

Title	Counter-currents in colonial discourse: The political thought of Vincent and Daniel Gookin
Authors	Coughlan, Patricia
Publication date	2000-06
Original Citation	Coughlan, P. (2000) 'Counter-Currents in Colonial Discourse: The Political Thought of Vincent and Daniel Gookin', in Ohlmeyer, J. H. (ed.), Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 56–82. isbn: 978-0-521-65083-0
Type of publication	Book chapter
Link to publisher's version	https://www.cambridge.org/ie/universitypress/subjects/politics-international-relations/history-ideas/political-thought-seventeenth-century-ireland-kingdom-or-colony
Rights	© Cambridge University Press 2000
Download date	2026-08-08 13:09:10
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/15628



UCC

University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

3 Counter-currents in colonial discourse: the political thought of Vincent and Daniel Gookin

Patricia Coughlan

Few episodes in Irish history have had more resonance than the policy of transplantation formulated in the wake of the Cromwellian conquest. To the Irish long a touchstone of nationalist indignation, the plan for the forcible removal of Catholics from their dwelling-places and their consignment to the barren wastes of the west has also struck students of the past from outside Ireland as a signal instance of inhumanity in the discharge of power. This chapter focuses primarily on one contemporary view of that policy, and considers it in the context of an investigation of the developing discourse about the English colonisation of Ireland. It also explores opposing views expressed at the time, and briefly examines a parallel discussion of questions to do with the treatment of indigenous inhabitants in another theatre of colonial activity, the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

The primary focus of the chapter is on the contributions of Vincent Gookin, a Corkman of English planter descent and friend and colleague of William Petty, to the 1655 pamphlet controversy about the policy of dealing with the Irish former rebels and their adherents by wholesale forced transplantation from their land to the uncultivated territories of Connacht. In *The great case of transplantation in Ireland discussed* (1655), and in its sequel later that year, Gookin developed a discourse of moderation and assimilation. The chapter seeks to place Gookin, who has not to date been the subject of any extensive study, in his background as the son of a New English Munster settler and office-holder and as a member of the Old Protestant interest.¹ It contrasts his assimilationist perspective on the problem of colonist-colonised relations with the irredentist position set out the same year in *The interest of England in the Irish transplantation* stated by his opponent Colonel Richard Lawrence, military governor of Waterford and an ardent Baptist. The last part of the discussion will

¹ Those English whose ancestors had settled in Ireland only during the fifty or so years leading up to 1641 were in the 1650s known as 'Old' (or sometimes 'antient') 'Protestants', to distinguish them from the new arrivals from the 1640s wars onwards.

consider, as an analogue to Vincent Gookin's writings, those of his first cousin Daniel Gookin, also from a County Cork settler family, who in the 1670s wrote *Historical Collections . . . of the Indians in New England* (c. 1674) and *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677*. Daniel Gookin migrated from Cork to Virginia in 1631 and later joined the Massachusetts Bay Colony. A convinced Puritan, friend of John Eliot and enthusiastic champion of the 'Praying Indians', he became an important figure in New England colonial government who was, for a time, discredited because of the perception of excessive and inappropriate sympathy on his part with the position and interests of the Native Americans. The chapter will consider the parallels that may be drawn between the two men's writings, and the possible influence of Vincent's unusually liberal thought on Daniel's later work. The Gookins' treatises afford a striking example of the kinship of ideas about colonial ideology and ethnicity and even about the moral status of colonists on one Atlantic seaboard with those on the other.

These texts rehearse important issues which go to the heart of colonial attitudes; this chapter aims to explore the ideology revealed in their rhetoric, particularly Vincent Gookin's pamphlets, which are important above and beyond their narrow context in the transplantation controversy because of their eloquence, which arises not merely from the rhetorical talent of their author but also from the exceptionally clear-sighted and humane exploration they make of the moral position of the colonist. It may seem an exaggeration to call Gookin's writings an enquiry into the ideology of colonialism, but at their most intense moments they certainly tend that way, and generate a distinct sense that the pressure on the author's mind of the difficult question of the proposed wholesale transplantation has produced a coherence and clarity of thought which rises well above the norm of the many merely controversial texts of the period. So far few historians have been prepared to consider this ideological aspect of the matter at any length, having concentrated for the most part on brief reference to Gookin's texts to elucidate facts or to illustrate opinions during narratives or analyses of the period's events and of the complex and crucial subject of the transplantation itself.²

² The ideological significance of Gookin's arguments was, however, acknowledged by Nicholas Canny. See the brief account in 'Dominant Minorities: English Settlers in Ireland and Virginia, 1550-1650' in A. C. Hepburn (ed.), *Minorities in History* (London, 1978), p. 64, and the extended and very valuable discussion by T. C. Barnard in 'Crises of Identity among Irish Protestants 1641-1685', *Past and Present*, 127 (1990), pp. 39-83. There is now a very large bibliography on the general question of colonial discourse, see note 90 below.

I

To be able to interpret these texts, it is necessary as far as possible to keep in mind the contexts of the debate, so as to grasp the interests of its various participants which, as is always the case, underlay their arguments, and also to understand the wider situation of competing factions among the parliamentary ruling elite within which the controversy was played out.³ The idea of dealing with the former rebels – a large proportion of the population of Ireland – by transplantation away from their localities was mooted in an Adventurers' petition of April 1652.⁴ This preceded by a few months the Act of Settlement (August 1652) which concentrated on the listing under five 'qualifications' of those among former rebels exempt from pardon for their lives or estates. The confiscation and redistribution of lands was projected from the start, but it appears that the mechanism for removing the incumbents only developed piecemeal. The commissioners for settling Ulster had proposed in April 1653 that 'those popular men in these parts' who could not be trusted to remain 'dutiful and peaceable' should be transplanted into other suitably distant Irish counties (though not to Connacht). Finally, in July 1653, a document from Westminster specifically directed the transplantation of 'all persons in Ireland who have a right to any favour and mercy' under any of the Act's qualifications to 'remove and transplant themselves into the province of Connaught and the county of Clare' before 1 May 1654.⁵ However, the logistics of the policy were not thought out, and its formulation was far from clear or sharp-edged. In the perennial *décalage* between London and Ireland, the lines of demarcation even between the broad categories of delinquents and those exempt became more blurred, and the overwhelming practical difficulties of enforcing the uprooting of thousands and their settlement far away in unknown country interposed

³ Among specific discussions of the transplantation, the clearest extended account is that of Corish, which approaches the subject primarily from the point of view of events in Ireland and which includes some detailed regional examples which are a help in imagining the actuality: Patrick J. Corish, 'The Cromwellian Régime' in *NHI*, III, pp. 364–73. Gardiner's long discussion, though written in 1899, remains indispensable in gaining a sense of the evolution of the official policy, seen largely from the viewpoint of the state papers and associated documents: S. R. Gardiner, 'The Transplantation to Connaught', *EHR*, 14 (1899), pp. 700–34. Many of the relevant documents are printed in R. Dunlop (ed.), *Ireland under the Commonwealth* (2 vols., Manchester, 1913). R. C. Simington's 'Introduction' to his *The Transplantation to Connacht* (IMC, Shannon, 1970) supplements Gardiner and shows, on the one hand, the lack of coherence in official policy and, on the other, the very impossibility of its execution because of the sheer insufficiency of land to meet the needs of the disbanding army, in spite of the transplantation of all Catholic landowners to points west of the Shannon.

⁴ Quoted in Gardiner, 'Transplantation', p. 701.

⁵ Both quoted in Gardiner, 'Transplantation', pp. 706–7.

themselves in all their immediacy between plan and execution. This left a fair amount of room for argument and manoeuvre about the whole matter and it could be argued that during the summer of 1654 the whole policy of transplantation itself was still under question in London.⁶ When Charles Fleetwood was sent to Ireland as lord deputy in August, his instructions allowed wide discretion in the implementation of the trans-plantation. In the end it very gradually emerged that only proprietors and any fighting men remaining would actually be transplanted, leaving other classes *in situ*; but during the latter half of 1654, when Gookin's first pamphlet must have been written, this eventual result could not have been easily foreseen even by those close to the authorities, and still less by the bulk of the Irish populace, who were or perceived themselves liable to transplantation.

The category of 'Irish' was, of course, a highly complex one; the interests of those making up the prospective initial transplanters could and did diverge from one another quite markedly (as indeed they had, with fatal results, during the Confederation). For instance, there were large-scale Catholic proprietors of Old English origin – specifically Nugent, Barnewall and Esmond – who in 1654 managed to pressure Cromwell directly in London for a larger grant of lands in Connacht after their prospective transplantation; and this in spite of their being specifically exempted by name in the Act for the Settling of Ireland from pardon for life or estate, i.e. automatically sentenced to death. A manuscript petition among the papers of Cromwell's secretary of state, John Thurloe, for May 1654 seems to reflect this kind of lobbying. It pointedly insists on the allegiance of the petitioners to Englishness, concluding with the contention that

the petitioners and their progenitors have since their arrivall there affected and continued the Civilitie, breeding, language, lawes, and manners, of the English, their extraction, interest, education and affection natura[lly] inclining thereto; whose example[s] have been forcible meanes to introduce among the people the same, who are now to be proscribed to a wilderness devoid of all accomodation [*sic*], as to diswont them from their accustomed Civilitie, and betray the same to barbaritic, Custom being a second nature.⁷

In addition, the petitioners complained, with some bitterness, that 'farmers and those of inferior qualitie are not to be transplanted though

⁶ Some of it in the form of a draft parliamentary proviso of September 1653 allowing for retention of some of the Irish perhaps by Gookin, as detailed by Gardiner, 'Transplantation', p. 709. Notes of a debate in council about sending an expedition to the West Indies, mentioned in Gardiner, 'Transplantation', p. 719, and quoted in C. H. Firth (ed.), *Clarke Papers* (4 vols., Camden Society, London, 1899), III, p. 207.

⁷ Bodl., Rawlinson MSS A 14 and summarised in *Analecta Hibernica*, I (1930), pp. 20–1.

not so innocent as most of the proprietors who are compelled to goe'.⁸ They also lamented the total absence in Connacht of the 'artificers' who would be needed to build any kind of dwelling.

Among the military faction and those whom Gookin acidly called 'the godly', many continued to cry out stridently for what they called justice, in the form of retributive punishment of the Irish for the 1641 atrocities. For instance, early in 1655, officers stationed in Ireland circulated a blood-and-thunder petition calling for universal transplantation of the Irish. Studded with Old Testament and apocryphal quotations about not 'committing of corporal and spiritual fornication [as] at Peor' and 'root[ing] them out before you', and with references to 'the land which ye go to possess' as 'an unclean land because of the filthiness of the people that dwell therein', this text by its rhetoric strikingly rehearsed fundamental colonial fears of contamination by the otherness of indigenes whom it conceived as idolatrous, alien and inveterately corrupt.⁹ In doing so, it recapitulated the tone and feeling of diatribes against the Irish from an earlier phase of intensive colonisation, such as the writings of Edmund Spenser and Barnabe Rich. It also highlighted the contrasting impulses of colonists either towards extirpation of the pre-existing population, or towards an ultimately shared existence (reached, to be sure, via the assimilation of native culture and identity into those of the colonists, not *vice versa*). 'I like', wrote Bacon in his essay 'Of Plantations', 'a *Plantation* in a Pure Soile', by which he meant, in plainer language, a land empty of prior inhabitants.¹⁰ The longing for a totally new beginning, so much a part of all seventeenth-century Puritan and millenarian aspiration, also haunted the American colonial adventure (discussed below, IV).

II

Before turning to Gookin's two texts, it is worth determining what is known about him and his family that may have influenced his motivation and his thinking. Of Kentish gentry extraction, his father, Sir Vincent, had settled during the early seventeenth century in County Cork, at Castle Mahon in the barony of Ibane and Barryroe as a tenant in fee simple to Phane Beecher, who had been one of the original undertakers in

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Published in *Mercurius Politicus* during March 1655 (BL, E. 831(7)) and quoted in full in Gardiner, 'Transplantation', pp. 723–7. See Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Poetics and Politics of Transgression* (London, 1986), for an illuminating discussion of the importance of motifs of purity and contamination in early modern bourgeois culture.

¹⁰ Francis Bacon, *The Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall*, Essay 33, ed. Michael Kiernan (Oxford, 1985), p. 106.

the Munster plantation. Sir Vincent's brother Daniel also came to County Cork, but left Ireland in 1621 with his son Daniel and fifty of his followers for Virginia, where he settled Newport News. Having earned commendations for a dogged resistance on his own plantation in the 1622 over-running and killing of settlers, the elder Daniel returned to Cork, where he acquired the castle and lands of Carrigaline, further east in the county.¹¹ Yet the Gookins were not grandee landowners. As T. C. Barnard has pointed out, their economic foothold in south Cork was originally acquired as a result of government service and their status in Munster Protestant society was considerably lower than that of the exalted Boyles, owners of the vast estates accumulated, often in dubious ways, by the first earl.¹² Still, the lands Sir Vincent did inhabit, dotted about the stretch of territory between the inlets of Timoleague to the east and Clonakilty to the west, were in an area of rich and fertile soil and enjoyed the mild and moist coastal climate of south Cork. As his will shows, he evidently profited from the abundant fisheries of Courtmacsherry Bay, as well as from cattle and a wool business, though on nothing like the scale of Richard Boyle.

When it comes to evaluating Gookin's arguments and the attitudes they reveal, it should be remembered that relations between New English settlers and the existing population differed markedly in Munster from those obtaining elsewhere in Ireland. Less than half of that province had been planted, which meant that in an area such as the barony of Ibane and Barryroe the position the incoming Gookins would have had to occupy was far from one of outright hegemony over previous landholders.¹³ Instead they had perforce to interweave themselves to a degree into the prevailing social grouping. In this region these arrangements still left at the top of the pyramid the septs of old Gaelic gentry such as the McCarthy Riabhach, and then the powerful local baronial

¹¹ The information in this paragraph is based on the following: *DNB* entries on all the Gookins; T. C. Barnard, 'Lord Broghill, Vincent Gookin, and the Cork Elections of 1659', *EHR*, 88 (1973), pp. 352-65; James Coombes, 'The Benedictine Priory of Ross', *JCHAS*, 73 (1968), pp. 152-60; C. M. Tenison, 'Cork MPs, 1559-1899', *JCHAS*, 1 (1895), p. 421; George Bennett, *History of Bandon* (Cork, 1869); Charles Smith, *The Ancient and Present State of the County and City of Cork* (Cork, 1815); F. W. Gookin, *Daniel Gookin, 1612-1687* (Chicago: privately printed, 1912); Guy I. Lewis, 'Daniel Gookin, Superintendent and Historian of the Massachusetts Indians: A Historiographical Study' (PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1973).

¹² See Barnard, 'Cork Elections', for a convincing exposition of this point, based on the dispute between Gookin and Lord Broghill about William Petty's prospective candidacy for a Cork constituency.

¹³ See Michael MacCarthy Morrogh, 'The English Presence in Early Seventeenth-Century Munster' in Ciaran Brady and Raymond Gillespie (eds.), *Natives and Newcomers: The Making of Irish Colonial Society 1534-1641* (Dublin, 1986), pp. 171-90, especially pp. 188-90.

families, especially the gaelicised Norman Barrys and to a lesser extent the Hodnett-MacSherrys.¹⁴ The Hodnetts were themselves originally English incomers from more than three hundred years before, but had long been gaelicised as 'Mac Séafraidh', from which came the name 'Courtmacsherry'. Sir Vincent became a tenant of these Hodnetts, but a humbler branch of the Barrys were in turn tenants of the Gookins.¹⁵ It is not difficult to see why Vincent, bred in such a milieu, should have formed different notions of the most viable social arrangements for the future in Ireland from those of Lawrence.¹⁶

One of the main questions to be considered in relation to the genesis of Vincent's writings is the extent to which the rebellion and wars of the 1640s affected the Gookins' security, physical or mental, and the young Vincent's attitude to the local Catholic gentry on the ground. Admittedly, during the earlier phases of the 1641 rebellion, south Munster had to some extent escaped the more major upheavals, dispossessions of planters and widespread killings that marked the period elsewhere in the country. This was especially true of the area – from Youghal at the east all along the Blackwater, across to Mallow and down to Bandon in the south-west – protected by the earl of Cork's defence plan.¹⁷ But the land between Timoleague and Clonakilty where the Gookins lived lies south of Bandon and west of Kinsale, and so outside even the Boyles' initial cordon. Thus the English population of Clonakilty fled to Bandon for protection in mid-January 1642, having been 'robbed, spoiled and their cattle carried away'.¹⁸ Eventually the rebels possessed every County Cork town except Kinsale, Bandon, Youghal and Cork itself.¹⁹ In these circumstances, the Gookins could very well have found themselves repeatedly exposed to danger between 1641 and 1650, whether resulting from the

¹⁴ See K. W. Nicholls, 'The Development of Lordship in County Cork 1300-1600' in Patrick O'Mahagan and Cornelius G. Buttner (eds.), *Cork: History and Society* (Dublin, 1993), pp. 157-212 and Rev. E. Barry, 'Records of the Barrys', *JCHAS*, 6 (1900), pp. 127-46. ¹⁵ Barry, 'Records of the Barrys', p. 131.

¹⁶ It is not clear what lands Vincent Gookin himself may have owned or leased before the 1650s; see the Books of Survey and Distribution, compiled c. 1680, listing a Vincent Gookin as holder of the 50 acres at BallymcWilliam and Cruary (on the western side of Barryroe, nearest Clonakilty) held by Sir Vincent before 1641; this may be a son of our Vincent's. Curiously, his father did not name him as a beneficiary of his will (as he did his younger brothers and the 'servant' John Burrowes). This may have something to do with the fact that Vincent, the eldest son, would already have attained the age of majority at the time of his father's will in 1637, whereas the land and rents bequeathed to the other sons were directed to be retained by the executors until one was twenty and the other twenty-four. A settlement may have been made upon Vincent if he married early, and perhaps his inheritance took the form of money rather than land.

¹⁷ See T. O. Ranger, 'The Career of Richard Boyle, First Earl of Cork, in Ireland, 1588-1643' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1959), conclusion.

¹⁸ Smith, *County and City of Cork*, p. 127. ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

activities of the changeable but militarily formidable Lord Inchiquin in the Munster theatre of fighting, or locally.²⁰ Certainly both the local Barrys (William and Redmond) and the Hodnetts (Edmond and his son and brother) joined the insurrection; Hodnett allegedly 'kept Courtmacsherry with men and Armes for the Irish against the English', and 'the Said Hodnett and Barry had comand of att least 400 men who did oppose a States Ship that were coming into the Harb[ou]r of Courtmacsherry'.²¹

There is also direct evidence about the dealings of these rebel Catholic gentry with Gookin property and with individuals associated with the Gookins, most probably their servants. Several depositions, taken in Kinsale during February of 1653/4, mentioned in the usual vivid terms the seizing of livestock, goods and money – variously £2,000 and £3,000, a very large sum – from 'Esquire Gookin', and one also named 'Mr Burres' as having been similarly robbed.²² It seems that Burrowes lost not only his 'house, goods and estate', but his life also, when he was tried and hung by one of the neighbouring McCarthys at the rebels' camp at Kilvarrig wood, in Kilmalooda parish.²³ Burrowes acted as steward to the elder Gookin, managing Sir Vincent's cattle business, his fishery at Lisle, and also his lease of Courtmacsherry from Hodnett.²⁴

There was probably a close connection between these depositions and the letter of June 1654 from Oliver Cromwell to Fleetwood about Gookin. 'This acknowledged 'sufferings' undergone by Gookin 'by plunder, sequestration, and imprisonment' for his 'constant adhering' to the parliamentary side, and directed that he receive a grant of lands in fee farm in the barony of Barrymore (some distance away, in east Cork) in compensation.²⁵ The sequestration – a formal legal process – may have referred either to the Hodnetts' and the Barrys' activities in 1641, or to what took place in 1648–9 when the alliance between Protestant and Catholic royalist factions, earlier at odds, enabled formal joint action in areas which

²⁰ See Scott Wheeler, 'Four Armies in Ireland' in Jane Ohlmeyer (ed.), *Ireland from Independence to Occupation, 1641–1660* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 43–65.

²¹ TCD, MS 828, f. 45, deposition by John Arthour, 21 February 1654.

²² TCD, MS 828, ff. 38, 39, 42, 45 and 47, depositions of Richard White, John Arthour and John Danuys(?), 21 February 1653/4. ²³ Bennett, *History of Bandon*, pp. 365–6.

²⁴ John T. Collins, 'Some Cork Wills, Deeds and Indentures', *JCHAS*, 64 (1959), pp. 104–8. Sir Vincent's will is dated 1 February 1637. There is no deposition from any of the Gookins themselves, however. Why did Vincent Gookin not depose on his own behalf on this occasion? Simply because he was absent from the area in February 1654, or did he for some reason deliberately refrain? Perhaps he was motivated by pragmatic caution in troubled times, or even, after all that had passed, can a trace of neighbourly feeling have existed given the dense interweaving of incoming and existing, Catholic and Protestant, landholders in Ibane and Barryroe?

²⁵ Quoted by Gardiner, 'Transplantation', p. 734, n.76.

these factions controlled against Protestant adherents to parliament such as the Gookins.²⁶ Gookin presumably alluded to some such event when he noted wryly that 'I have lost as good an estate almost, as Collonel Lawrence has got by them [the Irish]'.²⁷

Were Gookin's own Catholic neighbours transplanted? The surviving lists do not include the names either of the relevant Barrys, or of any Hodnetts.²⁸ If they ever were transplanted the Hodnetts or some of them certainly came back, as happened in many such instances. Like many others they escaped the death sentence for treason which had been pronounced on the father and son (together with eleven hundred other Catholic gentlemen of Munster) in Youghal in August 1642.²⁹ But, as the *Books of Survey and Distribution* clearly show, they certainly were dispossessed, like all the Catholic gentry in Barryroe. Edmund Hodnett's 810 acres at Courtmacsherry ended up, like so much else, in the hands of Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill and later earl of Orrery.³⁰ In the case of the Hodnetts, Robert Gookin acquired some of their land, at Abbeymahon slightly north of Courtmacsherry. Yet nearly fifty years later Hodnetts lived in the area, one still designated 'gent. of Courtmacsherry', who were outlawed in the Jacobite wars.³¹ Finally, Hodnett marriages in plenty were recorded in the Church of Ireland diocese of Cork and Ross from 1689 onwards.³²

It is possible that Vincent Gookin did not return to Barryroe: it is known that about 1652 he built a house 'near Cork' on lands in the barony of Barrymore, further east, which he then held on a short lease. In June 1654 Cromwell's letter directed that he be granted the fee farm of 'the lands now in his possession in the barony of Barrymore with the two ploughlands of Ahada, at such rent as they think fit'.³³ Yet in June 1655 he was still found petitioning the authorities to extend his lease in Barrymore 'lest any future Act of State prevent his just right of pre-emption in these

²⁶ See Patrick J. Corish, 'Ormond, Rinuccini, and the Confederates' in *NHI*, III, pp. 333-5. I am grateful to K. W. Nicholls who suggested this possibility to me and to Pádraig Lenihan for helpful further discussion of it. ²⁷ *Author and Case*, p. 41.

²⁸ 'List of Transplanted Irish, 1655-1659' in *HMC, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Ormonde*, OS (3 vols., London, 1895-1909), II, pp. 142-76. It is not known whether this list is complete.

²⁹ See 'J.C.', 'The Old Castles around Cork Harbour', *JCHAS*, 21 (1915), pp. 109-10.

³⁰ See *Books of Survey and Distribution*, Barryroe half of Ibane and Barryroe barony, parishes of Templemalice and Lisle.

³¹ The Jacobite Hodnetts outlawed were 'Edward Hodnett, Esq., and David Hodnett, gent., of Courtmacsherry', see James Coombes, *A History of Timoleague and Barryroe* (Timoleague, 1969), p. 38.

³² See Herbert W. Gillman, 'Index to the Marriage Licence Bonds of the Diocese of Cork and Ross . . . 1623-1750', *JCHAS*, 2 and 3 (1896 and 1897), p. 57.

³³ Printed in Gardiner, 'Transplantation', p. 734, n. 76.

lands', and to add a lease of 'certain lands near thereunto for convenience of fuel'.³⁴ Gookin's supplication specifically connected the building of this house with the discharging of his public duties, 'to which', he said in a curious phrase emphasising his own modesty, 'he was called without his knowledge'.³⁵ A surviving copy of an official Dublin document mentioned the grant of lands to him by a specific order of the lord protector in 1656, though unfortunately the barony name is illegible in the copy.³⁶ S. R. Gardiner's interpretation of the situation was that because of factional enmity to Gookin during 1654-5, Fleetwood dragged his feet in executing the order to secure Gookin in possession in Barrymore, and therefore Cromwell himself had to repeat it.³⁷

During the 1650s, Vincent was actively involved in political life and in constant contact with and service to the authorities both in Dublin and in London. He was a personal friend of Sir William Petty and, together with Petty and others, oversaw the distribution of allotted lands to the army in the context of an extreme shortage of available property. Furthermore, as well as holding other civil offices both in England and in Dublin throughout the latter half of the 1650s, Gookin was repeatedly appointed to small three- or four-man committees who were entrusted with the execution in Ireland of government directives and the carrying out of specific tasks which arose from the redistribution of land.³⁸ In the closely connected area of religious reform, he served with six others on a committee of 'Triers' for the approbation of suitable candidates for the ministry in County Cork, perhaps in particular for the exclusion of Episcopalian inclined ministers.³⁹ On one occasion in 1657 he worked together with Richard Lawrence, his very adversary of two years before, and three others, in treating with 'persons, being Protestants' offering to be tenants of Irish lands in various counties which would become disposable by the protector (having been forfeited by various categories of previous

³⁴ As for Aghada, the *Books of Survey and Distribution* name James Magner, 'Irish Papist', as pre-1641 holder of the 255 acres (together with some glebe land) of which the parish consisted, and Redmond Magner and Thomas Mitchell as joint owners of it afterwards. Perhaps Gookin never did get his grant there.

³⁵ See *Cal SP Ire, 1640-1660, Addenda*, pp. 803 and 573 respectively.

³⁶ 'Ordered that it be and it is hereby referred to Ben Worsley Surveyor Gen for lands to preserve the letter of his Highness in behalf of Vincent Gookin Esq. touching certain lands in the barony of Barrine[nr] or [m]y & Co of Cork to be held in fee farm . . .', References of Petitions Vol. XII, 1656-7, NA, T.5183. The barony name may be simply a mistake for 'Barrymore'. ³⁷ Gardiner, 'Transplantation', p. 734, n.74.

³⁸ Dunlop *Commonwealth*, II, documents 762, 829, 844, 915, 956; Barnard, 'Elections', pp. 356-7. In 1657 the mayor and corporation of Gloucester also appointed Vincent as their attorney to take possession of the Irish lands they expected to be allotted 'for their adventure', HMC, 12th Report, Appendix y (London, 1891), p. 515.

³⁹ St. John D. Seymour, *The Puritans in Ireland 1647-1691* (Oxford, 1912), p. 90.

holders), and also of town houses and tenements.⁴⁰ All this shows that, at least after the displacement from dominance of Fleetwood and the military party by the more moderately inclined Henry Cromwell, Gookin belonged, so to speak, to the *nomenklatura* of the protectorate in Ireland. He was evidently considered to be both capable of effective work and steadfast in discharging the tricky role of upholding, to both the London and Dublin authorities, the interests of the Old Protestant settlers in Ireland, whose County Cork electors returned him to three parliaments in succession.⁴¹ Within this ultimately broader allegiance Gookin was, however, so conspicuously identified with the protectorate and parliamentary side that in autumn 1659 when the Restoration seemed imminent he was putting out feelers about a possible appointment to the governorship of Barbados; in the event he died suddenly that October.⁴² As for Lawrence, a military man and enthusiastic Baptist, even if his underlying ideological position remained unchanged perhaps his growing stake in Ireland was already disposing him under the aegis of an emerging common interest to co-operate even with those less godly.⁴³

III

Gookin wrote two pamphlets, *The great case of transplantation in Ireland discussed* and *The author and case of transplanting the Irish into Connaught vindicated*, published in January and May 1655 respectively, the second in answer to Colonel Lawrence's *The Interest of England in the Irish transplantation stated*, which appeared in between. Gookin's two pieces were published in London and Lawrence's in Dublin, underlining the fact that Gookin's purpose was to influence policy at its source, and perhaps also reflecting the hostility of the Dublin administration, still under Fleetwood until September 1655, to the Old Protestant viewpoint being represented, or at least being elaborated in such a surprisingly liberal direction, by Gookin.

Why was Gookin's attitude to the 'Irish' (which really means the Catholics, since it refers to those of both Gaelic and Old English origin)

⁴⁰ Dunlop, *Commonwealth*, II, document 945.

⁴¹ See R. Caulfield (ed.), *Council Book of the Corporation of Kinsale* (Guildford, 1879), pp. xlv, 44, 45 for glimpses of his local role. He was also early made an alderman of the restored corporation of Cork city in 1656 (Cork Court of D'Oyer Hundred Book, Caulfield papers, University College Cork library, UC/RC/B.10/8/1).

⁴² BL, Add. MSS 11411, letter of Thomas Povey, a London agent for many Barbados merchants, to Daniel Searle, himself then governor, 20 October 1659; printed in *Analecta Hibernica*, 4-5 (1932-4), pp. 240-2.

⁴³ For Lawrence's role as prominent Baptist see Kevin Herlihy, "A gay and flattering world": Irish Baptist Piety and Perspective, 1650-1800' in Kevin Herlihy (ed.), *The Religion of Irish Dissent 1650-1800* (Dublin, 1996), pp. 59-67.

on the whole so free of the rhetoric of bitter abuse which pervaded most of the period's writings? Robert Dunlop, writing in 1913, somewhat optimistically explained this exceptionally positive view of the Irish as 'evidence of how residence in Ireland has always tended to draw English settlers and Irish natives together in one common interest'.⁴⁴ Certainly the fact of his not being a first-generation settler was one of the most sharply differentiating factors between him and the newly arrived Lawrence. The *Great Case* referred pointedly to the poor judgement of those who are 'strangers to Ireland' and the *Argument* insisted that lack of experience in Ireland led to his opponents' wrong-headed views.⁴⁵

A broader consideration of Gookin's mentality, however, indicates other variances. As well as sharp divergences in religious complexion, social status and its accompanying intellectual formation may play a role in these differences. Gookin's many allusions to ancient history and literature, his deployment of rhetorical effects, and some explicit references to the methods used in his time to impart logical skills suggest that he had a classical, and probably a university, education.⁴⁶ There was a sophisticated use of metaphor in both texts, usually to deepen a serious argument but sometimes also to score points, often to entertaining effect. Thus he deployed a military image to make fun of Lawrence's alleged ineptitude in argument, pointedly implying that this can be attributed to his opponent's *déclassé* status as an under-educated soldier: 'he has suffered two Objections to struggle from their company, to the Rear of his Book, Pag. 26. which I shall desire to march up into their proper place, that so I may take a view of them with the rest here, and the Reader see the whole strength he musters at one view.'⁴⁷ Lawrence's more pragmatic and less than elegant writing style entirely lacks these flavours. But as well as his rhetorical skills Gookin also showed other kinds of knowledge, most evidently in *The Author and Case... Vindicated*, when he referred to Plato and More and especially when he cited modern history, in particular the works of Sir John Davies, Edmund Campion and Spenser. He must presumably have read these authors in Sir James Ware's 1633 compilation, and his acquaintance with them revealed a reflective and philosophical interest in Ireland and in the history of English settlement there. *The Great Case* was on the whole less allusive; it seems that Gookin was stung by Lawrence's sneers into a fuller grounding of his arguments in the appropriate historical authorities the second time round. But both Gookin's pamphlets occasionally rose to moments of eloquence, and this effect was always associated with a group of topics which the times had

⁴⁴ Dunlop, *Commonwealth*, II, p. 609, n. 2. ⁴⁵ *Great Case*, p. 32 and *Argument*, p. 25.

⁴⁶ I have not however found any record of Gookin at Trinity College, Dublin or at the universities of Oxford or Cambridge. ⁴⁷ *Author*, p. 47.

bound inextricably together: namely, giving the reader an adequate sense of how terrible the condition of the Irish really was; getting his audience to acknowledge the exercise of compassion as a moral imperative; and solving the problem, immemorably incumbent upon the victorious, of reconciling justice with mercy.

Of course, much of the argument in these writings, however enlightened and humane, can be understood as also pragmatic and connected with economic self-interest. When, for instance, Gookin pleaded for the retention *in situ* of husbandmen and labourers, it is easy to discern the consternation of a landed gentleman at the prospective removal of the labour necessary to sustain farm, household and fishery as profitable going concerns.⁴⁸ Certainly there was no sign of Gookin feeling compunction specifically at the removal from their traditional habitations of the Catholic upper and gentry classes. But it is inadvisable to adopt too reductionist attitudes to what are, by any standards, ideologically remarkable texts. After due acknowledgement of the role of self- and class-interest in these writings, there remains an excess of expressed compassion and even of self-exploration which is altogether exceptional in the period and in the context.

In *The Great Case*, Gookin divided his argument into three sections: whether transplanting was appropriate or necessary to further the 'principles' of religion, 'in order to the purity of the Gospel'; of public good, 'in order to the preservation of the English Nation and Interest entire'; and finally of 'Advantage, in order to the fixing English Estates, where the hazard may be least, and profit greatest'.⁴⁹ He added an unsignalled last section which discussed 'the impossibility of this transplanting'.⁵⁰ In the first section, on religion (pp. 1-14), he maintained that the conversion of the Irish could be achieved *if* they remained among the English. A governing image and idea throughout the whole work was that of unification. At the very outset he merged the aim of religious conversion with his anti-transplantation argument by referring to 'the unitive principles of Christianity' which teach that 'separations of persons, are then onely Lawfull when necessary'.⁵¹ He took the opportunity to criticise sharply the bitter divisions among Protestants themselves as the reverse of edifying, to lament the scarcity of ministers, and pointedly to remark that 'it is sad [to] observe how Garrisons are placed in every quarter where the Irish inhabite, Ministers in none; as if our business in Ireland were onely to set up our own interest [*sic*], and not Christs [*sic*]'.⁵² He also attacked what he saw as the 'lamentable ignorance' or 'blasphemous haeresies' of

⁴⁸ *Great Case*, pp. 15-17.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 3.

some who had been employed as preachers and of 'gifted men'; in this he revealed his own position as firmly resistant to the religious experiments and innovations of the period, which especially characterised the recent military incomers to Ireland.⁵³ In a memorable metaphor he even discredited preaching itself, so central to the practice of Independents and Baptists: 'mans soul is like a narrow mouth'd bottle, the means to fill it is not to pour buckets of water over it, but to take it singly, and pour in the water gently by little and little; publick preaching may be compared to the former, but private catechizing and family duties to the lat[t]er.'⁵⁴

One can only imagine how infuriating Lawrence and other members of the more radical factions must have found this rather traditionalist position, with its distaste for a pre-eminence of preaching in religious exercise. Gookin's privileging here of private, familial and indoor piety over those dramatic group expressions of faith and self-abasement which characterised the English public culture of the Puritan Reformation in general is particularly striking; in a passage such as this, his views may seem far from the centre of gravity among his fellow members of the 1650s parliaments. They were, however, close to those of Edward Worth, dean of Cork, who during the period of Fleetwood's deputyship and the consequent dominance of the Munster military governors was struggling to carry out his aim for the re-establishment and consolidation of centralised religious organisation with a parochial ministry and against 'itinerant preachers and voluntarism'.⁵⁵ Worth, who was Presbyterian in his position, enjoyed the support of Henry Cromwell and Gookin seems to have been of like mind: a January 1657 letter in the Thurloe correspondence attributed to him discussed the recruitment of suitable ministers for Dublin and approvingly mentioned the 'many hopefull young men being ordained by the presbytery of London' as well as more specifically selecting one 'Newcomen, of the Presbyterian way . . . in Suffolke . . . whom I am now designing to get over'.⁵⁶ In this connection it may be worth recalling Alan Ford's recent observation that the 'disparate strands' of the Protestantism imported from England and Scotland were in fact held together in Ireland in the two decades before 1660 to a surprising degree, and that this was done 'partly through amnesia and carelessness, partly through the principled construction of a tolerant framework . . . in a

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 5-6. ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

⁵⁵ T. C. Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland: English Government and Reform in Ireland 1649-1660* (Oxford, 1975), p. 127.

⁵⁶ John Thurloe, *A Collection of State Papers of John Thurloe*, ed. T. Birch (7 vols., London, 1742), V, pp. 19-21. See Seymour, *The Puritans in Ireland*, especially pp. 54, 65-8, 154, 157, 162, 180-1, 199 and Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, pp. 117-32 for accounts of Worth and of the various religious tendencies in Ireland in the period.

peculiarly Irish compromise'.⁵⁷ Such a view helps to account for the apparent range of religious affiliations among the Munster Protestants: on the April 1655 committee of Triers, for example, Gookin sat together not only with Worth, but with Claudius Gilbert, a Limerick minister with well-known Independent views; and when later that year the Quakers preached in Kinsale, Worth's own wife Susannah was converted.⁵⁸

The real focus of this section of Gookin's argument, however, was hardly upon the hope of mass conversions at all. He very soon embarked on a topic that evidently fascinated him and worried his conscience: the validity of the notion of a 'national bloud-guilt' of the Irish. In spite of the well-known centrality of this belief to English official attitudes after the dissemination of the 1641 propaganda, he worked energetically at dismantling the certainty with which this guilt was collectively assigned to a whole nation, first questioning the infallibility and human unreliability of the English judicial system.⁵⁹ Then he disaggregated the nation into its particular members to point out that 'it is unnecessary that punishment should be inflicted in common, when triall of the guilt and execution of the guilty may be single'.⁶⁰ He stoutly maintained that the involvement of many of the Irish was produced by a degree of 'ignorance or infirmite' as well as by coercion, which he attributes to *both* sides in the early stages of the rising. Then he returned to query the very nature of punishment and the morality of continuing 'punishment against a Nation'.⁶¹ There follows a fine passage of deep compunction about the moral viability of the role of the English in so far as they were bent upon revenge for 1641. What was the purpose of punishment? 'The ends thereof are commonly mistaken', he argued, with 'men making punishment the end of punishment, and the gratifying either the Law it self . . . or God (who delights not in suffering, as such) or the partly injured (the scratching of whose itch, in the way of revenge, barely, is utterly unlawful)'.⁶² At the climax of this argument he acknowledged with simple dignity that 'the truth is, an injury done is unrepealable, and neither God, nor the law of Reason delights in accumulation of suffering, or are pleased with pain'.⁶³ It followed therefore that 'justice is not Anger but Caution; to devise how one may bite him that bites us, is the part of a beast'. To insist on punishment even when it was not 'in connexion with the ends' (that is, not likely to prevent the committing of a fault) was the act of 'the vulgar, who are as

⁵⁷ Alan Ford, 'The Origins of Irish Dissent' in Herlihy (ed.), *The Religion of Irish Dissent*, p. 30.

⁵⁸ See Raymond Gillespie, '"Into another intensity": Prayer in Irish Nonconformity, 1650-1700', in Herlihy (ed.), *The Religion of Irish Dissent*, p. 31; for Susannah Worth, see Seymour, *The Puritans in Ireland*, p. 132. ⁵⁹ *Great Case*, pp. 6-7.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8. ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 9. ⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 10. ⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

inexorable as Nemesis, and thinks him the justest man, that like Draco, writes all his Lawes in Blood'.⁶⁴

Again and again in both pamphlets, Gookin staged the key moment of compassion. A passage from *The Great Case* which described the abject condition of the Irish common people is often quoted:

for the poor Commons, the Sun never shined (or rather not shined) upon a Nation so miserable . . . There are not one hundred of them in 10000, who are not . . . under the penalty of losing life and estate; the Tax sweeps away their whole Subsistence; Necessity makes them turn Theeves and Tories, and then they are prosecuted with fire and sword for being so. If they discover not Tories, the English hang them, if they do, the Irish kill them . . .⁶⁵

The passage ended with a less frequently noted but equally passionate self-exculpation from blame for showing sympathy for their suffering: 'if any person melted with the bowels of a man, or moved by the Rules of Common Equitie, labour to bring home to them that little Mercy which the State allowes, there are some ready to asperse them as Tories, coverers of bloud-guiltiness . . .'.⁶⁶ In a remarkably direct repudiation of the governing rhetoric of the period's discourse about Ireland, the morally corrosive nature of self-righteous avenging rage was stressed: 'Must we still cry justice, justice? . . . the fair vertue of justice (overdon) degenerates into the stinking weed of Tyranny . . .'.⁶⁷ This passage is lent further resonance by the echo of the quasi-proverbial conclusion – 'Lilies that fester, smell far worse than weeds' – of Shakespeare's sonnet 'They that have powre to hurt, and will doe none'.⁶⁸ The attitude to the Irish in these passages finds an echo in what at first may seem a curious quarter, the Quaker John Perrot's letter to the pope. Describing how at this same time he pleaded with the military governor of Kilkenny that a group of Irish sentenced to be transported to Barbados might be spared, Perrot used a strikingly similar language of pity: 'I had written about three sheets of Paper, that represented the sore Grievances and heavy Oppressions of all thy Children in the Land, which none of them instigated me unto, but was only carried forth thereunto in the Mercies, Pities and Compassions that God had put in my soul, beholding them a *bleeding People*' (italics in original).⁶⁹

It is important to be aware that Gookin's whole discourse in both pamphlets was constantly addressing the moral attitudes and condition of the English themselves in so far as they were settlers. Throughout, then,

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10. ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 13–14. ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 14. ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁶⁸ William Shakespeare, *Shakespeare's sonnets. Never before imprinted*. London, 1609 (Menston, 1968), p. 90.

⁶⁹ John Perrot, *Battering Rams against Rome, or the Battel of John, the Follower of the Lamb . . .* (London, 1661), pp. 123–4.

he considered the specific position of the planter in Ireland as distinct from that of the English subject or Protectorate citizen in general. His writings therefore marked a formative moment in the development of the whole characteristic mentality of the Protestant interest in Ireland, an attitude which would eventually shape Protestant Ascendancy culture and, from within it in the course of time, colonial nationalism. The fundamental injustice of the fate of the Catholic proprietors should not overshadow Gookin's crucial gesture of assuming a certain degree of moral responsibility for present actions and therefore for future consequences. That concession was not the product primarily of pragmatism or self-interest, nor even of an exceptional degree of individual intelligence; true to its time, it was motivated by religious understanding and insight. The *Great Case* passage beginning 'The Sun never shined . . . upon a Nation so miserable', quoted above, rose to a climax with a protest that 'the Lord knows I spoke only from the bowels of a man towards men, and the charity of a Christian to miserable blinded Christians, and one who had read a little what has happened to others by this practice, and therefore would that we should avoid such rocks'.⁷⁰

It is noticeable that what was really focused on here was the inner state of the English, those with the power and therefore the responsibility. When he referred to 'what has happened to others by this practice', he clearly thought of the effect upon those in power of the misuse of that power. Such moments recurred throughout both the pamphlets, and in particular they dominated the concluding parts of *The Great Case*. To be sure, arguments about moral status such as 'it being an Heroickness not to insult upon an humbled Enemy' were accompanied by practical concessions like 'and Wisdome not to make him desperate', but the intensity of tone was most marked in the former, as for instance: 'God hath complicated our good with this mercy, as if he would not let Men be too cruel to those poor blind Natives, without being so to themselves'.⁷¹ In a ringing final passage, he represented the moral good of refraining from all action entailing destruction, urging that 'the most contemptible things carry Engins of death along with them; a Gnat, a Hair, a Rasin-stone can destroy, but great glorious universal agents (like the Sun) are the Parents of life'.⁷² Furthermore, 'a storm or accident may throw down a house, but art and industry are required to build it; and this way treads a destructive path, as hath been shewn, and therefore should no longer be trodden in'.⁷³

Gookin's whole conception of colonial development was predicated upon assimilation. Leaving aside the specific question of implementing

⁷⁰ *Argument*, pp. 41-2.

⁷¹ *Great Case*, p. 29.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

the transplantation, it was perhaps in this basic aspiration that he was most at odds with Lawrence. He predicted that the Irish, now 'so abated' by famine, the sword and foreign transportation, were no longer likely to 'overgrow the English as formerly', but that 'being mixed with, they are likelier to be swallowed up by the English, and incorporated into them; so that a few Centuries will know no difference present'.⁷⁴ Those parts of Lawrence's text which were most sequential, effective and urgent were precisely those passages where he elaborated his argument that only by consolidating English settlement and keeping the Irish outside these enclaves would the English interest in Ireland ever be secured.⁷⁵ Sounding quite a bit like Spenser in fundamental outlook, though not in style, he argued that the very cause of English weakness in 1641 was their 'not being embodied or . . . not cohabiting together'.⁷⁶ He developed a scenario of concentrating English plantations, such as the Ards peninsula, whose successful resistance to the 1641 insurrection he derived from this consolidation. Earlier English settlers, according to him, did well as long as they remained within the Pale or the English baronies in Wexford, whereas by their subsequent 'promiscuous and scattered inhabiting among the Irish', in the period of their 'degeneration', they were 'even as sheep prepared for the slaughter'.⁷⁷ In the spring of 1655 the authorities evidently supported Lawrence's views about effecting separate enclaves for Irish and English. This is shown by an official document of April 1655 about transplantation in the Cork area. Acting upon the report of an enquiry by a committee of six including Lawrence himself into 'what persons fell within the rules of the Act of Transplantation [*sic*]', this directed that any five of a large group headed by Broghill and Sir William Fenton but otherwise made up entirely of army officers were to 'take care that such Irish inhabiting the County Cork, as shall be thought fit to be dispensed with from Transplantation, do not live scatteringly, but be drawne together into townships'.⁷⁸ Further, it was ordered that 'watch and ward' be kept, allegedly 'for the better defence of the said inhabitants against disturbers of the Public peace', to catch 'Tories and other Felons'.⁷⁹ It continued that there should be 'no person inhabit[ing] without the lines of protection, or planting upon lands without the ancient declared lines' unless by a special licence.⁸⁰ The emphasis was laid on protection, but even if this was not disingenuous, the shared mentality between the document and Lawrence's own arguments remains clear.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21. ⁷⁵ *Interest of England*, pp. 15–18. ⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17. ⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁷⁸ University College Cork Library, Caulfield collection, UC/RC/PP/8/23. ⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

Gookin's firm adherence to an anti-military position in parliament emerged in his pamphlets, which repeatedly criticised the perpetration of violence by the army. Describing the harassment and grinding down of the common people by what he called the 'incredible oppression of the Souldiers', he did concede that 'there never was an Army (except of Angels, where the Lord of Hosts was Captain) that had not some that swerv'd from the integrity of the rest', but trenchantly inquired 'who will not believe an English Souldier, rather than an Irish Teige, if the matter should come to dispute[?]'.⁸¹ In the small body of his correspondence with Thurloe which has survived, he also expressed his disquiet about military hegemony. Opposing the military party in a 1657 vote (against the bill for decimating the cavaliers) he articulated a philosophical basis for his position:

that which makes me feare the passing of the bill is, that therby his highness government will be more founded in force, and more removed from that natural foundation, which the people in parliament are desirous to give him; supposing therby hee will become more theirs, than now hee is, and will in time find the safety and peace of the nation to be as well maintained by the lawes of the land, as by the sword.⁸²

This passage recalled the pointed terms in which in 1650 Andrew Marvell was praising Cromwell, then poised between his Irish and Scottish military campaigns, for his alleged amenability to the people's mandated representatives:

Nor yet grown stiffer with command,
But still in the Republic's hand:
 How fit he is to sway
 That can so well obey.
He to the Commons' feet presents
A kingdom, for his first year's rents:
 And what he may, forbears
 His fame, to make it theirs:
And has his sword and spoils ungirt,
To lay them at the public's skirt.⁸³

Gookin, then, by contrast to Lawrence's projected separation of castes, envisaged the future of the country as one of ongoing assimilation of Irish manners and culture by English ones, and concomitantly of Catholic by Protestant belief and practice. He differentiated this conquest from former ones by the engagement of the whole 'Nation of England' in it, as opposed to the partial nature of 'former Conquests'. Furthermore, in the past many English were tenants to Irish proprietors, the Irish were 'the

⁸¹ *Author and Case*, p. 16.

⁸² Thurloe, *State Papers*, V, p. 20.

⁸³ 'An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland' in *Andrew Marvell*, ed. Frank Kermode and Keith Walker (Oxford, 1990), p. 84.

chiefly estated', and lawyers, jurors and members of the parliament were Irish. He adverted also to language use: 'The frequent use of the Irish Language in all commerce, and the Englishes habituating themselves to that Language, was one great means of Irishifying the English Colonies; But now the Language will be generally English; and if the Irish be mingled with the English, they will probably learn and be habituated to the English Tongue'.⁸⁴ The thorough nature of this latest 'conquest', then, would in his sanguine view tip the balance decisively towards the establishment of hegemony of the English interest and Englishness in culture, language and way of life. He contested Lawrence's whole argument about 'cohabitation' being the cause of the rebellion, pinpointing instead those courses of action, neglected up to 1641, which could have averted it: care taken for spreading the Protestant religion, educating 'their gentry in civility', suppressing their language, and so forth. In places anticipating the tone of a Prendergast inveighing against English inhumanity, he recruited to his viewpoint Sir John Davies, complete with page-references, on how the English in effect made rebellion inevitable by 'seating themselves in the rich plains, and driving the Irish to mountains and barren lands'.⁸⁵

When at one point he directly broached the thorny question of future security for planters, it was in order to argue that while transplantation might help prevent unpleasant surprises to come, yet it did not constitute any kind of permanent solution: or as he put it in a vivid phrase: 'tis too narrow a plaister to cover the sore of Ireland'.⁸⁶ If safety were the only consideration, he drily added, then a safer way yet 'was to knock them all on the head, that will make them sure, and us safe for certain'.⁸⁷ The necessity of taking a longer view was far more evident to Gookin than to his opponent. Yes, transplantation or wholesale extermination would be ways of making the English safe, but there may be other, preferable alternatives. 'Our old dotting Ancestors thought Communion one of these wayes',⁸⁸ and, ignoring their alleged 'degeneration', he appealed to the most dignified historical precedents to support their view: 'Where had been our Empire (sayes *Seneca*) if wholsom Providence had not mixed the conquered with the Conquerours? And *Livy*, The State of Rome was advanc't by receiving their enemies into them'.⁸⁹

These ideas of 'Communion' and 'receiving their enemies into them' were instances of an important element in Gookin's thinking, and a highly unusual one. Certainly this vision of a long-term assimilation of Irish into English preserved intact the structure of a dominant and a submissive party, but it was also notably free of the fanatical quasi-compulsion to

⁸⁴ *Great Case*, p. 20. ⁸⁵ *Argument*, pp. 38-9. ⁸⁶ *Author and Case*, p. 39.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 39. ⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 40. ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

keep the Irish away as something foul, a contaminant to English being, which was produced in and by the 1641 atrocity literature and persisted in so many other writings from 1642 onwards.⁹⁰ Gookin repeatedly rehearsed this trope of absorbing, often with an eloquence which would seem to mark conviction, and using powerful metaphors. Even allowing for the untypicality and, on the national scale, unreliability, of his perception of the relative strengths of Irish and English (an insight which was probably the product of his own breeding in Munster), his line of argument was striking. First he noted the currently abject condition of the Irish:

they were strong, they are weak; they were numerous, they are consumed by Sword, Pestilence and Famine; they were hearty, they are out of courage; they were rich, they are poor and beggarly; they had Souldiers, they are left naked; they had Cities, strong-holds, they have now but cottages to put their heads in; they had civil power, they have lost it; they had Priests to harden them, they are banished; the Tables are just turned; the English are what the Irish were; rich, high, powerfull, *etc.* the Irish are what the English were, poor, few, *etc.* . . . What can they do? What may they not be made suffer? (*Italics in original*)⁹¹

This passage was presumably a further attempt to persuade the opposition that to refrain from large-scale transplantation would not carry unacceptable risks. Gookin's emphasis on the power previously wielded by the Irish may be read in two ways: either it was a disingenuous move by which he sought his audience's assent to a moderate line of action by reinforcing their assumptions about the 1641 rebellion, or it may be attributed to his own rather unrepresentative background in Munster. The final question, however – 'What may they not be made suffer?' – brings the reader sharply up against the responsibilities of rule and to a central concern in Gookin's thinking, namely the problem of discerning what was appropriate action by the English in relation to the defeated collectivity of the Irish nation. Following on this chilling reminder of the currently abject state of that nation, he went on to open out the view to the positive future which may be brought about, to the benefit of both groups as he saw it, if only extreme action was refrained from: 'they are few, the English many; we may overspread them, and incorporate them into our selves, and so by an

⁹⁰ The large body of recent writing in literary criticism and cultural studies on the development of a bounded selfhood – in Norbert Elias's phrase, *homo clausus* – in the early modern period, and its close connections with the development of various colonialisms, illuminates the function of these tropes in Gookin's mentality. See in particular Stallybrass and White, *The Poetics and Politics of Transgression* and, on colonial discourse theory in general, the writings by Stephen Greenblatt, Tzvetan Todorov, José Rabasa, Homi Bhabha, Peter Hulme and Benita Parry cited in the bibliography to that volume. There has not yet been enough application of these or other theoretical perspectives to Anglo-Irish writings outside the specifically literary canon: for some discussion of this see the essays by Patricia Coughlan cited in the bibliography.

⁹¹ *Author and Case*, p. 41.

oneness take away the foundation of difference and fear together; we may breed up their youth, habituate them to our customs, cause a disuse of their Language: we have opportunities of communicating better things unto them, and probabilities they may be received'.⁹² The word 'incorporation' with its implicit idea of arriving at the one body suggested an ultimate total fusing of English with Irish; Gookin presented this as a benign condition, removing 'difference' and 'fear' together. There is, however, no gainsaying the fact that the metaphor he used at this point, stripped of the beneficent eucharistic overtones of the earlier term 'Communion', was one based on cannibalism ('incorporate them into ourselves'), in which the English were perceived as not merely 'overspread[ing]' the Irish, but consuming them entirely so that ultimately only a single identity remains.⁹³ Ultimately, then, his careful reflections on viable moral stances did not extend, any more than those of his contemporaries, to anything which might be called cultural relativism towards the colonised.

IV

Twenty years later, in Massachusetts, questions of colonial relationships with earlier inhabitants were again being explored by Vincent Gookin's first cousin Daniel, his elder by seven years. Daniel was first a Virginia planter, from 1630 till 1644; then after his Puritan conversion he moved to New England, where he lived, first in Boston, then in Cambridge, till his death in 1687. Daniel was a prominent member of the Bay Colony, elected annually from 1652 to the office of 'assistant'. In 1656 he became 'superintendent' of all the Indians who had submitted to the Massachusetts government and discharged the civil aspects of the religious mission of his friend John Eliot, then working apace at the conversion of the Native American population. Daniel's surviving writings consist of two texts, both unpublished in his time: the *Historical Collections . . . of the Indians in New England* (c.1674) and *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677* (1677).⁹⁴ These writings, which have their own place in the

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 40–1. ⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁹⁴ Both unpublished in Gookin's time. *Historical Collections* is printed in *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, 1 (Boston, 1792), pp. 141–226, and *Historical Account in Archaeologia Americana: Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society*, 2 (Cambridge, MA, 1836); facsimile reprint in *Research Library of Colonial Americana* (New York, 1972), pp. 425–534. Also see Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York, 1998), which is an outstanding recent account of the historical and ideological context and has a very full analytic bibliographical essay. Louise A. Breen discussed Daniel Gookin in an unpublished 1997 conference paper, 'Praying with the Enemy: Daniel Gookin and the Perils of Intercultural Mediatorship in Colonial Massachusetts', abstracted at <<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/history/abstract.htm>>.

historiography of early colonial America and belong primarily in that context, will not be examined in detail here.⁹⁵ It is important to acknowledge all the objective divergences – anthropological and geographic, to mention only two – between the two theatres of discourse. Nevertheless striking parallels emerge between the underlying complexion of Daniel's and Vincent's thinking when it is considered as part of the subjective mentality of the colonial settlers. Both cousins may, after all, be counted members of a more or less Puritan elite engaging with the Irish and the American settlements and plantations and sharing a governing ideology.

If, as it is not unreasonable to suspect, there was an inter-influence of each upon the other, how might this have come about? No information about contact between the families during the earlier decades of the century, whether in County Cork or in Kent, appears to have survived, though Sir Vincent did bring up his family in Ireland.⁹⁶ But Daniel the younger visited England several times: in 1639 for his marriage; in July 1650 when he stayed a few months; and, significantly, in 1655 when he was there from at least July until early November. It is reasonable to assume that during this visit he could have read his cousin's two pamphlets, published in January and May respectively. Furthermore, Daniel, like Vincent on occasion, was in direct contact with Cromwell and had his distinct approval. Certainly after the unexpected and indeed unplanned capture of Jamaica that summer he was appointed as commissioner to persuade New England settlers to colonise the new acquisition. This proved a mixed blessing: Daniel's correspondence with Thurloe shows that his best efforts could not overcome the extreme reluctance of his fellow settlers in the Massachusetts area to remove to an island they believed was subject to Spanish harassment and to an unhealthy climate, and the plan failed.⁹⁷ After a prolonged residence at Dunkirk during 1657–8, Daniel returned to America for good, where he resumed his office as superintendent of the Indians, and continued so till his death. In 1674 he wrote the better known of his two treatises, the *Historical Collections*, which was overtaken by an historical irony in the form of the outbreak of 'King Philip's War', a cataclysmic set of events which among other things

⁹⁵ Neither do I propose to elide the differences between the historical situations of Munster in the 1650s and Massachusetts in the 1670s, or naively to equate the colonial project of the Bay Colony with the drive to establish once and for all on a secure footing the centuries-old English interest in Ireland. Nor can much ground for comparison be found between the way of life of the Native American nations and that of the Irish in the mid-seventeenth century; James Muldoon's often-cited 'The Indian as Irishman', *Essex Institute Historical Collections*, 3 (1975), pp. 267–89, while suggestive, in my view overstates the parallels which can be found between the two situations.

⁹⁶ *Cal SP Ire, 1647–1660*, p. 185.

⁹⁷ See Thurloe, *State Papers*, IV, pp. 449, 509–10; V, pp. 6–7, and J. H. Andrews, *The Colonial Period in American History* (4 vols., New Haven, 1934), I, p. 499.

swept away much of the work of converting and 'civilising' the Native American peoples of the region which had been so diligently pursued by Eliot for decades before. After the war his colleagues in the Massachusetts colony excoriated Gookin for his over-sympathetic attitude to the Indians, and temporarily removed him from his official functions. In *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians*, however, he sought to defend this group against the vilification by the settlers of all Native Americans. In it he doggedly recorded instance after instance of their mistreatment during the war because of a mixture of prejudice, war hysteria, and expansionist greed among many of the English. This included the forcible resettlement of the inhabitants of most of the 'praying towns' -- transplantation by any other name -- on Long Island and Deer Island, where they risked death from starvation and exposure; to Gookin's mind they were being made to 'pass into the furnace of affliction'.⁹⁸ He was clear-sighted about what might be called the popular paranoia prevailing in the colony in the war months: of the Boston trial for murder, instigated by the outstandingly brutal Samuel Moseley in August 1675, of fifteen Christian Indians (all but two of whom were ultimately acquitted and freed), he noted: 'the clamours of the people were very great upon this occasion, and all things against those praying Indians accused (as one of the most intelligent of the magistrates said) were represented as very great, as things appear in mist or fog'.⁹⁹

The first text, *Historical Collections*, was part-ethnography, part-enthusiastic charting of Eliot's work at conversion, part-project for bringing 'civilisation' to the Native Americans. The lists of praying towns with the numbers of their population and the detailed accounts of Eliot's preaching and catechising, while a useful early source of information, were not, however, the work's main claim to distinction. The points in both texts where Daniel Gookin was at his most compelling were rather the discursive exploration of his sense of what the appropriate English relation to the indigenous peoples might be, and ultimately of how productive co-existence might be achieved. Here the parallels with Vincent's thought are most apparent. Each man wrote from a convinced Protestant viewpoint about the pervasive, indeed governing inspiration of Christian faith and adherence (whatever their differences may have been about church government in practice, as between congregationalism and presbytery). Likewise each was, of course, unquestioning about the benefits of

⁹⁸ *Historical Account*, p. 497. For the fullest references to the forced removals, see especially *Historical Account*, pp. 468-9, 485.

⁹⁹ *Historical Account*, p. 459. See Lepore, *The Name of War*, pp. 137-8; one was the skilled artisan called by the English 'James Printer', trained by Eliot, who had printed his various volumes of proselytising literature.

English rule and authority in the milieu in question, and likewise each merged economic motives with spiritual ones. Daniel advocated the Indians' enlightenment by being shown the true way to civility and a Christian way of life, and there was, of course, no doubt in his mind about the hierarchy between the two cultures. He also showed, though to a muted degree by comparison with the likes of William Bradford, a familiar Puritan and bourgeois unease with the carnivalesque and communally participatory qualities of Native American culture. Instances of this are the potlatch custom where on certain occasions 'a man giveth away all that ever he hath', and with the 'great vehemency they use in the motion of their bodies, in their dances'.¹⁰⁰

So much would not distinguish either cousin from most of the normal views of the period. But they were also alike, and both different from dominant attitudes in their respective milieux, in being prepared to hold up an ultimate assimilation as the model and goal for the future development of their societies. Daniel also adduced some prudential considerations for building up the converted Indians' communities not far away, but right at the outskirts of English towns where they might have provided a 'wall' and preliminary defence against attack upon the colony's centres by hostile nations. His sad narrative of this and that injustice and atrocity in the *Historical Account* was pervaded by declarations, derived from scripture, of what was due to this group of what he and Eliot saw as newly enlightened souls. He perceived them as sharers in the Christian revelation who had been faithful allies of the English, assisting them as guides, trackers and spies.¹⁰¹ Thus 'a covenant, though made with the Gibeonites, is a very binding thing, and the breach of it sorely punished by the Lord, as may appear in 2 Sam.xxi.1,2,3'.¹⁰² But a secular discourse of civilly based rights was strikingly predominant even in his post-war writing; the following, arguing against the wartime practice of summary removal from their habitations of those against whom no crime had been proved, was a typical instance of the deployment of such discourse: 'the General Court hath granted those Indians lands and townships, and thereby confirmed and settled them therein as the English; so that, besides their own natural right, they have this legal title, and stand possessed of them as the English are'.¹⁰³

Further, there is intriguing evidence of tensions within his own think-

¹⁰⁰ *Historical Collections... of the Indians*, p. 153. Also see Andrew Parker, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer and Patricia Yaeger (eds.), *Nationalisms and Sexualities* (New York, 1992).

¹⁰¹ James Drake, 'Restraining Atrocity: The Conduct of King Philip's War', *New England Quarterly*, 70 (1997), pp. 33-56, usefully places Gookin's positive views in the context of others' very different attitudes. On a minor point, it does not seem accurate in attributing to him 'a military background in England'; his military title refers to his service in the town militias of the colony. ¹⁰² *Account*, p. 468. ¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 469.

ing about the status of the English in Massachusetts, anxieties which reveal a reflectiveness and capacity for compunction characteristic also of Vincent's thought. So at different moments he acknowledged the expansionist drive of the English as 'a growing and potent people, comparatively to the Indians'¹⁰⁴ and, albeit under the sign of Christian conversion, recalled the 'promises made to Jesus Christ' that 'God will give him the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession'.¹⁰⁵ Yet elsewhere he admitted, with a kind of rueful delicacy, that 'the Indians here [in the English town of Marlborough] do not much rejoice under the English men's shadow, who do so overtop them in their number of people, flocks of cattle, etc., that the Indians do not greatly flourish, or delight in their station at present'.¹⁰⁶

He specifically advocated close proximity between the English and Indians as the best way forward: 'that they may cohabit together, without which neither religion nor civility can well prosper'.¹⁰⁷ By the founding of a free school for both to attend at Okommakamesir (*alias* Marlborough), 'the Indians will be able to converse with the English familiarly; and thereby learn civility and religion from them'.¹⁰⁸ The momentous implications of this idea of shared education were evidently not lost upon him. If as a result the Indians would henceforth be able 'to converse with the English familiarly', that 'approved experiment' which was here specified as a linguistic one, would also enable the colony to change the speech of this 'barbarous people' into that of the 'more civil and potent nation that hath conquered them'.¹⁰⁹ Finally, the consequences of denying the Indians such civil conversation (to coin a phrase) were, he said, all too evident at the other side of the Atlantic:

And I incline to believe, that if that course had been effectually taken with the Irish, their enmity and rebellion against the English had been long since cured or prevented, and they better instructed in the Protestant religion; and consequently redeemed from the vassalage and affection to the Romish see; who have by this means kept the greatest part of them in ignorance, and consequentially in brutishness and superstition to this day.¹¹⁰

V

In conclusion, should the writings of Vincent and Daniel Gookin be judged as instances of political thought, however small scale and particular in their scope? Certainly, in Vincent's case, it is necessary to make allowance for all the practical circumstances underlying the composition

¹⁰⁴ *Historical Collections . . . of the Indians*, p. 179. ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 185. There is a scriptural allusion to David rejoicing under the shadow of Christ.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 179. ¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 220. ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 220, 221. ¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

of his two pamphlets: his wish to strike a blow against the military party for reasons of interest as well as political belief; his need (and that of his whole class) for the labour of the Irish common people to sustain the profitability of their estates; his conscious political role in building up an image of the Old Protestants as judicious and reasonable men to whom much could be entrusted; and his own active and paid function in the sharing out of the very land acquired by means of the expropriation of Catholic proprietors. But, perhaps paradoxically, the more detailed the analysis one makes of the background of the pamphlets, the greater the risk of losing sight of the degree of reflectiveness and even of moral insight or humane impulse shown by both Gookins.¹¹¹ In the case of Vincent in particular, he should not be seen as what Memmi called 'the colonist who refuses', because of course he evidently cannot be said to have refused.¹¹² But out of the extreme moment when the Irish transplantation policy, in all its barbarity, was being urged upon those in power, he defined and elaborated a position from which that inhumanity could be apprehended. The presence of pragmatic motives and social interests should not obscure the true note of reflection upon how settler and old inhabitant were, in some necessary future and in some sense, to learn to live together. Neither, in Daniel's case, should the ideological boundaries of his origins and of his religious belief, or the stake he too held in the Bay Colony, obscure the value he insistently placed upon willingness to accept Native Americans, once Christian, as fellow human beings, in all their vulnerability and in all their ultimate potential as fellow citizens.

¹¹¹ *Pace* the usual view hitherto taken among historians, of which a typical example is Ivan Roots' remark that '[t]he Old Protestants set out to mitigate the policy of "Hell or Connaught" not because of any squeamishness about the hardship it inflicted upon the natives' but because of their economic need of 'a cheap labour force': 'Union and Disunion in the British Isles 1637-1660' in Roots (ed.), *'Into Another Mould': Aspects of the Interregnum* (Exeter, revised and expanded edition, 1998), p. 18.

¹¹² Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, trans. Howard Greenfield (London, 1957, repub. 1990), pp. 84-110.

Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland

Kingdom or Colony

Edited by

Jane H. Ohlmeyer

Published in association with the Folger Institute,
Washington, DC



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



22724072
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521157728

© Cambridge University Press, 2000

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2000

First paperback edition 2010

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Political thought in seventeenth-century Ireland: kingdom or colony / edited by Jane H.
Ohlmeyer.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 65083 6

1. Political science – Ireland – History – 17th century. I. Ohlmeyer, Jane H.

JA84.I76P66 2000

320'.09415'09032 dc21 99-048704

ISBN 978-0-521-65083-0 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-15772-8 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in
this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,
or will remain, accurate or appropriate.