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Early modern Ireland is one of the most dynamic literary and political spaces in Renaissance Europe. It is the site of vibrant writing in English, Irish and Latin, and of translation from Latin, Spanish and Italian into English and Irish. While it has received extensive critical attention from historicists, cultural materialists, feminists and new-British historians over the past three decades, their focus has been the colonial context of the English Renaissance (and writers like Edmund Spenser) rather than the Gaelic and Old English cultures and communities thrown into crisis by the Tudor conquest (ignoring, thereby, writers like, say, Eochaidh Ó hEoghsa or Richard Stanihurst). MACMORRIS is a digital-humanities project designed to correct that lopsided focus by mapping cultural activity across the island in all languages. Working in an interdisciplinary and comparative framework, it will identify every significant cultural figure working in Ireland between, roughly, 1569 and 1641 and trace their nodal points and networks.

Digital humanities
What Ish My Network? Introducing MACMORRIS: Digitising Cultural Activity and Collaborative Networks in Early Modern Ireland

1. Enter MACMORRIS…

Early modern Ireland is rarely at the centre of its own story. Those who viewed it from afar saw double – which, in practice, meant seeing very little at all. In the breathtaking imperial cosmography that provides one of the centrepieces of Ercilla y Zuñiga’s *La Araucana*, the Spanish epic of the conquest of Chile, the wizard Fitón leads the narrator into a grotto vaulted by a crystal *orbuculum*. The magus takes the poet by the hand and, in the ‘milagroso globo’, ‘the wondrous orb’, Ercilla sees the earth, as though from space, ‘en su forma real y verdadera’, ‘in its real and true form’ (Ercilla, 1979, Canto 26, 50.7, 51.8). In the crystal ball which this ‘gran poma lucida’, ‘great lucent globe’, effectively provides, Ercilla’s patron,
Philip II, can scry a panorama of global empire (26.52.2). The spinning ‘poma’ offers to his purview, successively, India, Cathay, the Moluccas, Tamburlaine’s steppes, Mesopotamia, Libya, Sicily, Italy and France. Then ‘the islands’—what are we to call them?1—swim into view: ‘Ingalaterra, Escocia, Hibernia, Irlanda’, ‘England, Scotland, Hibernia, Ireland’ (27.26.8). The duplication of ‘Ireland and Ireland’ is less a case of ‘so good they named it twice’, more a salutary reminder of just how far out on the prismatic margins of Renaissance Europe Ireland actually lay. It is that very liminality which Miguel de Cervantes seized upon when, reproducing Ercilla’s binocular vision, he introduces Mauricio, the benign magus of his late romance, Persiles y Sigismunda, as an aristocratic exile from ‘las provincias de Hibernia y de Irlanda’, ‘the provinces of Hibernia and Ireland’ (Cervantes, 2003, p. 212; italics mine). The duplication that cleaves ‘Hibernia’ from ‘Irlanda’ opens up a space for the imagination—Mauricio becomes the spokesperson for Tasso’s notion of the ‘legitimate marvellous’ in the novel—even as it spins Ireland/Hibernia off into the misty regions of septentrional romance.2

Meanwhile, those who saw Ireland from closer up had difficulties of a different kind in seeing it whole. For the Elizabethan colonist, Ireland seems to float in the same ontological state of unfixity as the ‘wandring Islands’ descried by Guyon as he sailed for the Bower of Bliss; it was a ‘stragling plot’3 (in both senses of the word) that seemed strangely unanchored epistemologically. Fynes Moryson’s sceptical identification of Ireland as ‘this famous Island in the Virginian Sea’ relocated it to the Ultima Thule of colonial fantasy (Moryson, 1907–1908, 4:185).4 Richard Bingham declared Ireland to be ‘no other than a Tartarian waste’ (CSPI 1596–97, p. 162). While Bingham shifted the country eastward, Spenser’s Irenius displaced an oriental population westward by insisting that many Irish customs were ‘proper Scythian’ (Spenser, 1997, p. 61). The opacity of Ireland to the newcomers’ gaze, the
blockages put in place by their illusions of linguistic and cultural superiority, produced not so much a double vision as a recurring pattern of blanks and distortions (Palmer, 2001 & 2010a). Ireland is Renaissance Europe’s antipode, the place where its dark energies get released and creativity manifests itself only as destruction. It is ‘where truly learning goes very bare’ (Sidney, 1994, p. 103), where horse and gun-carriage sink up to belly and shaft in quagmire. It is home to the ‘saluage man’ and the ‘theeues and Brigants bad’ of The Faerie Queene (6.4.2.2, 6.10.40.7). It is where ‘calliots and drudges’, grinding ‘very naked, and beastly’ at the quern, powder themselves ghost-white with flour (Gainsford, 1618, p. 148); it is where lactating mothers toss heavy dugs over their shoulders, and run, feeding their suckling young on the hoof (Moryson, 1998, p. 105. It is a Hibernia that knows only winter; it is the land of Ire; it is the ‘Sacra Insula’ where ‘sacra’ means ‘accursed’ and nothing else (Maley, 1997, p. 18 & Spenser, 1997, p. 174).

Literary historians who come to Ireland via such variously astigmatic views need to ask what they hope to find there. Does their disciplinary allegiance to English literature license them to stay within the capsule of hostile colonial perceptions? By anatomising colonial anathemas and showing the workings of vituperation and stereotyping, can we really gain insights into native society? Can our understanding of Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland be advanced by applying literary forensics to, say, John Bale’s euphuistic invective or Barnaby Rich’s rambunctious bile? Suspicious reading can, of course, scrape away the distortions but, with the invective peeled back, can we then see sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Ireland clearly and on its own terms? Or is the ‘early modern Ireland’ of Renaissance Studies just a postulate, a heuristic construct that emerges from plunging into the deliciously transgressive energies of violence and imperial desire? Since the 1980s, the English writing of Ireland has attracted some of the most exciting political and historicist criticism in Renaissance English.
It can be argued, however, that we know more about the Ireland of sixteenth-century colonial fantasy (a false-Ireland that looks more like Irena – or false-Una – than Éire), than we know about the cultural realities of the country’s Gaelic and Old English inhabitants (Palmer, 2006).

In a sense, this is unsurprising. Critics come to Ireland, largely, in search of something – somewhere – else. So, for example, early modern Ireland has become a destination of choice for those interested in the formative phase of English colonial expansion. They take their lead from the historian, Nicholas Canny, whose study of sixteenth-century Ireland as the laboratory of English imperialism, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established*, itself established a pattern. Canny’s scholarship and Atlanticist perspective ghosts the postcolonial turn of subsequent critics who adopted – and adapted – his framework with élan.6 New Historicists and Cultural Materialists, keen to prise open the canon of English literature to political re-evaluation, used the Tudor conquest of Ireland to challenge the ever-recrudesceing myth that literature is ‘timeless, mythic, mysterious’.7 Focusing on a limited corpus of canonical works written in or reflecting on Ireland (*The Faerie Queene*, *Henry V*), supplemented by star-turn polemicists like Barnaby Rich and Fynes Moryson, the primary interest of such work is not Ireland or the Irish but ‘how English writers in the Renaissance perceived Ireland’ (Murphy, 1999, p. 9).8 The Gaelic Irish have the fact that they were misrepresented by unsympathetic and ill-informed soldiers and land-grabbers to thank for their resultant and highly conditional place in the limelight: they find themselves dragged along to the Renaissance party mantled up as ‘proximate Others [and] imperfect aliens’ (Murphy, 1999, p. 7). Institutionalised as the negative term in what Willy Maley calls the ‘stultifying binarism’ of a discourse of difference (Maley, 1989, p. 293), early modern Ireland becomes a pedagogical teething-ring where undergraduates cut their teeth on notions of
'otherness’ without anyone having to fret – Ireland being Ireland after all – about just how fine the line between critiquing racist stereotypes and indulging them really is. Such representations may not have anything very profound to tell us about Ireland but they do fix it in the minds of everyone who has as much as written a first-year essay on Henry V as a bricolage of glibs, brogues (in both senses of the word) saffron shirts and bareback-riding dart-throwers. Ireland earns its inclusion in the story only as the damp and boggy locus of English self-fashioning and identity formation. Christopher Highley lets the cat out of the hermeneutic bag when he remarks that Ireland is ‘a place seen as a wild backwater by sixteenth-century observers and modern critics alike’ (Highley, 1997).9

In this way, early modern Ireland became an annex to somebody else’s story. It was displaced to the west by New Historicists who, by looking ‘perspectively’, saw not ‘cities turned into a maid’ but Ireland turned into early colonial America.10 Towed back to Moryson’s ‘Virginian Sea’, Spenser’s ‘Irish question’ could easily be magicked into becoming an ‘American question’ (Reid, 2000, p. 86). Shifting it in the opposite direction, New British history re-inscribed Ireland in a narrative which sacrificed Irish specificity to the tendentious concept of ‘Britishness’. At the same time, by seeing ‘early modern history as a dialectic or dialogue between centres and margins… core and periphery’ (Baker & Maley, 2002, p. 1) it relaunched another binary which left Ireland, once again, as the subordinate term. Peripheralised, it became, in the terminology of Michael Hechter’s ‘internal-colonialism’ thesis, a ‘fringe’ (Hechter, 1975).11 If fringes – those ‘shagge rugge mantles purfled with a deepe Fringe of diuerse colours’ – had once provided a sartorial index of Irish marginality, Ireland’s status as a ‘Celtic fringe’ was equally marginalising.12 Peripheral to the various critical discourses which had built up around it, its status as a cipher for ‘otherness’ threatened to turn ‘early modern Ireland’ into an abstract concept, part early modern
projection, part contemporary theoretical construct. Unanchored to the realities of Gaelic or
Old English life, therefore, it became a purely discursive entity, a singularly dystopian eu-
topia (in the sense of non lieu) available for postmodern play. It became a site of
‘slipperiness’, ‘elisions’, silences and lacunae, a place where boundaries got blurred and
identity (invariably ‘hybrid’ and ‘unstable’) dissolved (Jones & Stallybrass, 1992, 165;
Hopkins, 1997, p. 16). Ireland becomes ‘an absent presence’, either ‘a crucial symbolic place
in the formation of emergent English notions of nationhood, empire, and cultural self-
understanding’ or (in a reversal that cancelled nothing) a place of ‘symbolic emptiness’
(Highley, 1997, 2, 64; McLeod, 1999, p. 54). (Peculiarly enough, it’s not just Early Modern
Studies that overlooks Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland. The phantom status of both in
Renaissance scholarship is oddly replicated even in Irish Studies which positions itself on the
far side of the nineteenth-century linguistic and cultural watershed. Focusing on writing in
English from the Famine onwards, the only Renaissance that interests Irish Studies as
currently constituted is the Irish Literary Renaissance.)

Of course, what I’m describing is a very discipline-specific problem. Historians offer the
fine-grained detail from which an informed understanding of Ireland in all its complexity can
emerge. As far as Gaelic scholarship goes, there is a surreal imbalance between the global
and almost industrial scale of work devoted to the smattering of English texts with an Irish
subtext and the handful of resilient scholars toiling amid the vast riches of an often unedited
and scarcely touched repository of poetry and prose in the Irish language.13 Similarly, the
long neglected field of late-mediaeval and early modern archaeology is now producing
transformative evidence about the material reality of Gaelic Ireland.14 Literary-historical
scholarship that takes its bearings from Ireland rather than elsewhere is starting to emerge.15
Still, the seemingly unstoppable – one might say alarming – hegemony of English within the
Arts and Humanities and the corresponding decline in language departments (and, by extension, Comparative Literature) means that the discipline is disproportionately influential in setting the scholarly agenda, not least when it comes to early modern Ireland. To re-centre the narrative and reposition early modern Ireland at the heart of its own story, we’re going to have to do some rebalancing. That means situating the New English and their representations in the wider context of the complex society that predated their arrival and was reconfigured by their arrival. It means reinstating the full insular cast and allowing the Gaelic Irish and Old English to tell their own stories, in their own words (and in their own languages). That, of course, requires an interdisciplinary, multilingual and comparative framework. It requires engaging meaningfully with the work of Gaelic scholars and involving them in the enterprise. And it means restoring a vital, continental European dimension to proceedings. In practice, what David Baker, Willy Maley and I are proposing is a major digital humanities project that maps significant cultural figures (of whatever ethnicity) writing in or engaging with Gaelic, English, Latin, Scots, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese and Dutch, in late sixteenth and early seventeenth century Ireland. Grounded in Ireland and in the belief that we need a much fuller picture of all its actors, native and newcomer, it starts on the ground, identifying not only these figures but, as far as possible, locating where they operated. The project is founded on the belief that, for example, it matters that Spenser’s castle was much closer to the Ó Caomh lordship (where Aonghus Ó Dálaigh Fionn, sometime ollamh to Domhnall Mac Carthaigh Mór wrote) than it was to Lodowick Bryskett’s or Walter Ralegh’s; that it matters that the same Aonghus Ó Dálaigh Fionn wrote elegies and religious poetry which drew on the same continental romance motifs that feature in The Faerie Queene; that it matters that Ó Dálaigh ran the bardic school where Fear Feasa Ón Cháinte learned his craft – the same Fear Feasa Ón Cháinte whose patron, Fínghin Mac Carthaigh Riabhach, wrote a now lost ‘Chronicle of Ireland’ while imprisoned in the Tower of London alongside Ralegh; and that Mac Carthaigh...
had been consigned to the Tower by Sir George Carew, himself the translator of Ercilla y Zúñiga’s *La Araucana* and the patron of the Ó Dálaigh poets of Mhuintir Bháire…

That cat’s cradle of connections all looks much clearer when it is digitally mapped out as a complex, intersecting network of contacts and writings between and across languages and ethnicities (including not just interpersonal connections but intertextual ones, such as the romance motifs which Spenser and Ó Dálaigh shared, all unbeknownst to one another). What emerges from the process of mapping that we’re suggesting is an extraordinarily vibrant island where creativity and destruction intersect, where Gaelic culture undergoes a renaissance of its own even as it confronts a threat to its very survival; where Old English writers, finding their ‘Englishness’ undermined by the (Protestant and colonising) incomers and the new realities they set in motion, write their way into a complex realignment with their Gaelic co-religionists; where the New English rewrite everything with their swords more than with their words. Ireland is not so much the dark side of the Renaissance as a place where the Renaissance’s dark side gets played out. If England is, right now, reliving its Renaissance as Brexit – once more, the break with Europe and, in some quarters, the demonisation of its citizens; once more, a John-of-Gaunt nationalism; once more, the freebooting mercantilism and the reorientation to America – Ireland needs to remember another time of complexity and upheaval where painful adjustments on the island also produced new alignments not just between Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England but with Europe and a wider world.

And so, a name for the project… If Shakespeare and subsequent criticism has been singularly disinclined to answer MacMorris’s incandescent question, ‘What ish my nation?’, we signal our intention to rise to that challenge by naming it MACMORRIS (Mapping Actors and Contexts: Modelling Research in Renaissance Ireland in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth
Centuries). In doing so, we also offer a nod to Mauricio, Cervantes’s exiled Hibernian magus, the rigorous Aristotelian who sifts fantasy from reality and, in the end, yearns to ‘verme en mi patria’, to see himself in his own country – and who is last heard of leaving it once more, in search of ease (Cervantes, 2003, p. 326).  

Patricia Palmer

2. MACMORRIS: A Virtual Ireland?

Ireland has often been virtual, at least for those not native to it. In his treatise, A View of the Present State of Ireland (1596), Edmund Spenser attests that

I do herein rely upon those Bardes or Irish Chroniclers, though the Irish themselves through their ignorance in matters of learning and deepe judgement, doe most constantly beleeve and avouch them, but unto them besides I adde mine own reading; and out of them both together, with comparison of times, likewise of manners and customes, affinity of words and names…and many other circumstances, I doe gather a likelihood of truth, not certainly affirming any thing…I doe hunt out a probability of things, which I leave to your judgement to believe or refuse.

Deftly, Spenser invites the ‘Bardes or Irish Chroniclers’ into the account he offers of his adopted kingdom, while at the same time consigning whatever they might have to say to ‘ignorance’, at least in ‘matters of learning’. The Ireland that he is assembling on the pages before us, he gives us to understand, is his Ireland, and ours, too, as our joint ‘reading’ follows the tracks of ‘probability’, not to Ireland itself, and certainly not to Ireland as the Irish conceive it, but to an artifact, a ‘thing’ we know to be artifact. (Virtual: ‘being such in
essence or effect though not formally recognized or admitted’. Spenser was hardly the first interloper to conjure up his own Ireland, though the subtlety with which he does it is notable. And he was certainly not the last. This --what we might call the ‘early modern Ireland without the Irish problem’ – is, as Patricia Palmer points out here, especially debilitating for critics of early modern English culture and literature in this period, though, as we would expect, it is much less so for historians and scholars of Irish culture and literature. Elsewhere, I’ve argued that it was an inability (an unwillingness?) to integrate non-English ‘circumstances’ into its readings that vitiated the ‘New British History,’ and left it at an ‘impasse’. But perhaps this was inevitable. The ‘New British History’ came to a stop at a hard border, the one that still separates the early modern texts that figure Ireland in English, such as Spenser’s View, or his Faerie Queene, from the ‘vast riches of an often unedited and almost untouched repository of poetry and prose in the Irish language’. Today, as in Spenser’s day, the questions are: who is reading whom, and how, and what is being consigned to ‘ignorance,’ especially in ‘matters of learning’?

MACMORRIS is intended, not as a way ‘out’ of this problem, since, as we will see, the problems of ‘reading’ early modern Ireland today are constitutive to it, and they cannot be resolved simply by adding ‘more’: more Gaelic texts, more Irish history, more of everything Irish. But it is meant as a way, if not ‘around’ that hard border, then a way of crossing it, repeatedly, and as often as possible. My collaborators and coauthors here, Palmer and Willy Maley, and I are proposing a web application devoted to early modern Ireland. As Palmer has noted, MACMORRIS is an acronym, though an inexact one, for ‘Mapping Actors and Contexts: Modelling Research in Renaissance Ireland in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’ (it will come as no surprise that we came up with the acronym first, and then added the phrasing). One key feature of MACMORRIS will be a roster of names, historical
figures who were either Irish or associated with Ireland. At this point, we are working with several datasets; these include figures ranging all the way from the early sixteenth to the early eighteenth century. We intend MACMORRIS to focus, however, on a more defined period: from the First Desmond Rebellion in 1569 to the Irish Rebellion of 1641. This web application will be bilingual, appearing in both English and Irish and it will, we hope, be accessible to and appeal to online users of many sorts and in many places. If the problem of the hard border between English and Irish representations of early modern Ireland is mostly disciplinary, then MACMORRIS is meant as a site where scholars can meet. MACMORRIS will take a linked data approach, sharing its content and datasets freely and linking to other websites, including those devoted to the Irish history of this and other periods. And we’re considering how to involve practitioners from all of the disciplines that are devoted to the study of Ireland’s past. One approach would be to create a tiered system of users: casual users would have access to the whole site, while scholars could contribute to it as well, adding material, editing and annotating texts, and updating the database. But we believe that non-scholars can get into the conversation, too. We think of MACMORRIS as having several compatible audiences: experts in a number of fields, including both English and Irish history, language, literature, and culture in the period, apprentice scholars, and then also students at the secondary and tertiary levels. For all of these audiences, we anticipate that MACMORRIS will provide access to early modern poetry and prose in the Irish language, either by linking to the archives that are now coming online, or by caching some of this material, select bardic poems, for instance, on the site itself.21

Accommodating these various audiences will be a matter of design. We’re guided by certain larger ambitions. Some of the features we mean to include are standard for any project of historical recovery: images of early modern Ireland, accessibly written essays on its history
and its culture, and so on. We will also include maps, of course, but these maps will make arguments of their own. Our ‘plat’ of County Cork will locate Spenser’s tower house at Kilcolman, as you would expect, but the castles of his neighbors as well—Castle Pook, for example. This contiguity makes a point: it suggests the influences (political, cultural, even literary) that may have flowed, however circuitously, among Irish and English places. And we’ll plot the locations of bardic schools and the peregrinations of bards as they move from patron to patron. Currently, we’re assembling geo-coordinates for such locations. Besides these maps, what we’re calling ‘breakout sections’ will enable users to click through to an in-depth treatment of the various topics. The Ó Dálaigh bardic family, for instance, might be delineated in its various branches, complete with family trees and an annotated map of its domain. And, in addition to these features, we want MACMORRIS to provide a digital reconstruction of the social networks that were in place in and around early modern Ireland.

Some readers will be familiar with the wittily named website *Six Degrees of Francis Bacon* (SDFB). Using data scraped from the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (ODNB), it models and visualizes connections among 18,000 plus figures in early modern ‘Britain’. SDFB stands out as an example of publicly available social network analysis, and MACMORRIS hopes to emulate it. A site such as SDFB maps the links among figures not according to their geographical proximity, but their social connectivity. This works particularly well for correspondence networks, patronage relationships, circles of intellectual influence, and the like. It is history in a new optic: you can see who knows whom—and, just as significantly, who doesn’t.

In these ways, we’re trying to counter a longstanding problem—the sequestration of early modern Ireland’s history and culture behind disciplinary boundaries—with a newly available solution: the internet and the digital tools that allow us to construct an online space and
configure it at will. That is, to pick up Palmer’s point, if, right now, early modern Ireland exists for many as a simulacrum, a ‘purely discursive entity’ that mostly floats free from the ‘realities of Gaelic or Old English life,’ then what we mean to do is to build…another simulacrum, but one that is more tethered to those realities and the ‘plurality and complexity’ of this early modern kingdom (colony? nation? contact zone?). It goes without saying that this is in itself a debatable enterprise. Unmediated access to early modern Ireland is not what MACMORRIS promises, and not what it can deliver. Nor is that where the advantage of a web application such as this one lies. MACMORRIS is virtual, true. (Virtual: ‘being on or simulated on a computer or computer network…a: occurring or existing primarily online…b: of, relating to, or existing within a virtual reality.’) But if this is to be a virtual Ireland, then, aspirationally, at least, it will not be one that is bent entirely to the perspectives of myopic or astigmatic views, nor will it be mostly evacuated of the particularity and diversity of Ireland, the actual conflicted territory in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

One way to avoid tunnel vision, of course, is to add in the Irish ‘circumstances’ that more blinkered views leave out. Indeed, this is perhaps the most important contribution that MACMORRIS can make. Besides giving online users some feel for the texture of everyday existence on the island, MACMORRIS will assemble, on a single (virtual) Irish terrain, representations of some of the people who lived in the kingdom, and it will try to do justice to their loyalties, informing beliefs, and conflicts, the stuff of their lives. The more figures who populate this space, the better. But the deeper commitment has to be to what Palmer calls ‘complexity’. This entails not simply positioning these figures inertly in relation to one another, and not just providing information (however welcome) on them, but conveying, as much as possible, the real dynamism of the early modern Irish scene. Ireland in this day was a place where factions and faiths, languages and literatures met, sometimes meshing.
sometimes clashing. A static early modern Ireland is…well, not early modern Ireland, virtual or not. How, though, to put this across?

The way forward, we take it, is not to duck the questions that make this enterprise problematic, but to embrace them, in fact, to turn them into (dis)organizing principles. Take the matter of who is to be represented in this web application. Right now, at its core, MACMORRIS exists as a relational database. In its most highly curated form, it includes the names of 338 people associated with Ireland in the early modern period. If English, they were present in Ireland for some time, either as administrators, combatants, travelers, or settlers, or they had strong ties to the island, usually through their families or patronage relationships.

Each figure has a unique identifier. Each is tagged according to ethnicity – Gaelic, Old English, or New English, with a smattering of Welsh, Scots, Dutch, Spaniards, Italians and others – and each according to gender, religion, occupation, and language(s) spoken. Each is assigned a lifespan, sometimes by conjecture. The names on this list were assembled (in this case by Maley) from the ODNB, with additional data provided by the Bardic Database. The attributes we’ve assigned to each name are based on the information provided there. Some of our figures are not only tagged, but linked to other figures by relations of patronage. These conjoined figures make up sub-groups within the larger dataset, and, by applying basic network analysis, we’ve begun to trace out skeins of association within and among them.

Often, these linkages extend in surprising directions. For example, a patron, whether English or Irish, will sometimes be found to have patronees in multiple ethnic and/or religious camps, or vice versa. At least initially, early modern Irish ‘communities’ turn out to be more porous and more interwoven than we might think. These analyses are still rudimentary and are certainly not conclusive at this scale. But they tell us something about the work that can be done with a dataset such as we have in MACMORRIS. This work depends, unavoidably, on
prior research, in our case the monumental labors that brought the Dictionary of National Biography (as it was then) into being in 1885 and that have sustained it ever since. But this research, with some digital transposition, can drive yet more research, and in new directions. By using digital tools to investigate the MACMORRIS dataset, we can detect the affiliations or antagonisms, sometimes explicit, sometimes tacit, that bound the inhabitants of early modern Ireland together or split them apart.

By the same token, however, MACMORRIS cannot escape the problems attendant on its sources. If a dataset is derived from an already existing archive, then the limits of the archive will be the limits of the dataset. It’s well known, for instance, that the ODNB doesn’t include as many women as might be expected, and a web application that relies solely on it, MACMORRIS included, will have the same difficulty. Certainly, SDFB does. As Craig A. Berry has remarked, ‘Perhaps the most glaringly skewed aspect of [this website]…arises from the gender bias in the written record, a bias that has been amplified by the gender bias in most periods of historical research, and finally amplified even further by the data mining methods used to identify relationships’. To their great credit, the creators of SDFB have recognized this challenge and have not only formed a ‘working group to address gender bias in the data set’, but recently held a ‘Networking Women Add-a-thon’ to counter it. When it comes to ethnic identity, the issues are similar, as are the limitations of the ODNB. Gaelic and Irish figures are not absent from it, by any means, but they are also not present in the numbers that a project such as MACMORRIS will require. The largest category represented in our dataset right now is the ‘New English’, a category complicated in Maley’s account that follows; their total stands at 135. When you add the English – that is, English figures with dealings in Ireland but no long-term presence – you get the biggest category by far: 166. This is larger than the two categories of indigenous Irish, Old English and Gaels, combined.
Together, those groups come to 146. (And women number ten.) My collaborators and I understand that it is imperative that we expand MACMORRIS’ dataset beyond the ODNB, that we bring in data from other sources. We are pleased to say, therefore, that we are now working to incorporate data from two new datasets, the first generously provided by the team at SDFB and the second by the Dictionary of Irish Biography. Amalgamating these datasets, assimilating them one to another, and cleaning this data will be our next tasks. Depending on the historical parameters we establish for our dataset, and on other factors, we estimate an eventual total of about 2,400 figures, with the possibility of a great many more, perhaps in a larger, somewhat less curated dataset. The dataset of MACMORRIS will never qualify as “big data,” but it can only get bigger, and it is.

Inclusivity, then, is a paramount goal. But it’s important to be clear on this: inclusivity, in and of itself, can only take you so far. Certainly, it can’t eliminate the biases that go into a project such as this, since biases of a kind will be intrinsic to it. Data will be selected by some criteria, with some governing notion of relevance in mind. Rather, it’s crucial to have the right biases, in this case, towards the languages, people, and literatures that were native to the island in the early modern period, as well as those that were ‘naturalized’ there. What MACMORRIS will be able to convey, we hope, is the tense relationality of the figures included in the data set, no matter what their ethnicity or religion, or how they came to be in early modern Ireland, whether as lifelong inhabitants, invaders, travelers, or settlers. It’s the encounter of these early modern people that we want to portray, and not just their conflicts, but also the inevitable negotiations, compromises, shifting alliances, and betrayals that occurred among them. “Relationality” in early modern Ireland, as we understand it, plays out along three axes: as location, it distributes early modern actors in geographical space, and connects them, whether they are contiguous or not. As interaction it brings these actors
together in a (contested) social space, and, again, connects them, whether their relations are
direct or mediated, amicable or hostile. As change it links these actors in a temporal space;
they are included in an overarching story, however that story turns out for them. For some, as
we know, the story of this period turns out well; for others it most assuredly does not. The
overall ambition of MACMORRIS is to tell the narrative, online, of a cataclysmic change: the
erosion, and then the collapse of traditional Gaelic governance and culture under the
pressures of Elizabethan and Jacobean colonialism. Rupture, struggle, and discontinuity have
to be part of it, as well as the accommodations by which the people on this island in this
period were able, however temporarily and provisionally, to manage these schisms.
MACMORRIS is an attempt to catch this slow-motion collapse in the act, to model
(virtually) a disaster.

It turns out, then, that Spenser was right about some things and wrong about others.
‘[G]ather[ing] a likelihood of truth’, and ‘not certainly affirming anything’, is in fact as far as
any project of historical reconstruction, digital or otherwise, is likely to go. But the
organizing move of his historiography, by which he seizes upon the works of ‘Bardes or Irish
Chroniclers’, while dismissing their ‘views’, is just the move that MACMORRIS hopes to
counter. As Spenser says, the question is one of ‘reading’, broadly conceived. ‘Suspicious
reading can…scrape away the distortions’ that are often projected onto early modern Ireland,
as Palmer remarks. And inclusive ‘reading’ can restore some of the Irish ‘manners and
customes…words and names…and many other circumstances’ that Spenser and others before
and after him elided. ‘Ignorance’ takes many forms, and some of them can be remedied.
‘[B]ut’, Palmer asks, ‘with the invective peeled back, can we…see sixteenth- and early
seventeenth-century Ireland whole and on its own terms?’ By asking this, she captures the
ambition of MACMORRIS, the ‘probability of things’ towards which it inclines.
3. The ‘New English’: A Complicated Category

If Cervantes’s exiled Hibernian magus yearns to see himself in his own country then what of those so-called ‘New English’ settlers in early modern Ireland? How did they see that country, themselves, and others? And just how ‘New’ and ‘English’ were they? If we take a small sample of our current ‘New English’ figures for MACMORRIS, what do they tell us about the diversity of settlement, both in terms of identity and duration of stay? It depends on how we look, and the vantage point we’re looking from. Here I want to suggest that ‘New English’ networks were more nuanced than has been acknowledged. I do so by extending our ‘binocular vision’ in order to see ‘Double Dutch’. In 1653, Dutch physician Arnold Boate reprinted Elizabethan inventor Hugh Plat’s pioneering encyclopedia, _The Jewel House of Art and Nature_, first published in 1594, adding his own appendix on minerals. One of Plat’s gems is his scaffolding glasses:

*How a man may walk safely upon a high scaffold or piece of Timber, without danger of falling.*

This is easily performed by wearing of a pair of spectacles, whose sights must be made so gross, as that he which weareth them may not discern any thing a far off, but at hand onely. For it is the sight onely of the steepnesse of the place, that bringeth the fear and overturneth the brain. By this means I have heard that the English man which displayed an ancient upon a scaffold near the top of the pinacle of Pauls steeple, did help himself in his desperate attempt.
Plat’s steeplejack spectacles offer a good metaphor for the series of close-ups that follow, part of a much larger canvas that seeks to demonstrate how Irish networks extended across the continent. It also affords an opportunity for seeing double, double Dutch, in this case. Let’s begin with Arnold Boate (1606–1653), ‘biblical scholar and writer on natural history’. Arnold was one of two Dutch brothers who, upon graduating in medicine at the University of Leiden, moved together to London in 1630, where Gerard (1604–1650), the elder brother, served as physician to Charles I, and, separately, on to Dublin in the 1630s and 1640s, where they each landed, years apart in Ireland at a time of transformation. Arnold arrived there in 1636 and served as physician to two viceroy, Robert Sidney (1595-1677) and Thomas Wentworth (1593-1641), as well as James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh (1581-1656), eventually becoming surgeon-general. Gerard, having been appointed physician to the army in Ireland in 1649, died shortly after his arrival there in 1650. Selected correspondence between Arnold Boate and James Ussher is published in Richard Parr’s 1686 biography of Ussher, focusing on the years 1642 to 1655, with three hundred letters from the Archbishop’s archive. The six letters from Boate – dated Dublin 15 November 1639 through to Paris 29 November 1651 – and three replies from Ussher concern the trade and traffic in books, and the transcription or translation of particular passages. In March 1651 Arnold thanks Ussher for a copy of his Latin work *Annals of the World* (1650) and reports on theological debates involving ‘some Irish-men here’. Arnold’s letters to Ussher can instructively be set alongside another correspondence, published as a short text – less than six pages – containing letters from one brother to another between 26th April and 11th May 1642, Arnold writing from Ireland to Gerard in London. Published as *A remonstrance of divers remarkable passages and proceedings of our army in*
the kingdome of Ireland, this is the groundwork for the research by the brothers that follows. In this short ‘extract’ can be found the seeds of Irelands Natural History.\footnote{Arnold’s name appears in 1643 as part of long list of signatures appended to ‘a petition of the well-affected nobility and gentry of the realm of Ireland who have suffered under the bloody rebels there’.\footnote{It is the petitioners’ hope:

That the losses of Your Protestant Subjects may be repaired in such manner, and measure as Your Majesty in Your Princely Wisdome shall thinke fit. And that this Kingdom may be so setled, as that your said Protestant Subjects may hereafter live therein under the happy government of Your Majesty and Your Royall posterity with comfort and security.\footnote{The Boates are exemplary figures whose significance can only be understood when they are viewed within the larger context that MACMORRIS affords us. Their work and indeed their very existence complicates our perception of the ‘New English’ colonial community that emerged with Edmund Spenser’s contemporaries and morphed into the ‘Old Protestants’ of the mid-seventeenth century before segueing into the eighteenth-century Ascendancy. Each brother contributed in key ways to philosophical, religious and scientific debates through connections with the Boyle family and the ‘Invisible College’ and as part of the Irish branch of the Hartlib circle, those Baconian protestant improvers who were the seedbed of both the Royal Society and the Dublin Philosophical Society, and whose various members included Robert Child (1613–1654), John Durie (1596–1680), Myles Symner, William Petty (1623–1687), Robert Wood (1621/2–1685) and Benjamin Worsley (1617/18–1677).\footnote{}}}}
Gerard’s contribution came through the posthumously published *Irelands Naturall History* (1652), for which Arnold did the early spadework, and Arnold’s through, among other works, that augmented edition of Plat’s *The jewel house of art and nature*, and most poignantly a richly rendered memoir of the Irish wife he had married in 1642, entitled *The character of a trulie vertuous and pious woman as it hath been acted by Mistris Margaret Dungan* (Paris, 1651). Margaret was the daughter of a prominent member of the Dublin protestant gentry, Thomas Dungan (1590?–1663), justice of the court of common pleas at Dublin. Her older brother William died at Naseby fighting for Charles I. Margaret does not earn an entry in the *DNB* or the *DIB*, so her husband’s hagiography stands in substantially for an otherwise unnoticced life, and in fact ‘hagiography’ is unfair, because despite the pious nature of the portrayal there is medical detail and attention to reading habits that is rich and revealing.

Central to the bibliophilic Arnold’s depiction of Margaret is her facility with languages and love of literature, particularly romance:

> so since our comming to Paris she perfected herselfe in the french tongue in much lesse time, than what is usuall unto most others. And for the same reason she bore also a greate love to all other productions of wit, especiallie to good verses and poemes, and to elegant well contrived Romants, or fained histories, such as Sidneys Arcadia.

The Boates – Arnold, Gerard, and Margaret too – demonstrate the ‘hubs and spokes’ nature of MACMORRIS. These three figures offer insights into the workings of colonialism, landscape, ecocriticism, the limits of archipelagic history, early modern reading circles, and the impact of Dutch intellectual culture on English colonial theory and practice. Arnold published *An interrogatory relating more particularly to the husbandry and naturall history*...
of Ireland as an appendix to the second edition of *Samuel Hartlib his legacie* (London, 1652), making him a pioneer in posting the first ‘English’ research questionnaire.\(^{42}\) As noted above, the brothers are known chiefly through *Ireland's Naturall History*, attributed to Gerard, with preliminary fieldwork carried out by Arnold. This work was completed before Gerard ever went to Ireland, and published two years after his death there. One historian of climate change calls it ‘essentially a manual for colonial management’.\(^{43}\) There are two chapters on bogs in *Ireland's Naturall History*, including one on the ‘Originall of the Bogs in Ireland; and the manner of Draining them practiced there by the English inhabitants’.\(^{44}\) Ireland’s wetness was an issue for colonists, especially those interested in how cultivation and deforestation could affect the weather. This is crucial for our understanding of climate change and illustrates the way in which our project links to other fields of study. As Brant Vogel notes in a recent essay on ‘Climate Change, Colonialism, and the Royal Society in the Seventeenth Century’, ‘the English ‘cult of improvement’ had already made climate changeability a commonplace notion in lands close to home’.\(^{45}\)

It’s not just people and human networks that are being mapped here but also the relevance of certain locations. When it comes to charting the intellectual culture of early modern Ireland that fed into the Hartlib circle and the Royal Society, Leiden matters as much as London as a key locus of learning, more perhaps, since from its founding in 1575 it was bound up with new learning and pioneering research in the Dutch colonies. William Petty was one of several key figures in early modern Ireland who studied medicine at Leiden in the wake of the Boates – others include Edmund Borlase (c.1620–1682), Robert Child, and Nathaniel Henshaw (bap. 1628, d. 1673). Richard Stanihurst (1547-1618) matriculated there in 1582 as a medical student. John Durie, who wrote the dedication to Boate’s *Naturall History* under Hartlib’s name, also studied there. According to Stan Mendyk:
It is significant that this university, and the Dutch in general, were now beginning to attempt the systematic natural history of their equatorial colonies. Fieldwork was carried out notably in Brazil (from 1637 to 1644) and the results were published. Such early research into natural phenomena had its effect on Boate and his work on Ireland was of a similar type.\(^46\)

The list of those who studies or served in Leiden is long. Josias Bodley (c.1550–1617), ‘soldier and military engineer’ forms a bridge between the Boates and the Boyles, who occupy the next section. Exeter-born Josias, son of a merchant and publisher John Bodley, is less celebrated than his older brother Thomas (1545–1613), founder of Oxford’s Bodleian Library. Josias fought at Leiden in 1586 under Leicester, before being sent to Ireland in 1598, where ‘he spent the remainder of his life and busy career there as soldier, engineer, surveyor, and map maker’, working as ‘trenchmaster-general’ and ‘chief engineer in the erection of siege forts at a stipend of 10s. per diem’.\(^47\) Skilled in siege warfare, including coastal fortification, Josias represents a further innovative strand of activity in Ireland. His expertise, alongside pioneers in architecture, husbandry, and mining, as well as poetics and translation, placed early modern Ireland at the leading-edge of knowledge exchange and impact across disciplines. Josias visited England in 1602, and according to his biographer: ‘It is likely that on that visit he donated a quadrant, an astronomical sphere, and other brass instruments, all signs of his mathematical and engineering skills, to the Bodleian Library in Oxford’.\(^48\) In Ireland, Josias worked with two Dutch engineers, Levan de Rosa and Joyes Everard, and was engaged in surveying for the Ulster plantation. Josias Bodley represents a crucial compass point on our map of early modern Ireland, a laboratory in which medical, scientific, military and in a very literal sense engineering frontiers were breached.
A circle is a ring, and another of Hugh Plat’s ingenious visual aids is ‘A perspective Ring that will discover all the Cards that are near him that weareth it on his finger’. This cheating device offers a neat metaphor for interdisciplinary study and a model of comparative analysis:

A Christal stone or glass of the bignes of a two-penny piece of silver, or thereabout, being the just half of a round ball or globe, and cut hollow within, having a good fyle sweetly conveyed within the concave superficies thereof, and the stone it self neatly polished within and without, wil give a lively representation to the eye of him that weareth it of all such cards as his companions that are next him do hold in their hands, especially if the owner thereof do take the upper end of the table for his place, and leaning now and then on his elbow, or stretching out his arm, do apply his Ring aptly for the purpose.49

This leads us to examine briefly an outbreak of Boyles, a dynasty of stirrers and shakers who shaped the intellectual culture of early modern Ireland. If we scratch the surface of the Boyles, beginning with Richard, first earl of Cork (1566–1643), landowner and administrator, we are immediately confronted with other dynasties, families, and networks. Richard Boyle married Geoffrey Fenton’s daughter Catherine in 1603, ‘making Fenton the grandfather of Robert Boyle and the dramatist Lord Orrery. Fenton’s advice on land grants and law helped Boyle to secure his position as the richest man in the British Isles’.50 Richard and Catherine’s offspring ripple out into a hugely influential shaping force in Anglo-Irish culture. Their marriages form what Toby Barnard calls a ‘thickening web of connections’.51 To take just a handful of their eleven children who survived into adulthood: Richard, first earl of Burlington
and second earl of Cork (1612–1698), ‘royalist army officer and politician’, Robert (1627–1691), natural philosopher, key figure in the Hartlib Circle, and founding figure in the Royal Society, and Roger, first earl of Orrery (1621–1679), politician and writer together with their sisters Katherine, later Katherine Jones, Viscountess Ranelagh (1615–1691), also a key figure within the Hartlib circle, and Mary, later Mary Rich, countess of Warwick (1624–1678), had a huge impact on literature, philosophy, politics, patronage and science in the latter half of the seventeenth century. And once we factor in John Boyle (1563–1620), Church of Ireland bishop of Cork, the earl of Cork’s elder brother, we can see the extent to which family ties play a part in the circles we are tracing. If we add two Boyle brothers who were cousins of the earl of Cork, Michael (1580?–1635), Church of Ireland bishop of Waterford and Lismore, and Richard (c.1574–1645), Church of Ireland archbishop of Tuam, we can see how kinship helped construct powerbases. Another Bishop Boyle, Roger (1617/18?–1687), Church of Ireland bishop of Clogher, may also be part of this extended clan Boyle.

Robert Boyle was one of two Irish-born founding members of the Royal Society, together with William Brouncker, second Viscount Brouncker of Lyons (1620–1684), ‘mathematician and first president of the Royal Society of London, born at Newcastle Lyons, co. Dublin’. Brouncker knew a thing or two about circles: ‘His most important contribution concerned the quadrature of the circle: Brouncker was the first to express the ratio of the area of a circle to the circumscribed square as an infinite continued fraction’. What Michael Hunter in his DNB entry on the ‘Founder members of the Royal Society’ calls ‘the foundational twelve’ also included another individual – William Petty – who had considerable experience in Ireland. Boyle and Brouncker were key players in the Irish wing of the Hartlib Circle – if circles have wings rather than rings.
We began with Hugh Plat’s prescription for mounting the scaffold without fear of falling, and invoked his cardsharp’s ring for spying on other players’ hands. Scaffolding glasses and reflective rings are not Plat’s only perspectival ploy, and nor are those steeplejack spectacles the only means to view St Paul’s in close-up, for Plat later alludes to a remarkable mirror that enables a room’s occupant to see into other chambers and even over rooftops: ‘So likewise it is possible by way of reflexion, for any man to behold in a looking glasse, and that also in his private study, all the gestures and actions whatsoever any person shall make or perform, in any room or corner of his house, as also to see in the bottom of his seller whatsoever is done on the top of Pauls steeple, or any other steeple within London, so as his dwelling be within the City, or the liberties thereof, or within any competent number of miles distant from the same’.\textsuperscript{53} MACMORRIS is just such a mirror, allowing the user to view a range of levels and locales rather than being limited to particular places and persons.

The ‘New English’, whatever their provenance or roots, set out to survey as well as settle, to experiment as well as exploit, to create as well as destroy. How exactly the innovations of early modern research communities depended on, drew on, and were driven by colonial design is a vast subject, entailing collective biography, depth bibliography, micro-history, interdisciplinary engagement and transdisciplinary collaboration, and for that, we’re going to need a bigger boat, which is where MACMORRIS comes in. Triangulating the \textit{ODNB} and other sources, it seeks to build groups and networks out of individuals and generate cultural conversations out of individual texts.\textsuperscript{54} Colin Matthew, the pioneering editor of the \textit{New DNB}, thought that ‘much of the interest of biography springs from the tension between individual characteristics and development and the family, social and class background to which such characteristics relate. Biographical research increasingly takes the form of books about groups of people’.\textsuperscript{55} It is groups that concern us, looked at in close-up, surveyed as
clusters and communities, and traced across generations and geographical space.\textsuperscript{56} In exploring the latticework of links, underground workings and intricate networks of early modern Ireland we are mindful of the groundwork that remains to be done. Arnold Boate served under Charles Coote in Ireland, and Coote, together with Richard Boyle, was heavily invested in ironworks there. Such industrial activity was tied to military endeavor.\textsuperscript{57} Macmorris, we recall, is one of four captains within a large and diverse army, whose assigned role is to undermine – to dig tunnels – even as he challenges efforts to undermine his own identity. The mine workings of MACMORRIS that David Baker, Patricia Palmer and myself are mapping out, likewise entail both excavation and contestation.

Willy Maley
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