

# Fashioning “British” Worlds in the Seventeenth Century

Nicholas Canny  
*University College, Galway*

Samuel Purchas, writing in 1625, looked forward to the dispersal “through the world” not only of “England’s out of England,” but also to “Royal Scotland, Ireland, and Princely Wales, multiplying new Scepters to his Majesty and his heirs in a New World.”<sup>1</sup> This indicates that what Purchas envisaged was a *British* Atlantic World whereas the overseas dominion espoused by earlier English advocates of colonization was purely English. Purchas and his predecessors were propagandists for militant Protestantism as well as colonization. They perceived the promotion of trade and colonies as one necessary means both to enhance the position of their respective Protestant monarchs in the world and to check the advance of Catholicism. Moreover they were of one mind that their monarchs, as upholders of true religion, were more duty-bound than Catholic rulers to bring the truths of Christianity to those who previously had been isolated from that knowledge. They were confident that the endeavours of those who engaged in colonization would be favoured by a benevolent Providence once they cast aside what the younger Richard Hakluyt condemned as that “preposterous desire of seeking rather gain than God’s glory.”<sup>2</sup>

The commitments of English enthusiasts for colonization were well in advance of those of their contemporaries and even of their government. This becomes apparent when we compare the preoccupations of the younger Hakluyt with those of Adam Winthrop of Groton Manor in Surrey who, in 1586, (when Richard Hakluyt was still writing) commenced a diary of the major events in his life which he would sustain intermittently until 1619.<sup>3</sup> During all of that time Winthrop did not make a single entry that concerned English voyaging in the Atlantic, nor did he mention any literature that would have shed any light on that subject except (p.58) Sebastian Münster’s *Cosmographia Universalis*, which he purchased in 1595 for five shillings. The matters that preoccupied him were rather his estate, his extended family, the lives and deaths of his immediate neighbors, the affairs of his own and neighboring counties, the happenings at various Cambridge colleges with which the family and its circle had associations, and occasional events of national importance.

Reference to Adam Winthrop is relevant not only because it was through his study of the Winthrop dynasty that Richard Dunn first came to study the British Atlantic World, but also because the diary of this well-educated, prosperous, squire can be used to demonstrate how little America and the Atlantic impinged upon the consciousness of even educated English people as late as the early decades of the seventeenth century. In so far as Adam Winthrop

looked beyond his immediate environs it was to Ireland, and that interest was again explained by family connection because several close relatives had become involved with the Munster plantation and belonged to the prime English settler community in the vicinity of Bandon, County Cork. The frequent references to Ireland made by Adam Winthrop convey the impression that that country was no more than a natural geographic extension of England. Certainly the ambition of those who promoted English settlement in the southerly province of Munster were ambitious to make it, and represent it, as just such an extension.<sup>4</sup>

Ireland's geographic position emerges in much the same light in the early surviving correspondence of Adam Winthrop's famous son John.<sup>5</sup> There is, however, one significant difference. John Winthrop, like Adam, was aware of his cousins who had made their home in Munster, but throughout the 1620s he kept a close eye on developments at the center of government in Ireland. He seems then to have expected that the entire kingdom of Ireland, and not just Munster, might be fashioned into a truly godly society. Apparently out of this belief he sent his son, John, Jr., to be educated at Trinity College, Dublin, in preference to any of the Cambridge colleges.<sup>6</sup> The special attraction that Trinity College, Dublin, held for John Winthrop and other militant Protestants was that it had surpassed even Emmanuel College, Cambridge, on which it was modelled, in creating what they considered a godly curriculum and environment.<sup>7</sup>

This is not to suggest that Winthrop considered Papist Ireland to be a reformed place, but he seemed confident that the moment was at hand when its long-deferred reform would be achieved, and this confidence may have stemmed from the success of his own brother-in-law, Emmanuel Downing, with his wife Lucy Winthrop, in creating a model plantation, Mount Wealy, while simultaneously holding a position in the Dublin government. Winthrop was also impressed by the plantation endeavours of the godly clergyman, Richard Olmstead, who worked under the patronage of Sir Charles Coote. It is thought that John Winthrop invested in these ventures when he visited Ireland in 1621. He even gave serious thought to making his home there: "I wish oft God would open a way to settle me in Ireland, if it might be for his glory, Amen."<sup>8</sup>

God, however, decreed that John Winthrop should translate himself from Groton to Massachusetts rather than to Ireland. Only when he made this decision did he develop the broad geographic perspective represented in his *Journal*. His New World was like his old in that it was circumscribed by menacing French and Spanish Papists lying respectively to the north and the south of New England, but plying the same ocean that was the lifeline for all European settlements. He himself, as a leader of the colony, had to overcome the fear of the sea by placing his trust in Providence. Then, having identified

the threats that were likely to come from known adversaries, Winthrop familiarized himself with the places in the Atlantic that were under English control even when these were ungodly outposts like Barbados and Newfoundland, or profane communities like Maryland where Jesuits abounded and the Mass was celebrated.<sup>9</sup> He took a particular interest in developments in Virginia and in the presence there of a godly minority among the English settlers, and also in the effort of some English Puritans of higher rank than himself to establish a second Puritan settlement on Providence Island, off the coast of Nicaragua. He cared about these ventures not only because these could complement or even be a source of settlers for his own community, but also because he feared rival communities might drain off settlers from Massachusetts.<sup>10</sup>

Therefore by looking, sometimes jealously, sometimes benevolently, at the endeavors of friend and foe, John Winthrop quickly constructed his mental map of European settlement in the Atlantic. At the same time he kept a close eye on political, religious, and social developments in Britain and Ireland, always with a view to calculating how these might hinder or help godly living at home and abroad, and more particularly the settlement of New England. The position of Ireland was altered dramatically in this geographic realignment. What had previously been but an extension of England and a would-be home for himself, now became a stopping place between Old and New England, and a source of colonists and supplies for Massachusetts. Settlers could sometimes be Irish Papists, both male and female, who were available in plentiful supply in the aftermath of the Cromwellian conquest of Ireland. Winthrop believed they would be made into good servants and proper Christians if integrated into conscientious families.<sup>11</sup>

More often, though, potential settlers were of the godly English with whom he had been familiar when he visited Ireland. The high opinion in which Winthrop held them and their achievements as planters is shown by his drawing upon the iron-smelting endeavors of Sir Charles Coote in Ireland when Winthrop attempted to establish iron works in Massachusetts.<sup>12</sup> During the 1630s, Winthrop had reason to hope that some of these Protestant settlers in Ireland would be ready to transfer to New England because of the official drive to reshape the Irish Protestant church along Arminian lines. His awareness of Protestant disquiet alerted him to the presence also in Ireland of godly Scots who were more immediately threatened by government policy. It seems that through this connection with Scots in Ulster Scotland entered Winthrop's consciousness as a place that might have potential migrants for his struggling settlement in Massachusetts. Thus, in 1634, he gratefully recorded the receipt of a letter, "from a godly preacher, Mr. Levinston [Livingstone], a Scotchman in the north of Ireland, whereby he signified, that there were many good Christians in those parts resolved to come hither, if they might receive

satisfaction concerning some questions and propositions which they sent over."<sup>13</sup>

This overture explains why, when John Winthrop, Jr., together with Mr. Wilson, the minister of Cambridge, was bound on a return voyage to Barnstable in the winter of 1635, his father could read it as a Providential sign when a storm brought them off course to the port of Galway on the west coast of Ireland. That town was no more noted then than now for its godliness, but the younger Winthrop's disembarkation provided him with the opportunity to proceed by road to Dublin, where he presumably met with some old acquaintances discontented with crown policy. From Dublin he travelled to County Antrim, on the northeast coast, to the house of the English settler Sir John Clotworthy. Again Providence decreed that he should arrive there: "the evening before the day when divers Godly persons were appointed to meet at his house, to confer about their voyage to New England."

Although Clotworthy was from Devon, we can presume that most of the godly who frequented his house were some of the many Scots who had settled in County Antrim. Clotworthy had emerged as their champion against official efforts to force their, and his, conformity with an Arminian church. This encounter gave Winthrop the opportunity to encourage the potential colonists on their proposed voyage. With his work done, he proceeded from Ireland to Scotland and thence to the north of England. All the time, he met "with persons of quality, whose thoughts were towards New England, who observed his coming among them as as act of Providence."<sup>14</sup>

While Providence may have brought possible Scots-Irish recruits for America to the Winthrops' attention, it frustrated their effort to bring them across the Atlantic. The one boatload that did set out from Ulster for New England in 1636, on the *Eaglewing*, was beset by storms off the coast of Newfoundland. The passengers accepted their forced return to Ireland as a sign that it was in Scotland that God intended them to establish His Commonwealth. This experience also explains what the same Sir John Clotworthy meant when he remarked, in 1638, when war was threatening between the Scottish Covenanters and King Charles I, that he hoped "to find an America in Scotland."<sup>15</sup> And as conflict between England and Scotland further polarized religious differences within England itself, the Winthrops were to find that some English people who might previously have been expected to travel to New England were now also hopeful that they could realise a godly life at home.

These various experiences help us to visualize the Atlantic world of the Winthrops as it was evolving over time. They had a clear understanding of the vastness of the Atlantic and of all European settlements there, but accepted that the English presence there was feeble, and an English godly presence more feeble still. There was no reason for them to hope, much less expect, that

their colony would multiply through natural increase. Therefore, it would have seemed that were the Protestant interest in the Atlantic ever to become secure, it would have to draw upon the human resources of Scotland and Ireland as well as of England. This would have resulted in a truly British community composed of English, Welsh, and Scots, as well as Protestants from all these jurisdictions who had been settlers in Ireland, together with some Irish Papists who would be employed as servants.

As with Purchas, this vision was far from a realistic portrayal of existing circumstances. In reality, English commitment to the Atlantic was still specialist and limited. Those who gained commercial monopolies there were determined to exclude Scottish interlopers from their companies, while the Scots themselves launched few ventures of their own in the Atlantic during the first half of the seventeenth century.<sup>16</sup> Ireland was even less involved with the Atlantic because what limited speculative capital existed there was usually invested in land or manufacturing enterprises at home rather than in trans-oceanic colonization. The only Irish adventurers who are known to have become involved with Atlantic enterprise during these years concentrated upon St. Christopher and the Amazon basin.<sup>17</sup>

Atlantic settlement in the name of the British crown still, therefore, relied principally upon English initiative and resources. The presence of Scots and Irish in English trans-oceanic settlements was usually in a menial, although sometimes numerically significant, capacity. The outbreak of civil wars in the three home kingdoms deprived the existing colonies of even this support and so brought an end to the first phase of colonization in the Atlantic. When adventures were seriously resumed after the Restoration of 1660, they were not only pursued more aggressively, but also more inclusively in the sense that these decades witnessed the fashioning of an Atlantic world that was British rather than narrowly English. Such a world had been conceptualized by a few during the decades before 1642. What was previously imagined came to be realised in the decades after 1660, principally because Scots as well as Englishmen appreciated the economic benefits that would accrue from colonization. One explanation for this appreciation is that they had served their apprenticeship in Ireland, and more particularly in Ulster, during the first half of the century. There they had established a community that was the first ever to identify itself as "British."

The role of Ireland as a testing ground for British colonization in America, our concern for the remainder of this paper, has previously been discussed by several authors, including myself. We have all been inspired by David B. Quinn, the pioneer of this line of investigation. Most of what has been written has drawn on the Munster experience to support the arguments advanced, which does make the case that during the years 1585-1641 Munster attracted more, and more highly skilled, settlers than any other English overseas destination.

The more successful English planters there certainly succeeded more spectacularly than any other group of English people either at home or abroad.<sup>18</sup> However what was created in Munster was pre-eminently an English settlement. This paper breaks new ground by looking at contemporaneous developments in the province of Ulster in an Atlantic context. This, it will be contended, was the first truly British settlement. To that extent it served as a prototype for what would develop in North America, and particularly in Pennsylvania, in the decades after the Restoration of 1660. It then follows that the creation of a British settler community in Ulster militated against the development of a British World further west in the Atlantic, because the effort exhausted the available human and material resources of Scotland. David Armitage has effectively made this point, but it will be substantiated here.<sup>19</sup>

\* \* \*

The plantation in Ulster was the most rigidly controlled colonization endeavor that was sanctioned by the British crown during the early modern period. It was so because it was a government undertaking in which the monarch himself took a personal interest. King James I hoped it would present the same opportunities for his lowland Scottish as for his English subjects. To an extent the Ulster plantation represented a continuation of the civilizing policies King James had long favored for the highlands and islands of Scotland. But the plantation in Ulster has also to be considered as a logical continuation of the plantation policies that had been attempted by the English government in Munster, and elsewhere in Ireland, during the sixteenth century. The strict conditions imposed upon the "Undertakers," "Servitors," and "Natives"—who would become the distinct categories of proprietor in the Ulster plantation—were therefore intended, in part, to remedy the shortfalls of the earlier experiences at colonization in Ireland. However, the Ulster scheme was also more carefully designed than anything previously attempted because it also intended to provide for the future defence of a previously rebellious province that, it was believed, would remain open to attack from the dispossessed landowners and their followers who had become mercenary soldiers in the army of Spain. There was, therefore, no avoiding the very strict building program required by the government of both those English and Scottish proprietors who were designated "Undertakers" in the plantation scheme, and of the London Companies who were persuaded by the monarch to become involved. Moreover the progress of all these grantees with their castles and towns was monitored and reported on by a sequence of official surveyors.<sup>20</sup> These reports have provided the material for those historians who have traced the development of the plantation in Ulster, but I propose to illustrate the unique *British* character of the settlement not so much through official papers, as through the records of two particular estates: those the Haberdashers and

the Ironmongers Companies established as their contribution to the involvement of the London Companies with plantation in Ulster.<sup>21</sup>

The prime responsibility with respect to Ulster which the Crown placed on the London merchant companies collectively was to create two trading ports at Derry and Coleraine. But individual companies were also required to plant an allotted proportion of an entire county, designated Londonderry, under the same conditions that bound the "Undertakers" in the general plantation scheme. These conditions stipulated that they should remove all native tenants from their property to make way for English or Scottish Protestant tenants, and that they should meet strict building conditions. Each company had to erect a castle and bawn on its particular plantation, as well as houses for their principal tenants, a church for the residents on their manor, and an artisan village. Historian T. W. Moody believes that their undertakings cost a minimum of £22,000, besides the £62,000 spent on the building of Derry and Coleraine.<sup>22</sup>

The Haberdashers Company was far from exemplary in living up to its responsibilities. In 1616, when they recognized that they had fallen behind the other companies, they even contemplated further prevarication so that "within a few years" their proportion would automatically increase in value, "our neighbours having planted about us and made out estates." For all of their reluctance to invest in their property the company had, by 1623, laid out a total of £1,124 on such mundane matters as surveying the property, commissioning maps, and establishing precise delineations. Money was also spent on pay for the agent and his assistants, and on such commodities as lead, nails, and iron. The largest expenditure was on the construction of their castle and a watermill.<sup>23</sup>

The Ironmongers Company proved more conscientious and provided their agents with specific directions both in relation to building and to tenancing their property. For all of this, they proved hardly more successful than the Haberdashers because their land contained no stone that was suited to building. When the Company's second agent, George Canning, finally had plans underway to commence building in 1615, he feared it might prove "necessary to frame your buildings round because the stone is so bad it will not make Quynes for the corner." All Canning could do towards building the required castle, while he awaited instruction from London, was to assemble whatever materials were available locally such as lime, slates, and sawed timber, and to investigate the cost and availability of the tradesmen from London who were clustered in the towns of Derry and Coleraine. These were awaiting contract work from the various merchant companies who were all bound by the similar building terms of their grants. Also, because he worked for the Ironmongers, Canning experienced no difficulty in importing ironmongery from London that would prove necessary for the building.<sup>24</sup> Rather than have no progress to

report on the building program, Canning, on his own initiative, contracted with Abraham Wott and Edward Elice, two carpenters based at Coleraine, to construct a village of six two-story timber houses with brick chimneys, close to the proposed castle at Athgeave. They were ready for occupation before the castle itself. He took such pride in his development of a village of pre-fabricated clapboard houses that he described the progress and building methods in precise detail, although his first experience with a winter storm made it clear to him that these tall buildings were less suited to the natural environment than the despised houses of the natives.<sup>25</sup>

The endeavors of George Canning on the Ironmongers proportion convey both the unusually high cost of founding a plantation in Ulster, and the frenetic energy invested in the enterprise, at least by the conscientious Ironmongers Company. Canning's accounts show that, besides the rents he collected locally, he received £615 from the parent company in London between 24 September 1615 and 11 August 1616. He spent £593 even before the castle was furnished and ready for habitation.<sup>26</sup> The accounts also indicate what a hive of industry Athgeave and its vicinity was during this interval when the construction was underway. Besides the carpenters, masons, and slaters employed on site, gangs of workers dug foundations, others cut timber and shaped it in the woods, and still other teams conveyed materials by water from Coleraine and overland by cart from the quarries, brick kilns, and lime kilns on the estates of other London Companies.<sup>27</sup>

The commitment of money and time associated with taking possession of their property and meeting their building obligations explains why the London Companies and their agents were not better able to look to tenanting their properties with English and Scottish Protestants. That they were slow to meet their obligation in this respect does not mean that they were unaware of it. George Canning addressed the question from the outset, not least because it was only by having tenants on the property that it would generate an income which would go to meeting his outlays. For this reason he entered into short contractual terms with the existing native tenants, and he also urged his superiors in London to have the plantation conditions altered so that Irish tenants who took the oath of allegiance and went to church might be retained on the property. When no concession was made and when the company was facing criticism, if not a financial penalty, for failure to meet its tenancy requirements, his superiors in London suggested he should himself bring over artisans from London who would work on the construction of the castle and who "after or rather presently may set down upon our land as tenants."<sup>28</sup>

The urgency of the building program was such, however, that Canning could not countenance becoming an active recruiter of personnel who would fulfill this dual purpose. Such effort would, in any event, have proved futile because, as he was to learn from experience, money in Ireland was "verious



pretious" and potential "takers of land" who were able to obtain leases at the bargain price of seven-years-purchase were "very unwilling" and "for the most part... unable to disburse money either for [entry] fines or purchase of land." In these circumstances, Canning got over the problem by entering into agreements with those artisans, based mostly in Coleraine, whom he engaged on his various building works and who were able to invest some of the money they received in wages to improve the estates he assigned them as freeholders on the Company's proportion. Typical of the agreements entered into by Canning on behalf of the Company was that of 2 June 1615 with Roger Holden of Coleraine, sawyer. Holden was assigned, at the annual rent of £7, a lease of two named townlands of the Ironmongers' estate for a term of thirty-one years or three lives. Holden, for his part, was permitted to sublet the property only to English or Scots "according to His Majesty's book of plantation" and was required to "enroll any such estate in the book of the Company's Manor." To make way for these subtenants, Holden was obliged to "expel and put out of the said lands all the Irish tenants upon lawful warning." Furthermore, Holden agreed, under bond, to build by 1 August 1616 two houses of "brick, stone or timber after the English manner," and also to "enclose a garden, orchard, and homestall with ditching and quickset about each house." He was required, within three years, to have subdivided and enclosed with quickset the entire two townlands.<sup>29</sup>

A series of similar agreements quickly followed. Canning was able to report in June, 1616, that he had entered into agreements with nine Englishmen and four Scotsmen. One of the Scots had "given [him] the slip," but the other three were building on their tenancies, either individually or collectively, as were the English, although the building standard of the Scots did not match that of the English. As a consequence, Canning looked forward by that Michaelmas to having not only a castle with an adjoining village of six houses "completed outwardly," but also to having twenty-one houses built by tenants including six built together "which is a great town in this country." By then, he was confident the Ironmongers would have "a good plantation," and he himself was resolved not only to continue on the property but "to have my wife and family out of Warwickshire, for me thinks it is uncomfortable living as I do."<sup>30</sup> An even greater indication of his confidence was his overture to the Company to have a manor court created and to have himself appointed steward of the manor so "the poor tenants shall be freed from many molestations they are now put to by the county sheriff and their bailiffs." These pleas were interspersed with reference to the daily assaults by alienated natives on the settler community, but this was as a preliminary to his ultimate request, conceded in August 1617, that he be appointed tenant of the castle, lands, and manor of the Ironmongers Company. Then Canning was assigned a lease of the whole proportion, in which the company had by then invested in excess

of £2,000, for an annual rent of £150, provided he fulfilled the outstanding contracts to pay the annual crown rent, to repair, glaze, and furnish the existing church, and to retain a minister at £20 a year.<sup>31</sup>

This arrangement was obviously satisfactory for Canning because he had acquired, at an apparently bargain price, a property which was a going concern and on which the principal capital investment had been made by the Company and the freeholders. The arrangement was also reasonably satisfactory to the Company because Canning was one of their own members whose brother had taken principal responsibility for their Ulster business. They could therefore expect the return, over time, of the money they had invested, while receiving gratitude from the king for developing their section of the plantation along the required lines. Moreover they expected, foolishly as it transpired, that they would be relieved from further outlay or responsibility towards the plantation.<sup>32</sup> However, even ignoring what lay in the future, we can see that there was something both artificial and fragile about the arrangements Canning had put in place. The buildings were tangible enough, but the merit of those freeholders he had chosen was that they had money to invest in their properties rather than that they would be caring residents. Indeed, most of them were busy artisans or merchants in Coleraine, suggesting that they would not be active on their estates. An even less hopeful sign was that some were simultaneously engaged as tenants by other merchant companies.

Canning himself acknowledged the shortcomings of the arrangements when he admitted he "could hardly hold [the] tenants to keep their bargains." The tenant-lists compiled from year to year show that while the proprietorship of the various townlands was changing steadily from Irish to "British," the actual occupancy of the land was remaining more constant as these new chief tenants retained most of the existing farmers as subtenants on their lands. Thus, in 1616, it was discovered that while Canning had placed eighteen tenants who were English or Scottish, there were still 129 Irish subtenants retained by these British tenants, while ten Irish chief tenants held leases of land.<sup>33</sup> This obviously did not comply with government stipulations, but Canning had chosen to meet the building requirement in full and the tenantry requirement in part, in preference to fully satisfying the tenantry requirement and neglecting the stipulations that related to defensible buildings. His choice would have been easy since it coincided with his own long-term interest. However it does seem that he was contemplating the alternate course in January, 1615, when he indicated that he had to decide between entering into agreement with English or Scottish tenants. Neither, he remarked, would agree to leases shorter than thirty-one years, and the English were not willing to pay the rents being sought if they were also required to bear the cost of building on their properties. However, even though Scots were more readily available and "willing to give better rents than the English," Canning opted for a primarily English

settlement because he doubted the Scots would “perform so good building.” Moreover, when he took account of the “catching after tenants” that was prevalent in Ulster, he thought it “not fit” to make agreements with any “that will condescend to indifferent conditions and covenants,” lest subsequently they would be seduced by better terms.<sup>34</sup> Even then, he did accept some Scots tenants on the property. It is likely that in the years immediately ahead, when the government insisted on compliance with tenancy requirements, Canning and his freeholders welcomed yet more Scots both as tenants and subtenants, although the ethos of the estate would have remained English.

If this was the intended outcome of the Ironmongers’ proportion, the Haberdashers lands were also a little Scottish world. The problems for that Company derived from their own neglect in developing an infrastructure, other than a castle and a mill, that would prove inviting for tenants. When they were exposed to criticism for lack of progress, the Company in London wondered, in desperation, if the “natives” on the land might not have “some poor houses wherein our people may lodge until they be better fitted.” Even then, they found it “impossible” to procure tenants of “any sufficiency” in London, “men being so loathe to remove from hence that have any good means to live here.” Then, as an official investigation was pending, they struck on the idea of leasing the entire property to any individual who would fulfill the obligations that they themselves had neglected. When the first overture came to nothing they resolved to build some small houses at £5 or £30 per house and also a church, “for it will be a good inducement to draw over English inhabitants if they may have churches near them furnished with a good minister.”<sup>35</sup>

Then suddenly, in 1617, all talk of further building was abandoned when a Scottish gentleman, Sir Robert MacClellan of Bomby, expressed interest in the proportion. The Company agreed to grant MacClellan the property for an annual rent of £350. The agent was instructed to assist him in taking over possession “without any prejudice against him or his nation,” although this was qualified by the directive that it was up to MacClellan to complete the roofing of the church.<sup>36</sup>

Once he had occupied the estate, Sir Robert MacClellan, later Lord Kircudbright, lavished on the property the attention that was required to bring it into conformity with official requirements. In doing so he populated it with tenants that he attracted directly from his own place of origin in Scotland, or else he contracted with Scottish tenants already in Ireland. The new world to which these tenants were being introduced was obviously shaped after the Scottish manner. This is clear from the “tack” drawn up in December, 1617, between MacClellan and Garvyn Kelso of Hollywood in County Down. Kelso agreed to move with his subtenants from his present residence in Clandeboy to MacClellan’s estate, but the lease assigned to him was described in “Scots

measure" and the rent was "the sum of seven score of marks Scots money."<sup>37</sup> The agreement soon became a reality because when a return was made to the "Governors and Committee for the City of London's plantation" of the "British habitation" on the Haberdashers' proportion, the third name to appear in a list of forty-four "British" tenants was Garvyn Kelso. He was credited with having "built, planted, and enclosed" the Ballyboe of Grannen and introduced "four or five undertenants there, all of them armed."

The surnames of the other forty-four tenants on MacClellan's property indicate that most of them were Scots, although some may have been English or even Irish. Sir Robert's stud mares, kept on the "two Gortcarbryes," were "looked to and kept by Scottish and Irish people who are provided with some small dwellings upon the same who are provided by the said Sir Robert with arms." The laborers in the twelve cottages in the vicinity of Sir Robert's castle were described as "British" and were armed and went to church. The twenty-eight householders who resided in stone and timber houses in a village within a half-mile of the castle were "all of them Britains and goeth to church." Their names again indicate that they were overwhelmingly Scots. The six freeholders, and the further six freeholders "in the nature of copyholders" settled by MacClellan on the estate were unquestionably Scots because their precise place of origin in Scotland was given. Therefore, the only three freeholders who were not Scots were three Irish tenants who had been placed there by the government before the land was assigned to the London Companies.

This return of tenants on MacClellan's estate suggests that this was a decidedly Scottish community. Sir Robert strove to exaggerate that impression when he purported not to know the names of the undertenants retained by his principal tenants.<sup>38</sup> This was disingenuous, because the surviving rent roll for 1623 indicates that the undertenants on the part of the estate managed directly by MacClellan were Irish. In many instances, they were the same people who had been chief tenants when the Haberdashers managed the property.<sup>39</sup>

Although the fact was that Irish people may have constituted a numerical majority on his property, the enclave developed by Sir Robert MacClellan on the Haberdashers' proportion was decidedly Scottish in its orientation. MacClellan himself retained his estates in Scotland while developing this and other properties in Ulster. He moved regularly between the two, sometimes leaving his daughter, Marion MacClellan, in charge of the Irish estate. Then, as is evident from Marion's account of disbursements from the Irish estate in 1623, there was a regular passage of messengers between Scotland and Ulster. The payment of £1.6s "for klipeing" of MacClellan's ship suggests that he tried hard to manage his Irish and Scottish interests as one and sail regularly between them. The disbursements also show that most of the skilled and some of the unskilled work on the Ulster property was being done by Scottish labourers, while those Irish workers who were retained, except the stud farmers,

were assigned menial tasks. Some of these payments also reveal how MacClellan and his agents were striving to reshape the environment by promoting improvements, as these were defined by MacClellan. A payment of £3.10s was recorded to Mr Robinson "for measuring your land," and one of £2.18s to "the sawyers for sawing the timber at Articleane." Five shillings were paid "to Mr. Campion the preacher," and the substantial sum of £9.1s.6d to "Mr. Godfree of London for your daughter's stuff for her gown and lace."<sup>40</sup> We learn from the accounts of Sir William Hamilton, another Scots planter in Ulster, that even the diet of his household was decidedly Scottish, with breakfast consisting of liberal helpings of bread and "bere," and the midday repast frequently including lamb puddings and dishes of "dropped eggs."

What we can piece together of the commercial and public lives of individual Scots planters in Ulster also shows that they associated and conducted business as far as was possible with fellow Scots. The detailed rental and account of the Hamilton estate that was compiled for 1614-15 on the death of the owner Sir Claud Hamilton reveals that while most of his tenants were still Irish and his rents were collected in kind, the cattle sold off the land for money went invariably to people bearing Scottish names.<sup>41</sup> When he had engaged in public affairs in Ireland Sir Claud had also associated principally with Scotsmen of previous acquaintance. His public outing of 1614, to attend the Dublin Parliament and to be inducted as a member of the Irish Privy Council, proved to be his last because he was taken ill in Dublin and died. Then, interestingly, the stream of acquaintances, besides Scottish personal servants who attended on successive days and nights at his death watch were all Scottish gentlemen; the sole exception was Christopher Hampton, the Lord Primate of Armagh, who was invited to be present only because he was "thought to have good skill in Physic."<sup>42</sup> What was true of Sir Claud Hamilton held true for Sir Robert MacClellan and other Scots in Ireland whose business lives we can piece together. They purchased from the English and Irish certainly, but they consorted as much as possible with each other. This can be illustrated by MacClellan's (then Lord Kircudbright) will of 1638. It names only Scots resident either in Scotland or Ireland as beneficiaries, except for Sir George Radcliffe, the trusted confidant of Lord Deputy Wentworth, to whom he left a diamond ring for favors rendered, and Thomas Talles of Dublin, his "faithful friend," to whom he left £70 for the purchase of plate by which he would remember him. More importantly the witnesses to the will were all Scottish gentlement settled in Ulster with the sole exception of Sir John Clotworthy who had perhaps been conceded the status of honorary Scotsman.<sup>43</sup> No such exception would have been made by another Scot, Lord Balfour of Clonawley. When advising his fellow Scottish peer, the Earl of Annandale, on the management of the fishery that Annandale had acquired in Killibegs in County

Donegal, Balfour insisted that he should never "trust any English in that place," since they would merely deceive him by "fair shows and protestations."<sup>44</sup>

Yet however much Scots, like Balfour, might have wished for an exclusively Scottish world in Ireland, this proved impossible. Their king, on whose support they ultimately relied, had taken up residence in London. When he admitted Scots as equal partners with his English subjects in the Ulster plantation it was in a jurisdiction where the administration and the state church were under almost exclusively English control. Thus within the local context of Ulster, Scottish settlers had to show deference to the, usually English, bishops of the Church of Ireland, while seeking to negotiate leases of land from them. They had to work closely with their English planter neighbors who dominated the local administration and defence of the province and they had to accept that they would, for some time to come, be reliant upon Irish tenants or subtenants to provide them with an income from the lands they were seeking to develop. At the same time, they had to establish and maintain contact with the administration in Dublin, a totally English body. Thus while we noted Sir Robert MacClellan spending a good deal of money to maintain contact with his Scottish homeland, he was at the additional expense of sending his servant, John Pooke, on frequent expeditions to Dublin. He also had to make regular payments to a Mr. Winslawe and a Mr. Wamsley for "law business," because it was English Common Law rather than Scottish law that obtained in Ireland.<sup>45</sup>

As the seventeenth century progressed, Scottish landowners in Ireland were forced to become more cosmopolitan than their countrymen at home. They were obliged to establish relationships at the court of King Charles I where Irish issues were increasingly resolved.<sup>46</sup> Therefore, despite the persistent endeavour to make it ever more Scottish, the society fashioned in Ulster during the course of the seventeenth century was a hybrid between English, Scottish, and Irish. Moreover, it was described as "British" both by English and Scottish observers who witnessed sizeable numbers of Scots and English living in close proximity. Together they sought to achieve dominance over a native Irish population whose property they had acquired either through plantation grant or commercial transactions.

Some well-placed Scots like Lord Annandale became involved with the lucrative fishing, whether coastal or freshwater, that Ireland provided. But this was normally an English preserve: Scottish involvement with Ulster usually concerned land, for which Scottish adventurers displayed an insatiable appetite. Some favored by King James received grants of land in the Ulster plantation, the more successful subsequently expanding upon their original holdings through purchase from less committed English grantees.<sup>47</sup> Others, like MacClellan, first made their way in Ulster by leasing land from the church. As in his case, many subsequently augmented these holdings by purchasing or leasing property from planters. MacClellan, for example, not only acquired

and developed the Haberdashers' proportion, but he also obtained a lease of the Clothmakers' proportion, on which he secured a jointure for his widow, and which he left in his will to his "kinsman" William MacClellan of Maghera in Londonderry. MacClellan's will further reveals that he owned yet more plantation land, in the Rosses of Donegal, which he left to his nephew Thomas MacClellan.<sup>48</sup> All such acquisitions were probably purchased by Scots from English grantees in the plantation, but this does not imply that there was much warmth between the two groups. The Scottish strove to maintain their distance from the English and to fashion their own enclaves whenever this was possible, while the English assumed a condescending attitude towards their Scottish neighbors. The view expressed in 1622 by the Englishman, Mr. Taylor of Armagh, when advocating "a plantation of British" for County Monaghan, was typical. The better lands to the south, he thought, should be reserved for English proprietors but "for the waste land on the north side . . . to which English will hardly be drawn; it were good to set it to Scotch men . . . the Scotch shall be as a wall betwixt them and the Irish through whose quarter the Irish will not pass to carry any stealths." While they might thus have been welcomed by the English as apt frontiersmen, the Scots for their part entered into commercial relationships with the Irish as readily as with the English. Thus yet further gains were made by MacClellan and other Scots at the expense of native proprietors in Ireland. The dismemberment of the estate of Con O'Neill from which MacClellan benefited was, as we learn from Raymond Gillespie, masterminded by Hugh Montgomery through the single-minded deployment of the mortgage device to seize property given as security on loans. Nor was this lesson lost on MacClellan; the reference in his will to debts valued at about £500 sterling due to him from Lord Viscount Mayo and Lord Viscount Taaffe suggest that he was contemplating an expansion of his interests from Ulster southwards into the province of Connacht.<sup>49</sup>

Irish land was of interest to Scottish gentlemen because good land was scarce in Scotland, and because Scots landowners could readily persuade Scottish tenants to join them. All records of Scottish-owned estates in seventeenth-century Ireland show that most principal tenants were Scots. It is evident as well that even Irish subtenants were gradually displaced by Scots. Significant numbers of Scottish tenants also made their way onto the estates of English planters in Ulster, although English rather than Scottish tenants were welcomed to the estates of those Irish Catholic proprietors in Ulster who wished to increase their rental income. It also appears that wives and children accompanied both Scottish tenants, and proprietors, or if not so soon followed them. The presence of a significant number of Scottish widows among the British population on the planted land in Ulster in 1622 is proof that Scottish settlers brought their wives with them. Some of these appear to have been doughty ladies, as for example the "widow McPatreek" a subtenant to the

freeholder Robert Montgomery on the estate of Archibald Achenson, who kept in her house "a sword and a pike for her maid."<sup>50</sup>

Estate records also provide some hints as to the character and pace of the human movement from Scotland into Ulster during the course of the plantation. For example, in 1621 Sir George Hamilton paid 40s. "for all the bairnes fetched between Scotland and Ireland and their entertainment on the way."<sup>51</sup> The conveyance to Ireland of Scottish proprietors together with their "men for laboring the ground, and many bestial and cattle for replenishing the same," occasioned such a traffic that there were already complaints in 1612 of the "extraordinary freights" being charged by the boatmen on the west coast of Scotland. The "passage" from Scotland to Ireland had been converted into "a common and ordinary ferry."<sup>52</sup>

The practices and procedures of the Scots in Ulster during the first half of the seventeenth century will strike a familiar chord with all who are acquainted with the British Atlantic world in the post-Restoration period. Then the Atlantic rather than the Irish Sea was the ferry that carried thousands of Scottish families and their animals to the west. Moreover, once we take account of the Protestant fervor of many of these Scottish migrants, it becomes clear why the Scottish settlement in Ulster proved of interest to John Winthrop when he began to despair of English recruits for New England. However, it is doubtful if Scotland, or the Scots in Ulster, would have supplied Winthrop with a significant number of settlers even if the *Eaglewing* had not been turned back by that providential gale. The inescapable fact was that with up to 30,000 Scottish settlers before 1641, Ulster must have exhausted the supply of skilled artisans and agricultural workers that Scotland could have supplied to any destination at that time, especially as there was a simultaneous exodus of Scottish fighting men to the continent of Europe.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, it is doubtful if many Scottish landowners in Ulster would have been at liberty to transfer themselves to Massachusetts because they had invested heavily in their Irish properties and were frequently indebted to Scottish moneylenders.

The little direct evidence that exists on such Scottish investment points to what must have been a general trend. Investment and guarantees for fulfillment of contract were required at two levels. The initial investment was required of the proprietors to meet the cost of entry fines, if they were taking land on lease, or of the steep building charges if they received grants under plantation conditions. The secondary investment would have been required of the tenants. The primary investment, as is hinted in the records of Sir Robert MacClellan, was made available to him by Scottish moneylenders who must have retained a claim on the property, or on other lands in Scotland, as security on the loan. Thus, in 1638, when Sir Robert willed the Clothmakers' proportion to his kinsman William MacClellan, it was not only on condition that William would pay the annual annuity of £50 to Sir Robert's widow, but also pay debts



due on the property “by contract, bonds, bills, recognizances, statutes, judgements or other ways whatsoever” to James Murray of Edinburgh, merchant, John Browne of Newbotell in Scotland, gentleman, Jennot King of Edinburgh, widow, and James Lone of Edinburgh, gentleman. This implies that the property was heavily incumbered from the outset. While Sir Robert MacClellan was lending money on the security of land to impoverished Irish landowners, his own Irish estates were mortgaged to moneylenders in Scotland.<sup>54</sup>

What holds true of Sir Robert obviously held true for many other speculators in Irish land. We can be equally certain that the landlords who bore the cost of transporting tenants, their families, and livestock from Scotland and setting them up in houses and farms that would comply with plantation conditions would have tied these Scottish tenants with stringent contractual conditions. There would, therefore, have been few Scots in Ulster who, if they had so wished, would have been at liberty to move to America and incorporate it into a British Atlantic world. Thus while the society evolving in Ulster in the decades previous to 1641 might be regarded as a prototype of what would emerge on mainland North America in the late seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, what was happening in Ulster hindered Scottish involvement in the Atlantic not only because of the demand it placed on human resources, but because of the strain it must have placed on the credit supply in Scotland, itself a poor society. Nonetheless, this English-dominated Protestant society, including a significant leaven of Scots and superimposed on a native society that it was seeking to transform, may well have been the kind of community that Samuel Purchas had in mind when he espoused the fashioning of a British society in a New World.

## Notes

1. Samuel Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas his Pgrimes*, 20 vols (Glasgow: 1905) I, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.
2. Richard Hakluyt, *Divers Voyages touching the Discovery of America . . .* [1582] (London: 1850), p.13.
3. "The Diary of Adam Winthrop, 1580-1630," in *Winthrop Papers*, vol. I (Boston: Mass., Hist Soc., 1929), pp. 39-145; on the Winthrop family background see Francis J. Bremer, "William Winthrop and Religious Reform in London," in *Sixteenth Century Journal*, forthcoming.
4. Michael MacCarthy Morrogh, "The English Presence in Early Seventeenth Century Munster," in Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie, eds., *Natives and Newcomers: the Making of Irish Colonial Society* (Dublin, 1986), pp. 171-90; Nicholas Canny, "The 1641 Depositions as a Source for the Writing of Social History: County Cork as a Case Study," in Patrick O'Flanagan and Cornelius G. Buttimer, eds., *Cork History and Society: Interdisciplinary Essays on the History of an Irish County* (Dublin, 1993), pp. 249-308.
5. *Winthrop Papers*, I, pp. 278-319.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 281, 283-4, 288-9, 311
7. Alan Ford, "The Church of Ireland, 1558-1634: A Puritan Church?," in A. Ford, J. McGuire and K. Milne, eds., *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation* (Dublin, 1995), pp. 52-68; Alan Ford, *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590-1641* (Frankfurt am Main, 1985).
8. *Winthrop Papers*, I, pp. 288-9, 311, 280-1; on Olmstead in Ireland, see Ford, *The Protestant Reformation*, pp. 205-8; on Downing in Ireland see Rolf Loeber, "Preliminaries to the Massachusetts Bay Colony: the Irish Adventures of Emanuel Downing and John Winthrop Sr.," in T. C. Barnard, D. Ó. Cróinín, and K. Simms, eds., *"A Miracle of Learning: Essays in Honour of William O'Sullivan"* (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 162-197.
9. J. K. Hosmer, ed., *Winthrop's Journal, 'History of New England', 1630-49*, 6 vols, vol. I (New York, 1908), p.126.
10. Karen Kupperman, *Providence Island, 1630-1641* (Cambridge, 1994); *Winthrop Papers* IV, pp. 263-7; *Winthrop's Journal*, I, pp. 334-5; II, p. 73.
11. Malcolm Freiberg, ed., *Winthrop Papers*, VI (Boston, 1992), pp. 309, 313, 314.
12. Sir Charles Coote's Account of His Ironworks, [c. 1643], in *Winthrop Papers*, IV, pp. 363-5; these same ironworks of Coote were also identified as exemplary, and were endorsed as such by Samuel Hartlib the noted Protestant divine and scientist, in Gerard and Arnold Boate, *Ireland's Naturall History* (London, 1652).
13. *Winthrop Journal*, I, p.127.
14. *Winthrop's Journal*, I, pp. 164-5.
15. Marilyn J. Westerkamp, *The Triumph of the Laity: Scots Irish Piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1670* (Oxford, 1988), p.36; Clotworthy is cited in Peter Donald, *An Uncounselled King* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 191-6.
16. David Armitage, "Making the Empire British: Scotland in the Atlantic World, 1542-1707," in *Past and Present*, no. 155 (May, 1997). I am grateful to David Armitage for letting me consult this paper in typescript.
17. Joyce Lorimer, ed., *English and Irish Settlement on the River Amazon 1550-1646* (London, 1989); Louis Cullen, "The Irish Diaspora of the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth Centuries", in Nicholas Canny, ed., *Europeans on the Move: Studies in European Migration, 1500-1800* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 113-49.
18. Michael MacCarthy Morrogh, *The Munster Plantation, 1583-1641*, (Oxford, 1985); MacCarthy Morrogh, "The English Presence;" Canny, "The 1641 Depositions as a Source."
19. David Armitage, "Making the Empire British."
20. See the chapter by Aidan Clarke with R. Dudley Edwards in T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, and F. J. Byrne eds., *A New History of Ireland, III, Early Modern Ireland, 1534-1691* (Dublin, 1976), pp. 186-232; on Scottish precedents see Jane Ohlmeyer, "'Civilizing of those rude partes:' Colonization within Britain and Ireland, 1580s-1640s," in Nicholas Canny, ed., *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. I, *The Origins of Empire*, forthcoming.

21. Ulster estate papers concerning the Ironmongers are in London Guildhall Library, especially Ms. 17,278(1), and those concerning the Haberdashers in Edinburgh, Scottish Record Office [S.R.O.], RH 15/91/33.
22. T. W. Moody, *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609-41: The City of London and the Plantation in Ulster* (Belfast, 1939), p. 270.
23. Copy of letter to Mr Beresford, 28 May [1616]; At the Court of Assistants...Company of Haberdashers, 30 July 1623; both in Edinburgh, S.R.O., RH 15/91/33; Account for Building a Castle and a Watermill, 1616 (Edinburgh, S. R. O. RH 15/91/60, no.1).
24. Report of George Canning, 9 August 1615 (London, Guildhall Library, Ms. 17,278(1), ff. 69-70); Report of George Canning, 16 Oct. 1615 (*Ibid.*, ff.73v-74v); Furniture sent by Company to George Canning (*Ibid.*, f.70v); Articles of Agreement...George Canning...and Richard Symson of Mavanhoe (*Ibid.*, ff. 74v-75r).
25. Report of George Canning, 9 Dec. 1615, (*Ibid.*, ff. 106r-108v).
26. Account of Mr George Canning, 24 Sept. 1615-11 August 1616 (*Ibid.*, ff. 141v-146v).
27. *Ibid.*, and Account of George Canning, Sept. 1614-Sept 1615 (*Ibid.*, ff. 102v-105v).
28. Commission to George Canning and his Instructions, 2 Nov. 1614, (*Ibid.*, ff. 49v- 50v); Report of George Canning, 9 Aug. 1615 (*Ibid.*, ff.69-70); Report of George Canning, 30 March 1616 (*Ibid.*, ff.122r-125r).
29. Report of George Canning 30 March 1616 (*Ibid.*, ff.122r-125v); Articles of agreement 2 June 1615 between George Canning agent for the Ironmongers and Roger Holden of Coleraine, sawyer (*Ibid.*, ff. 63.r and 63.v); further articles of aggrement between Canning and his individual frreholders are detailed successively (*Ibid.*, ff.78v-100v).
30. Report of George Canning, 8 June 1616 (*Ibid.*, ff. 134r-135v); Report of same, 30 March 1616 (*Ibid.*, ff. 122r-125v).
31. Canning to Ironmongers from Barton in Warwickshire, 15 March 1616/17 (*Ibid.*, f.119); Agreement, 14 Aug. 1617 (*Ibid.*, ff. 173-174v).
32. Moody, *The Londonderry Plantation*, pp. 238-58, 355-70; Jane H. Ohlmeyer, "Strafford, the 'Londonderry Business,' and the 'New British History,'" in J. F. Merritt, ed., *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-41* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 209-29.
33. Considerations for Ironmongers Proportion, 2 April 1616 (*Ibid.*, ff.125v-126v); Takers of Land according to the Report of Mr. Alderman Proby being at Athgeave, 14 Aug. 1616 (*Ibid.*, ff. 147-150v).
34. Report of Meeting with George Canning, 5 Jan.1614/15 (*Ibid.*, f.51v).
35. Copies of Letters to Mr Bersford, probably 1616 (Edinburgh, Scottish Record Office, RH15/91/33, at back of document, f.1 from end r. and v.); same to same, 28 May [1616] (*Ibid.*, f.2 from end).
36. Adrian Moore to Mr. Beresford, 9 Aug.1616, and same to same 23 Apr 1617 (*Ibid.*, f. 3v from back); Abstract of Covenant with Sir Robert MacClellan (Edinburgh, Scottish Record Office, RH15/91/59, no.4).
37. Copy of tack December 1617 (Edinburgh, S.R.O., RH15/91/59, no.2).
38. An answer to the Governors and Committee for the City of London's Plantation in Ireland...(Edinburgh, S. R. O. RH15/91/32, no. 2); The names of the freeholders...(Edinburgh, S. R. O. RH15/91/33).
39. The May rents received since Sir Robert's going, 6 June 1623 (Edinburgh, S. R. O. RH/15/91/60); Rent roll from All Saints 1616 to All Saints 1617 (*Ibid.*, RH15/91/35, 1r-4r).
40. Disbursements since Sir Robert's going, May 29 1623 (Edinburgh, S. R. O. RH15/91/60).
41. Accounts of Irish Estates of Sir Claud Hamilton of Shawfield, (Edinburgh Univ. Lib., Laing Ms., Div.2, no.5); the information on diet for the year 1629 comes at the end of this document when the property had been transferred to Sir William Hamilton.
42. John Hamilton to —, 22 Oct. 1614, in H. M. C. *Report on the Laing Manuscripts Preserved in the University of Edinburgh* (London, 1914), I, pp. 132-5.
43. Copy of testament of Lord Kirkcudbright, 31 Dec 1638, (Edinburgh, S. R. O. , RH15/91/40,no.18).
44. James, Lord Balfour of Clonawley to John,

- Earl of Annandale, 20 July 1626, in *H. M. C. Report on Laing Mss.*, I, pp.169-72.
45. Disbursements since Sir Robert's going May 29 1623 (Edinburgh, S. R. O. RH15/91/60).
46. Sir Robert's principal estate in Ireland went to his daughter Marion and her husband Robert Maxwell who was forced to become a petitioner at court to uphold their interests, see Robert Maxwell to Bishop of Derry, 14 March 1639/40 (Edinburgh, S. R. O., RH15/91/20, no.1).
47. Michael Perceval Maxwell, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I* (London, 1973); for evidence of Scottish purchase of English plantation land in Ulster see the certificates made for the 1622 survey of the plantation (Dublin, N. L. I. Mss. 8013, 8014).
48. Abstract of the Covenant between Sir Robert MacClellan and the Clothmakers (Edinburgh, S. R. O. RH15/91/59, no.4); Copy of Testimony of Sir Robert MacClellan, baron Kircudbright, 31 Dec. 1638 (*Ibid*, RH15/91/37, no.3)
49. Mr. Taylor of Armagh, his proposition for Planting my Lord of Essex Land, (Dublin, N. L. I., Ms. 8014 (x) ); Raymond Gillespie, *Colonial Ulster: the Settlement of East Ulster, 1600-1641* (Cork, 1985) pp. 121-2; testimony of MacClellan as in note 48.
50. Survey of the manor of... Clancurry... belonging to Sir Archibald Achenson (Dublin, N. L. I., 8014, ix).
51. Income and outlay of Sir George Hamilton 1620 and 1621 (Edinburgh University Library, Laing Ms., Div. 2., no. 5).
52. Petition of Abercorn et al., 27 Oct. 1612, in D. Masson ed., *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, IX, 1610-13 (Edinburgh, 1889), p.327.
53. T. C. Smout, N. C. Landsman, and T. M. Devine, "Scottish Emigration in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," in Nicholas Canny, ed., *Europeans on the Move*, pp.76-112.
54. MacClellan's testament, 31 Dec. 1638 (Edinburgh, S. R. O. RH15/91/37, no. 3).