

**Scotland and Ulster Connections
in the Seventeenth Century:
Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt and the
Scottish Parliament Under the Covenanters**

**John R. Young
University of Strathclyde**

Scotland and Ulster: A Conceptual Framework

It has long been recognized that a culture of mobility has existed in Scottish society. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the main destinations for Scottish migrants were Poland, Scandinavia, and Ulster, although there were many other destinations too (Smout, Landsman & Devine, 1994; Devine 1992). In recent years there has been a renewed interest in the study of the Scottish diaspora. This is reflected in the formation and activities of the Scottish Centre for Diaspora Studies at the University of Edinburgh, the Scotland and the Wider World project at the University of St Andrews, and an impressive range of scholarly books and articles on Scottish migrants abroad. The work of Steve Murdoch and Alexia Grosjean in particular has been important (Murdoch 2001; Murdoch 2003; Grosjean 2003; Grosjean & Murdoch 2005; Murdoch 2006). Their work has concentrated on Scandinavia and Poland in the early modern period, although Murdoch and Mackillop have extended the scholarly coverage to include the military and imperial experiences into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Murdoch & Mackillop 2002; Mackillop & Murdoch 2003). Furthermore, Worthington has engaged in a comparative approach embracing the British and Irish emigrant and exile experience in the seventeenth century (Worthington 2010), building on his previous work on Scots in Habsburg service (Worthington 2004). Scottish migrants in the Dutch republic have been studied by both Catterall and Gardner (Catterall 2002; Gardner 2004) and a major study of Scots in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth has recently been written by Bajer (Bajer 2012). The most recent scholarly monograph focuses on Scottish links with Germany (Zickermann 2013). In terms of

methodological approaches using new technology, the construction of databases relating to Scotland, Scandinavia, and Northern Europe, and Scots in the Italian peninsula during the Thirty Years' War, have provided useful electronic resources for scholars to use (Grosjean and Murdoch 1998-2004; Marks 2009-2014).

Given this impressive and developing historiography based on new scholarship, however, the study of Scottish migration to Ulster and the impact of the Scottish settlers there, both over several generations and as newcomers, has been somewhat left behind. There has certainly been a range of publications looking at different elements of migration history, the relationship between Ulster and Scotland, and some work on the Scots in Ireland in the post-1688 context, by scholars such as Fitzgerald (2004, 2005, 2012), Forkan (2003, 2007, 2011), Sherry (2009), and the edited books of Kelly and Young (2004, 2009), but there is not the level of detailed scholarship for Ulster as there is for the areas identified above, and there is indeed a need for more scholarly studies on the migration of Scots to Ulster and their activities and experiences there, along the lines of Michael Perceval-Maxwell's groundbreaking and seminal work (Perceval-Maxwell 1973) and Raymond Gillespie's work on East Ulster (Gillespie 1985). There is, of course, an important North American context to this and one that is often forgotten or sidelined in Scotland, namely the migration of large numbers of people from the north of Ireland in the eighteenth century, their role in the American Revolution, and their contribution to the development of the United States of America.

The Scotch-Irish dimension

From the perspective of Scotch-Irish history, an emphasis is often naturally placed on a historical chronology that starts with the great migrations from Ulster in the eighteenth century, and the earlier migrations from Scotland to Ulster over the course of the seventeenth century tend to be somewhat sidelined. From this 'side of the pond,' however, a welcome development is the growing awareness of Scottish migration to Ulster and also of Scotch-Irish history in the mind of the public. Television programs broadcast in Scotland, Northern Ireland and, occasionally, the Republic of Ireland have greatly contributed to this awareness. Media output has included the highly popular *Born Fighting. How the Scots-Irish Shaped America*, presented by Senator

James Webb based on his best-selling book of the same name in the US, which was broadcast on prime time television by STV (Scottish Television). The program was produced by a Scottish production company and was given a preview to an invited audience in the Scottish Parliament in Edinburgh. The four hundredth anniversary of the Plantation of Ulster was the subject of another television program, *Plandáil/Plantation*, broadcast in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, and a recent further television program, *An Independent People*, broadcast by BBC 2 Northern Ireland, looked at four hundred years of Presbyterianism in Ireland, including the impact of the Scotch-Irish in America, marking the settlement of the first Presbyterian minister in Ireland, the Reverend Edward Bryce from the parish of Drymen in Stirlingshire, Scotland, who settled at Ballycarry in County Antrim. *Mapping Ulster*, a BBC Northern Ireland production, examined maps in looking at Scottish and English settlement in Ulster, and noted how Ulster was one of the most intensively mapped parts of the world four hundred years ago. In Northern Ireland, of course, the publications of the Ulster Scots Agency have done much to raise the profile of Ulster-Scotland relations within the wider community. These publications have covered issues such as the Plantation of Ulster, the Hamilton Montgomery settlement of 1606, and the 1718 migration to America (Ulster Scots Agency publications).

The Adairs of Kinhilt

The Adairs of Kinhilt were a Scottish family that held land in Wigtownshire in the Galloway peninsula in southwest Scotland. Kinhilt was near Lochans, in Inch, just south of Stranraer. The Adairs of Kinhilt were ‘prominently involved in the Scottish migration to Ulster in the seventeenth century’ (Holmes 2004). They held lands in the Ballymena area of County Antrim and the legacy of their influence can still be felt today. There is an Adair Street in Ballymena and also a hotel named the Adair Arms. Ninian Adair of Kinhilt (1533-c.1608) had been mortgaging the family lands in Wigtownshire in the 1590s, but still faced debt problems by the time of his death in 1608 (Gillespie 1985, p37). His son, William Adair of Kinhilt, inherited these lands, but he settled in the barony of Toome in mid-Antrim. In Scotland he was regarded as a ‘prominent man in his district,’ being made a Justice of the Peace in 1623, but he appears to have inherited his father’s cash flow problems. In 1620 he sold some of his Wigtownshire lands to Hugh

Montgomery of Braidstane, later first Viscount Montgomery of the Ards (1622), one of the founding fathers of the Ulster Scots with the Hamilton and Montgomery Settlement of 1606. No specific date can be given for when William Adair of Kinhilt went to Ireland. Michael Perceval-Maxwell has noted that the 'first record' of Adair's 'presence' is for 1626 although 'it is probable that he arrived before this date' (Perceval-Maxwell 1973, p230). William Adair was made a denizen of Ireland in 1624. He died in 1626. Adair brought some of his Scottish tenants to settle in Antrim and by 1630 the Adair lands in Antrim had a large number of Scots on them, with the 1630 muster roll listing over 90% as Scots (Gillespie 1985, p42; Perceval-Maxwell 1973, p230).

William Adair's brother, Archibald Adair, and two of his sons, William Adair, and the son and heir of William the father, Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt, all had important roles to play in Ireland and Scotland. Archibald Adair (d.1647) is well known for his involvement in the Church of Ireland and Irish ecclesiastical politics. He was Dean of Raphoe, Bishop of Killala and Achonry (1630-1640), when he was deprived of office, but he was restored by Charles I and appointed to the Bishopric of Waterford and Lismore in 1641, an office that he held until his death in 1647 (McCafferty 2004). From a different denominational perspective, Reverend William Adair was the Church of Scotland Presbyterian minister of Ayr from 1639 to 1682, he was involved in administering the Solemn League and Covenant in Ulster in 1644 and he was one of the ministers present at the Battle of Mauchline Moor on 12 June 1648. He was an opponent of the 1648 Engagement, the military invasion of England in favor of Charles I, and he was one of the ministers of the Church of Scotland in the radical regime of the late 1640s and early 1650s (Mackenzie 1933; Killen 1866, p102, p116, p117, p119). Pride of place, however, is often given to the Reverend Patrick Adair, minister of Cairncastle, County Antrim, (1646-1674) and then Belfast (1674-1694), for his historical work entitled *A True Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, written towards the end of the seventeenth century, but lost and not discovered until the nineteenth century when it was edited and published. The editor of the published volume, W.D. Killen, described Patrick Adair as 'a Scotchman of highly respectable parentage.' Remarkably, as a young boy he was personally present at the Prayer Book riot of 23 July 1637, when a riot broke out in St Giles Cathedral, Edinburgh when the controversial new Scottish Prayer Book was read for the first time. This is associated with

the infamous Jenny Geddes throwing her stool at the pulpit, symbolic of Scotland's resistance to the religious policies of Charles I. Indeed, for Patrick Adair the events of this period were a 'revolution in Scotland' (*Adair's True Narrative*, 1866, pp 56-57). Adair later graduated from St Andrews University in 1642 and played an important role in the development of Presbyterianism in Ireland. As a prominent Ulster Presbyterian, for example, he welcomed William III of England [William of Orange] to England in 1689 and Ireland in 1690. Adair's *Narrative* provides a useful insight into his mindset and mentality. Accordingly, Scottish migration to Ulster was providential, especially in the context of the 1641 Ulster rebellion and the devastation that was caused. Hence 'God made way for a more full reformation; and as the foundation of a new plantation in the country' (*Adair's True Narrative* 1866, pp91-92). The rebellion paved the way for the Covenanting army that was sent into Ulster in 1642 and the related establishment of the first presbytery in Ulster. The Adairs of Kinhilt therefore represent an important Scottish family that needs to be placed and examined in the longer-term context of Scottish settlement in Ulster. Patrick Adair has been described as 'one of the leading Presbyterian ministers in Ulster in the 17th century' (Kirkpatrick 2006, p29).

Yet there is another member of the Adair network who also played an important role in the events of the seventeenth century and who can be tracked and identified intermittently in the historiography, but who has not received the same historical attention as his family counterparts. The individual in question is Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt. Sir Robert Adair has been recently described as 'a major Scots colonizer in mid-Antrim' (Holmes 2004) and he built Ballymena Castle as a center for his Irish estates. He was the brother of the Reverend William Adair and Patrick Adair was his nephew. Sir Robert Adair was an important Covenanter in Ulster and he played a role in Scotland in the Covenanting politics of the time. Sir Robert Adair and Sir Randal Macdonnell, second Earl, later first Marquis, of Antrim, are cited by Raymond Gillespie as two important examples of settlers in Ulster who maintained strong connections with Scotland. According to Gillespie, Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt 'did not see Ireland as a permanent base.' Yet Adair and the Earl of Antrim were 'untypical of most east Ulster settlers.' Antrim, as a Catholic, was 'marked off from the rest of the settler community, tending to associate with the Old English of the Pale. Adair, on the other hand, 'had arrived late in the settlement and hence had not time to shed his Scottish links

by 1640.' Adair had sold most of the family lands in Wigtownshire by 1630, but he kept the title of laird of Kinhilt. Gillespie rightly notes that Adair represented Wigtownshire in the Scottish Parliament in 1639-1641 and 1649-1650 (Gillespie 1985, pp144-145). Recent historiography on the Ulster Scots of the 1640s has identified Sir Robert Adair as being part of the 'Ulster Scottish élite' in east Ulster (Forkan 2007, p460). Yet the wider historical awareness of the presence and significance of Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt in the religious politics of the Covenanting movement has remained rather marginal. Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt was an important Covenanter in his own right, but he is also a key example of an individual with interests linking Scotland and Ulster over the maritime motorway of the North Channel. Adair was also involved in the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant that entered England in 1644. Adair, then, participated in the affairs of the three kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland and in this respect he can be regarded as an example of a 'three kingdom' individual that the New British and Irish history sought to understand and analyze for the bloody and troublesome wars of the three kingdoms, 1637-1651.

This paper focuses primarily on the role and profile of Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt in the Covenanting Parliaments in Scotland, 1639-1651, but it also touches on Adair's wider role in the religious and military affairs of the time. Technological advances with the creation of the Records of the Parliaments of Scotland website has now made it possible to conduct original research into Scottish parliamentary history with relative ease (www.rps.ac.uk). This has enabled a detailed analysis to be conducted into the parliamentary profile of Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt in his capacity as one of the parliamentary commissioners for Wigtownshire and the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright. It is therefore now possible to conduct micro-history research into individual commissioners and constituencies. Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt therefore represents an important and, in many respects pioneering, case study along these methodological lines. Nevertheless, the Records of the Parliament of Scotland website is also extremely useful for exploring wider links between Scotland and Ulster in the 1640s and also earlier and later periods, by using the search engine, typing in key words such as 'Belfast' and 'Carrickfergus,' for example. The website is freely available and it can be used anywhere in the world. There is now an excellent opportunity for genealogists, enthusiasts, and practitioners of Scotch-Irish history to explore and investigate families and individuals of Scottish origin, as well as the wider

historic links between Scotland and Ulster. This paper also aims to contribute to the historical understanding of relations between Ulster and Scotland, especially to a North American audience and the Scotch-Irish community, in having an awareness of the important seventeenth century context to Ulster-Scottish relations, by focusing on Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt.

The parliamentary context

The period 1639-1651 witnessed regular meetings of Parliament in Scotland (appendix 1). The demand for regular and free meetings of Parliament was one of the main political demands of the Covenanting movement as it emerged as a national movement of opposition by 1637-1638. This was in response to the previous Parliaments of 1621 and 1633 under James VI and Charles I respectively, which had been closely managed by the standing committee known as the Lords of the Articles. The term 'free' therefore meant that parliaments should be held in Scotland without royal interference, a reflection in particular of Charles I's arrogant and high-handed behavior in the 1633 Parliament. This was related to his first visit to Scotland for his coronation in 1633 despite the fact that he became king in 1625. The abolition of the Lords of the Articles, whose membership included bishops and archbishops, was another central political demand of the Covenanting movement and this would later have important implications for the committee structure of Parliament. Charles I's attempt to impose a military solution to deal with the Covenanters failed in the First Bishops' War of 1639 and also in the Second Bishops' War of 1640. The successful militarization of the Covenanting movement was largely due to return migration of battle-hardened Scottish veterans from continental Europe who had fought in the armies of the Thirty Years' War, such as Alexander Leslie, the leading military general in the Swedish army, and the role of Scottish commercial networks in securing the supply of arms and ammunitions. Sweden was regarded as having the most professional army in Europe at the time and Swedish military influences were adopted by the Covenanters to form a successful Covenanting army. The 1639 Peace of Berwick stated that a free Parliament should be held in Scotland: a Parliament duly met in Edinburgh on 31 August 1639. The organizational leadership of the Covenanting movement, known as the 'Tables,' played an important role in managing the elections of the barons/shire commissioners and the burgh commissioners. The 1639

Parliament was dominated by Covenanters and Charles I was not in personal attendance. His authority was instead invested in the office of the High Commissioner John Stewart, first Earl of Traquair, who was a figure of hate to many of the Covenanters. Traquair was unable to control the Covenanted dominance of the session as a range of legislation prepared by the Covenanters was submitted to the 1639 Lords of the Articles, whose membership included Covenanters, and Traquair was forced to prorogue the session on 14 November 1639. As events unfolded, the Scottish Parliament proceeded to convene without royal authority in June 1640. The June 1640 session enacted a range of legislation that enhanced parliamentary powers at the expense of the royal prerogative. Collectively the parliamentary sessions of 1640-1641 in Scotland enacted a constitutional settlement that was one of the most powerful of its kind in early modern Europe (Young 2000).

Legislation of 2 June 1640 dealt with the 'constitution of this parliament and all subsequent parliaments.' The clerical estate (bishops and archbishops) was abolished. The nobility, barons and burgesses and their commissioners were deemed to be 'the true estates of this kingdom, to be a true and perfect parliament and to have the same power, authority and jurisdiction as absolutely and fully as any parliament formerly has had within this kingdom in time bygone' (*RPS* 1640/6/5). In a series of acts, the 1640 session ratified the 1638 National Covenant and ordered that it should be subscribed by all the king's subjects, it ratified the proceedings of the General Assemblies of 1638 and 1639, and it abolished the unpopular religious policies of James VI and Charles I (*RPS* 1640/6/33, 1640/6/37, 1640/6/38). Of course, the Church of Scotland under the Covenanters would be a Presbyterian Church and during the 1640s there was an attempt to have a second Reformation in Scotland (Young 2006). The Triennial Act of 6 June 1640 stated that 'a full and free parliament' must be held every three years in Scotland (*RPS* 1640/6/27). This was the formal piece of constitutional legislation that provided for regular meetings of Parliament in Scotland under the Covenanters. This legislation was entitled the act regarding the choosing of committees out of every estate. This dealt with the issue of the committee of articles, which had been so controversial in the past, and the 'liberty' of parliament with regard to preparatory committees. Hence the act stated that 'all subsequent parliaments may, according to the importance of affairs of the time, either choose or not choose several committees for articles as they shall think expedient' (*RPS* 1640/6/39). A committee of articles was therefore

deemed to be optional and not mandatory, but in essence the Covenanters abolished the Lords of the Articles that had been so hated and so controversial in the 1621 and 1633 Parliaments. The act proceeded to state that each parliamentary estate was to elect its own members to parliamentary committees. The act therefore embraced the electoral principle based on each estate. A new and sophisticated parliamentary committee system emerged in the Covenanting Parliaments, based on session and interval committees. Session committees sat during parliamentary sessions and they had a wide range of remits to consider for the life of the nation and also for Covenanting diplomatic and military commitments. For example, the 1644 parliamentary session appointed a session committee on 4 June 1644 to consider the Covenanting army in Ireland (*RPS* 1644/6/33). Session committees usually had equal numbers of each estate elected to form its membership. Interval committees were appointed towards the end of a parliamentary session and they sat between parliamentary sessions or between parliaments and reported back to the next session or new parliament. Interval committees were not restricted to parliamentary members. They could include military and legal officials and they also drew on non-parliamentary members from the movement in the Scottish localities. The most important interval committee was the Committee of Estates, appointed on 8 June 1640. Committees of Estates were appointed on a regular basis 1640-1651 and they acted essentially as a provisional government. The initial structure of the Committee of Estates was based on an Edinburgh section and an army section to accompany the Covenanting army into England in the summer of 1640 for the Second Bishops' War, but by 1646-1647 the committee had a more detailed structure that included an Edinburgh section, a diplomatic section, an army section (England), an army section (Scotland), and an army section (Ireland), reflecting the three-kingdom commitments of the movement. The June 1644 parliamentary session appointed an interval committee for Irish affairs on 27 July towards the end of the session, for example. The rationale for this was the necessity of 'the better regulating of the forces employed against the rebels in Ireland and carrying on of the war there that committees be appointed by advice of both kingdoms to reside in Ireland' (*RPS* 1644/6/249). This reflected the situation on the ground of the different armies in operation in the Irish war zone and the nature of the Anglo-Scottish parliamentary alliance and the structural context of the Anglo-Scottish Committee of Both Kingdoms, c.1644-1646, for the conduct of warfare and diplomacy (Macinnes 2005, pp162-165, pp171-172, p183).

**Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt and the Scottish Parliament
Adair and the Parliament of 1639-1641**

Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt was an elected member of the Parliament that met in Edinburgh on 31 August 1639, representing the constituency of Wigtownshire in southwest Scotland. Wigtownshire was represented by two commissioners in parliament. As a result of the abolition of the clerical estate in 1640, the voting power of the barons/shire commissioners was doubled. Traditionally voting power was invested in the shire, so, for example, Wigtownshire had two commissioners but only one vote. The shire vote was doubled as each commissioner now had an individual vote. Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt is recorded in all the sederunts of the 1639-1641 parliamentary sessions. Adair of Kinhilt and Sir Patrick MacKie of Larg are recorded in the parliamentary rolls (attendance data) for 31 August 1639 and 2 June 1640. Only Adair is recorded for 19 November 1640. Adair and John MacCulloch of Myrton are recorded for 15 July and 17 August (Charles I arrived in Edinburgh on 14 August and was present at the session on 17 August onwards until news broke of the 1641 Ulster Rebellion when he returned to London shortly afterwards) and both men are recorded in the sederunt at the end of the 1641 parliamentary session on 17 November (*RPS* 1639/8/31/3, 1640/6/2, 1640/11/2, 1641/7/2, 1641/8/2, 1641/8/247). Two manuscript commissions for Adair's election to Parliament have survived for the 1639-1641 period, but do not appear to have survived for 1649-1650. On 2 May 1639 Adair was elected to the forthcoming Parliament and on 6 July 1641 Adair and McCulloch were elected to the session that convened on 15 July (NAS PA7/25/34/1-2). Specialists of Scottish parliamentary history have recognized that Adair was 'a strong adherent of the National Covenant' (Young 1992, p4) and it is no surprise that the landed influence of the Adairs of Kinhilt in south-west Scotland resulted in his parliamentary election.

Yet there is a wider context to Adair's election to the first Covenanting Parliament. Adair's presence in Scotland is related to developments in Ulster and Ulster-Scottish relations, 1638-1639, concerning the reception and threat of the National Covenant in Ulster, given the large Scottish population there and the fact that many of them were Presbyterians. This refers to, of course, the notorious 'Black Oath' of Thomas Wentworth, first Earl of Strafford, Lord Deputy of Ireland, whereby the Scots of Ulster were required to renounce the 1638 National Covenant. In an attempt to enforce obedience, 1500 soldiers were stationed in Ulster. It is the case that many Scots did sign the 'Black

Oath,' `but there was widespread opposition to the oath, especially in Counties Antrim and Down, but also in Counties Tyrone and Londonderry. In order to avoid taking the oath, many people simply fled their homes and went to Scotland. Many of them joined the emerging Covenanting army. This, in turn, demonstrated the level of support for the Covenant in Ulster (Stevenson 1981, pp18-19). Return migration from Ulster to Scotland is therefore an identifiable demographic feature in 1639, but movement across the North Channel to Ulster had been a concern for the Scottish Privy Council by the mid-1630s. The English traveler, Sir William Brereton, visited Ayrshire in 1636, noting that in the previous two years 10,000 Scots between Aberdeen and Inverness had crossed over to Ireland. Brereton also stated that when he was passing through Irvine he heard of 60 'emigrant' Scots who had been prevented from traveling to Ireland and forced to return to their own areas due to the lack of necessary certificates (*RPCS* 1635-1637, pxxiv). Brereton correctly identified a process that had been initiated by the Scottish Privy Council in 1636. On 23 February 1636 the Privy Council issued a proclamation forbidding all tenants from crossing to Ireland without certificates from their landlords or a justice of the peace and a similar proclamation was later issued on 7 September 1636 (*RPCS* 1635-1637, p198, p316). The proclamation included a strong element of maritime regulation whereby masters, skippers, boatmen and mariners of any ships, barques, or other vessels, were prohibited from transporting people from Ireland unless their passengers had the required certificate (*RPCS* 1635-1637, p198). Certainly this was concerned with the labor market and the movement of 'great numbers of persons, labourers of the ground and tennents to noblemen, barons and other landlords' (*RPCS* 1635-1637, p198), but this was also part of a law and order issue and the illicit movement of stolen goods between Scotland and Ulster, i.e. the sections of the labor market identified above as moving were involved in illicit trade and the movement of stolen goods to Ireland. Much of this appears to have been concentrated in the Borders of Scotland. On 13 September 1636, for example, the noblemen and others within the bounds of Crawfordmuir and the upper ward of Clydesdale were instructed to keep watch for Border outlaws within their bounds. The Privy Council also passed an act on 13 September against the illicit transportation of commodities into Ireland (*RPCS* 1635-1637, pp324-326). Similarly, the Justiciary Court held at Jedburgh in the Borders on 23 February 1637 empowered local officials to apprehend individuals involved in these

activities and to commit them to prison and jail to await trial (RPCS 1635-1637, p404). Maritime issues at a practical level for both trade routes and the movement of people between Scotland, the north of England, and Ireland can also be identified by the mid-1630s. In 1616 the Privy Council had granted a charter to Hugh Montgomery of Braidstane, later first Viscount Montgomery of the Ards, for a ferry crossing across the North Channel. The Donaghadee-Portpatrick route became an important one and in 1626 Montgomery wanted the renaming of the locations as Montgomery and Port Montgomery. This ferry service was based on a twenty-one mile route and an estimated crossing time of between three and five hours (Vann 2006, p231). By the 1630s there was a need for expansion. On 15 December 1635 the Privy Council ordered that a general collection was to be made towards the construction of a harbor and quay at Portpatrick. This was based on a petition to King Charles I from the inhabitants of Portpatrick in Scotland and Donaghadee in Ireland, recognized as the closest port to Scotland. Portpatrick was regarded as the 'cheefe passage not onelie for all that travel and trade betuix this kingdome and Ireland bot lykewayes for all suche as travel from anie place of England towards the north of Ireland.' Portpatrick was 'destitute' of any harbor and in violent storms boats had to be hauled to shore in small open boats, a situation that was deemed to be dangerous to the king's subjects (RPCS 1635-1637, pp150-151). There was a three-kingdom dimension to this concerning the movement of people from the north of England to Ireland via Portpatrick. Charles I in England and Ireland had already ordered a general collection for the construction of a quay and harbor. The construction costs were estimated to be above £60,000 Scots. John Montgomery of Cokilbie, James Blair, minister at Portpatrick, Thomas Dunlop, writer in Edinburgh, and Thomas Majorbanks, customer at Portpatrick, were given responsibility for the collection of this 'charitable contribution' and they were to report back with their financial accounts on 1 January 1637 (RPCS 1635-1637, pp151-152). A related issue to harbor construction as part of developing the maritime infrastructure was the contemporary hospitality industry. In his missive to the Privy Council from the Court at Bagshot on 29 July 1635, Charles I had noted 'the want of innes in the roade frome Carlill to Portpatrick' and how this was a 'great discouragement' to trade and travel. Charles I wanted advice to be taken from the landlords of towns and villages for their opinion on how inns 'may be convenientlie built and kepted by discreit persons' (RPCS 1635-1637,

pp152-153). Accordingly, the Privy Council ordered on 15 December 1635 that a list was to be made of the places between Carlisle and Portpatrick where inns might be established for the convenience of travelers passing to and from Ireland (*RPCS* 1635-1637, p153).

We return to the central theme of Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt: by 1638 he had been identified by the English authorities in Ireland as a troublemaker and by 1638-1639 he was back in Scotland. Henry Leslie, Bishop of Down, writing to Thomas Wentworth, first Earl of Strafford, Lord Deputy of Ireland, on 22 September 1638 from Lisnagarvey, stated that ‘there is one Robert Adaire a Justice of Peace in the County of Antrim, of five hundred Pound lands a Year, who having some Estate in Scotland, hath joined himself unto the Faction there, signed the Covenant, received the Oath of Rebellion, and now when the Marquis was last in Scotland, he was one of the Commissioners for the Country against the King, and one of them appointed to watch the King’s Castle, that no Provision should be carried in’ (*Strafford’s Letters* 1739, vol II, p219). This refers to Adair being a Covenanting representative in the negotiations with James, third Marquis of Hamilton, the king’s leading advisor on Scottish affairs. This in itself indicates that Adair had a prominent role in the movement with this diplomatic role. He also appears to have been typical of other Scots in Ireland at this time. The Bishop of Down further observed in his letter that he believed that ‘if there were a strict Enquiry, there will be found others who have Estates in this Kingdome have done this’ (*Strafford’s Letters* 1739, vol. II, p219). The mood of the Scots in Ulster was captured by Wentworth in a letter to Charles I from Dublin Castle on 11 November 1638. Thus, Wentworth told Charles, ‘I am informed the Scottish in these Parts are observed, all to ride up and down the Country armed with Swords, which formerly they have not been accustomed to’ (*Strafford’s Letters* 1739, vol. II, p233). The treatment of the Scots in Ulster through the imposition of the Black Oath was one of the grievances articulated in the accusations given in by Scottish diplomatic commissioners to the peers to be represented by them to the English Parliament against Lord Deputy Wentworth on 16 December 1640. This stated that the imposition had been an unchristian persecution that had resulted in thousands fleeing to Scotland. Many had been indicted and declared guilty of high treason for no other guiltiness than ‘for subscribing our national oath,’ which was not only impiety and injustice in itself, the document argued, but was an utter undoing of His Majesty’s subjects and was ‘a weakineing of the scottis

plantatioun' (*Transactions* 1640-1641, ff52a-53). Adair attended the 1638 General Assembly held in Glasgow in November and December 1638 (Vann 2006, p148). He was one of the lay elders appointed to a committee for the process of business on 29 November. This was one of the 'three or four Committees for preparing in private the chief and most weightie matters the Assembly had to treat of' (*Baillie's Letters and Journals* 1841, vol I, p147).

Adair's commitment to the Covenant resulted in him being declared a traitor and his estates were forfeited, but Adair was proactive in defending his landed interests when he returned to Scotland as an elected parliamentary commissioner for Wigtownshire. Adair submitted a supplication to the Lords of the Articles on 16 September of the 1639 parliamentary session. He 'craved that the forfeitures and fines passed against him in Ireland may be rescinded.' It was recommended to the High Commissioner, John Stewart, first Earl of Traquair, that this issue be represented to the king (RPS C1639/8/16). Other supplications presented to the 1639 Lords of the Articles were concerned with the implications of Wentworth's Black Oath. On 6 September 1639 a supplication was presented by the commissioners for the General Assembly to petition Charles I to 'liberate the Scots subjects trafficking in England or Ireland from oaths prejudicial to the Covenant.' A subcommittee consisting of the burgesses John Smith (Edinburgh), James Fletcher (Dundee), and Robert Barclay (Irvine) was appointed to speak with the supplicants 'that they may condescend upon the particular persons who have been urged with oaths prejudicial to the covenant,' in order that the Articles could further consider the supplication thereafter (RPS C1639/8/4). The following day, on 7 September, the supplication from 'some Scotsmen in England and Ireland' was recommended to High Commissioner Traquair and the Privy Council to be presented to Charles I, suggesting that a meeting had taken place with the supplicants on 6 or 7 September (C1639/8/5). Later, on 1 October 1639, three supplications were presented to the Articles. These were from William Stewart, Isobel Montgomery, and 'a third by the Scotsmen in Ireland, craving that they may be freed of oaths in Ireland contrary to the laws of this country.' These were also recommended to High Commissioner Traquair to be presented to the king (RPS C1639/8/38). It is not clear if this is the same William Stewart from Ireland who presented a supplication on 17 November 1641 (discussed later in this article), but this fits into the overall picture of returning Scots from Ulster who had refused to sign Wentworth's Black Oath, as well as some English non-conformists (Stevenson 1981, p18).

Back in Ireland, there appears to have been an attempt at a land grab on Adair's estates. This is apparent in a letter written by George Rawdon from Dublin on 10 June 1640 to Edward, Lord Viscount Conway and Killutagh. Rawdon informed Conway that he had suggested to Sir George Radcliffe, who was leaving Ireland for England, that instead of the £5000 arrears due to Radcliffe from Conway, Radcliffe should have the Adair estate at Ballymena. Rawdon pointed out that Adair 'has been convicted of high treason since he went to Scotland to fight with the Covenanters, and has forfeited his lands' (*CSPI* 1633-1647, p241). Adair's case was further considered by the June 1640 parliamentary session. A reference was issued in favor of Robert Adair of Kinhilt on 11 June. In procedural terms, it referred back directly to Adair's supplication of 1639, but it was now related to the current circumstances of events as per June 1640. The 1640 parliamentary reference also has more details than the 1639 supplication as it is recorded in the parliamentary records. Thus, Adair's 1639 supplication to High Commissioner Traquair and the estates had represented 'his great suffering in the kingdom of Ireland upon occasion of his constancy to the Covenant and necessary services and employments undertaken by him for the common cause' for which he had been indicted and found guilty of high treason (*RPS* 1640/6/64). His estate, to the value of £550 sterling (£6600 Scots), was now in the hands of the king and at the disposal of Lord Deputy Strafford, and he was debarred from accessing his movable goods and sums. This had been remitted to High Commissioner Traquair for redress in 1639, but circumstances had now changed and there was 'little hope' of redress via this route. Hence Adair had supplicated again, this time to the June 1640 session. Adair asked the assembled estates 'seriously to think upon the most commodious and convenient way for your supplicant's present relief and for the good of his estate thereafter, lest it tend to the utter ruin of him and his house, which has continued these 300 years most loyal to the crown and country.'

If time did not allow this, then Adair asked that his case be referred to 'some of your number to set down such overtures and remedies for his good and relief as shall be most expedient' (*RPS* 1640/6/64). In the context of the June 1640 session and the new emerging committee structure, Adair may well have been pragmatically and proactively suggesting the formation of a session committee to deal with his case, but the time factor in terms of parliamentary business and the fact that the issue was considered towards the end of the session probably worked against this option. As events transpired,

Adair's supplication was read to the estates, who recommended that the issue be referred to the Edinburgh section of the Committee of Estates newly established on 8 June 1640 (*RPS* 1640/6/64).

Adair's case was dealt with both at Westminster and at Edinburgh in 1641. Significant details are provided in Adair's petition to King Charles I at Westminster. His petition outlined how he had purchased an estate in Ulster and 'at hazard of his life had planted it with British.' It was 'a most barbarous place and receptacle of rebels.' Adair lived long there, but went to Scotland to care for his estate there in 1639. In June 1639 he was indicted for high treason at the Shire Hall in Carrickfergus 'on the charge of joining the King's enemies in Scotland, and plotting a Scotch invasion and rising at Ballymena in Antrim' (*CSPI* 1633-1647, p291). For Adair, therefore, this indictment was 'unjust' and he prayed to be 'relieved from it' (*CSPI* 1633-1647, p291). Six 'humble desires' were annexed to his petition; that the Lords Justices give order to the judges and law officers that his goods and estate be freed from the indictment; that the Attorney General be ordered to 'confess' Robert Adair innocent and 'shall do whatever Adair asks as necessary for his safety;' that Adair be given copies of the indictment and charges against him and a copy of his pardon under the Great Seal of Ireland; that the Lord Justices be ordered to allow him to 'ship' to and from one part of the King's dominions to another, 'as he pleases;' that these requests be speedily granted; and that all goods taken from him whilst he was under the indictment be restored (*CSPI* 1633-1647, pp291-292). Adair's fourth desire clearly indicates that he was demanding freedom of movement across the North Channel in both directions. Indeed, this was a feature of his behavior and activities that can be identified throughout the period. Adair was successful in his petition. On 26 May 1641 Charles I wrote to the Lord Justices from Westminster ordering that Adair be acquitted of high treason of the charges against him in June 1639 for joining the National Covenant in Scotland 'and all other offences charged against him and mentioned in his petition' (*CSPI* 1633-1647, p291).

Yet there is a further Edinburgh and Scottish parliamentary dimension to this too. Adair's case continued to be considered in the 1641 parliamentary session that Charles I was present in from 17 August onwards and when news of the Ulster rebellion reached Edinburgh. On 5 November 1641, with Charles I personally present in Parliament, the House 'all in one voyce' did 'seriously recommend' Kinhilt's business to the king, whereby he had been cited by the late deputy there as a traitor 'in respecte that he in the lait troubles

had adioyned himselue to his auen native countrey' (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol III, p138). In response to this, Charles I promised the House that he would order Sir Henry Vane, his Secretary, to write to Ireland that Adair's petition might be 'speedily' obeyed, and for that effect that he would write directly to his justices (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol. III, p138). One David Lisk's supplication for reparation of his losses in Ireland was also considered by the estates on 5 November. Both supplications were to be given to Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall, the King's Advocate, for delivery to William Hamilton, first Earl of Lanark, Secretary, for presentation to the king (*RPS* M1641/8/67). Adair's interests were also advanced in other legislation of the 1641 Parliament. In accordance with parliamentary procedure, private legislation was dealt with towards the end of the session, mainly in the form of ratifications. A ratification was passed in favor of Adair on 17 November 1641, the final day of the session. This ratification legally confirmed the rights of Adair to land in Wigtownshire, including Drummore and the patronage of the parish kirk and parish of Kirkmaiden, as the heir to an earlier charter granted by James VI to the late Ninian Adair of Kinhilt in 1602 (*RPS* 1641/8/389).

Yet Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt's profile in the 1641 parliamentary session was not restricted to his private landed interests and he was elected to two of the most important session committees. These were the Committee for the Trial of the late Incident, formed on 21 October, and the Committee regarding the commotion in Ireland, formed on 28 October. 'The Incident' took place in the second week of October 1641, focusing primarily on 11 and 12 October 1641. It was a rumored Royalist plot for the assassination or forced abduction by ship to London of Archibald Campbell, eighth Earl of Argyll, James, third Marquis of Hamilton, and his brother William Hamilton, first Earl of Lanark. Charles I's exact role in the plot is unclear, but his own behavior did much to undermine his trustworthiness, and 'The Incident' needs to be placed within the wider context of Royalist plots in England in 1641. The proposed plan appears to have been to assemble 400 armed men and seize Argyll, Hamilton, and Lanark, in the King's withdrawing room. The fact that the three men were to be brought to his room by William Murray, Groom of the Bedchamber, and that Murray had a key role in the plot makes it highly likely that Charles I was aware of the plot in one form or another, although his potential sanctioning of murder remains highly controversial. Ultimately the plot was betrayed and divulged to General

Alexander Leslie, the Covenanting military leader, and Argyll, Hamilton, and Lanark fled to Hamilton's residence at Kinneil on the Firth of Forth on 11 October, before the plot could be implemented. Charles furiously denied any involvement in the plot and argued that it was designed by his enemies to discredit him, yet he proceeded to come to Parliament the next day on 12 October accompanied by a guard of several hundred armed Royalists. The leading ringleaders of the plot were arrested, but Charles was weakened by these events. First, he insisted on a public investigation to clear his name and honor, but this backfired on him and Parliament decided to investigate 'The Incident' by a secret parliamentary committee, dominated by Covenanters. Second, 'The Incident' led to a rapprochement between Covenanters and pragmatic Royalists, which in turn forced Charles I to give his assent to the constitutional settlement of 1640-1641 and weakened his hand in his attempt to keep control over legal and executive appointments. Third, Charles proceeded to bestow honors on leading Covenanters in order to try and win over their support. Argyll was made a Marquis, Leslie was made an Earl, Archibald Johnston of Wariston was knighted, and Alexander Henderson, a leading Church of Scotland minister and the other author of the 1638 National Covenant with Wariston, was given the charge of the chapel royal, for example. Fourth, and what is particularly important in the context of this article is the fact that his trustworthiness and credibility had been undermined. Thus, when news of the 1641 Ulster Rebellion broke out, questions were raised, in England and Ireland too, about his involvement in the rebellion as it proceeded to unfold (Cowan 1977, pp122-129; Donald 1990, pp312-318; Macinnes 2011, pp144-146; Stevenson 1973, pp238-242; Woolrych 2002, pp189-192).

Sir Robert Adair's inclusion on the Committee for the trial of 'The Incident' indicates that he was highly regarded in parliament by his contemporaries. The committee was appointed on 21 October, just over one week after 'The Incident' had taken place. As noted above, the appointment of the committee was a political setback for the king, who wanted a public trial, and a victory for parliament. On 21 October the king, 'with advice of the estates of parliament,' agreed that the trial of 'the late Incident' should be 'by way of committee' (*RPS* 1641/8/122, M1641/8/57). Membership consisted of four of each estate and had twelve members in total. The only Royalist member was James Stewart, fourth Duke of Lennox. The remaining noble members were John Campbell, second Lord Loudoun, who was the

Scottish Chancellor, John Maitland, first Earl of Lauderdale, and John Elphinstone, second Lord Balmerino, who was the President of Parliament. The inclusion of both the Chancellor and the President of Parliament on the committee reflects the significance of the political issues involved in ‘The Incident.’ Adair of Kinhilt was one of the four gentry members appointed to this high profile committee (*RPS* 1641/8/122, M1641/8/57). Compulsory attendance at committee meetings was required and the members were also to take an oath of secrecy. Hence the committee’s proceedings were to be secret and not public. The committee was to ‘examine upon oath, without oath or either or both ways all persons necessary for trial and discovery of the verity of the said incident’ and was to take the depositions of the relevant parties (*RPS* 1641/8/122, M1641/8/57). It was empowered to ‘confront, sequestrate and imprissone suche as they shall think fitt’ (*Balfour’s Historical Works* 1824, vol. III, pp 117-118). The committee was instructed to meet that afternoon, 21 October at 3pm, and on the following morning at 8am. Thereafter the committee was to appoint its own meetings ‘as they shall think expedient’ (*RPS* 1641/8/122, M1641/8/57). On 1 November an order for Argyll, Hamilton, and Lanark to return to Parliament was passed by the Estates (*RPS* 1641/8/134, M1641/8/63). ‘The Incident’ committee, in chronological terms, must also be viewed in the context of the outbreak of the 1641 Ulster rebellion and the Committee regarding the commotion in Ireland of 28 October, discussed below, as well as the examination of James Graham, fifth Earl, later first Marquis of Montrose, one of the key figures in the movement who had become increasingly alienated from the direction matters were taking. Montrose had been imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle since 11 June 1641 as a ‘plotter’ against the regime and accusations that Argyll was acting as a dictator. Montrose’s letter of 11 October informed the king that he could prove treason against his enemies (Macinnes 2011, pp138-142; Cowan 1977, pp102-129; Stevenson 1973, pp223-233, pp238-242; Stevenson 2004). On 30 October nine members were instructed to meet with the ‘Incident’ committee, of which Adair was a member, and the king, to read the letter and examine Montrose on its contents (*RPS* 1641/8/132, M1641/8/63). The committee reported back outlining Montrose’s ambivalent response on 2 November (*RPS* A1641/8/102, M1641/8/65), yet the matter was not fully resolved and Montrose was released at the end of the parliamentary session on 17 November, albeit an interim committee was appointed on 16 November for trying Montrose and others before 1 March 1642. Final sentence and

punishment were to be remitted to the king (*RPS* 1641/8/186, 1641/8/187). The trial duly took place in February 1642. Montrose and the other plotters were found guilty of breaching the Covenant and making divisive motions, but they were exonerated by the king (Cowan 1977, pp130-132).

Scrutiny of the parliamentary records reveals that this was not the only session committee to which Adair was appointed that dealt with legal issues involving prominent individuals. One involved a dispute between the town of Wigtown and Alexander Stewart, first Earl of Galloway. A supplication and complaint against the Earl of Galloway by the town of Wigtown was presented to Parliament on 10 September 1641, most probably based on an earlier supplication that had been presented to the Lords of the Articles on 21 September 1639. The complaints made against the earl included one point of treason and eight of oppression (*RPS* C1639/8/25, 1641/8/49; *Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol. III, pp60-62). The supplication and complaint were read out in front of Charles I and Parliament. Both parties were instructed to cite their witnesses to appear before Parliament for examination and the date of 23 September was given as a deadline for citation. Two ordinances were issued by Parliament in this respect, one in favor of the town of Wigtown itself, and the other in favor of John McCulloch of Mertoun (*RPS* 1641/8/49, 1641/8/50). MacCulloch was the other representative for Wigtownshire in the 1641 parliamentary session (*RPS* 1641/7/2, 1641/8/2, 1641/8/247; Young 1993, p448). Sir James Balfour noted that the Earl of Galloway answered the complaint after it was made and that the town of Wigtown's replies to Galloway's answers were read (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol III, p61). It would seem highly likely that both Adair and MacCulloch participated in the exchanges that took place in the House and that they were the individuals who replied on behalf of the town. Following the specified deadline, on 24 September Parliament issued a warrant and commission for the examination of the town of Wigtown's witnesses and for the Earl of Galloway's witness against the town of Wigtown. This commission consisted of four members of each estate, with a total membership of twelve, but it did not include the two representatives for Wigtownshire, most probably because they had a vested interest and MacCulloch had presented the original complaint (*RPS* 1641/8/74, *Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol III, p62). In turn, the Earl of Galloway presented a supplication against the town and on 1 October Parliament issued an ordinance stating that letters were to be written for summoning witnesses for

proving of the complaints and answers against them (*RPS* 1641/8/94). ‘Diverse others’ had also made complaints against the Earl in the original supplication (*Balfour’s Historical Works* 1824, vol III, p62). This is evident from examination of a further parliamentary warrant issued on 9 October that was relevant to the case. Three members of each estate were commissioned by Parliament to examine the witness produced by one William Cunningham of Polton against the Earl of Galloway for proving the complaint in the supplication that he had given into Parliament. Significantly, Adair of Kinhilt was one of the four shire members included in the commission (*RPS* 1641/8/109). The dispute had still not been resolved by the close of Parliament on 17 November. The Earl of Galloway gave in a list ‘of those to whom he was content to submit all controversies between him and the town of Wigtown and all others who had given in supplications against him before the Parliament,’ and the town of Wigtown gave in its list. Both lists had six individuals named, but it is of interest that the Marquis of Argyll and his ally among the burgesses, John Semple, burgh representative for Dumbarton, were on the town of Wigtown’s list. John Campbell, first Earl of Loudoun, Chancellor, and John Elphinstone, Lord Balmerino, President of Parliament, or any of them being present, or four for each party, were to decide in all controversies between both parties with a time limit of 15 January 1642 (*RPS* 1641/8/249).

Adair’s profile in the 1641 parliament also extended into economic activities and the process of parliamentary business itself. On 10 September Adair was appointed as a member of the commission for manufactories. The commission had six members of each estate, plus Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall, the Lord Advocate, giving a total membership of nineteen. It was to consider the overtures for manufactories and report back (*RPS* M1641/8/21; *Balfour’s Historical Works* 1824, pp60-61). Incidentally, this was the same day that the House considered the town of Wigtown’s bill against the Earl of Galloway, as discussed above. A commission for manufactories was duly appointed towards the end of the parliamentary session on 16 November. It noted ‘how necessary, expedient and profitable the erecting and manufactories will be for this kingdom, as well as in keeping great quantities of money within the same, which is now daily exported for wrought commodities, as in setting poor ones on work, restraining of idle beggars, increase of virtue and bringing of monies into the country’ (*RPS* 1641/8/194). It noted previous legislation that had been enacted; yet ‘any

considerable progress' had not been made. According to the 1641 legislation, liberties, privileges, and immunities were to be granted to manufactory constructors. The issue was to be remitted to the Privy Council, which was given the power to name the commissioners for manufactories. Those commissioners were then to meet and establish the best rules, overtures, and propositions for erecting and maintaining all sorts of manufactories. Of wider interest in the context of Scottish society in the 1640s is that those commissioners were empowered to appoint 'correction houses in such parts of the kingdom as they shall think most conducive for the good of the said manufactories and restraint of idle and masterless beggars' (*RPS* 1641/8/194). 'Masterless' people were to be commanded to work at 'such reasonable rates' established by the commissioners. The commissioners were also empowered to establish corporations and grant them privileges according to the laws of the kingdom. In order to better encourage those who had already undertaken the erecting and maintaining of manufactories, or would do so in the future, Charles I and the estates granted privileges and immunities to specific sectors. All Spanish and foreign fine wool for the making of fine cloth was to be custom free, as were all dyed goods, oil, and other necessaries for the use of these activities. All parcels of cloth, serge (strong twilled fabric), and others made by any who had constructed, or would construct in the future, any of these works, were granted a custom free period of fifteen years. Furthermore, the workers of these activities were to be free of any taxation or imposition to be imposed on the kingdom. In terms of the labor market, it was deemed illegal for anyone to hire or maintain any of the servants of these activities without the consent of their masters (*RPS* 1641/8/194). Consideration of economic legislation of the Covenanting period has often been neglected and it has still not been fully explored, but a range of relevant economic legislation was also enacted on 16 November, including linen cloth, plaiding, the selling of yarn by weight, tin production, and the coal industry. Other economic legislation enacted on 16 November included regulation of the packing of salmon, the excise raised on herring, a ban on the importation of whisky, a ban on the illegal demolition of dykes and the destruction of parks and planting, and the regulation of the export of eggs out of the kingdom to the detriment of the diet of the poor laboring people and servants (*RPS* 1641/8/195, 1641/8/200, 1641/8/207, 1641/8/210, 1641/8/211, 1641/8/212, 1641/8/214, 1641/8/218, 1641/8/223, 1641/8/224).

News of the outbreak of the 1641 Ulster rebellion reached Charles I when he was in Edinburgh during the 1641 parliamentary session. On 28 October the king produced a letter that had been written to him by Edward Chichester, Viscount Chichester, 'regarding some late commotion in Ireland' (*RPS* M1641/8/60). Charles ordered the Clerk Register to read the letter out to the House (*Balfour's Historical Works*, 1824 vol. III, p119). The letter was dated 24 October at Belfast and reported on the opening events of the rebellion on 23 October. Chichester told the king that he had been given information by 'credible persons' that 'certain septs of the Irish of good quality in these northern parts of the kingdom of Ireland' had risen over the previous two nights and had taken Charlemont, Dungannon, Tonragee (Donaghadee), and Newry with the King's store there. These were described as 'towns of good consequence,' the furthest within forty miles of Belfast. The rebels had 'slain only one man,' but they were 'advancing nearer into these parts.' The letter further informed the king of some 'great fires' that had been set near to Belfast. As per 24 October Chichester stated 'what the intent is cannot at present be conceived, but these septs are all of the Romish religion.' Chichester had given instructions for the King's subjects to defend themselves and preserve the country 'until further course may be taken to suppress them.' He had also ordered the forces in the garrisons to be prepared for defense and to 'suppress the outrages if any shall be there attempted.' The 'best guard' presently available were defending the King's store at Carrickfergus. This guard would be 'watchful and diligent,' as would Chichester himself for giving his best assistance to 'the suppressing of these tumults.' This was the current state of events as reported by Chichester to Charles in whose 'great wisdom some course may be taken in time to curb these great insolencies which otherwise may grow to a greater head.' The actual letter itself was delivered by one Master Shiels, a Scotsman and 'one whom we conceive a loyal and true subject of your majesty.' Chichester likewise informed the king that Shiels would be able to provide further information on the letter's contents (*RPS* A1641/8/96).

The Chichester letter therefore described the early stages of the rebellion, before the horrors and atrocities were committed or had come to light. Further details on Charles I's speech are available in Sir James Balfour's contemporary account. According to Balfour, Charles I informed the House that he was to 'begin at this tyme with a bussines of grate importance' and whither it was of more or less importance, as yet he could not tell; 'onlie tuo

or 3 faithfull subjects had written to him,' one of whom was Chichester, whose letter he produced. Balfour described the reading of the king's letter to the House, 'showing the Irische had lepin out in Irland in opin rebellion, and that many of the papists ther had ioyn'd to them, taken some forts, as that of Dungannon.' Balfour's account also stated that one Lord Caulfield had been taken prisoner. The king added, according to Balfour, that 'he thought good to adwertisse the house of this, that if it proued bot a small reuolt, then he hoped ther was little neid of aney supplie from this, bot if it proued a grate one, he did put no questione bot they that were his auen, wold haue ane especiall care he wer not wronged' (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol. III, pp119-120). Significantly, Balfour's account makes it clear that Charles I immediately perceived and interpreted the Irish situation in a European context. The King's thoughts focused on France and Spain in particular in his speech. Charles explained that he thought that the 'rebells could expecte no supplie' from France, due to the 'neire relatione betuix the French King and him' (Charles I was married to Henrietta Maria, the sister of Louis XIII) and the fact that France was at war with Spain. With regard to Spain, Charles 'knew for certaine they could looke for lesse,' with 'the Spaniard having so much to doe,' not only against the French, Dutch, and Portuguese, but also 'at home,' both in Catalonia and Aragaon, 'bot euen in his auen bosome in Castill itselue' (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol III, p120). Charles I's perceptive awareness of Spanish problems concerning warfare with France, the Revolt of the Netherlands (from a Spanish perspective), uprisings in Catalonia and Portugal in 1640, and problems within Castile itself, are somewhat ironic given the ongoing problems that he was now facing in governing his three kingdoms, albeit England had not yet descended into civil war. In his speech, Charles explained that if the 'hopes' of the Irish rebels 'proceid from the papists of England,' then he thought 'the business of a grater consequence, and of a more transcendent nature.' Charles concluded his speech by asking that the House 'appoynte some of each estait' with Lord General Alexander Leslie to 'speike of the business'. The king wanted to be 'adwertissed of the treuth how matters went there' and he wanted to 'adwertisse' the English Parliament of this too. In response to the reading of the Chichester letter and the king's speech on the issue, the House proceeded to appoint a session committee of three members per estate to meet at 3pm that afternoon with Leslie, in order to 'advysse the best course for the present to be takin in this business' and to report back to Parliament (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol III, p120).

The Committee regarding the commotion in Ireland was duly appointed on 28 October. Four nobles were appointed: Chancellor Loudoun, General Alexander Leslie, now Earl of Leven, William Kerr, third Earl of Lothian, and James Livingstone, Lord Almond. Loudoun, Leven, and Lothian were all high profile Covenanters. Adair of Kinhill was one of the three members for the barons, the other two being Sir David Home of Wedderburne (Berwickshire) and Sir James Sinclair of Murkle (Caithness). Unsurprisingly, therefore, Adair was appointed to this key committee (*RPS* 1641/8/127, M1641/8/160). Home of Wedderburne's parliamentary track record extended back to the 1621 Parliament. In this context a practical example can be provided of someone who was an opponent of James VI's religious policies and who later became a Covenanter. Wedderburne voted against the controversial Five Articles of Perth in 1621, which were deemed to be 'popish.' In 1627 he had served in the army in France and it is of interest that he later served in the Covenanting army in Ireland in 1643. Furthermore, he supplied £1200 for the army in Ireland in 1643. His life experience extended from the origins of the Covenanting movement to its demise, for he was later killed in action at the Battle of Dunbar on 3 December 1650 (Young 1992, vol I, p357; Goddare 1995). Sinclair of Murkhill was a member of the Commission for Manufactories discussed above and he would therefore have known of and been in contact with Adair, assuming that they both attended the proceedings, especially as they were both members of the same estate (Young 1993, vol II, p642; *RPS* M1641/8/21). Burgh membership on the committee consisted of James Cochrane and Richard Maxwell (both Edinburgh), Patrick Bell (Glasgow), and John Osborne (Ayr). All four burgh representatives were also included on the Commission for Manufactories of 10 September, thereby providing evidence of closer links with Adair prior to the formation of the Irish committee (*RPS* 1641/8/127, M1641/8/121). The importance of Edinburgh as the leading royal burgh in the kingdom was reflected in the membership, as was the strategic and geographic importance of both Glasgow and Ayr to Ireland, but other important linkages can be identified. Patrick Bell was a member of the Committee for the trial of the Incident (as was Adair) and he had been a diplomatic commissioner for the 1640 Treaty of Ripon at the end of the First Bishops' War. He later died of the plague in London on 15 August 1642 (*RPS* 1641/8/122, 1641/8/127; Young 1992, vol I, p47). In 1642 John Osborn was one of the key individuals instructed to collect relief for victims of the 1641 rebellion who had fled to

Scotland (Young 1993, vol II, p557). James Cochrane was an important grain merchant and overseas trader who imported commodities from Campvere, Rotterdam, Middelburg, and the Baltic in the 1620s, and he had been a commissioner at the 1638 General Assembly in Glasgow (Young 1992, vol I, p128). Richard Maxwell had also been involved in Covenanting diplomacy, having taken part in the negotiations for the 1640 Treaty of Ripon (Young 1993, vol II, p482). He was a member of the 1640 Committee of Estates and participated in the activities of the Edinburgh section of the committee that continued to sit in 1641. On 18 February 1641, for example, he was one of the signatories on correspondence to the Scottish commissioners at London concerning Anglo-Scottish relations, and he signed similar correspondence on 14 April 1641 to the army section of the Committee at Newcastle (*RPS* 1640/6/42; *Transactions* 1640-41, ff 70, 94a).

The Committee regarding the commotion in Ireland was instructed to 'think upon any course necessary to be done regarding the business contained' in the Chichester letter and 'what is incumbent to be done by this kingdom thereupon.' It was instructed to meet in the Earl of Leven's lodgings that afternoon and to report back to parliament (*RPS* 1641/8/127, M1641/8/61). The committee reported back the following day on 29 October, and in terms of procedure an Ordinance regarding the Irish business was issued (*RPS* 1641/8/128). It informed the House that it had read the letter and it noted that Charles I had already acquainted the English Parliament of the intelligence from Ireland and had sent for further information about the 'certainty of the commotion' and the forces involved. Accordingly, the committee report stated that 'no particular course' should be taken for suppressing the commotion until further details were known, primarily because the kingdom of Ireland was dependent on the English crown and the kingdom of England and that 'the English may conceive jealousies and mistake our forwardness when they shall hear of our preparations without their knowledge in this.' Three specific points were thereafter made. If the insurrection was of such importance that the British in Ireland were not powerful enough to suppress it without assistance of 'greater forces than their own,' and that the king and the English Parliament 'shall think our aid necessary to join with them, we conceive that the assistance which we can contribute may be in readiness as soon as England,' and 'if after resolution by his majesty with advice of both parliaments, it shall be found necessary that we give a present assistance,' then 'we shall go about it with that speed which

may witness our dutiful respect to his majesty's service and our affection to our brethren, his majesty's loyal subjects of England and Ireland' (*RPS* 1641/8/128, M1641/8/61).

As a result of the committee's report, it was decided to appoint three of the barons and three of the burghs to meet with Alexander Montgomerie, sixth Earl of Eglinton, an Ayrshire nobleman, at 3 p.m. that afternoon to consider and estimate the number of boats and lymfads (defined as West Highland or Irish galleys) in the parts of the kingdom opposite to Ireland that may be in readiness, and the number of men that could be transported to Ireland, and to report back to parliament (*RPS* 1641/8/128, M1641/8/61). It is not known if Adair was one of the three barons appointed. Despite the report's emphasis on a 'wait and see' policy concerning the outbreak of the rebellion, parliament itself immediately initiated a strategic assessment overview in terms of ships and men for transportation to Ireland. The six-man committee of barons and burgesses reported back the next day, 30 October, and a second Ordinance regarding the Irish business was issued. The second committee reported its conclusions. The Committee for considering the number of boats in the west of Scotland for transporting men to Ireland, should they be required, stated that there was sufficient shipping between Glasgow and Ayr 'as may transport to the nearest part of Ireland' 4000-5000 men. The second committee report was read to Charles I and the assembled estates. The report was approved and the committee was instructed to meet again that afternoon with the Earl of Eglinton and it was instructed to call before them 'any person necessary to think upon the best means for staying a competent number of boats, barks, etc, for transporting the number of men foresaid contained in the report with the least prejudice of trade' (*RPS* 1641/8/130, M1641/8/62).

In order to have 'better information,' the estates remitted the issue to western nobles and representatives, namely Hugh, Lord Montgomery, John Crawford of Kilbirnie, Sir William Cunningham of Cunninghamhead (who had represented Ayrshire in parliament in 1639-1640), John Shaw of Greenock, John Brisbane of Bishopton, Sir Patrick Maxwell of Newark (one of the representatives for Renfrewshire), John Maxwell of Castlemilk, and the provost and bailies of Glasgow, Ayr, Irvine, and Renfrew. They were to take 'particular notice' of all useful vessels within their bounds and put such vessels 'under such assurance and readiness as they shall be directed' by Charles I and parliament. This was also deemed to be in addition to 'beside

what may be had upon the north side' within the bounds of Archibald Campbell, eighth Earl of Argyll (*RPS A1641/8/99*). On 1 November 1641 the central issue of readiness of forces and supplies being sent to Ireland was remitted back to the full Committee for the commotion in Ireland that had been appointed on 28 October, thereby formally including Adair once more. Chancellor Loudoun was instructed to speak with the Earl of Leven, General, on the time and place of the committee meeting (*RPS 1641/8/133, M1641/8/63*). On 2 November the Committee for the Irish business was instructed to meet at 2 p.m. Immediately prior to this decision being taken, Charles I had spoken to the estates about the necessity of having a public fast 'upon the commotions in Ireland.' Parliament then instructed the procurator for the kirk, Archibald Johnston of Wariston, to advise on the issue with commissioners from the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland that was currently sitting and report back with the time of and reasons for the fast (*RPS M1641/8/64; Coffey 2004*).

The Committee for the Irish business reported back to the House on 3 November, the same day that the Committee for the examination of the Earl of Montrose, of which Adair was a member, reported back, although details of the Irish committee's report have not been provided (*RPS M1641/8/65*). Each estate separately considered the report of the Irish committee on 4 November (*RPS M1641/8/66*) and on the same day the reasons for holding a public fast, given by the commissioners for the church, were issued by parliament. Three collective reasons were given. The first reason was the division and distraction in the kingdom, the rebellion in Ireland, the distress of the Palatinate and the reformed churches in Germany, which tended to 'the increase of popery, the ruin of the reformed religion and to the disturbance of the peace of the king's majesty and his kingdoms.' The second reason focused on the 'many sins of all sorts witnessing our want of the love of God and our neighbour, contrary to our late solemn oath and National Covenant, and our deep security and indisposition to the exercises of piety.' The third reason focused on praying more earnestly to God for 'a speedy and happy close of the parliaments of both kingdoms, for the preservation of this kirk in the truth and the kingdoms in unity under his majesty's happy government, to disappoint all secret conspiracies and open rebellions, and to bless all the reformed kirks with purity of religion and peace' (*RPS A1641/8/103*).

Of further interest here is the speech given to the House by John Elphinstone, second Lord Balermينو, President of Parliament, on

4 November 1641, in which he argued that an army should be raised and sent to Ireland. This was in the context of Balmerino's *mentalité* of a 'popish' conspiracy. Balmerino stated that 'I confesse, many of their accursed crew are aggregated in Ireland, and by an irregular insurrection, doe intend the utter demolition of Christian Religion.' Furthermore, he stated that 'this I am confident of, neither will I ever desists from my opinion, that unlesse we doe fully vindicate these malicious Papists, these two Kingdoms both Scotland and England, cannot sleepe long in security. If they doe not intend our subversion, why did they conspire against us? ... If they doe not intend our subversion why are they now gathered together in Ireland, dayly studying the demolition of this State and Kingdome ?' For President Balmerino it was therefore a matter of urgency that a 'sufficient army' should be levied to repel them, and if that did not suffice, then 'utterly to expel them.' Balmerino was confident of English support and he implored the estates not to 'procastinate' in this business. For Balmerino, then, raising a sufficient army to fight against them was required for 'the maintenance of true Religion' (*Lord Balmerino's speech 1641*, pp3-4).

The 1641 parliamentary session ended on 17 November and, as noted above, parliament had enacted legislation in favor of Adair at the close of the session. Two supplications relating to Ireland were also considered by parliament on 16 November and 17 November respectively. On 16 November a supplication by one Captain William Stewart, son of Harry Stewart of Cougan, esquire, in Ireland, was considered by the estates. It sought the support and backing of the Scottish Parliament for a petition that Stewart was planning to submit to the English Parliament on behalf of himself and his father. Stewart's supplication outlined the 'manifold sufferings and losses sustained' by him and his father in Ireland and Stewart had served in the 'bygone expedition with as much diligence and fidelity' as was incumbent to him. Accordingly, Stewart and his father intended to petition the English Parliament for reparation of their losses in Ireland, 'as also in respect' of his 'pains taken in the last expedition wherein and in everything else' he had behaved himself as 'a loyal subject and good patriot.' Stewart therefore sought a recommendation from Charles I and the Scottish Parliament to its English counterpart. This was duly considered by the estates and the required recommendation was granted and an act was passed in Stewart's favor (*RPS A1641/8/150, 1641/8/232*). A second and more general supplication was submitted to the estates on 17 November, but it too sought the support of the

king and the Scottish Parliament in lobbying the English Parliament. It was entitled the Supplication for relief of the British subjects in Ulster, with a following subheading of ‘the humble petition of diverse of your Majesty’s British subjects having estates in Ireland, for themselves and in name of their distressed countrymen and friends there.’ Information is not given on who presented the petition, but Adair may have been involved in this, given what has been established about his parliamentary profile in 1641. In many respects the supplication of 17 November provided new information in terms of human suffering and atrocities in a way that the Chichester letter had not, primarily due to the time factor and news of the progress and conduct of the rebellion itself. Hence the supplication started by stating that ‘the insolent rebellion and cruel outrages of the Irish rebels is now come to that height as they have wasted and overrun the most part of the province of Ulster, comprehending nine counties, most part thereof being planted with British subjects.’ It then proceeded to state that many of these British subjects had been killed and others taken prisoner. The rebels had ‘robbed and spoiled the goods of many hundreds, stripped and sent away numbers of them naked, burnt diverse towns and corns there,’ with the result that ‘all these counties are wasted and depopulated except some few parts about the sea near the strengths of Derry and Carrickfergus, as the letters directed to us from your majesty’s said British subjects there do most pitifully express.’ Such ‘miseries’ were on the increase due to the fact that these British subjects had ‘neither arms nor leaders to direct and help them in the necessary defence of their lives and estates, so they are in daily hazard to be killed or put to flight and to be a burden to your majesty’s other kingdoms if they shall happen to escape’ (*RPS A1641/8/160*). In the aftermath of the rebellion, victims of the rebellion were indeed fleeing to England and Scotland (Cope 2009; Lindley 1972; Young 2007). The supplication concluded by asking that Charles I, with the advice of the Scottish Parliament, would ‘remonstrate to the parliament of England the pitiful and lamentable state of the said British in Ulster,’ in order that the English Parliament would seriously consider this situation and that ‘such speedy course may be taken as may best conduce for their present help and relief.’ In the meantime, the supplication requested that ‘such as are willing to go as volunteers in that service may be permitted and arms furnished to them, and that some convenient proportion of arms may be granted upon loan for the unarmed British until the same may be repaid out of England’ (*RPS A1641/8/160*). The supplication was read and remitted to

the king (*RPS* A1641/8/160, M1641/8/76). David Stevenson has noted how support was already being provided from Scotland before the end of the parliamentary session. Many Ulster Scots who had come to Scotland during the Bishops' Wars and who had served in the Covenanting armed forces were returning to Ireland when the Ulster rebellion broke out. Furthermore, support was also provided by many Scots who had estates, or relatives or friends with estates, in Ulster. This was in the form of the raising of volunteers to go and fight in Ulster, a process that was made easier by the recent disbanding of the Covenanting army. Military service in Ulster therefore provided a good opportunity for those already accustomed to Covenanting military service. This trend of Scottish volunteers going to Ulster was also noted in contemporary English pamphlets. Likewise, on 16 November Charles signed commissions to several leading Ulster Scots that allowed them to raise and lead forces under James Butler, thirteenth Earl, later first Marquis and first Duke, of Ormond, recently appointed as Lieutenant General of Charles I's army in Ireland (Stevenson 1981, pp50-52).

The Irish situation was directly linked to the parliamentary session closing on 17 November. Six days earlier, on Thursday 11 November, Charles I informed the estates that he saw no new business 'still to draw in lenth' and 'his urgent necessity' on the other hand forced him to 'intreat them earnestly to accelerat matters to ane end,' for he protested to God 'he could stay no longer than Thursday' (18 November) as his staying could 'weill neire to losse him a kingdome,' meaning Ireland, and he 'looked hourlie for a petition from the parliament of England, crauing his speedie returne' (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol III, p143; Stevenson 1981, p50). Two session committees were appointed on 11 November 1641: a committee to consider all the ratifications that were to be produced and passed in parliament, consisting of two members per estate, and a committee to consider the acts which were to be passed in parliament, consisting of six members per estate (*RPS* 1641/8/147, M1641/8/71; *Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol III, p144). There was no common membership between the two committees and the membership of the ratifications' committee was smaller with two members per estate. This committee was therefore responsible for the ratifications that were passed on 16 November and 17 November (*RPS* 1641/8/147). The ratifications' committee was appointed first, with the acts' committee being appointed immediately afterwards (*RPS* M1641/8/71). According to Balfour, in order to bring parliamentary business

to a sooner close, on 11 November the House ordained that a committee of six of each estate was to be established to consider the acts to be presented by the barons and burgesses in their catalogues and which of those acts should be presented to parliament. This information is taken from Sir James Balfour's *Historical Works* and is not recorded in the official parliamentary records. Yet the parliamentary minutes for 11 November 1641 indicate that a committee was appointed to 'consider the catalogue of all acts exhibited and what of them are expedient to be passed in parliament' (*RPS M1641/8/71*). Six noble members are listed in the parliamentary minutes for this committee and the minutes state that 'the barons and burghs promised to condescend upon their number to the clerk' (*RPS M1641/8/71*). Balfour's *Historical Works* lists six members of each estate and noble membership matches that provided in the parliamentary minutes, but it appears that he may have been slightly confused when noting down the day's proceedings. The membership that he has provided, it may be argued, is the full membership of the committee for considering the acts which were to be passed in parliament, and not just acts presented by the barons and burghs (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol. III, p144). Adair of Kinhilt was one of the six baron members on the committee, again providing further evidence of his importance within that estate. Of further interest is that Patrick Bell (Glasgow) and either James Cochrane or Richard Maxwell (Edinburgh) were included as two of the burgh members. Argyll was included for the nobility and two of the other burgh members Robert Barclay (Irvine) and John Semple (Dumbarton) were important burgh members of the committee (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol III, p144).

Other issues relating to Ireland were considered on 11 November and 12 November. Chronologically this was linked to the context of the Thirty Years' War in continental Europe. Charles Louis, the Prince Elector Palatine, the king's nephew, accompanied Charles I to Edinburgh, and a committee was established on 11 November to consider his position. Parliament was therefore dealing with both the Irish situation and the position of the Prince Elector Palatine at the same time on 11 and 12 November. The Palatine committee quickly reported back on 11 November, recommending that 10,000 men should be levied and transported to Germany for the Prince Elector's service. An act was then passed on 12 November along these lines (*RPS M1641/8/71, M1641/8/72, A1641/8/123/1641/8/153*). After the Palatine report had been read, voted, and passed, Charles I then moved

that some course should be taken for the transport of ammunition from Dumbarton Castle, a key strategic location on the west coast of Scotland, to the castle of Kilmore in Ireland. This issue was referred to General Leven, Argyll, and Colonel Alexander Hamilton, General of the Artillery, who were instructed to speak with the king (*RPS* M1641/8/72). Balfour's *Historical Works* indicate that the castle of Carrickfergus was also mentioned in the king's speech and that both castles 'were in some distress for lack of powder and arms.' Dumbarton Castle had supplies of both powder and arms. Charles I stated that he would buy these supplies from the owners, paying ready cash, since they could not be so 'commodiously secured' from any other source but there. According to Balfour, the House agreed to the king's proposal to buy the ammunition for the relief of both castles (*Balfour's Historical Works* 1824, vol. III, pp145-146).

The newly appointed Privy Council was to play a significant role in 1642 in the preparations for sending 10,000 troops to Ireland, as agreed in 1642 with the English Parliament after a protracted political and diplomatic process (Stevenson 1981, pp43-64). The Privy Council played an important role in preparing the invasion and raising voluntary contributions to help finance the Covenanting army in Ireland, which was an army in distress due to underfunding and lack of finance from the English Parliament which was supposed to support it financially (Stevenson 1981, pp65-163). On 7 February 1642, for example, the Privy Council issued a warrant to George Porterfield, burghess of Glasgow, to liaise with the provost and baillies of Glasgow for the supply of 30,000 weight of biscuit of white bread for the supply of troops being sent to Ireland. Porterfield was also commissioned to receive pieces of ordinance, ammunition, and other necessities deemed necessary for the army and to provide safe conduct for the transport of such military supplies to Greenock, Ayr, or any other seaport appointed for the embarking or regiments to Ireland (*RPCS* 1638-1643, p196). Porterfield was an important Covenanting activist in the west of Scotland, serving on parliamentary interval committees in the early 1640s, then representing the burgh of Glasgow in Parliament, 1645-1647 and 1648-1650. He was an important burghess in the radical regime of the later 1640s and early 1650s (Young 1993, vol II, p568). On 28 February 1643 the Privy Council issued an appeal for financial support to maintain the Scottish army in Ireland. Analysis of financial accounts for 1643 indicates that contributions came from a wide social spectrum and were not restricted to ruling elites. In

Edinburgh, for example, money was given by James Wright, a hatmaker, and Nicoll Ewan, a fishmonger. Eleven of the 94 individual contributions (12%) listed in the Edinburgh accounts for 1643 were from women, ten of whom were widows while the other was listed as a daughter (Young 2004, pp19-20). Return migration in the aftermath of the Ulster rebellion created a humanitarian aid problem. On 1 February 1642 the Privy Council created an administrative system for the collection and distribution of humanitarian aid for victims of the Ulster rebellion now on Scottish soil. By 28 February 1642 a sum of £4000 had been collected in the presbyteries of Ayr and Irvine for this purpose and by 9 June 1642 it was estimated that there were over 4000 refugees within the bounds of the Presbyteries of Ayr and Irvine (*RPCS* 1638-43, pp189-191, pp209-210, p267; Young 2004, pp17-20; Young 2007).

Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt and Covenanting Intervention in England and Ireland, 1642-1648

Adair's profile continued in the aftermath of the 1641 Parliament, in the capacity of seeking support from the Church of Scotland for ministers to be sent to Ireland, and also as a soldier in the Covenanting army in Ireland and the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant that entered England in 1644 to fight alongside the English Parliamentarians as part of the process of the Covenanters seeking a British confessional confederation and establishing the 1643 Solemn League and Covenant on a British basis and having Presbyterianism in all three kingdoms. Adair emerged as a prominent spokesman and representative for the Scots in Ulster with regard to the issue of religion and the lack of ministerial provision in the aftermath of the 1641 Ulster rebellion. On 6 August 1642 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, meeting at St Andrews, received a 'humble Petition of the most part of the Scottish Nation in the North of Ireland, in their own names, and in name of the rest of the Protestants there' (*AGACS* 1843, pp52-73). It was presented to the Assembly by Mr. John Gordon and Mr. Hugh Campbell, described as 'our brethren,' and it outlined the case for support. It noted that due to the oppression of the prelates many of their ministers had been 'chased into Scotland' and 'we having been since oppressed and scattered, as sheep who have no shepherd, now at last, the wise and righteous hand of the Lord, by the sword of the rebels, hath bereft us of our friends, and spoiled us of our goods, and left us but a few, and that a poor handful of many, and hath

chased from us the rest that were called our ministers, the greatest part whereof we could scarce esteem much, as being rather officers to put the prelates' injunctions in execution, then feeders of our souls; so that now being visited with sword and sicknesse, and under some apprehension of famine, if withal we shall taste of the sorest of plagues, to be altogether deprived of the ministry of the Word, we shall become in so much worse a condition than any Pagans' (*ACGA* 1843, pp52-73). The 1642 petition from the Scottish Nation pleaded for ministers to be sent over from Scotland and asked that the General Assembly would 'take the cause of your younger sister, that hath no breasts, to your serious consideration, and pity poore Macedonians, crying to you that ye would come over and help us; being the servants of God of your fathers, and claiming interest with you in a common covenant, that, according to the good hand of God upon us, ye may send us ministers for the house of God' (*ACGA* 1843, pp52-73). The General Assembly immediately responded on 6 August by issuing a commission for ministers to go to Ireland. This was a short-term commission in the sense that it was to last until the next General Assembly, i.e., the Assembly that would meet in 1643. A ministerial rota basis was outlined, based on a four-month tour of duty. Robert Blair, minister at St Andrews, and James Hamilton, minister at Dumfries, were commissioned for the first four months, followed by Robert Ramsay, minister at Glasgow, and John McClelland, minister at Kirkcudbright. The third and final batch was to consist of Robert Baillie, Professor of Divinity at Glasgow University, and John Livingstone, minister at Stranraer (*ACGA* 1843, pp52-73).

Yet the issue remained a live one, and a new petition was presented to the 1643 General Assembly at Edinburgh on 5 August 1643, 'subscribed by very many hands.' The 1643 petition was from 'the distressed Christians in the North of Ireland' and it did not specifically mention the Scottish Nation, but the content of the petition indicates that both petitions were part of the same process and issue (*ACGA* 1843, pp73-96). The 1643 petition noted the 'short visit' that had been made by the ministry appointed by the Assembly and it lamented how it had not been 'expedient at that time to loose any for ful settling here.' It is also clear that not all of the ministers appointed in 1642 had been able to make the journey over the North Channel. The petition acknowledged the delay that had taken place, but it emphasized the dangers of further delay in the context of the dual threat from the prelatical faction and Jesuit activity in Ireland. In contrast to the 1642 petition, the petitioners

asked that ‘a competent number of our own ministers may be loosed to settle here, and break bread to the children that lye fainting at the head of the street’ (*ACGA* 1843, pp73-96). Hence the petitioners were seeking the return to Ulster of ministers who had fled to Scotland. Further details about the extent of the spiritual problem were given in the 1643 petition. It pointed out that there were ‘about twelve or fourteen waste congregations on this nearest coast,’ indicating the Antrim and Down areas that had the most concentrated levels of Scottish settlement. Given this situation, the petition pleaded for ‘at least a competent number that may erect Christ’s throne of discipline, and may help bring in others, and then we shall sing, that the people who were left of the sword have found grace in the wilderness’ (*ACGA* 1843, pp73-96). The petition was presented to the Assembly by Sir Robert Adair and Willam Mackenna of Belfast (*ACGA* 1843, pp73-96). Here we have strong evidence of the leadership role of Robert Adair on this issue, most probably due to his established profile in Scotland and activities in the 1641 Parliament, established commitment to the Covenanting military cause in Ireland, and knowledge of the political terrain and personnel in the institutional power structures of the Covenanting movement. By empowering Adair, in particular, and Mackenna, a Belfast merchant, to present the petition, this suggests that higher profile representation was being accorded to the issue than to the two ministers who had been sent in 1642.

The General Assembly responded in a similar way to the response to the 1642 petition by appointing another commission for ministers to go to Ireland on the final day of its proceedings on 19 August 1643. The tour of duty was reduced from four months to three and there was an Adair family interest with the appointment of William Adair, minister at Ayr and Sir Robert’s brother, as one of the ministers to be sent over. William Cockburn, minister at Kirkmichael, and Matthew Mackaill, minister at Carmanoch, were the first batch of ministers to be sent over for a three month employment, starting 8 September 1643, followed by George Hutchinson, minister at Calmonell, and Hugh Henderson, minister at Dalry, starting 8 December. William Adair and John Weir, minister at Dalsersf, were the third group to follow, for the period starting 8 March 1644, and the final group was James Hamilton, minister at Dumfries, and John McClelland, minister at Kirkcudbright, for the last three months starting 8 June 1644 (*ACGA* 1843, pp73-96).

Unsurprisingly, Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt was also involved in the military commitments of the Covenanters in both England and Ireland. Adair

had a troop of horse that served in Ireland (*CSPD Addenda*, 1625-1649, p665). In 1642 Adair was commissioned to be a captain in the horse regiment of Colonel William Balfour in the Ulster army. Balfour had previously served in the Dutch army, he was Governor of the Tower of London, 1630-1641, and he became a naturalized Englishman in 1640. In 1642 he became a lieutenant general of horse in the English parliamentary army and he never took up his charge in Ulster (Furgol 1990, p84). By 19 July 1642 Adair's troop had 71 men and officers and it was to provide cavalry support for the Ulster army. On 26 November or December 1643, the Earl of Leven secured permission to withdraw Kinhilt's troop, although it is unclear if Leven had ordered this at that time (Furgol 1990, p88, p159). Adair was specifically mentioned in the commission and instructions given to Robert Meldrum of Burghlie on 17 July 1643 that were to be presented to both Houses of the English Parliament. Meldrum of Burghlie, later designated of Tullibody, was instructed to press for the financing, support, and supply of the Covenanting army in Ireland, as per the 1642 treaty for Covenanting military intervention in Ireland. Thus Adair was to be paid for having raised and maintained his troop at his own expense (*RPS* 1643/6/33). Meldrum was secretary to General Sir Alexander Leslie, now Earl of Leven, in 1640, and was reappointed to this position on 17 August 1642. He later represented Fife in the second, third, and fourth sessions of the First Triennial Parliament in 1645, and the constituency of Clackmannanshire in 1648, after a disputed election was settled in his favor on 6 March 1648 (Young 1993, vol II, p484; *RPS* 1645/1/2, 1645/7/82, 1645/7/24/2, 1648/3/2, 1648/3/12). On 25 July 1644 Kinhilt's troops were part of Major General Robert Monro's forces that marched to Lisnagarvey in the campaign against James Tuchet, third Earl of Castlehaven, and his Irish Confederate troops. Adair's troops may have taken part in a cavalry skirmish on 12 August, which the Scottish forces won. Later on 19 August Adair's unit formed part of the troops which entered Cavan and burned 3000 barrels of corn. On 20 August the unit then moved into Leinster on intelligence gathering operations, before retiring to its quarters soon afterwards. Adair's unit may have been in England by 1645, as it is not mentioned as being part of the Scottish forces in Ulster at this time (Furgol 1990, pp87-88). In August 1646 the English parliamentary committee on Irish affairs, sitting at Westminster, issued orders for one Lieutenant James Lindsey, in Adair's regiment, to be cashiered of that employment for 'miscarriages' committed (*CSPD* 1633-1647, p488; Furgol 1990, p88). Adair's horse troop was part of

the Earl of Leven's regiment when it disbanded in February 1647 and 'it may be assumed that the troop ceased to exist at that time' (Furgol 1990, p88). This was Leven's regiment in the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant that entered England in 1644. Financial accounts relating to the Scottish army in Ireland for 1643 reveal that Adair was paid £2400 on 1 April 1643 as arrears of pay due to him by the English Parliament for his troop in Ireland (RPCS 1638-1643, p91). Adair was also involved in raising voluntary contributions for the Covenanting army in Ireland, as part of the process initiated by the Privy Council to help maintain the army in Ireland that was underfunded and under-resourced. John Jossie's financial receipts of the voluntary contribution of money lent by the gentry and others in Linlithgowshire in 1643 have details of Adair's activities. On 12 April 1643 Adair paid £1333 6 shillings 8 pence, in the name of Sir William Sandilands and Dame Elizabeth Cunningham, to help support the army in Ireland (RPCS 1638-1643, p90, p424, p618).

Adair's troops formed part of the Earl of Leven's regiment in the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant that went over the border in 1644 to fight on the parliamentary side in the English Civil War. Adair was a Major in Leven's regiment, 1643-1645 (Furgol 1990, p159). Adair was also a member of the shire committee of war for Wigtown and the stewartry of Kirkcudbright appointed by the 1643 Convention of Estates on 26 August (RPS 1643/6/91). Shire committees of war were the mechanism by which the Covenanters raised armies at a national level, i.e. the shire committees of war raised troops with their own localities (Young 2001). The legislation of 26 August 1643 therefore appointed shire committees at a national level and it was these committees that raised the troops that formed the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant. Likewise, Adair was later named as a member of the shire committee of war for Wigtown on 2 February 1646, based on the original committee of war legislation that had been enacted on 26 August 1643 (RPS 1645/11/197). Leven's regiment in the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant consisted of Major James Ballatyne's and Adair's troops of horse from Ireland, four troops from Roxburgh, Selkirk, and Peeblesshire, and two other troops whose locality cannot be determined. Leven's regiment fought at the Battle of Marston Moor in June 1644 and the Battle of Philiphaugh in September 1645. The regiment was present at the muster of Newark, 17 January 1646, and by that time consisted of eight troops, amounting to 535 rank and file and four sick (Terry 1917, vol I, ppxxiv-xxv, plv, plvi). As noted earlier, in November

or December 1643, Leven secured permission to withdraw Adair's troop of horse from Ulster. It has been argued that his troop may not have joined up with Leven's regiment until 1646 (Furgol 1990, p159), but evidence exists of Adair being active in England. Adair delivered 94 lances to the regiment on 20 February 1644. Financial accounts relating to Leven's regiment indicate that Adair was paid £60 (£720 Scots) on 17 December 1644. One Elizabeth Carlisle, wife of one of Adair's troopers, received 16 shillings sterling. Similar accounts for 1646 indicate that Adair was paid a sum of £20 (£240 Scots). Information from 12 August 1645 shows that Adair received 100 powder, 100 match, and 100 musket ball in terms of arms and ammunition (Terry 1917, vol I, p107, p132, p160, vol II, p658). At a meeting of the Committee of Both Kingdoms on 22 April 1645, attended by both Lauderdale and Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston, one of the decisions reached was that 26 days' personal pay was to be paid to Adair (CSPD 1644-1645, pp424-425). On 31 October 1645 the Committee of Estates, then sitting at Glasgow, appointed commissioners anent the quarterings of the army in England, i.e. the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant. Sir Robert Adair was one of the ten commissioners appointed. These ten commissioners included Sir Alexander Hamilton, General of the Artillery, Sir Adam Hepburne of Humbie, Army Treasurer, and Robert Innes, Quartermaster General. The commissioners were instructed to meet by themselves or with commissioners from the English Parliament to examine the relevant financial accounts and transactions (Stevenson 1982, pp21-22). The fact that Adair was appointed as one of these commissioners with this financial remit can be interpreted as recognition of his importance in military affairs.

In terms of the progress and conduct of the war in Ireland, further information relating to Adair can be identified for 1646-1647. The English parliamentary committee for Irish affairs undertook a review of the numbers of horse and foot in Ulster and Connaught. On 27 January 1646, the committee estimated that the strength of horse and foot in Ulster was c.1070 officers and 7500 foot. This included 17 troops of horse, one of which was Sir Robert Adair's, of 204 officers and 850 men. The comparative figures for Connaught were 48 officers and 240 men for the infantry, and 234 officers and 2230 men for the cavalry. The total number of horse and foot for both provinces was 12376 (CSPI 1633-1647, pp433-434). Mention was made of Adair as Captain of a troop of horse at a later meeting of the English committee for Irish affairs on 8 October, and Adair's troop was one of the 17

troops of horse in Colonel Arthur Hill's regiment listed in the overview of the Ulster and Connaught forces by the same committee on 19 October 1646 (*CSPI* 1633-1647, p526, p532). The Scottish Parliament enacted in favor of General Major Robert Munro and Sir Robert Adair, in a single piece of legislation, on 22 March 1647. Analysis of the legislation indicates that Adair had presented a supplication for reparation of 'his losses and sufferings and recompense of his service' (*RPS* 1646/11/422). Munro was due the sum of 10000 merks (c£6667 Scots) by the Scottish Estates. According to the legislation of 22 March, he was to be paid out of the money due to Parliament by the late Sir Edward Chichester, first Viscount Chichester, his son Arthur Chichester, the late Sir Arthur Tynningham, and Arthur Hill, esquire, and James Edmonstone, their attorney, for the price of 1000 muskets, 500 picks, 500 swords with belts, and a small proportion of ball, for the service of Ireland. Adair was to be paid out of the remaining surplus after Munro had been compensated (*RPS* 1646/11/422).

Sir Robert Adair 1648-1651

Adair was closely involved in the military and political events of the late 1640s and was a member of the radical regime that was established in the aftermath of the failed Engagement of 1648 in support of Charles I. The radical regime was anti-Engager and anti-aristocratic in tone. Adair's participation in the 1649-1650 parliamentary sessions proves that he was a committed member of the radical regime that was in power during these years and that his presence and moral stance and integrity had been sanctioned by the Church of Scotland. It is also clear that Adair was an important participant in that regime.

Adair appears to have been a victim of factional changes that took place within Scottish politics and the Covenanting movement in the aftermath of the decision of the movement to withdraw the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant from England in 1647 in return for arrears of pay from the English Parliament and the handover of Charles I to the jurisdiction of the English Parliament. The 1648 parliamentary session, the first session of the Second Triennial Parliament, witnessed the ascendancy of the faction of James Hamilton, first Duke of Hamilton. Noble attendance in the 1648 session amounted to 56 and was the highest noble attendance of any of the parliamentary sessions of the 1640s. The Hamilton faction successfully

managed the election of shire and burgh members in order to secure a majority and dominance of its faction among those two estates. The faction of Archibald Campbell, eighth Earl and first Marquis of Argyll, was in a minority. Robert Baillie, the Covenanting minister of Kilwinning in Ayrshire and a member of the Covenanting delegation sent to the Westminster Assembly of Divines, commented on this factional change: 'Never so many noblemen present in any of our Parliaments.' Only eight or nine nobles, according to Baillie, were 'for our way.' 'All the rest, with more than halfe of the barrons, and almost halfe of the burgesses, especiallie the greater tounes, Edinburgh, Perth, Dundee, Aberdeen, St. Andrews, Linlithgow, ran in a string after Duke Hamilton's vote. That partie, besides the advantage of the number of two at least to one, had likewise the most ablest of the speakers. For us none did speak but Argyle and Warriston, and sometimes Cassillis and Balmerinoch.' In addition to Argyll, Baillie was referring to John Kennedy, sixth Earl of Cassillis, John Elphinstone, second Lord Balmerino, and Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston (*Baillie's Letters and Journals* 1842, vol III, p35).

An additional feature of how the Hamilton faction enforced its dominance was through the control of disputed elections and electoral commissions for rival candidates that were presented to parliament. Adair of Kinhilt was part of this factional procedural process in the 1648 parliamentary session. The 1648 session opened on 2 March and disputed elections were considered in the opening days of the session. An Ordinance concerning the commissioners for the sheriffdom of Wigtown was issued by Parliament on 6 March. The sheriff was the key local official in the electoral process for the election of the shire representatives (Rait 1924, pp223-228). Two commissions had been produced for Wigtownshire for the start of the 1648 session. One commission was for Sir James MacDowall of Garthland and Andrew Agnew of Lochnaw, and the other was for Adair of Kinhilt and James Ross of Balneil. The estates considered the objections and answers of both parties for and against their commissions and then approved the commission granted to MacDowall of Garthland and Agnew of Lochnaw. Garthland, and Agnew were preferred and admitted 'to have place, sit and voice as commissioners for the sheriffdom of Wigtown in this parliament, according to the commission granted to them by the shire' (*RPS* 1648/3/13). No further details are provided in the official parliamentary records, but further consideration of the profiles of Agnew of Lochnaw and MacDowall of Garthland reveals interesting material. Ross of Balneil, on the other hand,

does not have any parliamentary profile that can be ascertained. Agnew of Lochnaw had represented Wigtownshire in the 1643 Convention of Estates and in the first, second, fourth, and sixth sessions of the First Triennial Parliament. He was a member of the local Committee of War in 1643 and 1646. Agnew of Lochnaw also participated in the radical regime and he was the other member for Wigtownshire, along with Adair, in the 1649 parliamentary session that met on 4 January 1649. He was a member of the 1649 Committee of Estates and the Committee for War. In 1652 he assented to the English Tender of Union for Wigtownshire and he later participated in the Cromwellian regime in Scotland in the 1650s, holding for example the office of the Sheriff of Kirkcudbright. In the Restoration era, he also represented Wigtownshire in the Conventions of Estates of 1665 and 1667 respectively, and the parliamentary sessions of 1669-1670 (Young 1992, vol I, p6; RPS 1643/6/1, 1644/6/2, 1645/1/2, 1645/7/24/2, 1646/11/2, 1665/8/2, 1667/1/2, 1669/10/2, 1670/7/2). The fact that Agnew represented Wigtownshire in 1649 suggests a radical affiliation and also the approval of the church for his participation in political affairs. MacDowall of Garthland, on the other hand, served in the Engagement army. He had previously served as a routmaster in the horse unit of Lord Kirkcudbright in the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant. He had also had acted as a commissioner to the Covenanting army in Ireland from the Committee of Estates in 1645, and he was present with the Marquis of Argyll at Carrickfergus in April 1646 [*Transactions of the Scots Army in Ireland*, documents 74, 85, 88]. On 15 April 1646 he was sent with a letter from the officers of the Covenanting army in Ireland to the Committee of Estates (*Transactions of the Scots Army in Ireland 1643-48*, documents 88 and 89).

On 4 May 1648 MacDowall of Garthland received a commission as a Colonel of Horse for the Engagement Army, in which he was to recruit 80 men from Ayrshire and Wigtownshire for his horse unit and it is possible that he recruited the full Ayrshire complement of 40 men. One authority has argued that ‘Garthland’s greatest service to the Engagement was acting as a commissioner to the Ulster army’ with the Earl of Glencairn and Alexander Crawford, who conducted the final arrangements for the transport of George Monro’s troops from Ireland to serve in the Engagement army (Furgol 1990, p276). This should be seen in the context of the strong support of many Ulster Scots for the Engagement (Forkan 2007; Forkan 2011, pp275-277). On 10 May 1648 MacDowall, along with William, first Lord Cochrane, and

Alexander Crawford, named above, burgess of Linlithgow, were instructed by parliament to proceed to Ireland and deliver correspondence to General Major Monro and other commanders of British forces there, for securing British support in Ireland for the Engagement (*RPS* 1648/3/126, 1648/3/128; *Transactions of the Scots Army in Ireland*, documents, 140, 141, 142). MacDowall was therefore an Engager, but he satisfied the Church of Scotland in repenting for his participation in the Engagement. On 24 June 1650 the Commission of the Kirk referred his petition to ‘give satisfaction for his accession to the late unlawful Engagement’ to the next General Assembly (*RCGA* 1648-1649, 1896, p424), and on 25 November 1650 the Commission of the Kirk referred him to the Presbytery of Stranraer to ‘try the evidence of his repentance for his accession to the said Engagement’ and thereafter to receive him to ‘public satisfaction’ (*RCGA* 1650-1652, 1909, p123). MacDowall later ‘experienced a political conversion’ (Furgol, 1990, p276) and he was a participant and supporter of the Cromwellian Commonwealth and Protectorate. In 1652 he too accepted the English Parliament’s Tender of Union at Dalkeith on behalf of Wigtownshire. MacDowall collaborated with the Cromwellian regime and he represented Wigtownshire in the Protectorate Parliaments of 1654, 1656, and 1659 respectively. He was a Commissioner for the security of the Protector, Oliver Cromwell, in 1656, and in 1659 MacDowall presented a petition to the English Parliament for perfecting the union between England and Scotland (Young 1993, vol II, p451). MacDowall is therefore an interesting character in his own right. He was a ruling elder for the Presbytery of Stranraer at the 1642 General Assembly of the Church of Scotland held at St Andrews, he represented Wigtownshire at the 1643 Convention of Estates and the six parliamentary sessions of the First Triennial Parliament, 1644-1647. He was nominated to the local Committee of War, 1643, 1644, 1646, and 1648, as well as the Committees of Estates of 1644, 1645, 1646, 1647, 1648, and 1651. In terms of the conduct of diplomacy, he was a member of the committee for propositions of peace with Charles I in 1644 and he was one of the diplomatic negotiators appointed to meet with Charles I at Newcastle in 1646 and 1647 (Young 1993, vol II, p451; *RPS* 1643/6/1, 1644/6/2, 1645/1/2, 1645/7/8/2, 1645/7/24/2, 1645/11/2, 1646/11/2).

Adair was also included on the Committee of War for Wigtownshire on 18 April 1648 (*RPS* 1648/3/79), but he was not an Engager and he played an

important role in the military affairs of the radical regime established in the aftermath of the defeat of the Engagers at the Battle of Preston in August 1648. With regard to the divisions among the Scots in Ulster concerning the Engagement, on 16 September 1648 Adair was at the forefront of the capture of Carrickfergus by anti-Engager Scots, leading on to the fall of Belfast and Coleraine. Adair returned to Scotland to explain his conduct in helping General George Monck suppress the Scots in Ulster who had supported the Engagement and this course of action was duly approved of by the Committee of Estates of the newly formed radical regime (Stevenson 1981, pp262-266; Forkan 2007, p471).

Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt, the Radical Regime, and the Aftermath of the British and Irish Wars

Adair is recorded in the parliamentary sederunts of the second, third, and fourth sessions of the Second Triennial Parliament for 1649-1650 (*RPS* 1649/1/2, 1649/5/2, 1650/3/2). He can be identified as an active participant in the affairs of the radical regime that was in power during these years. Adair's significance to the regime is reflected in his appointment as a Privy Councillor on 16 March 1649 and an Exchequer Commissioner on 5 July 1650 (*RPS* 1649/1/430, M1650/5/49). Legislation was also passed in his favor on the same day. The Act in favor of Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt referred back to previous legislation passed in his favor on 22 March 1647 for the payment of money for military supplies in Ireland (*RPS* 1646/11/422). Due to recent events in England and Ireland Adair was 'not only likely to be disappointed of what was expected that way, but also of very great considerable sums due to him by the parliament of England for his long service and great burdens undertaken by him' (*RPS* 1649/1/375). The estates therefore decided to recommend his case to the Committee of Estates or the Committee of Monies that were appointed on 14 March. The Committee for Monies and Accounts was a specialized interval committee with a financial remit (*RPS* 1649/1/293, 1649/1/295). Adair was in fact a member of the Committee of Estates of March 1649 (*RPS* 1649/1/293). The estates also decided that the former legislation of 22 March 1647 should be renewed (*RPS* 1649/1/430). What is particularly striking about the act of 16 March 1649 is that it reveals the high esteem in which Adair was held by the regime. Hence

Adair's sufferings and losses were 'known to be very great since the beginning' and 'his constant affection in adhering to the cause and covenant and what service he was able to do has been faithfully performed by him in all the three kingdoms since the beginning of the aforesaid troubles' was noted (*RPS* 1649/1/375). Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt was therefore not only regarded as a committed Covenanter, but he was also perceived and placed within a three kingdom context by his contemporaries.

Adair was appointed to a range of parliamentary session and interval committees in 1649-1650 (see appendix 2). Many of these committees had a financial remit, dealing with the excise, public arrears, and rectifying valuations, for example. The Committee concerning the public arrears due to Sir James Stewart, Commissary General, of 1 March 1649 was responsible for legislation passed on 7 March in favor of Stewart for payment of arrears due to him (*RPS* 1649/1/187, 1649/1/224). Adair was also involved in the parliamentary processes relating to financial, legal, and landed disputes between John Wallace of Burnbank against Sir Hugh Wallace of Craigie, and Thomas MacBirnie, the provost and burgh representative for Dumfries and William Livingstone, as well as the payment of expenses to those individuals who brought letters from Orkney that had been recovered at the Battle of Carbisdale of 27 April 1650 (*RPS* 1649/5/2, 1649/5/15, 1649/5/71, M1650/5/21, C1650/5/5). Adair was closely involved in the process of parliamentary business through his membership of the session committee, the Committee for Dispatches. The Committee for Dispatches appointed on 23 May 1649, for example, had a remit of dealing with the military affairs in Scotland, the quartering of troops, relations with the Commission of the Kirk of the Church of Scotland, and affairs in England, Holland, Ireland, or anywhere else abroad where the kingdom of Scotland 'may be concerned' (*RPS* 1649/5/7). The proceedings of this committee have in fact been transcribed. Adair is recorded in five out of ten sederunts of the committee between 24 May and 1 August. On 22 June the committee instructed Adair and Agnew of Lochnew to proceed to Ireland to receive arms, cannon, and ammunition belonging to the kingdom of Scotland that were in Carrickfergus and Belfast. They were either to transport them back to Scotland or leave them in the custody of appropriate individuals until further orders were received from Scotland. According to the terms of the surrender of Carrickfergus garrison on 4 July, Scottish rights to the artillery there were recognized, although it appears to be unlikely that this Scottish artillery was ever returned to Scotland. They were also instructed to send back intelligence

reports on the state of Irish affairs and at least one of them was to return back to Scotland as soon as possible and report (Stevenson 1981, p273; Stevenson 1982, p98, p104).

Adair is also recorded in all six sederunts of a joint meeting of the Committee of Dispatches, appointed on 16 May 1650, and the Commission of the Kirk between 16 May and 5 June. Analysis of the committee minutes indicates that the military issues discussed included the aftermath of the abortive invasion of Scotland by the James Graham, fifth Earl and first Marquess of Montrose, and his defeat at the Battle of Carbisdale, the transport of prisoners to Edinburgh, the quartering of troops, the supply of horses, the payment of arrears, and the purchase of pistols (*RPS C1650/5/1-6*). At the committee meeting of 4 June, Adair and Agnew of Lochnaw were instructed to dispose of a frigate at Loch Ryan and to do what they thought fit with the master of the ship and his crew (*RPS 1650/5/5*). Maritime issues were also part of the remit of the session committee concerning the arrears due to Sir James Stewart. Thus, the committee was empowered to find financial resources for equipping ships and maritime and coastal security of the kingdom (*RPS 1649/1/87*). The meetings of the Committee for Dispatches and the Commission of the Kirk were closely involved in the instructions given to the diplomatic commissioners to be sent to Holland in negotiations with Charles II to subscribe the 1638 National Covenant and the 1643 Solemn League and Covenant, and also in the nature of the coronation oath that he would take as a Covenanted king (*RPS C1650/5/1-3*). Adair therefore had a role in these critical events and processes that were discussed at the committee meetings of 16-20 May. Furthermore, Adair was a member of the session committee for the King's House, appointed on 23 May, to 'meet anent the affairs of the king's house, and to think upon what may be done for the accommodation and maintenance thereof', most probably in anticipation of the king's future arrival in Scotland should negotiations with him be satisfactorily included. Adair's importance in this is reflected in the fact that he was nominated to the committee by his own parliamentary estate (*RPS M1650/5/13, A1650/5/37*). On the same day, 23 May 1650, Adair was appointed as a member of the Committee for the payment of the laird of Assynt. Neil MacLeod of Assynt had captured Montrose about a week after the Battle of Carbisdale, and this committee was set up to think upon 'a way of payment and satisfaction' to MacLeod 'for his good service' (*RPS M1650/5/13; Stevenson 1977, p136*).

The argument that Adair was an important figure in the radical regime is further evidenced by his membership of the Commission of the Kirk appointed on 4 August 1649. Adair did not attend any of the meetings of the Commission recorded between 7 August 1649 and 28 June 1650, but that Adair was a member as a lay elder is significant in itself and it provides further evidence that he was an important member of the regime (*RCGA* 1648-1649, 1896, pp299-300, pp302-400). Furthermore, as noted above, he attended all the joint meetings of the Committee of Dispatches and the Commission of the Kirk between 16 May and 5 June 1650. He attended these meetings as a parliamentary commissioner, but he was also theoretically a lay elder in the Commission of the Kirk. Hence he attended in the capacity of the 'state' as opposed to the 'church,' in terms of Andrew Melville's two kingdoms' theory and church-state relations articulated in the Second Book of Discipline of 1578. The 1649 Commission of the Kirk did deal with affairs in Ireland (*RCGA* 1648-49, 1896, p272, pp275-277, p314, p393). On 19 August 1650 the Commission appointed Mr. John Meine as a minister to Sir Robert Adair's troop for three months (*RCGA* 1650-52, 1909, p42). Likewise on 15 March 1649 Adair had been appointed to the parliamentary interval committee for the Plantation of Kirks and Valuation of Teinds (*RPS* 1649/1/309).

Adair continued to be active in the military affairs of the period. On 15 February 1649 he was appointed as a Colonel for Wigtownshire and Stewartry of Kirkcudbright as part of a wider national appointment scheme laid out in the Act for putting the kingdom in a posture of defense. As per the Act of Levy of 28 February 1649, 600 foot and 240 horse were to be raised in Wigtownshire and the Stewartry, and Adair was to be a colonel of the horse. Later on 2 March, in terms of the newly levied troops, Agnew of Lochnaw and William Grierson of Bargatton nominated Adair to have 80 horse levied with the remainder to be made up to him. Both Agnew and Grierson were members of the Wigtownshire war committee and Grierson was also a colonel for the Wigtownshire troops. Further legislation of 31 July 1649 dealt with the maintenance of the newly levied army at a national level, and £1839 was to be paid out of the maintenance of Wigtownshire and the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright for Adair's 80 strong troop (*RPS* 1649/1/33, 1649/1/86, 1649/5/304, A1649/32). It has been noted, however, that there is no surviving commission for Adair's troop and this has led one authority to suggest that the troop 'may have been formed from Ulster refugees, as Kinhilt

had strong connections in the province' (Furgol 1990, p330).

The nature and extent of warfare in Ulster in 1649-1650 resulted in further return migration of refugees, most of whom were officers and troops who had fought against a Royalist resurgence in Ulster, *c.* March to July 1649. Such troops were ideal for staffing the armed forces of the radical regime, as having fled from Ireland in order to avoid submitting to Royalists they could then be trusted to resist Royalists in Scotland too. This was especially important in light of the purging of troops sympathetic to the Engagers and Royalists in Scotland (Stevenson 1981, p280). Article 6 of the Act for Purging the Army of 21 June 1649 stated that the commissioners for purging the army and the officers of the army were 'to fill up the places of such as shall be purged out with such well-affected officers and soldiers as have fled out of Ireland' (*RPS* 1649/5/109). Later on 6 August Parliament passed an Act in favor of the Irish officers whereby the 'well-affected soldiers that are fled out of Ireland' were to be formed into companies of foot not exceeding 500 men in total. Officers were to be appointed from the main officers who had served in Ireland and who were of known integrity and had been constant to the cause. The soldiers were required to have a 'testificate from the honest ministers in Ireland' or the 'well-affected' officers who had served in Ireland. These 500 men were to fill the places of those who had been purged from the army (*RPS* 1649/5/372). On 7 August legislation was enacted in favor of these 'well-affected officers.' Adair and Sir Hugh Campbell of Cessnock were appointed to divide up the financial provision among the shires for a three-month period. Financial provision for the upkeep of some of these officers was remitted to the Committee for Monies. The Committee of Estates was to grant some allowance to the rest of the officers who did not have a command of foot troops (*RPS* 1649/5/381). The Committee of Estates established on 7 August proceeded to form a subcommittee, of which Adair was a member, to select the officers for these companies. Hence Adair was accorded a leadership role by the Committee of Estates in the choice of officers who had fled from Ireland and who were to serve in the armed forces of the radical regime. Acting on the subcommittee's recommendation, on 10 August the Committee of Estates established 396 men and forty horsemen, plus officers, in six companies out of the refugees who had come to Scotland (Stevenson 1981, p280). Adair himself was a victim of on-going warfare in Ulster and he was in fact one of the refugees. His house and lands had been plundered by the pro-Engager

forces of Sir George Monro, and his wife and family had been forced to flee to Scotland. As a high-profile refugee with an established leadership role, Adair was one of those empowered by the radical regime to restrain all persons crossing over back to Ireland. This was in light of untrue rumors that Charles II was now at Carrickfergus and also due to fears that Scottish Royalists might gather in Ulster in order to undertake some design on Scotland (Stevenson 1981, pp281-282).

The extended Adair family influence in Wigtownshire can also be detected at this time. William Adair, apparent heir of Kinhilt, and Thomas Adair, provost of Stranraer, were also members of the Wigtownshire war committee appointed on 15 February 1649 (*RPS* 1649/1/133). On 16 January 1649 legislation was passed in favor of the ministers who were at Mauchline Moor, including William Adair, minister of Ayr. The rising in arms at Mauchline Moor was deemed to be 'not only lawful but a zealous and loyal testimony to the truth and the covenant and that which became faithful ministers of the Gospel and people zealous for the truth to do,' and all summons of treason or other legal processes against the ministers were discharged (*RPS* 1649/1/30).

With regard to military operations in Scotland, on 19 June 1650 Adair's troop was instructed to move from Nithsdale to Lanarkshire and it was in action at the disastrous campaign that led to defeat at the hands of Oliver Cromwell at the Battle of Dunbar on 3 September 1650, albeit the troop itself was not destroyed. Later on 20 September 1650 the troop was instructed to proceed to Fife along with four other cavalry units in order to defend Burntisland, and on 7 December 1650 Parliament remitted the issue of the quartering of two regiments that had recently arrived from Angus, including Adair's regiment (Furgol 1990, p330; *RPS* A1650/5/106, M1650/11/14). Yet by this point Adair had deserted his regiment and he had been appointed as a colonel in the recently formed Western Association Army. Adair had become embroiled in the divisions of the religious politics of the radical regime. The Western Association had its origins in the winter of 1648, but it became formalized in the autumn of 1650. In essence, the Western Association was the army of the radical Covenanting west and southwest of the country. The Association was ostensibly formed to defend the western shires from English penetration in the aftermath of the Battle of Dunbar of 3 September 1650, but it also had an ideological element that was hostile to an alliance with Charles II as an ungodly uncovenanted monarch. Hence it was hostile towards both

‘malignant Scots as well as sectarian English’ (Stevenson 1977, p146). Ideological hostility to Charles II was articulated in the Western Remonstrance of 17 October 1650. The Remonstrance disclaimed and renounced the guilt and sins of the king and perceived breaches of the covenants. The Remonstrants did accept Charles II as king, but they held the view that he should not be allowed to exercise power until his worthiness had been proved. Furthermore, they refuted the idea that the Scots had the right to impose a king on England (this was in the aftermath of the execution of Charles I in 1649), although they stated that they would fight to expel the English invasion for the national interest and for religious reasons (Stevenson 1977, pp156-157).

The Western Remonstrance did not have any noble support. The Remonstrants had their core support in the south-west, although they also had some radical support in the east. The Remonstrance itself was condemned by the Committee of Estates in a Declaration of 25 November. Parliament was prorogued from 20 November to 26 November and intense debates took place in the Committee of Estates concerning the Remonstrance (Stevenson 1977, pp158-159). The Declaration condemning the Remonstrance had been prepared by a sub-committee of the Committee of Estates which was established at the meeting of 23 November. Prior to its establishment, high profile members of the Committee, including Argyll, spoke against the Remonstrance as ‘the opiner upe of a breache for tolleratione and subversione of the gouerniment, bothe ecclesiasticke and civill’ (*Balfour’s Historical Works* 1824, vol. III, pp169-170). Recorded voting behavior for 23 November and 25 November on various aspects of the content of the Remonstrance indicates that Adair did not fully support the condemnation of the Committee of Estates and the Declaration that was approved on 25 November. Rather, on 25 November Adair, along with others, voted in favor of the Remonstrance being fully referred to the Commission of the Kirk. Yet Adair’s name is not present in the list of dissenters who voted against the Declaration as a whole and who had wanted a vote on the Declaration in its totality only after each ‘branch’ of the Declaration had been voted on separately. Furthermore, Adair is not recorded in the attendance data for the parliamentary session that convened the following day on 26 November (*Balfour’s Historical Works* 1824, vol III, pp168-180).

In military terms, four thousand men were to be provided for in the Western Association, supplemented by volunteers, and Adair was one of the

key military commanders as a colonel in the Association. Presbyteries in the west and south-west of the country played an important role in encouraging the raising of troops for the Association. The Presbytery of Stranraer, for example, encouraged the Wigtownshire committee of war, of which Adair was a member, to employ all possible diligence in raising forces and obeying the orders of the Association. Likewise, the Presbytery of Ayr ordered William Adair, minister of Ayr and Robert Adair's brother, to proceed to the Association army. Ultimately the Association was routed by Cromwellian forces at the Battle of Hamilton in the west of Scotland on 1 December 1650 (Stevenson 1977, p105, p146, pp151-152, p156, p158, pp160-161, p203; Stevenson, *Covenanters and the Western Association* 1982, pp150-156).

Adair's significance continued in the 1650s until his death in 1655, most notably in the Cromwellian regime's plans to transport the perceived troublesome Ulster Scots to the southern counties of Kilkenny, Tipperary, and Waterford. A Cromwellian proclamation of 23 May 1653 therefore ordered the transportation of 260 Scots from Antrim and Down. Full compensation was to be provided for the land and property left behind and Adair was one of the individuals who was to be sent to Tipperary in order to make preparations for the planned transportation. In the event, however, this Cromwellian policy option was dropped due to the political scene in England, with the dissolution of the English Long Parliament and the appointment of Cromwell as Lord Protector, as well as the lobbying against the scheme in London by prominent Ulster Scots. Whereas the 1653 transportation plans were largely focused on influential landowners, a similar plan of 1656 was directed at ordinary people. In February 1656 an order of the Council of State for Ireland stated that all the Scottish inhabitants of Ulster who had been in arms against the state and who had not received pardons and who were not freeholders were to leave and settle in other parts of Ireland by 27 September 1657. Furthermore, and without exception, all Scots who had settled in Ulster since 24 June 1650 were instructed to leave and no Scots were to be allowed to settle in Ulster in the future. In July 1657 the scheme was approved and extended further to include County Louth (McKenny 2005, pp109-131; Stevenson 1981, pp285-291; Menary 2009, *Adair's True Narrative*, 1866, pp201-203). Although this plan was not implemented either, it does provide clear evidence that the Scots of Ulster were regarded as a dangerous threat with unquestionable loyalty, which provides an interesting historical context and backdrop to the great waves of migration from Ulster

to America in the eighteenth century. The floodgates could not be closed for continued migration from Scotland to Ulster in the second half of the seventeenth century, with the most prominent migration being in the 1690s and the key one for linking Scotland, Ulster, and America in a transatlantic context (Fitzgerald 2004; Fitzgerald and Ickringill 2001). Adair also participated in the religious and ecclesiastical affairs of Antrim in the early 1650s, for example, concerning the maintenance of the minister David Bulhell in Ballymena in 1655 (Sweetnam 2012, p60, p61, p63, p69, p72). At the meeting of the Antrim ministers at Ballyclare on 1 August it was decided that a house should be built for Bulhell, 'but the more full answer' was referred until 'some of the ministers speak with Sir Robert Adair to that effect' (Sweetnam 2012, p69), albeit by 28 August the matter had still not been finalized. On 15 August Patrick Adair and one Mr. Thomas Hall had been appointed to speak to Sir Robert and report back to the next meeting, but no report could be made at the meeting of 28 August due to the absence of Patrick Adair (Sweetnam 2012, p72).

Conclusion

In Greyfriar's Church, Edinburgh, the spiritual home of the Covenanting movement and the location of the signing of the National Covenant in 1638, a copy of the National Covenant for Fife in 1639 hangs on the wall of the small exhibition for parishioners and visitors alike. Close reading of the parchment copy reveals the signature of Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt. Three hundred and seventy four years later, in 2013, this scholarly article contributes to and expands the existing historiography on Sir Robert Adair. It analyses the role that Adair played in the Covenanting movement of 1637-1651 in general, and to the activities of the Scottish Parliament in particular at a time when it had a leading role in the life of the ancient historic kingdom of Scotland. Technological advances with the Records of the Scottish Parliament website search engine have provided an efficient methodological tool for research purposes. In this respect, research conducted on Adair's profile represents an important case study that can be replicated for other members of the Scottish Parliament. Furthermore, the Adairs of Kinhilt, as a family with interests in both Ulster and Scotland, also constitute an important case study that can be further developed for a greater understanding of the Scottish diaspora in Ulster. For the Scotch-Irish audience and community in

America, important detailed historical information has been provided on Sir Robert Adair of Kinhilt as a member of an important family in County Antrim, whose heritage and influence are still apparent today in Ballymena, Northern Ireland.

**APPENDIX 1:
DATES OF SESSIONS OF PARLIAMENT AND
CONVENTIONS OF ESTATES, 1639-1641**

Second Parliament of Charles I, 1639-1641

(Session 1)	30 August – 14 November 1639
(Session 2)	2 June – 11 June 1640
(Session 3)	15 July – 17 November 1641

Conventions of Estates, 1643-1644

(Session 1)	22 June – 26 August 1643
(Session 2)	3 January – 3 June 1644

First Triennial Parliament, 1644-1647

Session 1	4 June – 29 July 1644
Session 2	7 January – 8 March 1645
Session 3	8 July – 11 July 1645 (at Stirling)
Session 4	24 July – 7 August 1645 (at Perth)
Session 5	26 November 1645 – 4 February 1646 (at St. Andrews)
Session 6	3 November 1646 – 27 March 1647

Second Triennial Parliament, 1648-1651

Session 1 (i)	2 March – 11 May 1648
Session 1 (ii)	1 June – 10 June 1648
Session 2	4 January – 16 March 1649
Session 3	23 May – 7 August 1649

Session 4	7 March – 8 March 1650
Session 5	15 May – 5 July 1650
Session 6	26 November – 30 December 1650 (at Perth)
Session 7	13 March – 31 March 1651 (at Perth)
Session 8	23 May – 6 June 1651 (at Stirling)

(Stevenson 1982, pp174-175). All sessions were held at Edinburgh unless otherwise indicated. The 1639-1641 Parliament and the 1643-1644 Convention of Estates did not have a consistent numbering of sessions in the way that the First and Second Triennial Parliaments did, but for the purpose of convenience these sessions have been numbered in parentheses (Stevenson 1982, p174).

APPENDIX 2.
PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES TO WHICH SIR
ROBERT ADAIR WAS NOMINATED.

1639-1641 Parliament

Committee to consider the overtures for manufactories, 10 September 1641 (session)

Committee for the examination of the town of Wigtown's witness, 24 September 1641 (session)

Committee for the trial of the late Incident, 21 October 1641 (session)

Committee regarding the commotion in Ireland, 28 October 1641 (session)

Committee for the examination of James Graham, fifth Earl of Montrose, 30 October 1641 (session)

Committee to consider the acts to be presented by the barons and burgesses in their catalogues and what of them is expedient to be presented in Parliament, 11 November 1641 (session)

1643 Convention of Estates, 22 June-26 August 1643

Committee of war for Wigtownshire and the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright, 26 August 1643 (interval)

First Triennial Parliament, 1644-1647
Fifth session, 26 November 1645-4 February 1646

Committee of war for Wigtownshire, 2 February 1646 (interval),
[Stewartry of Kirkcudbright had its own committee of war]

Second Triennial Parliament, 1648-1651

First session (i), 2 March-11 May 1648

Committee of war for Wigtownshire, 18 April 1648 (interval),
[Stewartry of Kirkcudbright had its own committee of war]

Second session, 4 January-16 March 1649

Committee of war for Wigtownshire, 15 February 1649 (session
and interval), [Stewartry of Kirkcudbright had its own committee of war]

Committee for an additional excise, 27 February 1649 (session)

Committee concerning the public arrears due to Sir James Stewart,
commissary-general, 1 March 1649 (session)

Committee of Estates, 14 March 1649 (interval)

Committee for the Plantation of Kirks and Valuation of Teinds,
15 March 1649 (interval)

Third session, 23 May-7 August 1649

Committee for Dispatches, 23 May 1649 (session)

Committee for rectifying the valuations, 1 June 1649 (session)

Committee of Estates, 7 August 1649 (interval)

Fifth session, 15 May-5 July 1650

Committee for Dispatches, 16 May 1650 (session)

Committee for the payment of the laird of Assynt (Neil MacLeod
of Assynt), 23 May 1650 (session)

Committee for the King's House, 23 May 1650 (session)

Committee for Valuation, 29 May 1650 (session)

Committee for Captain Charles Campbell and the reformeir officers*,
11 June 1650 (session)

Committee for the Exchequer, 5 July 1650 (interval)

*Reformier is the Scottish version of reformado. It refers to a military officer left without a command owing to military reorganization, but who kept his rank and seniority with full or half pay.

References

Manuscripts

Commissions to Commissioners to Parliament 1567-1706, PA 7/25,
National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh, PA 7/25/34/1-2 (Wigtownshire)
Transactions of the Committee of Estates of Scotland, August 1640-June 1641,
Edinburgh University Library, Dc 4.16

Websites

Brown, Keith, et al, eds, *The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707*
(see www.rps.ac.uk), University of St Andrews, 2007-2013.
Grosjean, Alexia and Steve Murdoch, *The Scotland, Scandinavia and Northern
European Biographical Database (SSNE)* (see www.st-andrews.ac.uk/history/ssne/),
University of St Andrews, 1998-2004.
Marks, Adam, *A Database of Scots in the Italian Peninsula during the Thirty Years
War, c.1600-1650 (S.I. Database)* (see www.st-andrews.ac.uk/history/ssne/scotsinitaly.php/),
University of St Andrews, 2009-2014.

Ulster Scots Agency publications

The 1718 Migration (see www.1718migration.org.uk)
The Covenanters in Ulster
The Hamilton & Montgomery Settlement of 1606: The Dawn of the Ulster Scots
(see www.HamiltonMontgomery1606.com)
The Plantation of Ulster (see www.plantationofulster.org)
The Scots in Ulster. Pocket History.1600-1800. From Ulster to America
(see www.ancestryireland.com/scotsinulster/pockethistory/Index.html)

Pamphlets

*The Lord Balmerino's Speech in the High Court of Parliament in Scotland,
Spoken November 4, 1641. Concerning the levying of an Army against the Papists
in Ireland. Describing their Conspiracies, which have a long time insulted and
continued against these two Kingdoms of England and Scotland*, London, 1641.

Primary sources

Brockington, William S., Kirsty F. McAlister, and John R. Young, eds, *Transactions
of the Scots Army in Ireland, 1643-48*, Dublin, Four Courts Press, forthcoming.
Christie, James, ed, *The Records of the Commissions of the General Assemblies of the
Church of Scotland Holden in Edinburgh in 1650, in St Andrews and Dundee in 1651
and in Edinburgh in 1652*, Scottish History Society, first series, Edinburgh 1909.
Haig, James, ed, *The Historical Works of Sir James Balfour*, 4 volumes, Edinburgh
1824-1825, volume II (1824), volume III (1824), volume IV (1825).
Hamilton, William, Douglas, ed, *Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1644-45*,
London, 1890.

YOUNG

_____, *Calendar of State Papers Addenda, 1625-1649*, London, 1897

Hume Brown, Peter, ed, *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, second series, volume VI, 1635-1637*, Edinburgh, 1905.

_____, *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, second series, volume VII, 1638-1643*, Edinburgh, 1906.

Killen, William Dool, ed, *A True Narrative of The Rise and Progress of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland (1623-1670) by the Reverend Patrick Adair*, Belfast, C. Aitchison; London, Hamilton, Adams, and Co.; Edinburgh, A. Elliot, 1866.

Knowler, William, ed, *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches*, 2 volumes, London, 1739.

Laing, David, ed, *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie*, three volumes, Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1841-1842.

Mahaffy, Robert Pentland, ed, *Calendar of State Papers Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of Charles I, 1633-1647*, London, 1901.

Mitchell, Alexander Ferrier, and James Christie, eds, *Records of the Commissions of the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland Holden in Edinburgh the years 1648 and 1649*, Scottish History Society, first series, volume 25, Edinburgh, 1896.

Pitcairn, Thomas, ed. *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638-1842*, Edinburgh, Church Law Society, 1843. 'Acts: 1642', *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland 1638-1842*, (1843), pp52-73. URL:<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=60087>. Date accessed 2 May 2013. 'Acts: 1643, Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland 1638-1842 (1843), pp73-96. URL: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=60088> Date accessed: 02 May 2013.

Stevenson, David, ed, *The Government of Scotland under the Covenanters 1637-1651*, Edinburgh, Scottish History Society, fourth series, volume 18, Clark Constable Limited, 1982.

Sweetnam, Mark S., ed, *The Minutes of the Antrim Ministers' Meeting 1654-8*, Dublin, Four Courts Press, 2012.

Terry, Charles Sanford, ed, *Papers Relating to the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant*, two volumes, Scottish History Society, second series, volumes 16-17, Edinburgh, 1917.

Reference Works

Young, Margaret, D., ed, *The Parliaments of Scotland. Burgh and Shire Commissioners*, two volumes, Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press, 1992-1993.

Secondary Sources

Theses

Forkan, Kevin, *Scottish-Protestant Ulster and the crisis of the three kingdoms, 1637-1652*, National University of Ireland, Galway, PhD thesis, 2003.

Sherry, John, Scottish commercial and political networks in Ulster during the reigns of King William III and Queen Anne, 1688-1714, University of Ulster, PhD thesis, 2009.

Vann, Barry Aron, 'Space of time or distance of place': Presbyterian diffusion in south-western Scotland and Ulster, 1603-1690, University of Glasgow, PhD thesis, 2006.

Books

Bajer, Peter Paul, *Scots in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 16th to 18th centuries. The formation and disappearance of an ethnic group*, Leiden, Brill, 2012.

Catterall, Douglas, *Community without Borders: Scots Migrants and the changing face of power in the Dutch Republic, c.1600-1700*, Leiden, Brill, 2002.

Cope, Joseph, *England and the 1641 Irish Rebellion*, Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer, 2009.

Cowan, Edward J., *Montrose For Covenant and King*, London, Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1977.

Devine, Thomas M., ed, *Scottish Emigration and Scottish Society*, Edinburgh, John Donald Publishers, 1992.

Furgol, Edward M., *A Regimental History of the Covenanting Armies 1639-1651*, Edinburgh, John Donald, 1990.

Gardner, Ginny, *The Scottish Exile Community in the Netherlands 1660-1690*, East Linton, Tuckwell Press, 2004.

Gillespie, Raymond, *Colonial Ulster: The Settlement of East Ulster 1600-1641*, Cork, Cork University Press, 1985.

Grosjean, Alexia, and Steve Murdoch, eds, *Scottish Communities Abroad in the early modern period*, Leiden, Brill, 2005.

Kirkpatrick, Laurence, *Presbyterians in Ireland. An Illustrated History*, Belfast, Booklink, 2006.

Macinnes, Allan I., *The British Confederate. Archibald Campbell, Marquess of Argyll, c.1607-1661*, Edinburgh, John Donald, 2011.

Mackenzie, Archibald, *William Adair and his Kirk. The Auld Kirk of Ayr 1639-1684*, Ayr, Advertiser Office, 1933.

McKenny, Kevin, *The Laggan Army in Ireland 1640-1685. The Landed Interests, Political Ideologies and Military Campaigns of the North-West Ulster Settlers*, Dublin, Four Courts Press, 2005.

Murdoch, Steve, and Andrew Mackillop, eds, *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experiences, 1550-1900*, Leiden, Brill, 2002.

_____, eds, *Military Governors and Imperial Frontiers c.1600-1800*, Leiden, Brill, 2003.

Murdoch, Steve, *Network North. Scottish Kin, commercial and covert associations in Northern Europe 1603-1746*, Leiden, Brill, 2006.

YOUNG

Rait, Robert S., *The Parliaments of Scotland*, Glasgow, MacLehose, Jackson and Co., 1924.

Stevenson, David, *The Scottish Revolution 1637-44*, Newton Abbot, David & Charles, 1973.

_____, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Scotland, 1644-1651*, London, The Royal Historical Society, 1977.

_____, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates*, Belfast, Ulster Historical Foundation, 1981.

Worthington, David, *Scots in Habsburg Service, 1618-1648*, Leiden, Brill, 2004.

_____, ed, *British and Irish Emigrants and Exiles in Europe, 1603-1688*, Leiden, Brill, 2010.

Zickermann, Katherin, *Across the German Sea. Early Modern Scottish connections with the wider Elbe-Weser Region*, Leiden, Brill, 2013.

Pamphlets

Stevenson, David, *The Covenanters and the Western Association 1648-1650*, Ayr, Ayrshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, 1982.

Articles

Coffey, John, "Johnston, Sir Archibald, Lord Wariston (bap. 1611, d. 1663)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article14933>, accessed 2 May 2013].

Fitzgerald, Patrick, "'Black' '97 ?": Scottish migration to Ulster in the 1690s", in William Kelly and John R. Young, eds, *Ulster and Scotland 1600-2000. History, Language and Identity*, Dublin, Four Courts Press, pp71-84, 2004.

_____, "Scottish Migration to Ireland in the Seventeenth Century", in Alexia Grosjean and Steve Murdoch, eds, *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period*, Leiden, Brill, pp27-52, 2005.

_____, "The Seventeenth-Century Irish Connection", in Thomas M. Devine and Jenny Wormald, eds, *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Scottish History*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp285-300, 2012.

Forkan, Kevin, "The Ulster Scots and the Engagement, 1647-8", *Irish Historical Studies*, 35, pp455-476, 2007.

_____, "The fatal ingredient of the covenant: the place of the Ulster Scottish colonial community during the 1640s", in Brian MacCurta, ed, *Reshaping Ireland 1550-1700. Colonization and its consequences. Essays presented to Nicholas Canny*, Dublin, Four Courts Press, pp 261-280, 2011.

Gillespie, Raymond, "Scotland and Ulster: a Presbyterian perspective, 1603-1700", in William P. Kelly and John R. Young, eds, *Scotland and the Ulster Plantations. Explorations in the British Settlements of Stuart Ireland*, Dublin, Four Courts Press, pp84-107, 2009.

Goodare, Julian, "The Scottish Parliament of 1621", *The Historical Journal*, 38, pp29-51, 1995.

- Holmes, Finlay, "Adair, Patrick (1624 ?-1693/4)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/83>, accessed 13 May 2013]
- Lindley, Keith J., "The Impact of the 1641 Rebellion upon England and Wales, 1641-5", *Irish Historical Studies*, volume 18, pp143-176, 1972.
- McCafferty, John, "Archibald Adair (d.1647)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/67209>, accessed 17 May 2013].
- Menary, David, "Rebellion, transplantation and composition: the Ulster-Scots landed élite and the Commonwealth", in William P. Kelly and John R. Young, eds, *Scotland and the Ulster Plantations. Explorations in the British Settlements of Stuart Ireland*, Dublin, Four Courts Press, pp137-159, 2009.
- Perceval-Maxwell, Michael, "Strafford, the Ulster-Scots and the covenanters", *Irish Historical Studies*, 18, pp524-551, 1972-1973.
- _____, "The adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant by the Scots in Ulster", *Scotia*, 2, pp3-18, 1978.
- _____, "Ireland and Scotland 1638 to 1648", in Morill, John, ed, *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context 1638-51*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, pp193-211, 1990.
- Smout, Chris, Ned C. Landsman, and Thomas M. Devine, "Scottish emigration in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries", in Nicholas Canny, ed, *Europeans on the move. Studies on European Migration 1500-1800*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp76-112, 1994.
- Stevenson, David, Graham, "James, first marquess of Montrose (1612-1650)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11194>, accessed 2 May 2013].
- Young, John R., "The Scottish Parliament in the Seventeenth Century: European Perspectives", in Allan I. Macinnes, Thomas Riis, and Frederick Pedersen, eds, *Ships, Guns and Bibles in the North Sea and the Baltic States, c.1350-c.1700*, East Linton, Tuckwell Press, pp139-172, 2000.
- _____, "Scotland and Ulster in the seventeenth century: the movement of peoples over the North Channel", in William Kelly, and John R. Young, eds, *Ulster and Scotland 1600-2000. History, Language and Identity*, Dublin, Four Courts Press, pp1-32, 2004.
- _____, "The Covenanters and the Scottish Parliament, 1639-1651: The Rule of the Godly and the 'Second Scottish Reformation'", in Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben, eds, *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550-1700*, Aldershot, Ashgate, pp131-158, 2006.
- _____, "Escaping massacre: refugees in Scotland in the aftermath of the 1641 Ulster Rebellion", in David Edwards, Pádraig Lenihan, and Clodagh Tait, *Age of Atrocity. Violence and Political Conflict in Early Modern Ireland*, Dublin, Four Courts Press, pp219-241, 2007.

YOUNG

Select Bibliography and Recommended Further Reading

Armstrong, Robert, *Protestant War: The 'British' of Ireland and The Wars of The Three Kingdoms*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2005.

Bardon, Jonathan, *The Plantation of Ulster*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 2011.

Bartlett, Thomas and Keith Jeffrey, eds, *A Military History of Ireland*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Bennett, Martyn, *The Civil Wars in Britain & Ireland 1638-1651*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 1997.

Darcy Eamon, Margey Annaleigh and Elaine Murphy, eds, *The 1641 Depositions and the Irish Rebellion*, London, Pickering and Chatto, 2012.

Macinnes, Allan I, *The British Revolution, 1629-1660*, Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.

Ó Ciardha, Éamonn and Micheál Ó Siochrú, eds, *The Plantation of Ulster: Ideology and Practice*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2012.

Ohlmeyer, Jane H., *Making Ireland English. The Irish Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2012.

Perceval-Maxwell, Michael, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

Wheeler, Scott, *The Irish and British Wars 1637-1654. Triumph, Tragedy, and Failure*, London and New York, Routledge, 2002.

Woolrych, Austin, *Britain in Revolution 1625-1660*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002.