26. The Reformation environment allowed for the development of religious doctrines which sought to establish a social 'reformation' of behaviour, or manners, on an individual basis across Europe — see J. Young, 'The Scottish Covenanters and the drive for a godly society 1639-1651', *Recherches anglaises et nord-américaines*, 40 (2007), pp. 25-35 for various examples of the intervention of the Scottish church.
[50] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', p. 26.

Closely related to the concept of 'civility' was that of 'civil society'. As part of his discussion of the history of 'civil society', Curtis Sarles explained that the Renaissance represented a crucial period within which the relationship between the private life of the individual and the authority of the state was challenged by scholars who began to advocate for the creation of larger political entities which could better maintain the loyalty of the 'citizenry' and act in their best interests.[51] In true Humanist tradition, then, Renaissance thinkers drew upon classical counsel in order to provide justification for their suggestions. For example, comprehensive translations of the work of Aristotle began to emerge throughout this period, which allowed for the widespread circulation of his concept of *politike koinonia*: known in Latin as *societas civilis*, this theory was based upon the creation of a political community which was possessed of a unifying *ethos*.[52] Translations of Cicero's works were also utilised by English writer John Barston to advocate for five distinct categories of society — 'private societie', 'societie of kindred', 'societie of friends', 'society of one town', and 'society of one country' — necessary for the formation of a 'civil society'.[53] Accordingly, the early modern configuration of 'civil society' had begun to take shape, and was characterised as a space of 'public government' supported by a system of shared political and legal institutions, to which citizens willingly submitted themselves for purposes of security, material prosperity, and 'sociability'.[54] Davetian discussed the emergence of this early modern model of 'civil society' and explained that, while princes maintained the highest political position within Renaissance city-states, a distinctly new appreciation for individualism had materialised and made way for the successful creation of a more person-

[51] Sarles, 'Civil Society History III', p. 350.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Withington, *Society in Early Modern England*, p. 103.
[54] J. Harris, 'From Richard Hooker to Harold Laski: Changing Perceptions of Civil Society in British Political Thought, Late Sixteenth to Early Twentieth Centuries', in J. Harris (ed.), *Civil Society in British History: Ideas, Identities, Institutions* (New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2003), p. 16.

orientated, secular model of ‘civil society’.[55] By way of example, early modern English philosopher and theologian Richard Hooker insisted that the ‘lawful power of making laws to command whole politique societies of men belongeth … properly to the same entire societies’, but he also maintained that a ‘prince or potentate’ was necessary for the enforcement of said laws.[56] Furthermore, Elias has explained that the early modern adaptation of ‘civil society’ substantiated the principles of absolutism which had really begun to take effect in areas such as France, Germany, and England during the first half of the seventeenth century.[57] English philosopher Thomas Hobbes had actually gone so far as to declare that ‘in all places, where men have lived by small families, to rob and spoil one another’, the establishment of a ‘civil society’ was not possible, and, rather, he proclaimed that such areas were bound to remain in a ‘primitive’ ‘state of nature’, so long as their inhabitants were left unchecked and unrestrained by a higher power.[58] Thus, given the contemporary English interest in the conquest and colonisation of Ireland, it is not difficult to understand their embracing of the tenets of ‘civil society’ alongside their attachment to ‘civility’.

Having considered both the endurance and development of the classical concept of ‘civility’ from its Greco-Roman advent down to its widespread application throughout the Renaissance period, the command of this particular philosophy should not be underestimated. ‘Civility’ was no longer simply concerned with the art of ‘citizenship’, but had come to represent various principles of individual conduct, political governance, and the organisation of society on a larger scale. Indeed, as Thomas has explained, ‘civility’ could refer either to a

[55] Davetian, *Civility: A Cultural History*, p. 92.
[56] Harris, ‘From Richard Hooker to Harold Laski’, p. 16.
[57] Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, pp. 188-194.
[58] Harris, ‘From Richard Hooker to Harold Laski’, p. 18.

state of being or a process of transformation.[59] Increasingly, then, 'civility' became employed on something of a comparative basis, from which certain peoples and societies could establish the extent of their own 'civilisation' in contrast with the perceived 'primitivity' or 'barbarism' of those of others which, in turn, led to the practical application of 'civility' within the early modern Anglo-Irish context.[60]

'Civility' and the Anglo-Irish Perspective

Consecutive to the previous discussion of the development of the concept of 'civility', the following analysis will consider the early modern application of 'civility' and its extended ideology, particularly in relation to the history of Anglo-Irish political and cultural conflict and the English conquest of the Irish landscape. Just as Humanism had been created from the contemporary desire to study and apply Greco-Roman principles to the trials and tribulations of the modern world, the increasing association between 'civility' and the early modern concern with the idea of human 'civilisation' had become manifest largely in response to the emergent need to distinguish oneself or one's society from an 'uncivilised', alien, 'other'.[61] From around the Middle Ages, interest in the distinction between what was regarded as the 'civil' and that which was perceived to be 'uncivil' has grown: for example, German commentators like Gunther of Pairis had publicly condemned the Slavs, Magyars, and Poles for their apparent lawlessness and lack of human reasoning, while Italian friar and diplomat John of Plano Carpini denounced the Mongols for their violence and brutality in warfare in an attempt to try to protect Christian Europe from further invasion.[62] Depictions of the

[59] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, pp. 4-6.
[60] Ibid.
[61] J. Hale, *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance* (London: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd, 1993), pp. 194-195.
[62] R. Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales: A Voice of the Middle Ages* (Gloucestershire: Tempus Publishing Limited, 2006), pp. 131-133, 136, 144, 151, 166.

prophet Muhammed were also regularly circulated throughout this period in order to represent the allegedly lustful, sinful nature of the Arab people.[63] However, the discovery of the Americas and their foreign inhabitants around the close of the fifteenth century heightened apprehension among European populations who were perplexed by these unfamiliar lands and peoples.[64] Inevitably, however, as a consequence of the ambitious spirit associated with Renaissance Humanism, European populations also began to perceive the Americas as an opportunity to garner wealth and esteem, which thrust colonial enterprise and competition to the forefront of their political agendas.[65]

Thus, in order to validate their interpretations of these foreign lands, and to make the case for their conquest, European powers began to construct a discourse intended to establish their cultural 'superiority', against which other peoples, societies, and territories could be defined as either more or — as was normally the case — less developed, based upon Western European standards.[66] Referencing their Greco-Roman masters, early modern authorities once again drew upon classical literature in order to characterise the nature of the 'barbarian': constructed as 'wild', 'bestial', lazy, impious beings, 'barbarians' existed in direct opposition to the 'civility' of the European 'citizenry' and, further, threatened both the foundation and advancement of their 'civilisation' on a larger scale.[67] The life of the 'barbarian' was also portrayed as uncontrollably passionate and violent, owing to their allegedly nomadic existence in the undomesticated woods and forests outwith the influence of law and order contained within the walls of towns and cities.[68] In their attempts to distance themselves from such imaginations of 'incivility', European explorers began to draw parallels between these

---

[63] Ibid.
[64] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', pp. 31-32.
[65] Withington, *Society in Early Modern England*, pp. 203-205.
[66] Bryson, *From Courtesy to Civility*, p. 51; Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 10.
[67] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility,* p. 118; Darwin, 'Civility and Empire', p. 322.
[68] Ibid, p. 127.

'inferior' societies in order to create something of a standardised profile of the 'barbarian', from which plans for their reformation — typically in the form of conquest and colonial settlement — or, oftentimes, their destruction could be devised.[69] Accordingly, it was within this particular context of European expansion and 'civilisation' that the English crown had become more interested in the conquest of Ireland and the conclusive containment of its allegedly 'wild', 'barbarous' population.[70]

Commenting upon the conditions of the English and Irish around the turn of the seventeenth century, Edmund Spenser explained that,

> the English were, at first, as stout and war like a poeple as ever were the Irish, and yet ye se are now brought to that civillity, that no nacon in the world excelleth them in all godly conversacon, and all the studies of knowledg and humanity.[71]

Indeed, having been invaded and subsequently conquered by the Romans around 43 AD, the social, religious, cultural, political, economic, and physical landscapes of England, formerly known in Latin as *Britannia*, had been radically transformed in order to allow for the realm to be incorporated as part of the Roman empire. Walled towns were constructed as authoritative centres from which the conquest could be coordinated, whilst the institutions contained within their boundaries — including the temples, villas, and markets — supported the

---

[69] Thomas Hariot claimed in 1588 that the North Carolina Algonkians hunted fish 'after the manner as Irishmen', while Thomas Morton observed in 1632 that the 'natives of New England are accustomed to build them houses much like the wild Irish'; see D. B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), pp. 20-26 for additional discussion of parallels between the English perceptions of the Irish and American inhabitants.

[70] N. Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), pp. 575-579.

[71] E. Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (Library of Alexandria, 1934), p. 19.

cultural Romanisation, or ‘civilisation’, of the country and its inhabitants. Crucially, however, for those writing 1500 years later, the Romans were respected for their conquest, and celebrated as liberators, freeing the English from their ‘primitive’ restraints, and bringing them into the realm of ‘civility’. In fact, Withington has explained that the English subsequently became engaged in various transformative endeavours which echoed classical conceptions of ‘civility’ in order to oversee the advancement of their own ‘civilisation’ throughout the Renaissance period, including

> the building of good houses, the opening of new markets, the study of new languages, the growth of schools and colleges, the domestic enjoyment of poetical music, the knitting together of intellectual friendships, the elaboration of courtesy and hospitality, and the germination of that which bore the fruit in the days of the Cavaliers, the English gentleman’s sense of honour.[72]

By improving their roads and transportation, commodities such as livestock and grain could be more easily transported between markets, which were held frequently throughout this period in order to encourage farmers to take advantage of commercial opportunities and to stimulate the economy.[73] As for trade, the rise of urban markets from Italy across the European continent and beyond had given the wealthy even greater opportunities to utilise agriculture in order to fund the importation of exotic, luxury goods, including wine; foods and spices; linen and other textiles; and even gold.[74] In doing so, Sir Thomas Smith — one of

---

[72] Withington, *Society in Early Modern England*, p. 23.

[73] M. Overton, *Agricultural Revolution in England: The transformation of the agrarian economy 1500-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 133-142, 207. From around the twelfth century, the English population had embraced the connection between market towns and ‘civilisation’, with the town itself representing both defence and security, while the market acted as a stimulus for agricultural productivity in rural areas outwith the urban centre; see Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, pp. 186-188.

[74] J. P. Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 61-62; A. R. Bridbury, ‘Sixteenth-Century Farming’, *The Economic History Review,* 27:4 (1974), pp. 340-341.

England's leading diplomats, political theorists, and trusted counsellor to Elizabeth I — declared within one of his most significant works, *De republica Anglorum* (1583), that the English had become 'superior' to all nations, the Romans included.[75] Furthermore, as part of his discussion of the English conquest of Ireland and its physical landscape, John Patrick Montaño has argued that the use of the land and the physical transformation of the landscape was closely linked with the advancement of English 'civility' and 'civilisation': characterised by walled market towns, villages, large houses, parks, gardens, hedgerows, ditches, and fencing, the English landscape appeared to be ordered, settled, and 'civilised'.[76] Evidently, then, English 'civilisation' was contingent upon their conquest, transformation, and control of the landscape, intended to physically exclude both 'wildness' and 'barbarism', as well as to symbolise their moral and intellectual ascent, both of which were necessary for the establishment of order and settlement from the comparative chaos and 'savagery' of the natural realm.[77]

In contrast, Ireland and the Irish were perceived by English commentators to have remained stubbornly outwith the reach of the Roman empire for the duration of its existence, retaining their Gaelic lineage, language, and customs at least up until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[78] Though English attempts to establish plantation in Ireland would not materialise significantly until around the mid-sixteenth century, the 'question' as to the nature and treatment of the Irish had endured within successive

[75] Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization', p. 589.
[76] J. P. Montaño, 'Cultural Conflict and the Landscape of Conquest in Early Modern Ireland', *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, 40 (2017), p. 127.
[77] Ibid, pp. 126, 131. Anderson has also commented upon the manifestation of a similar phenomenon following the arrival of the English colonists in New England around the beginning of the seventeenth century, after which the settlers began to affect the widespread alteration of the physical landscape, introducing things like fencing, barns, and permanent housing; see V. D. Anderson, *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 79-81.
[78] S. J. Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland 1460-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 10; English contemporaries were particularly exasperated by the continued Irish use of the Gaelic language, since the English dialect had come to represent the spread of their influence and authority in a colonial capacity.

English and non-Irish commentaries for centuries.[79] Leerssen has explained that Ireland was encompassed within a larger European discourse related to foreign exoticism, 'wildness', uncouthness, and strangeness, which was subsequently exported towards the farthest reaches of the Atlantic.[80] Commenting during the twelfth century, Gerald of Wales described the Irish as

> a wild and inhospitable people. They live on beasts only, and live like beasts … While man usually progresses from the woods to the fields, and from the fields to settlements and communities of citizens, this people despises work on the land, has little use for the money-making of towns, contemns the rights and privileges of citizenship, and desires neither to abandon, nor lose respect for, the life which it has been accustomed to lead in the woods and countryside.[81]

Conditioned by classical authors such as Livy, Sallust, and Cicero, Gerald's commentary was not only retroactively reinforced by Greco-Roman authorities, but also by subsequent early modern English contemporaries like Raphael Holinshed, Sir John Perrot, and Spenser throughout the Elizabethan period, to Sir John Temple and Edmund Borlase in the aftermath of the 1641 Irish rebellion, whose works were significantly informed by Geraldian anti-Irish rhetoric.[82] From the Gaelic dietary regimen and dress, to their language and religion, English commentators from the period of the Anglo-Norman settlement down to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had vilified Ireland and its inhabitants for their cultural difference, which, according to Nicholas Canny, became translated as cultural 'inferiority', particularly

---

[79] Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization', pp. 575-576.
[80] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', p. 32.
[81] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, p. 101.
[82] H. Morgan, 'Giraldus Cambrensis and the Tudor Conquest of Ireland', in H. Morgan (ed.), *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541-1641* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), p. 25.

in comparison with the self-proclaimed 'superiority' of the English themselves and their progressive 'civilisation'.[83]

This can be seen at the level of the land: for while the English topography was characterised by enclosed townships and symmetrical fields for widespread cultivation, Ireland remained largely unenclosed and maintained a predominantly pastoral, often transhumant, agricultural tradition, albeit supplemented by tillage. Simply put, from an English perspective, the Irish landscape was both 'wild' and 'untamed'.[84] Indeed, though the Irish preference for pastoralism and cattle raising, in particular, was significantly informed by both the topography and climate of Ireland, Canny has explained that English contemporaries largely perceived Irish pastoralism as an archaic form of nomadism and as a symptom of their 'primitivity', idleness, and 'barbarism'.[85] Having seemingly surrendered their dominion over the natural world in favour of idleness and 'savagery', allowing the 'wilderness' to remain unchecked and uncultivated, the Irish had failed in their God-given command to 'Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky and over every living creature that moves on the ground'.[86] Based upon both biblical and classical philosophies, including those of Aristotle and the Stoics, the prevailing belief in England throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was that nature existed solely to fulfil the needs of humanity.[87] Accordingly, English lands were valued in relation to their fertility for purposes of cultivation and 'improvement', while animals, vegetation, and

[83] Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, pp. 7-8, 64-67; N. Canny, 'The Marginal Kingdom: Ireland as a Problem in the First British Empire', in B. Bailyn and P. D. Morgan (eds.), *Strangers Within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire* (North Carolina: The University of Carolina Press, 1991), p. 35. The English authorities had previously introduced legislation intended to curb the spread of the Irish language and culture in 1366 in the form of the Statutes of Kilkenny, fearful of the potential 'civil' regression of the Old English settlers who had begun to intermingle with the Irish; see Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, p. 8.
[84] Montaño, 'Cultural Conflict and the Landscape', p. 122.
[85] N. Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established 1565-76* (Sussex: The Harvester Press Limited, 1976), pp. 13-14.
[86] NIV, 'Genesis 1: The Beginning – Verse 28'.
[87] Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, p. 17.

minerals were all regarded as commodifiable resources which could be employed in a range of capacities, from labour and construction, to textiles and sustenance.[88] As Irish geographer and archaeologist Emyr Estyn Evans has explained, the relationship between early modern contemporaries and the natural world was markedly different to that of the modern population, and, rather, the hopes, concerns, luck, and fortunes of those individuals were effectively dependent upon the flora, fauna, and other natural resources at their disposal.[89] After all, God had given unto mankind 'every seed-bearing plant on the face of the whole earth and every tree that has fruit with seed in it', and had charged them to work and toil upon the land in order to 'eat the plants of the field'.[90]

The Irish, on the other hand, were often perceived by English commentators in a similar manner to that of their cattle, wandering aimlessly across the 'wilderness' alongside their herds, squandering the potential of the physical landscape.[91] In fact, like the inhabitants of the Americas, the Irish were often compared, by contemporary English observers, with beasts — from vermin and dogs, to wolves and cattle — whose lack of rationality precluded the development of 'civilisation' on a fundamental basis.[92] Having considered early modern conceptions of 'barbarism' and 'beastliness', Thomas has explained that English contemporaries routinely employed such descriptions in order to fulfil a range of agendas, but

[88] W. Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), pp. 22-24; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, p. 17.
[89] E. E. Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage: Selected Writings* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd., 1996), p. 26.
[90] NIV, 'Genesis 1: The Beginning – Verses 29-30', 'Genesis 3: The Fall – Verses 17-19'.
[91] Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization', p. 587.
[92] Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, pp. 41-44; J. Walters, 'Human, All Too Human: Spenser and the Dangers of Irish Civilization', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual*, 30 (2015), pp. 151-165; Cronon, *Changes in the Land*, p. 56. For example, Gerald of Wales, Barnaby Rich, and Sir William Petty condemned the Irish for living 'like beasts' and 'in a brutish, nasty condition', while Edmund Spenser compared the mobility of the Irish to that of their cattle. Similarly, English colonist Robert Cushman rebuked the Indian culture of mobility, describing them as running across the land like 'foxes and wild beasts'; see also Anderson, *Creatures of Empire,* p. 79.

especially for colonial purposes in relation to Ireland and the Americas.[93] Additionally, Thomas has argued that the perception of any given people or population as ‘animal’ by another tended to precipitate the corresponding mistreatment of those people or populations as such, since the spirit of human dominion effectively removed animals, or those considered akin to animals, from the realm of human concern, thereby conferring the validity of their subjugation.[94] Furthermore, the denial of the humanity of these populations allowed English commentators to deny their ownership of the land, or sometimes their existence altogether, in accordance with the Roman principle of *res nullius*, or *terra nullius*, meaning ‘empty things’ or ‘empty land’.[95] Indeed, lands which were perceived as lacking in cultivation and settlement could legally be obtained by those who intended to pursue advancement in those areas, and so early modern English contemporaries employed these classical principles in order to press the case for their colonial intervention and occupation in both Ireland and the Americas.[96] In fact, Holger Nehring has argued that in all countries with a colonial past, domestic standards of ‘civility’ could be observed, against which conceptions of ‘savage outsiders’ could be contrasted in order to create a narrative which justified colonial enterprise.[97] Thus, if the Irish had failed to conquer the landscape, allowing both land and people to persist in a state of disordered, uncontrolled ‘wildness’ and ‘barbarity’, then the English authorities were more than willing, if not compelled by the nature of their own ‘civility’ and ‘superiority’, to do so themselves.

The English construction of Irish ‘barbarism’, then, much like the imagination of their own ‘civility’, not only allowed English contemporaries to reinforce the markers of Irish

[93] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 10.
[94] Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, pp. 41-44.
[95] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 216; Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*, p. 78.
[96] Ibid.
[97] H. Nehring, ‘“Civility” in history: some observations on the history of the concept’, *European Review of History: Revue européenne d’histoire*, 18:3 (2011), p. 314.

cultural 'inferiority', but simultaneously legitimised their interests in both conquest and colonisation. As Canny has explained, the English perceived an opportunity in Ireland to become 'the new Romans', and to impart their 'civility' and 'civilisation' upon those who would eventually be transformed into a grateful, obedient population.[98] The persistence of the English crown in their attempts to assert authority over Ireland and its inhabitants by way of conquest, supported by the endeavour of plantation, throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ensured the relative persistence of Anglo-Irish hostility throughout this period.[99] Montaño has also noted that the physicality of the English conquest and the material culture associated with their 'civilisation' — employed in order to validate their authority — allowed the Irish to identify the markers of their oppression and to direct their resistance upon the landscape accordingly.[100] Thus, the English concern with the spread of 'civility' and 'civilisation' had become synonymous with the Irish conquest, as did the 'barbarity' of the Irish and their supposed misuse, neglect, and desecration of the physical landscape, all of which contributed towards the creation and continued development of anti-Irish rhetoric up until the outbreak of rebellion in 1641.

[98] Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization', p. 588.
[99] Ibid, p. 575.
[100] Montaño, 'Cultural Conflict and the Landscape', pp. 134-135.

1641: Historiography and Context

Before it is possible to engage in any meaningful investigation of the 1641 Irish rebellion, it is necessary to contextualise the conflict in relation to the social, cultural, environmental, economic, political, and religious circumstances of England and Ireland during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as well as in relation to that of the existing body of academic literature on the subject. The significance of the events of 1641 within Irish history is palpable, even from cursory readings on the conflict, but Patrick Little has correctly pointed out that historians have tended to approach this episode with a mixture of both fascination and hesitation.[1] Such hesitation undoubtedly stems from the controversial position occupied by the rebellion within Ireland's past and, perhaps somewhat inevitably, its present: by the eighteenth century, the rebellion had achieved something of an iconic status, and had come to symbolise both sectarian loyalty and political allegiance.[2] John Gibney maintained that the almost immediate emergence of 'Protestant' and, later, 'Catholic' versions of events in the aftermath of the conflict effectively stripped the rebellion of its complexity and reduced the intricacy of the hostilities, instead separating the opposing camps based upon religious denominations which became crystallised through time.[3] These conflicting, often inflammatory, accounts of the uprising have therefore tainted the contemporary historiography of the 1641 rebellion, prompting historians of the nineteenth century to direct the majority of their research towards the establishment of the veracity of the allegations of

---

[1] P. Little, 'Introduction: the confederate wars revisited', in P. Little (ed.), *Ireland in Crisis: War, Politics and Religion, 1641-50* (Baltimore: Project Muse, 2019), p. 1.
[2] J. Gibney, *The Shadow of a Year: The 1641 Rebellion in Irish History and Memory* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2013), p. 89.
[3] Ibid, pp. 18, 161.

'savage' Irish violence and 'barbarous' atrocity.[4] However, within the last several decades, the scholarship on the rebellion has begun to shift from such a limited focus on the brutality of the episode, towards one which allows for the conflict to be considered within the broader contexts of both Irish and, indeed, British history.[5] The aim of the present discussion, then, is to explore the origins, organisation, execution, and reportage of the 1641 rebellion by examining the relevant literature and taking into account these recent historiographic trends. It is also important to note that this chapter does not attempt to account for what may be considered as the main cause of outbreak of the rebellion, but rather has endeavoured to assess a broad range of perspectives in order to restore the complexity of the conflict, and to highlight the need for a greater appreciation of larger Anglo-Irish, 'British', and European historical contexts.[6] Accordingly, the following investigation has been conducted by way of the assessment of both long- and short-term incentives to the Irish campaign of rebellion.

The Long-Term Causes of the Rebellion

Though contemporary English commentators consistently characterised the rebellion in Ireland as a sudden, unexpected occurrence, modern historians have sought to consider the conflict in relation to more enduring long-term issues, from which the foundations of Irish

---

[4] E. Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2013), p. 52; R. Gillespie, 'The End of an Era: Ulster and the Outbreak of the 1641 Rising', in C. Brady and R. Gillespie (eds.), *Natives and Newcomers: The Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1986), p. 192.

[5] J. Cope, *England and the 1641 Irish Rebellion* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009), pp. 15-16; Cathcart has also discussed the emergence of a New British and Irish History, and has explained that integrated approaches to the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries have drawn attention to the need to move beyond Anglocentrism and, in doing so, have produced important works on the individual territories of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. On the other hand, she has also highlighted the problematic consequences of this new scholarship, and has considered further issues of Anglocentrism and anti-Europeanism, often created by the dominant three- or four-kingdom framework employed within New British and Irish histories. See A. Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea, North Channel Communities of the Atlantic Archipelago c.1550-1625* (Oxford: Peter Lang Ltd, 2022), pp. 24-28.

[6] Though Britain, as it is known in the present day, did not technically exist at this time, the significance of the Irish rebellion in relation to the kingdoms of Scotland and England requires consideration.

resentment may be better understood.[7] Historically speaking, Anglo-Irish relations had been strained for many centuries prior to the outbreak of the Irish rebellion in 1641, but, as noted by both Jane Ohlmeyer and Ian Gentles, particularly during the Middle Ages.[8] Indeed, it was throughout this period that Ireland's proximity to England first began to dominate English strategic deliberations, directing their attention towards the conquest of Ireland in the interest of both security and colonial expansion.[9] It was also around this time, following the arrival of Henry II in Ireland in 1171, that the first English and non-Irish commentaries began to emerge on the condition of Ireland and the Irish. For example, Gerald of Wales' infamous *History and Topography of Ireland* (1188x1223) lauded Henry with praise for his purported conquest and successful subjugation of the country, decrying the supposedly 'barbarous', 'wild', 'filthy', and 'evil' nature of the Gaelic Irish in comparison with their 'civilised' English counterparts.[10] In spite of its publication during the twelfth century, Gerald's commentary would continue to inform almost all future accounts of Ireland and its inhabitants for centuries to come.[11] In fact, the juxtaposition between the 'barbarity' of the Irish and the 'civility' of their English neighbours became so ingrained within anti-Irish rhetoric that when Sir John Temple published his seventeenth-century account of *The Irish Rebellion* (1679), he traced the origins of the conflict back to the landing of Henry II, arguing

---

[7] G. Farrell, *The 'mere Irish' and the colonisation of Ulster, 1570-1641* (Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), p. 291; Gillespie, 'The End of an Era', p. 192; J. Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes": Colonization within Britain and Ireland, 1580s-1640s', in N. Canny, A. Low, and W. Roger (eds.), *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 143; N. Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 298; J. Cope, 'The Irish Rising', in M. J. Braddick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 77.
[8] Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 135; I. Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652* (Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2007), p. 35.
[9] Ibid.
[10] G. Cambrensis, *The History and Topography of Ireland* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1982), pp. 101, 106, 124; Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 131.
[11] Ibid.

that the Irish had retained their 'depraved and barbarous' manners throughout the ages, thereby echoing the sentiments of Gerald of Wales.[12]

Having considered the impetuses to the rebellion, Nicholas Canny has considered the argument for the colonial dimension of the 1641 conflict, thereby extending the original discourse established by David Beers Quinn during the 1960s. Quinn's earlier research did much to uncover the colonial connection between the English and the inhabitants of both Ireland and the Americas, finding a link between the apparent necessity of the English duty towards the advancement of human 'civilisation' and their subsequent conquests across the Irish Sea and the Atlantic Ocean.[13] Canny argued that the prejudicial English conceptions of the inhabitants of the Americas and of the Gaelic Irish, formed in order to provide moral justification for their colonial oppression and expropriation, had endured well into the seventeenth century.[14] According to Canny, English-language works written after the events of 1641, like Temple's, continued to utilise the same discriminatory language routinely associated with the Elizabethans, albeit in combination with common anti-Catholic jargon, to justify further expropriation of land and property from Irish landowners who remained within the country.[15] Both Canny and, historian of early modern Ireland, Eamon Darcy have also argued that the colonial relationship between England, Ireland, and overseas territories in the Americas allowed contemporary commentators to draw upon a growing body of atrocity literature, emerging from the continent and the Americas.[16] This enabled them to embellish

---

[12] J. Temple, *The Irish Rebellion: or, An History Of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion raised within the Kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October, in the year, 1641* (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1646), pp. 3-4; Gibney, *The Shadow of a Year*, p. 29; Gerald of Wales previously insisted that the Irish 'external characteristics of beard and dress, and internal cultivation of the mind, are so barbarous that they cannot be said to have any culture' and that '[a]ll their habits are the habits of barbarians' — see Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 101-102.
[13] D. B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), pp. 106-122.
[14] N. Canny, '1641 in a Colonial Context', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 53-54.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid, pp. 57-59; Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, pp. 8-9.

their descriptions of the Irish 'barbarian' which, although increasingly centred on the purported evils of Catholicism, only buttressed condemnation of the Irish population and their landscape against the backdrop of English 'civility' and 'civilisation'.[17] As will be established as part of the following investigation, then, such perceptions not only informed the violent responses of the Irish nobility and their non-elite forces to the increasing imposition of English 'civilisation' throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but also the subsequent representation of Anglo-Irish conflict among predominantly English authors.

Furthermore, Canny suggested that the colonial dimension of the Anglo-Irish relationship, while continually relevant throughout periods of Anglo-Irish conflict during the sixteenth century, was never completely disregarded by English contemporaries of the seventeenth century, and that officials gradually began to draw upon this connection to further explain why the Irish Catholics suddenly took up arms against their English and Protestant neighbours.[18] As such, Temple was able to place the Irish rebellion within a colonial context almost immediately, conceptualising the allegations of Irish atrocities as sound justification for the English to move forward with a new phase of colonisation, in which the separation of the Catholic and Protestant populations would be absolute.[19] Thus, Canny's consideration of the colonial dimension of the 1641 rebellion is crucial, and his arguments have established the importance of continuity when examining the events of 1641, which often have been either overlooked or downplayed by authors like Aidan Clarke.[20] Though Henry had initially shelved the idea for the procurement of Ireland for his brother William, his subsequent arrival in Ireland during the twelfth century, seeking to constrain the

[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid, p. 56.
[19] Ibid, p. 67.
[20] A. Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland, 1625-42* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1966), p. 220.

Anglo-Norman knights, with papal authority for English intervention in Ireland not only signalled the beginning of the future of hostile entanglement between England and Ireland, but also established the colonial 'civilising' dynamic between the two realms which would ultimately stand the test of time.[21] Therefore, by incorporating a colonial perspective throughout the present research, it became possible to begin to conceptualise the rebellion in relation to more substantial, yet remarkably underemphasised, drivers of the conflict, including the unwavering English concerns with 'civility', 'civilisation', and the subjugation of the Irish landscape and its people. Indeed, given the clear indications as to the evidence of previous social connections between the Catholic Irish and the English and Protestant settler populations - both among individual depositions and as part of larger accounts of the conflict - the colonial dynamic between the 'natives' and 'newcomers' demands further attention in order to account for the complete breakdown of Anglo-Irish relations in 1641.

During the centuries which followed Henry's first appearance, successive English administrations tried and failed to complete the conquest of Ireland and to resolve what has been called their 'Irish problem'.[22] Attempts to maintain Henry's Irish settlement were significantly frustrated by the Bruce invasion of 1315, the climatic and epidemiological devastation of the Little Ice Age (LIA), the spread of the bubonic plague, and, just as there were signs of recovery, the English Wars of the Roses in 1455, all of which threatened both the stability and potential for the expansion of the settlement. As a result, the scope of

[21] See F. X. Martin, 'Diarmait Mac Murchada and the Coming of the Anglo-Normans', in A. Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Medieval Ireland 1169-1534*, Vol. II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 43-66; neither the Anglo-Norman arrival in Ireland, nor Henry's subsequent landing, were actually 'invasions', both having been invited to Ireland by the deposed Irish king Diarmait Mac Murchada, the powerful O'Brien kings of Munster, and other Gaelic lords.
[22] B. Bradshaw, 'The Tudor Reformation and Revolution in Wales and Ireland: the Origins of the British Problem', in B. Bradshaw and J. Morrill (eds.), *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State formation in the Atlantic archipelago* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1996), p. 43.

English authority largely became confined to the English Pale and Ireland as a whole became a fairly serious drain on the English exchequer. Thus, according to Brendan Bradshaw, Ireland had become '*the* historic British problem' by the sixteenth century, as the Irish remained staunchly Catholic and stubbornly resistant to incorporation within the Union of the Crowns, while the English decline in Ireland raises an important discussion with respect to the Old English settlers who remained within the Pale.[23]

As a population who posed interesting ethnic and religious questions in relation to the later seventeenth century Irish rebellion, Quinn has discussed how the Old English traditionally represented the interests of the English crown in Ireland, and effectively embodied their ambitions for the conquest and colonisation of the realm.[24] However, having failed to promote and maintain a close relationship between the Old English magnates and the Dublin administration, crown authorities had looked on in horror as the Old English seemingly 'degenerated' from their status of 'civility', abandoning their English heritage in favour of the Irish language, law, and social customs.[25] While previous medieval Irish bardic poetry had alluded to the Anglo-Normans, or the Old English, as 'foreigners', by the seventeenth century references to 'foreigners' or *gaill* delineated those belonging to the New English settler community, which was indicative of the acceptance of the Old English as fellow Irish Catholics among the Gaelic learned classes.[26] David Scott has considered the somewhat ambiguous position of the Old English as part of his research into the wars of the three Stuart kingdoms, and has discussed the formation of 'English' identity during the early modern period, stating that English definitions of 'Englishness' had become gradually disassociated from the sole concern with ethnic identity, and had instead become more

[23] Ibid.
[24] Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, pp. 1-3.
[25] Ibid.
[26] B. Ó Buachalla, 'Poetry and Politics in Early Modern Ireland', *Eighteenth-century Ireland*, 7:1 (1992), p. 159.

concerned with one's judicial, regnal, and confessional status, particularly on the eve of the 1641 rebellion.[27] Scott's argument has effectively called attention to the increasing importance of nuanced perspectives in relation to concepts of identity and heritage throughout this period, which will become more important within the subsequent discussion of the short-term causes of rebellion. However, Scott's assertion has also demonstrated that English 'ethnicity' — which is to say, an English ancestry and bloodline — was no longer sufficient to command a truly English identity, and was therefore inadequate to confer true 'civility'.

Nevertheless, it was during the sixteenth century that England's Irish interests moved towards the center of their political agenda, leading to the emergence of the policy of plantation which, if undertaken successfully, was possessed of the potential to resolve their Irish problems by planting the country with 'civilised' English subjects. Henry VIII's break from Rome and the Catholic Church in 1533 had simultaneously elevated existing security concerns about the proximity of Catholic Ireland to the newly Protestant England and had invalidated *Laudabiliter*, the papal bull upon which English intervention in Ireland had originally been justified.[28] As such, Henry was persuaded by the Irish executive and his lord deputy, Sir Anthony St Leger, to create Ireland as a kingdom and to rule based upon English common law and custom.[29] In doing so, however, Henry had also accepted the 'moral commitment' to oversee the total subjugation of the island, bringing its inhabitants to obedience and 'civilisation' in the process.[30] Although there were previous attempts to

---

[27] D. Scott, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637-49* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 6.
[28] It is important to note that England had been embroiled in foreign conflicts with continental Catholic powers like Spain and France for the first three decades of the sixteenth century prior to the Reformation.
[29] B. Bradshaw, *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 231-238.
[30] Ibid.

establish English plantations in Ireland, these had been largely conceived in the interest of defending the Pale against Irish raiders.[31] Canny argued in his discussion of the ideology of English colonisation that it was during the years of 1565 to 1576 that there was an increase in the justification for the pursuit of colonisation, in the form of conquest, in Ireland, as various officials, including Sir Henry Sidney, Walter Devereaux, and Sir Humphrey Gilbert, publicised their support for plantation.[32] Ohlmeyer has explained that strategies on how to 'civilise' Gaelic Ireland and its 'barbarous' population ranged from assimilation to outright annihilation, and has maintained that debate was continuous over whether or not the Irish could be reformed in the absence of force.[33] On the other hand, Canny has pointed out that the majority of these projects normally included plans for the creation of English military garrisons across Ireland, and were also specifically designed to target areas which were inhabited by the Irish, rather than the Old English settlers, conferring the English belief that the Irish could only be brought to order by force.[34] Irrespective of their design, however, Ohlmeyer pointed out that these plans for plantation all presumed the ethnic and racial 'superiority' of the English in comparison with that of the Irish, establishing a socio-cultural power dynamic which would justify subsequent English intervention in Irish affairs.[35] Darcy

[31] N. Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), pp. 576-577.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 131. Debate over the English reform of Ireland and its inhabitants, versus their conquest and subjugation, has also endured within the historiography. For the perspective of conquest, see D. Edwards, 'Beyond Reform: Martial Law & the Tudor reconquest of Ireland', *History Ireland*, 5:2 (1997), pp. 16-21; D. Edwards, 'The escalation of violence in sixteenth-century Ireland', in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), pp. 34-78; and Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*. As for the reformist perspective, see Bradshaw, 'The Tudor Reformation and Revolution', pp. 39-65; Bradshaw, *The Irish Constitutional Revolution*; and C. Brady, *The Chief Governors: The rise and fall of reform government in Tudor Ireland 1536-1588* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). For a more recent perspective on this debate, see D. Edwards, 'Questioning the viceroys: toward a new model of English government in Tudor Ireland, 1536-1594', in S. Covington, V. P. Carey, and V. McGowan-Doyle (eds.), *Early Modern Ireland: New Sources, Methods, and Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), pp. 147-165. Herein, although Edwards argued that there is a growing acceptance that Tudor rule in Ireland, in terms of 'reform' versus military conquest, represented a combination of the two approaches, he also asserted that Tudor 'reform … was military-led'.
[34] Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization', p. 758.
[35] Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 131.

has also addressed the importance of England's presumptive 'superiority' over Ireland and the Irish in greater detail, specifically in order to better understand English responses to the 1641 rebellion. Accordingly, he has argued that English cultural values actually became entrenched within the idea of 'civility', which allowed English officials to justify the use of excessive force in order to halt rebellions both at home and abroad: by characterising various 'other' non-English populations as 'barbaric' and 'uncivilised', English authorities could absolve themselves of culpability while rationalising any number of punitive measures, including the employment of the full extent of martial law as also discussed by David Edwards.[36] In other words, the English conquest of Ireland had become synonymous with the advancement of English 'civilisation'. Darcy is one of the few historians who readily acknowledged the importance of contextualising the rebellion in relation to the sixteenth century and in reference to the reportage of the Nine Years' War.[37] By building upon the assertions of those such as Ohlmeyer and Canny, his discussion has helped to establish how the belief in English ethnic and racial 'superiority', inherent in their policy of plantation, became conflated with notions of 'civility' and 'civilisation', and was subsequently weaponised against non-English inhabitants such as the Americans and the Irish — a process which ultimately continued up until, and during the aftermath of, the rebellion of 1641.[38]

From an Irish perspective, English intervention in Ireland was far from accepted and was often met with fierce resistance, particularly from more powerful Gaelic lords who refused to tolerate attempts to usurp their authority, either by foreign intruders or neighbouring rivals. For example, during the mid-sixteenth century, Elizabeth I and Sir Henry Sidney, her lord deputy, spent a great deal of time and resources attempting to subdue Shane

---

[36] Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, pp. 25-28; Edwards, 'Beyond Reform', pp. 16-17.
[37] Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, pp. 18, 31.
[38] Ibid; Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 131; Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization', p. 758.

O'Neill — the most powerful Gaelic lord in the province of Ulster throughout this period — as he and his supporters wrought chaos and destruction throughout the Pale, launching attacks in the north of the country and upon various English garrisons. Ciaran Brady explained that Shane initially had hoped to cooperate with the crown in order to secure legal title to his father's lands as the Earl of Tyrone, but, after the English authorities began to work against him to secure an Anglo-Scottish alliance in Ulster, Shane was fully prepared, if not compelled, as 'the O'Neill' to go to war against the queen and assert his dominance by force.[39] The epitome of Irish resistance, however, was the rebellion of Hugh O'Neill, the second Earl of Tyrone, during the final decade of the sixteenth century.[40] Tyrone's opposition to the increasing violation of the power and autonomy of the Gaelic lords by the English authorities in 1594 escalated into the single most significant conflict between Ireland and England throughout the Elizabethan era, and would continue for a period of nine years, causing immeasurable damage and devastation across the country, and ultimately solidifying English perceptions of the inhabitants of Ireland as both 'barbarous' and dangerous.

Accordingly, Gerard Farrell has been particularly vocal on the importance of viewing Irish history through multiple lenses in order to avoid the adoption of a solely Anglo-centric worldview. Indeed, he has explained that within much of the existing literature on early modern Ireland and the plantation period, the Irish themselves tend to be discussed in terms of the threat that they posed to the survival of English settlement, while their Gaelic social institutions have been frequently evaluated and defined in relation to those of their 'civilised' English counterparts.[41] Furthermore, he also warned that historians must be cautious as to

[39] C. Brady, *Shane O'Neill* (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press, 1996), pp. 47, 66-68.
[40] The First and Second Desmond Rebellions from 1569-1573 and 1579-1583 were also representative of full-scale Old English and Irish resistance against the perceived incursion of the English crown upon their authority and jurisdiction.
[41] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 8-10.

avoid falling into the same patterns of English value judgements on the Irish, which are largely based upon the alleged 'superiority' of one culture over another, reminding his audience that contemporary narratives of Gaelic Ireland were deliberately constructed by the English authorities in order to justify their conquest and the subsequent seizure and exploitation of Irish lands.[42] Farrell has maintained that narratives in which the Gaelic Irish, and those of Ulster in particular, are characterised as the persistent 'thorn in the side of the English government' are highly problematic in their 'west facing' tendency, and fail to acknowledge that the English, to the same extent, at the very least, must also have constituted a problem for the Irish — an assertion which is particularly relevant in considering the consequences of the Nine Years' War and, indeed, the eventual outbreak of the 1641 rebellion.[43] Indeed, the following investigation has given due consideration to Farrell's perspective, and has endeavoured to consider the actions, experiences, and representations of the Irish rebels within the context of the conflict by simultaneously interrogating those of the English and Protestant settlers and commentators, whose judgements and beliefs have ultimately dominated the reportage of events in 1641.

Though some of the Ulster lords had been engaged in communications with the Spanish king since 1559, Tyrone's subsequent involvement around 1595 potentially indicated that the lords may have been more likely to receive a positive response in their pleas for military assistance against the English queen, especially given that they had also offered

[42] Ibid, pp. 10-12.
[43] Ibid, p. 9.

Philip II the crown of Ireland if he agreed to intervene on their behalf.[44] However, for the next six years, military aid from the Spanish remained both limited and unreliable.[45] By the time Philip's successor, Philip III, eventually warmed to the prospect of more forceful intervention in Ireland, Tyrone and the Ulster lords could endure only until around July 1601, though the Spanish forces would not arrive until September.[46] As the English authorities advanced upon Kinsale, Tyrone and the other lords marched to meet their Spanish allies in the south during what Gerard Hayes-Mccoy has described as the 'eleventh hour', but their efforts would ultimately end in vain.[47] The battle yielded a decisive English victory, which, according to Hayes-Mccoy, marked the collapse of Gaelic Ireland, though Tyrone refused to submit to the English authorities until 30 March 1603.[48] Tyrone and the other lords were subsequently pardoned by the new king, James VI and I, but John McCavitt's discussion has revealed that the Irish lords continued to engage in 'conspiratorial machinations' both at home with the Catholic Old English and abroad with the Spanish, causing rumours to circulate of an active pan-Catholic conspiracy against the Protestant English.[49] The Irish lord deputy and the London authorities then began to voice serious concerns about Tyrone's loyalties, and seemed fully prepared to take action against the earl and his associates if it became necessary — a fact which Tyrone discovered following communications from the Franciscan friar Archduke Albert, who had apparently received word that Tyrone and the Earl

---

[44] G. A. Hayes-Mccoy, 'The Completion of The Tudor Conquest and the Advance of the Counter-Reformation, 1571–1603', in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 121-122; Alexander Lynch had travelled from Ireland to Spain in 1559 seeking aid in exchange for the kingship of Ireland, while many subsequent discontented Irish perceived King Phillip II as a 'favourite' to secure a 'non-English sovereign'. Additionally, given that the Spanish retained the Catholic faith and that the Irish traced their ancestry to Spain, the candidacy of the Spanish monarchy was ideal; see C. Maginn, 'Whose Island? Sovereignty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Ireland', *Éire-Ireland*, 44:3 (2009), pp. 229-247, and B. Kane, 'The Nine Years' War in Ireland (1594-1603) as problem of government', in W. J. Bulman and F. C. Domínguez (eds.), *Political and Religious Practice in the Early Modern British World* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2022), pp. 181-202, for full discussion.

[45] Hayes-Mccoy, 'The Completion of The Tudor Conquest', pp. 122-123.

[46] Ibid, pp. 132-134.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid, pp. 135-136.

[49] J. McCavitt, 'The Flight of the Earls, 1607', *Irish Historical Studies*, 29:114 (1994), pp. 160, 172-173.

of Tyrconnell were due to be detained imminently by crown authorities.[50] Thus, it was within this context of increasing hostility and uncertainty that Tyrone and the earls of Ulster ultimately fled Ireland in September 1607, seeking refuge on the Catholic continent and leaving behind the majority of their families, followers, and, most importantly, their estates.[51]

Following the flight of the northern earls, and a somewhat lacklustre rebellion by Sir Cahir O'Doherty in April 1608, James charged Sir John Davies to oversee the legal proceedings to declare the Irish insurgents as treasonous, thereby expediting the forfeiture and confiscation of their lands and estates for use in a crown-sponsored plantation project which would encompass the six counties of Armagh, Donegal, Cavan, Fermanagh, Derry (later renamed Londonderry), and Tyrone.[52] Whilst various historians have referenced the years following James' implementation of the plantation of Ulster and those preceding the outbreak of rebellion in 1641 as those of the 'Early Stuart Peace', Farrell's contrasting discussion of those decades is particularly valuable, especially in order to appreciate the significance of loss and disorientation in Gaelic Ireland throughout this crucial period.[53] Farrell argued that the substantial period of time between the beginning of the crown plantation project and the rising in 1641 should not be interpreted as a measure of Irish contentment, but instead in relation to the significant lack of unified Irish nobility to co-ordinate effective resistance against the English newcomers, as well as with respect to the

[50] Ibid, pp. 171-173.
[51] There is significant debate around the motivations behind the Flight of the Earls in 1607, as well as in relation to the potential return of Hugh O'Neill in the aftermath; see McCavitt, 'The Flight of the Earls, 1607', pp. 160, 159-173; N. Canny, 'XVI The Flight of the Earls, 1607', *Irish Historical Studies*, 17:67 (1971), pp. 380-399; V. McGowan-Doyle, 'Christopher St Lawrence, ninth baron of Howth: conspirator and informer', in D. Finnegan, É. Ó Ciardha, and M. Peters (eds.), *The Flight of the Earls: Imeacht na nIarlaí* (Derry: Guildhall Press, 2010), pp. 13-19; and M. K. Walsh, *"Destruction by Peace": Hugh O'Neill after Kinsale* (Monaghan: Cumann Seanchas Ard Mhacha, 1986), p. 143.
[52] Canny, *Making Ireland British*, p. 203.
[53] D. Edwards, 'Out of the blue? Provincial Unrest in Ireland Before 1641', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 96; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 8-9.

widespread effects of depopulation and devastation throughout Ireland following the conclusion of the Nine Years' War.[54] It should also be noted that rumours continued to circulate of the possible return of Tyrone from Spain with an army of Spanish soldiers to command the rebellion, in spite of the fact that Tyrone had died in 1616.[55] James' project for the plantation of Ulster was by no means a novel enterprise, and the Irish had struggled, almost always physically, against the increasing incursion of the English authorities upon the Gaelic landscape for more than half a century. Thus, the outbreak of rebellion in 1641 — though canonised as a sudden outburst of Catholic Irish malevolence — can hardly be considered as an unfamiliar, or even unforeseen, circumstance when taken into account within the larger, historic context of Anglo-Irish relations, and should not be treated as such. Rather, the occasion of 1641 can also be interpreted as a measure of Irish resilience, and its scale as that of an indication of the survival of both the nobility and non-elite populations in spite of the English conquest.

In order to fully appreciate the long-term impact of the crown plantation of Ulster in relation to the Irish rebellion of 1641, it is useful to reflect upon the perspective of Geoffrey Parker on what he considered to be a global crisis of the seventeenth century.[56] Exacerbated by the extreme climatic phenomena of the LIA, Parker has argued that this period was characterised by persistent warfare, resistance, and rebellion among various composite monarchies from England to Spain, promoting substantial efforts to 'familiarise' these amalgam states with one another and to maintain monarchical authority.[57] It is through this lens that James' plantation efforts may be better understood: after the Spanish had attempted

[54] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 279.
[55] Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, pp. 1-2.
[56] G. Parker, 'The crisis of the Spanish and the Stuart monarchies in the mid-seventeenth century: local problems or global problems?', in C. Brady and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 278-279.
[57] Ibid, pp. 255-261, 265-279.

to exploit Tyrone's rebellion in Ireland and establish a vantage point at Kinsale against the English, the need to establish and maintain English and Protestant authority over Catholic Ireland was arguably more pressing than ever before.[58] Ohlmeyer agreed that James certainly saw himself as king of the three Stuart kingdoms, but the king was limited by both human and financial resources — following Elizabeth I's prolonged engagement during the Nine Years' War and, indeed, in the wake of the Anglo-Spanish War — which arguably necessitated initiatives for reform over military expeditions.[59] However, while historians like Hugh Trevor-Roper and Sean Connolly have tended to discuss the plantation as an attempt to facilitate the long-term assimilation of the Irish with the English settlers, or indeed with 'civil persons' more generally, Farrell has expressed disagreement with the view of the Ulster plantation as something of a relatively smooth process of integration between the Irish and the settler communities.[60] Though Connolly has acknowledged that James' vision for cultural assimilation in Ireland did assume the social, political, economic, religious, and cultural 'superiority' of the English population, Farrell has argued that — while the extermination of the Irish in totality may not have been the primary objective of the plantation — the elimination of the Irish inhabitants as a distinct people with their own unique social, economic, political, religious, and cultural customs undoubtedly was.[61] In this respect, 'assimilation' was wholly dependent upon the abandonment of Gaelic identities which, as will become evident within the subsequent examination of the weaponisation of Irish mobility and the reassertion of their cultural mores as part of their rebellion campaign, clearly failed.

---

[58] H. Trevor-Roper, *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1967), p. 409.
[59] J. Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', *History Today*, 48:11 (1998), p. 16; Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 132.
[60] Trevor-Roper, *Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 410-411; S. J. Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland 1460-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 310.
[61] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 284.

James' plans for the six counties of Ulster had transformed English crown policy with regard to plantation and, in spite of previous attempts to minimise the personal estates of great Irish lords like Tyrconnell and Tyrone, it had since become more practical to recognise those individuals as the sole keepers of the entire territories over which they proclaimed their authority, in order that those lands could then be forfeited for crown use.[62] As is generally accepted within Anglo-Irish historiography, the tenurial component of the plantation policy, which involved the widespread dispossession of the Gaelic and Catholic nobility and the displacement of their tenantry, was fundamentally important within the timeline of events leading up to the outbreak of the 1641 rebellion, and not only engendered enduring resentment among the deprived, but effectively set the precedent for subsequent Irish dispossession in the aftermath of the conflict.[63] Raymond Gillespie's case study on the murder of Dublin merchant Arthur Champion in 1641 by a group of his own Irish tenants has highlighted the importance of regional research in order to gain a deeper understanding of the motivations behind the rebellion, as well as the clear connection between the Irish hardships caused by plantation and occasion of the rebellion.[64] Farrell and Connolly have also shared an important interpretation of the experience of dispossession and displacement from the perspective of the Irish, as Farrell explained that the decision to force the Irish into areas which were often very close to their ancestral lands only fuelled their initial resentment, more so given their proximity to the English and Protestant outsiders who had moved into the spaces once occupied by themselves and their dependents.[65] James established the

---

[62] Connolly, *Contested Island*, p. 296. Indeed, James' policy of landed recognition was representative of the resurgence of the Tudor 'surrender and regrant' policy, first introduced in Ireland by Henry VIII.
[63] Gillespie, 'The End of an Era', pp. 195-196; C. Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 380-381; M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), p. 46; J. Kenyon and J. Ohlmeyer, 'The Background to the Civil Wars in the Stuart Kingdoms', in J. Kenyon, J. Ohlmeyer, and J. Morrill (eds.), *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 29-30; Connolly, *Contested Island*, pp. 295-296; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 257.
[64] R. Gillespie, 'The Murder of Arthur Champion and the 1641 Rising in Fermanagh', *Clogher Historical Society,* 14:3 (1993), pp. 53-66.
[65] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 278; Connolly, *Contested Island*, p. 299.

Commission for the Remedy of Defective Titles in 1606, which required all Irish landowners to provide proof of their titles to their lands — a requirement which many were unable to fulfil, resulting in fines, forfeiture, and the redistribution of lands among Protestant English and Scottish undertakers and servitors in various other counties, including Wexford, Leitrim, and Longford, between 1610 and 1620.[66] Michael Perceval-Maxwell has also noted that many of the Old English were similarly dispossessed as a consequence of such stringent legal requirements, since many of these landowners were possessed of incredibly old titles which were difficult to recover and defend in the English court of law.[67] Additionally, Sir John Davies, James' 'legal architect' of plantation, procured a judicial resolution which stated that Irish titles to lands obtained under 'gravelkind' — the Gaelic system of landed inheritance by division between multiple male heirs — had no standing in English law, thereby creating further insecurity, dispossession, and aggravation among the Irish population.[68] Simply put, the Gaelic landscape was under attack, physically, legally, and culturally.

Both Conrad Russell and Connolly have discussed the legal and political significance of Davies' views on landownership within the framework of the Ulster plantation, foregrounding Davies' belief in the necessity of English common law in order to effect 'civility' and to secure the king's title to the land, thereby establishing his sovereignty throughout the land.[69] However, it is worth noting that Davies' perspective, and by extension that of the crown itself, on the extension of authority and 'civility' was ultimately grounded within the land itself, and logically dependent upon the eventual control of the landscape in its entirety — a project which was undoubtedly well underway on the eve of the 1641

[66] Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 139. James had actually taken similar steps in order to secure the plantation of Lewis in Scotland — see Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea*, pp. 243-245.
[67] Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 46.
[68] Connolly, *Contested Island*, p. 296.
[69] Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, pp. 380-381; ibid, pp. 296-310.

rebellion, when Catholic landownership in the province of Ulster had declined to around 59 per cent.[70] Roman narratives of 'civilisation' were also regularly employed by the English authorities throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and particularly that of the principle of *res nullius*, in order to further their claims of entitlement to Irish lands which were constructed as 'empty', uncultivated, and effectively 'wasted'.[71] Indeed, it is the question of the enduring significance of the Irish landscape, and the use of the land itself, in relation to Anglo-Irish perspectives of the 1641 rebellion which, often having been overlooked within the historiography in favour of confessional or colonial narratives, has been the subject of the investigation of the following research. As for the non-landowning, non-elite population, the design of the Ulster plantation aimed to ensure, as Davies himself proclaimed, that the number of 'civil persons' in the planted areas was greater than 'the number of the natives', otherwise the Irish would 'quickly overgrow them as weeds overgrow the good corn'.[72] James, therefore, decreed that any Catholic Irish who remained upon the lands of the Protestant British undertakers were to be 'transplanted', 'disposed', or 'removed', and that these lands were to be planted only with 'English and Scottish tenants'.[73] Though subsequent surveys on the progress of the plantation have offered indications as to the continued presence of many of the Irish tenantry among the escheated lands, Connolly has argued that the proposal in itself to forcibly transplant around one third of the existing Irish inhabitants of six counties, irrespective of their disposition or behaviour, was representative of a distinctive hardening in opinion against the Irish population which, once

[70] Gentles, *The English Revolution*, p. 36.
[71] K. Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility: Manners and Civilisation in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), p. 216.
[72] 'Sir John Davys to Salisbury', in C. W. Russell, D. D., and J. P. Prendergast (eds.), *Calendar of the State Papers, Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of James I. 1608–1610* (London: Longman & Co., 1874), p. 17.
[73] 'A Project for the Division and Plantation of the escheated lands in six several counties of Ulster, namely, Tirone, Colraine, Donnegall, Fermanagh, Ardmagh, and Cavan, concluded by his Majesty's Commissioners', in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co., 1873), pp. 13-22.

again, was rationalised via the scope of 'civility'.[74] James' declarations were also indicative of the attitudes of the English crown towards their Irish 'subjects'.

Connolly's assertions have been reinforced by Edwards' work on provincial unrest in Ireland during the period prior to the outbreak of the Irish rebellion in 1641, which has called attention to the fact that the crown continued to maintain a force of around 2,000 men in Ireland even after 1605.[75] These men were issued with a mandate for the regular use of martial law and its range of powers of execution against any perceived 'malefactors', 'wrongdoers', or 'offenders'.[76] As such, the potential to face severe punishments based upon the discretion of the English military, including execution by hanging, without the security of a fair trial, had essentially become part of the day-to-day reality of the non-elite Irish population following the defeat of the Nine Years' War. Accordingly, Edwards has argued that these conditions should not only call into question the validity of the years of the apparent 'Stuart Peace', but also that this persecution undoubtedly sustained the resentment of the wider Irish population, who were documented to have been continually involved in episodic violence from the 1610s to the 1630s, even after the apparent collapse of Irish Gaeldom following the defeat of the Nine Years' War.[77]

Nonetheless, James' plans for the Ulster plantation did not exclude the Irish nobility in their entirety, as the king believed it was essential to allocate some of the escheated lands to around 300 of those deemed to be 'deserving Irish', thereby creating a vested Irish interest in the success of their endeavour.[78] Traditionally, English commentators had condemned the

---

[74] Connolly, *Contested Island*, p. 300.
[75] Edwards, 'Out of the blue?', pp. 96-97.
[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid, pp. 97-105.
[78] Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 138.

Irish nobility as tyrannical for their discretionary exactions of tribute upon the Irish tenantry, and such commentators had even attempted to fashion the English authorities as liberators of the Irish population, offering freedom and 'civilisation' as subjects of the crown in exchange for the surrender of 'barbarism'.[79] Nevertheless, the 'deserving Irish' were made up only of those Irish lords deemed worthy — either in recognition of their loyalty or of their prominence within Gaelic society prior to the expansion of the English policy of plantation — to obtain titles within the new order, including the O'Cahans, the Maguires, and particularly the O'Neills, who received around one third of all the lands granted to the 'deserving Irish'.[80] Indeed, it is important to acknowledge that many of the Catholic Irish welcomed the ascension of James VI and I after the defeat of the Nine Years' War, and actually accepted his authority in Ireland as legitimate, seeking greater freedom and toleration for Catholicism in Ireland and, perhaps more so, hoping to survive within the new order of 'civilisation.[81] In considering the outbreak of the rebellion in 1641, Gillespie noted that many of those 'deserving Irish' selected to obtain landed titles were actually involved in the subsequent organisation and execution of the rebellion almost four decades later, citing the curiosity of the phenomenon on account of the fact that these individuals had seemingly benefitted from the plantation scheme themselves.[82] Conversely, in his case study on the experience of the 'deserving Irish', Farrell argued that this group did not actually prevail to a much better extent than those among the dispossessed Irish population during the plantation period, largely as a consequence of the various restrictions inhibiting the management of their estates and the demands of the new economic order.[83] Though the 'deserving Irish' were not

[79] J. McGurk, 'The pacification of Ulster, 1600-3', in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), p. 128.
[80] Connolly, *Contested Island*, pp. 298-299.
[81] M. O'Riordan, *The Gaelic Mind and the Collapse of the Gaelic World* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1990), pp. 212-213; Ó Buachalla, 'Poetry and Politics', pp. 163-165.
[82] Gillespie, 'The End of an Era', p. 195.
[83] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 7.

restricted in who they could settle upon their proportions of land, they found themselves subject to higher rentals than Scottish or English undertakers or servitors, were required to issue their tenants with fixed rents, barred from using the ancient Gaelic economic exaction of coign and livery, and tasked with the enforcement of utilising 'tillage and husbandry after the manner of the English' on their estates.[84] Thus, the 'deserving' Irish were effectively incentivised to abandon their Gaelic ancestry and Irish tenantry in favour of the advancement of English 'civilisation', largely to their overall detriment.

Both Farrell and Perceval-Maxwell have commented upon the importance of acknowledging the difficulties faced by the Irish nobility in their attempts to adapt to the new economic order implemented by the English newcomers.[85] The plantation of Ulster was bound up with the introduction of a 'civilised', English-style economy centred on markets and the exchange of cash, which would ultimately replace the existing Gaelic redistributive economic order.[86] However, the Irish found themselves in constant competition with the Scottish and English settlers who were already well acquainted with the new commercial economy.[87] Ohlmeyer added that in order to ensure their survival within the emergent 'civilised' society, Irish lords quickly realised that they would have to maintain their image as 'civilised', 'worthy subjects', and thus became eager to prove themselves as 'improving landlords'.[88] As such, some began to engage in agricultural and landed 'improvement', constructed buildings after the manner of the English, travelled frequently between their

[84] Connolly, *Contested Island*, p. 292. According to the Lord Deputy Arthur Chichester in 1610, the yearly rent for the Irish was to be set at 10*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, while the English and Scottish servitors were to be charged a lesser 8*l.* However, it was stipulated that if those servitors ensured that their lands were planted exclusively with English and Scots, they would pay only 5*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* — the same reduced rate offered to the undertakers; see the 'Proclamation by the Lo. Deputy and Commissioners for the Plantation of the Escheated Lands in Ulster', in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co., 1873), pp. 61-62.
[85] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 247; Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 45.
[86] Kenyon, Ohlmeyer, 'The Background to the Civil Wars', p. 30; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 247.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 141.

estates and the British mainland, and generally spent lavishly to uphold their life at court, crafting an image which would appease both the crown and its agents in Ireland.[89] For example, Randal MacDonnell, the second earl of Antrim, engaged in lengthy discussions with Lord Deputy Wentworth and Archbishop Laud in 1637 as to how best to 'improve' upon his lands, and subsequently required his tenants to 'improve' their lands via the planting of trees, the enclosure of poor lands, and the digging of trenches or the erection of fences to designate their boundaries.[90] As one of the greatest landowners in Ireland during this period, and the largest in the region of Ulster, Antrim's efforts were indicative of the ardent embrace of English practical and ideological modes of 'civilisation' among some of the surviving Irish nobility. Unfortunately, such spending habits became untenable for the struggling Irish nobility, and many were eventually forced to mortgage their estates to their English or Scottish neighbours, but even more common was the cycle and accumulation of debt: for example, in 1639 the earl of Antrim had secured a fairly ample income of around £6,000 per annum, but had still managed to accrue around £50,000 worth of debts to this date.[91]

While various historians, including Ohlmeyer, Darcy, and Canny, have discussed the widespread increase in the phenomenon of indebtedness among the 'deserving' Irish community, and contextualised this issue in relation to the growth of resentment in the years prior to the outbreak of rebellion, Farrell and Robin Clifton have offered particularly valuable perspectives on the true impact of the cycle of debt.[92] By focusing on the financial circumstances of Sir Phelim O'Neill, one of the principal heads of the Ulster rising and an individual regarded as 'pre-plantation stock', Farrell has made a compelling argument

[89] Ibid, pp. 142-143.
[90] J. Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms: The career of Randal MacDonnell, marquis of Antrim, 1609-1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 33-40.
[91] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 7; Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 45.
[92] Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', p. 20; Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, p. 172; Canny, *Making Ireland British*, p. 541.

concerning the direct relationship between the indebtedness of the Irish nobility and the subsequent cause for rebellion.[93] Though Temple claimed that Irish landowners like O'Neill sought to settle their lands with British tenants — a measure which would have allowed them to expect higher rental returns — O'Neill's own debts hovered well above the £10,000 mark on the eve of the rising, which would have undoubtedly incentivised him to rebel against the oppressive colonial order which ultimately contributed to his deteriorating prosperity.[94] Clifton has also furthered the discussion of the plight of the 'deserving Irish', arguing that the sustained social and economic degradation of the Irish had been a gradual process, occurring over many years, and that the primary cause of this degradation was related to the emergent economic process of competition, purchase, and debt, directly associated with the implementation of English plantation.[95] Having considered these and various other perspectives on the impact of the plantation of Ulster upon both the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' Irish populations, it is impossible to discount the experiences of the denunciation, dispossession, displacement, and continued subjugation of the Irish in relation to the long-term causes of the 1641 rebellion. As Farrell has stated, it is unwise to overlook the significance of those experiences as stimulants of Irish resentment.[96]

Although included within the architecture of James' plans for the plantation of Ulster, the importance of religious tension and intolerance in Ireland throughout this period, especially in relation to the narrative of the 1641 rebellion itself, necessitates a more significant individual analysis of the larger contemporary confessional Anglo-Irish context. Trevor-Roper previously posited that the triumph of Protestantism in Ireland following the

---

[93] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 246-257; Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 45.
[94] Ibid.
[95] R. Clifton, '"An indiscriminate blackness"? Massacre, counter-massacre, and ethnic cleansing in Ireland, 1640-1660', in M. Levene and P. Roberts (eds.), *The Massacre in History* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1999), pp. 110-111.
[96] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 277-278.

defeat of the O'Neills and O'Donnells had been remarkably easy, and that the Roman Catholic Church had been abolished without any serious resistance.[97] However, Trevor-Roper's perspective on this particular issue must be considered as something of an exaggeration, if not a total distortion of the contemporary reality. The Protestant Anglican Church had been established as the 'official' church in Ireland following the Elizabethan settlement of 1560, and had been theoretically reinforced by the subsequent legal requirement of universal attendance.[98] Nevertheless, in most of the Gaelic regions outwith the boundaries of Dublin, where any agreements with the crown had barely been monitored or consummated, the authority of the crown in Irish confessional affairs, if ever at all significant, had been effectively neutralised.[99]

Ohlmeyer has argued that the inadequacy of both human and financial resources, combined with the vibrancy of Catholicism and the reluctance of both the Irish and Old English Catholic nobility to conform to the reformed religion, truly inhibited the spread of Protestantism in Ireland.[100] Indeed, the introduction of Protestantism was also closely associated with the extension of English crown authority and the imposition of English common law, which only created further suspicion and hostility among the Old English and Irish Catholic communities. In fact, it was reported by George Canning — the agent of the Ironmonger's Company associated with the London Companies of Londonderry — that many of the Irish who remained in the county were frightened to conform to the Protestant faith on account of the hostility of their fellow countrymen and women, offering further indications as to the tensions surrounding religion even after the defeat of the Irish in the Nine Years'

---

[97] Trevor-Roper, *Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*, p. 409.
[98] C. Lennon, 'The Counter-Reformation in Ireland, 1542-1641', in C. Brady and R. Gillespie (eds.), *Natives and Newcomers: The Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1986), p. 80.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 143.

War.[101] Accordingly, the vast majority of the country remained resoundingly Catholic around the beginning of the seventeenth century. However, as part of his research on the Catholic Counter-Reformation in Ireland, Colm Lennon discussed how the Irish upheavals of the 1570s and 1580s occurred against the backdrop of larger political and religious tensions in northern Europe between various Catholic and Protestant powers, which in turn made it increasingly difficult for people to remain in a neutral or uncommitted position in matters of religion, signalling an associated increase in religious polarity across Europe.[102] For example, in his discussions of the Protestant reformation, Canny argued that the question of religion during this tumultuous period would have registered with Elizabeth I the extent of the English failure to achieve genuine, progressive reform in Ireland, something perhaps best exemplified by the rebellions of James Fitzmaurice Fitzgerald, the Earl of Desmond, and James Eustace, both of whom had appealed to the Catholic continent for military intervention against the Protestant forces in Ireland.[103] Connolly also maintained that it was during this period that confessional identities in Ireland had begun to take shape in earnest, and that religious polarisation was ultimately engendered as a result of both political and ethnic conflicts within Ireland.[104] For instance, while Connolly noted that Tyrone's rebellion had not sparked the same kind of anti-Protestant demonstration which would engulf the realm in 1641, Theodore Moody asserted that Tyrone had taken care to identify his rebellion with the cause of the Roman Catholic Church, and Connolly himself admitted that the episode was characterised as something of a Catholic crusade within both contemporary Irish and English accounts.[105] In his discussion on the ideology of 'faith and fatherland' in Ireland during the sixteenth century, Hiram Morgan explained that such ideology was effectively appropriated

---

[101] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 107.
[102] Ibid, p. 85.
[103] N. Canny, *From Reformation to Restoration: Ireland, 1534-1660* (Dublin: Helicon Limited, 1987), pp. 97-98.
[104] Connolly, *Contested Island*, p. 337.
[105] Ibid, pp. 335, 358; T. W. Moody, 'Irish History and Irish Mythology', *Hermathena*, 124 (1978), p. 8.

by Irish rebels like the Earls of Desmond and Tyrone in order to combine the strength of Irish patriotism with the militant zeal of the Counter-Reformation, thereby affirming and galvanising their campaigns as essential for the defence of both Irish Catholicism and the Irish landscape more comprehensively.[106]

Furthermore, in the aftermath of the collapse of the Munster plantation in 1598 — during which the forces of Hugh O'Neill advanced upon approximately 4,000 English settlers in the region — Joan Redmond described how English commentators invoked the language of religious 'massacre' and the image of the 'bloody wolf', both of which were directly associated with religious atrocity, and the spectre of Roman Catholicism more specifically, in order to memorialise the settlers within a broader European Protestant martyrology.[107] However, Redmond also discussed the linkage between the violence in Munster, stemming from the crown plantation which had begun in Munster during the 1580s, and the rebellion in 1641, explaining that the scheme had been designed to effect gradual cultural change by exposing the Irish population to the 'superior' 'civilised' English culture and lifestyle, including that of their godly religion and methods of cultivation and landed 'improvement'.[108] Thus, following the outbreak of violence in Munster in 1598, those settlers who had suffered at the hands of the rebels became iconified as faithful martyrs of both godly 'civility' and social 'improvement', while the Irish were represented as wicked, godless 'savages'.[109] Redmond's article on the memories of violence and the identities of the New English in Ireland has therefore established an important link between Munster and the later Irish rebellion of 1641. Having noted the striking similarities between John Temple's work

---

[106] H. Morgan, 'Faith & Fatherland in Sixteenth-Century Ireland', *History Ireland*, 3:2 (1995), pp. 15-17.
[107] J. Redmond, 'Memories of violence and New English identities in early modern Ireland', *Historical research: the bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 89:246 (2016), pp. 708-713.
[108] Ibid, pp. 710-711, 716-717.
[109] Ibid, pp. 716-717.

and those texts which emerged following the eruption of violence in Munster, Redmond maintained that this episode undoubtedly created a lens, encompassing continuity in violence, symbolism, and rhetoric, through which the violence of 1641 could be better understood and documented by English contemporaries.[110] Furthermore, the resurgence of the ideology of faith and fatherland in 1641 tapped into Gaelic social, cultural, and religious identities in order to unite the rebel forces and to reinforce the gravity of their campaign. These discussions, then, have been invaluable in order to help contextualise the 1641 rebellion within a framework which acknowledges the importance of Anglo-Irish hostility throughout the sixteenth century and the Nine Years' War — a perspective which Darcy has insisted has been neglected within the current historiography, and which the current research seeks to expand upon.[111]

Connolly argued that confessional identities had begun to take shape in Ireland as a result of internal political and ethnic conflict, but Clarke has maintained that the lifeline of Catholicism in Gaelic Ireland was the country's close and continuous relationship with the Catholic continent in western Europe, which facilitated what Ohlmeyer has called the 'constant passage' of priests, traders, mercenaries, and scholars.[112] As such, Lennon has suggested that rebellions in Ireland, which were predominantly caused by the growing imposition of power from the English central administration in areas like Munster during the mid-sixteenth century, led to panicked responses from state officials who were tasked with the suppression of such insurrections, especially when rumours began to circulate of the apparent links between the Earl of Desmond, Catholic leaders in Europe, the Spanish king,

[110] Ibid, pp. 721-724.
[111] Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, p. 18.
[112] Connolly, *Contested Island*, p. 337; Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland*, p. 25; J. Ohlmeyer, 'Ireland independent: confederate foreign policy and international relations during the mid-seventeenth century', in J. Ohlmeyer (ed.), *Ireland from Independence to Occupation, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 89.

and the pope himself.[113] Lennon continued to explain that the subsequent revolt of Hugh O'Neill from 1594 effectively brought the true potential of the Catholic Counter-Reformation to bear upon the English government in Ireland, as O'Neill made a significant appeal to the Spanish monarchy which led strategists in Madrid to consider, for a time, an 'enterprise in Ireland' to succeed where their previous Armada had failed.[114] Accordingly, English apprehension towards Ireland as a Catholic security threat had only continued to rise throughout the sixteenth century, and indeed throughout the period of the 'Early Stuart Peace'.

Connolly has argued that the Irish Counter-Reformation truly began with the first arrival of the Jesuits and seminary-trained priests from the continent in 1596, marking the beginning of a more coordinated effort by the Roman Catholic Church to enforce the discipline of European Counter-Reformation ideology in Ireland.[115] The Jesuits were the sons of prominent families within the Anglo-Irish gentry and merchant circles, such as the Hollywoods, Fields, Sedgraves, and Fitzsimons, and their ecclesiastical mission was essentially to spearhead a radical reform to Catholicism in Ireland.[116] Upon their return from the continent, the Jesuits were both encouraged and assisted in their mission by their families and allies, who reached out with funding and support, and they were also able to take advantage of the basic network of parishes within which they could minister effectively.[117] By 1611, there were twelve continental Irish colleges in Spain, France, and the Netherlands — all of which were devoted to the training of priests and bishops for the Irish mission — and by 1617 there were also around 120 Franciscan friars in Ireland.[118] Additionally, in 1618,

[113] Lennon, 'The Counter-Reformation in Ireland', p. 85.
[114] Ibid, p. 87.
[115] Connolly, *Contested Island*, pp. 337-342.
[116] Lennon, 'The Counter-Reformation in Ireland', p. 87.
[117] Ibid, p. 88.
[118] Connolly, *Contested Island*, p. 338.

no Catholic bishops remained in Ireland as it had been too difficult for these individuals to operate effectively without detection but, by 1630, there were seventeen Catholic bishops and archbishops in residence, and thirteen vicars apostolic, ensuring that the Irish diocese and all four ecclesiastical provinces were in the charge of a clearly defined ecclesiastical 'superior'.[119]

On the other hand, the 'official' Protestant Church in Ireland was found to be lacking, not only in terms of funding and human resources, but also in both spiritual and theological identity.[120] Connolly argued that the Irish Church had gradually become something of a refuge for those who found themselves unable to conform to the tests of orthodoxy being imposed in England, such as the Puritans and the Presbyterians.[121] However, as part of his study of Protestantism in Ulster, Phil Kilroy examined the role and condition of the Church of Ireland in greater detail.[122] Kilroy has instead suggested that the Irish Church, suffering from a shortage of qualified clergy in Ireland, was forced to look towards the borders in order to make up for its clerical shortfall.[123] As a result, the Church of Ireland had become increasingly influenced by external sources of divinity, including Scottish Presbyterian ministers dissenting from crown ecclesiastical innovations and Laudian clergy under suspicion for their Arminianism in England.[124] Thus, the Irish Church struggled to maintain a sense of uniformity against the relative momentum of an increasingly well-articulated Counter-Reformation movement, which was intently focused upon the rousing and unification of the Catholic community.[125] This juxtaposition between the organisation and

[119] Ibid.
[120] A. Ford, 'The Protestant History of the Irish Reformation', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 106:424 (2017/18), pp. 448-455.
[121] Connolly, *Contested Island*, pp. 353-354.
[122] P. Kilroy, 'Protestantism in Ulster, 1610-1641', in B. Mac Cuarta (ed.), *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising* (Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies, 1997), pp. 27-28.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Ibid, pp. 27-29.
[125] Ibid.

force of Counter-Reformation Catholicism and what may be defined as the confessional plurality and insecurity of Protestantism within the 'official' Church of Ireland undoubtedly contributed to the increase in religious polarisation across the country, particularly so, as Darcy has pointed out, during the 1630s and in the years immediately preceding the rebellion of 1641.[126] As Protestant and English settlers came into much closer contact with the Catholic Irish and Old English inhabitants, they began to perceive both groups as members of a much larger, potentially dangerous, Catholic community.

The Short-Term Causes of the Rebellion

While the purpose of the previous discussion was to consider a range of issues and perspectives which would allow the 1641 rebellion to be better understood in relation to its long-term origins, the following analysis focuses upon those perspectives which have examined the more immediate short-term catalysts of rebellion.[127] Indeed, as part of their recent research on the relationship between conflict, debt, and climate in early modern Ireland, Francis Ludlow and Arlene Crampsie have argued that, in order to fully understand Ireland's transformation between the period of 1550 to 1730, both human-driven and natural factors must be considered, including those of climate and epidemiology.[128] Existing research has previously established that, in both the regions of China and the European continent, periods of cold weather tended to coincide with economic downturn and violent conflict, especially during the pre-industrial era associated with the LIA.[129] Archaeologist Brian Fagan

[126] Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, p. 4.
[127] Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland*, p. 220; Gillespie, 'The End of an Era', p. 194; Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', p. 20; Canny, *Making Ireland British*, p. 550; Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 15; Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, p. 7; Cope, 'The Irish Rising', p. 77; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 291; Little, 'Introduction: the confederate wars', p. 6.
[128] F. Ludlow and A. Crampsie, 'Climate, debt, and conflict: environmental history as a new direction in understanding early modern Ireland', in S. Covington, V. P. Carey, and V. McGowan-Doyle (eds.), *Early Modern Ireland: New Sources, Methods, and Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), p. 269.
[129] See R. S. J. Tol and S. Wagner, 'Climate change and violent conflict in Europe over the last millennium', *Climatic Change*, 99 (2010), pp. 65-79, and D. D. Zhang, H. F. Lee, C. Wang, Q. Li, Q. Pei, J. Zhang, and Y.

has written extensively on the sweeping impact of the LIA across Europe from around 1300 to 1850, detailing how a 'climatic seesaw' swung back and forth, bringing with it extremes of scorching summers, arctic winters, torrential rainfall and severe droughts, all of which, in turn, led to various social crises, such as harvest failure, disease, famine, and death.[130] Though debate has remained continuous as to whether the term 'Little Ice Age' ultimately stands the test of time — on account of both the longevity and scope of this concept — Parker has maintained that the particularly intense period of political crisis and military conflict associated with the seventeenth century was compounded by the climatic and epidemiological effects of the Little Ice Age, leaving few states unscathed in the aftermath of sweeping hardship.[131] Indeed, Ludlow and Crampsie have argued that during periods of social and political upheaval in Ireland, the additional burdens associated with environmental uncertainty and deterioration would only have exacerbated existing challenges and tensions among both the indigenous and settler communities alike, while Sam White's research on colonialism, climate, and weather has similarly attested that climatic changes and severe weather ultimately intensified existing distrust and conflict between existing and settler communities across various colonial spheres, especially as a result of contention over fuel, food, and clothing.[132] For example, during the 1620s, harsh climatic conditions led to a run of poor harvests in Ireland between the years of 1621 to 1624 and from 1627 to 1629, but this climatic phenomena continued to cause dearth and hardship well into the 1630s, and even on the eve of the rebellion between 1639 and 1641.[133] The abundance of cattle in Ireland may have somewhat safeguarded the population against the dangers of crop failure, but outbreaks

---

An, 'The causality analysis of climate change and large-scale human crisis', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 108:42 (2011), pp. 17296-17301.

[130] B. Fagan, *The Little Ice Age: How Climate Made History 1300-1850* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), p. 48.

[131] J. A. Matthews and K. R. Briffa, 'The "Little Ice Age": Re-Evaluation of an Evolving Concept', *Geografiska Annaler. Series A, Physical Geography*, 87:1 (2005), p. 31; G. Parker, *Global Crisis: War, Climate Change, & Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Yale University Press, 2013), pp. 1635-1644.

[132] Ludlow, Crampsie, 'Climate, debt, and conflict', p. 269; S. White, *A Cold Welcome: The Little Ice Age and Europe's Encounter with North America* (London: Harvard University Press, 2017), p. 254.

[133] Ibid, p. 281.

of disease among these stocks throughout the same period led to fierce competition over critically scarce resources, contributing towards a persistent undercurrent of unrest between the existing and settler populations during the first half of the seventeenth century.[134] The intensity of such competition and the associated severity of contemporary climatic phenomena in Ireland undoubtedly also impacted upon both the character and consequences of the actions of the Irish rebels in 1641. As will be established herein, multitudes of English and Protestant settlers ultimately perished as a direct result of both dearth and exposure to the Irish elements, effected by way of the rebels' campaign of theft, destruction, and violence.

Keith Pluymers' recent research on violence and climate change also echoed Ludlow and Crampsie's discussions on the relationship between debt and climatic turmoil.[135] Indeed, the extremities of the Irish weather contributed towards an increase in Irish borrowing patterns, evident within the statute staple books in the run-up to the rebellion. Particularly prevalent during the period of 1639 to 1641, these patterns reflected upon an increase in borrowing simply to maintain a status of subsistence, especially among the Old English and Irish communities which served as, what Pluymers has considered to be, a potential stimulant for revenge.[136] Pluymers' research was primarily focused upon an episode from the 1641 rebellion, during which a group of rebels held a mock trial for a group of English cows, imitating an English tribunal and even going so far as to gather a jury, before the cattle were eventually found guilty, sentenced to capital punishment, and put to slaughter.[137] Given the value of cattle within Irish society, this incident may appear to be shocking, and perhaps unusual, but Pluymers has concluded that this episode actually fits into much longer patterns

[134] Ibid, pp. 276-277.
[135] Ibid, p. 282; K. Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change, and the Causes of Violence', *Environmental History*, 25:2 (2020), p. 299.
[136] Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change', p. 299; Ludlow, Crampsie, 'Climate, debt, and conflict', p. 282.
[137] Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change', p. 288.

of conflict in early modern Ireland which involved contention over the land.[138] Furthermore, in searching for the meaning behind such episodes, there is an opportunity to look beyond traditional narratives of overpowering hatred between the English and Irish to consider larger contemporary issues related to weather, climate, and violence within the context of the 1641 rebellion.[139] Though the following investigation has exercised caution as to avoid notions of environmental determinism within the context of the 1641 rebellion, it is unwise to overlook the potential influence of severe climatic and environmental phenomena around such a volatile period of social, religious, and ethnic upheaval in relation to the scale, timing, and representation of the conflict.[140] Thus, in order to be able to appreciate the circumstances of the rebellion in their entirety, it is necessary to maintain a broad perspective which encompasses concerns related to the land, weather, climate, and uncontrolled natural environment, as well as those which pertain to human-driven social, political, economic, cultural, and religious contexts among the three Stuart kingdoms.

Accordingly, it is important to consider the events of 1641 in relation to the position of Ireland within the British composite monarchy, particularly given the interconnected nature of the political and religious crises which developed across all three Stuart kingdoms throughout this period. Though such crises have tended to dominate the historiography of the Irish rebellion, and have tended to overlook the experiences of the non-elite in favour of the political nobility the process, it is necessary to understand how those larger issues may have impacted upon the attitudes and concerns of the non-landowning populations among the three Stuart kingdoms. Ohlmeyer's work on the career of Randal MacDonnell, the Irish Marquis of

[138] Ibid, pp. 288, 300.
[139] Ibid.
[140] See also F. Ludlow and A. Crampsie, 'Environmental History of Ireland, 1550-1730', in J. Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Ireland, 1550-1730*, Vol. II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), pp. 608-637 for further discussion of the environmental contexts associated with the Nine Years' War and the 1641 Irish Rebellion.

Antrim, very much laid the groundwork for subsequent historians to approach Ireland and the rebellion from a 'three kingdom' perspective, including Perceval-Maxwell, Micheál Ó Siochrú, Canny, and Robert Armstrong, but also more recent publications by those such as Joseph Cope and Darcy.[141] In fact, by placing the Irish rebellion within this broader framework of crises which have become collectively known as the 'Wars of the Three Kingdoms', the true complexity of the conflict can be further appreciated, and the reality of the violence established.

While tensions had been festering throughout Ireland in the decades prior to the outbreak of rebellion in 1641, albeit largely in the form of what Edwards has called the 'spark and crackle' of local rebellion among the non-elite, significant developments during the 1630s enflamed those existing hostilities and ultimately forced the resentments of the Catholic Irish to the surface.[142] Various historians have discussed the absolutist characteristics of Charles I's kingship in relation to the crises among the Stuart kingdoms during this volatile period, but Allan Macinnes and Kevin Sharpe have engaged in detailed discussions of Charles' vision for his composite monarchy.[143] Macinnes explained that Charles may not have been completely devoid of political sensibility, but that his lack of political *nous* and disinclination towards criticism stood in stark contrast to the relative pragmatism of his father, and he concluded that Charles, in his pursuit of order and regularity, would ultimately opt to rule by 'proclamation rather than by consultation'.[144] Sharpe has also written

---

[141] J. Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration*, p. 6; Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 116-117; M. Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland, 1642-1649: A Constitutional and Political Analysis* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), p. 11; Canny, *Making Ireland British*, p. 535; R. Armstrong, *Protestant War: the 'British' of Ireland and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), pp. 11-12; Cope, *England and the 1641 Irish Rebellion*, pp. 15-16; Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, p. 7.
[142] Edwards, 'Out of the blue?', p. 109.
[143] See J. H. Elliott, 'A Europe of Composite Monarchies', *Past & Present*, 137 (1992), pp. 48-71 for further discussion of composite monarchy.
[144] A. Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1991), pp. 52-53, 204-205. One of James' biggest mistakes was his attempt to enforce the controversial Five Articles of Perth in an attempt to foster greater religious harmony between his Scottish and

extensively on Charles' personal rule, and discussed his classic label as an authoritarian leader. Sharpe agreed that Charles' language was often authoritarian in nature, and explained that he was undoubtedly an advocate for harsh punishments in order to prevent any further transgression, however he also maintained that this authoritarian rhetoric largely stemmed from Charles' belief that it was his duty to ensure his subjects obeyed the authority of God — a duty entrusted to him, and only him, by the royal prerogative.[145] These perspectives are particularly useful in order to understand both the absolutist nature of Charles' perception of royal authority, which will become more prominent in later discussions of his political engagement in Scotland and England, as well as his selection of Thomas Wentworth for the Irish lord deputyship.

Few historians would disagree with the 'brutality' of Wentworth's reputation in Ireland, but the bottom line of his governance, according to Clarke's study of Wentworth's regime, was his intention to rule in Ireland in the same manner with which he aspired eventually to govern in England: absolutely, efficiently, and with little to no regard to any interest other than that of the crown.[146] Indeed, Wentworth's 'thorough' policies in Ireland lived up to their namesake, as the lord deputy sought to seize any 'opportunity and means to supply the king's wants', which included the self-sufficiency of Ireland, religious conformity with the Church of England, the 'civilisation' of the Irish inhabitants, and the extension of

English domains, thereby extending his royal authority. However, following significant opposition from both the kirk and the Scottish nobility, James is often given credit for pulling back once he understood the magnitude of the potential repercussions of his persistence with the articles. This interpretation has been challenged recently by Laura Stewart who argued that James did insist on compliance and, in doing so, left behind a 'potential timebomb' for his son. See L. A. M. Stewart, 'The Political Repercussions of the Five Articles of Perth: A Reassessment of James VI and I's Religious Polices in Scotland', *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* 38:4 (2007), pp. 1013-1036 for further discussion.

[145] K. Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (London: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 193-194.

[146] R. McVeigh and B. Rolston, 'Civilising the Irish', *Race & Class*, 51:1 (2009), p. 14; A. Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth, 1632-40', in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 243.

royal authority via the existing policy of plantation.[147] While the incendiary role of Wentworth's administration in Ireland has been widely acknowledged, Gillespie and Clarke have argued for greater insistence upon the importance of his 'thorough' regime within the framework of the 1641 rebellion. Specifically, Clarke has argued against the view of the apparent 'inevitability' of the rising adopted by historians like Farrell, Robbie McVeigh, and Bill Rolston, and has instead maintained that the conflict was determined less by enduring grievances than the particular circumstances of 1641, and partly by contemporary political developments, including that of Wentworth's authoritarian regime.[148] Gillespie has also added that the concerns which united the leaders of the Ulster rising were indeed complex, and surely compelling, but he explained that the most plausible explanation for their union was provided by Rory O'More, one of the earliest conspirators, who professed to Lord Maguire the need for action to combat the hardships of the lord deputy's government which 'did beget a general discontent over the whole kingdom'.[149] In fact, it is difficult to dispute the severity of Wentworth's unpopularity in Ireland, as his determination to increase revenue for the crown via the expropriation of land isolated and disaffected Protestants and Catholics, the Irish, Old English, New English, and Scots alike. Thus, while subsequent analyses within this particular study are focused more intently upon the implications of long-term Anglo-Irish hostility and conflict in relation to the experiences of 1641 for the non-elite Catholic Irish, English, and Protestant communities, the rise in discontent throughout the 1620s and 1630s associated with the stringent rule of Charles and his Lord Deputy certainly offers insight as to the timing and occasion of the rebellion itself.

---

[147] Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth', p. 243; Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', p. 17.
[148] Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland*, p. 220; Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth', p. 243; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 291; McVeigh, Rolston, 'Civilising the Irish', p. 13.
[149] Gillespie, 'The End of an Era', p. 194.

Wentworth's policy on land was simple: since land was the central component of political power on a national level, and landed rights formed the basis of localised political and economic power, as much of this power as possible should remain in the hands of the king.[150] For example, as well as his excessive and wanton exploitation of the Commission for the Remedy of Defective Titles and his continued intervention in landed disputes through the Castle Chamber, Wentworth proposed a major scheme for the plantation of Connacht, with others to follow in areas like Clare and Ormond, which he estimated would yield around £5000 per year to the crown upon completion.[151] Not only did his proposal cause immediate alarm among the Old English Catholic nobility, who, for the most part, had managed to retain their properties and estates in these areas up until this point, but his plans were just as likely to have unnerved the wealthier Protestant New English and Scottish populations, who subsequently became principal targets for Wentworth's scheme.[152] The lord deputy's actions, therefore, increased tenurial insecurity across the whole country in the period prior to the outbreak of rebellion in 1641, vexing the Protestant New English and Scottish communities, causing unease among the Old English Catholic nobility, and exacerbating existing resentment among the Irish Catholic population, who were already intimately familiar with such treatment. Unsurprisingly, Wentworth's religious programme was no less inflammatory. Having committed to the controversial Laudian innovations Charles sought to implement across all three kingdoms, as well as the absolute implementation of the acts of uniformity and supremacy of the Protestant Church of Ireland, Wentworth fully believed in the ecclesiastical authority of the crown.[153] As such, the lord deputy began to clamp down on the relative toleration of Protestant diversity which had previously existed within Ulster, forcing bishops to require their congregations to adopt the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer, to

---

[150] Ibid, p. 194.
[151] Ibid, pp. 195-196; Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 14.
[152] Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 382; Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 14.
[153] Gillespie, 'The End of an Era', p. 196; Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 14.

remove those who refused, and to haul them before the Court of High Commission for punishment.[154] Nevertheless, the lion's share of Wentworth's hostility was undoubtedly reserved for Ireland's Old English and Irish Catholic populations.

Religious discrimination and persecution had become part of the everyday lives of the Catholic population in Ireland but, as Scott argued, what was increasingly worrying for the lay population was Wentworth's determination to deny them legal redress, and to prevent their leaders from appealing directly to the crown — one of the few cherished liberties which remained among the Catholic communities.[155] Additionally, the lord deputy had also taken steps to manipulate the New and Old English political communities during his first parliamentary session in order to secure crown subsidies and a statute of limitations on landownership which would allow for the further confiscation of land throughout the country. Darcy argued that Wentworth effectively held the 'carrot' of the 'Graces' — a series of concessions encompassing some degree of religious, political, legal, and tenurial security offered to the Old English Catholics during the 1620s, which had never been officially granted — to ensure their support, at which point the 'carrot' was removed.[156] The lord deputy declared that the government could not 'give way to the transmitting of this law of threescore years, or any other of the Graces prejudicial to the crown', and appealed to the Protestant New English community to prevent their religion being 'insensibly supplanted' by the Old English, whom he claimed had been corrupted by 'friars and Jesuits'.[157] Accordingly, Clarke has asserted that the tangible differences between Wentworth's governance in Ireland and that which was envisioned by the New English were outweighed by their similarities, and

[154] S. Connolly, 'Religion and Society, 1600-1914', in L. Kennedy and P. Ollerenshaw (eds.), *Ulster Since 1600: Politics, Economy, and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 76.
[155] Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 14.
[156] Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, p. 49.
[157] Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth', p. 250.

that their shared sense of anti-Catholicism proved sufficient for the conversion of the 'Protestant party' into the party of Wentworth's government, thereby conferring the scope and escalation of his confessional prejudice.[158]

Having secured the support of the New English, Wentworth utilised his monopoly to legislate against crimes such as blasphemy, usury, and 'primitive' farming practices; to alter legal processes in the interest of efficiency and equity; and to change the laws relating to land and inheritance in favour of the crown.[159] By framing Irish governance as an issue divided between 'protestant and papist', the lord deputy had intensified the religious partition beginning to emerge across the country in earnest. Russell also made an important point on the condition of the Old English as a result of Wentworth's appointment, stating that the increasing willingness of the crown to question the validity of land titles and its ambition to expand the policy of plantation meant that, perhaps for the first time, the Old English were reduced to the status of 'papists', drawing them closer in terms of both landed and confessional interest to the Irish population.[160] In spite of their gradual assimilation with the Gaelic population, the Old English had tended to emphasise the 'English' nature of their identities throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and vehemently maintained that their devotion to Catholicism did not prohibit their devotion to the crown, or indeed to a Protestant monarch. Rather, the Old English had existed in what Clarke has called a state of 'divided loyalties', avoiding those religious and temporal discrepancies which would ultimately force their reactionary alliance with the Catholic Irish rebels within the context of the hostilities of 1641.[161] Thus, Wentworth's governance exemplified was the inextricable relationship between politics and religion throughout this period — a relationship which

[158] Ibid.
[159] Ibid, p. 251.
[160] Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 382.
[161] Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland*, pp. 16-25.

requires constant consideration in order to appreciate the complexity of the Irish conflict and its position among the Wars of the Three Kingdoms.[162]

While the lord deputy continued to govern in Ireland with little regard for the grievances of the general population, King Charles, in his drive for absolutism and order within his composite monarchy, began to encounter serious difficulties north of the English border. In his previous attempts to maintain crown authority in Scotland following his transition to London, King James set his sights on the Scottish Kirk, which functioned as one of the main organs of both political and religious authority in the north, dominated by the Scottish ecclesiastical and landed nobility.[163] James had attempted to force what became known as the 'Five Articles' of Perth upon the Kirk in 1618: these articles constituted several ecclesiastical innovations, including the observation of holy days and the requirement of episcopal confirmation, but the most controversial article was undoubtedly the fifth, which required Scots to kneel when receiving communion.[164] In her reassessment of the religious policies of James VI and I, Laura Stewart argued that the fifth article was accompanied by a sense that the act of kneeling was akin to the acceptance of transubstantiation, and was also generally correlative of Catholic ceremony, but Stewart also went on to explain that the 'mass' rejection of this policy in Scotland raised serious questions about the extent to which the government required the consent of the people to enforce the will of the crown.[165] In fact, the breakdown of authority in Scotland as a result of James' religious reforms may also be considered as an example of the strength of the non-elite against the will of the crown, more than two decades prior to the mass outbreak of rebellion in Ireland. James clearly recognised the potential for political hostility among his three kingdoms, rooted within their religious

[162] Gibney, *The Shadow of a Year*, p. 161.
[163] Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 11.
[164] Stewart, 'Political Repercussions of the Five Articles of Perth', pp. 1013-1014.
[165] Ibid, pp. 1014, 1036.

inconsistency, but his attempts to bring the Scottish Kirk and episcopalian churches of England closer together, while remaining noticeably absent from his seat in Edinburgh, were arguably more damaging.[166] Instead, James' actions had fostered both suspicion and distrust among the Scottish nobility, who had effectively lost what David Stevenson has considered as frequent personal contact with the king, necessary in order to maintain their mutual respect and understanding.[167]

In his examination of the relationship between Scotland and James' successor, Charles I, John Morrill has argued that Charles abandoned his father's policy of congruity in order to re-establish the episcopate: where James had intended to rise to the occasion of the dual monarchy and to try to bring his kingdoms closer together, Charles opted instead for a policy of 'naked authoritarianism'.[168] Spurred on by his desire for obedience, order, and uniformity, Charles began to purge high political office of many leading nobles in order to promote more flexible individuals like bishops and lawyers, and was quick to quash any perceived opposition in parliament, mirroring the severity of his lord deputy.[169] Stevenson and Macinnes have discussed the hostility with which Charles commanded the Scottish parliamentary session of 1633, reproaching and taking note of any dissenters, discouraging debate, and establishing himself as both uncompromising and unapproachable.[170] Having also issued the Act of Revocation in 1625, revoking all titles to church or royal properties which had been alienated since 1540 and restoring them to the crown, Charles had already unsettled the Scottish landed nobility who feared the prospect of a more widespread crown assault on

---

[166] D. Stevenson, *The Scottish Revolution 1637-44: The Triumph of the Covenanters* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 2011), pp. 16-17.
[167] Ibid.
[168] J. Morrill, 'The National Covenant in its British Context', in J. Morrill (ed.), *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990), pp. 4-9.
[169] Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 13.
[170] Stevenson, *The Scottish Revolution*, pp. 16-17; A. Macinnes, *The British Revolution, 1629-1660* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), pp. 93-95.

property rights which, given the king's blatant disregard for their grievances and disaffection, only intensified the scale of Scottish dissent.[171] Evidently, the unification of the landed community over tenurial insecurity was not solely confined to the borders of Ireland, further reinforcing the importance of land ownership and the landscape itself among the three kingdoms in relation to the endurance of conflict.

Charles continued to push ahead with his policies of uniformity and raising taxes, driving the country towards recession, but his ultimate downfall would be the decision to force the Kirk to adopt a new prayer book designed by himself, a careful selection of Scottish bishops, and English Archbishop William Laud.[172] Charles had embraced the religious doctrines of Arminianism in his pursuit of absolute authority, which not only minimised Calvinist principles of predestination and the grace of God, but which also validated his position as head of the church and his reinforcement of ceremony and ritual in worship. Laud's similar passion for religious ceremony and his acceptance of the king's religious sovereignty made him a suspicious, controversial character south of the border, particularly among the Puritans who were sceptical of Laud's 'innovations' and began to view his ceremonies in the light of outright 'popery', rousing suspicions of the confessional disposition of the king by extension.[173] Nevertheless, without consultation or consideration of the cautionary advice of the Scottish clergy, Charles issued a royal proclamation on 20 December 1636 which required all services to be conducted according to the new prayer book, and commanded each parish to have purchased two copies by Easter.[174] Sharpe and Macinnes both agreed that the book was effectively damned prior to its publication in the

---

[171] Kenyon, Ohlmeyer, 'The Background to the Civil Wars', p. 13; Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, pp. 86-89.
[172] Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 15.
[173] Ibid, p. 4.
[174] Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 783-788.

spring of 1637 and that, as such, when the liturgy was first read at St Giles kirk in July 1637, the Scots rose up in open defiance of the Laudian scripture, allegedly crying out that 'the mass is entered among us'.[175]

Stevenson maintained that, although the Scots had their fair share of grievances with Charles and his authoritarianism up until this point, his infringement upon their religion and the Kirk was ultimately what incited them to rebellion.[176] Stewart's recent work on the Covenanting movement has also contended that hostility towards crown policy became popularised through the medium of 'anti-popery', abstracted through the common, visceral experience of receiving communion upon one's knees, allowing non-elite Scots to relate to larger political debates on church government and royal supremacy, and to respond to the National Covenant.[177] In this respect, the defiance of the Scots has also offered further indications as to the contemporary dissemination of larger political and religious crises down to the level of the non-elite, much like that which would unfold across the Irish landscape in 1641. On the other hand, Scott, whose work has not disputed that the short-term cause for the Scots' rebellion was the perceived 'popish' threat, argued that the Scots were also quite unused to the abrasive impact of unfettered prerogative power, and sought to preserve the Kirk's independence.[178] Alan MacDonald, who also explored the relationship between the Kirk and the king during the reign of James VI and I, highlighted that tensions between the two over the imposition of civil authority in ecclesiastical affairs were evident from as early as the 1580s.[179] Though MacDonald has argued that James' interest in the Kirk waned

---

[175] Ibid; Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, p. 158.
[176] D. Stevenson, *Alasdair MacColla and the Highland Problem in the Seventeenth Century* (Edinburgh: J. Donald, 1980), p. 62.
[177] L. A. M. Stewart, *Rethinking the Scottish Revolution: Covenanted Scotland, 1637-1651* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 38-41.
[178] Scott, *Politics and War*, pp. 15-18.
[179] A. MacDonald, *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625: Sovereignty, Polity and Liturgy* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1998), pp. 39-40.

following his departure to London, he also took care to point out that the king's absence, combined with increasing fears over a closer union with England and the continued proroguing of the General Assembly, increased clerical hostility, which in turn tainted the Scottish ecclesiastical legacy that James had passed on to his son.[180] These perspectives are, again, testament to the inextricable relationship between politics and religion during the Wars of the Three Kingdoms, but particularly considering the events which would follow the prayer book riot. Public demonstrations continued against Charles' Laudian scripture and, combined with the existing efforts of the clerical and landed nobility, led to the introduction of the National Covenant — a document which declared that Scottish loyalty was reserved for a 'covenanted king' who would defend the 'true reformed religion' and govern in accordance with the rules of the realm.[181] While Charles initially had been somewhat reserved in his response to the Scots' riots, weary of how harsh retaliation may be perceived by the Puritans, he refused to tolerate any infringement upon his royal prerogative, and the stage for the First Bishops' War was set.[182]

Charles and his advisors began planning a four-pronged assault on the rebels, with forces in the east of Scotland, the west Highlands, an Irish army raised by Wentworth invading from the north, and an English army commanded by Charles himself marching from the south.[183] Nevertheless, the Scottish Covenanters had garnered their own forces, bolstered by the support of the powerful Archibald Campbell, Earl of Argyll, and Charles' plans began to come apart at the seams: the Covenanting forces moved quickly against George Gordon, the Marquis of Huntly and one of Charles' chief supporters in the north-east, before

---

[180] Ibid, pp. 180-187.
[181] Scott, *Politics and War*, pp. 15-18.
[182] Ibid, p. 18.
[183] Ibid, pp. 20-21.

overcoming the Scottish royalists during the spring of 1639.[184] Finally, a breakdown in communications between Charles and his Irish supporters, including Wentworth and the Earl of Antrim, ensured that those additional forces never left the island, while the poorly trained English force was overwhelmed by the Covenanting army, forcing Charles to concede with the Treaty of Berwick.[185]

Historians have generally agreed upon the fact that the Wars of the Three Kingdoms can be traced back to Charles' conflict with the Scots, sustaining Ohlmeyer's earlier theory on the interplay between the Stuart kingdoms, but the implications of the Scottish revolt also warrant attention specifically in relation to the outbreak of rebellion in Ireland only two years later.[186] Stevenson has maintained that the relationship between the Scots' rebellion and that of the Irish is both complex and fascinating, and he has emphasised the reactive and contradictory affects which the combination of issues concerning politics and religion could produce during this volatile period.[187] On the one hand, the Scottish rising made the Irish one possible, and inspired the Irish by demonstrating that the power of the king, which had initially seemed irrefutable, could be successfully challenged.[188] On the other, the success of the Covenanters paradoxically represented cause for alarm, in that they remained vehemently opposed to Catholicism and possessed a powerful army capable of intervention in Ireland if the situation demanded it.[189]

---

[184] Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', p. 18.
[185] Ibid.
[186] Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration*, p. 6; J. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution: Essays* (London: Longman, 1993), p. 114; Kenyon, Ohlmeyer, 'The Background to the Civil Wars', pp. 12-13; M. Ó Siochrú, 'Introduction', in D. Cregan and M. Ó Siochrú (eds.), *Kingdom in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s: Essays in honour of Dónal Cregan* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), p. 12; Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 15; Gentles, *The English Revolution*, pp. 6-7; Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, pp. 1-2.
[187] Stevenson, *Alasdair MacColla and the Highland Problem*, pp. 73-74.
[188] Ibid.
[189] Ibid.

Though Charles had signed the Treaty of Berwick, the king had no intention of conceding the Covenanters' victory, and instead perceived their strength as evidence of some kind of Anglo-Scottish Puritan plot against the prerogative of the crown.[190] Almost immediately, Charles began planning a new offensive which would require an Irish army led by Thomas Wentworth, now elevated to the Earldom of Strafford, to invade from the west, while the Scottish royalists would deal with the Covenanters in the meantime.[191] Scott argued that Strafford was the guiding force behind the king's second campaign against the Scots, confident in his ability to help quash Charles' opposition, just as he had done in Ireland, and so he pushed towards the offensive.[192] Nevertheless, this new venture required financial backing and, although Strafford was able to extract some of the money from the Irish Parliament, more was required, and he knew that in order to raise the necessary funds the king would have no other option than to summon the English Parliament for the first time in 11 years.[193] However, Charles' unwillingness to consider the grievances of his parliament or subjects had already taken a toll.

Relations between King James and the English political nation had been continuously strained, as a result of his persistent demands for capital, and England's relative military ineffectiveness abroad against the backdrop of the Thirty Years' War, but Charles' attempts to reinforce military efforts by levying forced loans only increased the unpopularity of the government, especially considering that his tactics involved the intimidation of prominent taxpayers by imprisoning them without trial.[194] Charles continued to provoke discontent with his decision in 1629 to operate without recourse to parliament, exploiting the courts of the

---

[190] Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 22.
[191] Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', p. 18.
[192] Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 23.
[193] Ibid.
[194] Kenyon, Ohlmeyer, 'The Background to the Civil Wars', p. 10.

Star Chamber and High Commission, and generally avoiding compliance with the parliamentary Petition of the Right.[195] The king's confessional stance also placed him outside of the English norm, as his belief in royal supremacy over religious affairs particularly incensed many of the nobility who opposed increasing clerical involvement in temporal matters, and who believed that the utmost arbiter in church affairs should be the 'king-in-Parliament', as opposed to royal prerogative.[196] Charles' advancement of Laud's 'innovations', combined with his marriage to the Catholic, and French, Henrietta Maria and his willingness to ally himself with devout Catholics like the Irish Earl of Antrim in order to gather military support, also fuelled rumours in and out of parliament of his apparent 'popish' disposition, particularly among the Puritan factions in all three kingdoms.[197] Furthermore, suspicions of the relationship between the English crown and those among the supposedly 'deserving' Irish, like Antrim, were indicative of the endurance of Anglo-Irish ethno-religious tensions from the earlier sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In considering the political circumstances surrounding the Wars of the Three Kingdoms, Scott discussed the role of the English parliament in relation to the growing contemporary perception that the powers of sovereign princes across Europe were expanding at the expense of their subjects.[198] Scott argued that the English parliament, therefore, had come to represent the principal guardian of the 'liberties' of England's subjects, including the right of habeas corpus and the principle of not being taxed without consent, but he also explained that the preservation of such liberties had become synonymous with the defence of English Protestantism and autonomy against 'popery'.[199] In effect, parliament became the

[195] Ibid, p. 11.
[196] Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 4.
[197] Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', p. 17; Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration*, p. 13.
[198] Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 3.
[199] Ibid.

focus of patriotic zeal for 'the true Protestant religion', and its efforts were directed towards the fight against 'popery' and disorder at all levels, whether manifest in drunkenness or in the presence of 'evil counsellors' at court.[200] Scott's argument continued to call attention to the depth of the relationship between religion and the political sphere during this period, but is particularly valuable in order to highlight the importance of anti-Catholicism in relation to the ongoing strain between Charles and his political community, which would ultimately dominate subsequent narratives of the king's downfall and those like Temple's which chronicled the course and aftermath of the rebellion in Ireland.

Thus, when parliament was convened in April 1640, the House of Commons adamantly opposed any vote on the king's subsidies for his Scottish campaign until their array of social, economic, political, and religious grievances had been addressed, prompting Charles, who perceived their disobedience as symptomatic of a Puritan plot against him, to dismiss the 'Short parliament' in rage, and to move forward without their support. Having lost all patience and any remaining faith in the king, Scott explained that the most disaffected members of parliament, including Viscount Saye and John Pym, began to collaborate with the Covenanting forces to effect a Scottish invasion which would leave Charles with no other choice than to recall parliament.[201] These conspirators also encouraged local opposition against the mobilisation of the Yorkshire militia, who were expected to make up around half of the king's military strength for his Scottish offensive, sabotaging his campaign before it had even begun.[202] Consequently, Charles marched his army towards the north to meet the Covenanters, only to discover that they had moved during the spring of 1640 in order to defeat the pro-royalist Gordons in the north-east and to ravage the lands of other crown

[200] Ibid.
[201] Ibid, p. 24.
[202] Ibid.

supporters, including the MacDonalds, before continuing their advance into the north of England. Meanwhile, across the Irish Sea, a cooperative effort was well under way from foes on all sides — New English Protestants, and Catholic Old English and Irish — to assail Strafford's authority and interrupt the confirmation of the subsidy which would finance his 'New' Irish army, thereby delaying mobilisation until July.[203]

Morrill and Ohlmeyer have commented upon Charles' failure to successfully coordinate effective resistance to the Covenanters during the Bishops' Wars, and both have emphasised the importance of the three-kingdom dimension in order to appreciate the circumstances of such failure. Indeed, while Ohlmeyer has maintained that Charles' subsequent undoing could be attributed to his inability to successfully overcome his enemies in both Scotland and Ireland, Morrill has explained that the shared experiences of the king's authoritarian government during the 1630s led to the outbreak of rebellion in all three kingdoms, which was itself emblematic of their common concern with Charles' kingship.[204] Crucially, the three kingdom context allows for a greater appreciation of the circumstances which not only would oversee the ruin of the king, but which would also encourage periodic collaboration between Protestants, Catholics, English, Scottish, and Irish groups in response to shared grievances, such as that of the king's, and his advisors', absolutist tendencies. Ultimately, Strafford's army would not materialise in time, and the Covenanters invaded the north of England in late August, seizing Newcastle and parts of County Durham and Northumberland in a huge military victory for the Scots. Humiliated, demoralised, and having exhausted all avenues of support, Charles was forced to negotiate at Newburn in August 1640, resulting in the Treaty of Ripon in October.[205] While the treaty's chief provision

---

[203] Cope, 'The Irish Rising', p. 80.
[204] Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', p. 17; Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution*, p. 6.
[205] Ohlmeyer, 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', p. 19.

was to ensure a ceasefire, the agreement also required the king to recall parliament to London where a more permanent settlement could be reached — a clause which would lead to the collision of the Stuart kingdoms and which would fundamentally strengthen the resolve of the Catholic nobility, followed by the Irish non-elite, to rebel in 1641.

Having conceded his defeat to the Covenanters at Newburn and agreed to recall the English parliament in August of 1640, what would become known as the 'Long Parliament' was assembled on 3 November. Ohlmeyer has devoted particular attention to the role of this parliamentary session in relation to Charles' and his associates' downfall. She argued that the long parliament produced a limited alliance which transcended the ethnic and religious boundaries between all three kingdoms to affect the king's defeat, and stressed that this coalition constituted a perfect example of the importance of the interconnections between the Stuart kingdoms throughout this period.[206] While Ohlmeyer also stated that the subsequent removal of Strafford, the champion of Charles' absolutism in Ireland, likely helped to facilitate the outbreak of rebellion in Ireland, Little and Ó Siochrú explained that, in order to successfully impeach and remove Strafford from office, with the help of the Scottish, Old English, and Irish, the English parliament would find it necessary to exert some degree of authority over affairs of Ireland, thereby threatening the constitutional status of the country as a kingdom.[207] Ó Siochrú, in particular, maintained that it was in fact Strafford's trial during the period of the long parliament which presented the English parliament with the opportunity to claim jurisdiction over Ireland throughout this increasingly aggressive anti-

[206] Ibid, pp. 18-19.
[207] Ibid, p. 20; P. Little, 'The English parliament and the Irish constitution, 1641-9', in D. Cregan and M. Ó Siochrú (eds.), *Kingdom in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s: Essays in honour of Dónal Cregan* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), p. 108; M. Ó Siochrú, 'Catholic Confederates and the constitutional relationship between Ireland and England, 1641-1649', in C. Brady and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 210.

Catholic spectacle, effectively thrusting religion to the forefront of the political agenda during this clash of kingdoms.[208]

From the outset, Charles' parliamentary opponents were determined to restrict the king's authority, abolishing the courts of Star Chamber and High Commission which had allowed him to govern outwith the boundaries of common law and without parliament; passing the Triennial Act to ensure parliament would be called at least once every three years; and moving to impeach his top advisors, including Laud and Strafford. The Covenanters also intended to use their occupation, and the mounting cost of their army, in Newcastle to broker deals with the English parliament. Charles was anxious to settle with the Scots as quickly as possible, owing to the increase of civil unrest in London and the impending impeachment of his advisors, and so he made some important concessions, including the ratification of the resolutions of the General Assemblies which abolished episcopacy from the Scottish church and granted the freedom of the Scots to sign the National Covenant. However, many of the more zealous Covenanters sought to establish a single form of church government throughout the king's dominions, believing that the churches of England and Ireland should also become subordinate to autonomous Presbyterian assemblies, replacing Charles' programme of Laudian uniformity with Covenanted uniformity.[209] Although the Scots were encouraged by the fact that Westminster was now largely dominated by their allies, including Pym and Saye, these men balked at such demands, having only joined forces with the Covenanters because of what Scott described as a sense of 'godly fellowship' in the face of a cosmic struggle between Christ and the Antichrist.[210] This struggle was very much symptomatic of the wider trend of religious antagonism which had been gathering momentum across Europe with the

[208] Ó Siochrú, 'Catholic Confederates', p. 210.
[209] Scott, *Politics and War*, p. 26.
[210] Ibid, p. 27.

Thirty Years' War, and is particularly important in order to appreciate the increasingly hostile anti-Catholic environment emergent among the Stuart kingdoms.

Meanwhile, planning in Ireland to bring about Strafford's ruin had been well underway since the parliamentary session of 1640, but the convention of the long parliament encouraged his opponents to ramp up their efforts. The *Humble and Just Remonstrance* (1641) had been drafted shortly after the Irish parliament had been dissolved, condemning Wentworth's lord deputyship and focusing on issues which transcended confessional divides, such as economic and constitutional grievances, though the issue of the Graces was included at the behest of the Old English.[211] In order to manoeuvre the petition into the hands of the king's opposition at Westminster, prominent members of the Irish political community — including Lord Gormanston, an Old English Catholic with a nephew in the service of the Spanish king; Sir John Clotworthy, a Puritan Presbyterian politician with links to the Covenanters; and the 'deserving' Irish planter politicians — worked alongside those such as Pym and Saye to deliver their scathing address in time for the beginning of Strafford's impeachment trial.[212] While Russell has argued that the delivery of the petition into the hands of the king's opponents at Westminster exemplified the coordination between the Stuart kingdoms and the importance of outside intervention during particularly volatile episodes, Perceval-Maxwell has stressed that in order to convince the noncommitted in parliament to take extreme measures against the lord deputy, it was ultimately decided that the trial would focus on those grievances which would which would rouse most anxiety: beginning with issues of religion, then moving to trade, and so on.[213] Nevertheless, Strafford's trial would become dominated by religious testimony. After Pym won the vote to include Strafford's Irish

[211] Cope, 'The Irish Rising', p. 80.
[212] Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, pp. 383-384.
[213] Ibid, pp. 379-384; Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 95.

offences, Clotworthy appeared before the English parliament to describe in great detail Strafford's wrongdoings in Ireland, discussing almost every feature of Irish life which could exacerbate fear among English MPs, including his exploitation of the Court of High Commission, the sodomy committed by Bishop Atherton who was under the patronage of the lord deputy, and the growing strength of Catholicism within the kingdom.[214] Pym's chief concern, though, was the well-paid 'popish' army, previously raised by Strafford for use during the Second Bishops' War, that was 'ready to march where I know not'.[215]

Although it was difficult to prove Strafford's guilt, parliamentary opponents eventually resorted to an act of attainder against Charles' lord deputy, forcing the king to execute Strafford in May 1641. However, Gillespie argued that Strafford's removal and subsequent execution is not sufficient to explain the occasion of rebellion in Ireland, particularly since his previous appointment had generated opposition from various communities across the country, whether New English, Scottish, Old English or Irish.[216] Instead, Gillespie stressed the importance of the increase in anti-Catholic rhetoric emerging in the wake of Strafford's trial, explaining how these prejudices fuelled troubling rumours of an imminent clampdown on Catholicism in Ireland.[217] John Pym, along with his associates, continued to spout both anti-Catholic and anti-Irish rhetoric for the duration of the remainder of the English parliamentary session, denouncing prelates, 'evil councillors', and warning that Strafford's Irish army would ultimately be utilised to impose a new Catholic order upon England and the Protestant nations.[218] Unsurprisingly, these narratives also captured the

[214] Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, pp. 95-96.
[215] Ibid.
[216] Gillespie, 'The End of an Era', p. 199.
[217] Ibid, p. 200.
[218] Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 110.

imaginations of the Covenanters, who wanted to ensure there could never again be an Irish Catholic army raised with the intention of invading Scotland.

Perceval-Maxwell, continuing his discussion on the religious dimension of the long parliament, argued that the Catholic Irish and Old English, whether they liked it or not, had become firmly entangled within a web of political and religious hostility, from which they could no longer withdraw unscathed.[219] He also made a crucial point on the importance of perception versus actuality throughout this period, particularly in relation to how these events would have been perceived by the Irish groups who bore witness.[220] This is a point also addressed by Gillespie, who pointed out that many of the Ulster leaders were actually present during this parliamentary episode and would return to Ireland to report upon the disturbingly anti-Catholic atmosphere which had enveloped these proceedings.[221] Thus, when Charles initiated a somewhat last-ditch attempt to generate Irish support for his cause against the English parliament by restarting negotiations on the 'Graces', the firm instruction of the Westminster government to stay the issue was interpreted by both the Old English and Irish as a clear violation of the king's prerogative in Irish affairs.[222] Indeed, from the perspectives of the Old English and many of the Catholic Irish, loyalty to Catholicism and loyalty to the crown were not in fact mutually exclusive, exemplified by the fact that many of the conspirators and participants involved in the rebellion — both noble and non-elite, Irish and Old English — maintained that they were loyal subjects of the crown, yet consistently disobeyed or violated the prerogatives of the king throughout their campaign.[223] The climax of the episode would follow the direct intervention of Westminster in this case, and in April

[219] Ibid, p. 112.
[220] Ibid, p. 92.
[221] Gillespie, 'The End of an Era', pp. 200-201.
[222] Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 392.
[223] J. Ohlmeyer, 'Seventeenth-Century Ireland and the New British and Atlantic Histories', *The American Historical Review*, 104:2 (1999), pp. 450-453.

1641 the English parliament declared that Ireland was in fact 'united to England, and the parliament of England had always the cognizance of the original suits in Ireland', which effectively constituted an official declaration of Westminster's jurisdiction over Ireland and its parliament, and an assertion of the absolute power of king-in-parliament over royal prerogative.[224] Ó Siochrú discussed the importance of this declaration in relation to the events which would unfold in Ulster only six months later, and explained that where the English parliament had traditionally elected not to intervene in Irish affairs, the decision to make such a loaded statement within the context of such an aggressively anti-Catholic assembly directly impacted upon the constitutional relationship between the two countries.[225] In fact, Ó Siochrú argued that this declaration created such alarm across the Irish Sea that this perceived attack on the constitutional liberty of Ireland and its parliament would become one of the focal points of justification for the 1641 rebellion during the months to follow.[226]

Having considered and discussed what must be understood as the most important perspectives on the outbreak of the Irish rebellion in 1641, what has become abundantly clear about the nature and narrative of the conflict is surely the depths of its complexity. The decision of the Irish Catholic nobility of Ulster, followed by the Catholic Old English and non-elite Irish populations, to appear in open rebellion against the English colonial administration was neither inevitable or unpredictable, but was instead the result of a combination of both long-term subjugation and short-term crises which made the occasion of rebellion possible. This discussion has explored the longer historical trends to Anglo-Irish hostility, grounded firmly in English concepts of 'civility' and 'barbarism', which not only justified their colonial intervention in Ireland, but which also tainted long-term relations

[224] Ó Siochrú, 'Catholic Confederates', p. 210.
[225] Ibid, pp. 210-212.
[226] Ibid.

between the two countries. The subsequent development and expansion of the policy of plantation was similarly rooted in concepts of 'civility', but the intention to plant Ireland with 'civilised' English inhabitants constituted a more direct assault on both the Irish and the assimilated Old English, while their determination to replace the existing social, economic, political, religious, and cultural customs within Ireland exemplified their long-term plans to anglicise the country in its entirety. The flight of the earls and King James' project for the plantation of Ulster led to the development of widespread tenurial insecurity, stemming from the dispossession and displacement of the Irish population throughout the province, thereby creating an enduring atmosphere of discontent, which was compounded by the economic issues caused by indebtedness and the enforcement of a new economic order. The increasing force of Counter-Reformation Catholicism stemming from the European continent reignited the Irish and Old English commitment to a return to Catholicism in Ireland, and began to promote the consolidation of the confessional identities of both groups in the face of the intrusive Protestant Church of Ireland and its largely English colonial following.

On the other hand, the importance of short-term crises, including those of economic and environmental hardship in the years preceding the rebellion, should also be borne in mind as motivating factors in the course of the conflict. The appointment of Thomas Wentworth as lord lieutenant of Ireland, acting on behalf of King Charles, proved to be particularly incendiary, as Wentworth's policies of economic exploitation and religious persecution intensified the atmosphere of hostility within the country, particularly for the Catholic Old English and Irish. The religious and political crises which would emerge between Charles, the Scottish Covenanters, and the English parliament would also increase tensions among all three Stuart kingdoms, as disobedience became par for the course of Charles' kingship and the apparent spectre of Catholicism moved to the forefront of political discussion. The

English parliamentary session of 1640 to 1641, therefore, represented a culmination of the political and religious turmoil which had been brewing for some time under Charles' unrelenting authority, but the explosion of anti-Catholic and anti-Irish rhetoric which characterised its deliberations undoubtedly impacted upon both the resolution and timing of the Irish rebellion in 1641.

Life and the Landscape in Gaelic Ireland and Early Modern England

In order to explore the development of the English ideologies of ‘civility’ and ‘civilisation’ within the context of the Irish rebellion of 1641, as well as their imposition on the Irish people, it is necessary to obtain a more complete view of the day-to-day lives of the non-elite populations and of the conditions of both Ireland and England throughout this period. Accordingly, the following discussion will reconstruct the early modern climatic, environmental, and topographical circumstances which effectively created and governed the day-to-day organisation of these societies prior to the rebellion, primarily in relation to the undertaking of their landed, agricultural endeavours. Since the majority of the populations of both early modern Ireland and England were engaged in some form of subsistence farming, this process will offer valuable insight into some of the social, economic, and environmental circumstances which shaped the lives of these individuals, and which are vital for any detailed investigation of the Irish rebellion and its landed dimension. More so, however, this analysis will help to establish the centrality of land use, and the organisation of the landscape more broadly, in relation to English and Irish perspectives of ‘civilisation’ throughout the early modern period, both of which significantly impacted upon the extent and endurance of Anglo-Irish hostilities at least up until the outbreak of rebellion in 1641. While most modern interpretations of Gaelic Ireland are based upon both early Irish resources — including legal texts, annals, bardic prose, and archaeological evidence — as well as other non-Irish sources, early modern impressions of the Irish landscape were predominantly created by English

observers seeking to contrast what they perceived as the ‘primitivity’ of Irish society with that of their own apparent ‘civilisation’. As such, this discussion will also consider the construction of both the real and imagined landscapes of early modern England and Ireland, and will begin to account for their discrepancies in relation to the larger spectre of ‘civilisation’ and the associated ‘civilising’ process.

Gaelic Ireland

Topography and Climate

In order to reconstruct the nature and organisation of Irish land use, it is necessary, first, to consider the environmental circumstances which undoubtedly contributed towards the development and endurance of Gaelic agricultural traditions. According to Emyr Estyn Evans, Ireland was generally possessed of an oceanic climate which fashioned the country with its ‘uniquely wet’ character, often being affected by persistent rainfall and strong winds.[1] According to both the *Annals of Ireland* and English state papers, on more than one occasion from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, the Irish winds and rain ‘destroyed an immense deal of stone and wooden buildings, of Cranoges (fortresses on lakes), and corn stacks’, and prevented the ‘reaping … [of the] harvest’.[2] Indeed, writing during the twelfth century as part of his *History and Topography of Ireland* (1188x1223), Gerald of Wales commented upon the climate of Ireland, and stated that the country,

[1] E. E. Evans, *The Personality of Ireland: Habitat, Heritage and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 21.
[2] M. O’Clery, O. Connellan, and P. MacDermott (eds.), *The Annals of Ireland Translated From the Original Irish of the Four Masters* (Dublin: Bryan Geraghty, 1846), p. 297; ‘Colonel Edward Randolfe to same’, in H. C. Hamilton (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, of the Reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth. 1509–1573* (London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1860), p. 313.

> more than any other suffers from storms of wind and rain. A north-west wind, along with the west wind to its south, prevails here, and is more frequent and violent than any other. It bends in the opposite direction almost all the trees in the west that are placed in an elevated position, or uproots them.[3]

Robin Butlin has shown that contemporary descriptions of Irish weather conditions tended to capture climatic excesses as opposed to average atmospheric phenomena and, though Gerald's account was written before the period of the LIA, subsequent Irish and non-Irish accounts ultimately reflected upon the fact that Europe was suffering under the effects of the LIA from the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries.[4] While the period in question technically constituted that of recovery from the severe climatic catastrophes of the fourteenth century, it was also characterised by what Brian Fagan has described as some of the most erratic weather conditions of the LIA.[5] Francis Ludlow and Arlene Crampsie have also argued that the early modern period constituted one of the most turbulent in Ireland's socioeconomic, political, and cultural history which, in combination with the coldest extended period of the LIA and an increased prevalence and severity of extreme climatic phenomena, contributed towards the total transformation of the Irish landscape between 1550 and 1730.[6] Indeed, from the late 1500s, both Irish and English documentary records abound with references to the difficulties experienced by their military forces on account of the severity of the wet conditions, while 1580s and 1590s in Ireland were very much characterised by hugely wet and windy autumns and summers in the run-up to the Nine Years' War, contributing towards a

[3] G. Cambrensis, *The History and Topography of Ireland* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1982), pp. 34-35.
[4] R. A. Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 145; B. Fagan, *The Little Ice Age: How Climate Made History 1300-1850* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), p. 2.
[5] Fagan, *The Little Ice Age*, p. 28.
[6] F. Ludlow and A. Crampsie, 'Climate, debt, and conflict: environmental history as a new direction in understanding early modern Ireland', in S. Covington, V. P. Carey, and V. McGowan-Doyle (eds.), *Early Modern Ireland: New Sources, Methods, and Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), p. 269.

rising mortality rate due to a lack of food resources.[7] Thus, it was not wholly inconceivable that the inhabitants of Ireland could be stricken by serious outbreaks of disease and famine, particularly throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, caused by periods of 'B[o]isterous and excessively stormy weather', including 'both frost and snow', as well as 'Great heat and extreme drought'.[8]

On the other hand, in spite of the excesses of the LIA, seventeenth-century Irish historian Roderick O'Flaherty described the Irish climate, for the most part, as 'wholesome'.[9] Additionally, although his observations would have been based upon climatic phenomena associated with the Medieval Climatic Anomaly, Gerald of Wales greatly admired that in Ireland,

> Cancer does not here drive you to take shade from its burning heat; nor does the cold of Capricorn send you rushing to the fire. You will seldom see snow here, and then it lasts only for a short time … they are all moderate winds and none of them is too strong. The grass is green in the fields in winter, just the same as in summer … the meadows are not cut for fodder … The country enjoys the freshness and mildness of spring almost all the year round.[10]

Much like the atmospheric extremities of the period, then, contemporary descriptions of the Irish climate were also open to fluctuation: Ireland could be presented as a harsh,

---

[7] Ibid, pp. 276-277; F. Ludlow and A. Crampsie, 'Environmental History of Ireland, 1550-1730', in J. Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Ireland, 1550-1730*, Vol. II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), p. 620.

[8] O'Clery, Connellan, MacDermott, *Annals of Ireland Translated*, pp. 417, 491. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries experienced the strongest and stormiest periods of winds throughout the duration of the LIA.

[9] R. O'Flaherty, *A Chorographical Description of West of H-Iar Connaught, Written A. D. 1684* (Dublin: Irish Archaeological Society, 1846), pp. 8-15.

[10] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, p. 53.

unpredictable environment, or alternatively as a moderate, gentle landscape, typically in accordance with the objectives of the authors themselves. Indeed, Robert Foster has maintained that prejudicial English observers had few reservations about publicising their Irish critiques, while Irish chroniclers ultimately intended to document the ebb and flow of life in Gaelic Ireland, but the critical point of distinction between the two perspectives, whether in agreement or not, was rooted in their respective agendas: for the Irish, these records were most likely created in the interest of posterity, and for the English, in order to elevate perceptions of their own 'superiority' by foregrounding the apparent defects of Ireland.[11] However, in spite of their prejudice, ambitious, colonially-minded English observers were able to identify the potential of land within a region which offered milder temperatures and, as will be established hereafter, abundant topographical resources. This identification engendered an exhaustive body of contradictory literature which effectively sought to represent both Ireland's present state of inadequacy and its potential under the direction of a more 'civilised' authority.[12]

For example, Gerald of Wales described Ireland as being,

> a country of uneven surface and rather mountainous. The soil is soft and watery, and there are many woods and marshes. Even at the tops of high and steep mountains you will find pools and swamps. Still there are, here and there, some fine plains, but in comparison with the woods they are indeed small. On the whole the land is low-lying on all sides and along the coast; but further inland it

[11] R. F. Foster, *Modern Ireland 1600-1972* (London: Penguin Books, 1989), p. 19.
[12] Ibid.

rises up very high to many hills and even high mountains. It is sandy rather than rocky, not only on its circumference, but also in the very interior.[13]

Published almost four centuries later, during the first decade of the seventeenth century, by English cartographer and historian John Speed, the following map of the 'Kingdome of Irland' (see Figure 1) also authenticated Gerald's earlier description of the generally mountainous, marshy, wooded terrain of Ireland.[14]

Figure 1: J. Speed, 'The Kingdome of Irland Devided into severall Provinces and the againe devided into Counties Newly described. . . . 1610', https://www.raremaps.com/gallery/detail/62782/the-kingdome-of-irland-devided-into-severall-provinces-and-t-speed?q=0, accessed on: 15/8/19 (London: 1626).

Ulster, in particular, was often described as a remarkably wooded, boggy, 'wild' environment by English contemporaries throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, no doubt in

[13] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 33-34.
[14] Proponents of plantation in Ireland, writing in the late sixteenth century, often argued that it was necessary to establish English plantation in Ireland in order to combat shortages of wood at home; see K. Pluymers, *No Wood, No Kingdom: Political Economy in the English Atlantic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2021), pp. 53-54.

congruence with the correspondingly ‘wild’ nature of its inhabitants, though it should be noted that Fynes Moryson was actually surprised to discover that Ireland was not nearly as wooded as he had been informed.[15] Speed’s map actually constituted one of the most detailed representations of Ireland and its provinces during this time. In fact, prior to the 1600s, Ireland’s ‘native’ cartographic development was fairly minimal, in part due to the significantly smaller, localised nature of Gaelic Ireland — which gave little incentive for the inhabitants to ‘know’ the extent of their country outwith the fluid boundaries of their immediate and neighbouring lordships — but also because many of the inhabitants possessed an extensive store of mental knowledge related to the composition of their landscape and, as such, had little cause to follow after the example of English, or even continental European, cartographers.[16] On the other hand, from an English perspective, Jacinta Prunty has explained that the contemporary interest in overseas expansion transformed the process of mapping into an important tool for the appropriation of land, fostering a connection between the larger process of ‘civilisation’, the pursuit of scientific knowledge, and literacy.[17] In other words, only by ‘knowing’ Ireland could English authorities both theoretically justify their campaign for the advancement of ‘civilisation’ and realise their colonial objectives, prompting English cartographers to undertake extensive surveillance of the Irish landscape, blurring the lines between cartographer and coloniser in the process.[18]

[15] K. Pluymers, ‘Taming the Wilderness in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Ireland and Virginia’, *Environmental History*, 16:4 (2011), p. 621; English eyewitnesses to the topography and condition of Ireland often simply ignored evidence which contradicted the representation of Ireland which they sought to create or reinforce — see J. P. Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 21-22.
[16] J. Prunty, *Maps and Map-making in Local History* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), p. 40.
[17] Ibid, p. 16.
[18] Ibid, pp. 40-42; B. Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), p. 64; many contemporary Irish maps were produced around the time of the English plantation period at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and were often designed to depict Ireland as an ‘empty’ space without inhabitants.

Speed's map (Figure 1) clearly depicted the extent to which the north, west, and south-western regions of the Irish landscape — which had endured largely outwith the reach of the authority of the English Pale — were covered by forest, mountains, and hills, especially in comparison with the smaller, distinctively less hilly, region of Wales presented in the bottom-right corner of the map. Indeed, the topography of Ireland in the sixteenth century was characterised, primarily, by an abundance of rich pasture, which — along with many other upland regions of the north-west of Europe — was uniquely suited to the undertaking of animal husbandry, comprised of both stock raising and dairying.[19] Furthermore, Ireland's wealth of natural resources extended far beyond its lush pastures: the landscape was reported to have been divided by many 'magnificent rivers', including the Bann, the Foyle, and the Shannon, as well as 'goodlie lakes' like Lough Neagh 'that will carrie even shippes uppon theire waters', all of which Edmund Spenser claimed to be 'replenished with all sortes of fishe most aboundantlie'.[20] Likewise, the 'hidden veins of the earth' of Ireland were reportedly filled with 'different types of minerals', though Gerald of Wales maintained that these were 'not mined or put to any use', owing to the 'laziness' of the Gaelic inhabitants.[21] In spite of the consistency of English claims to the contrary, the Irish landscape was also not unsuitable to the task of cultivation, either: in a description of Connacht from 1648, for example, O'Flaherty commented that while the soils were 'for the most part good only for pasture and grasing', they would still yield 'as much corn, of wheat, barly, oats, and ry, as is enough to sustaine the inhabitants, and furnishes the market besides'.[22] English observers were also particularly complimentary of the Ards Peninsula in County Down, which was regularly praised as 'a champion and fertile land', so much so that Sir Thomas Smith would

---

[19] R. Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales: A Voice of the Middle Ages* (Gloucestershire: Tempus Publishing Limited, 2006), p. 132.
[20] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, p. 36; E. Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (Library of Alexandria, 1934), p. 31.
[21] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, p. 102.
[22] O'Flaherty, *Description of West of H-Iar Connaught*, pp. 15-17.

eventually pursue a grant from the English crown for those lands in order to undertake his own plantation during the late sixteenth century.[23] For all his criticism, even Gerald of Wales expressed his admiration for the 'fertility of the tillage-land' in Ireland, declaring that,

> The land is fruitful and rich in its fertile soil and plentiful harvests. Crops abound in the fields … The crops give great promise in the blade, even more in the straw … The plains are well clothed with grass, and the haggards are bursting with straw.[24]

Evidently, the landscape of Ireland did not constitute the archaic, barren 'wilderness' so often constructed by English observers within their Irish commentaries, but was instead an environment rich in natural resources, from climatic moderation and mineral wealth, to lush pasture and fertile ground.[25] Rather, the dominant early modern perception of the 'wilderness' of Gaelic Ireland was, to a greater extent, representative of the English concern with the establishment of true 'civilisation', based upon both classical and biblical rhetoric, and characterised by the intensive exploitation of the land and its natural resources. As Keith Pluymers has explained, though good lands could have been perceived as Edenic in their fertility and potential, they were not, according to English observers, until they were 'improved' by human toil.[26]

---

[23] M. Bagenal, H. F. Hore, and Lord Burghley, 'Marshal Bagenal's Description of Ulster, Anno 1586', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 2 (1854), pp. 153-154.
[24] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, p. 34.
[25] See A. Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea, North Channel Communities of the Atlantic Archipelago c.1550-1625* (Oxford: Peter Lang Ltd, 2022), p. 117. In 1568, Sorley Boy MacDonnell, one of the powerful Highland Scottish lords in the province of Ulster, was reported to have left as many 'peopill as he could gether manuring the land' while he made a trip to Rathlin Island.
[26] Pluymers, 'Taming the Wilderness', p. 615.

Cattle Rearing

Like the Scottish Highlands, the ancient culture and society of Gaelic Ireland was characterised by a number of distinctive traits which, according to both Evans and David Beers Quinn, were representative of the endurance of Ireland's 'Atlantic heritage' outwith the mainstream of continental European society, which was predominantly associated with the spread of both Roman and Anglo-Saxon influence.[27] Indeed, this Atlantic culture was associated with the development of a more isolated, familial-based society, much like that of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, as well as that of the Irish network of alliances largely based upon both kinship ties and ancestral lineage.[28] In addition, the culture of the Atlantic fringe was also distinguished by a predominantly pastoral economy which, particularly in the north and western regions of Ireland where Gaelic tradition continued to prevail, was manifest in the widespread rearing of cattle and the practice of seasonal transhumance, both of which reflected upon the centrality of cattle within Gaelic society on a much larger scale.[29]

Early modern Ireland was an effectively cashless society, lacking in towns or recognisable market centres — again, like the Scottish Highlands — and as such was perceived by English observers as something of a poverty-stricken, underdeveloped culture with little interest in commercialisation.[30] However, instead of coinage, cattle had become employed as the dominant form of currency and could be exchanged for any number of goods and services on a routine basis. For example, in accordance with early Irish Brehon law, an

[27] D. B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), p. 14; E. E. Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage: Selected Writings* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd., 1996), pp. 61, 67.
[28] Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage*, pp. 61, 67; R. A. Dodgshon, *No Stone Unturned: A History of Farming, Landscape and Environment in the Scottish Highlands and Islands* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015), p. 90; R. A. Houston, 'People, Space, and Law in Late Medieval and Early Modern Britain and Ireland*', *Past & Present*, 230:1 (2016), p. 69.
[29] Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage*, pp. 61, 67; Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', pp. 148-149.
[30] F. Kelly, *A Guide to Early Irish Law* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 2016), p. 113; A. Cathcart, *Kinship and Clientage: Highland Clanship, 1451-1609* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), p. 142.

éraic, or 'eric', fine was a payment which could be enforced in order to compensate for a range of criminal activities, including murder, but these penalties were primarily agreed upon in terms of specific numbers of cattle to be surrendered in exchange for the conclusion of justice.[31] During the fifteenth century, for example, one William Garv was reported to have been 'accidentally killed by the cast of a dart' by Gregory, 'son of Tanaidhe O Maolconry', who was then compelled to relinquish 'one hundred and twenty-six cows … as an eraic (or fine) for his death'.[32] As argued by Philip Robinson, the economic value of cattle in early modern Ireland could be inferred from the sheer multitudes of the animals retained by the Gaelic nobility throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[33] For instance, in 1546, it was reported that the O'Connors and O'Moores had been raided by English forces who had 'treacherously overran their country, and carried away many thousands of their cattle', which was indicative of the large quantities of cattle routinely referenced within Irish sources.[34] Furthermore, Hugh O'Neill, the Earl of Tyrone, collected his rents almost entirely in the form of cattle.[35] Even around the beginning of the seventeenth century, cattle continued to feature prominently within dowry agreements, jointures, and even mortgages, especially in the Gaelic and Gaelicised north and western regions.[36]

As Evans has argued, the possession and maintenance of such monumental cattle herds was another hallmark of Ireland's Atlantic heritage, within which these large herds conferred both economic wealth and political prestige.[37] In fact, based upon his studies in

---

[31] S. J. Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland 1460-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 15.
[32] O'Clery, Connellan, MacDermott, *Annals of Ireland Translated*, p. 193.
[33] P. Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-1670* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1994), p. 33.
[34] O'Clery, Connellan, MacDermott, *Annals of Ireland Translated*, p. 426.
[35] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 153; 'A Discourse of Ireland', in R. P. Mahaffy (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, 1601–03 (With Addenda, 1565–1654) and of the Hanmer Papers* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1912), p. 251; Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster*, p. 33.
[36] A. Clarke, 'The Irish Economy, 1600-60', in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 172.
[37] Evans, *The Personality of Ireland*, p. 48.

early Irish law, Fergus Kelly has argued that a wealthier non-elite farmer (known as a *bóaire*) may only possess approximately twenty cows, six oxen, and two bulls, while an even lesser peasant farmer (known as an *ócaire*) only seven cows, and perhaps one oxen — just enough to provide sustenance for their dependants.[38] Without followers or livestock to occupy the land, there was very little emphasis on the value of land in and of itself within Gaelic society.[39] Rather, lands were primarily defined in relation to the number of cows which could be grazed upon them: for example, in his *General History of Ireland* (1723), seventeenth-century Irish historian Geoffrey Keating lamented the flooding of 'a Tract of Land that would every Year afford sufficient Pasture for twelve Head of Cattel'.[40] Furthermore, according to the *Senchus Mór* — an ancient text pertaining to the Brehon law — a 'cumhal', or *cumal*, was defined as a unit of value which amounted to '3 cows of full legal value', but Kelly has maintained that the *cumal* was also employed as a unit of measurement for the land, and could range in value from twenty-four milch cows for fertile arable land, down to approximately eight dry cows for bogland areas.[41] In accordance with their social standing, then, an average *ócaire* may have inherited lands amounting to the value of around seven *cumals*, which would have been enough to raise a herd of approximately seven cows.[42] Thus, the predominantly pastoral economy and widespread dependence upon cattle more broadly had effectively conferred their relatively all-encompassing status within Irish culture and society, much to the dismay of their English neighbours.

---

[38] F. Kelly, 'Cattle in Ancient Ireland: Early Irish Legal Aspects', in M. O'Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), p. 44.
[39] Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 28-29.
[40] J. M. Graham, 'Rural Society in Connacht, 1600-1640', in N. Stephens and R. E. Glasscock (eds.), *Irish Geographical Studies: In Honour of E. Estyn Evans* (Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, 1970), pp. 199-200; G. Keating, *The General History of Ireland* (London: B. Creake, 1723), p. 422.
[41] T. Oakes (ed.), *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland. Introduction to Senchus Mor, and Athgabail; or, Law of Distress,* Vol. I (Dublin: Alexander Thom, 1865), p. 246; Kelly, *A Guide to Early Irish Law*, p. 99.
[42] Kelly, *A Guide to Early Irish Law*, p. 100.

Beasts and Booleying

Though English observers recognised that the Irish population loved their cattle 'as their lives', the dominance of pastoralism in Ireland had long been touted by those commentators as a symptom of their 'primitivity' and idle nature, and was contrasted with the 'full-time' task of cultivation, necessary for the maintenance of a rural, grain-growing economy like that of England and as a marker of the 'civilisation' of the physical landscape.[43] However, while pastoral farming technically constituted a more seasonal endeavour than cultivation, cattle rearing was still a laborious undertaking which bound herdsmen to the 'natural rhythms' of their animals, notwithstanding the fact that Gaelic pastoralism was also supplemented by tillage.[44] Having explored the character and composition of Irish society, Quinn has identified the practice of transhumance — known as *buailteachas*, or Anglicised as 'booleying' — as one of the most distinctive and defining features of Gaelic agriculture throughout the pre- and early modern periods.[45] O'Flaherty described this custom, somewhat simplistically, as a summer phenomenon wherein Irish herders would 'drive their cattle to the mountaines, where such as looke to the cattle live in small cabbins for that season'.[46] Spenser also described Gaelic transhumance as part of his critique in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596), in which he denounced the practice as both 'barborous' and 'evill' in order to foreground his perception of the Irish misuse of the land, explaining that

> there is one use amongst them, to keepe their Cattell, and to live themselves the most part of the yeare in Bollies, pasturinge upon the mountaines and wast wyld

[43] Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, p. 76; R. Gillespie, *Colonial Ulster: The Settlement of East Ulster 1600-1641* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1985), p. 71; K. Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800* (London: Penguin Group, 1984), pp. 254-255.
[44] Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, p. 76.
[45] Ibid, p. 14; E. Costello, 'Post-medieval upland settlement and the decline of transhumance: a case study from the Galtee Mountains, Ireland', *Landscape History*, 36:1 (2015), p. 48; G. Farrell, *The 'mere Irish' and the colonisation of Ulster, 1570-1641* (Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), p. 168.
[46] O'Flaherty, *Description of West of H-Iar Connaught*, pp. 15-17.

places; and removing still to freshe land, as they have depastured the former dayes.[47]

While O'Flaherty and Spenser have offered descriptions of Gaelic booleying practices, both accounts constituted fairly rudimentary explanations of the convention of transhumance, and are characterised by a notable lack, or ignorance, of in-depth understanding of the methodology overall. This lack of understanding, according to Theresa McDonald, has remained prevalent within Irish historiography up until recent years.[48]

Gaelic *buailteachas* was an ancient agricultural convention based upon the rundale, or 'infield-outfield', system of farming, which had encouraged the development of both co-operative farming and the retirement of arable lands for a specific period of time.[49] In practical terms, this endeavour required Irish cattle farmers to travel with their herds from their permanent, lowland winter homesteads to pastures and settlements called 'booleys', normally located in mountainous or hilly upland regions, during the summer season, to allow for the regeneration of their winter pastures to provide for their cattle throughout the following season.[50] Furthermore, while English commentators consistently denounced Irish booleying as an anarchic manifestation of their nomadic lifestyle, Nicholas Canny has argued that this movement was indeed both regular, occurring on a seasonal basis, and controlled, having been planned in order to provide annual sustenance for the Irish inhabitants as well as their livestock.[51] Thus, contrary to Spenser's proclamation that Gaelic *buailteachas*

[47] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 85-86.
[48] T. McDonald, 'The "Ups and Downs" of Booleying in Achill, Co. Mayo, Ireland', in M. O'Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), p. 57.
[49] Ibid.
[50] A. Horning, 'Archaeological Explorations of Cultural Identity and Rural Economy in the North of Ireland: Goodland, County Antrim', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 8:3 (2004), p. 201.
[51] K. Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility: Manners and Civilisation in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), pp. 184-185; W. J. Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory: A Geography of*

constituted ‘a very idle lyfe, and a fit nursery for a theife’, by which those who ‘live thus in theis Bollies grow thereby more barbarous, and live more licentiously’, the entire success of transhumance was contingent upon detailed planning and demanding physical labour undertaken by Irish farmers whose livelihoods were fundamentally intertwined with the health and wellbeing of their cattle.[52]

Normally, the booleying season would begin around the month of May, which also signalled the beginning of the growing season, when farmers would pack up their families and move with their cattle to their booley settlements until sometime around August, when they would return to their permanent homesteads, having vacated or dismantled their temporary upland dwellings in the process.[53] Archaeological excavations have contributed towards a greater understanding of the organisation of Gaelic booley sites, particularly in relation to the construction of the dwelling houses inhabited by farmers throughout the summer season. For example, as part of his recent study into the booleying settlements unearthed in the Mourne Mountains, Mark Gardiner has identified two distinctive types of hut dwellings. In general, type ‘B’ dwellings were uncovered at lower altitudes, were comprised of one room constructed of sod walls, and were square in shape.[54] Type ‘A’ constructions, on the other hand, tended to be discovered at higher altitudes and, although similarly fashioned with sod walls, were oval or circular in shape, and were almost always comprised of two or more connecting rooms.[55] Furthermore, it was determined that the latter type A dwellings were largely characteristic of the kinds of booley huts which would have

---

Colonial and Early Modern Ireland c.1530-1750 (Cork: Cork University Press, 2008), p. 74; N. Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established 1565-76* (Sussex: The Harvester Press Limited, 1976), p. 15.

[52] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 85, 88-91.

[53] T. McDonald, ‘The Deserted Village, Slievemore, Achill Island, County Mayo, Ireland’, *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 2:2 (1998), pp. 79-80.

[54] M. Gardiner, ‘A preliminary list of booley huts in the Mourne mountains, County Down’, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 67 (2008), pp. 144-145.

[55] Ibid.

been constructed throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: these structures were always located upon dry lands; were within the vicinity of running water, usually in the form of a stream; and, crucially, were built upon good pasture lands.[56] Eugene Costello's research into settlement and transhumance in the Galtee Mountains has also indicated that small-scale potato cultivation had taken place at these booley settlements, established by way of small ridge patches, though he has maintained that cultivation ridges may also have been missed amongst the vegetation.[57] Indeed, Costello's conclusions were similar to those of McDonald with respect to her excavations of the booleying sites of Slievemore village on Achill Island, which also comprised evidence of cultivation ridges and the use of fertiliser — indicated by the presence of calcium carbonate — in the form of seaweed and seashells, both of which were commonly associated with manurance in Ireland throughout the early modern period.[58]

While Gaelic herders undoubtedly travelled alongside their cattle to these upland pastures to ensure the safety and security of their animals from both human and animal threats, their rationale was also based, quite simply, upon the necessity of basic nourishment. Since non-elite tenant farmers were hugely dependent upon milk and other dairy produce to sustain their diets, it was not only crucial that those individuals collect milk from their dairy cows twice per day throughout the summer months, but also that their efforts were supplemented by cultivation to maintain their own health and wellbeing, should any complications arise.[59] The custom of Gaelic *buailteachas*, then, was by no means any indication of the kind of nomadic, rootless existence continually purported to reign supreme

---

[56] Ibid, p. 145.
[57] Costello, 'the Galtee Mountains, Ireland', p. 52.
[58] McDonald, 'Achill, Co. Mayo, Ireland', p. 58; see O'Flaherty, *Description of West of H-Iar Connaught*, pp. 57-59 for more detail on the use of fertiliser for cultivation purposes.
[59] E. Costello, 'Seasonal Management of Cattle in the Booleying System: New Insights from Connemara, Western Ireland', in M. O'Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), p. 70.

in Ireland by more ‘civilised’ English contemporaries, but, instead, was a reasoned and sophisticated agricultural methodology designed to maximise pastoral productivity and allow these settlements to function much like that of a permanent homestead throughout the summer months. Dry lands were sought out in order to allow for the construction of temporary, yet sturdy, dwellings, while booleying sites were also selected based upon their proximity to running water, necessary for the survival of both cattle and their custodians, and in accordance with the quality of their pasture.

Though the abundance of available pasture in Ireland had undoubtedly contributed to the development of Gaelic booleying practices, as well as the overall endurance of Irish pastoralism throughout the early modern period, this was by no means the sole justification for the prevalence of transhumance, nor arguably the most significant. For example, Ludlow and Crampsie have suggested that the maintenance of Irish pastoralism throughout the early modern period may have been impacted by the climatic phenomena of the LIA, particularly in relation to grain shortages and persistent harvest crises during the first half of the seventeenth century.[60] Costello has also argued that the organisation of booleying within the Irish context allowed farmers to maximise their stock numbers by taking advantage of common grasslands which far exceeded both the size and quality of those available at their permanent homesteads alone.[61] The preservation of the physical landscape and the production of fodder to provide for cattle during the winter season were also important concerns for the pastoral population since, as Kenneth Nicholls has pointed out, the Irish did not engage significantly in the process of haymaking, like their English counterparts.[62] In fact, Kelly has

[60] Ludlow, Crampsie, ‘Climate, debt, and conflict’, p. 276. A string of harvest crises occurred in Ireland during the following periods: 1600-1603, 1607-1608, 1621-1624, 1627-1629, 1630-1633, and 1639-1641.
[61] Costello, ‘Seasonal Management of Cattle’, p. 68.
[62] K. W. Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd, 2003), p. 137.

noted the absence of references to haymaking within early Irish legal texts, and has attributed this absence, primarily, to the success of booleying in Gaelic Ireland, which allowed grasses at the permanent homesteads to be replenished throughout the summer period when the weather was, at the very least, more forgiving, providing enough fodder to sustain cattle throughout the harsher winter period.[63] According to Evans, the lack of widespread permanent enclosure of common lands in Ireland may also be attributed to the prevalence of the booleying system, wherein such a process would have negatively impacted upon the relative freedom of mobility which allowed cattle to be moved from one pasture to another in order to provide variable pasture.[64]

Costello has also considered the importance of both varied and seasonal grazing in relation to the specialisation of pastoral farming in order to maintain the physical health and wellbeing of cattle: for example, grazing cattle upon coastal, sandy soils for extended periods of time could lead to the development of a cobalt deficiency, while grazing herds upon peaty, upland pastures for too long could lead to an increased risk of phosphorous deficiency, both of which could seriously impact upon the fertility, growth, and overall wellbeing of cattle.[65] Thus, Gaelic pastoralism and the associated practice of transhumance effectively represented the most optimum use of the physical landscape within the Irish setting: cattle were given the best grazing opportunities on rich, variable pasture and could be closely guarded and cared for year-round by their custodians, who reaped the rewards of their health and prosperity.

---

[63] Kelly, 'Cattle in Ancient Ireland', p. 45; Ludlow and Crampsie have argued that the particularly cold and wet conditions associated with the LIA could, in the absence of fodder, impact upon the survival of cattle throughout the winter months; see Ludlow, Crampsie, 'Climate, debt, and conflict', p. 276.
[64] Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage*, p. 67.
[65] Costello, 'Seasonal Management of Cattle', p. 69.

Tillage and Cultivation

Though Gerald of Wales, like many other subsequent English and non-Irish commentators, reported that the Irish lived 'on beasts only, and … like beasts', and further claimed that they had 'not progressed at all from the primitive habits of pastoral living', Gerald's allegations have since been both repeatedly and thoroughly debunked.[66] According to Butlin, while the dominance of pastoralism in Gaelic Ireland — and the associated social, political, cultural, and economic significance of cattle — cannot be understated, animal husbandry was supplemented by comprehensive tillage and cultivation efforts across the entire country, even outwith the Anglicised boundaries of the English Pale.[67] In fact, Raymond Gillespie's research into Irish harvest crises in the seventeenth century has demonstrated that both non-Irish settler and indigenous Irish communities were fearful of the failure of the grain harvest, while grain shortages across Ireland throughout the period of 1550 to 1600 had caused the entire population of Ireland to suffer from 'great dearth and scarcity'.[68] Although approximately one third of the topography of Ireland was categorised as peat-bog, and was, at the very least, unsuited to the task of cereal cultivation, there were also pockets of fertile arable land present throughout the realm, and additional methods were regularly employed in order to 'improve' upon the fertility of the land for purposes of cultivation.[69]

Like other predominantly pastoral societies, cultivation efforts in Ireland tended to be focused around the growing of oats, barley, rye, and small amounts of wheat, all of which were referenced within both English and Irish sources from the sixteenth and seventeenth

[66] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, p. 101.
[67] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 153.
[68] R. Gillespie, 'Harvest Crises in Early Seventeenth-Century Ireland', *Irish Economic and Social History*, 11 (1984), pp. 7-8; 'Wallop to Burghley', in H. C. Hamilton (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1586–1588, July.* (London: Longman & Co., 1877), p. 47.
[69] R. H. Buchanan, 'Field Systems of Ireland', in A. R. H. Baker and R. A. Butlin (eds.), *Studies of Field Systems in the British Isles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 580.

centuries.[70] Nicholls, however, stated that principal crop growth could be impacted by regional climatic and soil variations: for example, in 1601, it was recorded that Inishowen grew no rye or wheat, but plenty of oats, barley, and flax, particularly to facilitate the production of linen, while in former colonial centres, like Kilkenny and Tipperary, it was more common for greater amounts of wheat to be produced, for orchards to be established, and for greater overall variation in agricultural endeavours.[71] Nevertheless, the staple grain crop in Ireland, as was also the case with the Scottish Highlands, was undoubtedly that of oats.[72] Not only were oats the only cereal crop which could reasonably stand to survive upon the poorest quality of soils, which essentially characterised the largest portion of the Irish topography, but oats were also favoured by the Irish based upon their supplementary capacity to their primary diet of white meats, since they could be mixed with either dairy produce or animal blood to make foods like oatcakes or gruel.[73]

The ploughing season in Ireland generally commenced around March after manuring had taken place, at which point the oats would be sown broadcast, which involved spreading the seed across the arable land, and harrowed, which ensured that the seed was then properly mixed into the soil.[74] According to the *Críth Gablach*, higher-ranking non-elite farmers would generally possess around six oxen, which would allow them to undertake ploughing on an independent basis, whereas lower peasant farmers may only possess one or two oxen, which normally necessitated the requisition of a co-ploughing agreement (known as a *comar*)

---

[70] O'Flaherty, *Description of West of H-Iar Connaught*, pp. 15-17; Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 48-49.
[71] Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland*, p. 133.
[72] Ibid.
[73] J. Thirsk, 'Farming Techniques', in J. Thirsk (ed.), *The Agrarian History of England and Wales*, Vol. IV (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 171; Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage*, p. 29; J. Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland: Medieval and Early-Modern Patterns in the Demarcation of Civility', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 56:1 (1995), p. 37; Robinson has explained that the diet of the Irish peasantry primarily consisted of 'whitemeats', including milk, butter, curds, and cheese; see Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster*, p. 35.
[74] Buchanan, 'Field Systems of Ireland', p. 612.

with other farmers of a similar status who could not afford to provide their own full teams or their own ploughs.[75] Indeed, ploughing teams in Ireland normally consisted of around 'fiue or sixe' horses or oxen, who would be 'placed all in front, hauing neither cordes, chaines, nor lines, whereby to draw, but euery horse by his owne taile', to ensure that the animals would come to a halt if they struck a rock or a slump, guarding moderately against potentially irreparable damage to the tackle or plough — a practice which was widely condemned as 'barbaric' by indiscriminate English observers throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[76] Even so, both regional and soil variations would also have impacted upon the dominant methods of ploughing employed across the Irish landscape, as was evinced in the western regions of Ireland wherein the soil tended to be considerably more stony, which made it more efficient for farmers to dig up the land with spades as opposed to ploughs.[77]

In accordance with the timings of various Gaelic rituals and celebrations, the harvest period in Ireland was believed to have begun around the beginning of August, approximately halfway through the typical grazing season.[78] Indeed, this occasion was normally marked by the Irish atop their booley sites as a time for celebration, much to the frustration of their English neighbours, whose overwhelming perceptions of Irish ceremonies were clouded by both suspicion and unease over their seemingly pagan persuasion.[79] At this point, wealthier lords would have assembled their 'band of reapers' at the permanent homesteads to begin reaping the harvest, which would be followed closely by the binding and transportation of the crops.[80] However, for the Irish peasant population, the process of the harvest would have

[75] Kelly, 'Cattle in Ancient Ireland', p. 48.
[76] B. Rich, *A New Description of Ireland: Wherein is described the disposition of the Irish whereunto they are inclined* (London: William Jaggard, 1610), p. 26; Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland*, p. 134.
[77] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 151.
[78] Evans, *The Personality of Ireland*, p. 76.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Oakes, *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland*, Vol. I, p. 157; Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 155. See also M. Gardiner, 'Landscape and farming in the north of Ireland in the Late Middle Ages and early modern period: the evidence from the uplands', *The Journal of Irish Archaeology*, 27 (2018), pp. 117-134.

occupied all of those who had hands to spare.[81] In fact, according to early Irish legal texts, one of the only possessions which a woman could legally take from her husband without his permission was a reaping hook.[82] Not only did this law ensure that, in the event of his absence, the reaping process could continue, but this was also indicative of the importance of cultivation, and of mixed farming more comprehensively, within Gaelic society.

Evidently, in spite of the insistence of English and non-Irish commentators that Gaelic Ireland was a 'primitive', 'uncivilised' environment in which idle, nomadic inhabitants neglected their divine and moral imperative to cultivate and 'improve' upon the physical landscape, this impression was, at the very least, deceptive. Certainly, while both the physical composition and cultural organisation of early modern Ireland differed from that of their English counterparts, this contrast was by no means a symptom of their purported 'incivility', but rather the development of a separate social, cultural, political, economic, and environmental landscape. English commentators clearly intended to create a wider understanding of the 'inferiority' and 'barbarism' of Gaelic Ireland, while simultaneously advancing the impression of their own 'superiority' and 'civility' in order to rationalise their ongoing conquest of Ireland. Thus, it was the English imagination of Gaelic Ireland which not only fuelled much of their enduring anti-Irish rhetoric — which, as has been determined, was considerably based upon the use and misuse of the landscape — but which also impacted upon both the violent execution of the Irish campaign and the reportage of those events in 1641.

[81] Ibid.

[82] D. A. Binchy, 'The Legal Capacity of Women in Regard to Contracts', in R. Thurneysen, N. Power, M. Dillon, K. Mulchrone, D. A. Binchy, A. Knoch, J. Ryan, and S. J. (eds.), *Studies in Early Irish Law* (Dublin: Hodges Figgis & Co., 1936), p. 218.

The English Experience

Topography and Climate

As part of his historical and topographical account of the countries of Scotland, England, and Ireland from the late sixteenth century, English herald and historian William Camden described various regions of England as 'very fruitful', 'fertile', 'mild and summer-like', and as 'temperate'.[83] Camden's description of the English environment was typical of the kinds of sweeping, laudatory generalisations which characterised countless English commentaries on the nature of their country and society, embellished in order to advance the perception of their 'superiority'. Indeed, Camden's account continued to offer further detail on the favourable atmospheric conditions which characterised the English landscape, and, in discussing London, poetically remarked that,

> Aire, Land, Sea, and all Elements, shew favour every way.
> The weather no where milder is, the ground most rich to see,
> Doth yeeld all fruits of fertile soile, that never spent will bee.
> And Ocean, that with Tams streame his flowing tyde doth blend
> Conveis to it commodities, all that the world can send.[84]

Raphael Holinshed, another English historian, similarly defended the atmospheric conditions of Britaine, in reference to the areas of England, Scotland, and Wales, as he proclaimed that

[83] W. Camden, *Britain, or A chorographicall description of the most flourishing kingdomes, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the Islands adjoyning, out of the depth of Antiquitie* (London: George Latham, 1637), pp. 735, 220, 419.
[84] Ibid, p. 437.

> experience teacheth us, that it is no lesse pure, wholesome, and commodious, than is that of other countries, and (as Caesar himself hereto addeth) much more temperate in summer than that of the Galles, from whom he aduentured hither. Neither is there anie thing found in the aire of our region, that is not vsuallie seene amongst other nations lieng beyond the seas. Wherefore, we must needs confesse, that the situation of our Iland (for benefit of the heauens) is nothing inferior to that of anie countrie of the maine …[85]

In fact, Camden went so far as to proclaim that London was, 'that City strong to which three gifts are given by three, By Bacchus, Ceres, and Phoebus, Wine, Wheat, and Poetree', specifically referencing the Roman goddess of agriculture and fertility, Ceres.[86] Based upon the commentaries of Camden and Holinshed, as well as those of other renowned early modern English commentators, the climatic conditions of early modern England were represented as having some similarities to the Garden of Eden itself: it was regarded as a place wherein farmers, livestock, and crops would all seemingly be able to thrive and prosper with relative ease and efficiency. Yet, this was certainly not the case, and even less so within the volatile climatic context of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Like Ireland, and many other territories in the North Atlantic region, England was also stricken by the climatic turbulence associated with the LIA, and while these phenomena could not necessarily be considered as the norm with respect to the average climatological condition of early modern England, the unpredictable nature of these meteorological circumstances could often lead to severe stretches of famine, forcing the English peasantry

---

[85] R. Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles: England, Scotland, and Ireland,* Vol. I (London: J. Johnson; F.C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilkie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme; Cadell and Davies; and J. Mawman, 1807), p. 183.
[86] Camden, *Britain*, p. 436.

'to feed their children with cats, dogs, and roots of nettles'.[87] Joan Thirsk has also commented upon the significance of regional climatic variation across the English landscape in relation to the complexity of English farming methods: for example, she explained that the populations in the north and west of the country endured persistent rain-carrying westerly winds which, for the most part, gave rise to a cool, wet climate.[88] However, she also discussed the contrast which existed in the south and eastern regions of England, which blessed those inhabitants with a much drier, more forgiving climate, as well as other specific areas within each of the north, west, south, and eastern quarters, which were either more or less favoured in relation to those regions overall.[89] Thirsk's discussion has effectively helped to contextualise the reality of the early modern English landscape, with respect to other contemporary commentaries like those of Camden and Holinshed. Evidently, large portions of rural England were characterised by a gentler, more agreeable climate in comparison with that of Ireland, which was, in turn, more supportive of a comprehensive grain-growing economy, like that which conformed to the biblical and classical ideas of 'civilisation'. On the other hand, English commentators clearly endeavoured to both diminish and obscure the extent of the more challenging aspects of the English climate which did not necessarily concur with their imagination of a climatic utopia, particularly with respect to much of the unpredictable phenomena associated with the LIA. Based upon the biblical dominion of man over the natural world, as well as the subjection of the landscape for the purpose of the advancement of human 'civilisation', English contemporaries expected that their 'improvement' of the physical landscape could extend to the climate itself, and so these

---

[87] 'Justices of Gloucestershire to the Council', in R. Lemon (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1581–1590* (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1865), p. 323; Ludlow, Crampsie, 'Climate, debt, and conflict', pp. 269-270.
[88] J. Thirsk, *England's Agricultural Regions and Agrarian History, 1500-1750* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1987), p. 12; J. Thirsk, 'The Farming Regions of England', in J. Thirsk (ed.), *The Agrarian History of England and Wales*, Vol. IV (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 2.
[89] Ibid.

commentaries were intended to reflect upon the fruition of their progress within their own realm.[90]

Having been similarly commended by its early modern champions, the English topography was described by Camden as being ‘so plentifull is this countrey of graine … that it hath not onely sufficient to maintaine it selfe, but also affoordeth often times great store of corne into Spaine’.[91] Though Camden’s commentary appeared, again, to have been embellished for the benefit of his homeland, he attempted to justify his aggrandizement:

> Lest I should seeme to exceed over-much in the praise of my native country, heare in stead of me, that ancient Oratour, who with open mouth resoundeth out the commendations thereof, in this manner: O happie Britaine, and more fortunate than all other lands … for good cause hath nature endowed thee with all the blessed gifts of aire and soile; wherein there is neither excessive cold of Winter, nor extreme heat of Summer; wherein there is so great plenty of graine, that it serveth sufficiently both for bread and drink: wherein the forrests are without savage beasts, and the ground void of noysome serpents.[92]

Holinshed also championed ‘the soile of Britaine’, and maintained that ‘by the testimonies and reports both of the old and new writers, and experience also of such as now inhabit the same’, the land was ‘verie fruitfull; and such in deed as bringeth foorth manie

[90] Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, pp. 17-19; K. O. Kupperman, ‘The Puzzle of the American Climate in the Early Colonial Period’, *The American Historical Review*, 87:5 (1982), p. 1285. See Pluymers, *No Wood, No Kingdom*, pp. 108-109 for a discussion of English commentators’ obstruction of the climatic realities of the Americas, specifically in relation to their colonisation of Virginia.
[91] Camden, *Britain*, p. 186.
[92] Ibid, p. 3.

commodities'.[93] What was particularly interesting about Holinshed's commentary was that he went on to explain that the country was 'more inclined to feeding and grasing, than profitable for tillage, and bearing of corne; by reason whereof the countrie is wonderfullie replenished with neat [bovine animals], and all kind of cattell', quite contrary to the image of English 'civilisation' typically represented by cultivated fields.[94] Nevertheless, Holinshed's account continued to reinforce the generalised image of England as an abundant, fertile, early modern agricultural Eden, within which both animal husbandry and arable cultivation could be rewardingly sustained.

Similarly to both David Underdown and Thirsk, Mark Overton has discussed the impact of topography upon the development of English social conditions throughout the early modern period, and has argued that the diversification of English agriculture may be primarily attributed to the complexity of the landscape itself.[95] In an attempt to generalise the physical makeup of the English topography, Thirsk has compared the environmental circumstances in the north and western regions of the country with those in the south and east: while the former areas were generally characterised by large, sweeping mountains and moors; poorer quality and thinner soils; and a lack of valleys and plains, the latter was distinguished by gentler slopes; smaller hills; and deeper, more fertile soils.[96] These distinctions have also been depicted on a map previously commissioned by Jan Baptist Vrients in 1601 (see Figure 2), in which regional topographical variation between the north and western areas, and the south and east may be discerned by way of the quantity and spread

---

[93] Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles*, Vol. I, p. 183.
[94] Ibid.
[95] M. Overton, *Agricultural Revolution in England: The transformation of the agrarian economy 1500-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 57, 62; Thirsk, 'Farming Regions of England', p. 2. See also D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 183-207 for a discussion of the impact of geography and agriculture on political allegiance within the context of the English Civil War.
[96] Thirsk, 'Farming Regions of England', p. 2.

of hill emblems which covered the former regions in comparison with the latter. Crucially, though, Thirsk has maintained that even as these highland and lowland distinctions are useful for purposes of generalisation, it is necessary to take into account the significance of variation in both the composition and quality of English soils over very short distances.[97] Not only did this differentiation ensure that the complexion of many of the smaller farming regions would contrast with the lands around them, but also that division between borderlands was much less predictable, particularly around the Midland areas.[98]

Figure 2: J. B. Vrients, 'Angliae et Hiberniae Accurata Descriptio Veteribus et Recentioribus Nominbus Illustratus Et Ad D. Guilel. Camden Britaniam Accomodata …', https://www.raremaps.com/gallery/detail/63757/english-edition-angliae-et-hiberniae-accurata-descriptio-ortelius-vrients?q=0, accessed on: 15/8/19 (Antwerp: 1606).

Thus, given the relative complexity of both the climatic and topographical conditions of England throughout the early modern period, the emergence of a mixed farming culture was

[97] Thirsk, *England's Agricultural Regions and Agrarian History*, pp. 12-13.
[98] Ibid.

ultimately inevitable. English farmers could, and did, take action to try to adjust or 'improve' upon the lands they inhabited, but, as Thirsk has correctly pointed out, these environmental circumstances did impose strict limitations upon the physical potential of the landscape throughout the entire realm with respect to agriculture.[99]

Animal Husbandry

Though English commentators routinely boasted of the 'superiority' and 'civility' of their predominantly tillage-based agricultural economy, John Fitzherbert explained that the 'mooste generall lyuynge that husbandes can haue, is by plowynge and sowyng of theyr cornes, and rerynge or bredynge of theyr cattel, and not the one withoute the other'.[100] Fitzherbert's analysis was quite contradictory to the classical theory of 'civilised' human development touted by commentators like Gerald of Wales throughout the twelfth and subsequent centuries, in which human beings were expected to progress from a pastoral lifestyle in the woods and forests, to that of ploughing and cultivation in the fields, before finally settling into urban towns and cities.[101] Evidently, however, the early modern perception of the development of human 'civilisation' was both linear and, for the most part, inflexible, in contrast to the lived experiences of the inhabitants of both Ireland and England, whose farming methodologies were profoundly mixed in nature. Thus, in spite of the dominant contemporary English perspective that animal husbandry was a symptom of both

[99] Thirsk, 'Farming Regions of England', p. 2. See also Pluymers, 'Taming the Wilderness', pp. 611-612 for Pluymers' discussion of English landed 'improvement' within the colonial contexts of Ireland and the Americas.
[100] J. Fitzherbert, *The Boke of Husbandry* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1548), p. 1.
[101] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 101-102; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, p. 243. A similar, more developed, theory of 'Stadial Development' would later become significant during the eighteenth-century Enlightenment period under Adam Smith; see A. Smith, *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (New York: P. F. Collier & Son Corporation, 1909).

idleness and relative ‘primitivity’, English farmers were, themselves, inevitably engaged in the rearing of livestock, albeit in more of a supplementary capacity.[102]

In the north and west regions of England, where the soil was notably less fertile by arable standards, there was a much greater emphasis on cattle and sheep farming. In regions like the Fenlands, Northumberland, and Devon, the tradition of open or common pasture farming was vital for the rearing of livestock among non-elite communities: in fact, the right of common pasture allowed several farmers, normally from the same township, to graze a specified number of animals upon particular wastes, pastures, and, following the conclusion of the harvest season, arable and meadow lands in the manner of communal farming, thereby improving upon the economic prospects within those communities.[103] Animal husbandry, however, was not exclusively confined within the north and western regions of England, since irregularity of land use was both common and widespread. For example, as part of his extensive account, English poet and antiquary John Leland passed through ‘Ratesburgh, otherwyse Richeboro’ in the area of Kent, and described how ‘Corne groweth on the hille yn mervelus plenty’, which would have been fairly typical within such a southernly region.[104] However, as Leland advanced into the town of Romney, he observed that it was ‘a mervelus rank grownd for fedyng of catel, by the reason that the gresse groweth so plentefully apon the wose sumtyme cast up ther by the se’.[105] Towards the end of the sixteenth century, Camden also explained that the inland inhabitants of Kent ‘for the most part sow no corne, but live of milke and flesh’, and — rather than condemning those residents for their ‘lazy’ and ‘barbarous’ consumption of dairy and meat, as was common practice among English

[102] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 89-91.
[103] D. C. Coleman, *The Economy of England 1450-1750* (London: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 33; J. Thirsk, *The Rural Economy of England* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984), pp. 35-36.
[104] J. Leland, *The Itinerary of John Leland in or About the Years 1535-1543 Parts VII and VIII* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1909), pp. 61-62.
[105] Ibid, p. 67; note — ‘wose’ in this context is likely to mean either ‘seaweed’ or ‘sea foam’.

observers of Gaelic Ireland — Camden described this population as the 'most civill and curteous by far'.[106]

Donald Coleman has discussed the relative prosperity of pasture farming, whether for dairying purposes or for stock-fattening, in areas like the north of Essex, the south of Suffolk, and the Wealds of Kent, and has explained that the dense woodland and heavier clay soils which tended to characterise those regions were more keenly suited to grass-growing, which was, in turn, excellent for the grazing of livestock necessary to sustain the growing population of the city of London.[107] Thus, even among humble peasant farmers located in the Wealds of Kent or Sussex, it would have been customary to retain a herd of around sixteen cattle, and perhaps twice that of sheep, for dairying, cheese-making, and wool-gathering purposes.[108] Furthermore, it is important to note that only around one third of the lands in the Weald of Kent were suitable for arable farming, while the other two thirds were lain under grass, and so there were very few alternatives for subsistence farmers than to devote their efforts to stock raising, barring the small-scale cultivation of more resilient crops like oats, albeit in a supplementary capacity.[109] As Thirsk has explained, dairying, more than any other agricultural pursuit, was simply more consistent with the lifestyle and social status of these subsistence labourers.[110] Without adequate resources, like those of the agriculturalists of the yeomanry and gentry, to tide over their families until stock could be fattened for slaughter, or the ability to undertake full-scale ploughing and cultivation, as was the endeavour of the wealthier farming population who possessed of large acreages and sizeable workforces, peasant farmers could essentially survive on dairying.[111] With the co-operation and co-

[106] Camden, *Britain*, p. 29.
[107] Coleman, *The Economy of England*, pp. 32-34.
[108] Thirsk, 'Farming Regions of England', p. 58.
[109] Ibid.
[110] Thirsk, *England's Agricultural Regions and Agrarian History*, pp. 15-16.
[111] Ibid.

ordination of labour among subsistence communities, farmers could manage their flocks and herds while gathering regular returns from their production of cheese and butter, essential for the provision of their dependants.[112] Unsurprisingly, this method of common farming was dependent upon the same spirit of co-operation and freedom of pasture which characterised Gaelic booleying, though English commentators rarely sought to apply the principles of their anti-Irish rhetoric, including those which encompassed the 'primitivity' of pastoralism and the 'idle' nature of animal husbandry, to the customs of the 'civilised' inhabitants of their own realm. With around eighty per cent of the English population engaged, to some extent, in subsistence farming around the beginning of the sixteenth century, it is impossible to discount the necessity of animal husbandry for the majority of the English inhabitants, which ultimately suggested that English 'civilisation', irrespective of the impressions widely extolled by their contemporaries, depended as much upon the shepherd as it did the ploughman.[113]

Indeed, the significance of animal husbandry as part of the overall arrangement of early modern English agriculture may also be inferred within the emergent body of sixteenth century literature dedicated to the development and 'improvement' of husbandry, beginning with *The Boke of Husbandry* (1523) by Fitzherbert before being expanded by authors like Thomas Tusser, Leonard Mascall, and Gervase Markham. Andrew McRae has discussed the invention and advancement of works like those of Fitzherbert, outlining that such manuals were designed to appeal, specifically, to the wealthier agricultural elite, whose financial prosperity and sizeable estates enabled them to shoulder the economic risks and burdens

[112] Ibid.
[113] Overton, *Agricultural Revolution in England*, p. 22. See also V. D. Anderson, *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 75-105 for her discussion of the importance of livestock, and cattle in particular, for English colonists in the Americas.

inevitably associated with the undertaking of agricultural 'improvement'.[114] As such, these handbooks effectively set out to establish the most lucrative and efficient methods of farming, including of animal husbandry, from the employment of farm animals for labouring purposes, to the rearing and maintenance of different varieties of livestock. For example, Fitzherbert explained to his readers that, 'in some places, an oxe ploughe is better than a horse plough, and in somme places, a horse ploughe is better', but also insisted that,

> in euery place, where as the husband hath seueral pastures, to put his oxen in, whan they come fro theyr warke, there the oxe ploughe is better … And where as is noo seuerall pastures, there the horse plowe is better, for the horses may be teddered or tyed vpon leys [pasture-grounds], balkes [lands divided in an open field], or hades [strips of greensward], where as oxen maye not be kept.[115]

Fitzherbert also discussed which kinds of 'cattell shulde go to gether in one pasture', since he maintained that 'B[e]astes [cows] alone, nor horses aloone, nor shepe alone, excepte it be shepe vppon a verye hyghe grounde, wyll not eate a pasture euen'.[116] As such, he recommended that 'horses and beastes wyll agree well in oone pasture, for there is some maner of grasse, that or horse wyll eate, and the beast wyl not eate', advice upheld within subsequent husbandry manuals like Mascall's *First Booke of Cattell* (1587).[117]

While many of these contemporary handbooks were also substantially comprised of guidance and instruction pertaining to the endeavour of ploughing and cultivation, their

---

[114] A. McRae, *God speed the plough: The representation of agrarian England, 1500-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 138.
[115] Fitzherbert, *Boke of Husbandry*, p. 40.
[116] Ibid, pp. 42-43.
[117] Ibid; L. Mascall, *The First Booke of Cattell* (London: John Wolfe, 1587), pp. 69-70.

pronounced expertise in relation to the care and maintenance of livestock was particularly significant, given both the magnitude and intensity of English anti-Irish rhetoric which was specifically related to the dependence of the Gaelic population upon pastoral farming, and cattle more generally. Evidently, livestock did not simply constitute valuable living implements for the undertaking of arable farming, but were in fact a necessity for the vast majority of the English farming population, whether peasant or proprietor. Thus, commentaries which sought to portray the English realm as a paragon for the development of human 'civilisation', in which animal husbandry had become all but obsolete, were no less exaggerated than those which characterised the Irish as a 'barbarous', 'uncivilised', nomadic population. English commentaries, then, served a dual purpose: firstly, to establish the 'superiority' of the English in contrast with their 'inferior' Irish neighbours, whose misuse of the landscape was presented as a symptom of their 'primitive' and underdeveloped society, and secondly, to provide substantiation for their position at the apex of the imagined scale of human 'civilisation', particularly in comparison with other countries outwith the range of English dominion and authority, like Ireland.

Tillage and Cultivation

In spite of the clear indication of the practice of animal husbandry across the English landscape, the social, cultural, and economic circumstances of the early modern period effectively demanded that, even on the poorest of soils, farmers would endeavour to carve out at least one or two acres of scrub in order to reap the future benefits of its 'improvement'[118] In fact, though English land units tended to be defined in relation to their physical size, usually in acreages, their value could also be determined based upon the quality of their soils

[118] Thirsk, 'Farming Regions of England', p. 2.

for the purposes of cultivation. For example, 'low' marshes were typically valued at around a half penny per acre, since these lands could become fairly productive once they were dried out, while the 'high' marshes could sell for anything between two to six pennies per acre, largely based upon the quality of the grasses they could produce.[119] Furthermore, following a rapid increase in the English population — from around two million at the turn of the sixteenth century, to around five million by 1660, up to an approximate seven million at the beginning of the eighteenth century — the incentive towards cultivation was arguably more important than ever before.[120] English resources had become distressed between 1500 to the mid-seventeenth century, causing the prices of even basic commodities and foodstuffs to soar, which, in turn, created a much higher demand for the production of grain throughout the realm in order to meet the ever-increasing demand for food, forcing even the poorest of farmers to try to adjust their outputs.[121] Fagan has described how changes in both the climatic and environmental circumstances of early modern England prompted farmers to begin to experiment with new agricultural methodologies in order to try to combat the extremities of heat, cold, and rainfall which had become all too familiar throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[122] According to Thirsk, whatever physical constraints acted upon the farming potential of the English landscape, they were ultimately overridden by the overwhelming nature of human needs, more so given the weight of both the biblical and classical beliefs which established the subservience of the natural realm in relation to the interests of mankind.[123]

---

[119] J. Thirsk, *English Peasant Farming: The Agrarian History of Lincolnshire from Tudor to Recent Times* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd, 1957), p. 17.
[120] McRae, *God speed the plough*, pp. 12-13; Fagan, *The Little Ice Age*, p. 108.
[121] McRae, *God speed the plough*, pp. 12-13.
[122] Fagan, *The Little Ice Age*, p. 106.
[123] Thirsk, *England's Agricultural Regions and Agrarian History*, p. 15; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, pp. 17-25.

Attributable to the endurance of continental European culture spread by both the Romans and the Anglo-Saxons, early modern England was characterised, predominantly, by a tillage-based agricultural economy, within which the most common arable crops were wheat, rye, barley, oats, peas, and beans, though vetches, buckwheat, lentils, and tares could also be sown in particular areas.[124] Not only did the harvest of crops like wheat and barley require careful year-round planning and intensive human labour, but both were also highly esteemed for their versatile nature, and could be used for baking bread, malting, and fattening livestock.[125] Wheat, in particular, was considered to be a staple of human 'civilisation', and could be traced to the Roman goddess Ceres, who invented the plough in order to teach mankind how to sow wheat, whilst simultaneously taming their oxen, thus elevating their status to that of 'honest civility'.[126] As for the approximation of English yields, Holinshed estimated that,

> … each acre of rie or wheat, well tilled and dressed, will yeeld commonlie sixteene or twentie bushels, an acre of barlie six and thirtie bushels [a bushel is roughly equivalent to a dry 8 gallons], of otes and such like foure or fiue quarters [a quarter is roughly equivalent to a quarter of a gallon] … Of mixed corne, as peason [peas] and beans, sowen together, tares and otes (which they call bulmong) rie and wheat named miscelin hereis no place to speake, yet their yeeld is neuerthelesse much after this proportion, as I haue often marked.[127]

---

[124] Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, p. 14.
[125] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 186; Thirsk, *English Peasant Farming*, pp. 39-77; Thirsk, 'Farming Techniques', pp. 168-171.
[126] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 185.
[127] Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles*, Vol. I, p. 185.

While regional climatic and topographical variations tended to impact upon either the prevalence or scarcity of each of these crops on a local level, Samuel Hartlib, writing almost an entire century after Holinshed, insisted that for 'the Advancement of Husbandry. In the choice of seed-corn, prefer that wheat which is most weighty, as being more masculine and fitter for generation then the lighter graines', and also explained that, '[i]n the production of plants, the earth is considered as a female, whose sterility may be much helped by the extraordinary melioration of the seed'.[128] Indeed, both species of wheat — rivet wheat and bread wheat — were cultivated in England throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: while the former produced a rather mealy flour commonly utilised for making things like biscuits, the cultivation and application of the latter was arguably more significant, and produced a strong flour which was essential for bread-making and brewing.[129] In fact, throughout this period, wheaten bread was still considered to be something of a luxury, and farmers who possessed less than eight pounds worth of personal property were not typically in a favourable position to be able to keep any wheat in store whatsoever.[130] Instead, these farmers tended to focus on the cultivation of rye or barley for bread-making to sustain their dietary needs, as was evidenced by a complaint forwarded to the king in 1623 which condemned the waste of barley 'by the false making of malt', which had reportedly resulted in 'dearth to make bread' for 'thousands of poor people'[131] Barley even became commonly known as 'the countryman's tillage', because it could be cultivated upon less fertile soils in common fields.[132] Oats were also possessed of a similar versatility in that they could be easily cultivated for various purposes of sustenance, from simple oat cakes or oat bread; to

[128] S. Hartlib, *A Discoverie For Division or Setting out of Land, as to the best Form* (London: Richard Wodenothe, 1653), p. 22.
[129] Thirsk, 'Farming Techniques', p. 168.
[130] Thirsk, *English Peasant Farming*, pp. 40-41.
[131] Ibid; '— to the King', in M. A. E. Green (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I., Addenda, 1580–1625* (London: Longman & Co., 1872), pp. 651-652.
[132] Thirsk, 'Farming Techniques', p. 170.

gertbrew, washbrew, gruel, pottage or hasty pudding; to additional feed for livestock.[133] Certainly, Markham explained that horses could be fed 'well without Hay' by chopping 'half a Peck of Straw … and mingle a handful of Oats amongst it', and by adding 'Pease in the Straw', which would have amounted to a 'most hearty Food', great for 'cleansing the Stomach'.[134] Beans could also be mixed with oats, as was common practice in the regions of Kent and Hertfordshire where this combination was provided to 'Horses with Chaff or cut Straw, and they thereby eat up all and thrive exceedingly'.[135]

While England's diverse range of arable produce may have been typical for their lowland European culture and economy, and was undoubtedly quite contrary to that of Ireland's Atlantic disposition, the similarities between their arable farming preferences must not be neglected. Evidently, the English agricultural population was no less constrained by their social, cultural, economic, and environmental conditions than the Irish, since the relative privilege of agricultural flexibility and the undertaking of landed 'improvement' was reserved for the land-owning nobility.[136] Thus, the idealisation of English 'civilisation', seemingly earned via the cultivation and human triumph over the land itself, was a fantasy of the elite.

Although the growing season generally commenced around May within the Irish realm, Sir Thomas Roe's allegorical postulation that 'it is the plough from which the hand ought not to be withdrawn' was particularly apt to describe the continuous cultivation and conservation of English fields, in accordance with the extensive tillage-based operations of

[133] Ibid, p. 171.
[134] G. Markham, *The compleat husbandman and gentleman's recreation: or, the whole art of husbandry* (London: the Gold Ring, 1707), pp. 2-3.
[135] Ibid, p. 3.
[136] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 149.

the English agricultural population.[137] Much like the Irish with their cattle, English farmers were duty-bound by the intensive, year-round labour requirements of their grain-growing economy which — unlike the reputedly 'primitive', 'idle' nature of Irish pastoralism — was upheld as a foundation for human 'civilisation'.[138] For example, Fitzherbert explained that '[i]n the begynnynge of the yere, after the feast of the Epiphany, it is tyme for a husbande to go to the ploughe', and, though some husbandmen would 'begyn to sowe pees soone after Christmasse', he advised that peas would generally be sown 'sone after Candelmasse … ere the begynnynge of Marche'.[139] He then went on to explain that 'Marche is tyme to sowe otes', and indicated that barley could also be sown 'if a drye season come before Candelmasse', or alternatively any time 'before Apryll'.[140] Finally, he declared that the 'tyme to sowe bothe wheate and rye' would coincide with the period of 'Myghelmasse'.[141] Not only did the cultivation of each individual crop then require particular labour throughout the year, but each also required a significant level of planning and preparation in order to maximise the success of their harvest, including processes of manuring, ploughing, harrowing, reaping, and mowing, all of which could also vary in relation to the type of crop being sown. For example, gravelly or flinty soil tended to require the use of a double-wheeled plough drawn by oxen or horses, as was common in areas like the North Downs and Hertfordshire, while lighter soils, like those of the brecklands in Norfolk, favoured the use of a shorter, neater one-wheeled plough designed to be towed by a single horse.[142] The plough generally employed among lower peasantry farmers was called the plain plough: constructed without a foot or wheel, this was the simplest of English ploughs and could function adequately under the majority of

[137] '[Sir Thomas Roe] to Sec. Windebank', in J. Bruce (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I. 1633–1634* (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1863), p. 403.
[138] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility,* p. 186.
[139] Fitzherbert, *Boke of Husbandry*, pp. 7-10.
[140] Ibid, pp. 10-12.
[141] Ibid, pp. 24-25.
[142] Thirsk, 'Farming Techniques', p. 164.

topographical conditions, but was particularly adept upon hilly, uneven grounds.[143] In accordance with Overton's assessment of the range of agricultural implements utilised by the early modern English tillage farmer, the diversification of ploughing equipment was undoubtedly symptomatic of a larger trend towards specialisation in English agricultural endeavours, and was indicative of their arable expertise.[144] In addition, Fagan has maintained that agricultural experimentation and innovation allowed English farmers to adapt more easily to the cooler climate of the seventeenth century, and eventually allowed for intensive crop production and diversification which, generally speaking, safeguarded the English population against the previously catastrophic effects of poor grain harvests.[145] Clearly, the proficiency with which the Irish could undertake their pastoral endeavours was paralleled by a similar arable expertise within the English setting, but, from an English perspective, the latter was far more substantive in relation to the advancement of 'civility' and 'civilisation'.

Further developments in arable farming were also manifest in the advancement of English field systems. Traditionally, the English landscape had been characterised by the endurance of the common, or open, field system for the majority of the medieval period, which consisted of four main elements. Both arable and meadow lands would be divided into strips among cultivators who were then allowed to occupy a number of strips scattered among those fields.[146] Following the completion of the harvest, and during the fallow seasons, the arable and meadow lands would be opened up in order to allow for the common pasturage of the livestock of the peasantry.[147] Next, land held in common and waste lands would be given over to the cultivators of the strips for the purpose of stock grazing, and to

[143] Ibid.
[144] Overton, *Agricultural Revolution in England*, p. 12.
[145] Fagan, *The Little Ice Age*, p. 108.
[146] Thirsk, *Rural Economy of England*, pp. 35-36.
[147] Ibid.

allow for the collection of valuable commodities like peat and timber.[148] The order of these activities would be moderated by an assembly of the cultivators themselves, known as the manorial court, or, in the event that there was more than one manor within a single township, during a village meeting.[149] Thirsk has identified that these four elements — though fundamental to the existence of the common-field system throughout the Middle Ages — by the beginning of the sixteenth century tended only to exist in part, and has further determined that it was the right to common grazing upon pastures and wastes which predominantly endured above all else throughout the early modern period.[150] Brian Outhwaite has discussed the impact of the increase in the English population from around the beginning of the sixteenth century upon the organisation of the common-field system, and suggested that the increasing demand for cultivation on both marginal and waste lands throughout this period simultaneously constrained the potential for pasturage and produced more intensive crop rotations to maximise yields.[151] Accordingly, English cultivators subsequently tended towards the adoption of the two-field and, more so, the three-field systems, rotating between winter corn and spring corn before allowing the land to rest only for around one year in fallow under grass.[152] The emergence of the English enclosure movement and the larger drive for agricultural 'improvement' — both of which are explored in greater depth in relation to the execution and reportage of the rebellion of 1641 in the following chapter — was also largely representative of the increasing struggle between the contemporary demands of capitalist agriculture, necessary for the advancement of human 'civilisation', and the traditional character of a peasant farm, organised in relation to the object of subsistence.[153]

---

[148] Ibid.
[149] Ibid.
[150] Ibid.
[151] R. B. Outhwaite, 'Progress and Backwardness in English Agriculture, 1500-1650', *Economic History Review*, 39:1 (1986), p. 5.
[152] Thirsk, *Rural Economy of England*, p. 31.
[153] J. A. Sharpe, *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550-1760* (London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd, 1987), p. 134.

While the respective landscapes of Gaelic Ireland and early modern England were undoubtedly divergent from one another in many respects, this discussion has ultimately endeavoured to explore their commonalities as well as their disparities. Indeed, the endurance of Ireland's Atlantic heritage, characterised by a predominantly pastoral agricultural tradition and a kin-based social structure, both perplexed and perturbed their English neighbours, whose continental European conquerors had previously instilled within them the importance of ploughing and cultivation in order to advance human 'civility', on both an individual and collective basis. However — having considered the impact of their respective climatic, topographical, social, political, cultural, and economic circumstances upon the use and organisation of their landscapes — it has become clear that the inhabitants of early modern Ireland and England were both supported and constrained by the realities of their natural environments. As Pluymers has argued, nature and culture cannot exist separately from one another.[154] Farming in both domains was justifiably mixed, and varied between localities, in response to both social and environmental conditions. Thus, so much as English commentators sought to weaponise the idea of their own apparent 'civility' and 'civilisation' against the relative 'barbarism' and 'primitivity' of the Irish, by way of the discussion and representation of their agricultural expertise and landed development in contrast with that of the Gaelic population, the reality of their existence was far more ambiguous. Crucially, though, these propagandist accounts were undoubtedly responsible for the negative idealisation of Gaelic Ireland which formed the basis of much of the contemporary English anti-Irish rhetoric which endured throughout the early modern period, even up until the outbreak of rebellion in 1641. If Ireland could be portrayed as a domain in which the inhabitants were 'wild' and 'lazy', roaming around without purpose and neglecting the

[154] Pluymers, 'Taming the Wilderness', p. 626.

physical landscape, then the English plans for the conquest, colonisation, and reorganisation of Ireland would not only be seen as just, but as a necessary duty for their 'civilisation'. Accordingly, in order to examine the Irish rebellion of 1641 from both Irish and English perspectives, it is imperative to consider the long-term implications of the prejudicial English construction of Ireland and the Irish, both in a practical and ideological sense.

Enclosures, 'Improvement', and the Landscape of the 1641 Irish Rebellion

Having explored the contemporary construction of the landscapes of England and Ireland, as well as the representation of the English and Irish, in relation to the development of English frameworks of 'civility' and 'civilisation' throughout the early modern period, it is now possible to consider those implications within the context of the 1641 rebellion, specifically in relation to the use and control of the physical landscape and the development of anti-Irish rhetoric. Gathered in the aftermath of the Irish rebellion, the body of eyewitness testimonies known as the 1641 depositions are predominantly comprised of reports given by English and Protestant settlers of their experiences as victims of the conflict, but their contents far surpass that of the documentation of violence and destruction. Rather, the depositions constitute a unique source of the representation of the Irish landscape and its inhabitants following the expansion of the English policy of plantation during the four decades prior to the outbreak of rebellion in 1641, and have been commended by numerous historians for their utility and insight.

As part of her research on the Irish experience of civil war among the three Stuart kingdoms, Jane Ohlmeyer has discussed the value of the depositions, highlighting that these testimonies have not only provided more detailed, individual accounts of the events of the rebellion and the background to the conflict, but have significantly informed the current understanding of the political, economic, cultural, religious, and social contexts of Scotland,

England, and Ireland during the mid-seventeenth century.[1] In particular, Ohlmeyer has called attention to the rich evidence of the contemporary material culture of Ireland contained within the depositions, and has suggested that these details may lead to a greater understanding of numerous aspects of both settler and Irish culture at this time, from patterns of settlement exhibited by the English and Protestant newcomers, to the organisation of urban settlements.[2] Nicholas Canny has also painstakingly examined the original depositions, and discussed their importance in reference to the existing scholarship on Ireland and Anglo-Irish relations throughout the early modern period. The most common criticism of Irish historiography, and that which has focused specifically on the incessant competition between the Gaelic, Old English Catholic, and Protestant-settler communities over landownership and political authority in Ireland, is that it has been dominated by histories of the social and political elite.[3] As such, Canny has suggested that the depositions possess the potential to establish an alternative line of historical enquiry, created and based upon the experiences of non-elite individuals whose realities have been largely overlooked within mainstream historiography, and has encouraged historians to test the value of the depositions for themselves in order to unearth the 'riches' of their contents.[4]

Based upon arguments like those of Ohlmeyer and Canny, this thesis argues that any meaningful investigation of the 1641 rebellion would necessitate a closer examination of the depositions themselves, albeit alongside other contemporary sources and accounts, as a foundation from which to examine the English conquest and 'civilisation' of Ireland and its

[1] J. Ohlmeyer, 'The Civil Wars in Ireland', in J. Kenyon, J. Ohlmeyer, and J. Morrill (eds.), *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 74-75; J. Ohlmeyer, 'Anatomy of Plantation: the 1641 Depositions', *History Ireland*, 17:6 (2009), pp. 54-55.
[2] Ibid.
[3] N. Canny, 'The 1641 Depositions: A Source for Social & Cultural History', *History Ireland*, 1:4 (1993), pp. 52-53.
[4] Ibid, pp. 53-55; though Canny has discussed the depositions in relation to the experiences of 'individuals of relatively modest circumstances', the present investigation has simply employed the term 'non-elite'.

inhabitants, both upon and as part of the physical landscape. By employing the depositions as a foundation from which to examine the organisation, execution, and reportage of the Irish rebellion, this investigation will consider the perspectives of the non-elite, first, in order to relate their experiences of the conflict to the endurance and development of larger contemporary Anglo-Irish concerns with 'civility', 'civilisation', 'barbarism', and the use and control of the Irish landscape. The following discussion aims to establish the value of the depositions in relation to the understanding of agricultural organisation and development in Ireland during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but with a particular focus on the fundamental importance of agriculture and the landscape on both sides involved in the rebellion and within wider Anglo-Irish contexts.

1641: The Depositions in Context

The rebellion itself began during the evening of 22 October 1641 in the province of Ulster, primarily under the leadership of Sir Phelim O'Neill and Rory O'More, two prominent members of the 'deserving' Irish elite. By six o'clock in the evening, the rebels had successfully captured the town of Dungannon, quickly followed by other strongholds at Newry, Charlemont Fort, Tandragee, and Mountjoy Castle. Although the rebels had originally planned their revolt around the seizure of Dublin Castle and the commandeering of its battery, the plot was leaked to the Dublin authorities by Owen O'Connolly, brother to another conspirator Hugh MacMahon, and they were able to halt the rebel advance, imprisoning some of the insurgents in the process. Nevertheless, by 24 October Viscount Montgomery had written to the king to declare that 'the Irish in diverse parts of this Province of Ulster are risen up in arms, and … they have seized upon several towns, defeate some of the garrisons … and

… are marching on to make spoil of the rest of the country'.[5] Though the rebellion had initially begun as a coordinated, strategic attempt by the disaffected Catholic Irish nobility to obtain crucial landed and religious concessions from the English crown, elite conspirators like O'Neill and Maguire remained ignorant as to the grievances and hostilities of the non-elite Irish population and, as a result, were unable to contain the subsequent insurrection.[6] Whether aggrieved by their experiences of displacement, dispossession, impoverishment, martial law, or cultural and religious oppression, the non-elite Catholic and Irish population became emboldened on an individual and collective basis, seizing the opportunity to settle their own grievances with the intrusive English colonial regime. Even the Catholic Old English lords, who had initially professed their loyalty to the crown in the wake of the uprising, eventually found themselves in league with the northern rebels and, by 28 October, Archibald Stewart had written to the king to solemnly declare that '[a]ll the rebellion of which your Majesty has heard is merely the forerunner of a vast rising', the consequences of which would radically impact the course of Anglo-Irish history for generations to come.[7]

In response to the escalation of the conflict, the crown created the Commission for the Despoiled Subject in December 1641, dispatching eight clergymen to Dublin with the responsibility of collecting eyewitness testimonies from the Protestant refugees who had fled the violence. As the scale and force of the rebellion became more apparent to the authorities, an additional sub-commissioner was then appointed to gather victim statements from the settlers in the region of Munster with the help of local commissioners, but the Commission for the Despoiled Subject as a whole would continue their work throughout the majority of the 1640s. During the 1650s, another group of more than seventy commissioners were sent

---

[5] 'Viscount Montgomery of the Ards to the King', in R. P. Mahaffy (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland of the Reign of Charles I. 1633–1647* (London: the 'Norfolk Chronicle' Company, 1901), p. 341.
[6] N. Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 469-473.
[7] 'Viscount Montgomery of the Ards to the King', p. 344.

out across the country, comprised largely of local officials and military officers, to aid the high courts in their pursuit of justice for those devastated by the rebellion, gathering evidence against those accused of crimes involving murder or massacre. These efforts would culminate in the total collection of around 8,000 depositions, examinations, and related materials, all of which comprise the original thirty one volumes of the 1641 depositions held within the Manuscripts and Archives Research Library of Trinity College Dublin.

Given the constraints of time and resources, to undertake an examination of the depositions in their entirety remained outwith the scope of the present research. Accordingly, a sample of the depositions were selected as a foundation from which to conduct a preliminary investigation. Initially, the sample was based upon all of the available depositions from the two counties of Dublin and Limerick. While Dublin effectively represented the epicentre of English control and authority in Ireland, and had done for centuries — known as 'the royal city of Ireland, its most notable mart and chief seat of justice, defended with strong walls, adorned with beautiful buildings and well peopled with inhabitants' — Limerick existed in contrast.[8] Like Dublin, Limerick was considered as an important city in Ireland, and was the second or third largest around the beginning of the sixteenth century, but it had fallen into economic decline as a result of previous Anglo-Irish conflicts during the Desmond Rebellions and the Nine Years' War.[9] Indeed, situated within what English commentators had traditionally regarded as the 'wild' province of Munster, Limerick was closely associated with the contemporary English topographical perception of Munster as that of a 'refuge' for Irish rebels and outlaws.[10] Featuring extensive areas of mountains, boglands, and woods,

[8] R. A. Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 158.
[9] Ibid, p. 159.
[10] Ibid, pp. 142-145; J. Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland: Medieval and Early-Modern Patterns in the Demarcation of Civility', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 56:1 (1995), p. 33.

Irish military forces often used the terrain to their advantage during the regular episodes of English encroachment throughout the Elizabethan era, as English colonists repeatedly tried and failed to successfully plant and subdue the region.[11] Even the Old English descendants who were located throughout the province of Munster had largely assimilated with the Gaelic population, much to the dismay of their blood relatives across the Irish Sea.[12] Furthermore, unlike the eastern geographical location of Dublin and its relative proximity to England, Limerick also constituted a significant strategic concern for the authorities of the crown within a larger European context: located in the south-west of Ireland along the Shannon estuary, the position of Limerick was a constant source of anxiety for the English crown who feared the legitimate possibility of a Spanish incursion from the province of Munster.[13] By sampling depositions from both of these counties, the subsequent discussion is comprised of an appreciation of the potentially varying regional experiences of the conflict across the country. All of the depositions from Dublin and Limerick were then filtered to include only those which pertained to the crime of robbery, allowing for a greater analysis of the landed, material culture of the rebellion, from the theft of corn and cattle, to the appropriation of lands and estates.

Crucially, however, it is also necessary to acknowledge the limitations associated with the selection of such a sample: for example, apart from Limerick and Dublin, there are thirty other counties accessible via the 1641 Depositions Online Digital Archive which contain hundreds of depositions that remain outwith the scope of the following investigation. By focusing upon the regions of Dublin and Limerick specifically, many of the following

[11] Ibid; even the mountainous regions which existed around the area of Dublin were referenced by the authorities of the Pale as those of the 'Irish mountains', which were believed to conceal 'mountain rebels' who represented a threat to the English Pale and its 'civilised' inhabitants.
[12] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 148.
[13] N. Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), p. 578.

observations are based upon the experiences of individuals in particular localities, though more comprehensive accounts of the rebellion in 1641 have also been incorporated in order to compare those testimonies with those of individuals. Having established these research parameters, the total number of depositions which remained and were reviewed for the counties of Limerick and Dublin were 161 and 251 respectively, though only 246 of these records for Dublin appear to be accessible through Trinity College Dublin's online archive.[14] Hence, the following investigation is based upon the examination of 407 depositions in total. This discussion primarily constitutes a qualitative analysis, based upon the close examination and interpretation of individual depositions, in order to evaluate the importance of their contents in relation to wider Anglo-Irish concerns with land use and misuse, and 'civility' and 'civilisation', within the context of the 1641 rebellion.

Preliminary Observations From Limerick to Dublin

Before a more detailed examination of the contents of the depositions can be undertaken, it is important to contextualise the experiences of the 1641 rebellion within the respective counties of Dublin and Limerick in comparison with many of the other Irish counties. Seeking to create a 'cultural geography' of the 1641 rebellion, William Smyth has identified three regions within which the bulk of the destruction, devastation, and displacement associated with the Irish conflict primarily took place, two of which, crucially, comprised the majority of the counties of both Limerick and Dublin.[15] Though the present investigation is focused, primarily, upon those depositions which pertained to the crime of robbery, by comparing these specific samples with those filtered by a similar methodology from the other

[14] There does not appear to be any particular explanation for the difference in the number of depositions listed, and those which are actually accessible, for Dublin. This may simply be the result of human error, or an algorithmic miscalculation.

[15] W. J. Smyth, 'Towards a Cultural Geography of the 1641 Rising/Rebellion', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 72.

Irish counties, Smyth's assertions are sustained. Not only did Dublin and Limerick each fall within the top ten of those counties which reported the crime of robbery, but both also returned more than the average number of robbery cases confirmed across the entire country, by thirty-six and 126 respectively. Both counties, therefore, experienced the severity of the 1641 rebellion and, as such, are likely to reflect upon some of the more significant examples of violence and destruction, offering additional insight into the Catholic Irish campaign of resistance and the radical impetuses of rebellion.

It is also useful to consider the individual experiences of the counties of Dublin and Limerick in relation to the conflict: while the sample of depositions taken from Dublin yielded an overall loss in material assets to the approximate total value of £176,411 10*s.* 9*d.*, those taken into consideration from Limerick returned a notably lesser total of approximately £128,751 13*s.* 7*d.* Taking into account that Dublin was possessed of an additional eighty-five depositions in comparison with Limerick, it is more reasonable to compare the total average losses of both counties in order to obtain a more accurate impression of their material damages. Thus, Dublin's total average losses per deposition from this particular sample amounted to an approximate £694, calculated to the nearest pound, while Limerick's total average was estimated to be around £800 — a notable margin of difference, which could potentially reflect upon a more comprehensive campaign of destruction within the region of Limerick, or perhaps greater success in halting the Irish advance within the area of Dublin. Nevertheless, both Limerick and Dublin undoubtedly endured the intensity of the Catholic Irish campaign of destruction.

Having considered the regional contexts of the rebellion within the counties of Dublin and Limerick, the scope of the contents of their depositions, as well as the format in which

most were documented, can now be examined. Therefore, the deposition of one Simon Colston from County Limerick will be taken as an exemplar through which the majority of these details can be considered. Colston's deposition begins with a statement which recorded his name, his place of residence, and his profession, as well as the fact that he was a British Protestant and that his testimony was acquired legally under oath: 'Symon Colston late of the towne & parish of Loughall ~~barony of Connelly &~~ within the County of Limericke yeoman (~~a brittish protestant) duely sworne & examined by vertue of &c~~ deposeth and saith…'.[16] From this opening statement alone, useful information about the economic status of the deponent can be obtained: for example, by taking into account the occupation of the claimant, it can be inferred that Colston was clearly an individual of relatively average means, owing to his modest position among the yeomanry. Additionally, further indications about the localised spread and circumstances of rebellion can be acquired from the dwelling place of the deponent and the reported location of their criminal complaint which, in this case, was the parish of Loughall in the barony of Connelly. This particular deposition also confirmed Colston's status as a member of Ireland's settler population, as he was legally identified as a 'brittish protestant'.[17] Colston's ethnic and religious status was clearly important, and the Commission for the Despoiled Subject undoubtedly prioritised the documentation of this information from deponents before moving on to acquire their victim testimonies, thereby foregrounding the suffering of the English and Protestant settlers. Other depositions were also comprised of additional information within their opening statements, like that of the examination of John Ô Mawheir. Ô Mawheir was recorded as living in the 'Brough in the County of Lymericke' and as a 'yeoman' by trade, but he was also estimated to be 'aged 50

[16] The scoring out of what would have been considered 'cumbersome tautology' or 'tiresome' detail is common among the depositions from all counties; see M. Hickson, *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century, or The Irish Massacres of 1641-2* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1884), pp. 131-132; 'Deposition of: Symon Colston (7/10/1642)', MS 829, fols 167r-167v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, http://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829167r100, accessed on: 12/3/20.
[17] 'Deposition of: Symon Colston (7/10/1642)'.

yeres or thereabouts', allowing for a more comprehensive description of this particular deponent to be obtained.[18] Thus, preliminary details provide informative demographic profiles of the deponents, as well as additional insight into the social, economic, religious, and political contexts which surrounded each individual deposition. However, in order to uncover the physical and material culture of seventeenth-century Ireland contained within the depositions, the most relevant information can usually be found within the largest portion of the testimony which comes after the introduction. This is dedicated to the recording of the quantifiable losses and the criminal activities of the rebels associated with the deponent in question.

When the Commission for the Despoiled Subject was originally created in December of 1641, its primary objective was to serve as a documentary record of the material losses sustained by those settlers who had been victimised during the course of the rebellion. Accordingly, the depositions themselves constituted a legal record of those losses and, therefore, offer insight into both the distribution and variation of wealth across the settler communities, as well as a more comprehensive understanding of the physical organisation of the Irish landscape and the nature of the Catholic Irish resistance which ultimately drove the conflict. As may be expected, the extent of the recorded devastation varied markedly between each individual deposition. In Dublin, for example, the greatest estimated loss within a single deposition taken from the original sample was estimated to be around £7560, while the lowest was approximately 20s., and in Limerick the greatest reported loss within one deposition was approximately £11,700, with the lowest estimated at around £6. Indeed, some of the depositions contained only one or two lines dedicated to the estimation of such losses,

[18] 'Examination of: John ô Mawheir (11/11/1652)', MS 829, fols 370r-370v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin,* http://www.1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829370r248, accessed on: 15/3/20.

which was usually the case among deponents of fairly modest circumstances, while others required multiple pages in order to record itemised lists of valuables, ranging from reasonably standard rudimentary possessions such as '~~Howsehould lynnen~~' and '~~wearing cloathes~~', all the way up to '~~a little Castle and all vsefull howses of office~~'.[19] For example, in Colston's statement it was declared that he 'was robbed and forceably dispoyled of his goods and Chattles ~~to the seuerall values followeing vzt~~worth 89 li'., before the deposition moved on to list the full extent of those losses:

> ~~Of one Cowe foure yeerlings one mare one horse & two coults to the value of seaven pounds Of houshould goods to the value of ten pounds Of hay and Corne in the haggard to the value of thirteene pounds Of Corne in ground nowe lost by this rebellion to the value of fifteene pounds Of wood ready cutt for fireing & bayleing to the value of ffortie shillinges Of two boates with their tacklinges to the value of sixteene pounds~~ part consisting Of debts amounting to the sume of six & twenty pounds six shillinges…[20]

Furthermore, as was the case with Colston, many deponents concluded their victim statements by providing additional details about other individuals alleged to have participated in the crimes which they described, provided they were privy to such information, as well as any other individuals believed to have become active participants within the wider rebellion itself. Such statements also offer important indications as to the individual grievances and

[19] 'Deposition of: Sir Hardress Waller (21/5/1642)', MS 829, fols 284r-290v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829284r188, accessed on: 14/3/20.
[20] 'Deposition of: Symon Colston (7/10/1642)'; note — a 'haggard' is a kind of enclosure, situated near a farmhouse, in which crops are normally stored.

motivations of the non-elite Catholic and Irish rebels whose intensity stoked the flames of rebellion across Ireland:

> He further saith that the said Cowe & yeerlings were taken a[way] by Mohowne o Kelly of Loughall aforesaid & the said boates were likewise taken away by Mohowne Moyle of in the said County Clare gentleman & Roger mc Connor of Loughall aforesaid gentleman He further saith that Thomas Eaton of the same myner & Ellynor his wife & John Whatman of the same & his wife Thomas Blackbedge of Beth in the said County yeoman & his wife James Barly & his wife were formerly protestants but since this rebellion turned papists.[21]

Not only does Colston's testimony offer evidence of the relative culture of assimilation between the 'natives' and 'newcomers' of Ireland, best exemplified by his ability to denounce and report various Catholic and Irish individuals by name, trade, and residence, but his declaration is also indicative of the kinds of quantifiable losses typically reported by deponents across the entire country, including valuables such as household goods, debts, and raw materials, all of which amounted to a fairly standard financial loss of £89. However, significantly, Colston also declared the loss of his 'Cowe … yeerlings … mare … horse & two coults', his 'hay and Corne in the haggard', and his 'Corne in ground', and in doing so has drawn attention to one of the most universally significant trends among the depositions and wider reportage of the rebellion as a whole: that is, the overwhelming manifestation of attacks by the Catholic Irish rebels upon the agricultural capital and landscape of the English and Protestant settler communities.[22]

[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid.

Even after a cursory reading of a number of the depositions, the prevalence of deponents who deplored the loss of their livestock and '~~hay and Corne in stack and grounde~~' is palpable, while the sheer volume and consistency of such landed, agricultural attacks has undoubtedly exemplified the extent of this particular form of devastation across the country throughout this volatile period.[23] For example, deponents often cited the loss of their 'Implements of husbandry of all sorts', which could include '~~weaynes, Carts, & carriages … chaynes both for plowes and Cartes, sythes, spades , shouells, pickaxes, mattockes turfe spades, sawes, beetles , wedges, sledges, Croes of yron',~~ all '~~after the manner of England~~', while many others reported great material losses, having '~~expended much chardges in building and Improueing~~' upon their lands and lodgings following their settlement.[24] During another episode of the 1641 conflict, Henry Mawdesley, an English settler of the parish of Balscaddan in County Dublin, was driven off of his own estates and robbed of his goods and chattels by the Irish rebel forces. Mawdesley lamented the loss of at least 'a Thowsand fowerscore & six pownds seaventine shillings and six pence sterling' as a direct result of the rebel strike, including his 'corne and haye in his hagard', his 'Cowes, horses, Mares, sheepe, and hoggs', and his 'howsehowld stuffe and winter provision'.[25] Additionally, however, Mawdesley testified that 'by reason of the rebellion … he is depriued stripped and expelled of & from the benefitt of his buildings encloseing and other his emprovements made on his

[23] 'Deposition of: John Holmsted (9/5/1643)', MS 814, fols 244r-249v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=814244r153, accessed on: 11/3/20; 'Deposition of: George Winter (16/9/1642)', MS 829, fols 140r-141v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829140r083, accessed on: 12/3/20.
[24] 'Deposition of: Sir Hardress Waller (21/5/1642)'; 'Deposition of: John Billal (6/9/1642)', MS 829, fols 147r-148v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829147r087, accessed on: 12/3/20; note — a 'weayne' is a kind of wagon or cart used in agriculture.
[25] 'Deposition of: Henry Mawdesley (22/4/1642)', MS 810, fols 167r-167v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=810167r218a, accessed on: 10/3/20.

said seuerall farmes', contributing to an estimated loss of approximately 'a hundreth fowerscore and seaventine pownds or more'.[26]

Having discussed the value of the 1641 depositions in relation to the history of landed expropriation and, more specifically, the late-sixteenth and seventeenth century plantations in Ireland, Ohlmeyer has argued that the material culture that is visible within testimonies like that of Mawdesley contextualised land transfers and patterns of settlement, as the 'newcomers' built schools, churches, villages, and fortified mansions; and developed industry and urban settlements; but also shaped the landscape by the drainage and enclosure of Irish lands for their alleged 'improvement'.[27] Although Mawdesley's was one of the more explicit examples of the importation of English agricultural enclosures and landed 'improvements' by Ireland's settler population, Ohlmeyer explained that the depositions as a whole clearly convey the significant extent to which individual settlers had sought to 'improve' upon their lands by promoting tillage, exploiting natural resources, maximising profits from their mills, and introducing new breeds of cattle by the eve of the rebellion in 1641.[28] Plantation and 'improvement' had clearly arrived hand in hand.

Given the importance of agricultural subsistence across early modern European society, the fact that such landed devastation was so pervasive within the depositions is undoubtedly significant, but arguably more so considering the fact that agricultural custom, and the use and organisation of the physical landscape more broadly, constituted a perennial point of contention between the English and Irish throughout this period, and were inextricably linked with English concepts of 'civility', 'civilisation', and 'barbarism'.

---

[26] Ibid.
[27] Ohlmeyer, 'Anatomy of Plantation: the 1641 Depositions', p. 55.
[28] Ibid.

Ohlmeyer's discussion, then, has highlighted the importance of the physical, or material, culture of plantation, not only to enact the physical transformation of the Irish landscape, but as an abstract marker of Ireland's subordination, and so the depositions themselves offer critical insight into the extent to which the crown had managed successfully — or, arguably, unsuccessfully — to 'civilise' Ireland and its inhabitants.[29]

Furthermore, in order to explore the significance of agriculture and the landscape in relation to the organisation, execution, and reportage of the Irish rebellion — and within the larger early modern Anglo-Irish context — it is important to consider the centrality of agriculture and the use and control of the physical landscape in relation to the ongoing Anglo-Irish struggle over 'civility', 'civilisation', and the development of anti-Irish rhetoric throughout this period. Indeed, Keith Pluymers' recent case study on the Mayo cattle trials has highlighted the importance of moving beyond existing narratives of Anglo-Irish conflict, largely based upon notions of 'totalising hatred' between the two realms, in order to explore the 'myriad' of potential meanings behind such conflict.[30] For example, Pluymers argued that the Mayo cattle trials of 1641, during which a group of rebels held a mock trial and execution of a group of English cattle, can be considered in relation to a range of issues, such as the imposition of English common law, the apostasy of Catholicism, climatic vulnerability, and, perhaps especially, the growth and spread of commercialised agriculture in Ireland.[31] By placing the cattle trials, and therefore other forms of performative violence, within these alternative contexts, Pluymers has asserted that these actions may reveal more about the wider concerns which both characterised and directed Anglo-Irish relations throughout this

[29] Ibid.
[30] K. Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change, and the Causes of Violence', *Environmental History*, 25:2 (2020), p. 288.
[31] Ibid, pp. 287-290.

period, including the growth of commercialised agriculture and, undoubtedly, the transformation of the physical landscape.[32]

Smyth, likewise, has discussed the incidence of ritualised violence during the course of the rebellion, which included acts of stripping, bodily mutilation, and forced 'Mass-going', and maintained that such actions were indicative of the rebels' understanding of the symbols of the English and Protestant settlers' fertility, political standing, and confessional allegiance, respectively and, therefore, of their increasing expansion and imposition.[33] Thus, Smyth concluded that attacks which involved these kinds of targeted assaults were representative of the Catholic Irish rebels' desire to both halt settler expansion in Ireland and, more significantly, to deny those communities a future in Ireland altogether.[34] Smyth's discussion is also reminiscent of the work of Robert Darnton in *The Great Cat Massacre* (1984), wherein Darnton discussed the ritualistic killing of cats by a group of French printing apprentices who had endured poor working and living conditions while their master, his wife, and the master's cats prospered.[35] As a result of their mistreatment, the apprentices successfully tricked their master into ordering the extermination of all the cats, to which the apprentices happily obliged, bludgeoning any cats they could find, killing the favourite cat of the mater's wife, and even staging a mock trial and hanging for the animals.[36] According to Darnton, the massacre not only allowed the workers to 'turn the tables' on the bourgeois — making a fool of their master, upsetting his wife, and laughing all the way — it also

[32] Ibid, p. 300.
[33] Smyth, 'Towards a Cultural Geography', pp. 78-79.
[34] Ibid.
[35] R. Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre And Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: Basic Books, 1984), pp. 75-77; see Darnton's work as a whole for further detail in relation to the exhibition of performative, symbolic violence.
[36] Ibid.

represented a symbolic, rebellious act against the exploitation, neglect, and abuse of the workers themselves.[37]

These arguments should clarify the need to acknowledge the complexity of the 1641 rebellion and to investigate the violence and destruction of the conflict in greater depth, by taking into account dominant contemporary Anglo-Irish concerns related to matters such as 'civility', 'civilisation', 'barbarism', agriculture, land use, and land ownership — all of which informed the organisation, execution, and reportage of the rebellion. Accordingly, the following investigation will begin to consider the position and character of the English use, enclosure, and 'improvement' of the physical landscape, both in relation to the English origins of these processes and within the context of the Irish rebellion itself, analysing their significance with respect to the exhibition of Irish resistance and within the wider documentation of the 1641 rebellion. Furthermore, this discussion will also evaluate the significance of the English encroachment upon the Irish landscape in relation to the imposition of their 'civilisation' of Ireland and its inhabitants throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, specifically in order to reinforce the centrality of the physical landscape and the enduring Anglo-Irish struggle over its use and control. Hence, the following analysis will begin with the origins of the English processes of enclosure and 'improvement', which were refined and employed in order to establish greater control over land and people both at home and abroad.

[37] Ibid, pp. 75-77, 99-101.

Agriculture, Enclosure and Landed 'Improvement': the English Perspective

The official process of enclosure first began in England during the thirteenth century with King Henry III and the Statute of Merton (1235). While the statute itself contained several clauses, ranging in scope from marriage and inheritance to the repossession of land, perhaps the most important resolution was that which permitted manorial lords to enclose wastes and common lands for their individual benefit, so long as there remained enough land to fulfil the customary rights of the tenantry. Consequent disputes over depopulation and dispossession led to the periodic enactment of anti-enclosure legislation, firstly by Henry VII in 1489 and throughout the centuries to follow, but the movement continued its development in spite of persistent controversy and contention.[38] Unlike the following centuries, around the beginning of the fourteenth century and prior to the most significant period of the LIA, the process of enclosure tended to involve upland, wetland, and woodland areas in order to try to combat the increasing pressure upon the English countryside, stemming from increases in population, commercialisation, and a more general overall demand for resources, and could include participation from diverse sections of society, from peasants and townspeople, to lay magnates and other members of the gentry.[39]

The physical undertaking of enclosure is fairly self-explanatory, and generally involved the erection of a physical barrier, such as a hedge or a fence, in order to 'enclose' a specific area of land for private use, which could range from the conversion of arable to pasture lands and vice versa, to the clearing and enhancement of 'waste' lands. However, the legal

[38] J. R. Wordie, 'The Chronology of English Enclosure, 1500-1914', *The Economic History Review*, 36:4 (1983), p. 194.

[39] C. Dyer, 'Conflict in the landscape: the enclosure movement in England, 1220-1349', *Landscape History*, 28:1 (2006), p. 31.

ramifications of the act were arguably more potent, for the enclosure of land also signified the privatisation of land and, in turn, the suppression of common rights which were critical for the subsistence and survival of the peasantry. Indeed, as part of her research into the polemics of enclosure and the garden during the mid-seventeenth century, Katherine Attie has succinctly outlined the reasoning behind the growth of the enclosure movement: enclosed lands were simply more economically valuable to the individual than those which remained unenclosed and open to the exploitation of others.[40] According to Samuel Hartlib, one of the foremost proponents of agricultural 'improvement' and innovation in the mid-seventeenth century, the enclosure of land promised increased rental values, allowed for the selective breeding of livestock, 'improved' the quality of land through the floating of meadows or the draining of fens, and, generally, led to greater profits via the opportunity to engage in more flexible, intensive, and efficient arable farming.[41] As such, English landowners who opted to embrace enclosure undoubtedly did so, first and foremost, in the interest of both productivity and profit. While the transition increased both the economic and practical potential of their lands exponentially, the legal assertion of individual ownership over the land simultaneously facilitated the exclusion and deprivation of the peasantry.

Although the enclosure movement became more widely popularised under the Tudors, with approximately forty-seven per cent of England's surface area already enclosed by 1599, in his account of the chronology of English enclosure, James Wordie explained how the seventeenth century witnessed the enclosure of twice as much land as any other century, with around twenty-four per cent of England's surface area becoming enclosed during the period

[40] K. B. Attie, 'Enclosure Polemics and the Garden in the 1650s', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 51:1 (2011), p. 135.
[41] S. Hartlib, *Samuel Hartlib, His Legacie: or An Enlargement of the Discourse of Husbandry Used in Brabant and Flaunders* (London: H. Hills, 1651), p. 48.

from 1600 to 1699 alone.[42] Unsurprisingly, Wordie has maintained that the seventeenth century was undoubtedly England's 'great age of enclosure', and has argued that the uptake in enclosure throughout this period paralleled an associated increase in agricultural productivity — a concern which similarly propelled the associated English movement towards agricultural 'improvement'.[43] According to Joan Thirsk, the spirit of 'improvement' first began to emerge in earnest during the period after 1560, as English farming methodologies and techniques became increasingly scrutinised in search of refinement in order to cope with the ever-increasing demand for food felt in all regions of the kingdom.[44] A significant growth in population towards the end of the sixteenth century was also followed by a rapid increase in urbanisation, leading to an increase in the popularity of the marketplace as well as national interest in commercialised farming, as English landowners sought to capitalise on soaring food prices by ramping up the production and sale of surplus produce.[45] Farmers were expected to produce greater crop yields, to find ways to support larger numbers of stock on their pastures, and to transform wastelands into more productive agricultural spaces, providing for a population who were dependent upon the produce of the land but who, dwelling in urban centres, were not living or working upon it.[46] The growing consensus among agrarian 'improvers', as they became known, was that anything could, and indeed should, undergo 'improvement'.[47] In his seminal treatise *The English Improver, or, A New Survey of Husbandry* (1649), Walter Blith, one of the most ardent proponents of agricultural 'improvement', proclaimed that both arable and pasture lands could be 'improved' via 'Six Peeces of Improvement', namely:

---

[42] Wordie, 'Chronology of English Enclosure', pp. 502-503.
[43] Ibid.
[44] J. Thirsk, 'Farming Techniques', in J. Thirsk (ed.), *The Agrarian History of England and Wales*, Vol. IV (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 161.
[45] J. P. Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 62-63.
[46] Thirsk, 'Farming Techniques', p. 161.
[47] Ibid.

> By Floating or Watering such Lands as are Capable thereof … By Reducing Boggy or Drowned Land to sound Pasture … By such a way of Ploughing and Corneing old Courses Pasture, as not to Impoverish it, And by such a Method of Enclosure, as shall provide for Poore, And all Interests without Depopulation … By discovering Divers Materialls for Soyle and Compost, with the nature and use of them, as both Tillage and Pasture be advanced as big as promised … By such a New Plantation of divers sorts of Woods … By a more Moderate Improvement of other sorts of Lands, according to their Capacities they lye under, by more Common Experiences. [48]

Blith would also go on to recommend 'Six Newer Peeces of Improvement' only three years after his initial publication; specifically:

> Our English Husbandring Claver grasse, and St. Foyn, as high as may be … The facilitating the charge and burthen of the Plough, with divers Figures thereof … The Planting Welde, Woad, and Madder, three rich commodities for Dyers … The Planting of Hops, Saffron and Liquorish, with their Advance … The Planting of Rape, Cole-seed, Hemp, & Flax, and the profit thereof … The great Advance of Land by divers Orchards and Garden Fruits.[49]

Blith's authorship certainly captured the fervour and intensity of 'improvement', and indeed the practical implementation of ideas in relation to land use over the course of the early

---

[48] W. Blith, *The English Improver, or, A New Survey of Husbandry* (London: J. Wright, 1649), p. 2.
[49] W. Blith, *The English Improver Improved, or The Survey of Husbandry Surveyed* (London: John Wright, 1653), p. 2.

modern period resulted in a much broader movement directed towards the rationalisation and optimisation of the exploitation of all land, both within the English realm and, eventually, overseas in the colonial plantations.[50]

On a national level, the drive for 'improvement' was primarily spearheaded by Hartlib and his company of progressive associates who collectively became known as the 'Hartlib Circle'. Hartlib's admiration of the work of Francis Bacon and his reputation as an 'intelligencer' of scientific information and ideas prompted his commitment to become a 'conduit pipe' for the public, working alongside a range of other writers and educators in order to organise treatises on subjects such as medicine, chemistry, engineering, colonisation, and agriculture.[51] In discussing the significance of the movement, Andrew McRae argued that the Circle not only revised the existing discourse on landed, agrarian 'improvement', but also consolidated much of the previous husbandry material in line with modern objectives.[52] For example, Hartlib and the other 'improvers' built upon Bacon's recommendations about the importance of empirical learning in order to expand the knowledge of the agrarian 'improver' on the natural world, and they also recognised the connection between agriculture and the expanding English market economy, reinforcing the significance of the connection between the pursuit of 'improvement', the privatisation of land, and the maximisation of profit.[53] However, while the Circle were almost evangelical in their zeal for the promotion of 'improvement', 'improvers' increasingly faced criticism from various commentators who failed to conceive of the possible advantages of such methods beyond those which increased

[50] E. H. Ash, 'Reclaiming a New World: Fen Drainage, Improvement, and Projectors in Seventeenth-Century England', *Early Science and Medicine*, 21:5 (2016), pp. 446-447.
[51] M. Greengrass, 'Hartlib, Samuel (c.1600-1662)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/, accessed on: 18/8/21.
[52] A. McRae, *God speed the plough: The representation of agrarian England, 1500-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 159-160.
[53] Ibid.

the revenue of wealthy, private landlords, prompting advocates to rationalise their recommendations on a more inclusive basis.[54]

Paul Slack has maintained that agrarian 'improvers' were acutely aware of the dominant cultural forces in early modern England, and were particularly captivated by the civic Humanism of the Renaissance, and so they set out to offer ample justification for their endeavours in order to preserve their civic virtue and reaffirm their commitment to the public good.[55] For example, Hartlib, in his *Legacie* (1651) of husbandry, explained that enclosure constituted an 'Improvement of land', where 'men, when their grounds are enclosed, may imploy them as they please; but because it giveth … consequently fertility'.[56] Not only was enclosure characterised as a progressive, rewarding endeavour, but Hartlib also took care to promote the benefits of 'improvement' across society more broadly. In numerous areas, 'both in the North and West of England, where the name of Gardening and Howing is scarcely knowne', Hartlib maintained that 'a few Gardiners might have saved the lives of many poor people, who have starved these dear years'.[57] He even promoted the introduction of silkworms, not for 'private profit', but for 'the Publique Good; it being the best way I know, to set all the poor children, Widowes, old and lame people on worke: and likewise will save this Nation many 100. thousand pounds per annum'.[58] These rationales were clearly designed to represent agricultural 'improvement' as a more comprehensive campaign for the common good — as both an antidote to England's impoverishment, and a tool for the enrichment of the Commonwealth — but the drive for justification also became increasingly associated, and

[54] N. Blomley, 'Making Private Property: Enclosure, Common Right and the Work of Hedges', *Rural History*, 18:1 (2007), p. 6; P. Slack, *The Invention of Improvement: Information and Material Progress in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 53.
[55] Slack, *The Invention of Improvement,* pp. 53-60.
[56] Hartlib, *His Legacie*, p. 48.
[57] Ibid, p. 12.
[58] Ibid, p. 73.

familiar, with the promotion and implementation of English 'civility' and 'civilisation' more broadly.

In her investigation of 'improvement' and the epistemologies of landscape in seventeenth century England, Elly Robson has argued that 'improvement' was actually forged among conflicts situated within the landscape itself, and that the 'wild and ruinous' commons — which remained in what agricultural 'improver' John Norden regarded as their ungodly state of 'universall wildernesse' — became entirely irreconcilable with the tenets of 'improvement', particularly with respect to both cultivation and profit, but the same could also undoubtedly be said of 'civility' and 'civilisation'.[59] Indeed, Robson continued to emphasise the importance of the linkage between the language of 'civility', employed by colonists and other proponents of plantation in order to justify their endeavours in both the Americas and Ireland, and that which was adopted by English 'improvers' eager to emphasise the 'civilising' benefits of their innovations.[60] Just as proponents of 'civility' exploited biblical imagery in order to emphasise their cultural 'superiority' and confessional duty to their cause, advocates for 'improvement' would invoke the image of the Garden of Eden to emphasise the spiritual advantages of the enclosed space, maintaining that those who 'improved' their soil also 'improved' their soul.[61] Agrarian 'improvers' like Norden asserted that 'uncivilised' populations who remained 'as ignorant of God, or of any civil course of life … as the very savages amongst the infidels in maner' could be reformed through the process of enclosure and 'replanted where they may first learn and so live according to laws'.[62] Norden also argued that the enclosure of royal forests was beneficial for 'the good of the

[59] J. Norden, *The Surveyors Dialogue* (London: Simon Stafford, 1607), p. 223; E. Robson, 'Improvement and Epistemologies of Landscape in Seventeenth-Century English Forest Enclosure', *The Historical Journal*, 60:3 (2017), pp. 597, 615-616.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Attie, 'Enclosure Polemics', pp. 135-137.
[62] Norden, *Surveyors Dialogue*, p. 107.

commonwealth' because their 'plantation' would elevate 'the former unprofitable inhabitants to a civil and religious course of life'.[63] Insofar as these 'improvers' envisioned the total 'improvement' of the physical landscape and the commons, so too did they of the 'uncivilised', unruly commoner.[64]

In discussing the physical implications of the English enclosure movement and the increasing privatisation of land, Nicholas Blomley has argued that the erection of hedging and other physical barriers to cultivate the boundaries of private property triggered the suppression of free movement for both human and nonhuman bodies, reflecting upon an increasingly prevalent English ideological fixation with control of the 'body of the threatening commoner and his or her animals', which dominated husbandry manuals throughout this period.[65] For example, Thomas Tusser warned his readers to,

> Keepe safely and warely, thine uttermost fence,
> with ope gay and break hedge, do seldome dispence …
> The champion robbeth by night,
> and prowleth and filcheth by daie,
> Himselfe and his beast out of sight,
> both spoileth and maketh awaie.
> Not onely thy grasse but thy corne:
> both after and yer it be shorne.[66]

[63] Ibid; Robson, 'Improvement and Epistemologies', p. 616; Slack, *The Invention of Improvement,* p. 60.
[64] Robson, 'Improvement and Epistemologies', p. 616.
[65] Blomley, 'Making Private Property', p. 8.
[66] T. Tusser, *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry* (London: M. Cooper, 1744), pp. 129, 91.

Furthermore, Gervase Markham issued advice 'for the fencing or making priuate the garden-plot', and recommended that the 'best fence is a strong wall, either of Bricke, Ashler, rough-Stone, or Earth, of which you are the best-owner'.[67] He also stressed that any hedge whatsoever would have to be maintained and repaired 'as occasion shall require from time to time, till your quicke-set be growne vp, and, by continuall plashing and interfouldings, be made able and sufficient to fence and defend your garden'.[68] In his *Foure Books of Husbandry* (1577), Conrad Heresbach described an agrarian 'Paradise' wherein both an orchard and garden would be 'inclosed with several hedges and ditches, whereby they are defended from hurtfull beastes and unruly folkes'.[69] Indeed, it was commonplace for husbandry manuals to contain advice on the construction of hedges that were thought to be more difficult to 'break', while theologians and other commentators continued to utilise the hedge as a symbol of both impenetrability and a barrier against external misrule.[70] Similar rationales were also employed by English authors throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in order to advocate for the containment of the Irish population.

Blomley argued that husbandry texts like those of Tusser, Markham, and Heresbach, therefore, established a troubling connection between the commoner and the commons, and disorder and irrationality. This was a serious departure from the image of the 'honest ploughman' of the sixteenth century, who effectively represented 'civility' among England's non-elite population, but 'improving' landowners envisioned neither within the carefully crafted boundaries of their 'civilised' English farms.[71] Carl McDonagh and Briony Griffin

[67] G. Markham, *The English husbandman. The first part: contayning the knowledge of the true nature of euery soyle within this kingdome: how to plow it; and the manner of the plough, and other instruments belonging thereto* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1613), pp. 110-111.
[68] Ibid.
[69] C. Heresbach, *Foure Bookes of Husbandry* (London: Richard Watkins, 1577), p. 70.
[70] Blomley, 'Making Private Property', pp. 11-12.
[71] Ibid, p. 10.

explained that by enclosing common lands — that is, lands which were still held under custom-based common rights — the landlord legally transformed the rights to those lands, from those which were previously shared, into those which became amalgamated under a single, legal owner.[72] In effect, as the wealthy increasingly took advantage of the opportunities represented by enclosure and 'improvement', subsistence farmers became both legally and physically excluded from the wastes and common lands which they had been traditionally reliant upon to supplement their incomes, leading to dearth and destitution among these communities. On one occasion in the lordship of Dalston in the county of Cumberland, for example, Lord Burghley received correspondence that the 'poor' inhabitants had become 'greatly impoverished' as a direct result of the enclosure of Westward forest by the Earl of Northumberland.[73] They had been 'anciently accustomed to free common of pasture' within the forest, in order to have 'their horses grassed, and their cattle brought up and increased … which by the enclosure is greatly diminished'.[74] The combined processes of English enclosure and 'improvement' not only envisioned the total overhaul and transformation of agricultural practices and the physical, agricultural landscape, but also the removal and exclusion of those peoples deemed contrary to the quintessential image of English 'civilisation'. With the struggle for the commons well and truly underway, and the gap between the wealthier landed elite and the impoverished subsistence population growing, the English peasantry began to take matters into their own hands.

While enclosure disputes between landowners and disgruntled subsistence farmers normally found their way into the Court of Star Chamber, the law tended to favour the legal

[72] B. McDonagh and C. J. Griffin, 'Occupy! Historical geographies of property, protest and the commons, 1500-1850', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 53 (2016), pp. 2-3.
[73] 'Henry Lord Scrope to Lord Burghley', in M. A. E. Green (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566–1579* (London: Longman & Co., 1871), p. 367.
[74] Ibid.

rights of the wealthier landed elite, often forcing desperate communities to undertake desperate measures in order to protest the restrictive sanctions against their common use of the land.[75] For example, in 1631, around five hundred armed individuals marched into the Forest of Dean in order to destroy the enclosures there and return the lands to the common, later burning an effigy of the encloser himself, Sir Giles Mompesson, in an intimidating display of moral outrage.[76] Localised demonstrations became fairly common, but larger, more extensive protests offer an indication as to the potential scale of unrest. Kett's Rebellion is a prime example of these efforts: during the summer of 1549, around 16,000 common farmers took control of the city of Norwich as a means to protest profiteering and the advancement of enclosure by local landlords from Norfolk.[77] Another infamous example occurred during the summer of 1607 with the Midlands Rising in the areas of Leicestershire, Warwickshire, and Northamptonshire, which culminated in the assembly of a group of around 1,000 men, women, and children who gathered at Newton and began to dig up hedges, the newly-built enclosures erected by local landowner Thomas Tresham.[78] Failing to disperse in accordance with the demands of a royal proclamation, Sir Edward Montagu, deputy-lieutenant for Northamptonshire, ordered his forces to charge towards the rioters who, after an initial display of ferocious resistance, were forced to flee, though around forty to fifty people did lose their lives in the process.[79]

Defiant commoners adopted a variety of militant tactics in their opposition which were specifically engineered in order to undermine the efforts of 'improving' landlords and to

---

[75] K. Wrightson, *English Society 1580-1680* (London: Hutchinson & Co., (Publishers) Ltd, 1982), p. 179.
[76] Ibid, p. 177.
[77] E. Wright, 'Kett's Rebellion (July–August 1549)', in E. Wright (ed.), *A Dictionary of World History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 101.
[78] B. McDonagh and J. Rodda, 'Landscape, Memory and Protest in the Midlands Rising of 1607', in C. J. Griffin and B. McDonagh (eds.), *Remembering Protest in Britain since 1500: Memory, Materiality and the Landscape* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), p. 53.
[79] Ibid.

return the land to its common use: these actions could include the destruction of hedges and fencing; the occupation of enclosed lands; the targeted violation or appropriation of private resources; and even the crime of trespass, normally associated with the intrusion of livestock on to private property for purposes of ransacking. Such methods were significant, given that, according to Blomley, hedges and fencing had become valued as key symbols of private ownership and property within English society, and these tactics became routinely associated with anti-enclosure rioting across the English landscape, especially during particularly tense episodes such as the Midlands and Western Risings of the opening decades of the seventeenth century.[80] Thus, with enclosure and 'improvement' both firmly established as transformative, and inflammatory, processes within the framework of English social, landed, and agricultural organisation by 1600, it can only be expected that their scope and contentiousness would increase to include the English colonies and that, with the increasing transplantation of enthusiastic, aspiring colonists, Ireland and its inhabitants would soon become subject to the 'civilising benefits' of English 'improvement'. Accordingly, in order to consider the transplantation of these English mores across the Irish Sea, the 1641 depositions must be employed in order to obtain a greater understanding of the impact of the English imposition upon Irish society and Catholic Irish resistance within the context of the rebellion; specifically, their rejection of the English control, use, and 'civilisation' of the Irish landscape.

Resistance and Reclamation in the 1641 Rebellion

In his investigation of the 1641 rebellion, Canny maintained that Ireland's repeated subjection to various phases of English plantation and settlement throughout the early modern period set it apart from other domestic 'British' jurisdictions, but particularly during the second half of

[80] Blomley, 'Making Private Property', p. 8.

the sixteenth century.[81] Although there were numerous earlier plantation attempts in Ireland prior to the ascendancy of Elizabeth I, Canny explained that it was throughout the queen's reign that the question of how to deal with Ireland and the Irish moved to the forefront of the English agenda, as their administration proceeded towards a more offensive policy of conquest designed to bring the entire country under English control.[82] However, subsequent attempts to establish colonial settlements in the areas of Leinster, Munster, and Ulster during the 1560s and 1570s were perhaps predictably met with both hostility and physical resistance from the Irish inhabitants who opposed their creation, leading to violent clashes and persistent rebellion, seemingly validating English claims of Irish 'barbarity' and their 'brutish', 'warlike' disposition. [83] These assumptions were further exacerbated by the consequent brutality and longevity of the Nine Years' War. Thus, while the policy of conquest and colonisation in Ireland was by no means novel at the close of the sixteenth century, Slack argued that it was in fact this perceived state of persistent rebellion and endemic disorder within the country throughout this particularly volatile period which not only gave credence to the urgency of England's Irish problem, but which also saw the country earmarked as a prime target for plantation by English 'improvers' who sought to reform the Irish landscape and its inhabitants for the good of the commonwealth.[84]

Just as English 'improvers' had previously borrowed from the rhetoric and vernacular of earlier tracts and commentaries on 'civility', proposals for the plantation of Ireland from the late sixteenth century began to incorporate the language and spirit of 'improvement' in

[81] N. Canny, '1641 in a Colonial Context', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 53.
[82] Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization', pp. 575-576; B. Rich, *A New Description of Ireland: Wherein is described the disposition of the Irish whereunto they are inclined* (London: William Jaggard, 1610), pp. 17, 108.
[83] Ibid, pp. 587-589.
[84] Slack, *The Invention of Improvement,* p. 66.

order to emphasise the potential benefits and profits of their endeavours within the country.[85] For example, in *A letter sent by I. B. gentleman unto his very frende Mayster R. C. esquire* (1572), Sir Thomas Smith detailed his plans for the plantation and settlement of the Ards peninsula in County Down, and explained that 'for the present necessitie & lack of many commodities of the Countrey which are in Englande euery where', this region in Ireland,

> may be replenished with buildings, ciuill inhabitantes, and traffique with lawe, iustice, and good order, what shal let, that it be not also as pleasant and profitable, as any parte of England, especially when it shall be furnished with a companie of Gentlemen.[86]

Edmund Spenser's later *A View of The Present State of Ireland* (1596) was written to convey the extent of Ireland's perceived disorder and decay, but also to emphasise the urgency of the English conquest. Spenser declared that English intervention would not only 'settle an eternall peace in that country', but also 'make yt very profitable to her Majestie, the which I see muste be broughte in by a strong hande.[87] Sir John Davies, a renowned lawyer, poet, and solicitor-general for Ireland under James VI and I, also took on the question of how best to establish and maintain plantation in Ireland, delivering his own account as to the reasons why *Ireland was never entirely Subdued* (1612). In fact, Davies went so far as to explain that while in England,

[85] Ibid.
[86] I.B., *A letter sent by I. B. gentleman unto his very frende Mayster R. C. esquire, wherein is conteined a large discourse of the peopling and inhabiting the cuntrie called the Ardes, and other adiacent in the north of Ireland and taken in hand by Sir Thomas Smith, one of the queenes majesties privie counsel and Thomas Smith esquire, his sonne* (London: Anthonhson, 1572), p. 47; Smith published this pamphlet anonymously at the time.
[87] E. Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (Library of Alexandria, 1934), p. 60.

> and all well-order'd Commonweals, Men have certain Estates in their Lands and Possessions, and their Inheritances descend from Father to Son, which doth give them Encouragement to build, and to plant, and to improve their Lands, and to make them better for their Posterities,

Ireland, on the other hand, had arguably never been totally conquered and therefore never successfully 'planted, and improved; and returned a rich Revenue to the Crown of England'.[88] Furthermore, Thomas Blenerhasset, who became one of the official undertakers of the official crown plantation of Ulster, published a pamphlet on the direction for said plantation and insisted that, without the erection of fortified garrison towns throughout the region, the 'conditions … nature, and manner of life' of the 'meere Irish' would make it 'impossible … to improue any thing with security, to any great profit'.[89] Evidently, English commentators had very much embraced the language of profitable 'improvement' as part of their existing 'civilising' rhetoric, ensuring that concepts of political, economic, religious, cultural, social, and landed 'improvement' would follow the plantation of Ulster at the beginning of the seventeenth century and would continue to spread across Ireland during the decades to follow, as is also evidenced by the depositions of 1641.

The deposition of Henry Mawdesley is perhaps one of the most overt examples wherein the deponent's claim for material losses made reference to the damage of being 'depriued stripped and expelled of … encloseing and other his emprovements made on his said seuerall farmes', but Mawdesley's was by no means an isolated or exceptional

---

[88] J. Davies, *Historical Relations: Or, A Discovery Of the true Causes why Ireland Was never entirely Subdued, Nor Brought under Obedience of the Crown of England, until the Beginning of the Reign of King James the First* (Dublin: S. Hyde, 1733), p. 59.

[89] S. Lee and A. Hadfield, 'Blenerhasset, Thomas (c. 1550-1624)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/, accessed on: 18/8/21; T. Blenerhasset, *A Direction for the Plantation in Ulster* (London: Ed Allde, 1610), p. 9.

instance.[90] For example, in the barony of Connelagh in County Limerick, Dame Elizabeth Dowdall came under attack from the Irish rebels during November of 1641 and reported approximately £5,083 in material losses, including an estimated '~~one thousand pownds~~' associated with the loss of her '~~fayre enclosurs~~', which constituted almost one-fifth of her entire claim.[91] In other cases, like that of Samuell Felgate of the City of Dublin, enclosures were lost in the form of English-style 'hedging & ditching', or in the loss of '~~fenceing & quick setts~~', as was the experience of Andrew Prowse of the barony of Cosleagh in County Limerick.[92] Brian Neile, of the City of Dublin, also reported the loss of his enclosures at his 'seuerall howses' in the form of 'orchards' and 'gardens', both of which had gradually come to denote symbols of the triumph of English 'civilisation' over the Irish 'wilderness'.[93] Greater still are the numbers of depositions which cited the loss of various 'improvements' in a more general sense. John Mitchell of the City of Dublin testified that the Irish rebels had deprived and expelled him from his farm, whereupon he 'had bestowed great charges and improvement', while Andrew Prowse declared that he, and his sisters Sicily and Ellinor Prowse, had been dispossessed of their farm which had been 'well Improued'.[94] Furthermore, Thomas Browne, a '~~brittish protestant~~' of the parish of Cullen in County Limerick, was 'robbed and forceably dispoiled of his goods and Chattles', including '~~seuerall parcells of land~~' estimated in value to be worth approximately '~~one hu~~[~~n~~]~~dred & fiftie pounds~~', owing to

---

[90] 'Deposition of: Henry Mawdesley (22/4/1642)'.
[91] 'Deposition of: Elizabeth Dowdall (3/10/1642)', MS 829, fols 138r-139v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829138r082, accessed on: 12/3/20.
[92] 'Deposition of: Samuell Felgate (8/1/1644)', MS 810, fols 232r-232v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=810232r264, accessed on: 10/3/20; 'Deposition of: Andrewe Prowse (25/7/1642)', MS 829, fols 186r-186v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829186r115, accessed on: 13/3/20.
[93] 'Deposition of: Brian Neile (7/6/1642)', MS 810, fols 169r-170v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810169r220, accessed on: 10/3/20; W. Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), p. 5; Attie, 'Enclosure Polemics', pp. 136-142.
[94] 'Deposition of: John Mitchell (8/11/1645)', MS 809, fols 296r-296r, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=809296r184, accessed on: 11/3/20; 'Deposition of: Andrewe Prowse (25/7/1642)'.

Browne's '~~great chardges in building~~' and, notably, his '~~other necessary Improuements~~'.[95] In spite of their varying experiences of English colonial intervention, the depositions sampled from both Dublin and Limerick clearly exhibit similar patterns of the spread of English influence across the country by the mid-seventeenth century, particularly in relation to the importation and advancement of enclosure and 'improvement'. The emergence of these processes within the Irish setting, however, does not in itself constitute the focus of this particular investigation. Rather, the following discussion is concerned with the imposition of English landed 'improvements' in relation to the endurance of the Anglo-Irish struggle over 'civility', 'civilisation', and the use and control of the landscape within the context of the Irish rebellion, best exemplified by particular patterns of violence exhibited by the rebels throughout their campaign.

Given both the extent of the influence of the English ideology of 'improvement' and its increasingly intimate association with their 'civilising mission', it is useful to reflect upon the function of landed enclosure and 'improvement' in Ireland, specifically from a colonial perspective, in order to better understand how these combined processes impacted upon the organisation and structure of the Gaelic landscape and society up until the eve of rebellion. In his investigation of the international legal history of English enclosure, Henry Jones has discussed the relationship between property, territory, and English colonialism, beginning in the sixteenth century, and effectively argued that the English transformation from a feudalistic to capitalistic society was a legal transition which premeditated the associated transformation of land into privately owned property, freed from traditional rights and customs.[96] Crucially, though, as part of his wider discussion on the development of enclosure,

[95] 'Deposition of: Thomas Browne (19/11/1642)', MS 829, fols 150r-151v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://www.1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829150r089, accessed on: 12/3/20.
[96] H. Jones, 'Property, territory, and colonialism: an international legal history of enclosure', *Legal Studies*, 39:2 (2019), pp. 189-190.

and indeed the English culture of 'improvement', Jones argued that English colonialism was actually a necessary precursor for the emergence of enclosure, allowing for the abstraction of land at the root of private property.[97] He argued that it was via the process of colonisation in Ireland and the Americas that English colonists were able to develop this abstraction more fully, allowing for the commodification of lands at home and abroad, as well as the rendering of remote lands as vacant via the racialisation of Indigenous Peoples and their methods of land holding — a practice which had become commonplace within English commentaries on Ireland throughout the early modern period.[98]

English commentators routinely employed English standards of 'civility' and 'civilisation' in order to accentuate the alleged 'barbarity' of the Irish, attacking their religious, political, economic, cultural, and social mores, but also the purported 'wildness' and 'savagery' of the general population and their landscape. For example, in his *Image of Irelande* (1581), dedicated to the military exploits of Sir Henry Sidney during his time as the lord deputy in Ireland, John Derricke rebuked the detestable 'wilde shamrocke maners' and 'warlike wise' of the Irish 'woodkarne', declaring those individuals as 'brutisher then beastes' and 'more bloudier then the Wolfe, or sauage beare'.[99] Derricke explained that '[w]here Irishe karne haue superioritie, ther thei commit all thinges to fire and sword', and that their nature has 'extinguisht' the 'glorie of Irelande' and 'deformed' the land itself, meaning that only through English intervention and 'pollicie' could these 'brute beastes' be 'brought to a peaceable order of liuyng, seruyng and obaiyng man orderly in their nature and kinde'.[100]

---

[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid, p. 191.
[99] J. Derricke, *The Image of Irelande, with a Discouerie of Woodkarne* (London: J. Kingston, 1581), pp. 9, 45, 61; note — Irish 'woodkern' or 'kern' were lightly armed foot soldiers, who often launched guerrilla attacks from the woodlands. Particularly despised among English contemporaries as rootless outlaws, Irish kerns were regarded as unyielding and irredeemable.
[100] Ibid, pp. 41, 45.

Similarly, Edmund Spenser drew attention to the 'warlike', 'brutishe behavior' of the 'wilde and mere Irishe', which apparently led them to 'spoyle and waste at a tryce, as naturallye delightinge in spoyle'.[101] Spenser also delivered a scathing reproach to the appearance of the Irish, specifically 'the wearing of manteles and longe glebbes, which is a thicke curled bushe of heare, hanginge downe over their eyes'.[102] Aside from the apparent 'falstye, brutishnes and fythines' of the 'Irish glybbes', Spenser disparaged their manifestation '[as] fit maskes as a mantle is for a theife'.[103] As for the wearing of the mantle itself — a long cloaked or hooded garment — Spenser considered this dress to be 'a fitt howse for an outlawe, a meet Bedd for a Rebell, and apte Cloke for a theef', allowing the Irish to 'shroud' themselves, lurk and wander, free from 'the wrathe of heaven, from the offence of the earth, and from the sight of men'.[104]

Commentaries like those of Derricke and Spenser undoubtedly formed part of a much wider colonial discourse centred around the justification for the English conquest and colonisation of Ireland but, on a more foundational level, they also allowed for the construction of the Irish as an 'uncivilised', even inhuman, 'other'. Descriptions of the Gaelic population as a 'brutish', 'savage' people, cloaked in dark mantles with long, shaggy hair, invoked images of the 'wild man' of Renaissance Europe, who existed outwith the boundaries of Christian 'civilisation' and who was believed to occupy a kind of middle ground between man and animal, existing without culture, restraint, or rationality.[105] Thus, by rendering the Irish population as landless 'savages', English colonial authorities rationalised their landed displacement and dispossession, and made way for the creation of private property, which

[101] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland,* pp. 78, 31, 91, 141, 180.
[102] Ibid, p. 86.
[103] Ibid, p. 91.
[104] Ibid, pp. 88-90.
[105] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', p. 28.

allowed for the implementation of the transformative, landed processes of enclosure, settlement, and 'improvement' across the Irish landscape.

Crucially, Jones also highlighted the comparable significance of the concept of 'waste' in relation to the development of English colonialism and the emergence of enclosure. Jones explained that it was the indefensible nature of 'waste' lands — those places regarded as uncultivated, untapped, and 'wasted' — which fuelled the English culture of 'improvement', and allowed for its use in a colonial capacity to demand enclosure, and therefore the dispossession of Indigenous Peoples.[106] Thus, contemporary English commentaries on the state of Ireland from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries routinely referred to the country as spoil or 'waste': in 1612, for example, Sir John Davies commented that 'Ulster, and all the Irish Countries are found so waste and Desolate at this Day', while Spenser painted a picture of the country filled with 'soe manye wretched carcases starvinge, goodly countreys wasted', and 'soe huge a desolation and confusion'.[107] By condemning Ireland's 'wasted' potential, proponents of the English colonisation of Ireland simultaneously called to attention the need to 'improve' the land as part of their 'civilising mission' via the policy of plantation, all of which necessitated landed, physical 'improvements' in order to affect the corresponding social, economic, political, religious, and cultural 'improvement' of the Irish population; or, in other words, their 'civilisation'.

Accordingly, discussions between crown officials on the execution of the Ulster plantation reveal a distinctive preoccupation with the lack of 'building' and 'improvement' throughout the region: for example, Davies claimed that,

[106] Jones, 'Property, territory, and colonialism', p. 191.
[107] Davies, *Historical Relations*, p. 75; Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland,* p. 181.

> never any particular Person … did build any Stone or Brick House for his private Habitation … Neither did any of them in all this time, plant any Gardens or Orchards, inclose or improve their Lands, live together in settled Villages or Towns, nor made any Provision for Posterity …[108]

In discussing the importance of holding a parliamentary session in Ireland, it was also noted that 'all the possessions of the Irish shall from henceforth descend and be conveyed according to the course of the common law of England, and not accordiug to the barbarous customs of Tanistrie or Gravelkinde … For until this be done … they will never build houses' or 'improve their lands'.[109] Without secure ownership, like that which the crown had proposed with the policy of surrender and regrant, the English authorities suggested that the Irish would continue to possess no legal right to their lands and, as such, would not cultivate or invest in the land itself, unlike their English counterparts. The proposal for the division and plantation of the six escheated counties in Ulster, therefore, envisioned the total transformation of the physical landscape into that which resembled something of a typical English county: lands were to be divided into four specific parts, parish boundaries established; Anglican churches and free schools erected; corporate towns and markets built; and houses of stone or brick constructed to form villages built after the English manner.[110]

---

[108] Davies, *Historical Relations*, p. 75.

[109] 'Motives of importance for holding a Parliament in Ireland', in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co., 1873), p. 166.

[110] 'A Project for the Division and Plantation of the escheated lands in six several counties of Ulster, namely, Tirone, Colraine, Donnegall, Fermanagh, Ardmagh, and Cavan, concluded by his Majesty's Commissioners', in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co., 1873), pp. 13-16; 'Conditions to be observed by the Servitors and Natives of the Escheated Lands in Ulster consisting in three principal points', in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co., 1873), pp. 50-51.

English 'improvement', then, had come to serve the colonial regime on both a practical and ideological basis: while reinforcing the tenets and prejudicial rhetoric of the English 'civilising mission', the 'improvement' of Ireland also demanded physical intervention, the expropriation of Irish land, and the physical transformation of the landscape in order to reform the Irish 'wilderness' into the embodiment of English 'civilisation'. For example, Blomley has maintained that the image of the hedgerow or fence within the English realm had come to denote a symbol of privacy and private ownership, signaling the creation of a 'close' wherein the space was exclusive in both use and entitlement.[111] As the English population expanded their colonial settlements across Ireland during the first half of the seventeenth century, the creation of an enclosed space became a far more poignant symbol of the physical dispossession and cultural erasure of the Irish inhabitants as a result of the English 'civilising' agenda.[112] In particular, one of the best examples of such erasure is that which relates to the Gaelic agricultural practice of booleying, and its utter incompatibility with both the physical and ideological 'improvements' associated with the English conquest of Ireland.

As part of a wider discussion on how to 'drawe the Irish from desire of warre and tumults, to the love of peace and civylitye', Spenser asserted that, 'in all countryes that live in such sorte by kepinge of cattell … you shall find that they are both very barbarous and uncivill, and greatly given to warre', and so he recommended that 'yt is expediente to abridge theire custome of heardinge, and augment their trade more of tyllinge and husbandrye'.[113] Indeed, this view of the predominantly cattle-based Gaelic

[111] Blomley, 'Making Private Property', p. 8.
[112] Ibid.
[113] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland,* p. 90.

agricultural system can be traced back as far as the twelfth century with Gerald of Wales, who insisted that Irish pastoralism was 'primitive', 'barbarous', and 'deplorable'.[114] Furthermore, the characterisation of the Irish as a 'primitive', nomadic, and 'bestial' people had become customary among early modern English commentators who attributed this alleged backwardness and 'savagery' to their engagement in booleying.[115] Such beliefs lent credence to the apparent severity of Ireland's condition and the urgency with which English intervention was required in order to correct the 'natural' order, partly necessitated by the English belief in the ascendancy of humanity over the animal kingdom that was laid out in the concept of the 'Great Chain of Being'.[116] But, they also worked to undermine the legal claim of the Irish to their lands, given the fact that no wandering 'beast' could legally own or possess of land, nor were they gifted with any such authority in accordance with the will of God.[117]

The dehumanisation of the Irish via the denigration of transhumance also fed into the enduring English conceptualisation of land in Ireland as 'waste' or, as was common among various commentaries which called for the 'civilisation' of Ireland, as 'empty'. Based upon Roman principles, English commentators contended that the 'primitive' attachment of the Irish to their transhumant customs and nomadic lifestyle prevented their participation in cultivation, their 'improvement' of the land, and their adoption of permanent 'civilised' settlement, thus rendering Irish lands as 'wasted' and the 'property of no one'.[118] Indeed, English observers were unable, or more likely

[114] G. Cambrensis, *The History and Topography of Ireland* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1982), pp. 101-103.
[115] See previous discussion of Spenser and his prejudicial perspective of Irish booleying, pp. 98-100, as well as discussion of Gerald of Wales' dehumanisation of the Irish as 'beasts', pp. 28-32, 104.
[116] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', p. 26; K. Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800* (London: Penguin Group, 1984), p. 21; V. D. Anderson, *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 79.
[117] Ibid.
[118] Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*, p. 78; K. Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility: Manners and Civilisation in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), pp. 216-217.

unwilling, to acknowledge the ways in which non-English populations organised their labour in relation to the availability and preservation of their natural resources, and so their denial was undoubtedly strategic in nature.[119] Unlike England, Ireland benefitted from a lesser population density and, therefore, an abundance of available land, meaning that the 'negligence' of the Irish was not in their failure to utilise said land, but in their failure to utilise the land in the same highly intensive, commercialised manner as their English counterparts, who were becoming increasingly driven by the tenets of profitable 'improvement'.[120] However, in accordance with Roman law, this crude English abstraction presented Ireland as a prime target for English colonisation, reinforcing the ideological justification for their appropriation and intervention in Ireland.[121]

Thus, English observers simultaneously attempted to depict Ireland as a 'wasted' land with squandered potential, exemplified by the apparent rootless nomadism of the Gaelic inhabitants, and also as 'vacant' or 'empty', and ripe for the introduction of English 'civilisation'. Indeed, such representations strengthened the English recourse to plantation and settlement in Ireland, and established the importance of building 'strong enclosures' in order to facilitate the 'improvement' of both the land and its inhabitants.[122] These enclosures were planned in the form of 'stronglie trenched, or otherwise fenced' off towns to ensure that 'none should passe but thoorough those townes', or simply as individual efforts of farmers to 'dytch and enclose' their lands for cultivation and for 'fresh pasture, that nowe is all trampled and over runne'.[123] The

---

[119] G. Farrell, *The 'mere Irish' and the colonisation of Ulster, 1570-1641* (Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), p. 37. See previous discussion of Irish transhumance as a controlled, seasonal endeavour, pp. 98-104.
[120] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 36; Robson, 'Improvement and Epistemologies', p. 601.
[121] Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*, p. 78.
[122] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland,* pp. 141-142, 101.
[123] Ibid.

erection of such rigid boundaries and the intensity of English 'improvement' was naturally bound to unsettle the Irish landscape and disrupt the traditional organisation of Gaelic society, and so it is important to consider the impact of this disruption in relation to the experiences of the non-elite Irish in the decades which followed the crown plantation of Ulster, particularly in order to obtain a better grasp on their motivation to rebel in 1641.

From a solely practical perspective, the imposition of enclosure for the purpose of 'improvement' contravened the fundamental structure of early modern Irish society. For example, landholding in Gaelic Ireland primarily took place based upon the premise of kinship, wherein all members of a kindred were descended from a common male ancestor and were issued lands based upon a system of partible and collective inheritance.[124] As such, lands were frequently redistributed among co-heirs — at least once every two or three generations — and were not ordinarily held by any one individual for an extended period of time.[125] As for the non-elite Irish tenantry, migration between lordships was permitted in order to allow those individuals to seek better opportunities or to evade the demands of a particular lord.[126] Furthermore, while the commodity of land in Ireland was in no short supply, it was not in and of itself regarded as a particularly valuable economic resource, as was the case in England, due to the general volatility of peace and the carnage of warfare.[127] Instead, Irish lords were more concerned with the retention of labourers and, undoubtedly more so, of cattle —

[124] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 154.
[125] S. G. Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures 1470-1603* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1985), p. 41.
[126] N. Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established 1565-76* (Sussex: The Harvester Press Limited, 1976), p. 12.
[127] S. G. Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447-1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998), p. 41.

both of which were fundamental to the utility and productivity of the land in Gaelic Ireland — in order to garner wealth and political power.[128] Given the general state of unrest in Ireland throughout the early modern period, the mobility of the herd was particularly important among the non-elite and the nobility in order to preserve one's economic, political, and social security during times of conflict, while crops, granaries, and lands often had to be simply abandoned and left to the mercy of invaders, who routinely deployed scorched earth tactics during their raids and attacks.[129] Thus, in accordance with the variable nature of landholding and the precariousness of harmony in Gaelic Ireland, there was very little motive, or indeed sense, in moving towards a more intensive, exploitative system of agriculture, and, as it has been argued, Gaelic land use was most likely more efficient and ecologically sustainable within that particular environment than the kind of commercialised system of agriculture favoured by the English colonists.[130] Furthermore, the Gaelic lordship, in terms of its physical landscape, did not actually constitute a bounded, rigidly defined territory, but was instead a complex amalgam of tributes, authority, and rights associated with individual lords, whose power and reach was ultimately dependent upon their kin ties and diplomatic alliances.[131] These territories, therefore, could, and did regularly, contract, move, or expand in conjunction with the changing political circumstances within and around each individual lordship.[132] As such, not only was the English concept of enclosure, based upon English models of land ownership and 'improvement', entirely incompatible with Gaelic frameworks of land tenure and organisation, but it also

[128] D. B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), p. 14; E. E. Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage: Selected Writings* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd., 1996), p. 11; K. W. Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd, 2003), p. 135.
[129] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 82.
[130] Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*, p. 41; Ellis, *Tudor Ireland*, p. 41; ibid, p. 38.
[131] Ellis, *Tudor Ireland*, p. 41; R. A. Houston, 'People, Space, and Law in Late Medieval and Early Modern Britain and Ireland*', *Past & Present*, 230:1 (2016), p. 69.
[132] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 158-159.

effectively worked to undermine and erase these cultural frameworks as a direct result of its implementation within the Irish environment.

Physically speaking, the erection of enclosures and the subsequent implementation of landed, agricultural 'improvements' in Ireland also directly interfered with the practice of transhumance. By English standards, the Irish landscape was perceived as largely unenclosed, though enclosures were not entirely absent within the country. Rather, the Irish tended to favour low ditches, banks, and the occasional temporary fence for divisional or safeguarding purposes, as opposed to the towering hedges or robust fencing which generally characterised the English landscape.[133] Indeed, these seemingly impermanent 'enclosures' reflected more broadly upon the fluctuation of landholding within early modern Gaelic society, but also more significantly they embodied their agricultural preferences.[134] Common ownership of land and, specifically, the right to graze one's cattle upon the unused or unoccupied lands of another was protected under Brehon Law and was crucial for non-elite tenant farmers, and so the emphasis across Ireland was very much placed upon the augmentation of mobility, passage, and access in order to support Gaelic agricultural practices.[135] As such, the imposition of a pervasive campaign towards English-style enclosure and 'improvement' could only stand to impede the country's historic culture of environmental mobility and landed flexibility, and, therefore, must be regarded as wholly inconsistent with the primary objectives of Gaelic agriculture.

---

[133] P. Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-1670* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1994), p. 34.
[134] See previous discussion of the prevalence of Irish booleying and the corresponding lack of permanent enclosures, p. 103.
[135] Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland*, pp. 136-137.

Where the erection of a fence or hedge across the rural landscape of England by the country's landed elite primarily symbolised privatisation, dispossession, and landed exclusion for the non-elite farming population, the replication of these actions within the Irish environment — exacerbated by the imposition of the English colonial regime and the ongoing campaign of hostility and subjugation associated with the 'civilising mission' — was undoubtedly far more inflammatory. Though the confiscation and privatisation of land remained integral to the process of enclosure within the Irish realm, its consequences also made clear that the intention of the English policy of plantation was to engender the deterioration of Gaelic culture and society alongside their landed dispossession, in favour of an arguably more settled, 'civilised' form of living. In fact, the combined English processes of both enclosure and 'improvement' should be considered as a more subtle form of ammunition within the context of Anglo-Irish cultural warfare. What is particularly interesting, then, about the response of the Irish rebels to the enclosures and 'improvements' they encountered during the course of the rebellion are the parallels which have been identified between their actions and those which characterised anti-enclosure riots associated with the non-elite farming population within the English realm. For example, when Elizabeth Dowdall was targeted during the Irish insurrection, her '~~Castls and other houses to the number of twelue~~' were actually set alight by the rebel forces, destroying the '~~gardens & orchards & fayre enclosurs~~' which lined her properties, but also the actual homesteads supposedly protected within the boundaries of these enclosures.[136] Another incident which occurred in the parish of Hospital in County Limerick saw Dame Barbery Browne and her husband 'robbed & forcea[bly] despoiled' of their goods and assets, including their 'Corne in the groun[d]' which was physically 'reapt by & takn away by the means of the said Lord of Castle Connell' from within their lands, before their 'houses were demolisht by the

[136] 'Deposition of: Elizabeth Dowdall (3/10/1642)'.

rebbells'.[137] The deposition of Digory Cory of Rathcoole in County Dublin also recorded an incidence of 'trespasse' by one Edward Hetherington that his 'Cattle had done in this deponents corne' in the course of the rebellion, while a similar incident was reported in the parish of Killgoogen by Richard Germin who testified that his 'Hay in stacks' had been 'devowred' by the cattle of John Supple.[138]

The depositions also provide evidence of similar patterns of Irish resistance in response to the presence of settler 'improvements' more generally throughout the course of the conflict from a non-elite perspective. For instance, John Holmsted of '[the Citty] of Dublin' was 'robbed pillaged and dispoyled of all his personall Estate', including 'a great Reeke of hay burned by the Molloys & others', which was actually targeted from within the boundaries of his 'said haggard' enclosure.[139] Other cases of said resistance typically involved the burning or general destruction of an 'improved' building. While testifying on behalf of her husband Richard, Ane Graham, of the town and parish of 'hospitall' in County Limerick, declared that her husband's '~~dwelling howse with many~~ [-] ~~other out howses~~' had been '~~well Improued~~' and was estimated to be worth '~~with her lease three score pounds~~', but that '~~by meanes~~ [~~of~~] ~~this present rebellion hee was dispossessed of his howse an~~[~~d~~] ~~ffarme in the said County~~' by Irish rebels, who had proceeded to incinerate those buildings during their attack.[140] Deponents also frequently represented their losses in 'improvements' as a direct

---

[137] 'Deposition of: John Browne (4/2/1643)', MS 829, fols 250r-251v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829250r167, accessed on: 14/3/20.

[138] 'Deposition of: Digory Cory (11/5/1643)', MS 810, fols 123r-123v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810123r179, accessed on: 10/3/20; 'Deposition of: Richard Germin (27/5/1642)', MS 829, fols 175r-176v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin,* https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829175r107, accessed on: 13/3/20.

[139] 'Deposition of: John Holmsted (25/5/1643)', MS 814, fols 250r-250v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://www.1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=814250r154, accessed on: 11/3/20.

[140] 'Deposition of: Ane Graham (3/6/1642)', MS 829, fols 280r-281v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin,* https://www.1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829280r186, accessed on: 14/3/20.

consequence of their involuntary displacement by the Irish rebel forces, as was the case with Samuell Felgate. In December of 1641, Felgate was 'forceibly Robbed and dispoyled by Rebells to him vnknowne' at 'greate Cabbrough', which led to him, 'for saffty of his Liffe ~~flying to~~ repaireing to Grangegorman nere the City of Dublin: & dwelling there with his family'.[141] As a result, Felgate declared that:

> he hath since lost by meanes of the Rebellion the profitts for twoe yeres & a half & he is like to bee deprived of and Loose the future proffits of his said farme vntill a peace be setled: Besides the proffits of his building hedging & ditching eing & improveing of the said farme which cost this deponent 150 li. ster at least.[142]

Many of the other deponents from the areas of Limerick and Dublin also made reference to their being generally 'robbed & deprived', 'deprived robbed or otherwise dispoiled', or 'forceibly deprived & expelled' of the 'benefitt' of their goods, chattels, and, of course, 'improvements' as a direct result of the disruption, disorder, and displacement effected by the Irish rebels during the rebellion.[143]

The similarities between the actions of the Irish rebels during the course of the conflict — including those numerous additional examples which can be found among the

[141] 'Deposition of: Samuell Felgate (8/1/1644)'.
[142] Ibid.
[143] 'Deposition of: Edmund Perry (2/9/1653)', MS 829, fols 383r-384v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829383r256, accessed on: 15/3/20; 'Deposition of: Edward Neilson (22/6/1643)', MS 829, fols 309r-309v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829309r200, accessed on: 15/3/20; 'Deposition of: Symon Bellers (16/1/1646)', MS 810, fols 057v-058r, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810057v096, accessed on: 9/3/20; 'Deposition of: Edward Blennerhassett (14/10/1642)', MS 810, fols 118r-118v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810118r174, accessed on: 10/3/20. Further examples can be accessed through the Trinity College Library Dublin online archive of the 1641 depositions.

depositions of both Dublin and Limerick — and those favoured by the proponents of anti-enclosure within the English realm are unmistakable. Not only did both campaigns encompass tactics such as theft, displacement, destruction, and trespass but, significantly, both were also undertaken by non-elite English and Irish communities within their respective realms. In fact, these parallels are suggestive of the emergence of a distinct pattern of non-elite Irish resistance directed specifically against English landed and agricultural 'improvements' during the course of the 1641 rebellion.

At this juncture, it is important to acknowledge that the veracity of the contents of the depositions has been considered as part of existing research on the 1641 rebellion, and that scholars have called into question the obvious biases contained therein.[144] While the depositions were primarily intended to serve as a documentary record of the material losses experienced by the victims of the rebellion, English and Protestant commentators quickly realised their potential as propagandist accounts of the death and destruction suffered among the 'innocent' settler communities allegedly torn apart by the rebel violence.[145] Accordingly, Nicci MacLeod has suggested that the commissioners charged with the collection of the depositions may have exerted significant influence over their contents and composition in order to aid in the creation of a canonical English and Protestant version of the events, embellishing the depositions with their own biases.[146] Tim Stretton has also discussed the 'problem of the lawyer's hand' in relation to the academic study of various topics which

[144] M. Perceval-Maxwell, 'The Ulster Rising of 1641, and the depositions', *Irish Historical Studies*, 21 (1978), pp. 147-148; Canny, 'The 1641 Depositions', p. 53; Ohlmeyer, 'Anatomy of Plantation: the 1641 Depositions', p. 56; Canny, '1641 in a Colonial Context', pp. 57-60; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 16.
[145] M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer, 'Introduction 1641: fresh contexts and perspectives', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 2.
[146] N. MacLeod, '"Rogues, Villaines, and Base Trulls": Constructing the "Other" in the 1641 Depositions', in E. Darcy, A. Margey, and E. Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), pp. 125-127.

include women.[147] Specifically commenting upon the general use of depositions, Stretton argued that depositions have been historically abused — from the coaching of witnesses, to the invention and falsification of reports — by lawyers and litigants seeking to defame their adversaries or frame events in a particular fashion.[148] Having considered issues of bias, hearsay, and political ploy, various historians, including Canny and Michael Perceval-Maxwell, have maintained that the depositions can be utilised successfully and constructively in conjunction with other contemporary sources.[149] Canny has also made a crucial point on the reliability of the victim testimonies, arguing that even the most 'ghoulish' of reports constitute important sources of historical insight, if for no other reason than to explore and explain the terror of the settlers who became involved in the conflict.[150] As such, these depositions can be utilised in order to obtain a better understanding of the sorts of issues and concerns which coloured the imaginations of English commentators observing the situation in Ireland throughout this period, including religious persecution and of the destruction of their 'civilisation', both practically and ideologically. However, the larger significance of the actions of the Irish rebels within this particular context — with respect to their devastation of the landed and agricultural enclosures and 'improvements' among the English and Protestant settler communities — as well as the representation of those actions, demands consideration.

Having considered the ideological and practical ramifications of the imposition of Anglicised enclosure and 'improvement' within the Irish realm, it is impossible to discount

---

[147] T. Stretton, 'Women, Legal Records, and the Problem of the Lawyer's Hand', *Journal of British Studies*, 58:4 (2019), p. 648.
[148] Ibid, pp. 690-694. See also A. Shepard and T. Stretton, 'Women Negotiating the Boundaries of Justice in Britain, 1300-1700: An Introduction', *Journal of British Studies*, 58:4 (2019), pp. 677-683 for further reading.
[149] Perceval-Maxwell, 'The Ulster Rising of 1641', p. 147; Canny, 'The 1641 Depositions', pp. 52-53; Ohlmeyer, 'Anatomy of Plantation: the 1641 Depositions', p. 56; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 16-17; Smyth, 'Towards a Cultural Geography', pp. 74-81; Stretton has also acknowledged that it is 'unhelpful' to forward strict or comprehensive assertions as to the limits of the interpretation of legal sources, like the 1641 depositions — see Stretton, 'Women, Legal Records', pp. 693-694.
[150] Canny, 'The 1641 Depositions', p. 53.

their significance within the framework of the rebellion of 1641, both as vehicles for the advancement of English colonial ambitions, and as channels for the exhibition of Irish resistance and frustration towards the colonial order. In discussing the wrecking of fences or hedging as part of English anti-enclosure protests, Blomley has devoted special attention to the legal importance that these physical markers held within the eyes of the English courts, explaining that the crime of trespass did not require the breaking of a physical barrier, but that the legal risks associated with the said crime did increase substantially if an enclosure was damaged or destroyed.[151] Accordingly, Blomley has concluded that the deliberate action of physically damaging or wrecking an enclosure by protestors was imbued with a much greater symbolic purpose; one which specifically acknowledged and targeted both the legal value and exclusionary principles of the barrier itself.[152] Indeed, the symbolic power and defiance behind such an action would explain the shock and horror of those English commentators who chronicled the actions of the Irish rebels during the rebellion of 1641, as well as the intention behind these particular aspects of the Irish campaign.

In his description of *The History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion* (1680), English doctor and historian Edmund Borlase — son of the Irish lord justice Sir John Borlase — declared his intention to make 'clear by what Steps the late Rebellion arrived at its Height', and how the 'Malignant and Rebellious Papists … most disloyally, treacherously, and wickedly, conspired to surprize His Majesties Castle of Dublin' in such a 'generally inhumane, barbarous, and cruel' manner, 'as the like was never before heard of in any Age or Kingdom'.[153] However, in spite of the fact that Borlase's account contained numerous reports of 'barbarous and inhuman cruelties' allegedly committed by the rebels during the course of

[151] Blomley, 'Making Private Property', pp. 14-15.
[152] Ibid.
[153] E. Borlase, *The History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion* (London: Robert Clavel, 1680), pp. 7, 323.

the rebellion, he continually referenced the 'horrible destruction', 'spoil and devastation of his Majesties good People', and, in particular, how 'all Mens Estates, as well those whom they barbarously murthered … were wasted, ruined, and destroyed', causing immeasurable 'Devastation of Houses, Orchards, Gardens, Improvements … and the impairing the value of Land unto that time'.[154] Furthermore, as part of his own sensational account of the 1641 rebellion, Sir John Temple bitterly argued that the Irish 'Natives must confesse, that their Estates were hugely augmented by our improvements', and that 'so great an advantage did they finde by the English commerce and cohabitation in the profits and high improvements of their lands and native commodities'.[155] Evidently, Temple and the English authorities could not, or simply would not, comprehend the impact of the conquest and colonisation of Ireland upon the Irish inhabitants. For Temple, these actions only exemplified the alleged 'barbarity', wickedness, and depravity of the Irish rebels, for 'their malice towards the English' was clearly not limited to their 'murder in cold blood', but 'further even to the … improvements of their hands, for they destroy … all improvements made by the English, and lay waste their habitations'.[156]

In discussing the spread of violence and atrocity throughout Ireland during the rebellion, Smyth has also touched upon the significance of the theft and destruction carried out by the rebels on settler properties during the course of the conflict, and maintained that the digging up of gardens, the killing of livestock, and the destruction of enclosures all point toward a motive of both legal and symbolic significance — one that would ensure what he describes as the extinction of the 'cultural capital' of the coloniser on the ground.[157] For the

[154] Ibid, pp. 63, 89, 91, 34, 324.
[155] J. Temple, *The Irish Rebellion: or, An History Of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion raised within the Kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October, in the year, 1641* (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1646), pp. 112, 15.
[156] Ibid, pp. 5, 41, 88.
[157] Smyth, 'Towards a Cultural Geography', p. 74.

Irish farmers, smallholders, and artisans who drove the rebellion on a popular level, Smyth argued that this was essentially a war of the land, fought to restore their rights to ancestral lands, rights to lease lands, and rights to live and subsist sufficiently, but was also waged against the wider displacement, marginalisation, and impoverishment of the Irish population engendered by the English colonists.[158] Much like the Mayo cattle trials, then, the deliberate destruction of settler enclosures and 'improvements' by the Irish rebels can be considered as part of a much longer history of conflict in Gaelic Ireland, wherein the land and the landscape had long constituted sites of contention between the Irish 'natives' and the English 'newcomers', especially following the increase in both plantation and commercialised agriculture.[159] Not only had these processes become important agents for the aggressive implementation and spread of English 'civilisation' in Ireland, but their entrenchment within the wider English colonial process is also further testament to their oppressive function in relation to the physical assertion of English ownership and 'superiority' over foreign lands and peoples. Thus, the actions of the Irish rebels reflected upon a more visceral desire for reclamation; that is, of their lands, identities, and culture — all of which had been targeted in one way or another by the application of English enclosure and 'improvement' as part of their Irish conquest, even within the reportage of the 1641 rebellion itself. Although both Perceval-Maxwell and William Palmer have commented upon the difficulty of the historian in being able to make an authoritative connection between ideological motivation and historic action — especially in the case of the non-elite population who drove the rebellion on a popular level — the deposition of Digory Cory, 'late of Rathcoole in the County of Dublin gentleman', is able to offer a degree of insight in this instance.[160] Cory had given evidence

[158] Ibid.
[159] See Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change', p. 300.
[160] M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), pp. 231-233; W. Palmer, 'The Problem of Ideology in the Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Comparative Approach?', *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua*, 19:3 (2015), p. 128; 'Deposition of: Digory Cory (11/5/1643)'.

against various individuals who had 'expelled ~~this~~ deprived and dispoyled' him of his 'goodes and Chattles' during the course of the rebellion, including one 'Edward Hetherington … of Rathcoole', brother-in-law to one 'Garrett ffitzwilliams', and several others, but his discussion of an incident which occurred 'before Michaelmas Last' is arguably the most significant.[161] Cory testified that he had 'demaunded sattisfaccion of ~~said brothe~~ the aforesaid Edward Hetherington' in the presence of 'one Garrett ffitzwilliams' for the crime of trespass committed upon Cory's estates by Hetherington's cattle, but that,

> ffitzwilliams … then sayed that … before one ~~two~~ twelue moneth came to an end he [ffitzwilliams] hoped to see all the horses in the Country to grase in Comon vpon all the Corne in the Country or wordes to that effect.[162]

While Cory's testimony only constitutes a single deposition, Fitzwilliams' remark on the restoration of common grazing across the whole country remains both revealing and significant: although there may be no way to verify his declaration, its presence within the depositions is, at the very least, suggestive of the potential existence of such beliefs among Ireland's non-elite population, whose dependents, both human and animal, had traditionally been sustained by way of the Irish culture of transhumance and landed mobility. It can be argued, then, that the rebel attacks upon settler enclosures and 'improvements' should not be considered as random, isolated episodes of senseless violence. Not only does Fitzwilliams' reported declaration clearly represent, albeit on an individual basis, the Irish rejection of English enclosure and its exclusive, inflexible ideology, but, in the light of the entrenchment of enclosure and 'improvement' within English colonial process, it is also a much larger

[161] 'Deposition of: Digory Cory (11/5/1643)'.
[162] Ibid.

rejection of English intervention in Ireland and its historically oppressive impact upon Gaelic culture, society, and the landscape. Thus, the actions of the Irish rebels should be considered and examined as deliberate, symbolic, and individual efforts to undermine the physical impact of the English conquest upon the Irish landscape, and to oppose the prejudicial supporting ideologies which characterised Gaelic Ireland and its inhabitants as 'uncivilised' and 'inferior', including those of 'civility' and 'civilisation'.

Having endeavoured to substantiate and expand upon the existing literature of the 1641 Irish rebellion by considering the uprising from an alternative, non-elite perspective, what has become increasingly clear from these discussions of the significance of enclosure and 'improvement' within the framework of the rebellion is that there are indications of what can only be described as the emergence of a calculated, purposeful campaign of Irish violence, evinced by the depositions of 1641. The rebels clearly engaged in targeted displays of resistance — including destruction, theft, trespass, and an ongoing campaign of landed dispossession and displacement — in order to attack the physical markers of the English conquest of Ireland, especially those which represented agricultural capital and the 'civilisation' of the Irish landscape. By attacking the physical manifestations of English 'improvement', the Irish rebels demonstrated an understanding of the relationship between these physical markers of English oppression and the associated ideology of 'inferiority' which helped to facilitate and reinforce the English colonial establishment in Ireland. Not only did such actions physically jeopardise the future survival of England's colonial settlements, they also demonstrated the fragility of their colonial equilibrium and its so-called 'improvements'. Just as 'civility' had been utilised as an instrument of authority by Elizabethan colonists to legitimise and expand their reach within Ireland, 'improvement' had undoubtedly come to serve in a similar fashion, rationalising the landed confiscation of the

Gaelic population, the reconstruction and 'improvement' of the 'wild' Irish landscape, and the general eradication of the 'uncivilised' Gaelic culture and society which had existed long before their arrival. Indeed, it can be argued that 'improvement' had become integrated with the ideological framework of English 'civility' during the first half of the seventeenth century, and its established position among the depositions of 1641, particularly among the non-elite population, is indicative of its corresponding colonial function: to 'civilise' Ireland was to 'improve' it, and to 'improve' it, in turn, was to 'civilise' it, along with its 'uncivilised' inhabitants. As such, 'improvement' had become a necessary component of the English policy of plantation, prompting settlers to dispossess, displace, build, repair, enclose, manure, and plant in order to transform Ireland's physical landscape into that which was not only suitable for long-term settlement, but which also reflected upon the social and cultural values of the colonisers. Thus, as tensions erupted on the eve of rebellion in 1641 and the conflict began to take hold among the non-elite population, the Catholic Irish rebels seized their opportunity to unleash their frustrations towards the English colonial establishment, resulting in a colossal campaign of violence and destruction designed to restore Irish lands to their previous ownership and condition, thereby reclaiming Irish cultural identities and livelihoods in the process. In doing so, the rebels rejected the imposition of English agricultural enclosure, their culture of landed and moral 'improvement', and their arbitrary vision for the 'civilisation' of Ireland and its people, even expressing their intentions to 'beate all the english out of Ireland' and to eradicate all traces of their interference — a rationale which acknowledged that the undertaking of agriculture and the use of the land itself had in fact become a central component of England's 'civilising' agenda and, as such, had become a focal point of Anglo-Irish conflict.[163]

[163] 'Deposition of: Elizabeth Dowdall (3/10/1642)'.

People, Place, and Possession: A Topography of 'Barbarity' and 'Civility' During the 1641 Irish Rebellion

In seeking to contribute to a deeper understanding of the Irish rebellion, it is important to interrogate the 'official' narrative of the conflict constructed largely from an English, Protestant point of view. The obvious biases associated with the 1641 depositions have already been acknowledged, but the wider reportage and comprehensive documentation of the conflict was undoubtedly co-opted by English and Protestant writers who seized the opportunity to create an enduring narrative which framed the episode as an anti-Protestant, wholesale religious massacre.[1] Discussing the writing of violence in early modern England and Ireland, Sarah Covington connected the works of Protestant polemicists like Sir John Temple with those of earlier authors such as John Derricke and Edmund Spenser in order to highlight continuity in their representations of Ireland, and its inhabitants, as godless, brutal, and 'uncivilised'.[2] Kathleen Noonan, whose work Covington has also explored, discussed English and Irish identities within propaganda and policy from the seventeenth century; in doing so, Noonan focused particularly on the work of Temple and argued that he used the

---

[1] See chapter on "Enclosures, 'Improvement', and the Landscape of the 1641 Irish Rebellion", pp. 174-175; N. Canny, 'The 1641 Depositions: A Source for Social & Cultural History', *History Ireland*, 1:4 (1993), pp. 54-55; J. Gibney, *The Shadow of a Year: The 1641 Rebellion in Irish History and Memory* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2013), p. 26.
[2] S. Covington, '"Realms so barbarous and cruell": Writing Violence in Early Modern Ireland and England', *History*, 99:336 (2014), pp. 488-491.

shocking allegations of atrocities committed during the 1641 rebellion to prove that the Irish were not simply 'barbarous', but inhuman altogether.[3] Covington suggested that Temple's work was deliberately designed to elicit outrage among its readership, focusing on the victims of the rebellion as 'silent recipients of abject and unending punishment' who endured atrocities reminiscent of those seen previously in 'the Bible, the St Bartholomew's Day massacre, John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, the Thirty Years' War pamphlets, and above all the earlier English writings on Ireland'.[4] As such, Covington argued that Temple's infamous treatise placed the insurgency of 1641 within a longer, more ancient biblical and historical timeline, which in turn saw the victims positioned within a 'quasi-sacred narrative' that would expedite calls for vengeance on their behalf from 'God's elect'.[5] From this perspective, the 'official' narrative of the rebellion did not exist in isolation, and instead built upon various issues which had directed the course of Anglo-Irish history for centuries, including religious hostilities, colonial entanglement, and the struggle over 'civility'.

Commentators like Temple who sought to account for the rebellion claimed to be able to trace its origins back as far as the medieval period.[6] However, they were also able to relate the insurgency to the wider contemporary conflict taking place between Catholicism and Protestantism across Europe and, more so, to contextualise it in relation to the tumultuous history of the English conquest of Ireland and the corresponding spectre of Irish resistance.[7] Previous English commentaries on the state of Ireland from the twelfth through to the

[3] Ibid; K. Noonan, '"The Cruell Pressure of an Enraged, Barbarous, People": Irish and English Identity in Seventeenth-Century Policy and Propaganda', *The Historical Journal*, 41:1 (1998), pp. 160-162.
[4] Covington, '"Realms so barbarous and cruell"', p. 491.
[5] Ibid, pp. 490-491. See J. Temple, *The Irish Rebellion: or, An History Of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion raised within the Kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October, in the year, 1641* (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1646) for a more complete view of this timeline.
[6] See previous discussion of Temple's claim that the Irish rebellion of 1641 could be traced back to the arrival of Henry II, pp. 36-37.
[7] N. Canny, '1641 in a Colonial Context', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 59.

seventeenth centuries had utilised the Irish landscape itself as a vehicle in order to discuss the necessity of conquest, highlighting the 'inferiority' of the Irish while underscoring the 'civility' and overall 'superiority' of their English counterparts.[8] John Patrick Montaño discussed how, in the past, the natural environment was utilised to organise daily routines and to 'create meaning' among diverse communities, suggesting that the landscape also could have been employed to both further, and demonstrate resistance to, the English colonial 'civilising project', which was, in itself, designed to alter the relationship between the Irish and their environment, separating the 'natives' from the 'newcomers'.[9] Indeed, Montaño also maintained that the Irish immediately recognised the expansion of English cultivation, order, and 'civility' as symbolic of their own dispossession, inadvertently causing the Irish to direct their resistance towards the material culture of the 'intruders'.[10] As such, the Anglo-Irish struggle over the organisation, use, and ownership of the Irish landscape arguably remained very much at the forefront of conflict on the eve of rebellion, something reflected not only in the scale of physical destruction and upheaval which quickly followed the insurgency, but also within its discourse and representation.

This chapter will explore how accounts of the 1641 rebellion discussed and represented the topography of Ireland within the context of the insurrection itself. It will also consider how and to what extent these accounts drew upon existing English concepts of 'civility' and 'barbarity' in order to denigrate both the 'wild', untamed Irish landscape and, in

[8] See previous discussion of the English representation versus the contemporary reality of the Irish landscape and its inhabitants, particularly in relation to the construction of English 'superiority' and Irish 'inferiority', pp. 25-33, 88-108, 160-181.
[9] J. P. Montaño, 'Cultural Conflict and the Landscape of Conquest in Early Modern Ireland', *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, 40 (2017), pp. 128-129. See previous discussion of the physical construction of English 'civilisation', pp. 26-28.
[10] Montaño, 'Cultural Conflict and the Landscape', pp. 128-129. See previous discussion of the Irish destruction of the 'cultural capital' of the English settlers, pp. 177-180, as well as previous discussion of the 'spark and crackle' of local rebellion and the underlying hostility caused by the regular employment of martial law in Ireland, pp. 51-52, 64, prior to the outbreak of the Irish rebellion in 1641.

turn, its ‘uncivilised’, uncontrolled populace during the course of the rebellion. Finally, it will determine the main purpose behind this denigration and so contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of Anglo-Irish relations during the mid-seventeenth century, with a particular focus on the wider, ongoing concerns with agriculture, colonialism, land use, and landownership in Ireland. By drawing upon both the depositions and wider chronicles and accounts from the rebellion, this investigation will consider the rhetorical utility of Ireland’s topography in both specific cases and on a more comprehensive basis.

Constructing Ireland

In discussing the general undertaking of early modern colonial expansion, Carl-Gosta Ojala and Jonas Nordin have explained that the control and conquest of the physical landscape was, and remains, at the heart of the colonial process, which in turn accentuates the role of map-making and other associated forms of spatial construction.[11] Indeed, Jacinta Prunty argued that map-making cannot, and should not, be regarded as either a ‘neutral’ or ‘true’ endeavour, given that maps were constructed to serve the specific interests of their human creators, as was very much the case with the English expansion of topographical description, surveying, and cartography in relation to Ireland.[12] The cartographic process during this period effectively created a relationship — based upon an ambiguous goal of ‘dominion’ — between the ‘viewer’ and the landscape, whereby topographical knowledge and understanding gave real power over the landscape itself as well as its inhabitants.[13] Bernhard Klein has argued that geographical images and texts allowed for the ‘production’ of space by way of the calculated representation of various political and social spaces, enabling English officials to

[11] C. Ojala and J. M. Nordin, ‘Mapping Land and People in the North: Early Modern Colonial Expansion, Exploitation, and Knowledge’, *Scandinavian Studies,* 91:1-2 (2019), pp. 99-101.
[12] J. Prunty, *Maps and Map-making in Local History* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), p. 16.
[13] E. Robson, ‘Improvement and Epistemologies of Landscape in Seventeenth-Century English Forest Enclosure’, *The Historical Journal*, 60:3 (2017), pp. 622-623.

‘appropriate’ the Irish landscape and shape its representation for their own ends, namely to assist in their colonial endeavours.[14] Thus, in order to examine representations of Ireland’s topography within the context of the 1641 rebellion, it is important to consider the longer history of Ireland’s spatial construction and to explore the ways in which diverse, often contradictory, representations were employed during particular historical moments in order to meet various expectations. By drawing upon the abundant body of English writing directly focused on the state of Ireland and its inhabitants, from the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries, it is possible to both isolate and explore some of the key thematic renderings of Ireland’s topography which dominated Anglo-Irish discourse throughout the early modern period, and to consider the implications of their endurance within the context of the rebellion in 1641.

Perhaps one of the earliest and most all-encompassing representations of Ireland is the twelfth-century work of Gerald of Wales, which portrayed Ireland as something of an exotic, alien environment in which ‘wildness’ and ‘wilderness’ appeared to characterise both the inhabitants and the landscape. As part of his efforts to document both the history and topography of Ireland, Gerald prefaced a larger discussion of what he called the ‘Wonders and Miracles of Ireland’ by stating that ‘history does not spare the truth’, but ‘recounts rather what is in fact true than that which seems like the truth’.[15] This section of his work explored ‘those things which, appearing to be contrary to nature’s course, are worthy of wonder’; here he described the existence of ‘two islands in one of which no one dies; into the other no animal of the female sex can go’, as well as the ‘wonderful nature of wells’ and even ‘a

[14] B. Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 10, 61-63.
[15] G. Cambrensis, *The History and Topography of Ireland* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1982), pp. 57-58.

remarkable pile of stones which was called the Giants' Dance, because giants brought it from the farthest limits of Africa to Ireland, and erected it'.[16]

Joep Leerssen discussed Gerald's 'exoticisation' of Ireland as part of his study on the medieval and early modern demarcation of 'civility' and explained that the 'wildness' of Ireland was in fact captured via this 'iconography' of seemingly wondrous 'natural phenomena', effectively placing the realm outwith the boundaries of conceivable reality and of the 'civilisation' contained within the Anglicised Pale.[17] Gerald's marvellous claims saw Ireland conceptualised as a strange land, in the senses of both 'foreign' and 'weird', and the connection between the Irish landscape and its inhabitants became more apparent as his commentary continued.[18] For example, Gerald reported upon the existence of 'an island divided into two parts', one of which was 'stony and ugly and is abandoned to the use of evil spirits only', while another island was believed to exist in the west of Connacht where 'human corpses are not buried and do not putrefy'.[19] He also went on to describe a large lake of 'marvellous origin' which overflowed and wiped out the entire population of an area in Ulster, as the ancient inhabitants were allegedly 'particularly addicted, above any other people in Ireland, to bestiality'.[20] If such representations of Ireland's wondrous landscape failed to elicit some form of terror or, at the very least, unease among his predominantly English readership, his subsequent relation of the 'wonders' he claimed were manifest among the Irish population certainly would. For example, Gerald had already established that Ireland was once home to 'giants', but he also described the existence of various half-humans, including a 'man that was half an ox and an ox that was half a man' and a 'wolf that could

[16] Ibid, pp. 58-69.
[17] J. Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland: Medieval and Early-Modern Patterns in the Demarcation of Civility', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 56:1 (1995), pp. 31-32.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, p. 61.
[20] Ibid, p. 64.

speak human words', as well as recounting the horrific tales of 'a lion that loved a woman' and 'a goat that had intercourse with a woman'.[21] Finally, in order to bring to a conclusion the second portion of his Irish historical and topographical account, Gerald warned his audience of the fact that 'the saints of this country seem to be of a vindictive cast of mind', and declared 'that just as the men of this country are during their mortal life more prone to anger and revenge than any other race, so in eternal death the saints of this land that have been elevated by their merits are more vindictive than the saints of any other region'.[22]

Gerald's fantastical narration of the Irish topography was not only designed to both exoticise and alienate Ireland's physical landscape from that which was familiar and predictable, but so too was it intended to reflect upon the corresponding 'abnormal' nature of the inhabitants who dwelled within that environment. By devoting such a significant portion of his work to the exploration and documentation of Ireland's natural 'marvels' and 'miracles', Gerald clearly intended to provoke the imaginations of his readership in order to ensure that their enduring perception of the Irish landscape was, as Leerssen contends, one of 'strangeness', but also of considerable, innate difference.[23] Montaño has argued that Gerald's influence upon the discourse surrounding Ireland and the Irish was so prominent that subsequent commentators were inclined to repurpose, repackage, and reinforce his claims during the following centuries, creating a powerful narrative of cultural difference around which generalised notions of English 'superiority' and Irish 'inferiority' could be built.[24] Indeed, in discussing the importance of discourse within the framework of English colonialism, Montaño has stated that representations, and indeed misrepresentations, of

[21] Ibid, pp. 73-94. See also Geoffrey of Monmouth, *History of the Kings of Britain* (London: Dent, 1958), pp. 19-21, 25-27, 164-165, 211-215 for further reference to the existence of giants in Briton.
[22] Ibid, p. 91.
[23] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', pp. 31-32.
[24] J. P. Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 18-23.

Ireland may be better understood once it is accepted that such representations are essential for the very existence of that discourse.[25] Gerald's commentary related the problem of Ireland to its physical landscape, and the conquest of that landscape more specifically. Ireland's difference, or abnormality, was characterised almost as symptomatic of its strange, backward population, and so Gerald's subsequent reassurance of Ireland's eventual subjugation under Henry II served, in effect, as a glimmer of hope, and as an enduring reminder of the duty of the English crown towards Ireland. The image of an exoticised Ireland, then, can be regarded as a foundational component of early English colonial thinking, particularly necessary for the gradual formation of a discourse reliant, as both Montaño and Leerssen have claimed, upon cultural difference.[26]

Following the discovery of the Americas over two centuries after the publication of Gerald of Wales' Irish commentary, Ireland's 'exotic' status changed from that of 'far' to 'near' and from 'distant' to 'domestic', facilitating, to an extent, a change in English policy towards Ireland; one more intensely focused on the completion of conquest and the establishment of control.[27] Crucially, though, echoes of Gerald's exoticisation remained present within successive commentaries on the state of Ireland and its 'unruly' inhabitants at least until around five centuries later, whether consciously or unconsciously — though much of his marvellous Irish 'iconography' had become somewhat outdated with the advancement of exploration and cartography — as early modern commentators continued to convey images of Ireland as something of a mystical, almost supernatural land inhabited by a strange, 'uncivilised' population.[28] Gerald of Wales' *History and Topography of Ireland* (1188x1223)

---

[25] Ibid, pp. 22-23.
[26] Ibid; Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', pp. 31-32.
[27] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', pp. 32-33.
[28] Raphael Holinshed published his *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* in the late 1570s as part of a larger literary and cartographic effort to consolidate English 'superiority', and dedicated his entire sixth volume to the history and description of Ireland, referencing the 'better and the more certeine opinion' of Gerald while

in fact demonstrated that difference was not necessarily defined solely by the extent of the 'civility', or even the 'barbarity', of the population, but also by the topography and physical organisation of the landscape itself, both of which would go on to reflect significantly upon the successes and failures of the English conquest, guaranteeing the official management of their representation well into the seventeenth century.

With the emergence of so many overlapping, often contradictory, representations of Ireland's topography throughout the medieval and early modern periods, it is perhaps difficult to comment upon the existence of a dominant perspective of Ireland and, by association, its inhabitants. Nevertheless, the apparent correlation between the nature of the Irish landscape and the disposition of the Irish people themselves was palpable. In his *Image of Irelande, with a Discouerie of Woodkarne* (1581), published almost four centuries after Gerald of Wales' fantastical account, John Derricke commented on the 'straunge' appearance of the 'Irish Karnes', and carefully described how 'their weedes be straunge, and monstrous to beholde: So doe their maners far surpasse'.[29] Not only did Derricke's account hint at the continuation of Geraldian-style rhetoric — evident in his denunciation of the strangeness of the Irish inhabitants along with their flora, like those Gerald had claimed were 'so removed … from the ordinary world of men, as if they were in another world altogether' — but his allegorical description also reinforced the idea that the 'wildness' of the Irish was reflected in the 'wildness' of the Irish topography.[30] Derricke's woodcuts offer further insight into the

delivering a similar account of Ireland's marvellous topography, from the 'strange wels', islands, and rivers, to the 'venemous' inhabitants — see R. Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles: England, Scotland, and Ireland,* Vol. VI (London: J. Johnson; F.C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilkie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme; Cadell and Davies; and J. Mawman, 1808), pp. 15, 26, 36-42. Even after denouncing those who touted the 'many strange Miracles' of Ireland, Barnaby Rich did also to an extent extend the alien imagination of Ireland himself, describing a land inhabited by 'many Sorcerers', 'Witches', and those akin to 'Deuils of Hell', who engaged in 'superstitious ceremonies' throughout the country — see B. Rich, *A New Description of Ireland: Wherein is described the disposition of the Irish whereunto they are inclined* (London: William Jaggard, 1610), pp. 8-9, 13, 48-53.

[29] J. Derricke, *The Image of Irelande, with a Discouerie of Woodkarne* (London: J. Kingston, 1581), pp. 51-52.

[30] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 102-103.

pictorial representation of Ireland’s topography, especially during the volatile tenure of Sir Henry Sidney as lord deputy. Derricke was most probably employed by Sidney throughout the 1570s, and so his depictions of military conflict in Ireland are especially valuable given the likelihood that he witnessed for himself many of these engagements during the first Desmond rebellion in the province of Munster.[31]

One of his plates depicted the image of an Irish ‘rebel’ cloaked in a traditional Irish mantle, seemingly hidden in the depths of a dense forest, and menacingly flanked on his right-hand side by two wolves (see Figure 3). Beneath the plate, Derricke described a ‘rebell stoute, in traytrous sorte, that rose agaynst his Prince’, all so that he may idly ‘enjoy the fruite which other men had sowne’.[32]

Figure 3: Woodcut of an Irish kern soldier; Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 190-191.

[31] A. Hadfield, ‘Derricke, John (fl. 1578-1581)’, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/, accessed on: 18/8/21.
[32] Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 180-181.

Derricke's impression sought to capture the 'wild' appearance of the Irish kern, but also the 'wilderness' of the Irish landscape which surrounded him, represented by the thick woods and the presence of carnivorous beasts, creating a frightful image of both the Irish inhabitants and the landscape within which they appeared to 'lurk'. Indeed, the woods, or woodland, were perceived as the utter antithesis to 'civilisation', lacking in order, refinement, and the convention of daily social activity associated with city-dwelling in a 'civilised' society, while the province of Munster, in particular, was perceived as a strategic danger for the English authorities, lacking in religion or 'civility'.[33] It was only on account of the expansion of the English policy of plantation across Ireland that the trees and forests became gradually disassociated with the 'wild' and dangerous, and instead became perceived by the settlers as valuable resources upon their estates, further evincing the significance of the environmental context with respect to the volatility of Anglo-Irish relations throughout this period.[34]

Another of Derricke's plates depicted three of the Irish kern seemingly preparing for military engagement, passing long spears and axes to one another, donning swords, and accompanied by a horse, but it is the background of this particular scene which gives additional character to the Irish landscape (see Figure 4). The Irish once more are set against the backdrop of a dense forest to their left, but to the right-hand side of the scene there are large sloping hills, and a mountaintop clearly visible, giving the impression that the Irish are assembling their forces in a hidden, upland area, preparing to incite violence by their 'murd'ring hand'.[35]

---

[33] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', p. 28; N. Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), pp. 578, 584.
[34] J. Adelman and F. Ludlow, 'The past, present and future of environmental history in Ireland', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy: Archaeology, Culture, History, Literature*, 114C (2014), pp. 377-378.
[35] Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 116-117.

Figure 4: Woodcut of three Irish kern soldiers and a horse; Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 126-127.

Derricke's striking imagery buttressed the representation of Ireland's topography as that of an unyielding 'wilderness', apt only to help conceal the equally 'wild' and unruly population who used the terrain to their advantage. English commentators commonly viewed forests, woodland, and mountainous regions as sanctuaries for criminals and thieves, and so the physical landscape of Ireland was represented as an asset for the 'barbarian' Irish, from which they could engage in guerrilla attacks against the English and consequently evade retributive justice.[36] The message was clear: so long as the Irish landscape was allowed to remain in a state of 'wilderness' — both unmanaged and disordered — so too would the 'savage', 'barbarian' Gaelic population continue to behave as such, leading various English commentators to explore the relationship between the Irish and the physical Irish landscape within their works, especially within the context of Anglo-Irish conflict.

[36] A. Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea, North Channel Communities of the Atlantic Archipelago c.1550-1625* (Oxford: Peter Lang Ltd, 2022), p. 156.

The first edition of English historian Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (1577) was published in the late 1570s and, in seeking to create a comprehensive description and history of these realms, Holinshed gave an account of numerous aspects of Irish history, topographical makeup, and the nature of its people.[37] In doing so, he drew upon the events of the first Desmond rebellion in a similar fashion to Derricke, using the Irish landscape in order to accentuate the 'barbarity' and 'savagery' of the rebels. Holinshed claimed that the Irish, 'revolting from their former feined obedience, became open rebelles and traitors vnder Iames Fitzmoris an archtraitor, and as dogs they returne to their vomit, and as swine to their durt and puddles'.[38] He reported that 'the countrie and other small townes did not so escape' the aggression of the Irish, and that 'all Englishmen and English gouernment … if not the whole land, was imbrued & infected with this rebellion'.[39] In fact, Holinshed asserted that Sir John Perrot, newly appointed to the Munster presidency in 1570, was forced to pursue the rebels, chasing them 'from place to place: in the bogs he pursued them, in the thickets he followed them, in the plaines he fought with them, and in in their castels and holds he beseeged them', until 'hauing thus rid the garden from these weedes, and rooted vp the fields from these thornes, he entereth into the gouernment by order of law'.[40] Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1577) created something of a spatial timeline of Irish history which supposedly reflected upon the consequences of Irish occupancy and rebellion. Thus, his account not only reinforced the link between the disordered, desolate Irish landscape and the 'savage' inhabitants — even drawing upon topographical allegory in order to emphasise their destructive tendencies — but also the link between Ireland's possible

[37] C. S. Clegg, 'Holinshed [Hollingshead], Raphael (c. 1525-1580?)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/, accessed on: 18/8/21.
[38] Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles*, Vol. VI, p. 369.
[39] Ibid, p. 363.
[40] Ibid, pp. 369-370; R. Turvey, 'Perrot, Sir John (1528-1592)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/, accessed on: 18/8/21.

salvation and the establishment of English law and order: English ‘civility’.

Reflecting on the state of Ireland during the 1590s, Edmund Spenser also focused heavily upon the relationship between the ‘barbarous’ Irish inhabitants and the construction of the physical landscape in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596). Spenser’s work was created during the period of the Nine Years’ War, otherwise known as Tyrone’s rebellion, which constituted one of the most vicious, widespread episodes of Anglo-Irish conflict during the sixteenth century, allowing Spenser to appropriate the events of the rebellion for his own ends. On multiple occasions he argued that the ‘thicke woodes’, ‘mountaynes’, ‘bogges’, ‘faste places’, ‘glenns’, and ‘straigt passages’ which characterised the Irish landscape played host to any number of ‘wilde’ Irish ‘scatterlyn[g]s’, ‘outlawes’, ‘rebelles’, and ‘theves’, who would ‘breake forth … sometymes into smale vilages to robbe and spoyle’.[41] Spenser, much like Derricke and Holinshed, decried the alleged prevalence of such ‘wylde places’, which were particularly associated with the Gaelic strongholds of Ulster and Munster in the north and west, and doubled down on their association with lawlessness, ‘savagery’, and ‘barbarity’, which he also condemned even outwith the context of war.[42] In discussing the ancient Irish agricultural custom of booleying, Spenser claimed that the Irish allowed,

> any outlawes, or loose people, as they are never without some, which live upon the stelthes and spoyles [to] … fynd Releef onely in those Bollies, beinge upon

[41] E. Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (Library of Alexandria, 1934), pp. 29, 31, 65, 78, 84, 89, 142, 168, 179.
[42] Ibid, p. 26; Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 116-117; Holinshed, *Holinshed’s Chronicles*, Vol. VI, pp. 369-370; R. A. Butlin, ‘Land and People, c. 1600’, in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 145-148.

> the wast places … where eles they should be dryven shortly to sterve, or to come downe to the townes to seeke relief, where … they would soone be caught.[43]

Although such claims constituted little more than a prejudicial misrepresentation of Gaelic culture, Spenser's assertions — particularly when considered within the context of such a volatile period of Anglo-Irish conflict towards the end of the sixteenth century — exacerbated the construction of the Irish landscape as something of a haven for nomads, marauders, and outlaws. In fact, it was rendered as such that it seemed as though the topography lent itself to the perpetuation of 'savagery' within that environment.

Evidently, the construction of a 'wild', 'uncivilised', or unyielding Irish landscape was all but impossible to avoid, especially during the incessant periods of Anglo-Irish conflict throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but this was only intensified by the ongoing colonial struggle between the two realms. As part of a larger discussion on the construction of 'wilderness' in early modern Ireland and Virginia, Keith Pluymers has compared descriptions of nature in both Ireland and Virginia by early modern English travel writers and colonial commentators, and maintains that these commentators had to contend with the task of 'transforming a wild land' into one which could support English settlement, all the more difficult given the fact that these writers tended to describe a 'dark and frightening landscape inhabited by savages'.[44] However, as Pluymers went on to argue, if the 'rebellious' Irish could be successfully separated from their physical landscape, then the land itself could be transformed into a rich, abundant environment with untapped potential for

[43] Ibid, pp. 84-85.
[44] K. Pluymers, 'Taming the Wilderness in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Ireland and Virginia', *Environmental History*, 16:4 (2011), p. 620.

profit.[45] As noted earlier, one such method which helped to facilitate this separation on a literary basis was the principle of *res* or *terra nullius*, which dictated that any lands which remained empty or unoccupied were possessed only under common ownership until such a time that those lands could be put to the correct use — primarily through agricultural cultivation.[46] Keith Thomas explained that this 'law of nature' was not only cited in order to help separate 'civilised' from 'barbarian' or 'savage' peoples — based upon the apparent necessity of 'human reason' required to warrant access to such laws.[47] It was also used to provide justification for the hostile, landed dispossession of 'inferior' populations who 'denied others their right by natural law to take it over and cultivate it'.[48] These arguments could also find theological backing since, after the Fall, God had cursed the land and all mankind so that only 'through painful toil you will eat food from it all the days of your life … and you will eat the plants of the field … By the sweat of your brow'.[49] The tendency to refer to the 'emptiness' or 'vacancy' of Ireland, then, was by no means a novelty of the early modern period, but rather an effective narrative defence inherited from both classical and biblical ideology.

Gerald of Wales previously described the Irish landscape as being 'deprived of anyone to inhabit it', 'abandoned', 'empty', 'destroyed', or quite simply 'uninhabited'.[50] He also explained that it was Gurguintius, the king of the Britons, who originally granted Ireland to the Spanish Basclenses for settlement, at which point it was allegedly 'entirely uninhabited

---

[45] Ibid, p. 626.
[46] A. Pagden, 'The Struggle for Legitimacy and the Image of Empire in the Atlantic to c.1700', in N. Canny (ed.), *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 42-43; K. Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility: Manners and Civilisation in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), p. 216; Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea*, p. 161.
[47] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, pp. 138-139, 216-217.
[48] Ibid.
[49] NIV, 'Genesis 3: The Fall — Verses 17-19'.
[50] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 95-99, 119.

or had been settled by him', pressing the case for England's ancient 'claim' over the ownership of Ireland.[51] Gerald, therefore, appropriated the literary composition and construction of the Irish landscape, and even the existence of its inhabitants, which distorted reality in order to create the righteous, triumphant narrative desired by the English king, Henry II, following the apparent success of his conquest. Yet, Gerald's work is pervaded by contradictory assertions which ultimately negated the representation of Ireland as an 'empty', 'uninhabited' environment: for example, he acknowledged the existence of the Irish by describing the nature and characteristics of the Gaelic population at length in the third section of his work, and claimed that they were 'fully endowed with natural gifts', but, at the same time, were 'so barbarous that they cannot be said to have any culture'.[52] William Palmer has discussed the difficulty in dealing with colonial ideology within the context of the Elizabethan conquest of Ireland, and has acknowledged the glaring contradictions present within Anglo-Irish commentaries, but has also emphasised the importance of this ideology for the early modern historian.[53] Rather, he maintained that the existence of paradoxical claims did not automatically negate their individual power, and instead posited that historical actors did not necessarily require consistency in order to obtain validation for their actions, particularly when dealing with the conquest of Ireland and its landscape.[54]

More than four centuries later, as part of his employment with Sir Charles Blount, eighth Baron Mountjoy and lord deputy of Ireland, Fynes Moryson published his own topographical account of the condition of Ireland during the Nine Years' War, and was, like Gerald of Wales, also engaged in the perpetuation of contradictory observations of Ireland.

---

[51] Ibid, p. 99.
[52] Ibid, pp. 34, 101.
[53] W. Palmer, 'The Problem of Ideology in the Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Comparative Approach?', *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua*, 19:3 (2015), pp. 128-135.
[54] Ibid, pp. 135-142.

For example, he described particular areas of Ulster as being ‘barren’ and others ‘not bearing man or beast, but dangerous to passe’ — in other words, as uninhabited.[55] He concluded that Ireland, ‘after much bloud spilt in the Civill warres, became lesse populous’ leaving ‘much grasse (wherewith the Iland so much abounds) to have perished without use, and either to have rotted, or in the next spring-time to bee burnt’.[56] Ironically, Moryson’s claims did contain elements of the truth, as Irish population levels were undoubtedly much lower than those of England throughout this period.[57] What he failed to mention was that the numbers of the Irish had been significantly reduced as a consequence of the precedence of English scorched earth policies in Ireland — designed to literally starve the Irish to death by destroying their corn and livestock during periods of Anglo-Irish conflict. These policies were favoured by various Lord Deputies, but especially by Sir Charles Blount who claimed that the Irish were ‘little better than devils’.[58] Instead, Moryson blamed the Irish for this destruction, ‘not only being idle themselves, but in naturall malice destroying the labours of other men, and cutting up the very trees of fruits for the same cause, or else to burne them’.[59] This description was, likely, both a distortion of and reference to the agricultural practices of the Irish and Indigenous Peoples in the Americas, which had traditionally involved burning oats from their straw and surface burning the land in order to increase its nutritional contents. Barnaby Rich also constructed the Irish landscape as having previously been marred by the ‘raging fury’ of ‘barbarous sauages’ who were ‘delighted with Rebellions, Commotions, and

---

[55] F. Moryson, *An Itinerary: Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland & Ireland*, Vol. IV (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1907), pp. 190-192.
[56] Ibid, pp. 192-193.
[57] Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea*, p. 152.
[58] Ibid, pp. 185-186; J. McGurk, ‘The pacification of Ulster, 1600-3’, in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), p. 123.
[59] Moryson, *An Itinerary*, Vol. IV, p. 192; D. B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), p. 14; E. E. Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage: Selected Writings* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd., 1996), p. 63; J. F. Collins, ‘Geology, Soils and Cattle Production’, in M. O’Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), pp. 3-4.

Insurrections', causing the 'vtter decay, ruine, and desolation' of the land while leaving 'so much of the Countrey againe lying wast for want of Inhabitants'.[60] Notwithstanding the obvious contradictions related to the existence of the Irish population within their works, accounts like those of Moryson and Rich reinforced existing representations of Ireland's apparent 'emptiness' well into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Additionally, they helped to demonstrate the development of English discourse surrounding the Irish landscape and its problematic inhabitants, exemplified by the connection being drawn between the 'savage', 'warlike' disposition of the Irish and the subsequent ruination of the land.

Evidently, the concept of 'emptiness' or 'vacancy' must be treated carefully, considering the glaring inconsistencies within English commentaries on the character of the Irish landscape and its inhabitants. As part of their analysis of the 'civilisation' of the Irish, Robbie McVeigh and Bill Rolston have discussed what they termed the 'legal fiction' of *terra nullius* as part of the colonising process: in fact, they maintained that the construction of an 'empty' landscape, in spite of the obvious presence of an existing population, could instead designate a territory which contained 'the wrong kind of people doing the wrong kind of things', perhaps offering further insight into the function of various, often paradoxical, representations of Ireland's topography within particular Anglo-Irish contexts.[61] Furthermore, Alison Cathcart has explained that *res nullius* did not necessarily mean that Ireland was entirely uninhabited, but was instead regarded as both unproductive and uncultivated — as 'wasted'.[62] To an extent, Gerald of Wales had contributed to this representation as far back as the twelfth century, having initially commended the Irish topography as being filled with good 'pastures and meadows, honey and milk, and wine', 'magnificent rivers' abundant with

---

[60] Rich, *A New Description of Ireland,* pp. 9, 18, 32.
[61] R. McVeigh and B. Rolston, 'Civilising the Irish', *Race & Class*, 51:1 (2009), pp. 7-8.
[62] Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea*, p. 152. See also chapter on "Enclosures, 'Improvement', and the Landscape of the 1641 Irish Rebellion" for further discussion of 'waste' lands, pp. 163-168.

fish, and ‘different types of minerals … with which the hidden veins of the earth are full’.[63] Gerald maintained that the defect of the land was in fact the Irish people, who ‘have not progressed at all from the primitive habits of pastoral living’, ‘despise … work on the land’, and were ‘devoted only to laziness’.[64] In this respect, Gerald’s account demonstrated the potential for profitable settlement in Ireland under the direction of a more ‘civilised’ population, on account of the ‘backward’, ‘barbarous’ nature of the existing inhabitants, apparently too lazy to put the landscape to its divinely-intended use through cultivation and ‘improvement’. English colonial expansion, then, was justified by the spatial construction of Ireland as an ‘abundant’, ‘fertile’ arena in desperate need of organisation and proper use in order to combat its ‘waste’.

English commentators understood the importance of striking a balance between the construction of a ‘wasted’ Irish landscape and one of ‘abundance’, especially in order to generate interest, financial support, and personnel for the undertaking of plantation, which was imagined as the epitome of English ‘civility’ and ‘civilisation’.[65] As Cathcart has explained, the process of plantation did not only involve the transplantation of English people into Ireland, thereby facilitating the implementation of good government, law, and order among a ‘rebellious’ and ‘backward’ population, but also the physical plantation of crops and the intensive economic exploitation of the land for both its mineral wealth and agricultural value.[66] Various proposals for the establishment of plantation in Ireland had emerged over the course of the sixteenth century, initially intended to settle internal unrest in Ireland involving the O’Connors, but it was not until the mid-sixteenth century that the crown began to

---

[63] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 34-36, 102.
[64] Ibid, pp. 101-102.
[65] P. Withington, *Society in Early Modern England: The Vernacular Origins of Some Powerful Ideas* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010), p. 205.
[66] Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea*, pp. 146-147, 151-152.

consider these proposals more seriously, given the increase in English security concerns during this period.[67] Even so, numerous attempts to plant the areas of Offaly, Laois, Munster, and Ulster were largely unsuccessful, and Elizabeth remained reluctant to offer any significant financial backing for such ventures. However, when Sir Thomas Smith forwarded a proposal for a privately funded plantation of the Ards peninsula, the frugal queen gave her consent.[68] Smith advertised his colonial scheme by way of a pamphlet, wherein he was determined to highlight Ireland's economic potential, as well as its capacity to relieve the pressure on England's ever-expanding population and as a viable employment avenue for their unoccupied younger sons.[69]

Early on in his work, Smith posited that if Ireland could be reformed, 'the whole countrey replenished with Englishe men … and polliced with Englishe lawes', then it 'would be as great commoditie to the Prince as the realme of England, the yerely rent and charges saued that is now laide out to maintaine a garrison therein'.[70] Indeed, he actually invoked biblical imagery in order to construct the Irish landscape as 'a lande that floweth with milke and hony', just like that which God had promised to deliver to the Israelites, and he went into great detail to explore its rich topography for the benefit of his readers:

---

[67] Ibid, pp. 123-124; A. Cathcart, 'The Maritime Dimension to Plantation in Ulster, ca. 1550-ca. 1600', *Journal of the North Atlantic*, 12 [SP1] (2019), pp. 95-96; Henry VIII's break with Rome and the wider Reformation context certainly exacerbated English fears over the potential for Ireland to be used as a 'backdoor' to launch an attack on England, but their anxieties were also heightened by rumours of the possible return of the exiled heir to the Kildare estates, Gerald FitzGerald, potentially supported by the French and the Scots.
[68] Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea*, pp. 124-137; I. W. Archer, 'Smith, Sir Thomas (1513-1577)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/, accessed on: 18/8/21. See also H. Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture of Sir Thomas Smith in Ulster, 1571-1575', *The Historical Journal*, 28:2 (1985), pp. 261-278 for further discussion of Smith's Irish exploits.
[69] Archer, 'Smith, Sir Thomas (1513-1577)'.
[70] I.B., *A letter sent by I. B. gentleman unto his very frende Mayster R. C. esquire, wherein is conteined a large discourse of the peopling and inhabiting the cuntrie called the Ardes, and other adiacent in the north of Ireland and taken in hand by Sir Thomas Smith, one of the queenes majesties privie counsel and Thomas Smith esquire, his sonne* (London: Anthonhson, 1572), p. 11.

> a fertile soile truly if there be any in Europe, whether it be manured to corne, or left to grasse. There is Timber, stone, plaister, & state commodious for building euery where aboundant, a countrey full of springs, riuers and lakes bothe small and greate, full of excellent fishe and foule, no parte of the countrey distant aboue, viij. miles from a moste plentifull sea, or land water able to beare lode.[71]

Crucially, Smith argued that Ireland 'lacketh only inhabitants, manurance, and pollicie', but that without the establishment of a reforming English plantation, it would continue to 'lye almoste desolate'.[72] Thus, by invoking providential justification, he declared that 'God did make apte and prepare this nation for such a purpose', and concluded that 'To inhabite & reforme so barbarous a nation as that is, and to bring them to the knoweledge and lawe, were bothe a godly and commendable deede, and a sufficie[n]t worke for our age'.[73] Evidently, English commentators understood the importance of their colonial propaganda in relation to the long-term success and maintenance of plantation in Ireland: the construction or representation of the Irish landscape was critical for the captivation of an ambitious, affluent audience who not only saw Ireland's economic potential, but who believed that it was their duty, as both godly individuals and as 'civilised' subjects of the English crown, to reform this land and its people as the Romans had once done for them.[74]

A few decades after Smith's endeavours, around the turn of the seventeenth century, Edmund Spenser described the Irish topography as part of his *View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596), depicting

---

71 Ibid, p. 26; NIV, 'Exodus 3: Moses and the Burning Bush — Verse 8'.
72 I.B., *A letter sent by I. B. gentleman*, pp. 11, 25.
73 Ibid, p. 25.
74 See Monmouth, *History of the Kings of Britain*, pp. 66-87, 231 for further reference to the Roman conquest of Briton.

> a most bewtifull and sweete Country as is any under heaven, seamed thoroughout with many godlie rivers, replenished with all sortes of fishe most aboundantlie; sprinkled with verie many sweete Ilandes and goodlie lakes … adorned with goodlie woodes, fitt for buildinge of houses and shipes … besides the soyle it selfe most fertile, fitt to yelde all kynde of fruit …[75]

However, clearly reflecting upon the events of the Nine Years' War, and in a similar fashion to Smith, Spenser also denounced the Irish for their 'barbarisme' and lawlessness, and argued that Ireland could only be reformed

> by the sworde, for all those evilles must first be cutt awaye with a stronge hande, before any good cann bee planted; like as the corrupt branches and unwholsome lawes are first to bee pruned, and the fowle mosse clensed or scraped awaye, before the tree cann bringe forth any good fruicte.[76]

Even in spite of his harsh criticism of Ireland and its general population, he sought to remind his readership of Ireland's topographical riches, and utilised agricultural analogy in order to exemplify its potential, under the correct management. Indeed, much like the contemporary English perception of the Gaelic nobility, the Irish non-elite were perceived as having tyrannised the landscape itself by way of their warlike, 'savage' nature.[77] Thus, Spenser advocated the wholesale military conquest of Ireland, which would be supported by the

[75] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 31-32.
[76] Ibid, pp. 162-163.
[77] Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space*, p. 61.

creation of fortified townships and the extensive transplantation of 'civilised' English settlers to secure its settlement.[78]

During the first decade of the seventeenth century, Sir John Davies also sought to dispute the claim that 'Ireland long since might have been subdued and reduced to Civility, if some Statesmen in Policy had not thought it more fit to continue that Realm in Barbarism', and instead insisted that the 'Defects which hindred the Perfection of the Conquest' were 'In the same Prosecution of the War' and 'In the looseness of the Civil Government'.[79] While he acknowledged the 'great defect in the civil Policy' of the English in regard to their subjugation of Ireland, and conceded that 'the English Laws were not communicated to the Irish', depriving them of the apparent 'Benefit and Protection thereof', it was clear that his sympathy remained limited.[80] Accordingly, he determined that the Irish could never have been 'other than Out-laws and Enemies to the Crown of England', unable to 'converse or commerce with any civil Men, nor enter into any Town or City', and were as such doomed to inhabit 'the Woods and Mountains, and there live in a wild and barbarous manner'.[81] Davies' commentary therefore imagined the Anglo-Irish struggle between 'civility' and 'barbarity' as taking place not simply between various populations, but upon, and as part of, the landscape itself since the Irish 'wilderness' could entice those who remained outwith the boundaries of lawful 'civilisation', making both the expediency and expedition of the English conquest clearly apparent.

---

[78] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 19, 38, 40, 162.
[79] Ibid; J. Davies, *Historical Relations: Or, A Discovery Of the true Causes why Ireland Was never entirely Subdued, Nor Brought under Obedience of the Crown of England, until the Beginning of the Reign of King James the First* (Dublin: S. Hyde, 1733), pp. 4-5. It is also worth stating that Davies was himself an accomplished lawyer during this period, though he had also been granted the status of the king's serjeant in 1609, which conferred his royal standing and allegiance; see previous discussion for additional context on Davies' Irish work, pp. 50-51.
[80] Davies, *Historical Relations*, p. 52.
[81] Ibid, pp. 52-53.

Davies also explained, allegorically, that ‘the Husbandman must first break the Land before it be made capable of good Seed’ — a process which he then implied had been finally completed during the reign of James VI and I, as ‘the Multitude … admiring the Power of the Crown of England … submitted themselves to the English Government … which made, indeed, an entire, perfect, and final Conquest of Ireland’.[82] He concluded that ‘the Hearts of the People are also settled … but raised and encouraged to build, to plant, to give better Education to their Children, and to improve the Commodities of their Lands; whereby the yearly Value thereof is already increased double’.[83] On the other hand, from a Gaelic perspective, Fear Flatha Ó Gnímh - an early seventeenth century Gaelic poet whose family had traditionally served as bards to the O'Neills - observed in a poem entitled ‘Pitiful are the Gaels’ that Ireland had become ‘a New England in all but name.’[84] Thus, English commentaries like Davies' depended upon concepts of ‘civility’ and ‘barbarity’ in order to contrast the potential of the landscape under an apparently peaceful, ‘settled’ English community with the idea of its ‘waste’ or ruin if left in the hands of an untamed, ‘uncivilised’, and ungrateful Irish population. Irrespective of the rather delicate language used by Davies to describe the importance of breaking the land before it could yield ‘good Seed’, the English conquest would have a brutal impact upon both the Irish inhabitants and their familiarity with the landscape, further distancing the population from their ancestral lands and making it difficult to envisage the survival of Irish Gaeldom beyond the first decade of the seventeenth century.[85] The English construction of the Irish landscape, therefore, was a focal point in both a literary and physical sense, necessary for the

[82] Ibid, pp. 5, 33.
[83] Ibid, p. 120.
[84] J. Ohlmeyer, ‘Seventeenth-Century Ireland and the New British and Atlantic Histories’, *The American Historical Review*, 104:2 (1999), pp. 460-461.
[85] Davies, *Historical Relations*, pp. 5, 33.

justification of English colonial ambitions as well as for the actualisation of those ambitions in reality.

1641: A 'Topography' of Terror

Following the English victory over the Irish in the Nine Years' War, and the subsequent flight of the northern Earls, Davies' declaration in 1612 that Ireland had 'been brought into his Highness peaceable Possession' and that 'all the Inhabitants, in every Corner thereof, have been absolutely reduced under his immediate Subjection' would not have seemed to be inordinately improbable.[86] Indeed, in the aftermath of the defeat of the Irish and Spanish forces at the Battle of Kinsale in 1602, Hugh O'Neill — one of Ireland's most influential commanders and one of the crown's most formidable adversaries — joined Rory O'Donnell, Earl of Tyrconnell, Cuconnaught Maguire, and several of their allies at Rathmullan in September 1607 for their departure to the European continent.[87] Reflecting upon the 'flight', the Irish annalists lamented 'the project of their setting out on this voyage, without knowing whether they should ever return to their native principalities or patrimonies to the end of the world', which, as it happened, they never would.[88] Breandán Ó Buachalla has suggested that this particular lamentation not only mourned the departure of the northern earls, but of the loss of the Gaelic nobility more generally, including the FitzGeralds, O'Moores, O'Rourkes, and O'Sullivans, whose decline was believed to have signalled the associated decline of Gaelic Ireland.[89] Indeed, although the flight was followed closely by Sir Cahir O'Doherty's rebellion against the English authorities in April 1608, his campaign proved to be both short-

[86] Ibid, p. 123.
[87] D. Finnegan and É. Ó Ciardha, 'Introduction: ''Cáit ar ghabhadar Gaoidhil?' 'Where have the Gaels gone?'', in D. Finnegan, É. Ó Ciardha, and M. Peters (eds.), *The Flight of the Earls: Imeacht na nIarlaí* (Derry: Guildhall Press, 2010), p. xv.
[88] J. O'Donovan (ed.), *Annála Rioghachta Éireann: Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, from the Earliest Period to the Year 1616*, Vol. VI (Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co., 1856), p. 2359.
[89] B. Ó Buachalla, 'Poetry and Politics in Early Modern Ireland', *Eighteenth-century Ireland*, 7:1 (1992), p. 157.

lived and futile, paving the way for the advancement of English settlement in the north and enabling James VI and I to embark on a grand scheme for the widespread plantation of Ulster.[90] Accordingly, these events have been perceived historiographically as 'the effective collapse of an independent Gaelic Ulster', and Jane Ohlmeyer has argued that the subsequent English overhaul of Irish social, political, cultural, and physical landscapes effectively ensured that English jurisdiction extended throughout Gaelic Ireland prior to the rebellion in 1641.[91]

Evidently, given the woeful nature of the Irish chronicle by the Four Masters and Davies' aforementioned declaration of the finality of the Irish conquest in 1612, the representation of Ireland during this critical period was undoubtedly managed in order to substantiate its defeat, subjection, and, most importantly, its transformation under the direction of the English crown in the decades preceding the outbreak of rebellion in October 1641. Therefore, this discussion will begin by focusing on the representation of Ireland's topography, or landscape, in relation to the portrayal of events leading up to the insurgency.

In spite of its brutal beginnings, David Edwards has noted that some historians have since referred to the first four decades of the seventeenth century following the conclusion of the Nine Years' War as those of the 'Early Stuart Peace', or the 'forty-year peace', largely based upon the fact that the English crown did not have to quash another Irish rebellion on the same scale as that of Tyrone, or even O'Doherty, throughout this period.[92] Having

---

[90] Finnegan, Ciardha, 'Where have the Gaels gone?', p. xv; Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea*, p. 214.
[91] Finnegan, Ciardha, 'Where have the Gaels gone?', p. xv; J. Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes": Colonization within Britain and Ireland, 1580s-1640s', in N. Canny, A. Low, and W. Roger (eds.), *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 145.
[92] D. Edwards, 'Out of the blue? Provincial Unrest in Ireland Before 1641', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 96.

considered the harsh realities of daily life in Ireland under English martial law, as well as the persistence of localised episodic violence throughout these four decades of apparent peace, Edwards has convincingly questioned the credibility of the 'forty-year peace', but a general belief in Anglo-Irish harmony throughout this period has commanded the historical record, and not without significant reinforcement from the English narrative of the Irish rebellion of 1641 and its alleged origins.[93] While the magnitude and ferocity of the Irish conflict did, in itself, help to sustain the idea of the 'Early Stuart Peace' in hindsight, English commentators were certainly responsible for the augmentation of this perspective via their reportage of the rebellion and the events which preceded the insurgency, both of which drew upon conceptions of the Irish landscape in order to convey images of Ireland's settlement, tranquillity, and 'improvement' under the direction of the 'civilised' English colonial administration.

For example, Sir John Temple garnered immediate authority in the aftermath of the 1641 rebellion as a learned eyewitness whose professional standing and seemingly thorough investigation of events conferred his expertise on Anglo-Irish affairs.[94] As such, Temple sought to contextualise the 'forty-year peace' as part of his infamous publication *The Irish Rebellion, or, An History of the Beginnings of the First Progress of the General Rebellion Raised Within the Kingdom of Ireland* (1646), and explained that it was during Tyrone's rebellion that the English queen finally 'discerned how much her great clemency had been abused in suffering former rebellions to be smothered over and loosely peeced up with protections and pardons'.[95] Thus, 'with great successe in a short time', she 'brought him upon

[93] Ibid, pp. 97-109.
[94] R. Dunlop and S. Kelsey, 'Temple, Sir John (1600-1677)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/, accessed on: 18/8/21.
[95] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 10-11.

his knees', which in turn saw the Irish landscape 'most miserably wasted, and a generall desolation and famine brought in, mightily consuming what was left undevoured by the sword'.[96] However, Temple described how King James then 'took into his care the peaceable settlement of Ireland and civilizing of the people' via the policy of plantation, laying

> the foundations of some good Towns, soon after encompassed with stone wals … severall castles and houses of strength built in severall parts of the country, great numbers of British inhabitants there setled, to the great comfort and security of the whole kingdome. And the same course was taken likewise for the better assurance of the peace of the country.[97]

Temple's description of Ireland's topography during this period was critical: he argued that not only was it in fact Tyrone's insurrection which had apparently left the Irish landscape 'miserably wasted' and in a state of 'generall desolation', but it was also only by way of English military intervention, and the care and supervision of the new king, in the face of Irish aggression which facilitated the apparent revitalisation and subsequent development of Ireland's landscape.[98] Like those of Moryson and Rich several decades prior, Temple's account constructed the 'waste' and devastation of the Irish landscape during the Nine Years' War as a detrimental consequence of unchecked Irish 'irreligion and barbarisme', which would have ultimately led to the total ruination of the land, if not for James' 'Royall bounty and Princely magnificence'.[99] Thus, based upon Temple's construction of the Irish landscape, the perceived completion of England's Irish conquest had not only been necessary for the settlement of the land and the people, but for the restoration of the landscape and the overall

---

[96] Ibid; Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea*, pp. 281-282.
[97] Ibid, pp. 11-12.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Ibid, p. 10; Moryson, *An Itinerary*, Vol. IV, p. 192; Rich, *A New Description of Ireland*, pp. 9, 18, 32.

advancement of ‘civilisation’ as previously maintained by Spenser and Davies, evinced by Ireland’s subsequent material progress and the apparent long-term establishment of Anglo-Irish ‘peace’.[100]

Authors like Temple tended to overemphasise the extent of the alleged amity and cooperation between the Irish and settler populations throughout this period in order to help construct the enduring narrative of the ‘Early Stuart Peace’. For example, Temple claimed that Ireland and England

> had now lived together 40 years in peace, with great security and comfort, which had in a manner consolidated them into one body, knit and compacted together with all those bonds and ligatures of friendship, alliance, and consanguinity as might make up a constant and perpetuall union betwixt them.[101]

Not only did he maintain that ‘intermarriages’ were ‘frequent’, but so too was ‘fostering (relations of much dearnesse among the Irish) together with all others of tenancy, neighbourhood, and service interchangeably passed among them’, though Temple’s obvious disdain for this ‘transmigration’ clearly reflected upon long-standing English concerns over the potential for their ethnic and cultural ‘degeneration’.[102] Nevertheless, writing just over three decades later in the aftermath of the Cromwellian conquest of Ireland, Edmund Borlase similarly attested in *The History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion* (1680) that ‘the minds of the People were broken to the obedience of the Law’, and so for ‘near fourty years there

[100] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 11-12; Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 31-32, 162-163; Davies, *Historical Relations*, pp. 5, 33, 120.
[101] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 14.
[102] Ibid, pp. 14-15. See the Statutes of Kilkenny. Additionally, see chapter on “1641: Historiography and Context” for additional discussion of Old English ‘degeneracy’, pp. 39-40.

seemed no material distinction betwixt the Natives and other Inhabitants, each concentring in subjection to the Laws, making up but one Jury, living in mutual amity and friendship'.[103] Even the depositions, taken in the shadow of the events of 1641, were scripted to some extent to create a subtle, yet concordant impression of Anglo-Irish harmony during the four decades prior to the outbreak of the rebellion: countless deponents testified to their shock over the sudden animosity of the Irish towards 'the English' and 'the Protestants their neighbours', besides whom they had lived for many years in apparent peace and friendship.[104] In other words, having seemingly finalised the conquest of Ireland, the 'civilisation' of its people appeared to have been in progress, just as those such as Smith, Spenser, and Davies had previously promised.[105] Crucially, though, in order to reinforce their narrative, English commentators once again began to exploit the topographical description of the Irish landscape during the decades of the so-called 'Early Stuart Peace', with a focus on the overall physical 'improvement' of Ireland and the growth of English 'civilisation' via their policy of plantation.

While many of the Irish were commended for having 'taken up the English language' and donning their 'apparell', Temple focused more intently on the assertion that the Irish had been given a 'great … advantage … by the English commerce and cohabitation in the profits and high improvements of their lands and native commodities, so incomparably beyond what they ever formerly enioyed' prior to the period of the 'forty-year peace'.[106] Borlase also

---

[103] A. Clarke, 'Borlase, Edmund (c. 1620-1682)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/, accessed on: 18/8/21; E. Borlase, *The History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion* (London: Robert Clavel, 1680), p. 1.
[104] 'Deposition of: Henry Hughes (13/7/1643)', MS 829, fols 352r-353v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin,* https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829352r230, accessed on 15/3/20; 'Deposition of: John Crewes (1/9/1653)', MS 829, fols 453r-455r, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829453r305, accessed on 17/3/20.
[105] I.B., *A letter sent by I. B. gentleman*, pp. 11, 25; Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 31-32, 162-163; Davies, *Historical Relations*, pp. 5, 33, 120.
[106] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 14-15.

referred to the development of the Irish landscape following the apparent completion of the English conquest in the decades after the failed rebellion of O'Doherty, and stated that Ireland 'seemed very happy, both as to Improvement of Land, Plenty, and Peace'.[107] For example, he explained that the landscape had since been 'in many parts happily planted', and that 'great sums of Moneys' had been 'disbursed in Buildings and Improvements, Churches edified and endowed, and frequented with multitudes of good Protestants'.[108] Temple also made sure to highlight the fact that many of the Irish had since taken up a 'decent manner of living in their private houses' after the manner of the English, which not only implied that the Irish had begun to embrace English-style stone and timber construction — though both Irish archaeological and documentary evidence has demonstrated that such buildings were already in existence — but also the more permanent form of 'civilised' settlement associated with these solid structures.[109] Indeed, according to the surveys conducted by Sir George Carew and Nicholas Pynnar on the progressive works of the Scottish and English undertakers on the escheated counties of Ulster, the campaign for Ireland's 'civilisation' was already underway as early as 1611 — though progress was indeed patchy in particular areas — as settlers transplanted their families, labourers, and livestock; ploughed and sewed various crops; felled Irish woodland to produce timber; repaired castles and churches; and built barns, mills, new houses, castles, bawn enclosures (buildings used for the safeguarding of livestock), forts, brew houses, and towns.[110] The depositions are also characterised by testimonial evidence of

---

[107] Clarke, 'Borlase, Edmund (c. 1620-1682)'; Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, p. 16.
[108] Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, p. 62.
[109] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 14-15; Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 140; T. McDonald, 'The Deserted Village, Slievemore, Achill Island, County Mayo, Ireland', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 2:2 (1998), pp. 73-112; M. Gardiner, 'A preliminary list of booley huts in the Mourne mountains, County Down', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 67 (2008), pp. 143-145; K. W. Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd, 2003), pp. 140-141. For further discussion of the 'deserving' Irish and the embrace of English 'civility' and 'civilisation' in Ireland throughout this period, see: J. Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms: The career of Randal MacDonnell, marquis of Antrim, 1609-1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); G. Farrell, *The 'mere Irish' and the colonisation of Ulster, 1570-1641* (Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 247-258.
[110] See 'A relation of works done by Scottish Undertakers of Land in the Escheated Counties of Ulster, certified by the Governors, Sheriffs, and others; and some seen and surveyed by us in one journey into that Province,

English material 'improvements', from the widespread erection of enclosures, to the introduction of English-style buildings and architecture, to the importation of English livestock and seed, all of which were marketed by English commentators as commodities solely attributed to the intervention of 'an industrious people' who 'could draw out of a good inland soile'.[111] Essentially, these English landed 'improvements' were constructed as valuable contributions from a more advanced, 'civilised' people, whose intentions for Ireland were clearly both progressive and just.

By conceptualising the period of the 'forty-year peace' in relation to the apparent settlement, development, and 'civilisation' of the Irish landscape prior to the outbreak of rebellion in 1641, English commentators were able to successfully reframe their conquest as something of an orderly, even amicable, campaign. In exchange for their submission, the Irish had been rewarded with the fruits of English 'civility', manifest in the reparation and construction of new towns; the increasingly intensive exploitation of Ireland's natural resources for commercial development; and the introduction of landed 'improvements', such as widespread cultivation, enclosure, manurance, and quality English-bred livestock.

---

begun the 29th July 1611', in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co, 1873), pp. 75-9; 'A perfect relation and report of the Works, Buildings, and Fortifications done by the English, surveyed by us in most places, and the rest certified by the Governors, Sheriffs, and others employed by us in our journey in the Province of Ulster, begun the 29th of July 1611', in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co, 1873), pp. 220-227; 'A Book of the Plantation of Ulster', in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co, 1873), pp. 392-422; 'Escheated Lands in Ulster', in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co, 1873), pp. 422-423.

[111] 'Deposition of: Samuell Felgate (8/1/1644)', MS 810, fols 232r-232v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=810232r264, accessed on: 10/3/20; 'Deposition of: John Mitchell (8/11/1645)', MS 809, fols 296r-296r, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=809296r184, accessed on: 11/3/20; 'Examination of: Adam White (13/9/1652)', MS 829, fols 367r-, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829367r241, accessed on: 15/3/20; 'Deposition of: Judith Walcott (29/10/1642)', MS 810, fols 184r-184v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810184r230, accessed on: 10/3/20; Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 39. See chapter on "Enclosures, 'Improvement', and the Landscape of the 1641 Irish Rebellion" for additional examples of Ireland's material transformation in the period prior to the outbreak of rebellion, pp. 140-141.

However, it was also implicit that the maintenance and development of this 'civilising' process was dependent upon the preservation of English governance and authority which, in turn, hinged upon the permanence of Anglo-Irish amity. Thus, the narrative of the 'forty-year peace' not only absolved the English authorities of their military excesses during the previous campaign for the conquest of Ireland — necessary for its eventual 'civilisation' — but also reinforced the justification for their ongoing colonial intervention. Indeed, by captivating their readership with the imagery of Irish tranquillity, assimilation, and progress as a preface to their commentaries on the sheer brutality of the rebellion, English commentators were able to construct a powerful impression of the benevolent, yet subsequently thankless, nature of their campaign for the 'civilisation' of Ireland and its people. The ensuing rebellion could therefore not simply be regarded as an outrageous display of Irish 'barbarity' and insubordination, but as an outright attack on English 'civility' and 'civilisation', both of which represented Ireland's only chance for salvation.

As previously discussed, Pluymers theorised that if the Irish population could be separated from their physical topography, then the landscape could be reformed and 'improved' under the direction and authority of the English crown.[112] However, the outbreak of rebellion in Ireland in October 1641 — exacerbated by wider political and religious conflicts brewing across the three kingdoms — forced English authorities to look upon their failure to sever the close connection between the Irish and their landscape and, ultimately, to reconfigure their representation of Irish 'improvement' in relation to the overall composition of their narrative. Having considered the roles of particular words, phrases, and more developed thematic concepts employed by the crown commissioners in the recording of the 1641 depositions, Nicci MacLeod has effectively called to attention the importance of the

[112] Pluymers, 'Taming the Wilderness', p. 626.

recognition that language was crucial for the subsequent construction of the Catholic Irish as 'other'. [113] As will be argued hereafter, the said language was also critical for the construction of the Irish landscape itself. That the rebellion constituted an extreme divergence from the reasonable calm of the 'forty-year peace' was captured via the overwhelming representation of the conflict as an 'unjustified' 'surprise attack' by the 'treacherous' Catholic Irish population against 'defenceless' English and Protestant settlers.[114] While there are few historians who would disagree with the relatively sudden nature of the Irish insurgency, Nicholas Canny has acknowledged that this perspective was predominantly engendered by English and Protestant authors who sought to command the chronology of those events, chiefly via the perpetuation of many of the same contradictory anti-Irish — and indeed anti-Catholic — conceptual traditions from centuries past.[115]

For example, while Temple claimed that the English authorities 'had not any certain notice of this generall conspiracy of the Irish, untill the 22. of Octob'., since Ireland had apparently remained in a 'happy condition … at the time of the breaking out of the Rebellion' with the Irish and English living 'so peaceably and lovingly together as they had just reason most confidently to believe, that the Irish would never upon any occasion generally rise up again to their destruction', he also claimed to be able to trace the origins of the rebellion back long before its advent in October 1641.[116] Indeed, Temple insisted that 'we must beleeve the plot for a Rebellion in Ireland, of a very ancient date, as well as of a large extent: It had been long in contriving', and, making no distinction between the 'deserving' and supposedly 'undeserving' Irish populations, declared that '[t]he main ground-work, and first

[113] N. MacLeod, '"Rogues, Villaines, and Base Trulls": Constructing the "Other" in the 1641 Depositions', in E. Darcy, A. Margey, and E. Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), pp. 113-114.
[114] Canny, '1641 in a Colonial Context', pp. 53-55.
[115] Ibid.
[116] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 16-17, 36, 39-40.

predispositions to a Rebellion in generall, were most undoubtedly with great dexterity and artifice laid … taking such deep roots in the minds of a blind, ignorant, supersticious people', as the Irish were apparently adjudged.[117] Though Temple's assertions somewhat undermined the overarching narrative of the 'forty-year peace' and betrayed a more significant lack of knowledge and understanding of the origins of the rebellion itself, his inconsistent declarations exemplified the convergence of both English and Protestant anxieties surrounding the potential for further Irish and Catholic conspiracy following the conclusion of the Nine Years' War and the flight of the northern earls.[118] Indeed, the failure of the Reformation in Ireland and the persistence of a Catholic majority, combined with larger fears over the momentum of the Counter-Reformation movement, ensured the prevalence of both religious and ethnic paranoia towards Ireland throughout this period.[119] Nevertheless, Temple's work did ultimately contribute toward the emergence of the dominant narrative of the rebellion as something of a 'bolt from the blue'.[120]

According to Temple's Irish chronicle, the rebellion

> had its foundation laid in the dark … to bind up the consciences as well as the tongues of men from discovery: Besides, they knew well enough, that the Plot

---

[117] Ibid, p. 66.
[118] S. J. Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland 1460-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 377. See previous discussion of the fallacy of the 'forty-year peace', pp. 46-47, 51-52, and that of the contrast between English perceptions of the Irish landscape under the management of the Irish themselves versus their English colonial counterparts, pp. 201-206.
[119] C. R. Langley, 'Sheltering under the Covenant: The National Covenant, Orthodoxy and the Irish Rebellion, 1638-1644', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 2:243 (2017), pp. 137-160; A. Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland, 1625-42* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1966), p. 25; J. Cope, *England and the 1641 Irish Rebellion* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009), pp. 26-28; M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), p. 108.
[120] Edwards, 'Out of the blue?', p. 110.

> being most abominable … would certainly render the first authors, as well as the bloody actors, most odious and execrable to all Posterity.[121]

Thus, the 'great secresie' of the Irish plot itself was given as the 'main and principall reason that the English were so easily over-run … and so suddenly swallowed up, before they could make any manner of resistance in the very first beginnings of this Rebellion'.[122] MacLeod's study of the language employed within the depositions has also helped to confirm the role of these testimonies in the construction of the conflict as both a surprising and unpredictable event, exemplified by the frequent use of the term 'suddenly' in relation to the movements of the rebels.[123] Not only did this assertion give credence to the prolonged English concern with the potential for further upheaval in Ireland, but it also positioned the Catholic Irish as an inherently 'treacherous', conspiratorial people — an assumption which was further substantiated by the ominous, malignant character of the Irish landscape within dominant accounts of the rebellion itself.

For example, after Temple reminded his readership that the Irish had lived 'upon the mountains in the boggs and woods', wherein they would openly 'declare their malice and hatred against the English colonies planted neer unto them', he cited rumours which suggested that the rebellion had first begun to take hold with images of the Irish 'marching down from the mountain side', as numerous unnamed settlers claimed to have witnessed.[124] Another infamous commentary on the Irish rebellion by Henry Jones, the dean of Kilmore and head of the crown Commission for the Despoiled Subject, also placed the rebel forces

[121] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 16-17, 39-40, 66.
[122] Ibid.
[123] MacLeod, '"Rogues, Villaines, and Base Trulls"', p. 121.
[124] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 7, 24.

within wooded areas and upon hills, awaiting orders to attack unsuspecting settlers.[125] Indeed, the English perception of mountains and upland areas as something of a refuge for outlaws has been established, and their 'liminality' discussed, by Eugene Costello, who explained that the potential for injury or even death in these regions created a very real sense of their danger among various rural European populations throughout the early modern period and during the centuries to follow.[126] Furthermore, from an English military perspective, the Irish mountains represented, at best, an elusive obstacle which often evaded their best cartographers or, at worst, a topographical snare from which surprise attacks could be launched and military defences eclipsed.[127] In fact, Borlase described how, after the rebellion was fully underway, the Irish rebels began to use the hills and mountains to evade English counterforces, but also to launch their own attacks against the settler population.[128] One particular episode saw English soldier Sir Charles Vavasor undertaking the 'Passage to the Comroe; upon the left hand whereof there stands an exceeding high Mountain', when '[t]he Enemy… against Sir Charles', in an attempt to ensnare the English forces within the unfamiliar Irish terrain, 'cast up a Trench breast high, with spike holes along the side of the Wood, from the Mountain to the Bog'.[129]

Perhaps most worrying of all was a rumour that had apparently begun to spread widely which claimed that a force of '10000. of the Rebels' had gathered 'together in a body

[125] H. Jones, *A Remonstrance of The beginnings and proceedings of the Rebellion in the County of Cavan, within the Province of Ulster in Ireland, From the 23. of October, 1641. untill the 15. of June, 1642.* (London: Godfrey Emerson, 1642), pp. 24, 28-29, 32-33.
[126] E. Costello, *Transhumance and the Making of Ireland's Uplands, 1550-1900* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2020), p. 166. See K. Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800* (London: Penguin Group, 1984), pp. 254-262 for additional discussion of the early modern perception of mountains as 'uncivilised'.
[127] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', pp. 142-143; D. Edwards, 'The escalation of violence in sixteenth-century Ireland', in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), p. 42; Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea*, pp. 156, 177-178.
[128] Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, pp. 84, 116.
[129] Ibid, p. 116.

at the hill of Tarah', the foremost topographical site of early Irish kingship and religious spirituality, where they 'intended without any further delay to march on and presently surprise' the settlers, causing a great 'panick fear among them'.[130] Both ethnic and religious paranoia undoubtedly coloured this account of the conflict, particularly given the increase in the English destruction of hallowed sites and grounds associated with 'paganism' or 'popery', which were often conflated with one another, during the decades which preceded the outbreak of rebellion in 1641.[131] Alexandra Walsham has argued that the attempted Reformation of Ireland was not confined solely to the population, but was extended to the physical landscape, and, therefore, became something of an extension of the English colonial campaign to finalise the conquest and 'civilisation' of Ireland as a whole.[132] In response, Ireland's devout Catholic population was forced to embrace the natural environment — including desecrated shrines, wells, ruined castles and churches, mountains, bogs, caverns, and woods — in order to express their devotion and engage in worship, paradoxically fostering an intimate connection between Ireland's physical landscape and Counter-Reformation Catholicism.[133] Thus, from an English and Protestant perspective, the image of the Catholic Irish rebels gathering en masse at the Hill of Tara would not only have constituted an alarming display of Irish resistance, but also a clear demonstration of their devotional conspiracy.

That the rebellion in 1641 was rumoured to have been launched in secret from the Irish mountaintops, woods, and hillsides would not only have resonated with English audiences who could readily recall the works of commentators like Derricke, Spenser, and Davies —

[130] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 24; E. Bhreathnach and C. Newman, 'Tara, Co. Meath: A Guide to the Ceremonial Complex', *Archaeology Ireland*, 41 (2008), pp. 1-6.
[131] A. Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 98-137.
[132] Ibid, pp. 108-109, 155-156.
[133] Ibid, pp. 169-189.

whose accounts routinely described how the 'barbarous' Irish roamed and inhabited mountains, woods, bogs, and other 'wast wyld places' — but it would also have seemed entirely plausible to an increasingly fearful Protestant readership whose suspicion of Catholicism had extended to the very landscape itself.[134] The topographical dimension evident within dominant accounts of the origins of the rebellion therefore fuelled existing perceptions of the inherent 'savagery' and 'wildness' of the Catholic Irish population, and also buttressed the overall English and Protestant narrative which sought to codify both the shocking and 'treacherous' nature of the Irish advance. Clearly, the outbreak of rebellion in 1641 constituted a critical juncture in the English construction of Anglo-Irish relations and the physical Irish landscape throughout this period: from this point onwards, the Irish and their environment were radically transformed into hostile, 'treacherous' actants within the emergent narrative of the conflict.

Although the opening stage of the conflict was not immediately characterised as a Protestant massacre, the Catholic rebels did begin to engage in a widespread campaign of pillaging, dispossession, and destruction, largely aimed towards the initial procurement, recovery, or destruction of material assets as well as a more general assault upon the visible English colonial landscape.[135] The very existence of the crown Commission for the Despoiled Subject and the sheer number of individual depositions taken in the wake of the insurgency in order to value and catalogue the material losses of the victims is suggestive of the significant regional spread of these actions, but the testimonies themselves abound with descriptions of

[134] Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 116-117; Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 84-85; Davies, *Historical Relations*, pp. 52-53.
[135] R. Clifton, '"An indiscriminate blackness"? Massacre, counter-massacre, and ethnic cleansing in Ireland, 1640-1660', in M. Levene and P. Roberts (eds.), *The Massacre in History* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1999), p. 109; Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion*, p. 228.

the material violation of the settler community.[136] For example, William Wilkinson — a 'mazon' and '~~brittish protestant~~' from 'the Towne and parish of Kilmallocke' in Limerick — recalled how 'the lord Montgarretts forces consisting of foure thousand men or thereabouts … came in a hostill maner with collors flyeing to the County of Corke' around 'Candlemas 1641' in order 'to rob & pilladge the English in the said County'.[137] The rebels then 'robbed and forceably dispoiled' Wilkinson of his 'goods and ~~Chattles~~ … worth 20 li'., including his 'cowes', 'houshold stuff & weareing apparell'.[138] Richard Lacky — a '~~husbandman~~' and '~~brittish protestant~~' from the town of Newcastle (modern-day Newcastle West) in Limerick — described the arrival of around 'seaven Thousand' rebels on 'horse & foote in hostill ~~maner~~ maner with collors flyeing & other warlicke Engines as battering & field peeces', ready 'to besiedge Newcastle'.[139] Lacky's subsequent losses were significantly more extensive than those of Wilkinson at an estimated 'value of 135 li'. and included '~~Cowes~~', '~~yeerlings & horses~~', a '~~bull~~', '~~houshould stuff~~', '~~hay & turffe~~', '~~corne in ground~~', and '~~a parcell of land~~ … ~~wherein he hath a lease of nynteene yeeres to come~~'.[140] One particularly destructive account from Thomas Bacon 'of the Cittie of Dublin gent' detailed how the rebels 'deprived robbed or otherwise dispoyled' Bacon of his material assets, but also how he was 'credibly informed' that both 'his farme & Castle of Maharefelt' and 'all his tennants howses' were 'burned by Sir Phelim ô Neile knighte & other rebells his souldjers or Complicees'.[141] Simon Swayen of the town of '~~Laghanstowne~~' in County Dublin also recounted how he and other settlers 'were besett by about 100 Rebells', who proceeded to rob him and steal his

[136] For further insight into the scale and spread of the Irish rebellion across particular counties and localities, see The 1641 Depositions Online Digital Archive.
[137] 'Depositions of: William Wilkinson (29/3/1643)', MS 829, fols 331r-331v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829331r215, accessed on: 15/3/20.
[138] Ibid.
[139] 'Deposition of: Richard Lacky (7/12/1642)', MS 829, fols 136r-136v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829136r080, accessed on: 12/3/20.
[140] Ibid.
[141] 'Deposition of: Thomas Bacon (12/5/1642)', MS 810, fols 110r-111v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810110r169, accessed on: 10/3/20.

‘corne, garrans, vtensiles and household stuffe to the value of 200 li. sterlinge’, but not before they ‘found meanes to fire the … Castle’ of Laghanstowne, almost burning him to death.[142] To summarise their plight, Temple maintained that the Irish rebels had effectively begun to direct ‘their rage and malignity aganst the English and Protestants’, and explained how the settlers ‘had all their goods and cattell seazed and carried away, their houses burnt, their habitations laid waste, and all as it were at an instant before they could suspect the Irish for their enemies’.[143]

The dominant narration of the initial outbreak of the rebellion in Ireland was clearly prepared in order to foreground the seemingly reckless fury and destructive character of the Irish rebels, whose ‘barbarity’ seemed to know no bounds. While a more in-depth investigation of the Irish campaign of destruction is undertaken as part of a previous chapter, Temple’s assertion that the ‘malice’ of the Irish was not solely confined to the English themselves, but was said to extend ‘to the beasts of their fields, and improvements of their hands … because they are English’ bears scrutiny.[144] Both individual accounts and larger chronicles from polemicists like Temple employed these initial reports of pillaging, dispossession, and destruction among the settler communities in order to further the impression of Irish and Catholic ‘treachery’ following the decades of the ‘Early Stuart Peace’, apparently engineered by a deceitful population who had lain in wait in order to lull the English and Protestants into a false sense of security while these newcomers introduced an array of landed ‘improvements’. The representation of these actions, then, not only served to further reinforce existing conceptions of Irish ‘barbarity’ chronicled by previous

[142] ‘Deposition of: Simon Swayen (9/2/1643)’, MS 810, fols 183r-183v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810183r229, accessed on: 10/3/20.
[143] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 40.
[144] Ibid, p. 41. See chapter on “Enclosures, ‘Improvement’, and the Landscape of the 1641 Irish Rebellion” for more detail.

commentators like Davies — typified by their rejection, and desecration, of the 'fruits' of English 'civility'.[145] Rather, they also placed the ideological confrontation between English 'civility' and Irish 'barbarity' into the realm of the physical by positioning the struggle as part of the landscape itself, much like Derricke, Spenser, and Holinshed had done.[146]

Commensurately, however, it is important to consider the restorative quality of the rebels' focus on the destruction of English colonial settlements from an Irish perspective. Though Temple had suggested that it was in fact 'Sir Phelim O Neale, and many others of the prime leaders in this rebellion' who had 'turned their Irish tenants of[f] their lands … even to starve upon the mountains', it was the expansion of the English policy of plantation which was primarily responsible for the majority of Irish dispossession and displacement, among both the non-elite and wealthier populations.[147] Accordingly, Gerard Farrell has considered the importance of the crown plantation of Ulster in relation to the subsequent outbreak of rebellion in Ireland in 1641. Specifically, Farrell has argued that it was in fact the failure of the English authorities to remove the Irish from the landscape in totality which led to their armed resistance, as many were forced to watch while English 'outsiders' benefitted from their dispossession and, in some cases, had little choice but to turn to these 'outsiders' for employment, painfully aware of their own subjugation.[148] While the English and Protestant settlers often allowed the Irish non-elite to remain upon their ancestral lands, in violation of the conditions of the undertakers and servitors of the plantation of Ulster, these concessions simply allowed those colonists to issue the Irish tenantry with higher rental fees,

[145] J. Redmond, 'Religion, civility and the 'British' of Ireland in the 1641 Irish rebellion', *Irish Historical Studies*, 45:167 (2021), pp. 2-3.
[146] Davies, *Historical Relations*, pp. 52-53; Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 116-117; Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 26, 84-85; Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles*, Vol. VI, pp. 369-370.
[147] Ibid, p. 15; W. J. Smyth, 'Towards a Cultural Geography of the 1641 Rising/Rebellion', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 72-75; Canny, '1641 in a Colonial Context', pp. 54-55.
[148] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 247-258, 277-278.

exemplifying their impoverishment and oppression. As for the 'deserving' Irish, although various members of the Gaelic nobility and learned classes - whether willingly or reluctantly - had attempted to embrace James' plans for 'civilisation', Farrell explained that the reaction among the elite to the overall decline in their economic and political prosperity was 'delayed' as they attempted to survive within, and sometimes to exploit, the colonial regime which ultimately restricted their prospects.[149] Echoing the topographical allegorical tradition of his predecessors, Temple warned that the Irish would 'never give over untill they leave not any seed of an English-man in Ireland', and declared that their ambition was 'to destroy and plucke up by the roots all the British planted thorowout the Kingdome' and to 'waste their Habitations', burn 'their Evidences', and deface 'in many places all the Monuments of civility and devotion'.[150] The depositions also contain references to individual declarations made by some of the Irish rebels in which they allegedly expressed their desire to 'beate all the english out of Ireland', 'beate all the protestants out … too', and even to 'have noe Relation to England at all'.[151] Thus, the rebels' ruination of the material culture of the English colonial landscape was not only testament to their desire for landed reclamation, but for reclamation on a more comprehensive social, political, cultural, and even religious basis; to 'burn and ruine … all Records, and Monuments of the English government … [in order] that … the ancient names [be] restored'.[152]

While the conspirators of the Irish rebellion had perhaps previously envisaged their campaign as a 'bloodless military coup', their actions thrust the landscape into a state of chaos and disorder which, following a total breakdown in authority, ultimately led to the

149 Ibid.
150 Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 40, 110.
151 'Deposition of: Elizabeth Dowdall (3/10/1642)', MS 829, fols 138r-139v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829138r082, accessed on: 12/3/20; 'Deposition of: Henry Hughes (13/7/1643)'.
152 Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 9.

subsequent escalation of violence on a popular level and, in turn, the widespread brutalisation of the English and Protestant settler communities.[153] Indeed, both the depositions and more expansive polemical accounts of the conflict are haunted by tales of the alleged wickedness, cruelty, and 'barbarity' of the Catholic Irish forces who — seemingly driven by blind and irrational hatred for the English and their Protestant faith — turned their attention from the material desecration of the colonial landscape to seek out the total extirpation of the settlers in Ireland once and for all. Thus, according to Borlase, the rebels committed an innumerable range of 'inhumane and barbarous Cruelties' against the settler population in their pursuit, while English and Protestant commentators quickly transformed these obscenities into a more powerful and enduring narrative of atrocity, seeking to immortalise the consequences of unchecked Irish 'barbarity' via their representation of Catholic Irish aggression as well as the hostile, unforgiving nature of the Irish landscape.[154]

Following the intensification of the conflict, targeted attacks upon English and Protestant individuals within settler communities initially tended to involve seemingly non-lethal acts of ritualised stripping and landed displacement, which — at first glance — may have allowed many of the settlers to escape from the conflict with their lives.[155] However, according to Temple, these actions in fact typified the 'mercilesse cruelty' of the Catholic rebels who sought to drive the English 'clear out of the countrey' through sheer deprivation and want, stripping 'them, their wives, and children naked' and barring them from receiving 'any kinde of shelter by the way, relief, or entertainment'.[156] For example, in County

[153] D. Scott, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637-49* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 31.
[154] Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, p. 264.
[155] S. Covington, '"Those Savage Days of Memory": John Temple and His Narrative of the 1641 Uprising', in F. Dillane, N. McAreavey, and E. Pine (eds.), *The Body in Pain in Irish Literature and Culture* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), pp. 57-75; Smyth, 'Towards a Cultural Geography', pp. 75-76; J. Redmond, 'Memories of violence and New English identities in early modern Ireland', *Historical research: the bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 89:246 (2016), p. 713.
[156] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 42.

Limerick, Peeter Mainsell 'of Courte Browne' described how 'three score persons men and women English and protestants were taken prisoners' by the Irish rebels '& then stripped but afterwards … by reason wherof diuers of them dyed'.[157] In Dublin, John Fenn 'sayth That about the 15th day of November last past … this deponent and his wife & children' were threatened and 'expelled from their habitacion' during the night, '& had all their clothes afterwardes taken from them by the said Rebells & left to the cold weather & … extreame want … soe they are vtterly vndone & like to perish'.[158] Another particularly harrowing account from Margaret Huiberts of Holmpatrick, County Dublin, described how the Irish rebels banished her, her husband, and her sister-in-law from their home, before they 'sett vpon them & stripped them to the skinnes', and,

> afterwards this deponent & her said sister in law were exposed the following night to extreame Cold of ffrost & snow in the long & tedious darke night naked as they were till they had trauelled six miles & then they entreatedd for a Carre to carry them to Dublin where within a short tyme after by reason of the said extreamity of weather this deponents said sister in law dyed.[159]

Evidently, the position of the Irish environment and the severity of climatic phenomena within the deposition testimonies offers further indications as to the significant environmental context of the Irish rebellion, also serving as a potential trigger for the violence against the

[157] 'Deposition of: Peeter Mainsell (7/2/1943)', MS 829, fols 302r-305v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829302r196, accessed on: 15/3/20.
[158] 'Deposition of: John Fenn (12/2/1642)', MS 811, fols 097r-097v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=811097r069, accessed on: 9/3/20.
[159] 'Deposition of: Margaret Huiberts (14/3/1644)', MS 810, fols 239r-239v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810239r270&Keywords=Huiberts, accessed on: 11/3/20.

larger backdrop of Ireland's increasing social hostility and polarisation.[160] Thus, while the actions of the rebels in this respect may be considered as non-lethal in theory, the consequences for those targeted within English and Protestant settler communities were often, in reality, quite the opposite, particularly given the ignorance of the settlers in relation to the Irish landscape.

In spite of the advancement of English cartography, surveying, and plantation during the decades prior to the outbreak of the rebellion in 1641, English authorities, for the most part, did not possess the detailed topographical understanding of Ireland and its landscape which would have simplified the completion of their conquest and accelerated the expansion of their political authority.[161] Indeed, the Gaelic population had remained largely uncooperative and hostile towards English cartographers who sought to obtain a complete image of Ireland throughout the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, undoubtedly aware of the firm correlation between map-making and the encroachment of English authorities upon their ancestral landscape.[162] David Baker has also explained how the nature of the Irish landscape, with its fragmented cartography, allowed Irish forces to hinder the colonial authorities' sense of location and to impede upon their bearings, by targeting particular features and locations in order to circumvent their prescribed boundaries.[163] Therefore, while those areas which lay outwith the established boundaries of English settlements had previously constituted sources of confusion, obscurity, and conjecture among

---

[160] F. Ludlow and A. Crampsie, 'Environmental History of Ireland, 1550-1730', in J. Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Ireland, 1550-1730*, Vol. II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), pp. 632-637.
[161] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 167.
[162] Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space*, p. 112. See previous discussion of cartography and the 'production' and appropriation of space, pp. 185-186. For example, in 1573 in the province of Ulster, the son of Sir Thomas Smith was slain in the Ards as he attempted to establish and maintain the organisation of his father's colony there.
[163] D. J. Baker, 'Off the map: charting uncertainty in Renaissance Ireland', in B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield, and W. Maley (eds.), *Representing Ireland: Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 82-84.

settler communities, their relative lack of topographical awareness and climatic inexperience became a genuine source of vulnerability and peril within the context of the rebellion, and indeed within dominant accounts of those events.[164] Simply put, Ireland's severe climatic and environmental phenomena not only impacted upon the organisation and execution of the rebellion from an Irish perspective, but also the representation of the conflict as that of a 'wild' and vicious campaign devised by an equally 'wild' and dangerous population from the perspective of English and Protestant commentators.

The Irish rebels' expulsion of the settlers from their homes in order 'to drive them to the Mountains' and 'to wander through the Woods and Bogs', stripping them of their clothes when the weather was 'most bitter cold and frosty', and prohibition 'in some places so much as to shelter themselves under bushes, or in the Woods' was, therefore, presented as a twofold attack on English 'civility' and 'civilisation'.[165] From an Irish perspective, the rebels' weaponisation of their knowledge and understanding of their ancestral landscape — combined with the memories of what has been termed the 'slow violence' of their dispossession, displacement, and subjugation under the invasive English colonial regime — demonstrated their resilience in the face of oppression, but arguably further exemplified their larger campaign for reclamation.[166] Accordingly, the expulsion and displacement of the English and Protestant communities, with the underlying intention to bring about their end, was both a political statement and an objective necessity. From an English and Protestant perspective, however, the actions of the Catholic Irish rebels exemplified their destructive impact upon the 'civilisation' of the physical landscape, transforming Ireland's topography from the seemingly peaceful and progressive domain engineered by the 'civil' English

[164] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 167; Baker, 'Off the map', pp. 76-83.
[165] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 88.
[166] K. Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change, and the Causes of Violence', *Environmental History*, 25:2 (2020), pp. 290-300; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 277-278.

authorities back into that of a perilous, arguably alien, landscape poisoned by the wickedness of Irish 'barbarity', just as anti-Irish commentators had previously alleged during those centuries prior to the intervention of the crown.[167] Thus, by breaking the boundaries of English and Protestant settlements and forcing unsuspecting settlers to flee into the woods, mountains, and bogs — the embodiments of undomesticated 'barbarism' — where many would meet their untimely demise, the Irish rebels were also condemned as having violated both the corporeal and ideological realms of 'civility' and 'civilisation'.[168]

Ultimately, the failure of the Catholic Irish elite to maintain control over the spread and organisation of the Irish insurgency would culminate in the further escalation of violence sombrely consecrated by contemporary English and Protestant polemicists, whose overall narrative of the events of 1641 has endured the test of time. Reports of grave human atrocities began to circulate following the first few weeks of the conflict and — in spite of the subsequent and brutal retaliation of the English and Protestant forces in kind — the English press were inundated by gruesome tales of Protestant 'men, women, and children stripped naked, and after murther'd', or mutilated in some horrific fashion before being discarded across the landscape by the Catholic Irish rebels.[169] The propagandist value of such reports has been previously acknowledged, and English and Protestant commentators undoubtedly utilised familiar anti-Irish tropes in order to fuel their lurid narrative of atrocity, including those previously employed by Elizabethan authors like Derricke, Spenser, and Davies, who regularly exploited the depiction of the Irish landscape to enhance their own commentaries on the 'wild' and unruly nature of Ireland and its inhabitants.[170] By drawing upon these works,

---

[167] See previous discussion of Gerald of Wales and the exoticisation of the Irish landscape, pp. 186-193.
[168] See previous discussion of the English perception of woods, bogs, and mountains as criminal domains, pp. 189-197.
[169] Scott, *Politics and War*, pp. 31-34; Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, pp. 111-112, 119.
[170] Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 116-117; Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, pp. 84-85; Davies, *Historical Relations*, pp. 52-53.

commentators on the rebellion therefore not only ensured the continuation of the established rhetorical connection between the alleged malignancy of the Irish and the decay of the physical landscape, but also broadened the scope of this construction to create the landscape as an accessory in the purported Catholic Irish campaign to engender the total annihilation of the English and Protestant settlers.

According to Temple, 'Multitudes of men, women, and children were found drowned, cast into ditches, bogges and turfe-pits', while the rebels 'denied all manner of buriall' and 'digged up and left' English and Protestant victims who 'had been formerly buried … to putrifie above ground'.[171] Indeed, whether or not multitudes of these kinds of atrocities occurred in reality, the depositions certainly corroborated many of Temple's more grisly claims. For example, in the County of Dublin, Edward Carney testified that he 'credibly heard & beleeveth' that the Catholic rebels 'most cruelly & barbarously drowned one hundreth & threescore Protestants or thereabouts', and, while his statement was a probable exaggeration designed to elicit horror and outrage, other deponents have described similar incidents.[172] In fact, Mary Phillipps gave a particularly harrowing account of a 'handsom yong English woman' who 'passed ~~d~~ vpp the Shannon towards Limerick in a boate when shee was great with child', when 'some wicked villains in the boate threw her in part out of the boat into the River And … to save her self catching hold on the boate with both her handes some of those villains cutt them both off & so shee was drowned in the water'.[173]

[171] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 91-103.
[172] 'Deposition of: Edward Carney (25/2/1643)', MS 810, fols 122r-122v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810122r178, accessed on: 10/3/20; see also 'Deposition of: George Saunders (31/8/1656)', MS 829, fols 431r-432v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829431r295, accessed on: 15/3/20, and 'Deposition of: Nicholas Ronan (31/8/1653)', MS 829, fols 447r-448v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829447r302, accessed on: 17/3/20 for further examples of drowning atrocities.
[173] 'Deposition of: Mary Phillipps (2/9/1653)', MS 829, fols 435r-436v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829435r297, accessed on: 15/3/20.

If images of the bodies of English and Protestant settlers floating along the rivers of Ireland failed to provoke fear and outrage among those communities, other witnesses described how 'Englishmen' were 'hanged … to death' and left 'vnburied' by the rebels with 'their bodies exposed' and 'their bones there above ground 3 or 4 months after whereon some flesh was still left'.[174] In County Limerick, Samuell Wishlade testified that the Catholic Irish,

> hanged or caused to be hanged … Steven Dauis & his son … & one other their names he knoweth not & they being only halfe hanged … [were] stripped & then halfe ~~aliue~~ dead to throwe them into a ditch where … they pittifully grouned (a litle earth being cast vpon them) till at last they dyed.[175]

Mary Phillipps also described how 'one Richard Blagrave gouldsmith of London' was carried 'away to a great wood neare the place where the deponent ~~Live~~ had Lived & then & there murthered him', while 'another English woman named Ann a shoomakers wife was … by the said Owen Mc Clowne & his Complicees greevously & wounded & left … on the ground for dead.[176] One of the most abhorrent allegations of atrocity from County Limerick even saw 'some of the wicked rebbells' come 'into Munchoins Church in Limerick' and proceed to dig 'out of his grave the bodie of the late Reverend Bishop Webb', before they 'robbed him of his shrowd'.[177] The occasion of the rebellion and the 'wickedness' of the Catholic Irish had effectively transfigured the representation of the Irish landscape from that of a budding realm

[174] 'Deposition of: Richard Swinfenn (28/7/1645)', MS 810, fols 325r-326v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810325r339, accessed on: 11/3/20.
[175] 'Deposition of: Samuell Wishlade (8/3/1643)', MS 829, fols 142r-143v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829142r084, accessed on: 12/3/20.
[176] 'Deposition of: Mary Phillipps (2/9/1653)'.
[177] 'Deposition of: Michael Swainton (2/9/1653)', MS 829, fols 381r-382v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829381r255, accessed on: 15/3/20.

of 'civility' into a literal mortuary for both living and dead colonists, whose torture and humiliation was not consummated even in death.

The reportage of the ritualised brutalisation, killing, and desecration of the English and Protestant settler communities was not reflective of that of a mindless display of Catholic Irish aggression, but rather as a more sinister campaign of extermination, perhaps best exemplified by the prevalence of the prevention of the burial — or the physical disinterment — of the victims who were said to have littered the Irish landscape in the aftermath of the conflict. Not only was burial considered to be one of the foundational characteristics of human culture — crucial for the development and maintenance of 'civility' and 'civilisation' — but it was also regarded as one of the fundamental qualities which separated humanity from animals, particularly on account of its confessional significance.[178] Having considered the rebel actions as part of his work on performative and political violence within the 1641 depositions, John Walter has argued that such acts were indicative of a much greater level of political participation and confessional division among the non-elite population than once thought, since the bodies of the Protestants effectively symbolised confessional contamination, and so their disposal, desecration, and disinterment would have been fitting as apparent 'enemies' of the Lord with 'no place in God's acre'.[179] Canny has suggested that the Catholic elite who originally orchestrated the insurgency were unaware of the extent of the grievances among non-elite Catholic Irish communities, and has cited the removal and desecration of Protestant corpses as a manifestation of the cultural hatred of the English

[178] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', p. 26; B. Mac Cuarta, 'Religious violence against settlers in south Ulster, 1641-2', in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), p. 168.
[179] J. Walter, 'Performative violence and the politics of violence in the 1641 depositions', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 141.

within these communities.[180] English and Protestant victims were effectively rejected and removed from both the corporeal and metaphysical realms of Ireland by the rebel forces, their bodies surrendered to the landscape like insignificant flesh and abandoned to the consumption of the elements; eradicated in perpetuity by the forces of nature and condemned to obscurity by a seemingly 'barbarous', 'savage' population of Catholic apostates. The infamous narrative of the Irish rebellion therefore cannot be understood simply as a wholesale English and Protestant 'massacre', but must be considered on a multidimensional level as a clash of cultures, a struggle between Protestant good and blasphemous evil, and as a confrontation between English 'civility' and Irish 'barbarity'. Thus, where the Catholic Irish inhabitants perceived and took advantage of the insurgency in order to reassert their authority on a social, political, cultural, economic, religious, and even landed basis, English and Protestant populations observed the need to reconquer Ireland, justified by way of their atrocity narrative and finalised only by the complete subjugation of the 'wild' Irish population and their untamed landscape.

Though Temple claimed to have sought to create a historical record

> of the first beginnings and fatall progresse of this rebellion, together with the horrid cruelties most unmercifully exercised by the Irish Rebels upon the British, and Protestants within this Kingdome of Ireland…

his work became notorious for its harrowing description of the trauma and pain inflicted upon the English and Protestant settler populations by the Catholic Irish rebels, and his 'apocalyptic' chronicle became favoured in posterity as one of the first canonical accounts of

[180] N. Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 515.

those events.[181] Having examined Temple's account of the Irish rebellion, as well as the wider English and Protestant reportage of the insurgency, the present investigation has not only interrogated the dominant interpretation of the conflict as a wholesale ethnic and religious 'massacre', predominantly driven by the Catholic Irish non-elite and seemingly ordained by their nobility, but has also considered the main objectives behind this interpretation, primarily through the medium of the construction and representation of the Irish landscape within those accounts. In doing so, it has become clear that the English and Protestant narrative of the 1641 rebellion must be considered within a much longer timeline of Anglo-Irish conflict directly related to the advancement of the English colonial 'civilising' agenda. Indeed, the works of both pre-modern and early modern commentators like Gerald of Wales, Holinshed, Spenser, and Davies established a connection between the representation of the Irish landscape and the composition of anti-Irish rhetoric, frequently co-opting the topographical description of Ireland in order to reinforce various, often paradoxical and overlapping, conceptions of Gaelic Ireland and its inhabitants. As a result, Ireland had been figuratively transformed from a 'wild' and wondrous alien landscape into a 'savage' and 'barbarian' wasteland, fit only for the habitation of rebels and outlaws, before it was finally reconstructed as a potentially abundant — yet underexploited and underdeveloped — environment divinely prepared for English conquest and colonisation. The development of English anti-Irish rhetoric was therefore linked with questions related to the correct ownership, usage, and organisation of the Irish landscape under the direction of a more 'civilised', progressive authority, designed to reinforce English acts of violence, dispossession, and displacement against the Irish population in their move toward conquest.

[181] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 6; Redmond, 'Memories of violence and New English identities', pp. 722-723; Covington, '"Those Savage Days of Memory"', p. 60; Covington, '"Realms so barbarous and cruell"', p. 503.

Thus, in the aftermath of the outbreak of the Catholic Irish rebellion in 1641, English and Protestant commentators quickly began to draw upon existing modes of anti-Irish rhetoric in order to chronicle and catalogue the vicious atrocities committed by the 'barbarous' rebel forces against the 'civilised', unsuspecting settler communities. Accordingly, these commentators turned their attentions back toward the Irish landscape as a vehicle for their discussion of the apparent peace and progression engendered by the English conquest of Ireland prior to the rebellion in 1641, characterising the period of the so-called 'Early Stuart Peace' as one of 'civilised' assimilation and landed 'improvement' as part of the expansion of the English policy of plantation in Ireland. In contrast, the actual outbreak of the rebellion saw the landscape transformed once again, into a disordered, hostile, perilous environment in which the apparent 'treachery' and inherent 'barbarity' of the Catholic Irish rebels had affected the total breakdown of English 'civilisation' and colonial authority, typified by the secrecy of the Irish plot and their destruction of English landed 'improvements' by masses of the non-elite. The apparent culmination of the 'treachery' and 'savagery' of the Catholic Irish rebels was then established via the representation of their violation of both the physical landscape and the physical bodies of the English and Protestant settler population. English and Protestant commentators painstakingly detailed the innumerable accounts of the stripping, displacement, mutilation, and murder of countless men, women, and children whose bodies were often discarded in rivers, bogs, ditches, and woods, killed either by the severity of the unforgiving Irish landscape or, predominantly, by the brutality of its 'wild' population. Evidently, much like their predecessors, these commentators utilised the representation of the physical Irish landscape in order to oscillate between the poles of English 'civilisation' and Gaelic 'barbarity' as part of their overall interpretation of the conflict and its consequences. If Ireland could be conquered, once and for all, then its landscape could be envisioned as the crown jewel of English 'civilisation',

benefitting from both the moral and landed 'improvements' promoted by an apparently peaceful, progressive population. On the other hand, if the Irish were able to reassert their ancestral authority and reclaim control, then the landscape was to be reconstructed in order to reflect upon the backward, destructive, and hostile nature of its Gaelic inhabitants, poisoned by their 'barbarity' and immobilised by their 'degeneracy'.

Roving, Raiding, and Restoration in the 1641 Irish Rebellion

Following decades of English intervention and colonial oppression, the Irish rebellion of 1641 may be better understood, from an Irish perspective, as a campaign towards the achievement of social, political, economic, religious, cultural, and landed reclamation. Accordingly, the Irish insurgency must also be considered in relation to the endurance of Irish Gaeldom and its associated customs in spite of the volatile nature of Anglo-Irish relations throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Indeed, the outbreak of the rebellion in and of itself did, to an extent, exemplify the resilience of Irish military opposition even after their totalising defeat during the Nine Years' War almost four decades prior, while the resoundingly confessional nature of the Irish conflict undoubtedly characterised the conclusive failure of the English authorities to affect the Protestant Reformation in Ireland.[1] In fact, the strength and solidarity displayed by the Catholic Irish forces behind the insurgency of 1641 was testament to the consolidation of Irish unity, partly around their devotion to Roman Catholicism which, in turn, had become increasingly associated with anti-English sentiment during the period prior to the outbreak of rebellion in 1641.[2] Both the depositions and the wider reportage of the rebellion have also provided indications as to the resilience of Gaelic language, ethnicity and culture within the context of the conflict,

[1] D. B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), p. 14; E. E. Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage: Selected Writings* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd., 1996), p. 6.
[2] J. Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland: Medieval and Early-Modern Patterns in the Demarcation of Civility', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 56:1 (1995), p. 35.

particularly as enduring conduits for the expression of anti-English sentiment, even among the non-elite Catholic and Irish forces whose hostility was often expressed towards their English and Protestant neighbours and documented within their victims' testimonies.[3] Thus, while the fortitude of the Irish and their Gaelic heritage had been asserted through numerous declarations and activities undertaken by the Catholic Irish forces during their rebellion campaign, one of the more subtle manifestations of their resolve, signalled by both the immediate scope and spread of the rising as well as during subsequent stages of the campaign, can be considered by way of their movement across the Irish landscape.

Though the allegedly 'sudden' nature of the Irish insurgency has been well documented within the contemporary narrative of the rebellion, it is impossible to ignore the juxtaposition between the purported calm and stability associated with the permanent settlements of the English and Protestant colonists in comparison with the relative chaos and disorder attributed to the destructive, widespread campaign of the Catholic Irish forces. Aside from the construction of the decades prior to the outbreak of the rebellion as those of tranquillity and settlement, one of the most foremost concerns of the English administration throughout this period was the finality of the Irish conquest and their subjugation of the Irish inhabitants, once and for all. Since the Irish 'settlement' was a colonial endeavour, the English imagination of this conquest depended upon the establishment and maintenance of their control over the Irish population, physically and theoretically speaking. Thus, both the physical and non-physical mobility of the Irish was targeted by the English colonial authorities, by way of the imposition of their laws, language, liturgy, and landowners, as well as the physical limitation of their landscape via the introduction of permanent private

[3] R. F. Foster, *Modern Ireland 1600-1972* (London: Penguin Books, 1989), pp. 28-30; J. Gibney, *The Shadow of a Year: The 1641 Rebellion in Irish History and Memory* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2013), p. 6; J. Redmond, 'Memories of violence and New English identities in early modern Ireland', *Historical research: the bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 89:246 (2016), pp. 712-713.

property ownership and widespread enclosure. Indeed, it can be argued that the Irish rebellion of 1641 was perceived by both English and Protestant contemporaries as so 'sudden' on account of the fact that the oppressive colonial regime had presumed their absolute authority and control over the Irish inhabitants, and had failed either to recognise or physically prevent the spread of their movement. Furthermore, Nicci MacLeod has considered the construction of the identities of the Catholic Irish rebels as part of her analysis of the language employed within the 1641 depositions, and in doing so has managed to isolate the theme of Catholic Irish movement as one of the more prominent concerns associated with the representation of both the rebels and the outbreak of the rebellion in and of itself.[4] In fact, MacLeod has argued that the frequent association between the terms 'rebells' and 'came' within the depositions was indicative of a clear concern with the movements of the Irish rebels towards physical space which was inhabited by the English and Protestant settler population, whom they believed to have no rightful claim of ownership over those lands.[5]

The significance of these movements, then, both of the Catholic Irish rebels and of the campaign of the rebellion itself, must not be overlooked. Rather, this contemporary concern with mobility and movement may not only offer greater insight into the organisation and execution of Irish resistance to the oppressive, English colonial regime — particularly in relation to the ongoing Anglo-Irish struggle over 'civility', land use, and land ownership throughout the early modern period — but also in relation to the endurance and development of English anxiety surrounding the mobility and freedom of the unyielding Irish. By examining the depositions alongside larger, more comprehensive accounts of the Irish insurgency, this chapter will consider the prevalence of Gaelic mobility from Irish and

[4] N. MacLeod, '"Rogues, Villaines, and Base Trulls": Constructing the "Other" in the 1641 Depositions', in E. Darcy, A. Margey, and E. Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), p. 121.
[5] Ibid.

English perspectives, and will endeavour to position the overarching English concern with movement and its association with 'barbarity' within a larger ideological framework of anti-Irish rhetoric, designed to justify the need for the ongoing colonisation and conquest of the Irish landscape and its inhabitants in the seventeenth century.

Mobility and Movement in Gaelic Ireland: An Historic Overview

In order to explore the manifestation of Irish mobility within the context of the 1641 rebellion, it is necessary to first consider the importance and utility of movement within Gaelic culture on a historic basis and, further, to analyse the impact of this mobility in relation to the development of Anglo-Irish hostility during the decades and centuries prior to the outbreak of rebellion in 1641. While the differences between early modern English and Irish societies were marked, Gaelic Ireland was characterised by a culture of mobility which shaped the structure and organisation of Irish society to a large extent, from the physical undertaking of agriculture, settlement, and warfare, to the more abstract fluidity associated with the nature of Irish lordships, inheritance practices, and their Brehon law.[6] However, above all else, Ireland's mobility was predominantly engendered, and necessitated, by their primarily pastoral tradition, as well as their concurrent dependency upon cattle, both of which constituted two of the most significant points of cultural contention between the Irish and English throughout the early modern period.

---

[6] G. Farrell, *The 'mere Irish' and the colonisation of Ulster, 1570-1641* (Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 158-159; N. Patterson, *Cattle Lords & Clansmen: The Social Structure of Early Ireland* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), p. 98; S. G. Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures 1470-1603* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1985), p. 41; Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, pp. 14, 45-46; J. P. Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 28-29; Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage*, p. 29.

Having considered Ireland's Atlantic ancestry outwith the reach of the Roman empire, Emyr Estyn Evans has argued that Ireland was controlled by what he described as a 'semi-religious' 'cult of cattle' which had existed since the Iron Age, and he explained that this phenomenon largely reflected upon the strongly pastoral disposition of Gaelic Ireland which would ultimately prevail for centuries to come.[7] Indeed, David Beers Quinn has suggested that Gaelic pastoralism was accompanied by an associated culture of adherence to ancestral custom, which guaranteed the longevity of Irish agricultural traditions at least up until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[8] However, Gerard Farrell and others have argued that the character of Ireland's climate and geography — being uniquely wet with an abundance of boggy, mountainous, and often infertile land — was largely responsible for the endurance of pastoralism and the proclivity of movement in Gaelic Ireland.[9] The dominance of the pastoral economy helped to nurture a distinctive connection between the Irish and their cattle, creating what was essentially a co-dependent relationship in which both parties relied upon one another for their provision and prosperity.[10] For example, the Irish tradition of booleying exemplified their pastoral knowledge and associated mobility, as well as their commitment to the wellbeing of their cattle, since this practice maximised both the fertility of the land and the variable pasturage of the herds.[11] This movement was particularly significant given the fact that cattle — and especially cattle-based produce known as white meats — were staples

---

[7] Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage*, pp. 29, 50.
[8] Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, pp. 11-14, 68.
[9] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 168; E. E. Evans, *The Personality of Ireland: Habitat, Heritage and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 21; N. Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established 1565-76* (Sussex: The Harvester Press Limited, 1976), p. 14.
[10] Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage*, p. 26.
[11] E. Costello, 'Seasonal Management of Cattle in the Booleying System: New Insights from Connemara, Western Ireland', in M. O'Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), pp. 66-70; T. McDonald, 'The "Ups and Downs" of Booleying in Achill, Co. Mayo, Ireland', in M. O'Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), p. 57. See also the section titled 'Beasts and Booleying' in previous chapter on "Life and the Landscape in Gaelic Ireland and Early Modern England".

of the Irish diet, though blood could be extracted from living cows and mixed with other products for consumption, sparing many from slaughter.[12] The importance of dairy produce in Ireland was a constant source of critique from contemporary English observers throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and can also be inferred from early Irish legal texts which referenced the milch cow (known as *bó mlicht*) as the most basic unit of currency in Ireland, valued as approximately equivalent to one ounce of silver, while lesser amounts were defined in relation to an approximate number of younger female cows.[13] Castrated male cows tended to be reserved for slaughter within a two-year period and were valued for their meat and hides, though ancient Irish legal texts have also indicated that oxen (called singularly a *dam*) could also have been selected on an individual basis for their strength and obedience, to be trained as draught animals or, for their aggression, to be employed as bulwarks to protect herds against animal attacks, which continued to represent a threat even as late as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[14] Thus, cattle not only constituted the main agricultural resource within Gaelic society, but were also one of the most valuable implements of husbandry in general. As such, the sustained development of the Irish culture of mobility during the pre- and early modern periods was not only necessitated by an enduring adherence to pastoralism, but also by a dependency upon cattle more generally.

Since early modern Ireland was, for the most part, a cashless society in which affluence was not directly associated with property ownership or coinage, both economic wealth and political authority also became inextricably bound up with the control and

---

[12] F. Kelly, 'Cattle in Ancient Ireland: Early Irish Legal Aspects', in M. O'Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), p. 48; R. A. Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 154.
[13] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', pp. 153-154; Kelly, 'Cattle in Ancient Ireland', pp. 44-45.
[14] Ibid, p. 48.

ownership of cattle, to such an extent that, in 1586, Sir John Perrot claimed the Irish nobility were ‘lords of cattle, but not of much money’.[15] Having considered the centrality of cattle in relation to the rhythm and organisation of Gaelic society, Audrey Horning has explained that Irish kinship obligations and property ownership were characterised by fluidity and inconsistency which precluded the development of monetary wealth, and instead led to the emergence of cattle, or ‘wealth on the hoof’, as a more reliable, moveable source of currency.[16] Indeed, Fergus Kelly’s extensive research into ancient Irish Brehon law has also confirmed that cattle — termed as *béodili,* meaning ‘living valuables’ — constituted the dominant form of currency in Ireland throughout this period even in spite of the introduction of coinage, first by Norsemen during the tenth century, then subsequently by the Anglo-Normans in the early thirteenth century.[17] Butlin has also maintained that there can be ‘no doubt’ as to the continued importance of cattle with respect to the Irish economy in the seventeenth century, even among the anglicised regions of the country.[18] According to various contemporary sources, powerful members of the Gaelic elite were reputed to have possession of herds which consisted of thousands of cattle: for example, in 1601, the cousin, son, and grandson of Turlough Luineach O’ Neill — who, as The O’ Neill, was head of one of the most powerful septs in the north of Ireland for almost three decades — each possessed around 2,000 head of cattle.[19] In 1598, it was also estimated that Hugh O’Neill, the infamous second earl of Tyrone, possessed no less than 120,000 milch cows, and ‘three times more of

---

[15] P. Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-1670* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1994), pp. 33-34; S. J. Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland 1460-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 280.
[16] A. Horning, ‘Minding the gaps: exploring the intersection of political economy, colonial ideologies and cultural practice in early modern Ireland’, *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 52:1 (2018), p. 7; indeed, Irish kinship obligations were complex, and depended upon mutual relationships between families which could change over time, while property ownership was also contingent upon such ties, to a certain extent, and was as such rarely guaranteed.
[17] F. Kelly, *A Guide to Early Irish Law* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 2016), pp. 99, 113.
[18] Butlin, ‘Land and People, c. 1600’, p. 153.
[19] C. Lennon, *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: The Incomplete Conquest* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1994), p. 44; K. W. Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd, 2003), p. 136; Butlin, ‘Land and People, c. 1600’, p. 153.

barren kine besides other cattle'.[20] Thus, since the Irish custom of collectible and partible inheritance — termed by the English as 'gravelkind' after a similar Kentish tradition — saw the periodic redistribution of lands among an extended kin or clan group, the true wealth of a lord was measured by the quantity of their followers, forces, and, crucially, in the abundance of their herds, which effectively fostered a close connection between economic wealth and mobility in Gaelic Ireland.[21]

On the other hand, Robin Butlin has argued that the very existence of such extensive herds of cattle created a source of vulnerability among the Irish lords who retained these multitude of beasts, on account of the prevalence of animal attacks, military conflict, or, most commonly, cattle raiding.[22] Despite the prohibition on cattle theft outlined by the Irish Law of *Dar Í* (which expressly commanded '*cen bú do gait*', meaning 'not to steal cows'), the phenomenon of cattle raiding in Gaelic Ireland was indeed widespread, not simply for purposes of plunder or economic gain, but in order for Irish lords to establish their political power and prestige.[23] For example, in 1454, following the death of Hugh O'Molloy, Lord of Fircall, Cucogry O'Molloy succeeded to his father's position and immediately 'proceeded with his forces to the east of Fircall, to oppose Theobald O'Molloy, who was trying to obtain the chieftainship for himself, and seized upon great spoils, Theobald having left his fastnesses and his cows to them'.[24] In 1490, 'great depredations and spoliations were committed by Hugh Oge, the son of Hugh Roe O'Donnell, upon the sons of Donough, the son of Hugh

---

[20] Ibid.
[21] S. G. Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447-1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998), pp. 41-44; Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 154.
[22] Butlin, 'Land and People, c. 1600', p. 153; Kelly, 'Cattle in Ancient Ireland', p. 45.
[23] Kelly, *A Guide to Early Irish Law*, p. 26; Kelly, 'Cattle in Ancient Ireland', p. 49; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 166-167.
[24] J. O'Donovan (ed.), *Annála Rioghachta Éireann: Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, from the Earliest Period to the Year 1616*, Vol. VI (Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co., 1856), p. 991; note — a 'fastness' is a kind of stronghold, which can either occur naturally within the environment, or can be physically constructed.

Maguire', because 'the warders of the town … had given up the castle of Ballyshannon to Hugh Oge, without consulting O'Donnell', and so Hugh Oge 'carried the preys, consisting of four hundred cows, to Ballyshannon'.[25] On another occasion, Breifny O'Rourke had become aware of the approach of an army led by 'Philip, the son of Thomas Maguire, and his sons', and so 'before their arrival, [he] sent his cows into the fastnesses of the country', preventing their seizure by the Maguires, who instead proceeded to burn O'Rourke's town 'as well as the entire country [around it]'.[26]

Given that the Gaelic custom of succession, known as tanistry, consisted of the appointment of individual lords based upon their wealth and merit, the execution of a cattle raid upon a neighbouring lordship allowed a lord to demonstrate his military prowess, galvanise his followers and allies, and to establish his authority as head of a kindred in his own right — a ritual which was particularly important for new lords in the very beginning of their leadership.[27] As such, Irish Brehon judges tended to ignore or dismiss allegations of cattle raiding (known as *creach*), while bardic poets — who enjoyed an elevated social status within Gaelic society as learned professionals — would attempt to incite raids through verse, and would subsequently share in the plunder of the lord before immortalising their victories in bardic prose.[28] The frequency of raiding among the Irish lordships also contributed towards the Gaelic practice of 'creaghting', which, distinct from the agricultural practice of booleying, involved the movement of large herds of cattle and people during periods of

[25] Ibid, p. 1179.
[26] Ibid, p. 999.
[27] J. McGurk, *The Elizabethan conquest of Ireland: The 1590s crisis* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), pp. 4-5; D. Edwards, 'The escalation of violence in sixteenth-century Ireland', in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), p. 41; Kelly, 'Cattle in Ancient Ireland', p. 49. It is worth noting that the Gaelic custom of tanistry often lead to in-fighting among a kindred, and was therefore perceived by English observers as a 'savage', violent ritual.
[28] Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, pp. 43-47; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, p. 161. See *Táin Bó Cúailnge*, translated into English as 'The Cattle Raid of Cooley', for one of the most famous examples of an Old Irish cattle-raiding epic.

conflict, whether for purposes of protection, escape, or for the maintenance of mobile armies.[29] Cattle raids were also regularly recorded within the Irish Annals up until the conclusion of the final volume in 1616, not — as contemporary English commentators would have suggested — as random episodes of wanton disorder, but instead as politically significant events. The 'endemic' nature of cattle raiding, therefore, reinforced the necessity of mobility and movement in Gaelic Ireland: while raiding allowed individual lords to fulfil the obligations of their status and to expand their political jurisdiction by physically removing wealth from one lordship into another, the general freedom of movement across the unenclosed Irish landscape also allowed for some level of defence to be actioned during periods of conflict, since cattle, unlike crops, could be driven into neighbouring lands or into wooded areas away from the grasp of predatory forces.[30]

Evidently, Gaelic Ireland was characterised by an enduring culture of physical mobility and movement, as well as an overarching trend towards social and political fluidity. This was traceable to the dominance of pastoralism in Ireland, which in turn both necessitated and engendered an all-encompassing dependency upon cattle that regularly caught the attention of non-Irish commentators and observers from across the Irish Sea. English society, on the other hand, was palpably dissimilar. For one, 'wealth on the hoof' was replaced by a cash economy in which wealth was primarily contingent upon definitive land and property ownership, the growing commercial market fostered within walled towns and cities, and the increasing and intensive exploitation of the land for commercial, predominantly tillage-based, agricultural purposes.[31] Indeed, the maintenance of English 'civilisation' was directed by a

---

[29] Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland*, p. 136; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 167-168.
[30] Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*, p. 40; Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage*, p. 29; Edwards, 'The escalation of violence', p. 41; Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland*, pp. 131-132; Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 266-268.
[31] Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 268-271; W. Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), p. 56; K. Thomas, *In Pursuit of*

strong impetus toward the construction and maintenance of a singular, permanent homestead driven by the tenets of discipline, profit, and landed 'improvement' through arable cultivation. In fact, these were encouraged by the divine, legal ordinance of primogeniture, which ensured that land was passed down from father to son.[32]

Since, within the Christian framework, the Fall of Man had rendered nature imperfect and had seen the land 'cursed', it was also implicit that man would be forced to work and toil upon the land to maintain his dominion over the natural world as God had commanded.[33] Accordingly, arable farmers were held in much greater esteem, though the character of English agriculture throughout this period was undoubtedly mixed.[34] Indeed, English commentators like Sir Thomas Smith fundamentally maintained that the endeavour of cultivation would guarantee the advancement of 'civilised' settlement on a permanent basis, as English farmers worked diligently to construct sturdy stone and timber dwellings, erect fencing and hedging to secure their fields, and to plough the land in order to reap its fruits.[35] In accordance with both Roman and Greek principles of the development of human 'civility' and 'civilisation', English contemporaries believed from around the twelfth century that humanity was expected to progress from habitation in the woods and from pastoral labour, to plough and cultivate the land, before finally settling on a permanent basis in urban market

---

Civility: Manners and Civilisation in Early Modern England (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), p. 187; R. B. Outhwaite, 'Progress and Backwardness in English Agriculture, 1500-1650', *Economic History Review*, 39:1 (1986), pp. 2-8.

[32] J. P. Montaño, 'Cultural Conflict and the Landscape of Conquest in Early Modern Ireland', *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, 40 (2017), p. 125.

[33] K. Pluymers, 'Taming the Wilderness in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Ireland and Virginia', *Environmental History*, 16:4 (2011), p. 612; A. Cathcart, *Plantations by Land and Sea, North Channel Communities of the Atlantic Archipelago c.1550-1625* (Oxford: Peter Lang Ltd, 2022), p. 153.

[34] J. Thirsk, 'Farming Techniques', in J. Thirsk (ed.), *The Agrarian History of England and Wales*, Vol. IV (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), p. 163.

[35] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 185; D. C. Coleman, *The Economy of England 1450-1750* (London: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 32; J. Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes": Colonization within Britain and Ireland, 1580s-1640s', in N. Canny, A. Low, and W. Roger (eds.), *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 140; A. McRae, *God speed the plough: The representation of agrarian England, 1500-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 1.

towns and cities.[36] Even the uniformity associated with English common law and the answer of the English 'citizenry' to a powerful, centralised monarchical authority — purportedly necessary for the maintenance of control over human violence and aggression — were both designed to establish and uphold the values of law and order, which were in turn prerequisites for the development and maintenance of a 'civilised' society.[37]

By the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the structure and organisation of early modern English society had been built upon the principles of permanence and stability, wherein both progress and 'improvement' were effected in a controlled fashion in order to further the development of 'civilisation'.[38] From an English perspective, then, concepts of movement, mobility, and fluidity in general had become synonymous with chaos, disorder, and 'primitive' 'barbarism' — particularly in the absence of a permanent, 'civilised' settlement, no centralised authority, and a lack of trade.[39] All these things contravened the cardinal principles of landownership, cultivation, and progressive land use more broadly. Thus, the respective foundations of the societies of both early modern England and Gaelic Ireland existed in opposition to one another, and, while early modern English commentators undoubtedly tended to exaggerate the extent and impact of Irish mobility, the movement and fluidity of the Irish population became a focal point within the larger framework of anti-Irish rhetoric developed in order to legitimise the English sense of cultural 'superiority', and to

---

[36] R. Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales: A Voice of the Middle Ages* (Gloucestershire: Tempus Publishing Limited, 2006), pp. 143-145; Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 187.
[37] Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes"', p. 132; B. Davetian, *Civility: A Cultural History* (London: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2009), p. 67; C. Sarles, 'Civil Society History III: Renaissance', in K. A. Helmut and S. Toepler (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* (New York: Springer, 2010), p. 350.
[38] Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 268-271; Cronon, *Changes in the Land*, p. 53.
[39] Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 27-28.

offer moral justification for their plans for the 'civilisation' and colonial conquest of Ireland.[40] In other words, Irish mobility was something to be constrained and contained.

Having explored the divergence between the beliefs of the Irish and the English settlers in relation to the use of the land and the landscape, as well as the emergence of early modern English strategies for the reform of Ireland and its inhabitants, John Patrick Montaño has considered the resurgence and employment of classical ideologies throughout this period.[41] Specifically, Montaño has argued that those which related to the alleged 'barbarism' of nomadic, or even pastoral, populations allowed English commentators to distinguish between their own 'civility' and the conflicting 'savagery' of the Irish, in order to support the case for their subjugation, reformation, and 'improvement'.[42] For instance, while the Irish were a predominantly pastoral population supported by cultivation on a supplementary basis — who engaged in regular, controlled movements associated with the established custom of transhumance — English and non-Irish commentators regularly branded and generalised Ireland's Gaelic inhabitants as a nomadic people, whose unsettled, vagabond tendencies had been passed down through their apparent Scythian ancestry.[43] Indeed, having sought to give a detailed description of all of 'the first inhabitants' of Ireland, Gerald of Wales previously chronicled the 'arrival … of Nemedus from Scythia with his four sons', who had 'multiplied in a short time to such an extent that they filled every corner of the whole island with more inhabitants than it ever had'.[44] Subsequently, he declared that the Irish had never then 'progressed from the primitive habits of pastoral living' in 'the woods and countryside', and

[40] K. Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change, and the Causes of Violence', *Environmental History*, 25:2 (2020), p. 295.
[41] Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 17-18.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland*, p. 15; N. Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), pp. 587-588.
[44] G. Cambrensis, *The History and Topography of Ireland* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1982), pp. 92, 95, 101-102.

remained as a ‘wild and inhospitable people’.[45] Around four centuries later, travel writer Fynes Moryson documented his journey through Ireland as part of his extensive itinerary, and made similar observations to those of Gerald of Wales, stating that ‘A man would thinke these men to bee Scythians … and (as I have formerly said), some of the Irish are of the race of Scythians’.[46] He also specified that ‘the very vagabond Rebels, had great multitudes of Cowes, which they stil (like the Nomades) drove with them, whether soever themselves were driven’.[47] Then, around the turn of the seventeenth century, Edmund Spenser also explained that, before it was possible to account for the customs of the Irish, ‘yt is first needfull to consider from whence they sproung’, which he maintained was indeed from the ‘Scythians’ who ‘first possessed, and inhabited’ the Irish realm.[48] Accordingly, Spenser was able to trace the ‘evill’ Irish custom ‘to live in heardes as they call them, being the very same that the Irishe Bollies are, dryving their cattell continually with them, and feeding onely on their whyt meates’, to the ‘manner of the Scythians’.[49]

According to both classical and early modern texts, the Scythian peoples were believed to be one of the most ‘savage’, ‘barbarous’ populations to have ever walked the earth, possessed by an apparent thirst for violence and even a desire for human flesh.[50] As such, early modern commentators from across Europe would compare the nature and customs of other peoples outwith their ‘civilised’ societies with the Scythians in order to establish both the dimensions of their own ‘superiority’ as well as the features which perhaps best

[45] Ibid.
[46] F. Moryson, *An Itinerary: Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland & Ireland*, Vol. IV (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1907), pp. 201, 193.
[47] Ibid.
[48] E. Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (Library of Alexandria, 1934), p. 63.
[49] Ibid, pp. 84, 86.
[50] E. Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2013), p. 19; N. Das, J. V. Melo, H. Smith, and L. Working, *Keywords of Identity, Race, and Human Mobility in Early Modern England* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2021), p. 57.

exemplified the ‘inferiority’ of those other nations, and the English were clearly no different in this respect.[51] The inclusion of Scythian ancestry as part of their chronicles of Ireland helped to reinforce English assertions about the ‘barbarous’ nature of the Gaelic population. Additionally, though, the Scythians were also represented as the epitome of global ‘barbarism’ based upon their lack of land and property ownership, and their unsettled, nomadic lifestyles, which became synonymous with both ‘primitivism’ and ‘barbarism’ on an international scale.[52] Early modern English observers, therefore, perceived the Irish keeping of herds of cattle as clear evidence of their nomadism, which constituted the very antithesis to English ‘civil society’ and ‘civilisation’, which was, in turn, exemplified by the methodical nature of their cultivated fields and the boundaries of their walled towns and cities.[53] Like the Scythians, then, the Irish could feasibly be touted as a nomadic population, and therefore branded as idle ‘barbarians’ whose primitivity precluded their cultivation of the land and encouraged their blatant misuse of its resources. Additionally, they could also reasonably be denied any claim of ownership over their ancestral lands, based upon their total disregard for the divine will of God.[54] Indeed, it is difficult to determine, based upon the contradictory nature of English rhetoric, whether one particular element of Irish ‘barbarity’ — such as their alleged nomadism, idleness, or irreligion — was believed to have been responsible for the manifestation of another, but the regular employment of these cultural stereotypes allowed for their logical association within anti-Irish discourse. Ultimately, early modern English commentators co-opted Ireland’s culture of mobility for the advancement of their anti-Irish rhetoric, conflating their pastoral heritage with that of Scythian nomadism, which in turn

[51] Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, p. 40.
[52] Canny, ‘The Ideology of English Colonization’, pp. 587-588.
[53] Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, pp. 28-29; Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 19-20.
[54] H. Jones, ‘Property, territory, and colonialism: an international legal history of enclosure’, *Legal Studies*, 39:2 (2019), pp. 196-197; R. McVeigh and B. Rolston, ‘Civilising the Irish’, *Race & Class*, 51:1 (2009), pp. 7-10.

reflected upon their landlessness, 'barbarity', and 'savagery' as both a population and a land desperately in need of some form of 'civilised' intervention.

The apparent correlation between the Gaelic pastoralists and the nomadic Scythians was also significant in relation to the inherited characteristics of the Irish as a people in general. Indeed, the Romans believed that all those who remained outwith the reach of their authority and 'civilisation' would fail to obtain *humanitas* (meaning those qualities associated with humanity, such as gentility, culture, and intellect), and would instead endure in a state of *barbaria*, or 'barbarism', which was associated with lawlessness, violence, cruelty, and brutality.[55] English and other non-Irish commentators not only absorbed classical teachings which conceived of a connection between mobility, movement, and the manifestation of chaos and disorder, but also those which coupled nomadism with the human characteristics of criminality, 'savagery', and 'warlike' behaviour.[56] For example, Gerald of Wales warned his readership that the Irish 'above all other peoples … practise treachery' since they 'were in another world altogether and consequently cut off from well-behaved and law-abiding people', though his claims were somewhat vague as to the manifestation of this 'treachery' outwith the alleged Irish tendency 'to violate every day the bond of their pledge and oath given to others'.[57] Subsequent anti-Irish commentators, however, clearly set out to establish a more direct connection between the apparent lawlessness and hostility of the Irish, and the endurance of their pastoral, mobile traditions, which was perhaps best evinced by the representation of their incessant raiding practices.

[55] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 3.
[56] Ibid, p. 187; Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 27-28; Canny, 'The Ideology of English Colonization', p. 589.
[57] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 103, 106.

Having previously discussed the centrality of cattle within Gaelic society, Moryson warned that the Irish 'fought for them [cattle] as for their alters and families' and 'as for religion and life', before he explained that they would 'watchfully keepe their Cowes' and take them inside' at night, 'for feare of theeves, the Irish using almost no other kind of theft' to target and despoil one another.[58] Around the turn of the seventeenth century, Sir John Davies described Ireland as a 'warlike' nation, blaming the alleged habitation of the Irish in the 'Woods and Mountains' — within which 'they lurkt, and lay in waite to do mischief' while maintaining 'their Creaghts or Heardes of Cattle, liuing by the Milke of the Cowe, without Husbandry or Tillage' — for the creation of the people as 'Out-Lawes and Theeues'.[59] Spenser had also previously addressed the lawless nature of the Irish and explained that there were 'many wide countries in Ireland, in which the lawes of England were never established, nor any acknowledgement of subjection made', and so the Irish 'altogether conceale amongst them selves ther owne crimes' and were 'greatlie encouraged to steale … knowing howe hardlie they can be brought to any triall of lawe'.[60] As such, he described how the Irish, 'in order to settle a debt, would 'streighte goe and take a distres of his goods or Cattel, where he could find them' and 'doth yt openly, for the moste part before witnesses', before he proceeded to blame the Gaelic custom of booleying for such 'treachery', claiming that 'if there be any outlawes, or loose people … such stelthes of cattell they bringe comonly to those Bollies, where they are receaved readily, and the theif harbored from daunger of Lawe'.[61] To conclude, he cautioned his readership by stating that,

[58] Moryson, *An Itinerary*, Vol. IV, pp. 193, 200.
[59] J. Davies, *Historical Relations: Or, A Discovery Of the true Causes why Ireland Was never entirely Subdued, Nor Brought under Obedience of the Crown of England, until the Beginning of the Reign of King James the First* (Dublin: S. Hyde, 1733), pp. 6, 160-161.
[60] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, p. 8.
[61] Ibid, pp. 85, 90.

> whatsoever kepeth twentye kine shold kepe a plough goinge, for otherwise all men would fall to pasturinge, and none to husbandrye…[62]

English commentators were evidently fixed upon the idea that the mobility of the Irish — directly linked with their misuse of the land — combined with their lack of centralised monarchical authority and recourse to common law, had led to a lack of development within Irish society. Without any secure interest in the land itself, the Irish seemed to have become a population whose dependency upon cattle was so great that there was little hesitation when it came to raiding against one another, thus evidencing an alleged appetite for 'treachery' and brutality.[63] Indeed, this perspective is best portrayed by John Derricke in his *Image of Irelande* (1581), which conveyed the character of an Irish cattle raid in a woodcut designed to represent a band of Irish kern — lightly armed forces perfectly suited to the Gaelic guerrilla-style warfare — launching a surprise attack against some of their fellow inhabitants (see Figure 5).[64]

His pictorial impression depicts the Irish kern emerging from a wooded refuge on the left hand side of the image, armed and headed toward a homestead on the right hand side, which is being deliberately set on fire by other kern as its residents look on in horror, arms thrown into the air in a display of both anguish and surrender. Towards the top of the image, kern can be seen pointing back towards the woods from which they emerged, only this time they are accompanied by a large group of horses and cattle, stolen during the course of the raid. Beneath the image, Derricke described how the Irish 'creepes out' like a 'packe of

[62] Ibid, p. 90.
[63] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, p. 3; Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 24-29.
[64] Connolly, *Contested Island*, pp. 13-14; J. Derricke, *The Image of Irelande, with a Discouerie of Woodkarne* (London: J. Kingston, 1581), pp. 132-133.

prowling mates, Most hurtfull to the English pale', before 'They spoile, and burne, and beare away'.[65]

Figure 5: Woodcut of Irish kern soldiers conducting a raiding attack; Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 132-133.

Crucially, however, he also declared that they 'spare no more their country byrth, then those of th' english race', since the Irish 'thinke the greater ill they doe, the greater prayse deserve', and 'ioy to see the fire … To see both flame, and smouldering smoke, to duske the christall skyes, Next to their pray, therein I say, their second glory lyes'.[66] Unlike many of the other English commentators, Derricke clearly utilised the example of an Irish cattle raid upon their own people, whose very survival was often dependent upon the care and preservation of their livestock, in order to reinforce the perception of their inherently 'warlike' nature, not to mention the additional circumstance of Anglo-Irish conflict. Lastly, he warned his readership

[65] Derricke, *The Image of Irelande*, pp. 132-133.
[66] Ibid.

that the Irish, 'passe not for the poore mans cry, nor yet respect his teares', and 'thus bereaving him of house, of cattell and of store, They do returne backe to the wood, from whence they came before'.[67] Evidently, Gaelic cattle raiding became ingrained within anti-Irish rhetoric as clear evidence of the purported link between the endurance of pastoralism, the mobility of the Irish, and their apparently 'treacherous', violent nature, which effectively also exemplified the markers of 'barbarity' outwith the realm of 'civilisation'. However, arguably more so, representations like those of Derricke and Spenser characterised these actions not simply as 'treacherous' or brutal, but as uncontrollably so, much like those 'barbarians' decried within Roman literature, and also in a very similar fashion to irrational, arguably inhuman beings devoid of *humanitas* in every sense of the word.[68]

Although the alleged 'incivility' of the Irish was augmented by the comprehensive body of anti-Irish rhetoric which targeted both Gaelic culture and society, English and non-Irish commentators sought to expand upon their rationale for Irish 'inferiority'. Indeed, in order to further the justification for English colonial intervention, and to finalise the conquest of Ireland, contemporary commentators foregrounded those characteristics which typified the 'savage', 'bestial' disposition of the Irish, including their supposedly nomadic, itinerant lifestyle.[69] For example, Gerald of Wales infamously denounced the Irish as a 'wild', 'literally barbarous' people on account of his assertion that they lived 'on beasts only, and … like beasts', and this claim would go on to fundamentally influence almost all subsequent commentaries on the state of Ireland and its inhabitants well into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[70] Throughout his *Itinerary* (1617), Moryson also described the Irish as a 'wild' people and compared them with 'beasts', but he also compared Irish cattle with the

[67] Ibid.
[68] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, pp. 126-127.
[69] Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 27-30.
[70] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 101-102.

Irish themselves.[71] According to Moryson, the Irish would 'willingly eate the hearb Shamrock, being of a sharpe taste, which as they runne and are chased to an fro, they snatch like beasts out of the ditches', while he claimed that Irish cattle were 'as rebellious to their owners, as the people are to the Kings'.[72] Finally, he issued a warning to his readership, that 'these wild Irish are not much unlike to wild beasts, in whose caves a beast passing that way, might perhaps finde meate, but not without danger to be ill intertained, perhaps devoured of his insatiable Host'.[73]

Spenser similarly complained that the Irish would 'use all the beastlie behavior that may bee to oppresse all men', and called them 'cruell and bloodye', much like 'wild', untamed animals.[74] Furthermore, he declared that the root cause of their 'beastlie manner of life, and saluaige condicon' was in fact their 'lyinge and lyvinge together with his beaste in one howse, in one rowme, and in one bed'.[75] Spenser then concluded that the Irish 'thinke them selves half exempted from Lawe and obedience, and havinge once tasted freedome, doe, lyke a steare that hath bene longe out of his yooke, grudge and repyne ever after to come under rule againe'.[76] Evidently, Spenser considered the failure of the earlier English colony as a partial cause for the regression and resolve of the Irish, having been previously restrained by the influence of English 'civilisation', only to have become subsequently unshackled as a direct result of the reduction of English influence throughout the Irish realm. Thus, if the Irish could revert back to their 'natural' status in the absence of English 'civility' and 'civilisation', so too, potentially, could their English counterparts. In fact, Sir John Davies later expressed his concern that the 'English Colonies did embrace' the 'Irish Customes', causing them to

[71] Moryson, *An Itinerary*, Vol. IV, pp. 186, 194, 198-201, 203.
[72] Ibid, pp. 200-201.
[73] Ibid, p. 203.
[74] Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, p. 123.
[75] Ibid, pp. 89, 141.
[76] Ibid, pp. 85-86.

become 'degenerate' like 'Nabuchadnezzar: who … had the face of a man', but 'the heart of a Beast; or like those who had drunke of Circes Cuppe, and were turned into very Beasts; and yet tooke such pleasure in their beastly manner of life, as they would not returne to their shape of men againe'.[77] In failing to assert control over their natural environment via the introduction of permanent settlements, fields, and widespread cultivation, the Irish, and even the Old English nobility in this instance, were not simply regarded as 'primitive' or 'uncivilised', but were actively dehumanised and likened to the very cattle they valued above all else.[78]

That the Irish, and their perceived 'primitivism', were comparable with lowly, 'uncivilised' beasts was reason enough to warrant their conquest and colonial subjection by their 'civilised' English neighbours, but the idea that Irish 'barbarism' could potentially usurp the 'civility' of English settlers drew attention to the extent of their potential threat to the larger movement towards human 'civilisation'. Having explored the work of Edmund Spenser in relation to the English proposal for the 'civilisation' of Ireland and its inhabitants, John Walters has argued that Spenser's fictional speakers, Irenius and Eudoxus, were fundamentally fixated upon the relationship between the Irish and their cattle, as well as other 'natural' factors, which appeared to typify the early modern English concern with the interaction between humanity and the natural world.[79] Indeed, he has explained that the relationship between the Irish and their cattle — and their all-encompassing status across Irish society more broadly — symbolised the extent to which the natural environment could potentially shape, or alter, one's human culture, which in turn represented a direct threat to

[77] Davies, *Historical Relations*, pp. 181-182; Davies was referencing the Old English adoption of Gaelic language and custom.
[78] J. Walters, 'Human, All Too Human: Spenser and the Dangers of Irish Civilization', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual*, 30 (2015), pp. 153-154, 158-159.
[79] Ibid, pp. 151-152.

English colonial ambitions, as exemplified by the supposed regression of the Old English inhabitants who had largely assimilated themselves with the 'uncivilised' lifestyle and traditions of the Gaelic population.[80] Crucially, however, the Old English continued to maintain their separation in identity from the 'Old Irish', insisting upon their loyalty to the crown whilst practicing Catholicism in a more discrete fashion in comparison with their Gaelic counterparts.[81] Thus, it was largely on account of the successive political and religious crises associated with Europe and the three Stuart kingdoms throughout the 1630s that the English administration became less concerned with the distinction of one kind of Catholic from the next. Nevertheless, the connection between the mobility of the Irish, their pastoral heritage and dependency upon cattle, and the development of anti-Irish rhetoric within English commentaries on the state of Ireland throughout the early modern period was clearly established, allowing anti-Irish commentators to transform both the land and society of Irish Gaeldom into something of a *terra nullius*, containing the 'wrong kind of people doing the wrong kind of things'.[82] By maintaining that Ireland was a country controlled by 'savage' nomads and 'treacherous' noble tyrants, who misused and effectively abused the fruits of the land by wandering aimlessly with their herds, English colonial intervention could be justified, and argued to be necessary, through both biblical and Roman principles related to land use and ownership.[83] Additionally, by reducing the Irish from human beings to 'wild', untamed beasts, English commentators were also able to legitimise their 'superiority' over their 'inferior' Gaelic counterparts, further fashioning the Irish into an 'uncivilised', inhuman, and inherently conquerable population.[84]

---

[80] Ibid, pp. 151-153, 157-160.
[81] A. Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland, 1625-42* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1966), pp. 16-26.
[82] McVeigh, Rolston, 'Civilising the Irish', p. 8.
[83] Walters, 'Human, All Too Human', pp. 153-156; V. D. Anderson, *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 78-79.
[84] Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, pp. 120-122, 180-185; Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', pp. 30-34.

Movement, Mobility, and Human 'Civility' in the 1641 Rebellion

Having established the connection between the development of English anti-Irish rhetoric and the Gaelic culture of mobility and movement — both intrinsically linked with the dominance of pastoralism and the all-encompassing status of cattle within early modern Irish society — it is now possible to consider the implications of this historic contention within the context and reportage of the 1641 rebellion. Indeed, up until the eve of the Irish insurgency, the English conquest of Ireland appeared to be conclusive, with colonial settlements established after the manner of English townships across the landscape, designed to both utilise Ireland's natural resources in the 'correct' manner and to eradicate the 'barbarous' culture and condition of the Irish in the process.[85] However, while English and Protestant commentators have promulgated their relative shock and surprise over the outbreak of rebellion, itself part of their reportage of the Irish insurgency, the representation of the rapid spread and scale of the rising has offered indications as to the resilience of the Irish up until the period in question, particularly in relation to the endurance of the Gaelic culture of mobility and movement.[86]

As previously mentioned, MacLeod has explored the language contained within the 1641 depositions and identified a definitive concern with the movement of the Irish rebels, particularly in relation to the spread of chaos and disorder, but larger, more comprehensive accounts of the Irish insurgency also fit into a similar pattern of description, clearly intended to represent the mobility of the Catholic Irish forces during the initial stages of the rebellion as both frantic and hostile.[87] For example, according to Henry Jones, when 'the first of that

[85] Foster, *Modern Ireland 1600-1972*, p. 59.
[86] MacLeod, '"Rogues, Villaines, and Base Trulls"', p. 121; N. Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 461.
[87] Ibid, p. 121.

Rebellious rout' decided to rise up in open rebellion against their English and Protestant neighbours, he described how the Irish made 'incursions upon us', specifically by 'surprising the Towns of Trim, Kelles, Navan, Ardbraccan, Athboy', and by 'over-running the County of Meath' like unwanted vermin.[88] Edmund Borlase also described the beginning of the Irish rebellion and explained that 'all the Lords and Gentlemen in the Kingdom (that were Papists) were engag'd in this Plot', and so it happened 'That what was that day to be done in other parts of the Countrey, was so far advanc'd by that time' that he proclaimed that 'it was impossible for the wit of Man to prevent it'.[89] Accordingly, he explained that the Irish forces 'had in this short time made themselves Masters of the whole Province of Ulster', but he also described their rebellion as a 'Fire' which had been 'thus kindled', and which 'shortly after spread its fury in the Provinces of Munster and Connaght', all of which were regions routinely associated with the endurance of Gaelic tradition.[90] Sir John Temple's account was similar to that of Borlase in that he described the insurgency as a 'formidable … universall defection and generall Revolt, wherein not only all the meer Irish, but almost all the old English that adhered to the church of Rome, were totally involved', and so 'the power of the Rebels was suddenly swollen up to so great a bulk, and likely so fast to multiply and increase', like that of some kind of contagious infection.[91] Temple's account ultimately failed to distinguish between the motivations of the Catholic Irish nobility, the Old English, and the non-elite Catholic Irish, thereby extending the generalised perception of the rebellion as a wholesale Catholic and Irish conspiracy. Indeed, he reinforced this comparison during a later discussion in which he referenced the 'poyson of this rebellion' and described how it had

---

[88] H. Jones, *A Remonstrance of The beginnings and proceedings of the Rebellion in the County of Cavan, within the Province of Ulster in Ireland, From the 23. of October, 1641. untill the 15. of June, 1642.* (London: Godfrey Emerson, 1642), p. 1.
[89] E. Borlase, *The History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion* (London: Robert Clavel, 1680), p. 20.
[90] Ibid, p. 59.
[91] J. Temple, *The Irish Rebellion: or, An History Of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion raised within the Kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October, in the year, 1641* (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1646), pp. 16, 25.

subsequently 'infected the counties of Letrim, Longford, West-Meath, and Lowth'.[92] As part of his reproach of the Catholic Irish, Temple lamented the fact that the Irish had 'appeared without all manner of question … and like a torrent … come down most impetuously upon' the English and Protestant settlers, who had been 'so easily over-run within the Northern Counties', being what he described as 'so suddenly swallowed up', like animals, 'before they could make any manner of resistance in the very first begnnings of this Rebellion'.[93]

By comparing the movements of the Catholic Irish rebels during the initial stages of the rebellion in 1641 with natural phenomena such as wildfires, disease, flood waters, and even with animals, English and Protestant commentators not only reinforced existing philosophies which connected mobility and movement with chaos and disorder upon the landscape, but also the existing framework of anti-Irish rhetoric which, specifically, identified Gaelic mobility with the endurance of 'barbarism' in Ireland. Since the process of human 'civilisation' had effectively become synonymous with the conquest of nature itself, the comparison of the Irish rebels with 'wild', unpredictable features of the natural realm was significant: just as man was compelled to tame the 'wilderness' and to cultivate the landscape in order to exploit its resources for the advancement of human 'civility', so too were the English authorities charged with a duty to conquer and settle the 'wild' Irish inhabitants.[94] With the onset of the rebellion, then, not only had this responsibility become paramount, but the English officials were also forced to confront the reality of their own failure with respect to the finality of the conquest of Ireland.

---

[92] Ibid, p. 60.
[93] Ibid, pp. 25, 39-40.
[94] A. Horning, 'Archaeological Explorations of Cultural Identity and Rural Economy in the North of Ireland: Goodland, County Antrim', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 8:3 (2004), pp. 201-202.

From an Irish perspective, however, the representation of the initial scope and spread of the rebellion in this particular manner was indicative of a resurgence in the Gaelic culture of mobility which had vexed English authorities for centuries. The previous experience of dispossession and subjugation by the English military and colonial authorities across Gaelic communities, the organisation and execution of the rebellion on a popular level, and the relative surprise of the English and Protestant settler communities who suddenly found themselves under attack were all circumstances which, upon closer inspection, were arguably reminiscent of the same kind of incursions and retaliatory strikes which traditionally occurred between Irish lordships.[95]

Furthermore, while the insurgency has been memorialised by both English and Protestant polemicists as a wholesale ethnic and religious 'massacre', the vast majority of macabre tales and atrocity allegations did not begin to emerge immediately following the outbreak of the rebellion in October 1641. Rather, the initial stages of the Catholic Irish campaign were overwhelmingly characterised by acts of pillaging, destruction, and theft undertaken by non-elite Irish rebels across the country, best exemplified by the sheer scale of material losses detailed by English and Protestant neighbours within their deposition testimonies.[96] As has been uncovered as part of the previous investigation, rebel attacks which focused specifically upon the theft or destruction of the settlers' agricultural implements and resources — including their ploughs, carts, fences, landed 'improvements', and crops — have dominated English and Protestant victim testimonies.[97] Significantly,

[95] Edwards, 'The escalation of violence', pp. 41-44.
[96] M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), p. 228; M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer, 'Introduction 1641: fresh contexts and perspectives', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 1-2.
[97] See previous chapter on "Enclosures, 'Improvement', and the Landscape of the 1641 Irish Rebellion" for a more detailed discussion on the theft and destruction of the agricultural landscape and capital of the settlers.

though, one of the most prominent allegations associated with Irish attacks was that which involved the appropriation, movement, and relocation of cattle.

During one such attack, William Hodgson of Donnybrook in Dublin described how approximately 'threescore' of the Catholic Irish rebels had come to pursue himself 'and the rest of his company' in the area of 'Rings end Armed with muskettes pyks & other weopens'.[98] However, Hodgson explained that before they made it to Ringsend, the Irish forces 'perceiving a great number of cattle to be grazing in a park or closse Imediatly went thither & by force drove and tooke away all those cattle … [and] some sheepe which were there runing from them towardes the Rings end'.[99] Another encounter reported by John Johnson 'of the Citty of Dublin' saw the rebels identified,

> neere Saint Keavens Church in the subburbs of the Citty of Dublin And then and there (whenas they were not suspected to come) they being Armed with weapons for their purpose, did forceibly & Rebelliously seize vpon take and carry away 359 Cowes oxen & bulls.[100]

Johnson further claimed that 'Those ~~Rebells~~ Irish that tooke them … vowed to restore & send back all the rest to the owners of them ... If their Counsell at Kilkenny shold giue them such direccion', but after 'about 2 dayes … these ~~Rebells~~ Irish sent back' only '46 of the worst of those cattle which they had soe taken'.[101] Then, after 'the bringers promissed to bring thither

[98] 'Deposition of: William Hodgson (4/7/1645)', MS 810, fols 318r-319r, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810318r334, accessed on: 11/3/20.
[99] Ibid.
[100] 'Deposition of: John Johnson (8/1/1644)', MS 810, fols 250r-250v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810250r278, accessed on: 11/3/20.
[101] Ibid. The reason for the rebels' relinquishment of any of the settlers' cattle is uncertain, though their surrender of 'the worst' cattle of the herd may simply constitute further emphasis, either by the deponents themselves or by those documenting their testimonies, of the 'treachery' and 'barbarity' of the Catholic Irish.

alsoe all the rest', and were given 'seuerall direccions & orders … both from their Counsell at Kilkenny and Cashell to restore the rest of the goodes', the rebels 'did not restore them, but did … drive them further into the Cuntry amongst the woodes: & haue euer since deteined them.[102] As part of his account of the rebellion, Temple explained that, 'the very day before the breaking out of this rebellion', Irish priests had offered,

> the people a dismisse at Masse, with free liberty to goe out and take possession of all their Lands, which they pretended, unjustly detained from them by the English; as also to strip, rob, and dispoyle them of all their Goods and Cattell.[103]

More significantly, Temple concluded that,

> It is most apparant, that the prime Gentlemen in all parts, as well as the Clergy, pressed them [the Irish rebels] on to despoyle the English of all their Goods and Cattell, well knowing their avaricious humour and greedy desires to get them into their possession, and that they could not possibly finde out any other thing that would engage them more readily to undertake, or more desperately to execute all manner of villanies, then the hopes of enjoying so rich a prey now presented unto them.[104]

Thus, while the actions of the Irish rebels were undoubtedly representative of the endurance of their mobile heritage, particularly in relation to the organisation and employment of their military stratagem during the initial stages of the insurgency, these

[102] Ibid.
[103] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 87.
[104] Ibid.

attacks may also be considered in relation to the prevalence of Gaelic pastoralism and the associated tradition of cattle raiding. Though Eamon Darcy has explained that these actions often served as something of a precursor to physical violence targeted towards the English and Protestant settler communities, the immediate fixation of the Catholic Irish forces upon the settlers' cattle — and other livestock — was undoubtedly testament to their value and significance within Gaelic society, as well as of the economic deprivation of the Irish tenantry as a consequence of the expansion of English colonisation.[105] Much like previous commentators, both English and Protestant chroniclers seemed to have quickly attributed the actions of the Catholic Irish rebels to their allegedly 'barbaric' nature, but, in order to consider their significance from an Irish perspective, this raiding must be interpreted more carefully within the context of the rebellion itself and in relation to the longer history of Anglo-Irish hostility.[106]

Just as a traditional Irish *crech*, or cattle raid, possessed important cultural, economic, and political applications within Gaelic society, the tendency towards raiding which became manifest as part of the Irish campaign during the 1641 rebellion may be perceived in a similar fashion.[107] According to William Smyth, the driving force of the rebellion, on a popular level, was made up of non-elite Irish farmers, smallholders, and artisans, who very much viewed the conflict as one of the land itself, grounded in a fight to restore their ancestral territories, livelihoods, and resources, which had to have included that which was bound up in the wealth of cattle.[108] Indeed, during previous confrontations with their Irish neighbours throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries — including both of the Desmond Rebellions and the

[105] Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, p. 64.
[106] Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, p. 46.
[107] Kelly, 'Cattle in Ancient Ireland', p. 49; Evans, *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage*, p. 29.
[108] W. J. Smyth, 'Towards a Cultural Geography of the 1641 Rising/Rebellion', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 74.

long period of the Nine Years' War — English forces were only too aware of the necessity of cattle within Gaelic society, and so they were routinely instructed to steal or slaughter Irish cattle alongside the employment of scorched earth tactics in order to reduce the inhabitants to starvation and force them to vacate their ancestral lands, either through dearth or death.[109] David Edwards has also suggested that Irish cattle raiding, though undoubtedly also a political manoeuvre, constituted a primarily economic form of warfare. Designed to enrich individual lords at the expense of their enemies, prolonged periods of raiding against particular lords would not only cause destitution and starvation among non-elite farmers and labourers, whose cattle were supposed to remain under the protection of the lord, but would also serve to undermine their political authority.[110] Insofar as the actions of the Catholic Irish rebels may be better understood as a resurgence of the historic struggle over cattle herds in Gaelic Ireland — based upon the ancient cultural, economic, and political value given to cattle within that context — their appropriation of the settlers' cattle may then also be interpreted as a form of restorative justice. In fact, these actions were arguably designed to affect the restoration of the balance of power in Ireland back into the hands of the Irish inhabitants themselves as opposed to their English and Protestant oppressors, whose previous Irish military experience would have impressed upon them the potential for the complete devastation of their communities. While Ireland's pastoral heritage and its associated culture of mobility had been regularly denounced by English commentators as the utter antithesis to their version of 'civilised' society, it was in fact the resilience of these attributes which not only awarded the advantage to the Catholic Irish forces during the initial stages of the conflict, but which also emphasised the vulnerability of the English and Protestant settlers to

---

[109] Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 109-110; W. J. Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory: A Geography of Colonial and Early Modern Ireland c.1530-1750* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2008), p. 7; A. Cathcart, 'The Maritime Dimension to Plantation in Ulster, ca. 1550-ca. 1600', *Journal of the North Atlantic*, 12 [SP1] (2019), p. 103.
[110] Edwards, 'The escalation of violence', pp. 44-45.

Irish attacks.[111] Thus, the Irish non-elite forces had effectively weaponised the static nature of English 'civilisation': by attacking the very foundations of the latter's 'superiority', including their landed and agricultural assets, the Irish employed the maxims of their own perceived 'barbarity', in the form of their mobility and ancestral raiding practices, in order to disrupt and disempower the English and Protestant settlements, reflecting upon their correspondent deprivation.

On the other hand, from an English and Protestant perspective, commentators who reported on the alleged organisation and execution of the Irish rebellion did so through the lens of their own 'civility' and presumptive 'superiority', which in turn coloured their reportage of the insurgency overall, transforming the might of Irish resistance in 1641 into another chapter within the overarching narrative of Anglo-Irish hostility that ultimately cast the Irish inhabitants as 'barbarous' 'rebels' who disdained the worldly advantages offered by their colonial 'superiors'. Indeed, English commentators undoubtedly drew upon their previous experience with Ireland and its Gaelic inhabitants — including the existing bulk of their anti-Irish rhetoric — in order to consider both the motivations and aggressive mobility of the Catholic Irish forces as part of their overall narrative of the rebellion. For example, like Moryson and Spenser, both English and Protestant observers utilised the actions of the Irish forces in the aftermath of the outbreak in October 1641 in order to reinforce pre-existing conceptions of their 'treachery' and 'barbarity', both of which are evidenced on an individual basis within victim testimonies. According to John Mayes 'of the Towne and parish of ~~Rathkiele barony of Connelloe and with~~ in the County of lymericke carrier', he and around 'fiftie protestants in company with him … wer besiedged by Patricke Purcell of Crow' and 'Oliuer Stevenson of Dunmoylin in the said County Esquire & others whoe faithfully

[111] Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*, p. 40; Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change', p. 295.

promissed them quarter of their liues and goods', only to 'treacherously' rob and strip them of their clothing and possessions.[112] In County Dublin, George Davys described how 'william Clifford not having god before his face, came to this examynetts brothers house accompayned with Rorry oge mc Dermott … and many others' in order to come to a marriage agreement for his niece, but instead they 'did … Threacherously intrape This examynett & his said brother and bound them with a cord all that night & took away from this examinetts brother and from this examynett all that euer they had dispossest this examynetts brother out of his house & Lands'.[113] Rowland Price 'of the Citty of Dublin' also reported that he saw,

> … divers others irish horsmen and foote forceibly suddenly & Rebelliously martched to certeine groundes nere Harroldes cross … & then and there forceibly seazed on tooke & drive quite away with them (amongst a multitude of other goodes of his neighbors) 14 … Cowes and oxen of the deponentes worth 84 li. ster And sent only 4 of the worst of them back.[114]

Over in County of Limerick, George Man and Robert Willies claimed that they 'together with at least fiftie men women and children ... all fled to ~~the Castle~~ Chancellors Castle at Rathkeile', and 'within a forthnight after were closely besiedged by Morris Harbert the elder of Rathkeale aforesaid gentleman Garrett Harbert of the … same gentleman Morris Harbert the yonger of the same gen', and many of the other Irish rebels, 'all which parties and euery of them seuerally & from time to time continued siedge to the said Castle for three

[112] 'Deposition of: John Mayes (24/1/1643)', MS 829, fols 264r-265v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin,* https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829264r175, accessed on: 14/3/20.
[113] 'Information of: George Davys (n/d)', MS 830, fols 010r-011v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=830010r015, accessed on: 9/3/20.
[114] 'Deposition of: Rowland Price (8/1/1644)', MS 810, fols 251r-251v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810251r279, accessed on: 11/3/20.

quarters of a yeere'.[115] However, after 'the said Castle was deliuered vpon quarter vnto the said Harbert whoe concluded to giue the said besiedged quarter for liues and goods', Harbert and 'his said company trayterously & contrary to the lawe of armes … in all other nations robbed and stripped the said besiedged starke naked'.[116] Just as Gerald of Wales had warned, the Irish had resorted 'to the arts of evil and their accustomed weapons of deceit', and, as such, these shocking testimonies of the robbery, besiegement, and stripping of the English and Protestant victims by the Catholic Irish rebels reinforced existing English conceptions of a 'barbarous' and 'savage' population.[117]

Clearly, the depositions were endowed with the language of existing anti-Irish rhetoric typically employed by prominent English commentators to describe the behaviours and disposition of the Irish inhabitants: victims regularly denounced the actions of the Catholic Irish forces as 'barbarous', 'treacherous', 'traitorous', 'rebellious', and simply as unlawful in some cases, just as their predecessors had cultivated the crucial link between the apparent 'treachery' and 'barbarity' of the Irish and their seemingly nomadic, unsettled lifestyle. Accordingly, whether the rebels were reported to have physically plundered the settlers' livestock and resources, or had simply reneged on a pledge of mercy, the depositions served as a vehicle for the dissemination of the same anti-Irish rhetoric which had dominated the Elizabethan and earlier periods; simply put, the Irish were seen to be acting exactly as they had always done, as erratic 'barbarians'. Indeed, according to Borlase, 'every History (concerning Ireland)' was 'full of this Truth, with horrible Presidents of Treachery and Barbarism', because the Irish possessed an 'inbred malice and hatred to the English' from

---

[115] 'Deposition of: George Man and Robert Willies (31/3/1643)', MS 829, fols 345r-346v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829345r226, accessed on: 15/3/20.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 101-102, 106-107.

which their 'Rebellions sprung … not to leave one alive'.[118] In spite of the fact that the English had seemingly 'abolished' those 'barbarous Customs continually us'd by the Irish', 'made currant by Act of Parliament, in Ireland' all of 'the Laws of England', and settled the 'Lands (belonging to the Natives)', there was 'nothing' which 'could keep them from Rebelling'.[119] Thus, Borlase concluded that 'none were more treacherous and fierce than they, as great inhumanity and cruelty being acted by them', having 'wasted and fired' those places which were 'well accommodated with good Land for Corn and Cattle'.[120] Again, like those works by Gerald of Wales, Moryson, and Spenser, Borlase's chronicle sought to account for the 'treachery' of the Irish, tracing those qualities to the endurance of their 'barbarous Customs', which undoubtedly included their pastoral farming, cattle raiding, and generally mobile culture more broadly.

Like his predecessors, Temple also traced the origins of the Irish to the 'Scythians', who were believed to have first inhabited the Gaelic north, which, uncoincidentally, was where the Catholic Irish rebels first 'began to find their owne strength, and that partly by treachery, partly by force they had possessed themselves of all the chiefe places of strength in Ulster'.[121] He also explained how the Irish customs of 'Tanestry and Gavelkind' had been 'most destructive', since these ensured that land did not pass from 'father to sonne', or even 'to him that was next of kinne', but instead fell into the hands of 'he that was most active, of greatest power, and had most followers', which often led to the same use of 'open force and violence' that would subsequently cause the Irish to 'desperately … struggle for their liberty'.[122] Ignoring the fact that the Irish tenantry were free to pursue alternative prospects

[118] Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, p. 14.
[119] Ibid, pp. 17-18.
[120] Ibid, pp. 30-31, 117.
[121] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 90.
[122] Ibid, pp. 8-9.

between Irish lordships, Temple claimed that the Catholic Irish rebels had broken into open rebellion 'most furiously' after the manner of their most powerful lords, having 'surprized by treachery' the English and Protestant settlers, before the rebels began their campaign, 'despoiling, robbing, and murthering all the English inhabitants', wherein they also 'burnt all their fair well-built houses, drove away their cattell, and laid siege' to many of the English and Protestant settlements and strongholds across the country.[123] Evidently, English and Protestant commentators like Borlase and Temple — who sought to construct the dominant narrative of the rebellion — utilised their commentaries to both reinforce and build upon the foundations of existing anti-Irish rhetoric, establishing their own link between the 'barbarous' mobile culture of the Irish, the apparent failure of the English colonial authorities to settle those inhabitants on a permanent basis, and the 'treacherous' conception, organisation, and execution of the Catholic Irish rebellion in 1641.

Worse still was the suggestion that the unchecked 'barbarity' of the Irish had not only given rise to the circumstances of the insurgency, but that the endurance of their mobile tendencies was indicative of their resolve to prevent the wholesale advancement of English 'civility' and 'civilisation' within the Irish realm. For example, Temple explained that while the English were 'certainly in point of interest and universall possession, owners, and proprietors of the whole Kingdome of Ireland', and had made 'good the rights and possessions they had gotten by conquest, and went on, endeavouring to civilize the people, introducing the English Laws, language, habit, and customes long used among them', they had also become 'more carelesse … to suffer the Irish to intermingle with them'.[124] Indeed, he suggested that 'these acts, and other courses tending to the advancement of true Religion,

[123] Ibid, pp. 39, 60.
[124] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 7-8.

and Civility, were highly displeasing, and most incompatible with the loose humours of the Natives, who apprehended even the most gentle means of reformation'.[125] Thus, he concluded that the English conquest and the advancement of their 'civilisation',

> had no manner of influence upon the perverse dispositions of the Irish: the malignant impressions of irreligion and barbarisme, transmitted down, whether by infusion from their ancestors, or naturall generation, had irrefragably stiffned their necks, and hardned their hearts against all the most powerfull endeavours of Reformation: They continued … in all their wicked customes and inclinations … their hearts enraged with malice and hatred against all of the English nation, breathing forth nothing but their ruine, destruction, and utter extirpation.[126]

The dominant English and Protestant narrative of the rebellion was therefore constructed, at least to some extent, with the intention to explore the dangers of inherent Irish 'barbarity' in reality: having elected to wander idly out with the perceived limits of 'civilisation' in permanent settlements such as towns and cities, the Irish were effectively comparable to 'wild men', who lived under the cover of darkness in the woods and forests, far removed from the culture, order, refinement, and humanity associated with the court scene.[127] As Joep Leerssen has argued, although the 'wilderness' was primarily a spatial construct associated with peripheral regions such as woods, forests, and the natural realm more generally, it also became directly intertwined with the concept of 'wildness', which was then established as a behavioural characteristic borne from the separation of supposedly 'wild' individuals — like the inhabitants of Ireland — from mainstream society.[128] Thus, the

[125] Ibid, p. 9.
[126] Ibid, pp. 9-10.
[127] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', pp. 27-28.
[128] Ibid, pp. 28-29.

English and Protestant reportage of the rebellion was versatile: while the Irish insurgency had been convincingly represented as a physical manifestation of the overarching struggle between English 'civility' and Irish 'barbarity' which had dominated both anti-Irish rhetoric and colonial narratives throughout the early modern period, the Irish, and in turn the Catholic Irish forces, were inherently 'barbarous' and therefore not simply resistant to the introduction of 'civilisation' and 'civility', but were altogether incapable of reformation on account of their uncontrollable malice and hatred towards the English. In fact, the seemingly outrageous and brutal nature of the actions of the Catholic Irish rebels — evinced by their widespread campaign of destruction and appropriation, but more by their subsequent purported committing of widespread human atrocities against the English and Protestant settler population — not only reinforced the representation of their 'barbarity', but actually fed into additional modes of anti-Irish rhetoric which characterised the inhabitants of Ireland as ungodly, irrational, inhuman creatures. Thus, while the Irish had been traditionally represented by English commentators through classical lenses of 'civility' and 'barbarity', the actions of the Catholic Irish forces throughout the conflict itself effectively substantiated those existing conceptions.

Having considered the significance and extent of the rationality of animals in comparison to humans in early modern thought, Erica Fudge has discussed what she has termed the 'making-animal', or making 'animal-like', of a human being, victimised by deliberate and abject human cruelty. [129] Fudge has examined Tacitus' story of 'The Saints of God suffering martyrdome' and has explored the making of the martyrs into 'laughing stockes' within the story by dressing them in the 'skinnes of wilde beasts' before allowing

[129] E. Fudge, *Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality, and Humanity in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), pp. 70-71.

them to be ‘exposed to the tearing and renting asunder by dogges’.[130] In doing so, she has argued that this ideological process of ‘making-animal’ not only allows for cruelty to be inflicted more easily upon targeted victims, but is also associated with the figurative transformation of both the victims and their abusers into animals themselves, or, at least, to the status of animals in theory.[131] Simply put, those who are ‘animalised’ can then be victimised, while those who ‘animalise’ become ‘bestial’ in and of themselves via their actions.[132] Thus, based upon the dominant reportage of the events of 1641, English and Protestant commentators utilised this rationale in order to depict the Catholic Irish rebels as animal-like via their ‘savage’ atrocities, while the rebels themselves were engaged in the process of ‘making-animal’ the English and Protestant victims. Indeed, John Walter has considered Fudge’s discussion of the ‘making-animal’ of victims throughout the early modern period in relation to the events of the Irish rebellion in 1641.[133] He has argued that the Catholic Irish rebels, by ‘making-animal’ the English and Protestant settlers, were able to exclude those victims from ‘humanity’ and therefore from the accepted ‘prohibitions’ of human brutality: for example, Walter has cited the name-calling of English and Protestant victims as animals as a prelude to the Irish engagement in physical violence, and he has maintained that the endurance of such abuse was commonly reported by victims within their deposition testimonies.[134] MacLeod has also commented upon the occurrence of this name-calling as part of her investigation into the depositions, and has further argued that this dehumanisation of victims was a common theme within the rhetoric of warfare.[135] In fact, MacLeod has suggested that the narrative of the name-calling of their victims by the Catholic

[130] Ibid.
[131] Ibid.
[132] Ibid.
[133] J. Walter, ‘Performative violence and the politics of violence in the 1641 depositions’, in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 138.
[134] Ibid.
[135] MacLeod, ‘“Rogues, Villaines, and Base Trulls”’, pp. 124-125.

Irish rebels helped to establish the position of the English and Protestants as fairer, and more objective, while the rebels' employment of such dehumanising language only served to reinforce, as Fudge explained, their own 'beastliness'.[136]

For example, in the County of Limerick, Thomas Southwell 'of Clough Kotterd' described an encounter with some of the Catholic Irish rebels, during which 'Oliuer Stephenson the Shehyes the Pursells & the Herberts' allegedly stated that it was Southwell and his associates who 'were the … rebbells', before they proceeded to call them 'Puritan doggs & traytours'.[137] During another incident, John Crewes 'of the Citty of Limerick' recalled that he and many of the other English and Protestant settlers were besieged by the Irish forces after they had 'fledd for the safetie of their lives to the Castle of Ballyaley', at which point the rebels 'threatened to burne' the castle if the Earl of Thomond, who 'had not appeared in Armes', refused to 'turne the English puritant doggs (as they called them) out of the said Castle'.[138] Indeed, according to Temple, the Irish had been led by their Roman Catholic priests to believe that 'it was lawfull for them to rise up and destroy all the Protestants, who, they told them, were worse then Dogs; that they were Devils, and served the Devill', and also that 'it was no more sinne to kill an English-man, then to kill a dogge'.[139] Interestingly, Temple's account echoed that of the earlier *Remonstrance of the Irish Chiefs to Pope John XXII* (1317): authored by the Irish lord of Cenel Eoghain, Domhnall Ó Néill, the remonstrance was written to object to the English oppression of the Irish, and one of the claims made against the English was that they proclaimed that 'it is no more sin to kill

---

[136] Ibid.
[137] 'Deposition of: Thomas Southwell (14/10/1642)', MS 829, fols 268r-268v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829268r177, accessed on: 14/3/20.
[138] 'Deposition of: John Crewes (1/9/1653)', MS 829, fols 453r-455r, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829453r305, accessed on 17/3/20.
[139] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 87, 78.

an Irishman than a dog or any other brute'.[140] From an Irish perspective, then, such comments may also be considered an inversion of traditional anti-Irish rhetoric which equated the mobility of the Irish with that of animals or beasts, and which was utilised to bolster the ideological justification for various oppressive actions taken by the intrusive colonial English regime against the 'native' inhabitants, from their landed dispossession to their military slaughter. From an English and Protestant perspective, however, Walter has considered the Catholic Irish comparison of the English and Protestant settlers with dogs, specifically, and has explained that these insults were intended to reflect upon the correspondent greedy, filthy, 'bestial' nature of such animals that, at the Resurrection, would be excluded from the honour of godly salvation.[141] MacLeod has also explained that by foregrounding the Irish perception of the English and Protestant settlers as dogs within the depositions — as well as within larger accounts of the rebellion — commentators were not only able to establish the depth of Irish hatred towards the English, but also the idea that the settlers were facing imminent danger if they had become so significantly dehumanised within the minds of the Irish forces.[142]

The significance of the 'making-animal' of the English and Protestant settlers within the dominant narrative of the rebellion was thus twofold. On the one hand, the deliberate nature of the Catholic Irish allegedly calling the settlers animals established the depths of Irish 'barbarity' and their purported inhumanity, being possessed of such little regard for the humanity or condition of their English and Protestant victims. On the other hand, the

---

[140] D. Ó Néill, *Remonstrance of the Irish Chiefs to Pope John XXII* (Cork: University College, 2007), p. 43.
[141] Walter, 'Performative violence and the politics of violence', pp. 137-138.
[142] MacLeod, '"Rogues, Villaines, and Base Trulls"', pp. 124-125. Though dogs had been employed in a working capacity in Ireland from, at least, around the Early Christian period, they were also consumed during periods of shortage, and beaten, presumably if they failed to yield to the commands of their human keepers; see F. McCormick, 'The Dog in Prehistoric and Early Christian Ireland', *Archaeology Ireland*, 5:4 (1991), pp. 7-9 for more detail.

ideological dehumanisation of the settlers also prefaced the subsequent commitment to, and the discussion of, the widespread physical devastation and atrocity endured by those communities under the direction of the Irish forces. Irish 'barbarism' then — as opposed to any legitimate Irish grievances — was upheld within both English and Protestant commentaries of the rebellion as an explanation for the outbreak and character of the conflict itself.

As discussed in the previous chapter, as the conflict escalated and the Irish campaign began to spiral entirely outwith the control of the Catholic Irish elite, the attacks of the non-elite forces upon English and Protestant settlements graduated from material acts of raiding, plundering, and destruction, to those which physically targeted the settlers themselves, including the stripping of individual settlers of their clothing and possessions; the displacement of men, women, and children from their homes; and, finally, the mutilation, murder, and dumping of settlers' bodies on a large scale across the country.[143] Exploring the humiliation and dehumanisation of settlers within the context of the rebellion, Smyth has examined the act of stripping individuals of their clothing and material possessions, specifically, and has maintained that the widespread reportage of such actions was indicative of a marked increase in the denial of the humanity of English and Protestant victims by the Catholic Irish forces.[144] Smyth has also argued that the image of settlers being stripped and forced away from their homes by the Catholic Irish forces — who were no strangers to these kinds of abuses themselves — to try to survive within the harsh reality of the Irish 'wilderness' was powerful, and has insisted that the evidence suggests that these actions were intended to both dehumanise and engender the expulsion and eradication of the English and

[143] Redmond, 'Memories of violence and New English identities', pp. 712-713.
[144] Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory*, pp. 131-141.

Protestant settlers from the Irish landscape.[145] Furthermore, the act of stripping individuals of both their worldly possessions and basic necessities, in and of itself, must also be considered in relation to the weaponization and reciprocation of the classical concept of *terra nullius* and its philosophy of rightful landownership, which had been employed in relation to Ireland for colonial purposes by the English crown for centuries. For example, to focus solely on the stripping of victims' clothing for a moment, it should be noted that the wearing of clothes was considered to be one of the foundational hallmarks of human culture which helped to maintain the strict separation between humanity and the animal kingdom, since animals were believed to lack the rationality and culture required to understand the very concept of nakedness or the shame associated with nudity.[146] The production of textiles and cloth utilised to make clothing was also considered to be an integral process as part of the overall development of human 'civilisation', analogous to the conquest of nature on a larger scale: to make and wear clothes was to assert the dominion of humanity over the natural world by exploiting its bountiful array of resources, both vegetable and animal, for the purpose of human advancement and refinement.[147] By stripping the English and Protestant settlers of their clothing, then, as well as their other possessions, farms, and homesteads, the Catholic Irish forces not only undermined the material foundations of their 'civility' and their purported 'superiority', but they effectively also engendered the return of the English and Protestant settlements back into a relative state of *terra nullius*, since the settlers, devoid of their clothing, were no longer recognised as humans based upon their own English rationale. Instead, they were regarded as mere beasts who, as they themselves had previously maintained, had no claim to the land or its resources.

---

[145] Ibid.
[146] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', p. 26; Fudge, *Brutal Reasoning*, p. 14.
[147] K. Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800* (London: Penguin Group, 1984), pp. 21-25.

Though both the name-calling and stripping of the settlers has offered insight into the extent of their dehumanisation by the rebel forces as part of the Catholic Irish rebellion, the physical movement of English and Protestant victims also became a highly significant occurrence within the dominant reportage of the Irish insurgency. Whether fleeing from their settlements in fear for their lives or being moved from one place to another by the Irish rebels as prisoners of war, these movements effectively represented the weaponisation of Irish mobility against the apparent fixity of English 'civility' and 'civilisation'. For example, as part of his deposition testimony, Richard Mason of the County of Dublin described how the Irish rebels 'forceibly deprived, ~~robbed~~ & dispoiled' him of his material goods and possessions, including his prized 'English' cattle, but he also explained that he had been 'expelled & driven from his farme at Shalcocks wood' by the Catholic Irish forces, and had therefore 'quite Lost his interest and benefite thereof … by meanes of the present rebellion'.[148] 'Sir Gerrard Lowther knight Cheiffe Justice of his Maiest[ies] Court of Common' also lamented that he had been forced to send 'his wife and Childe with their servants into England for safegarde of their lives', but that he was himself was 'driven … to forsake his house in the subburbs' by the Catholic Irish insurgents.[149] Towards the southwest '~~in the parish of Effen~~' in County Limerick, Richard Ashton 'saieth that hee was expelled' and was physically 'driven Away ~~his~~ from his farme of Ballishonakin in the aforesid County where hee … had a lease of Twenty three yeeres vnexpired together with his Improvments in fencing and building', forcing him to abandon his 'Corne in Ground to the value of three skore pownds ster'.[150] Having been 'robbed and forceably dispoyled of his goo[ds] and Chattells … worth 485 li. 10 s'., John Pilkington of Bruff in County Limerick also declared

---

[148] 'Deposition of: Richard Mason (29/5/1645)', MS 810, fols 022v-023r, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810022v035, accessed on: 9/3/20.
[149] 'Deposition of: Gerrard Lowther (26/2/1642)', MS 809, fols 290r-290v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=809290r178, accessed on: 11/3/20.
[150] 'Deposition of: Richard Ashton (3/8/1642)', MS 829, fols 276r-277v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829276r184, accessed on: 14/3/20.

that '~~hee was expelled~~' and had been '~~driven away from his dwelling howse att Bruff~~' during the rebel advance.[151] Commenting upon the frequency of the expulsion and displacement of the settlers, Temple prefaced his discussion with a reminder that the Irish were seemingly 'devoid of all manner of civility, governed by no setled lawes', and therefore lived 'like beasts', but specifically like 'bruit Beasts' whose 'madnesse, fury, and most implacabe malice, did … transport them towards the destruction of those miserable harmlesse soules'.[152] He then proceeded to describe an incident involving English and Protestant 'men, women and children' who were,

> by the Rebels driven like hogs about six miles, to a River called the Band: in which space the foresaid Christians were most barbarously used … and the rest they drove to the River aforesaid, and there forced them to goe upon the bridge, which was cut downe, and with their pikes and swords, and other weapons, thrust them downe headlong into the said River and immediatly they perished.[153]

Another particularly harrowing account which Temple included as part of his chronicle seemingly captured the severity of the Irish forces, who 'hanged after a most barbarous manner' a number of Protestant ministers in the province of Munster, while one minister who became an individual target for their depravity, was 'stripped stark naked, and so driven like a beast thorough the Town of Cashell, the Rebels following and pricking him forward with darts and rapiers' like hunters, and 'so pursuing him till he fell downe dead'.[154] Temple also described many other similar incidents which saw the Catholic Irish rebels 'in a most

[151] 'Deposition of: John Pilkington (14/9/1642)', MS 829, fols 258r-259v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829258r171, accessed on: 14/3/20.
[152] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, pp. 1, 5.
[153] Ibid, p. 92.
[154] Ibid, p. 98.

barbarous manner' drive 'many of those miserable stripped Christians unto the place of their sufferings', comparing their movement and steerage with that of 'Swine', 'Cattell', 'Sheep', or even simply with that of 'Beasts' in general.[155]

Walter has briefly considered this 'herding' and 'driving' of the English and Protestant settlers by the Catholic Irish forces during the course of the conflict, and has argued that the treatment of victims in this manner contributed to the further dehumanisation and 'making-animal' of the settler population, which, in turn, led to an associated increase in their experience of violence and atrocity.[156] Indeed, while English and Protestant commentators set out to demonstrate that the outbreak of rebellion in 1641 was driven by both irrationality and 'treachery' — both of which were historically and contemporaneously associated with a reportedly 'uncivilised' Irish population — they also sought to foreground the virtue and innocence of the settler communities by contrasting their innocence with their unfathomable experience of Irish atrocity. To that end, those accounts which likened the dispossession and forceful physical movement of the settlers with that of animals, and with livestock animals in particular, fulfilled those objectives arguably too well, and, in turn, reinforced the perception of the Irish themselves as a 'bestial' population.

However, from an Irish perspective, these actions and their reportage must be considered in relation to their experience of anti-Irish rhetoric which vilified the Irish population for living 'on beasts' and 'like beasts' from at least the twelfth century onwards.[157] Certainly, English commentators had systematically condemned Ireland's Gaelic inhabitants as both 'barbarous' and 'bestial' in their appearance, wearing long cloak-like mantles with

[155] Ibid, pp. 92-93.
[156] Walter, 'Performative violence and the politics of violence', pp. 137-138.
[157] Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 101-102.

longer hair and beards; in their diets, allegedly consuming only ‘whitemeats’ and raw flesh; in their agricultural endeavours, described as nomadic, rootless herdsmen; and in their disposition, as violent, brutal, untrustworthy beings who wandered the landscape preying upon one another.[158] Thus, actions which included the despoiling, stripping, and forced shepherding of the English and Protestant settlers not only took direct aim at both their ‘civility’ and humanity, but also indicated that the Catholic Irish forces were embroiled in a systematic and reactionary campaign for retribution against their colonial oppressors. In addition, the concern that the Irish and their unbridled ‘barbarism’ may have possessed the potential to alter the nature and disposition of foreign inhabitants had long since represented one of the most prominent anxieties for both the English crown and the colonial authorities in Ireland. Thus the ideological ‘making-animal’ of the English and Protestant settlers via their name-calling, as well as the physical reduction of their humanity via their stripping, herding, and steering, represented a dramatic rejection and inversion of anti-Irish rhetoric which had traditionally reduced the Irish to the status of mere beasts. In doing so, it represented the actualisation of English fears regarding the fragility of their apparent ‘civility’ and ‘superiority’ exposing concerns of their own potential ‘degeneracy’ in a substantive, visceral fashion.[159]

With so many of the English and Protestant settler communities having been despoiled, displaced, and destroyed, the sheer number of victim testimonies which contained horrific tales of the Catholic Irish campaign of terror and atrocity is hardly surprising, nor is their indisputable propagandist inclination. Nicholas Canny has argued that while the authenticity of these numerous reports may not be confirmed or denied, the exceptionally

[158] Quinn, *The Elizabethans*, pp. 91-95; Butlin, ‘Land and People, c. 1600’, p. 154; M. Shanahan, ‘“When chiefest Rebell feede”: food, fosterage and fear in early modern Ireland’, *Food, Culture & Society*, 25 (2022), pp. 1-2; Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility*, pp. 117-118, 127-185.
[159] Walters, ‘Human, All Too Human’, pp. 151-152.

gruesome, macabre nature of these testimonies must be considered, in and of itself, as significant evidence of the experience of terror and suffering clearly assumed, if not endured, by the settlers themselves.[160] Thus, while reports of settlers being mutilated and disembowelled, babies being torn from their mothers' wombs and murdered, women being raped, and pregnant women being hanged from the gallows only to deliver their dead children in the process may not have actually taken place — or at least not nearly as frequently as many of the victims have suggested — those reports would have been accepted unconditionally by those who read or heard about them as further definitive proof of the 'barbarity' and inhumanity of the Catholic Irish enemy, as well as of the dehumanisation of the settlers themselves.[161]

Accordingly, one of the most provocative English concerns, present within both individual testimonies and larger accounts of the Irish rebellion, was that of consumption, and, more specifically, the possibility of being consumed as a 'civilised' human being and effectively 'made animal' during the process. Having explored the manifestation of 'wildness' and 'wilderness' in relation to the medieval and early modern development of 'civility', Leerssen has explained that the cooking of food — alongside other actions such as the tilling of the land, the erection of buildings, and the burial of the dead — was one of the unambiguous rituals associated with human culture, which constituted one of the most important characteristics necessary for the demarcation of difference between humankind and the animal kingdom overall.[162] Keith Thomas has similarly argued that the cooking of food and of flesh symbolised man's ascendency over the animal world, since animals did not

---

[160] N. Canny, 'The 1641 Depositions: A Source for Social & Cultural History', *History Ireland*, 1:4 (1993), p. 53.
[161] N. Canny, '1641 in a Colonial Context', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 58; Gibney, *The Shadow of a Year*, p. 23; Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, p. 175.
[162] Leerssen, 'Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland', p. 26.

prepare their food, but consumed raw meats and vegetation.[163] While the consumption of animals had become part of humanity's Christian right after the events of the Fall, this coincided with the fall of humanity from God's grace, thus creating something of a paradox: meat eating conferred the 'degeneracy' of humanity so much as its dominion over the animal kingdom, and was therefore a somewhat tricky endeavour.[164] Indeed, Thomas has also explained that explicit as well as underlying anxieties related to animals, including their consumption, were endemic within the environment of early modern England, and were directly associated with a larger fear of a potential breakdown of the boundaries which separated humanity from animals.[165] As such, English dietary preferences — as well as those of non-English communities — became closely related to the development and maintenance of human 'civility' and 'civilisation', both of which had purportedly come under attack by the Catholic Irish forces during the course of their 'barbarous' rebellion.

During one particular incident in the County of Limerick, 'Captaine Joseph Cuffe of Mungrett' reported that 'the Castle of Bellyaley in the County of Clare' had been 'beseiged by the forcs of the said County Comanded by Colonell Dermott ô Brian: Captain Conner ô Brian … of Luminey Captain Conner ô Brian of Ballymackoodah and divers others', who murdered 'severall English men' who 'were in and near their Irish Campe'.[166] Later, Cuffe testified that the English and Protestant settlers who had 'fledd into Castles were afterwards beseeged' for 'soe long that very many of them died of cold & want', but that, horrifically, those who survived had become so 'famished & starved' that they were forced to eat, 'horse

[163] Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, pp. 37-39.
[164] E. Fudge, 'Early Modern: Flesh', in D. Ryan (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Literature and Animals* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023), pp. 40-44.
[165] Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, pp. 37-41.
[166] 'Deposition of: Joseph Cuffe (1/9/1653)', MS 829, fols 449r-450v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829449r303, accessed on: 17/3/20.

flesh & other course food to keepe themselues alive'.[167] Cuffe's claims were seemingly corroborated by a testimonial given by 'John Crewes of the Citty of Limerick merchant' who, alongside his family and neighbours, had also 'fledd for the safetie of their lives to the Castle of Ballyaley', where he claimed that they were subsequently beseiged by the Irish rebels 'at length' and 'wanted victualls insomuch as most of them eate horsflesh Catts & doggs they were inforced to … stoope to that necessity'.[168] Another similar incident was reported to have occurred in 'Cullen … ~~with~~in the the County of Lymerick', where Thomas Browne 'among diuers other English & protestants men women & children to the number of two hundred & odd persons betooke themselues to the Castle of Cullen in the said County for the safeguard of their lifes'.[169] When the Irish forces then arrived 'with collors flying in hostill & rebellious maner' in order 'to besiedge this deponent And the rest of the said Englishmen & protestants in the said Castle', they continued their siege for 'neere halfe a yeere together, nyne weeckes', and 'through the extremity of the said long & tedious siedge the besiedged in the said Castle were driuen to eate horse flesh'.[170] Not only were animals like cats and dogs predominantly regarded as filthy, 'bestial' creatures unfit for human consumption by early modern contemporaries, both on account of their feral nature as well as their potentially wicked association with witchcraft and the occult, but horses were also held in particularly high esteem, and were usually provided with additional care and attention as a kind of 'forbidden flesh', deemed to be too noble for nominal human consumption.[171] In other words, they were the wrong kinds of flesh.[172]

---

[167] Ibid.
[168] 'Deposition of: John Crewes (1/9/1653)'.
[169] 'Deposition of: Thomas Browne (19/11/1642)', MS 829, fols 150r-151v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://www.1641.tcd.ie/deposition.php?depID=829150r089, accessed on: 12/3/20.
[170] Ibid.
[171] C. R. Millar, 'The witch's familiar in sixteenth-century England', *Melbourne Historical Journal*, 38 (2010), p. 118; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World*, pp. 101-108, 109-119; Patterson, *Cattle Lords & Clansmen*, p. 86; Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*, p. 41.
[172] E. Fudge, 'Saying Nothing Concerning the Same: On Dominion, Purity and Meat in Early Modern England', in E. Fudge (ed.), *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans and Other Wonderful Creatures* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004), p. 132.

That the English and Protestant settlers were reported to have been driven to such extremes of want by the Catholic Irish forces to the end they had miserably consumed such 'forbidden' creatures would have horrified the 'civilised' English and Protestant readership, inflaming their anxieties surrounding the 'making-animal' of their own people while reinforcing the disposition of the Irish as 'bestial' within their imagination. Indeed, as the rebellion had progressed, Jones explained that the 'provision of victuals was short' and that many of the English and Protestant settlers were left with no other choice than to 'eat the Hydes of Beasts slain many moneths before', after they had already consumed their milch cows, dogs, and horses.[173] Additionally, he claimed that provisions for the settlers' relief had subsequently fallen 'short, by feeding so many mouthes' in various castles across the country, that 'thenceforth' the settlers would be forced to 'fight for what they must eate; which they commonly did thrice a week, with very great hazard', much like animals who were compelled to hunt and compete with one another for their sustenance and survival.[174] More disturbingly, Borlase discussed the eating habits of the Irish rebels, and explained that they 'would not kill any English beast and then eat it, but they cut Collops [slices] out of them being alive, letting them there waste till they had no more flesh upon their backs; so that sometimes a beast would live two or three days together in that Torment'.[175] Similarly, Temple reported that 'The Irish in many places killed English Cowes and Sheep meerly because they were English; in some places they cut off their legges, or tooke out a peece out of their buttocks, and so let them remain still alive'.[176] Furthermore, in Munster alone,

---

[173] Jones, *A Remonstrance of The beginnings and proceedings of the Rebellion*, p. 35.
[174] Ibid, p. 32.
[175] Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, p. 133. It is difficult to determine the intent behind such actions beyond the prevention of the use of the cattle by the settlers but, given the proficiency of the Irish in their raiding exploits and the importance of cattle within Gaelic Ireland, greater meaning must undoubtedly be considered.
[176] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 84.

Temple claimed that the Irish forces had ‘consumed no lesse than 50000. others say 100000. English Sheep, besides a great abundance of English Cattell, and such as they could not eat, yet they killed and left in great multitudes, stinking, to the great annoyance of the Country’.[177] By way of explanation, Temple declared that ‘they destroy all Cattell of English breed, and declare openly, that their reason is, because they are English; so great is their hatred, not onely to the persons of the English, but also to every species of that Nation’.[178] Given the value of cattle within Irish culture and society, as well as the fact that English commentators frequently suggested that English cattle were the ‘best’ or were more ‘faire’ in comparison with the Irish Kerry black breed, the mutilation and slaughter of the settlers’ livestock was significant from both perspectives.[179] Borlase’s and Temple’s claims were supported by many of the victims whose testimonies were included within the depositions and who made similar allegations about the rebels killing off their livestock in a calculated manner, to the utter detriment of their sustenance.[180]

As a result of this seemingly malicious slaughter, the English and Protestant settlers were forced by the Irish rebels to compromise their own ‘civility’, and thus their human culture, in order to survive under the circumstances of the Irish rebellion — a rebellion which eventually drove many of the settlers to the very limits of their humanity, breaking the

[177] Ibid.
[178] Ibid, p. 41.
[179] Ibid, pp. 79, 112; Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland*, p. 137; Robinson, *The Plantation of Ulster*, p. 35. English commentators throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries often claimed that Irish cattle were much smaller in size than their English counterparts, and produced a lot less milk, which made them ‘inferior’ in comparison.
[180] ‘Copy of Answer of: William Lord Baron of Castle Connell (6/9/1653)’, MS 829, fols 443r-446v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=829443r301, accessed on: 17/3/20; ‘Deposition of: Mary Hill (29/8/1642)’, MS 810, fols 152r-153v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810152r201, accessed on: 10/3/20; ‘Deposition of: John Johnson (8/1/1644)’; ‘Examinations of: Ellinor Farrell and Morgan Murrey (7/11/1653)’, MS 817, fols 317r-321v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=817317r218, accessed on: 11/3/20; ‘Examination of: Patrick Macquier (1/2/1653)’, MS 810, fols 379r-380v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810379r375, accessed on: 12/3/20.

boundaries between man and beast. For example, as part of Temple's account, it was reported that one 'Arthur Agmoughty … during the siege of Castle Forbez', had witnessed or had heard of the Catholic Irish rebels having murdered 'poor children' who, driven by hunger and want to an absolute state of irrationality, had emerged like livestock from their refuge to 'eat weeds or grasse'.[181] In addition, both Temple and Borlase also cited a particular incident within their larger commentaries on the Irish rebellion which was clearly intended to encapsulate the settlers' simultaneous literal and metaphorical fall from 'civility', engendered by the Catholic Irish forces. Thus, Borlase and Temple described how 'A young youth having his backbone broken' by the rebels, 'was found in a field', and that, most shockingly, 'like a beast', he had 'eaten all the grass round about him', thereby creating a physical representation of the inversion of existing English anti-Irish rhetoric, which disdained the Irish living 'like beasts'.[182] In response, the Irish rebels were reported to have declared that they had not in fact 'killed him', but had instead 'removed him to a place of better pasture', metaphorically mimicking their own 'primitive' pastoral agricultural tradition of booleying.[183] Thus, English and Protestant commentators clearly understood the powerful impact of such reports within the composition of their atrocity narrative. From an Irish perspective, however, these actions speak to both a calculated and responsive retaliation to English anti-Irish rhetoric and policy which had reduced Ireland's inhabitants to the status of mere animals. That is, the Irish can be read as understanding the English constructs of 'civility' and 'barbarity' which were routinely weaponised against them and their landscape.

Ultimately, the further escalation of the Catholic Irish campaign, as well as the enduring English and Protestant anxiety over the fates of their settlers, culminated in the

[181] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 99.
[182] Ibid, p. 125; Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, pp. 134-135.
[183] Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, p. 135; Cambrensis, *History and Topography of Ireland*, pp. 101-102.

eventual mutilation, killing, and disposal of the victims of the Irish rebellion, whose bodies were often abandoned to the consumption of the Irish 'wilderness' without proper burial, having been totally expelled from the realm of human 'civilisation' and reduced to mere flesh and blood. While the Irish, in these cases, were not alleged to have consumed the bodies of the settlers themselves, the monstrous spectacle of cannibalism by proxy was undoubtedly inherent within such reports, since the forbidden consumption of human flesh by lowly animals had been facilitated via the malicious actions of the rebels, who cared not for the value of human life.[184] Indeed, Bernhard Klein has argued that the value of the image of human consumption often helped to consolidate early modern English political identities against images of those whose depravity and 'otherness' constituted the complete antithesis to their 'civilised' humanity, and represented the violation of both the boundaries of the individual, of the state, and of the Creator.[185] According to Richard Swinfenn of the County of Dublin, the Irish rebels had hanged three of the English settlers during one particular encounter and had left 'them vnburied', which in turn had caused their corpses to be

> exposed to doggs … swyne Crowes and Ravenous creatures to be devowred as in deed they were … And theis deponente & others fownd their bones there above ground 3 or 4 months after whereon some flesh was still left.[186]

---

[184] This argument is derived from Nicholas Canny, who compared the rebels' use of English and Protestant corpses to make saltpetre for gunpowder with the practice of ritualised cannibalism. Just as ritualistic cannibalism was not usually associated with a genuine dietary preference, the use of the corpses of the settlers in this manner was not likely the result of a specific command from the Catholic Irish clergy or nobility, despite their gunpowder shortage. Rather, these actions were more likely an extreme manifestation of the animosity of the Catholic Irish forces towards the settlers themselves, which ultimately led to the degradation of their physical remains and abstract memories; see Canny, *Making Ireland British*, pp. 515-516.
[185] B. Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 181-182.
[186] 'Deposition of: Richard Swinfenn (28/7/1645)', MS 810, fols 325r-326v, *1641 Depositions: Trinity College Library Dublin*, https://1641.tcd.ie/index.php/deposition/?depID=810325r339, accessed on: 11/3/20.

Another report from County Dublin alleged that one 'Mr. Pardoe a Minister' and 'William Rimmer a packet Post' had been murdered by the Catholic Irish forces in the area of Balrothery, whereafter the body of 'Mr. Pardoe' was 'afterwards cast on a Dunghill, and his head eaten with Swine'.[187] In County Down, a woman was allegedly murdered, 'and her belly rip'd up (she being great with Child of two Children)' by the Irish rebels in the area of Newry, 'who threw her and her Children into a ditch' before the woman's husband was forced to drive 'away Swine from eating one of her Children'.[188] John Montgomery, 'of the County of Monaghan', reported a similar incident wherein a young settler woman from the Parish of Clownish had 'delivered of a child in the fields', at which point 'the Rebels, who had formerly killed her husband and father, killed her and two of her children, and suffered the dogs to eat up and devour her new borne Child'.[189] In the Parish of Dumcres, Thomas Green and his wife actually alleged that 'the Rebels at severall times murdered, killed and destroyed the most part of the Protestants' in that area, and explained that the Catholic Irish forces had killed these settlers 'by drowning, hanging, burning, the sword, starving, and other deaths, exposing their slaughtered bodies to be devoured by dogs, swine, and other ravenous creatures'.[190] Indeed, it had been reported during another incident that the rebels had declared that 'the English were meat for dogs', and that they 'would not suffer or permit any to bury them, but would have them to lye naked, for the dogs, beasts, and fowles of the ayre to devour them'.[191] Arguably, the transformation of the English and Protestant settlers into meat for dogs and other animals signalled the complete eradication of their humanity, being no longer even recognised as 'human', but instead simply as flesh. Thus, Borlase concluded that the Catholic Irish, in their 'barbarous' rebellion, had demonstrated such 'bruitish outrage' that

[187] Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, p. 114.
[188] Ibid, p. 113.
[189] Temple, *The Irish Rebellion*, p. 97.
[190] Ibid, p. 99.
[191] Ibid, pp. 105, 108.

it was ‘as though Infidels, or rather the wild Beasts of the Wilderness, Wolves, and Bears, and Tigres, nay, Fiends and Furies, had been brought into the Land’.[192]

By killing the English and Protestant settlers on such a large scale across the entire country of Ireland, preventing their burial, and surrendering their bodies to the exposure and consumption of the natural elements, the non-elite Catholic Irish rebels not only sought to engender the complete eradication of all traces of those individuals who had prospered in the wake of their own dispossession, deprivation, and subjugation, but also targeted the very foundations of the ‘civility’ and ‘civilisation’ of those English and Protestant communities. While the development of predominantly English anti-Irish rhetoric had seen the Irish generally portrayed as an ‘inferior’, ‘barbarous’, and even ‘bestial’ population, the literal reduction of the English and Protestant settlers to raw, edible flesh by the rebels had actualised their fears over the potential for their ‘barbarous’ regression in Ireland, but to an almost unimaginable extent, having both their ‘civility’ and humanity stripped from them in the process. That so many of the settlers were allegedly consumed by the Irish ‘wilderness’ and its ‘wild’ beasts — which, according to the dominant English and Protestant narrative of the rebellion, also included the Irish themselves — only increased the association they had made between the Irish inhabitants and the ‘savagery’ and ‘barbarity’ of the of the untamed natural environment.[193] Thus, the consumption of the English and Protestant settlers not only represented the Irish rejection of alleged English ‘superiority’, from the perspective of the non-elite, but also the rejection of the larger campaign for the ‘civilisation’ of the Irish landscape and its inhabitants, once again placing the rebellion, as well as the subsequent

[192] Borlase, *History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion*, p. 312.
[193] Shanahan, ‘“When chiefest Rebell feede”’, pp. 11-14.

English campaign for the conquest of Ireland, within a larger, more significant struggle over the very fate of human ‘civilisation’.

Conclusion

Various historians have acknowledged that the events of 1641 have 'cast no end of a shadow' for both early modern and modern Catholics and Protestants alike, and have maintained that animosity and division surrounding the conflict continues to linger beneath the surface in Ireland even today.[1] Indeed, having previously studied the history of Gaelic Ireland in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, one of the most striking features of the historiography of the Irish rebellion is undoubtedly that the conflict and its memory has, perhaps understandably, maintained such a provocative status.[2] Gerard Farrell has discussed the development of the historiography of the Irish rebellion, and has called attention to the influence of contemporary politics and ideologies which have ultimately produced tangible consequences for those who live in modern Ireland today.[3] Indeed, Farrell has explained that the pursuit of 'balance' among historians seeking to produce a history of 1641 which promotes the 'healing' of sectarian divisions in Ireland has contributed towards the obstruction of truth, prompting modern researchers to attempt to search for trends, patterns, and explanations against the backdrop of 'complexity'.[4] Accordingly, there have been an overwhelming abundance of both confessional and political perspectives produced within the larger body of literature associated with the rebellion, and indeed Eamon Darcy has

[1] J. Gibney, *The Shadow of a Year: The 1641 Rebellion in Irish History and Memory* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2013), pp. 158-161; M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), p. 291; N. Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World 1560-1800* (London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), pp. 137-141.
[2] See E. Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2013), pp. 52-172 for a discussion of the emergence of a 'Protestant' and, eventually, a 'Catholic' version of the events of 1641 in Ireland.
[3] G. Farrell, *The 'mere Irish' and the colonisation of Ulster, 1570-1641* (Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 286-293.
[4] Ibid.

highlighted the failure of historians to position the Irish insurgency in relation to the events of the Nine Years' War.[5] Although some valuable works by those such as Joan Redmond, Farrell, John Patrick Montaño, David Edwards, and William Smyth have since drawn important connections between 1641 and previous Anglo-Irish hostilities, further investigation must be undertaken in this respect in order to acknowledge the significant and enduring influence of Anglo-Irish conflict prior to the outbreak of rebellion in 1641.[6] With increasing access to and availability of resources like the 1641 depositions, historians seeking to contribute towards the advancement of the study of the Irish rebellion have been given greater opportunity to engage with the violence and destruction on a foundational level, allowing for a larger shift away from issues of high politics and sectarianism to focus more directly upon issues such as conflict, environmental continuity and change, and identity from the perspectives of the non-elite.[7] One of the principal aims of the present research, then, was to move beyond existing confessional and political perspectives in order to locate the rebellion of 1641 more firmly within the dominant Anglo-Irish contexts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, particularly in relation to the English conquest and colonisation of Ireland, as well as the subjugation of its inhabitants. Thus, this thesis has examined the organisation, execution, and English and Protestant reportage of the 1641 rebellion in relation to the persistent early modern Anglo-Irish struggle over the English concerns with 'civility'

[5] Ibid, p. 18.
[6] J. Redmond, 'Memories of violence and New English identities in early modern Ireland', *Historical research: the bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 89:246 (2016), p. 729; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 277-284; J. P. Montaño, 'Cultural Conflict and the Landscape of Conquest in Early Modern Ireland', *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, 40 (2017), pp. 134-135; D. Edwards, 'Out of the blue? Provincial Unrest in Ireland Before 1641', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 105-109; W. J. Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory: A Geography of Colonial and Early Modern Ireland c.1530-1750* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2008), pp. 136-138, 141, 454-455. While Redmond has drawn connections between Anglo-Irish conflict in the collapse of the Munster plantation in 1598 and the 1641 Irish rebellion — exploring issues of ethnicity, culture, religion, land, and the rhetoric of 'civility' — Farrell, Montaño, Edwards, and Smyth have incorporated similar issues within their own works in order to consider the idea of the insurgency as an episode in continuity.
[7] For example, see K. Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change, and the Causes of Violence', *Environmental History*, 25:2 (2020), 287-309 for discussion of how the incident of the Mayo cattle trials may offer greater insight into contemporary issues pertaining to the environment, economy, and violence.

and 'civilisation' versus that of 'barbarism'. Specifically, the focus of this investigation was Anglo-Irish conflict over the dominion and use of the physical Irish landscape, as enshrined within the English ideologies of 'civility' and 'civilisation', which had, historically, created an atmosphere of social, political, economic, military, and cultural contention between the two realms. Based upon the original examination of a sample of the 1641 depositions collected from the Counties of Dublin and Limerick, this research has also considered the flow of those larger issues associated with 'civility' and 'barbarism' down to the experiences of non-elite Catholic Irish, English and Protestant communities who became immersed in the conflict.

Building upon the arguments of Clodagh Tait, Padraig Lenihan, Edwards, and John Walter, this research has considered the rebellion, not as a kind of 'climacteric event', but as another episode in what can be described as a cyclic occurrence of Anglo-Irish hostility and conflict throughout the early modern period — albeit increasingly complicated by issues of religion and crisis among the three Stuart kingdoms.[8] This has allowed for patterns of continuity to be identified and explored. In doing so, it has become clear that the English and Protestant reportage of the 1641 rebellion ultimately served as a vehicle for the reinforcement of existing anti-Irish rhetoric, not only based upon the antitheses of English 'civility' and 'civilisation', but also upon their associated belief in the 'waste' of the physical landscape by the inhabitants of Ireland.[9] As has been established, perceptions of both early modern England and Ireland were largely based upon descriptions by English commentators whose representations of the two realms often reflected their own prejudices. English writers

---

[8] C. Tait, D. Edwards, and P. Lenihan, 'Early modern Ireland: a history of violence', in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), p. 33; J. Walter, 'Performative violence and the politics of violence in the 1641 depositions', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), p. 147.
[9] Redmond, 'Memories of violence and New English identities', p. 729.

successfully established and developed the idea of their own cultural 'superiority', based upon the premise of their 'civilisation' and 'improvement' of the landscape. On the other hand, Ireland and its inhabitants were often generalised and constructed as both 'inferior' and 'barbarous', principally, as this work has shown, via English accounts of the supposed 'waste', misuse, and lack of 'improvement' of the landscape by its supposedly 'nomadic' Gaelic population.

Furthermore, while this rhetoric was employed in various, often contradictory, ways throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, English authorities utilised their negative idealisation of Gaelic Ireland and its inhabitants in order to justify their plans for the conquest and colonisation of Ireland and the Irish. Then, having created new towns, markets, parishes, churches, schools, farms, and homes as markers of their 'civilisation' of the Irish landscape — even promoting a select few of the 'deserving' Irish to assist in their transformative endeavours — English and Protestant settlers had established their 'right' to the lands upon which they had settled.[10] Thus, alongside their intensive commercial exploitation and agricultural cultivation of Irish land for its 'improvement', the physical transformation of the Irish landscape was created as a necessary component of the English conquest and colonisation of Ireland and its inhabitants.[11] As Jane Ohlmeyer has suggested, these actions were indicative of the English desire to 'make Ireland English' and, as Farrell has argued, to effectively eliminate the Irish as a people with a distinctive culture and society.[12] Thus, insofar as debates have continued over whether the English intention was to 'reform' Ireland

[10] J. Ohlmeyer, '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes": Colonization within Britain and Ireland, 1580s-1640s', in N. Canny, A. Low, and W. Roger (eds.), *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 140.
[11] J. P. Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 17-78.
[12] J. Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English: The Irish Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), pp. 475-478; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 277-284.

and its inhabitants via their programme of 'civilisation' or, alternatively, to conquer them, the centrality of the total transformation of the Irish landscape, as evidenced within the English and Protestant reportage of the 1641 rebellion, must be regarded as a violent process of forceful erasure.[13] In other words, this research has shown that the English plan to 'civilise' the inhabitants of Ireland on a social, political, economic, religious, and cultural basis had necessitated, first, the deconstruction, and indeed the conquest, of what was often referenced as the Irish 'wilderness', with or without their cooperation.

Accordingly, following the actual outbreak of the rebellion itself in October 1641, English and Protestant commentators contrasted images of the Irish destruction of the 'civilised' and 'improved' English colonial landscape with those of the alleged period of tranquillity and progress throughout the 'Early Stuart Peace'. This was then used as further evidence of the 'barbarity' and 'savagery' of the Catholic Irish population, who were seemingly beyond the pale of reform. By using the representation of the actions of the rebels in combination with established anti-Irish rhetoric within their reportage of the rebellion, these commentators created a powerful and enduring narrative of the conflict, which was reinforced by widespread reports of alleged atrocities committed indiscriminately against unsuspecting English and Protestant settlers. What was once imagined as an 'improved', flourishing marker of the success of English 'civilisation' became depicted as both a target of, and accessory to, the rebellion. Indeed, the Irish landscape was physically and rhetorically transformed into a very real threat to the lives of the English and Protestant victims who had been displaced by the Catholic Irish forces, often perishing in the harsh, unfamiliar topographical conditions outwith the boundaries and 'safety' of their settlements.

[13] See also D. Edwards, 'Questioning the viceroys: toward a new model of English government in Tudor Ireland, 1536-1594', in S. Covington, V. P. Carey, and V. McGowan-Doyle (eds.), *Early Modern Ireland: New Sources, Methods, and Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), pp. 147-165.

Both Joep Leerssen and Darcy previously suggested that while contemporary English commentators often described the Irish as 'barbarous' and 'savage' within dominant accounts of Ireland during streaks of Anglo-Irish conflict, the Irish were also described almost as 'civil' during periods of relative calm, which was testament to the importance of contemporary political realities in relation to the representation of the inhabitants of Ireland.[14] However, by exploring representations of the Irish and, in particular, the Irish landscape both prior to and during the period of the Irish rebellion in 1641, this investigation has found that multiple, often paradoxical, impressions of the Irish could exist during any given period, and indeed that such representations extended to include the Irish landscape. In fact, these representations ultimately exemplified the existence of various interconnected, if sometimes conflicting, English assumptions and agendas related to Ireland and its Gaelic population, from the establishment of English cultural 'superiority', to the climatic and topographical potential of Ireland, to the justification for the conquest of the Irish and their landscape. Thus, since the 'barbarity' of the Irish had become physically manifest upon the landscape in 1641, English and Protestant commentators effectively utilised their reportage of the conflict to establish that the crown was left with little recourse but that of reconquest by any means necessary, in order to regain control and restore 'civilisation' throughout Ireland.

On the other hand, from the perspective of the Irish population, following the conclusion of the Nine Years' War there had been a concerted effort by the English crown and colonial authorities to dispossess, displace, and subjugate the inhabitants of Ireland in order to oversee the expansion of their policy of plantation. Unlike the English and Protestant

[14] Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, pp. 46-47; J. Leerssen, *Mere Irish and Fíor-Ghael: Studies in the Idea of Irish Nationality, its Development and Literary Expression prior to the Nineteenth Century* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996), pp. 377-379.

portrayal of the almost forty-year period of the 'Early Stuart Peace', these decades were characterised by the regular employment of English martial law against the Irish population, who responded with recurring episodes of localised rebellion, albeit in the absence of any larger, full-scale rebellion up until 1641.[15] Furthermore, following their expulsion from their ancestral lands, many of the Irish inhabitants were forced to live in close proximity to those settlers who now occupied their previous domains.[16] This meant that they might observe the newcomers as they demolished, constructed, enclosed, cultivated, and dwelled upon the lands which were once their own, exacerbating underlying tensions among these communities. Accordingly, the physical transformation and 'improvement' of the Irish ancestral landscape, which was integral to the English conquest and colonisation of Ireland, must have been perceived by the Irish population as a symbol of their landed dispossession, displacement, and subjugation. Within this context, then, the sheer scale of the physical devastation executed by the Catholic Irish rebels throughout the duration of their campaign in 1641; the purposeful targeting of the settlers' farms, homes, enclosures, and agricultural capital; and the general destruction of the 'improved' colonial landscape of the English and Protestant settlers was far from basic wanton violence, or even the actions of an allegedly 'wild' and 'barbarous' people. Rather, these actions speak to the exhibition of agency of the non-elite Catholic Irish population which, as has been demonstrated, was often obscured by dominant narratives of English anti-Irish rhetoric which reduced those peoples to 'bestial' or 'barbarian' 'savages', acting without rationality or reason, as well as by the historiography of the Irish rebellion which has been dominated by perspectives of the elite. Through their resistance, the rebels had initiated something of a counterattack against the English colonial authorities, designed not only to ensure the expulsion of the settlers and their oppressive regime, but to reclaim

[15] Edwards, 'Out of the blue?', pp. 96-105.
[16] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 277-279.

their ancestral landscape and to restore the Gaelic order, rejecting the tenets of English 'civility' and 'civilisation' in the process. Thus, while Nicholas Canny has suggested that the question as to whether the events of 1641 may be located within a larger colonial context is a complex one, this research has shown, through the examination of both the rhetorical and physical struggle over the appropriation and transformation of the Irish landscape, that to separate the Irish rebellion from the English conquest and colonisation of Ireland is to neglect both a fundamental and inflammatory context.[17]

Following the spread and escalation of the Catholic Irish conflict throughout the entire country, the landed dimension of the rebellion became even more significant, as the rebels began to utilise the physical landscape, alongside other prevailing aspects of traditional Gaelic culture, in order to reassert their authority and cultural jurisdiction, and to reverse the corrosive impact of the English conquest of Ireland upon their lives and lands.[18] Indeed, this research has demonstrated something that has been undoubtedly overlooked within other studies of the rebellion: how the Irish use of mobility and movement as part of their campaign, evinced within the deposition testimonies of the non-elite English and Protestant settlers, represented perhaps a more subtle demonstration of the endurance of Gaelic culture beyond the period of English colonial expansion.[19] From their engagement in agricultural transhumance by the Irish tenantry to provide the best grazing opportunities for their cattle, to the practice of guerrilla-style cattle raiding and counter-raiding in order to garner wealth, political esteem, and authority for the nobility, Irish mobility was a fundamental

[17] N. Canny, '1641 in a Colonial Context', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 66-67.
[18] W. J. Smyth, 'Towards a Cultural Geography of the 1641 Rising/Rebellion', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 88-89; Montaño, 'Cultural Conflict and the Landscape', p. 135.
[19] Ibid. See Smyth's discussion of the use of Gaelic language, dress, and kin structures in order to forward their campaign in 1641.

characteristic of their culture, necessary for all: from the wealthiest members of the Gaelic elite down to the peasant farmer. Despised by English commentators for its allegedly ‘barbarous’, ‘primitive’, even ‘bestial’ connotation, the Irish rebels employed their mobility in order to pillage, raid, and destroy the English and Protestant settlements with relative ease during the course of their campaign, utilising their ancestral knowledge of the Irish landscape and their cultural conventions in order to overcome English subjugation, as they had done so many times previously. Irish acts of name-calling; stripping; ‘driving’ settlers from their homes into the Irish landscape; forcing their consumption of forbidden or filthy foods; and, eventually, killing, disinterring, and dumping the bodies of the settlers across the Irish landscape also robbed the settlers of their humanity and ‘civility’, engendering their regression while overseeing the removal and extinction of English ‘civilisation’ *in toto*.[20] Thus, given the long history of Anglo-Irish conflict prior to the rebellion in 1641, the actions of the Irish rebels must be considered as a form of restorative justice, designed to invert and weaponise anti-Irish rhetoric against the English and Protestant settlers, and to affect both cultural and landed reclamation from the oppressive English colonial regime.

While historians such as Ohlmeyer, Smyth, and Montaño have all discussed the loss and transformation of Irish land and property as one of the main causes of the initial rebellion in 1641, this research has expanded upon the centrality of the landed dimension of the Irish conflict.[21] In particular, the experiences of the non-elite Catholic Irish, English, and Protestant populations, as opposed to those of the nobility, have been considered via the

[20] Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory*, pp. 131-134; Smyth has discussed how the rebels’ name-calling the settlers ‘dogs’ and stripping them of their clothing and valuables were actions which mirrored existing English perceptions of the Irish, extending to the denial of their humanity. However, the various actions of the Catholic Irish rebels throughout their rebellion campaign have been considered throughout this thesis, and have been shown to have constituted inversions of multiple aspects of anti-Irish rhetoric, including comparisons of the Irish with their cattle and the denunciation of their culture of mobility. See also N. Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 545.

[21] Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English*, pp. 475-478; Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory*, pp. 142-143, 107, 115, 136-141; Montaño, ‘Cultural Conflict and the Landscape’, pp. 134-135.

critical examination of the 1641 depositions and larger chronicles of the rebellion, alongside analyses which have explored the meaning and significance of the landscape among non-elite communities in both Gaelic Ireland and early modern England. Thus, as Smyth has argued as part of his work on the 1641 rebellion, this research has furthered the idea that the construction of the insurgency as something of a 'two-tiered' rising — initiated by the Catholic Irish nobility then driven by the non-elite Catholic Irish population — is too simplistic in its imagination.[22] To consider the Irish rebellion like this is not only to overlook, to a great extent, the clear centrality of the landscape within the context of the conflict, but to obscure the understanding and experiences of the Irish non-elite and the dissemination of larger contemporary Anglo-Irish conflicts down to those communities. In fact, such a reading serves to undermine the shared experiences of both the Catholic Irish nobility and their non-elite followers of displacement, deprivation, and subjugation, stemming from the English conquest of Ireland and their associated colonial expansion.

This investigation has also demonstrated that Anglo-Irish conflict over the use, organisation, and ownership of the Irish landscape not only influenced both the outbreak and larger campaign of the rebellion in 1641, but has ultimately determined that the landscape, in and of itself, became established as a critical lens through which the Catholic Irish and English and Protestant populations could understand, explain, and represent their perspectives of the violence. Redmond previously suggested that the experiences of earlier English planters in Ireland contributed towards the English and Protestant understanding of the rebellion, and that these memories were evinced by continuities in symbolism, violence, and rhetoric.[23] In fact, she has argued that the parallels between depictions of the suffering of

[22] Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory*, pp. 106, 112-113.
[23] Redmond, 'Memories of violence and New English identities', p. 729.

English colonists from 1598 and 1641 were indicative of ongoing Anglo-Irish contention over religion, culture, ethnicity, and land.[24] Similarly, the present analysis has delved deeper into this continuity, and has reinforced the representation of the landscape and its status of 'civilisation' as a connective thread, even from descriptions of Ireland and its inhabitants which were not solely concerned with any immediate Anglo-Irish conflict.

Additionally, as opposed to what Audrey Horning has trivialised as 'half-remembered slights', this research has built upon the assertions of Keith Pluymers, Farrell, and Smyth in order to explain how existing patterns of physical dispossession, displacement, and transformation stemming from the English conquest of Ireland and the expansion of plantation, alongside the continuation of anti-Irish rhetorical traditions rooted in English concepts of 'civility' and 'civilisation', were not only remembered by the rebels, but understood and resented.[25] Indeed, Pluymers' discussion of the English transformation of the Irish landscape as that of a process of 'slow violence' which contributed towards the exclusion, vulnerability, and deprivation of the Irish population, whether 'deserving' or 'undeserving', has been especially valuable.[26] Though Walter has cautioned against 'over-explaining' the actions of the Irish, this thesis has demonstrated that their destruction of the colonial landscape was not only physically planned and executed in order to expel the English and Protestant settlers from Ireland, or even to reclaim and restore their ancestral lands to their former conditions and ownership.[27] Rather, the actions of the Irish rebels were symbolic in their retaliation and reassertion of Gaelic culture, and, particularly, of meaningful

[24] Ibid.
[25] A. Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013), p. 263; Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change', pp. 288-300; Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 123-124, 277-278; Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory*, pp. 107, 115, 136-143.
[26] Pluymers, 'Cow Trials, Climate Change', pp. 288-300.
[27] Walter, 'Performative violence and the politics of violence', p. 138.

ties to the Irish landscape, long-established as part of their enduring traditions of mobility, movement, and pastoralism.

Given the fact that land in Gaelic Ireland has been long perceived as having little to no value among the Irish elite without labourers and livestock, especially cattle, with which to reap its rewards, these conclusions may seem somewhat contradictory. However, in this respect, it is necessary to revisit Farrell's consideration of the 'west-facing' tendencies of some historians whose perspectives have been influenced by the same patterns of value judgements as those of previous contemporary English commentators.[28] In particular, Farrell has called for the reorientation of historical perspectives which have positioned Ireland as something of 'a thorn in the side' of the English authorities, and which have tended to describe and define Gaelic society with reference to those characteristics which were 'lacking', or simply different, in comparison with those of England.[29] It is the view of the present research, then, that in seeking to better understand early modern Ireland and the lives of its inhabitants, it is important to consider land not simply as an economic asset as understood from a commercialised, English perspective. Rather, future investigations must acknowledge that the 'value', and indeed the use, of land in Gaelic Ireland, especially among the Irish tenantry, far exceeded classifications of cash value or of agricultural over-exploitation, and was instead more fundamentally connected with concepts of cultural significance and ancestry, including those of physical movement and social fluidity, the bonds of kinship, and the preservation and survival of custom.

[28] Farrell, *The 'mere Irish'*, pp. 9-13.
[29] Ibid.

Finally, though the prejudicial nature of the depositions of 1641 has been discussed, this investigation has also shown that the depositions can, and should, be employed in order to examine both the rebellion and the wider context of Anglo-Irish history from non-elite Irish perspectives. In accordance with the assertions of Smyth, if researchers 'listen very closely' to the narratives of the English and Protestant settlers, then it is possible to discern the behaviours, intentions, and attitudes of the Irish themselves.[30] Thus, by combining the depositions with the wider English and Protestant reportage of the rebellion, as well as with a range of other English and Irish sources from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, important conclusions about the endurance of Irish culture, the centrality of the physical landscape, and the continuation of Anglo-Irish hostilities have been established herein. Just as previous historians have utilised an abundant variety of English contemporary sources on the state of Ireland and its inhabitants in combination with fewer Irish documentary records in order to analyse, critique, debate, and offer interpretations of early modern Anglo-Irish history from Irish perspectives, the same must be encouraged among those who intend to tackle the rebellion of 1641. The depositions have already contributed, and continue to do so, towards a greater understanding of the rebellion as it literally unfolded on the ground, while their regionality offers significant potential for future case studies and research into the territorial experiences of the conflict, which were beyond the scope of the present analysis. However, these testimonies are also undoubtedly invaluable for any investigation of the diffusion of larger sixteenth and seventeenth century political and intellectual concerns among larger non-elite Irish and English populations, including those such as 'civility', 'civilisation', 'barbarism', and the use of the landscape, as has been the focus of the present investigation, but also of conquest, plantation, religion, ethnicity, identity, and memory.

[30] Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory*, pp. 104-105, 113-126.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival Sources

The 1641 Depositions Online Digital Archive (Manuscripts and Archives Research Library of Trinity College Dublin), https://1641.tcd.ie.

Printed Primary Sources

Atkinson, E. G., (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1 November, 1600–31 July, 1601* (London: Mackie and Co. LD., 1905) [accessed via Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online; hereafter MEMSO].

Bagenal, M., Hore, H. F., and Lord Burghley, 'Marshal Bagenal's Description of Ulster, Anno 1586', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 2 (1854), 137-160.

Bates, T., *A Wild-fire Plot Found out in Ireland: Shewing How the Rebels Would haue consumed the City of Dublin with Wild-fire* (London: Thomas Bates, 1641).

Blenerhasset, T., *A Direction for the Plantation in Ulster* (London: Ed Allde, 1610).

Blith, W., *The English Improver, or, A New Survey of Husbandry* (London: J. Wright, 1649).

Blith, W., *The English Improver Improved, or The Survey of Husbandry Surveyed* (London: John Wright, 1653).

Borlase, E., *The History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion* (London: Robert Clavel, 1680).

Brewer, J. S. and Bullen, W., (eds.), *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts Preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, Vol. V (London: Longman & Co., 1873) [accessed via MEMSO].

Bruce, J., (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I. 1633–1634* (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1863) [accessed via MEMSO].

Cambrensis, G., *The History and Topography of Ireland* (London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1982).

Camden, W., *Britain, or A chorographicall description of the most flourishing kingdomes, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the Islands adjoyning, out of the depth of Antiquitie* (London: George Latham, 1637).

Davies, J., *Historical Relations: Or, A Discovery Of the true Causes why Ireland Was never entirely Subdued, Nor Brought under Obedience of the Crown of England, until the Beginning of the Reign of King James the First* (Dublin: S. Hyde, 1733).

Derricke, J., *The Image of Irelande, with a Discouerie of Woodkarne* (London: J. Kingston, 1581).

Fitzherbert, J., *The Boke of Husbandry* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1548).

Geoffrey of Monmouth, *History of the Kings of Britain* (London: Dent, 1958).

Green, M. A. E., (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, Addenda, 1566–1579* (London: Longman & Co., 1871) [accessed via MEMSO].

Green, M. A. E., (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I., Addenda, 1580–1625* (London: Longman & Co., 1872) [accessed via MEMSO].

G.S., *A Briefe Declaration Of The Barbarovs And inhumane dealings of the Northerne Irish Rebels, and many others in severall Counties up-rising against the English, that dwelt both lovingly and securely among them* (London: Abel Roper, 1641).

Hamilton, H. C., (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, of the Reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth. 1509–1573* (London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1860) [accessed via MEMSO].

Hamilton, H. C., (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1586–1588, July.* (London: Longman & Co., 1877) [accessed via MEMSO].

Hartlib, S., *Samuel Hartlib, His Legacie: or An Enlargement of the Discourse of Husbandry Used in Brabant and Flaunders* (London: H. Hills, 1651).

Hartlib, S., *A Discoverie For Division or Setting out of Land, as to the best Form* (London: Richard Wodenothe, 1653).

Heresbach, C., *Foure Bookes of Husbandry* (London: Richard Watkins, 1577).

Holinshed, R., *Holinshed's Chronicles: England, Scotland, and Ireland,* Vol. I (London: J. Johnson; F.C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilkie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme; Cadell and Davies; and J. Mawman, 1807).

Holinshed, R., *Holinshed's Chronicles: England, Scotland, and Ireland,* Vol. VI (London: J. Johnson; F.C. and J. Rivington; T. Payne; Wilkie and Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme; Cadell and Davies; and J. Mawman, 1808).

I.B., *A letter sent by I. B. gentleman unto his very frende Mayster R. C. esquire, wherein is conteined a large discourse of the peopling and inhabiting the cuntrie called the Ardes, and other adiacent in the north of Ireland and taken in hand by Sir Thomas Smith, one of the queenes majesties privie counsel and Thomas Smith esquire, his sonne* (London: Anthonhson, 1572).

Jones, H., *A Perfect Relation of The Beginning and Continuation of the Irish-Rebellion, From May last, to this present 12th of January* (London: J.R., 1642).

Jones, H., *A Remonstrance of The beginnings and proceedings of the Rebellion in the County of Cavan, within the Province of Ulster in Ireland, From the 23. of October, 1641. untill the 15. of June, 1642* (London: Godfrey Emerson, 1642).

Keating, G., *The General History of Ireland* (London: B. Creake, 1723).

Leland, J., *The Itinerary of John Leland in or About the Years 1535-1543 Parts VII and VIII* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1909).

Lemon, R., (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1581–1590* (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1865) [accessed via MEMSO].

Mahaffy, R. P., (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland of the Reign of Charles I. 1633–1647* (London: the 'Norfolk Chronicle' Company, 1901) [accessed via MEMSO].

Mahaffy, R. P., (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers Relating to Ireland, 1601–03 (With Addenda, 1565–1654) and of the Hanmer Papers* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1912) [accessed via MEMSO].

Markham, G., *The English husbandman. The first part: contayning the knowledge of the true nature of euery soyle within this kingdome: how to plow it; and the manner of the plough, and other instruments belonging thereto* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1613).

Markham, G., *The compleat husbandman and gentleman's recreation: or, the whole art of husbandry* (London: the Gold Ring, 1707).

Mascall, L., *The First Booke of Cattell* (London: John Wolfe, 1587).

Moryson, F., *An Itinerary: Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy,*

Turky, France, England, Scotland & Ireland, Vol. IV (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1907).

Norden, J., *The Surveyors Dialogue* (London: Simon Stafford, 1607).

Oakes, T., (ed.), *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland. Introduction to Senchus Mor, and Athgabail; or, Law of Distress,* Vol. I (Dublin: Alexander Thom, 1865).

O'Clery, M., Connellan, O., and MacDermott, P., (eds.), *The Annals of Ireland Translated From the Original Irish of the Four Masters* (Dublin: Bryan Geraghty, 1846).

O'Donovan, J., (ed.), *Annála Rioghachta Éireann: Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, from the Earliest Period to the Year 1616*, Vol. VI (Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co., 1856).

O'Flaherty, R., *A Chorographical Description of West of H-Iar Connaught, Written A. D. 1684* (Dublin: Irish Archaeological Society, 1846).

Ó Néill, D., *Remonstrance of the Irish Chiefs to Pope John XXII* (Cork: University College, 2007).

Ormonde, J. B., *A True Declaration of the last affaires in Ireland, Shewing the late overthrowes given to the Irish Rebels* (London: I. Franke, 1642).

Rich, B., *A New Description of Ireland: Wherein is described the disposition of the Irish whereunto they are inclined* (London: William Jaggard, 1610).

R.P., *The True Demands of the Rebells in Ireland* (London: R.P., 1642).

Russell, C. W., D. D., and Prendergast, J. P., (eds.), *Calendar of the State Papers, Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of James I. 1603–1606* (London: Longman & Co., 1872) [accessed via MEMSO].

Russell, C. W., D. D., and Prendergast, J. P., (eds.), *Calendar of the State Papers, Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of James I. 1606–1608* (London: Longman & Co., 1874) [accessed via MEMSO].

Russell, C. W., D. D., and Prendergast, J. P., (eds.), *Calendar of the State Papers, Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of James I. 1608–1610* (London: Longman & Co., 1874) [accessed via MEMSO].

Smith, A., *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (New York: P. F. Collier & Son Corporation, 1909).

Spenser, E., *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (Library of Alexandria, 1934).

Temple, J., *The Irish Rebellion: or, An History Of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion raised within the Kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October, in the year, 1641* (London: Samuel Gellibrand, 1646).

Tusser, T., *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry* (London: M. Cooper, 1744).

Waring, T., *A Brief Narration Of The Plotting, Beginning & Carrying on of that Execrable Rebellion and Butcherie in Ireland* (London: B. Alsop and T. Dunster, 1650).

W.B., *A true Relation Of the Plot Discovered In Ireland, And Rising of the Papists there, truly declared by a letter sent from one of the Aldermen in Dublin* (Dublin: Society of Stationers, 1641).

Online Sources

Medieval and Early Modern Sources Online [MEMSO] (TannerRitchie Publishing, 2003-21), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

The Bible – New International Version [NIV], https://www.biblegateway.com.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://www.oxforddnb.com.

Maps

Speed, J., ‘The Kingdome of Irland Devided into severall Provinces and the againe devided into Counties Newly described. . . . 1610’, https://www.raremaps.com/gallery/detail/62782/the-kingdome-of-irland-devided-into-severall-provinces-and-t-speed?q=0, (London: 1626).

Vrients, J. B., ‘Angliae et Hiberniae Accurata Descriptio Veteribus et Recentioribus Nominbus Illustratus Et Ad D. Guilel. Camden Britaniam Accomodata ...’, https://www.raremaps.com/gallery/detail/63757/english-edition-angliae-et-hiberniae-accurata-descriptio-ortelius-vrients?q=0, (Antwerp: 1606).

Cover Image

The British Museum, Museum number: 1854, 1113.100, Asset number: 250408001, A broadside with an ABC on the Irish Massacre of Protestants, by Wenceslaus Hollar (London: John Rothwell, 1642), https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/P_1854-1113-100.

Secondary Sources

Published Works

Aalen, F. H. A., *Man and the Landscape in Ireland* (London: Academic Press, 1978).

Adelman, J. and Ludlow, F., ‘The past, present and future of environmental history in Ireland’, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy: Archaeology, Culture, History, Literature*, 114C (2014), 359-391.

Allen, R. C., *Enclosure and the Yeoman: The Agricultural Development of the South Midlands 1450-1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

Anderson, V. D., *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Andrews, K. R., Canny, N., and Hair, P., (eds.), *The Westward Enterprise: English activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America, 1480-1650* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1978).

Andrews, J. H., 'The Mapping of Ireland's Cultural Landscape, 1550-1630', in P. J. Duffy, D. Edwards, and E. FitzPatrick (eds.), *Gaelic Ireland, c.1250-c.1650: land, lordship, and settlement* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), 153-180.

Archer, I. W., 'Smith, Sir Thomas (1513-1577)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Armstrong, R., *Protestant War: the 'British' of Ireland and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005).

Ash, E. H., 'Reclaiming a New World: Fen Drainage, Improvement, and Projectors in Seventeenth-Century England', *Early Science and Medicine*, 21:5 (2016), 445-469.

Attie, K. B., 'Enclosure Polemics and the Garden in the 1650s', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 51:1 (2011), 135-157.

Backhaus, G., 'The Problematic of Grounding the Significance of Symbolic Landscapes', in G. Backhaus and J. Murungi (eds.), *Symbolic Landscapes* (London: Springer, 2009), 3-31.

Baker, D. J., 'Off the map: charting uncertainty in Renaissance Ireland', in B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield, and W. Maley (eds.), *Representing Ireland: Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 76-92.

Barnard, T. C., 'Crises of identity among Irish protestants, 1641-1685', *Past & Present*, 127 (1990), 39-83.

Bartlett, R., *Gerald of Wales: A Voice of the Middle Ages* (Gloucestershire: Tempus Publishing Limited, 2006).

Bartlett, T., ‘Politics and Society, 1600-1800’, in L. Kennedy and P. Ollerenshaw (eds.), *Ulster Since 1600: Politics, Economy, and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 27-42.

Baumgarten, B., Gosewinkel, D., and Rucht, D., ‘Civility: introductory notes on the history and systematic analysis of a concept’, *European Review of History: Revue européenne d’histoire*, 18:3 (2011), 289-312.

Berman, D., ‘David Hume on the 1641 rebellion in Ireland’, *Studies: an Irish quarterly review*, 65 (1976), 101-112.

Bernheimer, R., *Wild Men in the Middle Ages: A Study in Art, Sentiment, and Demonology* (New York: Octagon Books, 1970).

Bhreathnach, E. and Newman, C., ‘Tara, Co. Meath: A Guide to the Ceremonial Complex’, *Archaeology Ireland*, 41 (2008), 1-6.

Binchy, D. A., ‘The Legal Capacity of Women in Regard to Contracts’, in R. Thurneysen, N. Power, M. Dillon, K. Mulchrone, D. A. Binchy, A. Knoch, J. Ryan, and S. J. (eds.), *Studies in Early Irish Law* (Dublin: Hodges Figgis & Co., 1936), 207-234.

Blomley, N., ‘Making Private Property: Enclosure, Common Right and the Work of Hedges’, *Rural History*, 18:1 (2007), 1-21.

Bradshaw, B., *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

Bradshaw, B., ‘The Tudor Reformation and Revolution in Wales and Ireland: the Origins of the British Problem’, in B. Bradshaw and J. Morrill (eds.), *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State formation in the Atlantic archipelago* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1996), 39-65.

Brady, C., *The Chief Governors: The rise and fall of reform government in Tudor Ireland 1536-1588* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Brady, C., 'England's Defence and Ireland's Reform: The Dilemma of the Irish Viceroys, 1541-1641', in B. Bradshaw and J. Morrill (eds.), *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State formation in the Atlantic archipelago* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1996), 89-117.

Brady, C., *Shane O'Neill* (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press, 1996).

Breen, C., Reid, G., and Hope, M., 'Heritage, identity and community engagement at Dunluce Castle, Northern Ireland', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 21:9 (2015), 919-937.

Brenneman, Jr., W. L., 'Serpents, Cows, and Ladies: Contrasting Symbolism in Irish and Indo-European Cattle-Raiding Myths', *History of Religions*, 28:4 (1989), 340-354.

Bridbury, A. R., 'Sixteenth-Century Farming', *The Economic History Review,* 27:4 (1974), 538-556.

Brown, D. and Sharman, F., 'Enclosure: Agreements and acts', *The Journal of Legal History*, 15:3 (1994), 269-286.

Brück, J., 'Landscape politics and colonial identities: Sir Richard Colt Hoare's tour of Ireland, 1806', *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 7:2 (2007), 224-249.

Bryer, R. A., 'The genesis of the capitalist farmer: towards a Marxist accounting history of the origins of the English agricultural revolution', *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 17:4 (2006), 367-397.

Bryson, A., *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Buchanan, R. H., 'Field Systems of Ireland', in A. R. H. Baker and R. A. Butlin (eds.), *Studies of Field Systems in the British Isles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 580-618.

Butlin, R. A., ‘Land and People, c. 1600’, in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 142-167.

Campbell, E., ‘*Pobul Uí Cheallacháin*: Landscape and Power in an Early Modern Gaelic Lordship’, *Landscapes*, 18:1 (2017), 19-36.

Campbell, I., *Renaissance Humanism and Ethnicity Before Race: The Irish and the English in the Seventeenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013).

Canny, N., ‘XVI The Flight of the Earls, 1607’, *Irish Historical Studies*, 17:67 (1971), 380-399.

Canny, N., ‘The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America’, *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 30:4 (1973), 575-598.

Canny, N., *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established 1565-76* (Sussex: The Harvester Press Limited, 1976).

Canny, N., *From Reformation to Restoration: Ireland, 1534-1660* (Dublin: Helicon Limited, 1987).

Canny, N., *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World 1560-1800* (London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988).

Canny, N., ‘The Marginal Kingdom: Ireland as a Problem in the First British Empire’, in B. Bailyn and P. D. Morgan (eds.), *Strangers Within the Realm* (North Carolina: The University of Carolina Press, 1991), 35-66.

Canny, N., ‘The 1641 Depositions: A Source for Social & Cultural History’, *History Ireland*, 1:4 (1993), 52-55.

Canny, N., ‘England’s New World and the Old, 1480s-1630s’, in N. Canny (ed.), *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 149-169.

Canny, N., ‘Poetry as politics: a view of the present state of *The Faerie Queene*’, in H. Morgan (ed.), *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541-1641* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), 110-126.

Canny, N., *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Canny, N., ‘1641 in a Colonial Context’, in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 52-70.

Cathcart, A., *Kinship and Clientage: Highland Clanship, 1451-1609* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

Cathcart, A., ‘The Maritime Dimension to Plantation in Ulster, ca. 1550-ca. 1600’, *Journal of the North Atlantic*, 12 [SP1] (2019), 95-111.

Cathcart, A., *Plantations by Land and Sea, North Channel Communities of the Atlantic Archipelago c.1550-1625* (Oxford: Peter Lang Ltd, 2022).

Cavanagh, E., ‘Kingdom or Colony? English or British?: Early Modern Ireland and the Colonialism Question’, *Journal of Colonialism & Colonial History*, 14:2 (2013), n/a.

Cavanagh, S. T., ‘“The fatal destiny of that land”: Elizabethan views of Ireland’, in B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield, and W. Maley (eds.), *Representing Ireland: Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 116-131.

Clark, S., *Thinking with Demons: The Idea of Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Clarke, A., *The Old English in Ireland, 1625-42* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1966).

Clarke, A., ‘Borlase, Edmund (c. 1620-1682)’, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Clarke, A., ‘The Breakdown of Authority, 1640-41’, in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 270-288.

Clarke, A., ‘The Government of Wentworth, 1632-40’, in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 243-269.

Clarke, A., ‘The Irish Economy, 1600-60’, in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 168-187.

Clarke, A., ‘The 1641 Rebellion and Anti-popery in Ireland’, in B. Mac Cuarta (ed.), *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising* (Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies, 1997), 139-157.

Clegg, C. S., ‘Holinshed [Hollingshead], Raphael (c. 1525-1580?)’, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Clifton, R., ‘“An indiscriminate blackness”? Massacre, counter-massacre, and ethnic cleansing in Ireland, 1640-1660’, in M. Levene and P. Roberts (eds.), *The Massacre in History* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1999), 107-126.

Coffey, J., *Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Coleman, D. C., *The Economy of England 1450-1750* (London: Oxford University Press, 1977).

Collins, J. F., ‘Geology, Soils and Cattle Production’, in M. O’Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), 1-11.

Connolly, S. J., *Contested Island: Ireland 1460-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Connolly, S., ‘Religion and Society, 1600-1914’, in L. Kennedy and P. Ollerenshaw (eds.), *Ulster Since 1600: Politics, Economy, and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 74-89.

Cope, J., *England and the 1641 Irish Rebellion* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2009).

Cope, J., ‘The Irish Rising’, in M. J. Braddick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 77-95.

Corish, P. J., ‘The Rising of 1641 and The Catholic Confederacy, 1641-5’, in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 289-316.

Costello, E., ‘Post-medieval upland settlement and the decline of transhumance: a case study from the Galtee Mountains, Ireland’, *Landscape History*, 36:1 (2015), 47-69.

Costello, E., ‘Seasonal Management of Cattle in the Booleying System: New Insights from Connemara, Western Ireland’, in M. O’Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), 66-74.

Costello, E., ‘Liminal learning: Social practice in seasonal settlements of western Ireland’, *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 17:2 (2017), 188-209.

Costello, E., *Transhumance and the Making of Ireland’s Uplands, 1550-1900* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2020).

Costello, E., ‘The Colonisation of Uplands in Medieval Britain and Ireland: Climate, Agriculture and Environmental Adaptation’, *Medieval Archaeology*, 65:1 (2021), 1-29.

Costello, E., ‘Agriculture and the Integration of British Colonial Migrants in Early Modern Ireland’, *Journal of Migration History*, 8 (2022), 291-312.

Covington, S., *Wounds, Flesh and Metaphor in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009).

Covington, S., '"Realms so barbarous and cruell": Writing Violence in Early Modern Ireland and England', *History*, 99:336 (2014), 487-504.

Covington, S., '"Those Savage Days of Memory": John Temple and His Narrative of the 1641 Uprising', in F. Dillane, N. McAreavey, and E. Pine (eds.), *The Body in Pain in Irish Literature and Culture* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), 57-75.

Covington, S., 'Towards a new "folkloric turn" in the literature of early modern Ireland', *Literature Compass*, 15:11 (2018), 1-13.

Covington, S., 'Dung beetles and the "Vulgar Traditions": Applying folkloric sources and methods to early modern Ireland', in S. Covington, V. P. Carey, and V. McGowan-Doyle (eds.), *Early Modern Ireland: New Sources, Methods, and Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 213-232.

Covington, S., Carey, V. P., and McGowan-Doyle, V., 'Introduction: the past, present, and future of early modern Ireland', in S. Covington, V. P. Carey, and V. McGowan-Doyle (eds.), *Early Modern Ireland: New Sources, Methods, and Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 1-26.

Craig, J., 'Spenser's Ireland and Spenser's Queen', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 43:1 (2001), 1-28.

Cramer, C. and Richards, P., 'Violence and war in agrarian perspective', *Journal of Agrarian Change,* 11:3 (2011), 277-297.

Crawford, M. H., 'citizenship, Roman', in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 4th edn.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Cressy, D., *Travesties and Transgressions in Tudor and Stuart England: Tales of Discord and Dissension* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Cronon, W., *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983).

Cronon, W., ‘The Trouble with Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature’, in W. Cronon (ed.), *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1995), 69-90.

Cullen, L. M., ‘Population Growth and Diet, 1600-1850’, in J. M. Goldstrom and L. A. Clarkson (eds.), *Irish Population, Economy, and Society: Essays in Honour of the late K. H. Connell* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 89-112.

Cunningham, B., ‘Native Culture and Political Change in Ireland, 1580-1640’, in C. Brady and R. Gillespie (eds.), *Natives and Newcomers: Essays on the Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1986), 148-170.

Cunningham, B. and Gillespie, R., *Stories from Gaelic Ireland: Microhistories from the sixteenth-century Irish annals* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003).

Darcy, E., ‘The Social Order of the 1641 Rebellion’, in E. Darcy, A. Margey, and E. Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 97-111.

Darcy, E., *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2013).

Darcy, E., ‘The confederate Catholics of Ireland and popular politics’, in P. Little (ed.), *Ireland in Crisis: War, Politics and Religion, 1641-50* (Baltimore: Project Muse, 2019), 172-186.

Darnton, R., *The Great Cat Massacre And Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

Darwin, J., ‘Civility and Empire’, in P. Burke, B. Harrison, and P. Slack (eds.), *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 321-336.

Das, N., Melo, J. V., Smith, H., and Working, L., *Keywords of Identity, Race, and Human Mobility in Early Modern England* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2021).

Davetian, B., *Civility: A Cultural History* (London: University of Toronto Press Incorporated, 2009).

Derrida, J., *The Animal that Therefore I Am* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008).

Dodd, A. H., *Life in Elizabethan England* (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1961).

Dodgshon, R. A., *No Stone Unturned: A History of Farming, Landscape and Environment in the Scottish Highlands and Islands* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015).

Donald, P., 'The Scottish National Covenant and British Politics, 1638-1640', in J. Morrill (ed.), *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990), 90-106.

Donnelly, C. J. and Horning, A. J., 'Post-Medieval and industrial archaeology in Ireland: an overview', *Antiquity*, 76 (2002), 557-561.

Duby, G., *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West* (London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd., 1968).

Dudley Edwards, D. W. and O'Dowd, M., *Sources for Early Modern Irish History, 1534-1641* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Duffy, P. J., 'Social and Spatial Order in the MacMahon Lordship of Airghialla in the Late Sixteenth Century', in P. J. Duffy, D. Edwards, and E. FitzPatrick (eds.), *Gaelic Ireland c.1250-c.1650: Land, Lordship and Settlement* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 115-137.

Duffy, P. J., Edwards, D., and FitzPatrick, E., 'Recovering Gaelic Ireland, c.1250-c.1650', in P. J. Duffy, D. Edwards, and E. FitzPatrick (eds.), *Gaelic Ireland, c.1250-c.1650: land, lordship, and settlement* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), 21-73.

Dunlop, R. and Kelsey, S., 'Temple, Sir John (1600-1677)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Dyer, C., 'Conflict in the landscape: the enclosure movement in England, 1220-1349', *Landscape History*, 28:1 (2006), 21-33.

Edwards, D., 'Beyond Reform: Martial Law & the Tudor reconquest of Ireland', *History Ireland*, 5:2 (1997), 16-21.

Edwards, D., 'The escalation of violence in sixteenth-century Ireland', in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 34-78.

Edwards, D., 'Out of the blue? Provincial Unrest in Ireland Before 1641', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 95-114.

Edwards, D., 'Questioning the viceroys: toward a new model of English government in Tudor Ireland, 1536-1594', in S. Covington, V. P. Carey, and V. McGowan-Doyle (eds.), *Early Modern Ireland: New Sources, Methods, and Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 147-165.

Edwards, J., '"Nature in Defect": Yielding Landscapes in Early Modern Discourses of Enclosure and Colonisation', *Studies in Travel Writing*, 4:1 (2010), 1-28.

Elias, N., *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000).

Ellis, S. G., *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures 1470-1603* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1985).

Ellis, S. G., *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, 1447-1603: English Expansion and the End of Gaelic Rule* (London: Longman, 1998).

Ellis, S., ‘The English Pale: A “Failed Entity”?’, *History Ireland*, 19:2 (2011), 14-17.

Elliott, J. H., ‘A Europe of Composite Monarchies’, *Past & Present*, 137 (1992), 48-71.

Ernle, L., *English Farming Past and Present* (London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd, 1912).

Evans, E. E., *The Personality of Ireland: Habitat, Heritage and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

Evans, E. E., *Ireland and the Atlantic Heritage: Selected Writings* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd., 1996).

Fagan, B., *The Little Ice Age: How Climate Made History 1300-1850* (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

Farrell, G., *The ‘mere Irish’ and the colonisation of Ulster, 1570-1641* (Cambridge: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

Feerick, J., ‘Spenser, Race, and Ire-land’, *English Literary Renaissance,* 32:1 (2002), 85-117.

Fenlon, J., ‘Moving towards the formal house: room usage in early modern Ireland’, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature*, 111C (2011), 141-168.

Finnegan, D. and Ó Ciardha, É., ‘Introduction: ‘Cáit ar ghabhadar Gaoidhil?’ ‘Where have the Gaels gone?’’, in D. Finnegan, É. Ó Ciardha, and M. Peters (eds.), *The Flight of the Earls: Imeacht na nlarlaí* (Derry: Guildhall Press, 2010), xv-xxi.

Finnegan, D., ‘Old English views of Gaelic Irish history and the emergence of an Irish Catholic nation, c.1569-1640’, in B. Mac Cuarta and N. Canny (eds.), *Reshaping Ireland 1550-1700: Colonisation and its Consequences: Essays Presented to Nicholas Canny* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011), 187-213.

Finnegan, D., ‘What do the Depositions say about the Outbreak of the 1641 Rising?’, in E. Darcy, A. Margey, and E. Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 21-34.

Fitzpatrick, L., ‘Raiding and Warring in Monastic Ireland’, *History Ireland*, 1:3 (1993), 13-18.

Ford, A., ‘The Protestant History of the Irish Reformation’, *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 106:424 (2017/18), 448-455.

Foster, R. F., *Modern Ireland 1600-1972* (London: Penguin Books, 1989).

Fudge, E., ‘Saying Nothing Concerning the Same: On Dominion, Purity and Meat in Early Modern England’, in E. Fudge (ed.), *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans and Other Wonderful Creatures* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004), 123-142.

Fudge, E., *Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality, and Humanity in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

Fudge, E. and Richard, T., ‘Visiting Your Troops of Cattle’, *History Today*, 62:12 (2012), 37-41.

Fudge, E., ‘Early Modern: Flesh’, in D. Ryan (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Literature and Animals* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023), 38-56.

Furgol, E., ‘The Civil Wars in Scotland’, in J. Kenyon, J. Ohlmeyer, and J. Morrill (eds.), *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 41-72.

Gardiner, M., ‘A preliminary list of booley huts in the Mourne mountains, County Down’, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 67 (2008), 142-152.

Gardiner, M., ‘Landscape and farming in the north of Ireland in the Late Middle Ages and early modern period: the evidence from the uplands’, *The Journal of Irish Archaeology*, 27 (2018), 117-134.

Garnsey, P., ‘Roman Citizenship and Roman Law in the Late Empire’, in S. Swain and M. Edwards (eds.), *Approaching Late Antiquity: The Transformation from Early to Late Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 133-155.

Gasteyer, S. P. and Flora, C. B., ‘Modernizing the Savage: Colonization and Perceptions of Landscape and Lifescape’, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40:1 (2000), 128-149.

Gentles, I., ‘The Civil Wars in England’, in J. Kenyon, J. Ohlmeyer, and J. Morrill (eds.), *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 103-155.

Gentles, I.*, The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652* (Harlow: Pearson/Longman, 2007).

Gibney, J., *The Shadow of a Year: The 1641 Rebellion in Irish History and Memory* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2013).

Gillespie, R., ‘Harvest Crises in Early Seventeenth-Century Ireland’, *Irish Economic and Social History*, 11 (1984), 5-18.

Gillespie, R., *Colonial Ulster: The Settlement of East Ulster 1600-1641* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1985).

Gillespie, R., ‘The End of an Era: Ulster and the Outbreak of the 1641 Rising’, in C. Brady and R. Gillespie (eds.), *Natives and Newcomers: The Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1986), 191-213.

Gillespie, R., ‘The Murder of Arthur Champion and the 1641 Rising in Fermanagh’, *Clogher Historical Society,* 14:3 (1993), 52-66.

Gillespie, R., ‘Destabilising Ulster, 1641-2’, in B. Mac Cuarta (ed.), *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising* (Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies, 1997), 107-122.

Gillingham, J., ‘From *Civilitas* to Civility: Codes of Manners in Medieval and Early Modern England’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 12 (2002), 267-289.

Goodare, J., 'The Rise of the Covenanters, 1637-1644', in M. J. Braddick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 43-59.

Graham, J. M., 'Rural Society in Connacht, 1600-1640', in N. Stephens and R. E. Glasscock (eds.), *Irish Geographical Studies: In Honour of E. Estyn Evans* (Belfast: Queen's University of Belfast, 1970), 192-208.

Grau-Sologestoa, I. and Albarella, U., 'The "long" sixteenth century: a key period of animal husbandry change in England', *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences*, 11 (2019), 2781-2803.

Gray, C., '"Wild Civility": Men at War in Royalist Elegy', in J. Feather and C. E. Thomas (eds.), *Violent Masculinities: Male Aggression in Early Modern Texts and Culture* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 169-189.

Greengrass, M., 'Hartlib, Samuel (c.1600-1662)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Hadfield, A. and Maley, W., 'Introduction: Irish representations and English alternatives', in B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield, and W. Maley (eds.), *Representing Ireland: Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 1-23.

Hadfield, A., 'Derricke, John (fl. 1578-1581)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Hale, J., *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance* (London: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd, 1993).

Hall, D., "'The Rebel's Turkish Tyranny': Understanding Sexual Violence in Ireland During the 1640s', *Gender & History*, 22:1 (2010), 55-74.

Hall, D., '"Most barbarously and inhumaine maner butchered": Masculinity, Trauma, and Memory in Early Modern Ireland', in F. Dillane, N. McAreavey, and E. Pine (eds.), *The Body in Pain in Irish Literature and Culture* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), 39-55.

Hall, D., '"Joy among the Irish children that […] there will be war": Irish Children and Seventeenth-Century Wars', *Parergon*, 38:2 (2021), 105-129.

Hampton, B., 'Purgation, Exorcism, and the Civilising Process in Macbeth', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 51:2 (2011), 327-347.

Harrigan, M., 'A Need to Narrate? Early Modern French Accounts of Atlantic Crossings', in C. Mathieson (ed.), *Sea Narratives: Cultural Responses to the Sea, 1600-Present* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), 23-45.

Harris, J., 'From Richard Hooker to Harold Laski: Changing Perceptions of Civil Society in British Political Thought, Late Sixteenth to Early Twentieth Centuries', in J. Harris (ed.), *Civil Society in British History: Ideas, Identities, Institutions* (New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2003), 13-38.

Harrison, R. P., 'Toward a Philosophy of Nature', in W. Cronon (ed.), *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1995), 426-437.

Hayes-Mccoy, G. A., 'The Completion of The Tudor Conquest and the Advance of the Counter-Reformation, 1571–1603', in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne (eds.), *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691*, Vol. III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 94-141.

Herron, T., and Potterton, M., (eds.), *Ireland in the Renaissance c. 1540-1660* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007).

Hickson, M., *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century, or The Irish Massacres of 1641-2* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1884).

Hickson, M., 'The Depositions of 1641', *English Historical Review*, 2:7 (1887), 527.

Higgins, N., ‘The Lost Legal System: Pre-Common Law Ireland and the Brehon Law’, (2011), 193-205.

Horning, A., ‘“Dwelling houses in the old Irish Barbarous Manner”: Archaeological evidence for Gaelic Architecture in an Ulster Plantation village’, in P. J. Duffy, D. Edwards, and E. Fitzpatrick (eds.), *Gaelic Ireland 1300-1650: Land, Lordship, and Settlement* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 375-396.

Horning, A., ‘Archaeological Explorations of Cultural Identity and Rural Economy in the North of Ireland: Goodland, County Antrim’, *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 8:3 (2004), 199-215.

Horning, A., *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2013).

Horning, A., ‘Minding the gaps: exploring the intersection of political economy, colonial ideologies and cultural practice in early modern Ireland’, *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 52:1 (2018), 4-20.

Houston, R. A., ‘People, Space, and Law in Late Medieval and Early Modern Britain and Ireland*’, *Past & Present*, 230:1 (2016), 47-89.

Hoyle, R. W., ‘Disafforestation and Drainage: The Crown as Entrepreneur’, in R. W. Hoyle (ed.), *The Estates of the English Crown, 1558-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 353-387.

Hunter, R. J., ‘Ulster Plantation Towns, 1609-41’, in D. Harkness and M. O’Dowd (eds.), *The Town in Ireland* (Belfast: Appletree Press, 1981), 55-80.

Jardine, L., ‘Encountering Ireland: Gabriel Harvey, Edmund Spenser, and English colonial ventures’, in B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield, and W. Maley (eds.), *Representing Ireland: Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 60-75.

Jones, H. M., ‘Origins of the Colonial Idea in England’, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 85:5 (1942), 448-465.

Jones, H., ‘Property, territory, and colonialism: an international legal history of enclosure’, *Legal Studies*, 39:2 (2019), 187-203.

Jones, I., ‘“Holy War”? Religion, Ethnicity and Massacre during the Irish Rebellion 1641-2’, in E. Darcy, A. Margey, and E. Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 129-142.

Kane, B., ‘The Nine Years’ War in Ireland (1594-1603) as problem of government’, in W. J. Bulman and F. C. Domínguez (eds.), *Political and Religious Practice in the Early Modern British World* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2022), 181-202.

Kelly, F., *A Guide to Early Irish Law* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 2016).

Kelly, F., ‘Cattle in Ancient Ireland: Early Irish Legal Aspects’, in M. O’Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), 44-50.

Kelly, M. and Ó Gráda, C., ‘The Waning of the Little Ice Age: Climate Change in Early Modern Europe’, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 44:2 (2013), 301-325.

Kelsey, S., ‘Davies, Sir John (bap. 1569, d. 1626)’, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Kennedy, A., ‘Civility, order and the highlands in Cromwellian Britain’, *The Innes Review*, 69:1 (2018), 49-69.

Kenyon, J. and Ohlmeyer, J., 'The Background to the Civil Wars in the Stuart Kingdoms', in J. Kenyon, J. Ohlmeyer, and J. Morrill (eds.), *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 3-40.

Kidd, C., 'Gaelic Antiquity and National Identity in Enlightenment Ireland and Scotland', *The English Historical Review*, 109:434 (1994), 1197-1214.

Kilroy, P., 'Protestantism in Ulster, 1610-1641', in B. Mac Cuarta (ed.), *Ulster 1641: Aspects of the Rising* (Belfast: Institute of Irish Studies, 1997), 25-36.

Kishlansky, M. A. and Morrill, J., 'Charles I (1600-1649)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Klein, B., *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).

Knapp, J. A., '"That moste barbarous Nacion": John Derricke's "Image of Ireland" and the "delight of the well disposed reader"', *Criticism*, 42:4 (2000), 415-450.

Kupperman, K. O., 'The Puzzle of the American Climate in the Early Colonial Period', *The American Historical Review*, 87:5 (1982), 1262-1289.

Kwiatkowski, N., 'Forced witnessing of pain and horror in the context of colonial and religious massacres: the case of the Irish Rebellion, 1641-53', in T. Macsotay, K. van der Haven, and K. Vanhaesebrouck (eds.), *The hurt(ful) body: performing and beholding pain, 1600-1800* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), 202-220.

Langert, C. B., 'Hedgerows and petticoats: sartorial subversion and anti-enclosure protest in seventeenth-century England', *Early Theatre*, 12:1 (2009), 119-135.

Langley, C. R., 'Sheltering under the Covenant: The National Covenant, Orthodoxy and the Irish Rebellion, 1638-1644', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 2:243 (2017), 137-160.

Lecky, K., ‘Irish Nonhumanness and English Inhumanity in A Vewe of the Present State of Ireland’, *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual*, 30:1 (2015), 133-150.

Lee, S. and Hadfield, A., ‘Blenerhasset, Thomas (c. 1550-1624)’, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Leerssen, J., ‘Wildness, Wilderness, and Ireland: Medieval and Early-Modern Patterns in the Demarcation of Civility’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 56:1 (1995), 25-39.

Leerssen, J., *Mere Irish and Fíor-Ghael: Studies in the Idea of Irish Nationality, its Development and Literary Expression prior to the Nineteenth Century* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996).

Lenihan, P., ‘Strategic Geography 1641-1691’, in P. Lenihan (ed.), *Conquest and Resistance: War in Seventeenth Century Ireland* (Boston: Brill, 2001), 115-150.

Lennon, C., ‘The Counter-Reformation in Ireland, 1542-1641’, in C. Brady and R. Gillespie (eds.), *Natives and Newcomers: The Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1986), 75-92.

Lennon, C., *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: The Incomplete Conquest* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1994).

Liddy, C. D., ‘Urban Enclosure Riots: Risings of the Commons in English Towns, 1480-1525’, *Past & Present*, 226:1 (2015), 41-77.

Lincoln, B., ‘Cattle’, in L. Jones (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion*, Vol. III (USA: MacMillan Reference, 2005), 1464-1467.

Little, P., ‘The English parliament and the Irish constitution, 1641-9’, in D. Cregan and M. Ó Siochrú (eds.), *Kingdom in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s: Essays in honour of Dónal Cregan* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 106-121.

Little, P., 'Introduction: the confederate wars revisited', in P. Little (ed.), *Ireland in Crisis: War, Politics and Religion, 1641-50* (Baltimore: Project Muse, 2019), 1-15.

Lowry, S. T., 'The Agricultural Foundation of the Seventeenth-Century English Oeconomy', *History of Political Economy*, 35 (2003), 74-100.

Ludlow, F. and Crampsie, A., 'Environmental History of Ireland, 1550-1730', in J. Ohlmeyer (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Ireland, 1550-1730*, Vol. II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 608-637.

Ludlow, F. and Crampsie, A., 'Climate, debt, and conflict: environmental history as a new direction in understanding early modern Ireland', in S. Covington, V. P. Carey, and V. McGowan-Doyle (eds.), *Early Modern Ireland: New Sources, Methods, and Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 269-300.

Lupton, J. R., 'Mapping mutability: or, Spenser's Irish Plot', in B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield, and W. Maley (eds.), *Representing Ireland: Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 93-115.

Lydon, J., *The Lordship of Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003).

Lydon, J., 'The Impact of the Bruce Invasion, 1315-27', in A. Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Medieval Ireland,* Vol. II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 275-302.

Lysacht, P., 'Livestock Kept in the Dwelling House: Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Evidence for the Practice in Ireland', in M. O'Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), 75-91.

Lyttleton, J., 'Trends in the Archaeology of Early Modern Irish Settlement: An Interview with Dr. James Lyttleton', *Eolas: The Journal of the American Society of Irish Medieval Studies*, 2 (2007), 62-78.

MacCoinnich, A., *Plantation and Civility in the North Atlantic World: The Case of the Northern Hebrides, 1570-1639* (Leidenn: Brill, 2015).

MacCotter, P., *Medieval Ireland: Territorial, political, and economic divisions* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008).

Mac Cuarta, B., 'Religious violence against settlers in south Ulster, 1641-2', in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 154-175.

MacDonald, A., *The Jacobean Kirk, 1567-1625: Sovereignty, Polity and Liturgy* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 1998).

MacFarlane, A., 'Civility and the Decline of Magic', in P. Burke, B. Harrison, and P. Slack (eds.), *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 145-160.

Maginn, C., 'Whose Island? Sovereignty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Ireland', *Éire-Ireland*, 44:3 (2009), 229-247.

MacGregor, M., 'Gaelic Barbarity and Scottish Identity in the Later Middle Ages', in D. Broun and M. MacGregor (eds.), *Mìorun Mòr nan Gall, 'the Great Ill-will of the Lowlander'? Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands, Medieval and Modern* (Glasgow: Centre for Scottish and Celtic Studies, 2007), 7-48.

Macinnes, A., *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1991).

Macinnes, A., *The British Revolution, 1629-1660* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005).

MacLeod, N., '"Rogues, Villaines, and Base Trulls": Constructing the "Other" in the 1641 Depositions', in E. Darcy, A. Margey, and E. Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 113-127.

MacLysaght, E., *Irish Life in the Seventeenth Century* (Cork: Irish University Press, 1969).

MacNiocaill, G., 'Socio-Economic Problems of the Late Medieval Irish Town', in D. Harkness and M. O'Dowd (eds.), *The Town in Ireland* (Belfast: Appletree Press, 1981), 7-22.

Maley, W., '"Barbarisme, and obdurate wilfulnesse": agricultural materialism, animal welfare, and Irish studies', in S. Covington, V. P. Carey, and V. McGowan-Doyle (eds.), *Early Modern Ireland: New Sources, Methods, and Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019), 233-253.

Margey, A., '1641 and the Ulster Plantation Towns', in E. Darcy, A. Margey, and E. Murphy (eds.), *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 79-96.

Mark, C., 'The Natural Laws of Good Manners: Hobbes, Glory, and Early Modern Civility', *Review of Politics*, 80:3 (2018), 391-414.

Martel, J. R., *Bodies Unburied: Subversive Corpses and the Authority of the Dead* (Massachusetts: The Amherst College Press, 2018).

Matei, O., 'Gabriel Plattes, Hartlib Circle and the Interest for Husbandry in the Seventeenth Century England', *Prolegomena: Journal of Philosophy*, 11:2 (2012), 207-225.

Mathieson, C., 'Introduction: The Literature, History and Culture of the Sea, 1600-Present', in C. Mathieson (ed.), *Sea Narratives: Cultural Responses to the Sea, 1600-Present* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), 1-21.

Matthews, J. A. and Briffa, K. R., 'The "Little Ice Age": Re-Evaluation of an Evolving Concept', *Geografiska Annaler. Series A, Physical Geography*, 87:1 (2005), 17-36.

Martin, F. X., 'Diarmait Mac Murchada and the Coming of the Anglo-Normans', in A. Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Medieval Ireland 1169-1534*, Vol. II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 43-66.

McAreavey, N., ‘Children’s Experiences of Violence during the Irish Rebellion of 1641’, *Parergon*, 38:2 (2021), 71-103.

McCavitt, J., ‘The Flight of the Earls, 1607’, *Irish Historical Studies*, 29:114 (1994), 159-173.

McCormick, F., ‘The Dog in Prehistoric and Early Christian Ireland’, *Archaeology Ireland*, 5:4 (1991), 7-9.

McCormick, F., ‘Exchange of Livestock in Early Christian Ireland, AD 450-1150’, *Anthropozoologica*, 16 (1992), 31-36.

McCormick, F., ‘The Decline of the Cow: Agricultural and Settlement Change in Early Medieval Ireland’, *Peritia*, 20 (2008), 210-225.

McDonagh, B. and Griffin, C. J., ‘Occupy! Historical geographies of property, protest and the commons, 1500-1850’, *Journal of Historical Geography*, 53 (2016), 1-10.

McDonagh, B. and Rodda, J., ‘Landscape, Memory and Protest in the Midlands Rising of 1607’, in C. J. Griffin and B. McDonagh (eds.), *Remembering Protest in Britain since 1500: Memory, Materiality and the Landscape* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 53-79.

McDonald, T., ‘Booleying in Achill, Achillbeg and Corraun: survey, excavation and analysis of booley settlements in the Civil Parish of Achill’, National University of Ireland (2013) [thesis].

McDonald, T., ‘The Deserted Village, Slievemore, Achill Island, County Mayo, Ireland’, *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 2:2 (1998), 73-112.

McDonald, T., ‘The “Ups and Downs” of Booleying in Achill, Co. Mayo, Ireland’, in M. O’Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), 56-65.

McGowan-Doyle, V., ‘Christopher St Lawrence, ninth baron of Howth: conspirator and informer’, in D. Finnegan, É. Ó Ciardha, and M. Peters (eds.), *The Flight of the Earls: Imeacht na nIarlaí* (Derry: Guildhall Press, 2010), 13-19.

McGurk, J., *The Elizabethan conquest of Ireland: The 1590s crisis* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997).

McGurk, J., ‘Terrain and Conquest 1600-1603’, in P. Lenihan (ed.), *Conquest and Resistance: War in Seventeenth Century Ireland* (Boston: Brill, 2001), 87-114.

McGurk, J., ‘The pacification of Ulster, 1600-3’, in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 119-129.

McHugh, J., ‘“For our owne defence”: Catholic insurrection in Wexford, 1641-2’, in B. Mac Cuarta and N. Canny (eds.), *Reshaping Ireland 1550-1700: Colonisation and its Consequences: Essays Presented to Nicholas Canny* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011), 214-240.

McKibben, S. E., ‘In their “owne countre”: Deriding and Defending the Early Modern Irish Nation after Gerald of Wales’, *The Journal of the American Society of Irish Medieval Studies*, 8 (2015), 39-70.

McLeod, W., *Divided Gaels: Gaelic Cultural Identities in Scotland and Ireland 1200-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

McRae, A., *God speed the plough: The representation of agrarian England, 1500-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

McVeigh, R. and Rolston, B., ‘Civilising the Irish’, *Race & Class*, 51:1 (2009), 2-28.

Meacham, S., ‘Pets, status, and slavery in the late-eighteenth-century Chesapeake’, *Journal of Southern History*, 77:3 (2011), 521-554.

Merchant, C., ‘Reinventing Eden: Western Culture as a Recovery Narrative’, in W. Cronon (ed.), *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1995), 132-159.

Mervyn, J., *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in early modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

Millar, C. R., ‘The witch’s familiar in sixteenth-century England’, *Melbourne Historical Journal*, 38 (2010), 113-130.

Mitchell, T., *Colonising Egypt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

Molloy, K. and O’Connell, M., ‘Farming Impact in Ireland From the Neolithic To Recent Times With Particular Reference To A Detailed Pollen Record From East Galway’, in M. O’Connell, F. Kelly, and J. H. McAdam (eds.), *Cattle in Ancient and Modern Ireland: Farming Practices, Environment and Economy* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016), 27-43.

Montaño, J. P., *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Montaño, J. P., ‘Cultural Conflict and the Landscape of Conquest in Early Modern Ireland’, *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, 40 (2017), 120-141.

Moody, T. W., ‘Irish History and Irish Mythology’, *Hermathena*, 124 (1978), 6-24.

Morgan, H., ‘The Colonial Venture of Sir Thomas Smith in Ulster, 1571-1575’, *The Historical Journal*, 28:2 (1985), 261-278.

Morgan, H., ‘Faith & Fatherland in Sixteenth-Century Ireland’, *History Ireland*, 3:2 (1995), 13-20.

Morgan, H., ‘Beyond Spenser? A historiographical introduction to the study of political ideas in early modern Ireland’, in H. Morgan (ed.), *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541-1641* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), 9-21.

Morgan, H., ‘Giraldus Cambrensis and the Tudor Conquest of Ireland’, in H. Morgan (ed.), *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541-1641* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), 22-44.

Morgan, H., ‘Overmighty Officers: “The Irish Lord Deputyship in the Early Modern British State”’, *History Ireland*, 7:4 (1999), 17-21.

Morrill, J., ‘The National Covenant in its British Context’, in J. Morrill (ed.), *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1990), 1-30.

Morrill, J., *The Nature of the English Revolution: Essays* (London: Longman, 1993).

Morrill, J., ‘The British Problem, c. 1534-1707’, in B. Bradshaw and J. Morrill (eds.), *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State formation in the Atlantic archipelago* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1996), 1-38.

Morrill, J., ‘Introduction’, in J. Kenyon, J. Ohlmeyer, and J. Morrill (eds.), *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), xix-xxiv.

Morrill, J., *Revolt in the Provinces: The people of England and the tragedies of war, 1630-1648* (London: Longman, 1999).

Muldrew, C., *Food, Energy and the Creation of Industriousness: Work and Material Culture in Agrarian England, 1550-1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Nauert, Jr, C. G., *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Nehring, H., ‘“Civility” in history: some observations on the history of the concept’, *European Review of History: Revue européenne d’histoire*, 18:3 (2011), 313-333.

Nicholls, K. W., ‘Some Documents on Irish Law and Custom in the Sixteenth Century’, *Analecta Hibernica*, 1 (1970), 103-129.

Nicholls, K., ‘Woodland Cover in pre-Modern Ireland’, in P. J. Duffy, D. Edwards, and E. FitzPatrick (eds.), *Gaelic Ireland c.1250-c.1650: Land, Lordship and Settlement* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 181-206.

Nicholls, K. W., *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: The Lilliput Press Ltd, 2003).

Nicholls, K., ‘The other massacre: English killings of Irish, 1641-3’, in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 176-191.

Nixon, R., *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011).

Noonan, K., ‘“The Cruell Pressure of an Enraged, Barbarous, People”: Irish and English Identity in Seventeenth-Century Policy and Propaganda’, *The Historical Journal*, 41:1 (1998), 151-177.

O’Brien, M. and O’Brien, C., *A Concise History of Ireland* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1972).

Ó Buachalla, B., ‘Poetry and Politics in Early Modern Ireland’, *Eighteenth-century Ireland*, 7:1 (1992), 149-175.

O’Conor, K., ‘Gaelic lordly Settlement in 13th and 14th Century Ireland’, in I. Holm, S. Innselet, and I. Øye (eds.), *Utmark: The Outfield as Industry and Ideology in the Iron Age and the Middle Ages* (Bergen: University of Bergen Press, 2005), 209-221.

Ó Doibhlin, D., ‘The plantation of Ulster: aspects of Gaelic letters’, in É. Ó Ciardha and M. Ó Siochrú (eds.), *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), 198-217.

Ó Domhnaill, S., ‘Warfare in Sixteenth-Century Ireland’, *Irish Historical Studies*, 5:17 (1946), 29-54.

O'Dowd, M., 'Gaelic Economy and Society', in C. Brady and R. Gillespie (eds.), *Natives and Newcomers: Essays on the Making of Irish Colonial Society, 1534-1641* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1986), 120-147.

Ó Gráda, C., 'Irish Agricultural History: Recent Research', *The Agricultural History Review*, 38:2 (1990), 165-174.

O'Halloran, C., 'Recalling the View: Edmund Spenser and Ireland in the Eighteenth century', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy: Archaeology, Culture, History, Literature*, 114C (2014), 215-234.

Ohlmeyer, J., *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms: The career of Randal MacDonnell, marquis of Antrim, 1609-1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Ohlmeyer, J., 'Introduction. A failed revolution?', in J. Ohlmeyer (ed.), *Ireland from Independence to Occupation, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 1-23.

Ohlmeyer, J., 'Ireland independent: confederate foreign policy and international relations during the mid-seventeenth century', in J. Ohlmeyer (ed.), *Ireland from Independence to Occupation, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 89-111.

Ohlmeyer, J., '"Civilizinge of those Rude Partes": Colonization within Britain and Ireland, 1580s-1640s', in N. Canny (ed.), *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 124-147.

Ohlmeyer, J., 'The Civil Wars in Ireland', in J. Kenyon, J. Ohlmeyer, and J. Morrill (eds.), *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 73-102.

Ohlmeyer, J., 'The Wars of the Three Kingdoms', *History Today*, 48:11 (1998), 16-22.

Ohlmeyer, J., ‘Seventeenth-Century Ireland and the New British and Atlantic Histories’, *The American Historical Review*, 104:2 (1999), 446-462.

Ohlmeyer, J., ‘Anatomy of Plantation: the 1641 Depositions’, *History Ireland*, 17:6 (2009), 54-56.

Ohlmeyer, J., *Making Ireland English: The Irish Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012).

Ojala, C. and Nordin, J. M., ‘Mapping Land and People in the North: Early Modern Colonial Expansion, Exploitation, and Knowledge’, *Scandinavian Studies,* 91:1-2 (2019), 98-133.

Olsh, J. L., ‘The Growth of English Agricultural Productivity in the Seventeenth Century’, *Social Science History*, 1:4 (1977), 460-485.

O’Riordan, M., *The Gaelic Mind and the Collapse of the Gaelic World* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1990).

Ó Siochrú, M., *Confederate Ireland, 1642-1649: A Constitutional and Political Analysis* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999).

Ó Siochrú, M., ‘Introduction’, in D. Cregan and M. Ó Siochrú (eds.), *Kingdom in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s: Essays in honour of Dónal Cregan* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 11-19.

Ó Siochrú, M., ‘Catholic Confederates and the constitutional relationship between Ireland and England, 1641-1649’, in C. Brady and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 207-229.

Ó Siochrú, M., ‘Atrocity, Codes of Conduct and the Irish in the British Civil Wars 1641-1653’, *Past & Present*, 195 (2007), 55-86.

Ó Siochrú, M., ‘Civil Autonomy and Military Power in Early Modern Ireland’, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 15:1-2 (2011), 31-57.

Ó Siochrú, M. and Ohlmeyer, J., ‘Introduction 1641: fresh contexts and perspectives’, in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 1-16.

O’Sullivan, A., ‘Crannogs in Late Medieval Gaelic Ireland, c.1350-c.1650’, in P. J. Duffy, D. Edwards, and E. FitzPatrick (eds.), *Gaelic Ireland, c.1250-c.1650: land, lordship, and settlement* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), 397-417.

Otto, J. S., ‘Cattle-Grazing in the Southeastern United States, 1670-1949: An Economic and Social Adaption’, in M. J. Henninger-Voss (ed.), *Animals in Human Histories* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2009), 56-82.

Outhwaite, R. B., ‘Progress and Backwardness in English Agriculture, 1500-1650’, *Economic History Review*, 39:1 (1986), 1-18.

Overton, M., *Agricultural Revolution in England: The transformation of the agrarian economy 1500-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Pagden, D., ‘The Struggle for Legitimacy and the Image of Empire in the Atlantic to c.1700’, in N. Canny (ed.), *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 34-54.

Palmer, W., ‘The Problem of Ideology in the Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Comparative Approach?’, *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua*, 19:3 (2015), 128-142.

Parker, G., ‘The crisis of the Spanish and the Stuart monarchies in the mid-seventeenth century: local problems or global problems?’, in C. Brady and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *British Interventions in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 252-279.

Parker, G., *Global Crisis: War, Climate Change, & Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Yale University Press, 2013).

Patriquin, L., 'The Agrarian Origins of the Industrial Revolution in England', *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 36:2 (2004), 196-216.

Patterson, N., *Cattle Lords & Clansmen: The Social Structure of Early Ireland* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994).

Peck, D. L., 'Civility: A Contemporary Context for a Meaningful Historical Concept', *Sociological Enquiry*, 72:3 (2002), 358-375.

Perceval-Maxwell, M., 'The Ulster Rising of 1641, and the depositions', *Irish Historical Studies*, 21 (1978), 144-167.

Perceval-Maxwell, M., *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994).

Petto, C. M., 'Semblance of Sovereignty: Cartographic Possession in Map Cartouches and Atlas Frontispieces of Early Modern Europe', in G. Backhaus and J. Murungi (eds.), *Symbolic Landscapes* (London: Springer, 2009), 227-250.

Pluymers, K., 'Taming the Wilderness in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Ireland and Virginia', *Environmental History*, 16:4 (2011), 610-632.

Pluymers, K., 'Cow Trials, Climate Change, and the Causes of Violence', *Environmental History*, 25:2 (2020), 287-309.

Pluymers, K., *No Wood, No Kingdom: Political Economy in the English Atlantic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2021).

Pocock, J. G. A., 'The Atlantic Archipelago and the War of the Three Kingdoms', in B. Bradshaw and J. Morrill (eds.), *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State formation in the Atlantic archipelago* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 1996), 172-191.

Porter, J. R., 'Witchcraft and Magic in the Old Testament, and their Relation to Animals', in J. R. Porter and W. M. S. Russell (eds.), *Animals in Folklore* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer Ltd, 1978), 70-85.

Portis, E. B., *Reconstructing the Classics: Political Theory from Plato to Marx* (New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1998).

Pribyl, K., *Farming, Famine and Plague: The Impact of Climate in Late Medieval England* (Charm: Springer, 2017).

Probasco, N., 'Cartography as a Tool of Colonization: Sir Humphrey Gilbert's 1583 Voyage to North America', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 67:2 (2014), 425-472.

Prunty, J., *Maps and Map-Making in Local History* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004).

Purcell, N., 'economy, Roman', in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 4th edn.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Quinn, D. B., *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966).

Raber, K., 'From Sheep to Meat, From Pets to People: Animal Domestication 1600-1800', in M. Senior (ed.), *A Cultural History of Animals in the Age of Enlightenment*, Vol. IV (Oxford: Berg, 2007), 73-100.

Rapple, R., 'Writing About Violence in the Tudor Kingdoms', *The Historical Journal*, 54:3 (2011), 829-854.

Redick, K., 'Wilderness as Axis Mundi: Spiritual Journeys on the Appalachian Trail', in G. Backhaus and J. Murungi (eds.), *Symbolic Landscapes* (London: Springer, 2009), 65-90.

Redmond, J., 'Religious Violence and the 1641 Rebellion: Divided Communities in Seventeenth-Century Cavan', *The Undergraduate Journal of Ireland and Northern Ireland*, (2011), 216-226.

Redmond, J., 'Memories of violence and New English identities in early modern Ireland', *Historical research: the bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 89:246 (2016), 708-729.

Redmond, J., 'Religion, ethnicity and "conversion" in the 1641 Irish Rebellion', *The Seventeenth Century*, 35:6 (2020), 715-739.

Redmond, J., ‘Religion, civility and the ‘British’ of Ireland in the 1641 Irish rebellion’, *Irish Historical Studies*, 45:167 (2021), 1-21.

Ritvo, H., ‘The Sincerest Form of Flattery’, in M. J. Henninger-Voss (ed.), *Animals in Human Histories* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2009), 295-315.

Robinson, M. T. P., ‘An act “soe fowle and grievous”: contextualising rape in the 1641 rebellion’, *Irish Historical Studies*, 156 (2015), 595-619.

Robinson, P., *The Plantation of Ulster: British Settlement in an Irish Landscape, 1600-1670* (Belfast: Ulster Historical Foundation, 1994).

Robson, E., ‘Improvement and Epistemologies of Landscape in Seventeenth-Century English Forest Enclosure’, *The Historical Journal*, 60:3 (2017), 597-632.

Rollinson, D., ‘Exploding England: The Dialectics of Mobility and Settlement in Early Modern England’, *Social History*, 24:1 (1999), 1-16.

Russell, C., *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

Sarles, C., ‘Civil Society History III: Renaissance’, in K. A. Helmut and S. Toepler (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* (New York: Springer, 2010), 350-353.

Sax, B., ‘The Magic of Animals: English Witch Trials in the Perspective of Folklore’, *Anthrozoös*, 22:4 (2009), 317-332.

Schaefer, L., ‘History and Civility’, *NAMTA Journal*, 40:1 (2015), 103-111.

Schot, R., Newman, C., and Bhreathnach, E., (eds.), *Landscapes of Cult and Kingship* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011).

Scott, D., *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637-49* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

Senior, M., ‘The Souls of Men and Beasts, 1630-1764’, in M. Senior (ed.), *A Cultural History of Animals in the Age of Enlightenment*, Vol. IV (Oxford: Berg, 2007), 23-46.

Shagan, E. H., ‘Continuing discord: ideology, propaganda, and English responses to the Irish rebellion of 1641’, *Journal of British Studies*, 36 (1997), 4-34.

Shanahan, M., ‘“When chiefest Rebell feede”: food, fosterage and fear in early modern Ireland’, *Food, Culture & Society*, 25 (2022), 1-20.

Sharpe, J. A., *Early Modern England: A Social History 1550-1760* (London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd, 1987).

Sharpe, K., *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (London: Yale University Press, 1992).

Shepard, A. and Stretton, T., ‘Women Negotiating the Boundaries of Justice in Britain, 1300-1700: An Introduction’, *Journal of British Studies*, 58:4 (2019), 677-683.

Shugg, W., ‘The Cartesian Beast-Machine in English Literature (1663-1750)’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 29:2 (1968), 279-292.

Simms, K., ‘Warfare in the Medieval Gaelic Lordships’, *The Irish Sword*, 12 (1975), 98-108.

Simms, K., ‘Guesting and Feasting in Gaelic Ireland’, *The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland,* 108 (1978), 67-100.

Simms, K., *From Kings to Warlords: The Changing Political Structure of Gaelic Ireland in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1987).

Simms, K., *Gaelic Ulster in the Middle Ages: History, Culture and Society* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2020).

Sinder, J., ‘Irish Legal History: An Overview and Guide to the Sources’, *Law Library Journal*, 93:2 (2001), 231-260.

Slack, P., *The Invention of Improvement: Information and Material Progress in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Smith, K. C., ‘The Role of Animals in Witchcraft and Popular Magic’, in J. R. Porter and W. M. S. Russell (eds.), *Animals in Folklore* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer Ltd, 1978), 96-110.

Smyth, D., *A Guide to Irish Mythology* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1988).

Smyth, W. J., *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory: A Geography of Colonial and Early Modern Ireland c.1530-1750* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2008).

Smyth, W. J., 'Towards a Cultural Geography of the 1641 Rising/Rebellion', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 71-94.

Stevenson, D., *Alasdair MacColla and the Highland Problem in the Seventeenth Century* (Edinburgh: J. Donald, 1980).

Stevenson, D., *The Scottish Revolution 1637-44: The Triumph of the Covenanters* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 2011).

Stewart, L. A. M., 'The Political Repercussions of the Five Articles of Perth: A Reassessment of James VI and I's Religious Polices in Scotland', *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* 38:4 (2007), 1013-1036.

Stewart, L. A. M., *Rethinking the Scottish Revolution: Covenanted Scotland, 1637-1641* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Stretton, T., 'Women, Legal Records, and the Problem of the Lawyer's Hand', *Journal of British Studies*, 58:4 (2019), 684-700.

Tait, C., Edwards, D., and Lenihan, P., 'Early modern Ireland: a history of violence', in D. Edwards, P. Lenihan, and C. Tait (eds.), *Age of Atrocity: Violent death and political conflict in Ireland, 1547-1650* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 9-33.

Tan, E. S., '"The bull is half the herd": property rights and enclosures in England, 1750-1850', *Explorations in Economic History*, 39:4 (2002), 470-489.

Tanner, J. R., *Tudor Constitutional Documents A.D. 1485-1603* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1922).

Tarlow, S., *The Archaeology of Improvement in Britain, 1750-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Thirsk, J., *English Peasant Farming: The Agrarian History of Lincolnshire from Tudor to Recent Times* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd, 1957).

Thirsk, J., 'Farming Techniques', in J. Thirsk (ed.), *The Agrarian History of England and Wales*, Vol. IV (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 161-197.

Thirsk, J., 'The Farming Regions of England', in J. Thirsk (ed.), *The Agrarian History of England and Wales*, Vol. IV (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 1-112.

Thirsk, J., 'Seventeenth-Century Agriculture and Social Change', in J. Thirsk (ed.), *Land, Church, and People: Essays Presented to Professor H. P. R. Finberg* (Reading: British Agricultural History Society, 1970), 148-177.

Thirsk, J., *The Rural Economy of England* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984).

Thirsk, J., *England's Agricultural Regions and Agrarian History, 1500-1750* (Basingstoke: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1987).

Thirsk, J., *Alternative Agriculture: A History, From the Black Death to the Present Day* (New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 1997).

Thomas, K., *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800* (London: Penguin Group, 1984).

Thomas, K., *In Pursuit of Civility: Manners and Civilisation in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018).

Thompson, E. H., 'Moryson, Fynes (1565/6-1630)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Thrower, N. J., *Maps & Civilisation: Cartography in Culture and Society* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996).

Trevor-Roper, H., *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1967).

Tol, R. S. J. and Wagner, S., 'Climate change and violent conflict in Europe over the last millennium', *Climatic Change*, 99 (2010), 65-79.

Turvey, R., 'Perrot, Sir John (1528-1592)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition 2008-14), https://tannerritchie.com/memso/.

Underdown, D., *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

Van Es, B., 'Discourses of Conquest: "The Faerie Queene", the Society of Antiquaries, and "A View of the Present State of Ireland"', *English Literary Renaissance*, 32:1 (2002), 118-151.

Van Krieken, R., 'Three faces of civilisation: "In the beginning all the world was Ireland"', *The Sociological Review*, 59:1 (2011), 24-47.

Wadoski, A., 'Framing civil life in Elizabethan Ireland: Bryskett, Spenser and The Discourse of Civill Life', *Renaissance Studies*, 30:3 (2015), 350-369.

Wall, W., 'Renaissance national husbandry: Gervase Markham and the publication of England', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 27:3 (1996), 767-785.

Walsh, M. K., *"Destruction by Peace": Hugh O'Neill after Kinsale* (Monaghan: Cumann Seanchas Ard Mhacha, 1986).

Walsham, A., *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Walter, J., 'Performative violence and the politics of violence in the 1641 depositions', in M. Ó Siochrú and J. Ohlmeyer (eds.), *Ireland: 1641 Contexts and Reactions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 134-152.

Walters, J., 'Human, All Too Human: Spenser and the Dangers of Irish Civilization', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual*, 30 (2015), 151-165.

Watson, K. L., *Insatiable Appetites: Imperial Encounters with Cannibals in the North Atlantic World* (New York: New York University Press, 2015).

Watt, J. A., 'The Anglo-Irish colony under strain, 1327-99', in A. Cosgrove (ed.), *A New History of Ireland: Medieval Ireland,* Vol. II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 352-396.

Welch, R., *The Concise Oxford Companion to Irish Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

White, S., *A Cold Welcome: The Little Ice Age and Europe's Encounter with North America* (London: Harvard University Press, 2017).

Wilby, E., 'The witch's familiar and the fairy in early modern England and Scotland', *Folklore*, 111:2 (2000), 283-306.

Wiseman, S., *Writing Metamorphosis in the English Renaissance, 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Withington, P., *Society in Early Modern England: The Vernacular Origins of Some Powerful Ideas* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010).

Withington, P., 'Plantation and civil society', in É. Ó Ciardha and M. Ó Siochrú (eds.), *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012), 55-77.

Woodward, D., 'Straw, Bracken and the Wicklow Whale: The Exploitation of Natural Resources in England Since 1500', *Past & Present*, 159 (1998), 43-76.

Wordie, J. R., 'The Chronology of English Enclosure, 1500-1914', *The Economic History Review*, 36:4 (1983), 483-505.

Wright, E., ‘Kett’s Rebellion (July–August 1549)’, in E. Wright (ed.), *A Dictionary of World History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 101.

Wrightson, K., *English Society 1580-1680* (London: Hutchinson & Co., (Publishers) Ltd, 1982).

Young, J., ‘The Scottish Covenanters and the drive for a godly society 1639-1651’, *Recherches anglaises et nord-américaines*, 40 (2007), 25-35.

Zhang, D. D., Lee, H. F., Wang, C., Li, Q., Pei, Q., Zhang, J., and An, Y., ‘The causality analysis of climate change and large-scale human crisis’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 108:42 (2011), 17296-17301.