***Domestic Materiality in Ireland, 1530-1730***

Over the past four decades, there has been a proliferation in historical studies of material culture. These include explorations of changing attitudes towards acquisition and ownership as well as the ways in which consumer goods were interpreted. This work was originally stimulated in the 1980s, when Neil McKendrick provocatively proclaimed a ‘consumer revolution’ in eighteenth-century Britain, leading to a surge in quantitative studies attempting to chart its development.[[1]](#footnote-1) In more recent years, however the trend has been towards studies that move beyond the enumeration of goods to explore the meaning attached to objects and practices. There are problems inherent in both approaches. Broad quantitative studies de-contextualise things and shed little light on the creative potential of belongings. On the other hand, micro-historical, semiotic studies can present an atypical and rarefied view of the cultural meaning of things. Such issues aside, however, there is little doubt that the intensive interest in consumption and its materiality, rooted in the use of previously neglected sources, and in the development of multidisciplinary approaches, has transformed our understanding of early modern society.

In Ireland, the study of material culture has been slow to interest historians. Until recently, work in this area was limited almost entirely to attempts to chart the development of specific expressions of Irish culture, focussing, in the ‘traditional’ historiographical manner, on production, rather than consumption, and providing little cultural context of the ‘meaning of things’ beyond their utility. There are a number of reasons for this lack of engagement with the post-production life of objects.

First, the dearth of appropriate source material, particularly for the earlier part of this period, is a significant issue. The poor survival, recovery and recording of the physical evidence, along with the shortage of documentary material, means that the scope for engagement is limited. That said, however, such sources as exist have not been fully exploited by historians. While, for instance, there may not be a sufficient number of surviving probate inventories or wills to generate macro-analytical studies of consumption patterns and the changing use of objects in Ireland, micro-analytical approaches are certainly possible, and have proven useful elsewhere. In an English context, for example, Elizabeth Salter analysed a small sample of early modern wills to investigate the social and cultural significance of ‘gifting strategies’ with regards to material culture, an approach with potential in Ireland.[[2]](#footnote-2) There has also been interesting work, by historical archaeologists, on the linguistic components of inventories, to examine ‘past systems of meaning’ with regards to material culture.[[3]](#footnote-3) This methodology can be applied to other sources such as account books, sales catalogues or indeed any source that records objects, and may yield interesting results in an Irish context. The 1641 Depositions, for instance, while generally approached from a political or economic perspective, list and sometimes describe in detail, the contents of the household, shedding light on the significance of everyday goods in a contested and volatile environment. Source problems, therefore, while an obvious barrier to engagement, can be somewhat ameliorated by engagement with emerging methodologies.

Perhaps more difficult to address are the ideological obstacles to this field of study. There is a tendency in Ireland, as elsewhere, to see certain areas of life rather than others as being ‘serious, significant, worthy of attention’.[[4]](#footnote-4) These are the areas defined as public and male: politics, industry and science. The devalued areas, the private and female, are seen as less worthy of attention. Objects, particularly consumer goods, enter the private realm once they are produced. As Carrier put it, ‘They enter stores. People shop for them. People take them to what may be the most private and female realm there is, home’.[[5]](#footnote-5) This ideological resistance is compounded in an Irish context. As Barnard noted, in a society where many died of famine, the materials of life, often not sufficing for subsistence, are assumed to be unworthy or too sparse to warrant investigation.[[6]](#footnote-6) Related to this issue is the persistent overemphasis on Irish economic underdevelopment and cultural isolation, particularly earlier in this period; along with a tendency to view any evidence for development as a function of colonisation.[[7]](#footnote-7) These assumptions mean that when it is considered at all, Irish material culture tends to be presented as monolithic, reactive or emulative, with tastes and preferences imposed upon society, rather than developing organically, or in relation to wider European and global influences. Likewise, while some studies are certainly sensitive to the complexities of identity formation in relation to material culture, there is a tendency in general to present a dichotomised picture of consumption and material culture, with ‘traditional’ Irish native habits on the one hand, opposing or becoming ‘modernised’ by English habits and tastes, on the other.

The result is that the issues, questions and approaches generating interest elsewhere, tend to be side-lined in an Irish context. Nonetheless, work currently underway in a number of areas of Irish material culture shows significant development and engagement with broader historiographical trends. Recent studies, for example, have begun to widen the chronological approach of material culture studies beyond the traditional eighteenth-century focus, which has generated a clearer picture of the complexity and sophistication of material culture in Ireland in the pre-Plantation period.[[8]](#footnote-8) There has also been an effort to develop new methodological approaches to the history of objects through the integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches to establish a contextualised framework for changes in consumption. [[9]](#footnote-9) The use of previously overlooked sources has also facilitated the development of studies. Shanahan’s work on early modern recipe books at the *National Library of Ireland*, in particular, has placed Irish culinary and material developments in a broader context, and has added significantly to our understanding of the relationship between women and material culture.[[10]](#footnote-10) Likewise, there has been an effort to expand the study of objects to include not only the elite, rare and expensive, but also the stuff of ‘everyday life’ which has opened a valuable window on domestic life; an area attracting much attention in English and American historiography of late.[[11]](#footnote-11) Most important, however, is the development of interdisciplinary studies in the field, facilitated by the collaboration of post-medieval archaeologists and historians. A recent interdisciplinary conference, *Becoming and Belonging in Ireland 1200-1600*, for example, aimed to ‘provide a space for archaeologists and historians to consider how peoples on the island…constructed and transformed self and group identities in this key period, and how their senses of belonging were made manifest through their cultural practices’.[[12]](#footnote-12) Together these emergent approaches have affected a sea-change in the study of material culture in Ireland and this has become a fruitful, collaborative field with significant potential for further development.

This chapter explores the ‘meaning of things’ in early modern Ireland by focussing on one key representative area: the material culture of food. It considers what food-related ‘objects’, in the broadest sense, can tell us about the changing nature of domestic life. Analysing new archival evidence for material culture in household accounts, port books, recipe books, wills and inventories, the chapter adopts a thematic approach, examining the use of utensils, vessels, furniture, ephemera, manuscript books, food, and domestic space, in relation to early modern concepts of civility, kinship and authority. It explores the Irish evidence comparatively, using current micro-historical methodologies, and places Irish historical developments and historiography within the context of broader social issues and historiographical debates.

***Civility and Manners***

During the early modern period the physical and symbolic experience of eating underwent profound changes across Europe. These were linked to globalisation and commercialisation, which led to an ever increasing range of domestic objects and dining paraphernalia, but also to the so called ‘civilising process’ which influenced how people interacted with these objects, with their food and with each other. The nature of this process remains contested, but a number of food-related ‘civilising’ trends, linked to wider political and social processes, have been identified from the mid-sixteenth century, including the rise of ‘individualism’; a growing preoccupation with self-regulation and bodily propriety and an increased emphasis on domestic ‘privacy’.

Although little attention has been paid to Irish developments in this context, it is clear that here, as elsewhere, table manners became more formalised and codified from the sixteenth century. Contemporary manners books became increasingly available, and affordable, indicating a growing concern with corporeal propriety, self-regulation and education. ‘Small books for children’, most likely referring to the popular late medieval *The Little Children’s Little Book*, and Francis Seager’s *The School of Virtue* were importedfrom at least 1576; the pre-Plantation date, raising questions about the relative significance of Anglicisation on the ‘civilising process’ in Ireland.[[13]](#footnote-13) Both books contained advice to children regarding manners and food hygiene, including detailed instructions on hand-washing before and after eating. Etiquette books were accompanied by other material signifiers of ‘civility’ in the sixteenth century. Fine napery and hand towels occur in sixteenth and seventeenth-century wills and inventories, accompanied sometimes by the descriptors ‘old’ or ‘Irish’, a reminder that manners, even if evolving, were not new, and not necessarily imported.[[14]](#footnote-14) Other items suggest the extent to which behaviour at the table was influenced by emerging fashions. Children’s bibs and scented washing balls, ‘luxuries’ imported for the first time in the late sixteenth century certainly indicate an early element of conspicuous consumption in relation to table manners.[[15]](#footnote-15)

The dearth of sources and work in this area means that it is difficult to trace the elaboration of manners in Ireland, or to establish the pace at which behaviour became standardised below elite society. If sixteenth-century etiquette books, however, indicate the growing codification and formalisation of behaviour in Ireland, then the menu plans of the eighteenth century show a peak in this movement. Discussed by both Fitzgerald and Shanahan for the later period, table settings and menu plans appear in women’s recipe manuscripts from the mid- seventeenth century, illustrating the extent to which the physical experience of elite dining had developed. [[16]](#footnote-16) As Shanahan notes, menu plans, which were influenced by contemporary printed advice books in Britain and Europe, provide a graphic description of the layout of the late early modern table, showing how meals were served and arranged and how diners physically related to each other and to the materiality of food. These plans show the extreme formalisation of dining by this period relating to the ‘increasing control and restraint of modern society’.[[17]](#footnote-17) People were acutely aware of the ‘correct’ way to eat. The basic behavioural advice laid out in earlier prescriptive literature, such as not spitting, farting or belching at the table, had been fully internalised. Standardisation of behaviour at this level of society was now such that people were literally told how to ‘correctly’ lay the table, what to eat, how to serve it and when to eat it.[[18]](#footnote-18)

These changing sensibilities had a direct impact on the material culture of eating in this period. In broad terms, from the sixteenth century, food consumption throughout Europe evolved from a communal, to an individualised event. By the seventeenth century, in elite homes, shared messes had been replaced with individual plates and cups; long tables and benches with individual chairs; and fingers with a bewildering range of cutlery, which served to further separate the diner from the ‘brutish’ process of eating. Again, the pace of such broad developments is very difficult to track, but occasional documentary evidence presents a glimpse of a world in transition. A will made by Andrew Roche Fitz Michael in Cork in 1618 shows that he possessed a mix of furniture associated with ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’ modes of dining. Fitz Michael bequeathed his son table boards, and forms, or backless benches, clearly still high status items since they were engraved with the donor’s name. The presence of these items suggests that the family dined in a formal and probably ‘communal’ manner, seated on display along one side of the long board. On the other hand, Fitz Michael also owned some individual chairs, an item used to display high social status in the medieval period, but becoming part of standardised practise in the seventeenth century. Chairs accompanied modern tables which were lighter, smaller and more mobile and allowed the family to dine intimately, seated individually, as ‘civil’ behaviour required.[[19]](#footnote-19) An inventory of the goods of the Earl of Orrery, taken in Castlemartyr in 1677, suggests the full progression to individualised dining in certain elite homes by that date. The goods listed in the dining room include, for example, ‘24 chairs of Turkey work’ and ‘1 oval table’.[[20]](#footnote-20)

It is generally assumed that the evolution of eating habits was slow, spanning the entire period, and only applicable to the upper echelons of society. Irish evidence, intriguingly, both agrees with and contradicts this analysis. Quantitative evidence, for instance, suggests that the spread of new modes of eating could be surprisingly rapid and widely diffused. Import records show that the humble wooden trencher became an item of mass consumption in the south of the country by the 1590s, with almost 22,000 common trenchers imported by various merchants in that year.[[21]](#footnote-21) The massive increase in the use of this non-elite item of tableware may well have been stimulated by the arrival of settlers with the Munster Plantation, but the fact that such large numbers were imported, and continued to be imported after the collapse of the enterprise, suggests that demand for this particular type of wooden dish developed quickly in Ireland. The reasons are unclear. The trend may have been stimulated by economic reasons; the wooden trencher replaced the bread trencher which made it a particularly practical item in times of grain shortage. It may also be that the item was adopted for emulative or coercive reasons; its use representing the civilisation of eating habits. Whatever the reasons, its acceptance suggests a swift shift in non-elite modes of dining and the growing individuality and standardisation of eating practises in parts of Ireland, which certainly deserves further attention.

On the other hand, while change might not always have been slow, it was most likely restricted by social and regional factors. As anecdotal evidence suggests, some signifiers of ‘civilised’ and ‘polite’ dining, for instance the fork, may well have remained unknown outside of fashionable circles until at least the early eighteenth century.[[22]](#footnote-22) Reverend Caesar Otway, for example, described dining with a knife only and drinking from a wooden noggin rather than a cup in 1698.[[23]](#footnote-23) For the poor, especially in more rural areas, it is likely that little changed in their experience of eating, with few objects involved in meal times at all.[[24]](#footnote-24) Detailed studies of consumer behaviour in Britain however, should serve as a warning against the acceptance of simple dichotomies in consumption such as urban/rural, upper/lower class or indeed Irish/English, which are too simplistic and mask the complexities of consumer culture.[[25]](#footnote-25)

The evolution of manners related not only to the use of material goods but also to changes in the design and function of domestic space. Between the late sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, communal, multifunctional spaces in houses declined and there was a rise in specialised rooms for activities such as cooking, eating and sleeping. Over time, the domestic environment became more complicated, with increasing possibilities for arranging rooms and the objects within them.[[26]](#footnote-26) In Ireland, recent efforts to examine the domestic environment have shown similar trends. Focussing on the development of the Gaelic tower-house in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Sherlock, for example, noted, that while there was considerable diversity in practise at regional and social levels, the open hall was in decline in favour of more specialised spaces.[[27]](#footnote-27) The development of Bunratty Castle exemplifies these changes. An inventory of the castle in 1639, values the furnishings of the Great Hall at just £2, a ‘paltry sum’ when compared to the valuation of over £52 in the new dining room, added by the fourth earl of Thomond.[[28]](#footnote-28) Jane Fenlon has also explored changes in great house design and room usage in this period. Again, in line with continental and English developments, the homes of the elite were found to have become less communal, more hierarchical, and increasingly commodified, with a profusion of lavish furnishings and new luxury goods serving to differentiate the status of rooms.[[29]](#footnote-29)

Yet, while a considerable amount is known about the fabric and structure of early modern buildings, at least at elite level, there is little agreement about what the ‘civilising’ of domestic space meant in social and cultural terms. For many years, the standard narrative of developments in the built environment was that they represented the gradual and generalised retreat of families to less accessible spaces in search of privacy. This is a contested and profoundly important issue, since the increasing desire for privacy has been linked not only to the changing use of domestic space, but to broader social trends such as the decline of open hospitality, and the segregation of activities and members of the household, particularly in terms of social class and gender. [[30]](#footnote-30)

In Ireland, as elsewhere, an increasing desire for privacy has been linked to material changes.[[31]](#footnote-31) Where evidence can be found for the actual use of space, however, the picture is more nuanced. Household accounts kept at Dublin Castle in the mid-1570s and 1590s, in particular, present a vivid, if atypical, view of the negotiation of domestic space in the earlier part of this period. As the seat of English power in Ireland, Dublin Castle was still, in many ways, a typical medieval structure, retaining its Great Hall and serving a very public function in the provision of hospitality. Nonetheless, as has been argued in an English context, while such spaces might have been more open and inclusive than their successors, they nonetheless had distinct separatist agencies. The purchase of items such as ‘black buckram screens’, curtains, and canopies at Dublin Castle indicate how ‘privacy’ could be attained without any architectural change.[[32]](#footnote-32) Likewise, a seventeenth-century inventory of the goods of Katherine Villiers, the Duchess of Buckingham, taken at Dunluce Castle, County Antrim, contains a large number of curtains and screens including 2 ‘large folding screens’ valued at a substantial £13 and 3 ‘red folding screens’, valued at £4 10*s*.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Similarly, architectural change cannot always be taken as evidence of absolute change in practise. In the late sixteenth century, significant building work at Dublin Castle saw the interior much improved, and a new house built for the Lord Deputy. The new layout provided ample ‘private’ dining opportunities for the Lord Deputy and his wife, yet the daily accounts show that meals, for the most part, continued to be eaten formally and in public, with the Lord and Lady seated at a longboard in the dining chamber.[[34]](#footnote-34) Further, it should not be assumed that architectural and material changes in this period led progressively towards either privacy or ‘civility’. While newer houses had many more rooms and ‘intimate’ spaces, they also had many more areas designed for public consumption. Ornate staircases, plaster ceilings, carved doors, mantle-pieces, wainscoting and turkey carpets were all showpieces, and it is difficult to assess which items were intended for private enjoyment and which were for public display.[[35]](#footnote-35) Likewise, some ‘innovations’ in this period may actually have reduced privacy and indeed civility. The manufacture of a close stool for Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam, in 1575, is a crude but thought provoking example.[[36]](#footnote-36) Changing design features in the early modern period led to the abandonment of the private garderobe and the adoption, in wealthy homes, of the early modern ‘close stool’; a covered chamber pot enclosed in a wooden frame.[[37]](#footnote-37) This was a less hygienic, and far less ‘private’ alternative since it was not always situated in the seclusion of the bedroom, and had, of course, to be emptied by servants.[[38]](#footnote-38)

Social hierarchies had always been carefully maintained with regards to the rituals of dining. Certain foods were restricted to the elite palate: objects and furnishings, such as the great salt or an elaborately carved chair, served to reinforce the status of the host in relation to his guests; architectural features such as an elevated dais or a decorative canopy distinguished the elite family in the great hall. Nonetheless, there is little doubt that early modern developments greatly facilitated the reinforcement of social hierarchies, in particular, through the physical segregation of individuals. At Dublin Castle, for example, while the Great Hall continued in use in the late sixteenth century, its status had already been downgraded to that of a mess hall. While the gentlemen ate at the longboard in the Presence Chamber, square boards were set up in Great Hall, for the officers and stewards, who in the daily accounts are never mentioned in relation to the Presence.[[39]](#footnote-39) A century later, an inventory of the Castle taken in 1678, shows the evolution of the dining space which had by now become a fully specialised ‘dining room’ for elite guests, containing 24 ‘turkey work’ chairs along with a range of other luxurious furnishings.[[40]](#footnote-40) Likewise, an inventory of Kilkenny Castle from 1639, also shows a separate ‘dining room’ in this case richly decorated with ‘5 pieces of Imagery hanging 10 foot deep’ and valued at a staggering £55. [[41]](#footnote-41) In contrast, nine year previous, in 1630, the ‘Great Chamber’ at Kilkenny Castle was seemingly furnished with only an ‘old moth-eaten green carpet’.[[42]](#footnote-42)

There are also some intriguing hints in the archival material at the gendered use of space in this period, another issue that has not yet been explored in an Irish context. At Dublin Castle, in the late sixteenth century, when Lady Anne Fitzwilliam chose to ‘keep to her chamber’, her gentlewomen ate apart from the gentlemen at a square board in the dining chamber.[[43]](#footnote-43) This was presumably a more ‘proper’ arrangement for unaccompanied women that, as the prevailing civil code demanded, kept them removed from the male public gaze. There are other suggestions too, of the segregation of women within this particular space. Lady Anne and her daughter, for example, kept individual closets; seemingly deeply secluded and inaccessible places. Lady Anne’s had multiple locks, as did the chamber where it was probably contained; and also her chests, trunks, cupboards and desk. Yet there is little evidence here of the use of space to subordinate women. Indeed, of late, the so-called ‘separate spheres’ theory, just like that of privacy, has come under considerable scrutiny, with historians showing the nuanced and complex ways in which people experienced space in this period.[[44]](#footnote-44) Certainly, there are hints, even within this single source, of the complex negotiation of space in gendered terms. While there were certain spaces where the gentlewomen did not dine, for example the newly built Council Chamber, there were also a number of occasions when the women’s dining requirements superseded the men’s, and where the ladies actively appropriated the main dining space. In 1574, Lady Anne hosted a number of ‘drinkings’ for her gentlewomen; events that took place in the main chamber, replaced supper and excluded men.[[45]](#footnote-45) Likewise, rather than remaining ‘becomingly within’ as prescribed by contemporary patriarchal ideology, when the Lord Deputy was away, his wife and her ladies dined out, and were hosted by both men and women. [[46]](#footnote-46) Women could control domestic space in more subtle ways too. It is significant, for example, that in a Castle comprising all male kitchen staff, Marie, a lady’s maid, was solely responsible for the spices, the most expensive consumables in use; indicating that social class was more significant than gender with regards to domestic authority in this period. [[47]](#footnote-47)

***Kinship and Consumption***

As a political and social concept, civility encompassed ideals beyond polite manners and physical decorum. It was a code of civic conduct intrinsic to the maintenance of social order, most vitally preserved at the level of the patriarchal household. At this most basic collective unit of society, objects and their ritual use served to reinforce the ‘corporate identity’ of the family.[[48]](#footnote-48) In Ireland, as in England, family status ‘rose and fell as a result of the efforts of each generation to increase the standing and honour of the lineage’. [[49]](#footnote-49) Family consumption was a reciprocal and collective process spanning generations. To satisfy the ‘cult of family status’, objects needed particular qualities. They had to be able to withstand many generations of ownership and they had to be able to assume ‘patina’, or the ‘mysterious ability to grow more valuable as they became more ancient and decrepit’.[[50]](#footnote-50) New objects might show wealth and standing but ‘patina’ symbolically reassured the observer that the family were well bred and not new comers to their status.

Certain objects were particularly favoured in this regard. These were generally expensive items that held a strong ritual association.[[51]](#footnote-51) Wills from Cork show that merchants and the civic elite particularly prized silver standing cups and salts; items of high symbolic value which contributed to the rituals and ceremony of elite dining. [[52]](#footnote-52) The standing salt, for example, held a prominent and specific position on the elite dining table, to the right of the host, visually and physically indicating his prosperity and status. The seating placement of other guests in relation to the salt served to identify their social status in relation to their host. The transmission and continued use of such items reaffirmed paternal authority within the household, preserved the social hierarchy of the family in relation to outsiders, and crucially, served as a reminder of the heir’s responsibility in maintaining the honour of the family and the memory of the deceased.

An objects ‘patina’ in this period was not merely assumed through the bumps and scrapes of age. Engraving, in particular, served to prove the provenance of elite objects and increase their prestige.[[53]](#footnote-53) Domestic plate, jewellery and furniture were frequently emblazoned with the family crest or with a personal name. Maurice Roche Fitz Edmond, for example, in 1582, bequeathed his heir his ‘yellow bell piece cup double gilt and graven descended to me from my father’.[[54]](#footnote-54) Likewise, David Tirry left his son his ‘principal cup’ while Andrew Roche Fitz Michael left his son ‘two formes’ or benches, ‘with my one name’ along with a goblet and salt engraved with the family arms.[[55]](#footnote-55) Testators took particular precautions to ensure such items remained within the family. In 1582, Edmond White bequeathed pewter dishes, candlesticks and an exotic coconut cup to his brother Sir Perceval to be held during his lifetime, stipulating that they must be passed on to White’s own son and heir on Perceval’s death.[[56]](#footnote-56) Keeping the silver within the family was also on Andrew Galway’s mind, when he bequeathed ‘three silver spoons’ to his third son Richard, with the stipulation that he was not to inherit them should he ‘enter in religion or become a priest’.[[57]](#footnote-57) Similarly, Richard Boyle, the Earl of Cork, made specific changes to his will after the death of son Lord Viscount Kinalmeakie, to ensure that his silver vessels and white plate ‘engraven and marked’ with his ‘arms’, a ‘crescent’ and a ‘Viscount coronet’ should pass to his remaining son Sir Roger Boyle.[[58]](#footnote-58)

While objects played a key role in ordering masculine relationships within the patriarchal household, they were also central to the development of female identity and the negotiation of gendered relationships. It has been argued, that in patriarchal society, household goods, like domestic space, ‘enclosed and subordinated’ women.[[59]](#footnote-59) Cooking, largely the province of women, ‘generated little esteem’ and cooking pots were not ‘objects to which power accrued’.[[60]](#footnote-60) On the other hand, recent analyses have begun to expand the view of women’s agency in ‘creating and modifying the cultural framework within which they lived’ through their engagement with domestic objects and food stuffs.[[61]](#footnote-61) Objects were used to negotiate kinship and community bonds, showcase female expertise, as well as demonstrating the ‘civility’ of the early modern household. Material culture is thus seen as central to the concept of female identity, having complex meanings and a key role in ordering society.

In Ireland, there is no doubt that ‘mundane’ objects were invested with personal significance beyond their utility. Cooking utensils, hearth goods, and table ware, along with clothing, were part of the ‘paraphernalia’ legally allowed as limited property to married women and were common bequests between female kin and friends. Ellyne ny Connyly, in 1581, bequeathed her granddaughter two ‘brassen panns’ and a pipe of barley, while leaving her table cloths, to Catherine Tirry.[[62]](#footnote-62) Table cloths, just like ceremonial vessels, were items invested with ritual and symbolic significance and the use of the possessive descriptor ‘my’ in relation to the bequest, indicates the personal value attached to the item.[[63]](#footnote-63) Gennett Creaghe, in 1582, carefully itemised her durable household things, including all her pewter, ‘greatest’ brass pans and a brass ‘sarvyse’ and divided these between her female relatives. The more valuable domestic items, including a silver cup, were left to the unmarried women, who had yet to set up home, while her married daughters were bequeathed mainly clothing. John Creaghe, her nephew, was left unspecified ‘timbre household stuff’, while a further male relative, possibly a stepson, received a ‘brass pan that lackett one leg’, perhaps indicating a less than perfect relationship.[[64]](#footnote-64) Such objects were intended for practical use by the recipient, but their ‘heritable potential’ also communicated ‘physical and moral solidity, the recognisable and the durable retained amongst the ephemeral’.[[65]](#footnote-65) These were personal items and treasured family possessions, and just like elite goods, were often inscribed with decorative details, a monogram, date or even a moralising verse. Their bequest was not only a means of practically assisting the living, but in reaffirming maternal lineage through time.

The relegation of domestic objects and utensils to the ‘female sphere’, however, should not be overemphasised. While it is interesting to question the extent to which women were ‘subordinated’ by domesticity, feminising such objects, even in a positive way, simplifies the role of everyday things in negotiating kinship relations. Fathers, too, bequeathed their daughters domestic objects. Henry Verdon, in 1572, left brass services to both his daughters on their marriages, a gift both reinforcing and supporting their domestic role.[[66]](#footnote-66) Also, while there was a tendency for men to leave their sons items that assumed ‘patina’, rather than ‘everyday’ goods, this was by no means absolute. Andrew Roche, in 1618, left his son a brass pan owned by his grandfather, suggesting that ‘ordinary’ cooking equipment could traverse gendered lines and had a status value to men beyond its monetary worth.[[67]](#footnote-67) Roche also bequeathed his son a ‘jug that his mother had’.[[68]](#footnote-68) Indeed, all of the carefully itemised domestic items in Roche’s will were left to his son while his current wife merely retained the ‘use of a brandiron’ if ‘it was idle and she had occasion to use it’.[[69]](#footnote-69) Roche’s gifting strategy was designed to honour his first wife, with whom he and his children were to buried, while placing his current wife in a position of obligation to his heir. There are other, less cynical, examples of men using gifting strategies to negotiate and reaffirm gendered relationships. Edmund White, in 1582, used his gifts to honour a female friendship, leaving his maid, Anastas, ‘the chest that was my wife’s and a little brass pan and the brandiron’.[[70]](#footnote-70)

Conversely, women might sometimes own and bequeath objects traditionally associated with masculinity and paternal authority. Francis Aungier, baron of Longford, for example, in 1628, bequeathed his wife Margaret ‘a silver tankard she brought with her’ and a cup given by Lord Grandison on their marriage’.[[71]](#footnote-71) Likewise, Elizabeth Boyle, viscountess Shannon owned silver cups engraved with her mark *E.S*, along with ‘a clock that goes a month’. Her ownership of the latter raises interesting questions about the gendered control of timekeeping in the early modern home.[[72]](#footnote-72)

For both men and women then, in the earlier part of this period, the durable, the solid and the antique, be they high status or more everyday items, were highly prized and central to the maintenance of kinship bonds. This, however, was changing. By the late sixteenth century in England, writers such as Harrison were already lamenting the investment of family money in the ephemeral; in objects such as glass and earthenware that ‘all go one way, that is to shards at the last…their pieces do turn onto no profit’.[[73]](#footnote-73) This fascination with the flimsy, rare and exotic had led to a ‘loathing’ of traditional gold and silver vessels among the well- off, who now spent their money on delicate luxuries, with no thought to future generations.[[74]](#footnote-74)

The extent to which Irish consumption evolved in this context is uncertain. Novelty may indeed have become an ‘irrepressible drug’ in the latter part of the period, but the affluent were slow to throw over objects that could assume ‘patina’ for those that could not.[[75]](#footnote-75) Historians examining the consumption of silver ware in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have noted its feverish accumulation by the upper-classes, in contrast to contemporary tastes in England.[[76]](#footnote-76) This may relate to economic factors. Banking was slow to develop in Ireland and coin remained scarce, meaning that silver continued to be valued as a currency.[[77]](#footnote-77) It could also be read as symptomatic of the instability of Irish society, where visual reminders of status and lineage remained vitally important. The Kildare’s, for example, ‘trumpeted’ their re-entry to Irish protestant society with commissions of ostentatious silver services to the extent that it was remarked that Lord Kildare ‘makes a much greater show of his plate than of his virtues’.[[78]](#footnote-78) Certainly, there is also evidence that silver continued to be bequeathed along traditional family lines.[[79]](#footnote-79) The pace, however, at which it changed hands and followed fashion suggests a relative change in its perceived value. [[80]](#footnote-80) Barnard, for example, notes a lack of sentiment with regards to the treatment of bequests in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the 1680s, the widow of the first Lord Orrery, unsentimentally disposed of 3,700 ounces of silver bequeathed her by her husband. [[81]](#footnote-81) Likewise, in 1748, on the death of Lord Barrymore, the family silver was removed from the ancestral seat at Castlelyons, in ‘defiance of the expectation that it would be “left as an heirloom”’.[[82]](#footnote-82)

Yet, despite the continued popularity of silver, there is little doubt that the relative value attached to objects was changing in Ireland, in line with trends noted elsewhere. The newer objects appearing on the market in the early modern period, being semi-durable, fragile and often without a significant second hand value, are difficult to trace in contemporary records. Likewise, as already noted, archaeological evidence is sparse.[[83]](#footnote-83) What evidence does exist, however, suggests that even by the late sixteenth century, Irish families too were investing their wealth in items that ‘went to shards’.[[84]](#footnote-84) Highly decorated Iberian earthenware, attractive for its fineness and thinness was already widely prized; while such delicate exotica as Ming China had penetrated elite Gaelic society.[[85]](#footnote-85) These trends gained pace. As the European luxury ceramics and the Irish delftware markets developed in the late seventeenth century, those aspiring to gentility on a budget could now acquire fashionable and high quality copies of luxury items like Chinese porcelain. Indeed, between 1692 and 1695, 280,000 pieces of earthenware and glass were imported to Ireland; the quantity suggesting, that desire for novelty had spread well beyond the elite. As the trappings of elite status became easier to counterfeit, gentile consumption became ever more extravagant, defined as much by quantity and novelty as by quality. An inventory of the Inchiquin O’Brien china from the mid- eighteenth century, shows the range of goods now required by the assertively ‘civilised’ and ‘polite’ family. Serving china alone included significant quantities of round plates, square plates, lobster, soup and scallop shell bowls, japanned bowls and candle cups along with a suite of items required for the serving of new beverages, tea, coffee and chocolate, commodities that were themselves, indicators of status.[[86]](#footnote-86)

But, what did early modern commodification ‘mean’ with regards to family identity? To what extent, for example, was ‘fashionable’ spending directed towards the immediate needs of status competition, rather than the long term needs of the family?[[87]](#footnote-87) The evidence is intriguing and conflicting. Undoubtedly, certain rare and expensive items of porcelain tableware were still purchased with an eye to preserving the families’ reputation through time, and just as with silver, were often emblazoned with the family crest and coats of arms.[[88]](#footnote-88) Despite their fragility, novelty items were mended when they were broken, and like plate, remained within family collections over generations, as a visual and symbolic reminder of their social and kinship connections. The O’Brien’s, for example, listed ‘one very small blue and white pot with a silver spout, this belonged to Queen’.[[89]](#footnote-89) Tellingly, however, no other items in the inventory have a recorded provenance, and the descriptors for the most part are concerned with distinguishing the old from the new, rather than the lineage of the item.[[90]](#footnote-90) This preoccupation with the new is also evident in the archaeological evidence. The important recent discovery of a ‘hoard’ of discarded elite domestic goods at Rathfarnham Castle, including glass, pottery and porcelain, suggests that as in England, commodification had led to distinct elements of ‘conspicuous’ family consumption even by the mid seventeenth century.[[91]](#footnote-91)

This is not to say, however, that use of domestic objects had become devoid of social meaning. As consumption practises evolved, new domestic rituals emerged, which served to reinforce the ‘civility’ of the family and regulate kinship relations. Perhaps the best example of this is the tea drinking ritual which developed from the early eighteenth century. Tea was a domestic event; a ‘training ground’ for adult behaviour and polite manners; and a symbol of ‘respectable’ family life.[[92]](#footnote-92) It was not a ritual from which men were excluded, but nonetheless, its symbolic power undoubtedly lay within the female ‘sphere’. It was women, for example, who generally presided over general decorum and conversation in the tea room; making, pouring and distributing tea, and acting out the role of “civiliser” and domestic executive’ in the early modern household.[[93]](#footnote-93) Certainly there are strong hints at the gendered nature of the ritual in an Irish context. An inventory of goods in the O’Brien recipe manuscript, for example, compiled most likely by Mary O’Brien, lists all the tea-making equipment under the category ‘China in my Closett’, suggesting the gendered nature of tea related consumption and space. If, as Douglas claims, ‘the more costly the ritual trappings, the stronger we can assume the intention to fix meanings to be’, then the tea meal was by far the most important symbolic domestic ceremony in this period.[[94]](#footnote-94) The necessary list of equipment and accoutrements was extensive, and costly.[[95]](#footnote-95) Those who could afford to, spent their money on spoons, cups and saucers, canisters, tea tables, slop bowls, tea pots, kettles and lamps; not to mention the tea itself.[[96]](#footnote-96) The less well-off invested over time and worked their way towards owning all of the necessary items.[[97]](#footnote-97) That tea was significant more for its symbolic value, than for private enjoyment or indeed taste, is suggested by the fact that in the absence of the real thing, consumers were willing to resort to artificial substitutes. Jane Burton’s manuscript recipe book, for example, features a recipe for ‘artificial tea’ comprised of ‘new hay, black and white thorn and honeysuckle’, a concoction presumably served with all the expected ritual formality.[[98]](#footnote-98)

***Authority and Expertise***

In addition to the exchange of objects and the performance of domestic rituals, women used domestic artefacts to construct and transmit authority in other ways. Traditionally, domesticity has been viewed by historians as trivial and trivialising, a particularly anachronistic assumption given the post reformation glorification of the household. [[99]](#footnote-99) Recent scholarship, however, has done much to rescue early modern domesticity from this perception. Work on didactic literature has explored the cultural significance of domesticity, and the dynamic nature of female expertise.[[100]](#footnote-100) Likewise, analyses of manuscript recipe books has shed light not only on the material culture of food and the kitchen, but on the role of domestic expertise in the manifestation of female authority and identity. Rather than a ‘dull and routinized’ sphere, the kitchen, in historiographical terms, has become a creative space; a ‘laboratory’ where women constructed themselves as authorities on matters relating to cooking, domestic life and health.[[101]](#footnote-101)

Irish historians have been slow to engage in this area. Recent work in the field of historical archaeology, however, based on the extensive collection of recipe manuscripts at the *National Library of Ireland*, has opened a new window on material culture in this period, and highlighted the potential for interdisciplinary engagement.[[102]](#footnote-102) As Shanahan argues, recipe books are a vital source *for* material culture; recording the objects and foodstuffs in actual, or aspirational, use in the early modern kitchen. In addition, though, they are also cultural artefacts in their own right; objects that held symbolic significance, and can facilitate our understanding of the flow and dissemination of domestic expertise which ‘served to animate and maintain relationships across and between social, geographic and intellectual space’.[[103]](#footnote-103)

In Ireland, as elsewhere, recipe books were shared documents, frequently annotated with the names of donors, thus providing a unique map of the social connections of the compiler, both within and without their own kinship and status groups. Recipes in the Irish collection show that domestic expertise could traverse gender, social and intergenerational divisions. Mothers, grandmothers, sisters, aunts and female in-laws frequently donated recipes, along with doctors, clergymen, lay women, servants and cooks, raising further questions about the issue of gendered and social spheres in relation to the diffusion, and authority, of knowledge. In this space, individual expertise could be immortalised. A note under a recipe for Mrs French’s currant wine, in the Inchiquin O’Brien book, for example, notes that ‘the late Mrs Synge told me the very best white wine she ever tasted was made of white currants entirely, and sweet sugar’.[[104]](#footnote-104) Likewise, as objects, recipe manuscripts were highly valued female heirlooms. The O’Brien manuscript, for instance, started in the late seventeenth century, was added to by four generations of women in the family; its elaborate title page and careful curation evidence of its high estimation in the eye of its inheritors.[[105]](#footnote-105)

While knowledge could traverse social divisions, many recipes in these collections are from women of similar elite social standing. In the O’Brien example, donors include the Duchess of Buckingham, Lady Powerscourt and Lady Blessington; the book clearly representing a ‘social register’ of the families connections.[[106]](#footnote-106) Recipes, in a similar manner to elite domestic objects, showcased the wealth, sophistication and lineage of the household. A recipe for ‘Lady Hewitt’s water’, for example, contains a list of eighty exotic items, including gold leaf, saffron, besoar and China root and is annotated with a note reading, ‘this is my Lady Hewitt’s original receipt given by my Lady Wiseman to our family’.[[107]](#footnote-107) The distinct lack of wear on some of these books indicates that rather than being functional objects designed for use in a busy kitchen, they were ‘artefacts of display and social prestige’ - symbolic items that reinforced the elite identity of the owner, by emphasising the illustrious status of her friends and family.[[108]](#footnote-108)

The role of such items in the formation of social and gender identity is, of course, particularly significant in the context of early modern Ireland, where food culture was highly politicised and where the expertise of the housewife was used as a yardstick with which to measure ‘civility’ in an ethnic context.[[109]](#footnote-109) The Inchiquin O’Brien’s, for example, were of noble Gaelic origin but the recipe manuscripts were compiled by Aristocratic English women marrying into the family, thereby raising the interesting question of the role of food culture in ‘making Ireland English’.[[110]](#footnote-110) Certainly, the spread of ‘English’ modes of ‘gentile’ food writing implies, and may have facilitated, the Anglicisation of Irish food ways and domestic practise, but it is important to remember that cultural exchange was a two-way process of acculturation. A recipe ‘To make Usquebagh the best sort’ in the O’Brien manuscript is in fact a Gaelic Irish recipe, made with raisins and liquorish but ‘modernised’ and ‘Anglicised’ by the addition of refined brown sugar. [[111]](#footnote-111)

Beyond their symbolic function, recipe manuscripts shed a great deal of light on the development of female expertise in practical terms. In this period new scientific methods, informed by empiricism, and the emphasis on experimentation and observation, had a major influence on female practise and on the scope of the female role. Recipe books show how women attained and organised knowledge and how they tested and proved it, in effect, becoming scientists in their own distilling rooms, sickrooms and kitchens. The recording of recipes requiring a “limbeck” (distillation vessel), for example, shows that elite Irish women had, by the seventeenth century, embraced the distillation craze sweeping England and the Continent, and were experimenting with complex recipes in their still rooms. Annotations and marginalia show which recipes women self-tested, and those that did not make the grade. In the O’Brien manuscript, a recipe for dying yellow hair brown has an annotation reading ‘as tried’, signifying its approval and trustworthiness.[[112]](#footnote-112) In contrast, a recipe for spitting of blood, given by Mr Annesley is crossed out, while an ointment purportedly ‘good for any breaking out’ is also crossed out with an annotation deeming it ‘unsafe’.[[113]](#footnote-113) The word ‘approved’ is frequently found in recipes, often added to the marginalia of older manuscripts by later hands, signifying that the new owner had reproduced and improved upon a recipe or cure and taken ownership of it.[[114]](#footnote-114) It is also clear from the recipes that domestic expertise was often remarkably ‘up to date’ in scientific terms. A ‘poultice for the worms’, for example, originating with a lower class woman, Mrs Berney, prescribes the use of ground earthworms to treat infantile intestinal worms, suggesting engagement with controversial Paracelsian theory which, in contrast to traditional Galenism, argued that ‘like cured like’.[[115]](#footnote-115) Similarly, there is evidence that women had knowledge of treatments for conditions before they became authorised and formalised by professional medicine.Irish women, for example, were recommending citrus fruit for the treatment of scurvy well before the publication of Lind’s findings in 1773.[[116]](#footnote-116)

The arrangement and organisation of women’s recipe books also sheds light on female domestic practise. These manuscripts were living artefacts, evolving to reflect wider social and technological change. With regards to measurements, for example, analysis shows the overlap of a traditional organic system of quantification relying on know-how and experience, with more precise and standardised instructions, shaped by empirical science.[[117]](#footnote-117) This was also a trend with the organisation of knowledge itself. Women restructured and organised messy books begun by earlier hands.[[118]](#footnote-118) Indeed by the end of this period, the personal and chaotic arrangement of these manuscripts was being replaced by a more structured approach: alphabetised and tabulated, suggesting, as Shanahan argues, that Irish women were engaging with printed cookery books from England and the Continent, which had started to adopt a new level of organisation. [[119]](#footnote-119)

Finally, domestic expertise and material culture in this period facilitated more overt forms of female authority. Nowhere is this clearer, than in the practise of domestic medicine. In Ireland, as elsewhere, the early modern home was the primary location for medical care and the centre for female authority in medical matters.[[120]](#footnote-120) In line with prevailing humoral theory, manipulating the diet was the key to maintaining health and medical and culinary skills placed the housewife in a profoundly authoritative position. Cures might require household members to submit to regimens that induced sweating, vomiting and fasting or procedures including the application of hot poultices, bloodletting or the lancing of boils. The preparation of remedies required killing, plucking, dismembering, grinding or distilling the essences of a range of domestic and wild animals, indicating a level of licensed brutality often overlooked and intriguingly at odds with both modern and contemporary depictions of the idealised subservient housewife.[[121]](#footnote-121)

Recipes required the procurement and handling of such items as mouse ears, earthworms, ground crab’s eye, fresh adder tongues, pigeons and dog grease. The use of such ephemera, entirely ignored in the historiography of Irish material culture, can reveal many aspects of the domestic experience. In the Irish kitchen, something as transient and fragile as a feather could affect submission to female authority and cause considerable discomfort and even humiliation. A treatment for ‘convulsions or anything in the head’, for example, required de-feathering a pigeon and clapping the ‘vent’ of the (hopefully) dead bird to the anus of the sufferer, ‘letting it lye till it parts extreamly; & so aplye fresh one after another till you find relief by them’.[[122]](#footnote-122) The same object could also be used to facilitate female creativity in the culinary arts. The creation of marchpane tarts, for example, required the use of a feather to delicately apply a ‘good icing’ which would make them ‘very pretty’.[[123]](#footnote-123) A feather could also express and demonstrate female agency. Elizabeth Hughes, most likely, deployed her quill to experiment with the ‘invisible ink’ recipe she recorded in her manuscript, along with other directions such as ‘how to hide a letter in an egg’.[[124]](#footnote-124) Such ephemera raise intriguing questions about the paradoxes of early modern society as expressed through material culture. It is difficult, for example, to reconcile the medicinal and cosmetic use of dog grease, which in some cases involved the boiling alive of dogs, with extravagant expenditure on the accoutrements of pet ownership, including such luxuries as silver dog collars and lavish portraits.[[125]](#footnote-125)

***Conclusion***

In early modern Ireland, as elsewhere, domestic objects were invested with value beyond their utility. In a changing society, domestic goods served to reinforce social status and civility; negotiate kinship and gendered relationships and demonstrate female agency, authority and expertise. Examining evidence for the material expression of civility and manners in an Irish context has indicated trends similar to those noted elsewhere: the increasing codification of manners; the commodification of dining rituals; and the standardisation of eating practises. It has also shown, however, the dangers inherent in broad and overarching explanations of such changes, suggesting nuanced and complex attitudes to issues of privacy and gendered spaces and spheres. Likewise, evidence for the role of material goods in the maintenance of kinship bonds, sheds interesting light on the overlapping values attached by men and women to everyday goods and the significant value of extending the scope of analysis in Ireland, to include consideration of ‘mundane’ materiality. Finally, engagement with the issues of expertise and authority, as expressed broadly through the use of domestic objects, perishables and ephemera, opens a new window on the generally forgotten items of daily life, and highlights the scope of the domestic role for female agency, creativity and cooperation.

Work in the field of Irish material culture is still in its infancy. Since Toby Barnard’s ground breaking work, just over a decade ago, few have taken up the challenge to engage with the study of objects as a discipline, and far fewer have ventured into the world of ‘everyday’ materiality. This however seems likely to change with emerging Irish studies showing innovative approaches, methodologies and the use of previously untapped sources. There, is however, much work to be done. While multidisciplinary collaborations exist, there is room for significant development and the stimulation of dialogue, between not just historians and archaeologists, but also, art historians, curators, anthropologists and sociologists, all of whom can contribute significantly to the expansion of the field. There is also an urgent need for training in this area of history. One of the most significant barriers to the use of non-textual evidence by historians is the inability to ‘read’ and integrate objects. In Ireland, there has as yet been no significant debate about the methodological issues inherent in the study of objects, either in quantitative or qualitative terms, an issue that should be addressed before progress is made in the field. Finally, and most importantly, as this chapter shows, there is great value in expanding the focus of Irish studies of material culture beyond the issues of colonisation and Anglicisation. People consumed goods for many reasons, and the historiographical focus on oversimplified and dichotomised expressions of identity retards progress in this field and masks the complexities of material culture in early modern society.
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