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Thesis Abstract

This thesis examines the experience of the Blakes of Ballyglunin from 1641 until 1777. It presents a reinterpretation of a minor gentry Catholic landowning and merchant family from the mid-seventeenth century until the eve of the repeal of the penal laws. It places the family firmly in its local and national context in terms of landownership, economic affairs and confessional identity. Two themes dominate the text: in the second half of the seventeenth century the family became part of the Catholic ‘new interest’, those who prospered under the Restoration land settlement; and in the eighteenth century they survived and consolidated their estate in the face of the penal laws. It examines the defeat, transplantation, survival, expansion, consolidation, resistance and endurance of a Catholic landed family in the period c.1641-1777.

Chapters 2 to 5 present a chronological examination of the family in relation to its wealth and landownership. Tracing the family’s expulsion from Galway town, transplantation to County Galway, the re-establishment of their wealth and land during the Restoration and their survival and consolidation during the penal era. Their religious identity and the effects of the penal laws on the estate and the family are explored in Chapter 6. The family remained ‘Galway townsmen’ at heart and this is examined in Chapter 7. While they were expelled from Galway town in the early 1650s, they returned to trade and live in the town as early as they could in the Restoration and, ultimately, purchased a house in the town in 1677. They were again forced to leave Galway town in the early 1690s but they never completely severed their ties with the town. The changing experience of urban Catholics under the penal laws is illuminated and eventually their changed situation by the mid-eighteenth century enabled the family to return to live, for part of the year, in the town. A vital role in the survival of Catholic landownership was played by younger children and they are surveyed in Chapter 8.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

This is the study of one family’s experience over a century and a half from the outbreak of the 1641 rebellion to the first acts repealing the penal laws in the 1770s. It presents a reinterpretation of the experience of Catholic Ireland, in an attempt to get away from the twin poles of nationalist or Whig historical traditions that have dominated the interpretation of the history of Ireland. A more nuanced approach is vital in any attempt to understand Catholic Ireland in the second half of the seventeenth century and during the period of the penal laws. The experience of Catholics in Ireland during the seventeenth and eighteenth century often times gets lost in the complexities of scale. The extent of the land confiscated in the wake of the Parliamentary victory of 1653 and the overwhelming mass of the people of the island being Catholic, at times overwhelms any attempt to get to grips with the history of the period. County Galway entered the eighteenth century with the largest number of Catholic landowners in the country. This was a direct result of the transplantation of the mid-seventeenth century but also reflected the wealth of the Galway townsmen prior to that date. It then can present in microcosm the best and worst of how Catholics experienced the history of the period.

The thesis is divided into two main parts, one a chronological examination of the Blakes of Ballyglunin from their expulsion from Galway town until the third quarter of the eighteenth century. The other part investigates the family’s experience in Galway town, of their younger children and their experience as Catholics. Its primary focus is on the land; how Catholics forfeited their urban and rural holdings, were transplanted to new lands, accumulated more as and when they could and then secured and consolidated the lands they held by 1704 for the next seventy-odd years. However, as landownership had an influence on a much wider aspect of life in Ireland during the early modern period than simply buying and selling land, its other features are also examined.

The continued use of the same Christian names within Blake families, as indeed all families of the ‘tribes of Galway’ and others from County Galway, has long been a source of confusion and complaint. Lord Chief Baron Edward Willes writing from the Connacht circuit in 1761 complained that ‘tis difficult to know who is meant by John Blake’. The use of ‘Fitz’ before the person’s father’s name began to die out by the beginning of the eighteenth century, though Willes remarked that on panels of Galway juries they usually used the convention ‘John Blake James’ leaving out the Fitz which had been ‘dropped long’, but he complained that as a result of this ‘in the trial of an ejectment which depended upon
a pedigree, it was very troublesome to understand it’. The uses of ‘Fitz’ can be seen up to mid-century so it was not long dropped before Willes’ time and remained in use for much of the eighteenth century, indeed there were numerous individual examples of its continuation after mid-century. In order to differentiate between different Blakes, one would either have to number them or continue using ‘Fitz’. The convention chosen in this thesis is the latter.

Measurements of land present their own problems, for the most part, they are represented as either measures of a ‘quarter’, with a quarter in turn dividing into four cartrons, or acres variously as per the Stafford Survey, Irish or plantation acres. The surveyors of the Stafford Survey set down ‘the bound and meares, names and by-names, of all the quarters, plowlands, and other denominations…together with all the owners’. Galway presents an extreme contrast between the enormous ‘quarters’ of the woodland region in Killian barony and the small ones in the eastern baronies. No attempt has been made to give an equivalency and it is unlikely this would even be possible. Irish farm measures were based ‘less on superficial area than on productive capacity’, nevertheless, the ‘quarter’ is generally held to measure 120 acres in Connacht, though this varied widely within Ireland comprising 90-480 acres in Donegal or 360 acres in Munster. Deeds in the Ballyglunin papers variously list a half quarter as 95 acres or 2 quarters as 278 acres. The cartron is generally held to be equivalent to 30 acres in Connacht but again varied throughout Ireland, being mentioned in the Ballyglunin papers in one case as being forty-six acres. The Books of Survey and Distribution for County Galway were based on the Strafford Survey of 1636 but as all documents, including the manuscript and printed editions of the Books of Survey and Distribution, refer to the owners as of 1641, the convention is to still refer to the landholding as if it represented that held in 1641, as this was the date defined by law to determine penalty of confiscation and this formula is followed throughout.

The names of individual townlands have been updated, as far as possible, to correspond to current names used by Ordnance Survey Ireland. There are some

---

4 Kenneth Nicholls, ‘Gaelic society and economy in the high Middle Ages’, *N.H.I.*, ii, 408.
6 *The Discovery Series* 1:50,000 maps of Ordnance Survey Ireland have been used to confirm current names. Two websites have been very helpful in this regard, the Placenames Database of Ireland (http://www.logainm.ie), and Galway County Library’s Place names of Galway and the people who resided therein, a database including the Ordnance Survey Field Name Books relating to Galway (http://places.galwaylibrary.ie).
exceptions as townland names have changed a lot since the seventeenth century. Most notably the three townlands of Bunona, Garryduff Bunona, and Tarmon in the Barony of Clare, County Galway, within which townlands the Blakes owned land from the seventeenth century. They had by the nineteenth century Ordnance Survey been amalgamated into the single townland of Bunoghanaun. As these three townlands were purchased and leased numerous times over the period concerned as individual townlands, they have been left with their contemporaneous names. There are other examples, such as the townlands of Cullurty and Drishigan in the Barony of Tiaquin which became Brierfield by the nineteenth century, although still known in Irish as An Dríseachán. In such cases, the original names along with the current names in square brackets are given. By the Ordnance Survey Ballyglunin refers to the current village but Ballyglooneen to the townland. The original house was built on the Ballyglooneen townland. When it was purchased in the seventeenth century it was called the townland of Kilmoylan, but the village of Ballyglunin was built up around the train station in the nineteenth century. It is, therefore, anachronistic to refer to a ‘Ballyglunin Estate’ prior to the early eighteenth century. However, this nomenclature has been used prior to this date in order to distinguish this Blake family from related and neighbouring Blake families throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Thus, the convention is to refer to the Ballyglunin estate in general, referring to all land owned and leased by the Blakes of Ballyglunin throughout Galway and Mayo, but to the townland of Ballyglooneen.

i. Historiographical overview

The primary sources for this thesis are the Blake of Ballyglunin Papers in the National Archives of Ireland. This collection consists of six separate parts, 1) M6931: deeds, 1652-1898; 2) M6932: Maps and plans; 3) M6933: Rentals, accounts and inventories; 4) M6934: Papers relating to law cases, 1777-1869; 5) M6935: Miscellaneous seventeenth to the nineteenth century, mainly dealing with nineteenth century elections, and some family wills; and 6) M6936: Correspondence, primarily of Martin Joseph Blake in the early nineteenth century. There is a good summary calendar of the papers in the reading room of the National Archives. There are also Blake papers in the National Library relating to inter-related families in Galway, as well as abstracts, primarily made by Martin J. Blake, from documents destroyed in 1922.

Land ownership forms the major theme of this thesis and for the seventeenth century, we are lucky to have the Books of Survey and Distribution for the whole country setting out landownership in 1641, the assignments in the Restoration settlement and finally
those who bought land forfeited under the Williamite Forfeitures. Galway, as well as Clare, Mayo and Roscommon are slightly different from the other counties in that while the measurements and recording of who owned what in 1641 and in the Restoration were taken from the Down survey in the rest of Ireland, for these counties they were taken from the Strafford survey, that for Galway being from 1636. The convention is to still refer to the landholding as if it represented that held in 1641, as this was the date defined by law to determine penalty of confiscation and that has been followed here. The books themselves present numerous problems, reflecting deficiencies in the original manuscripts rather than in the excellent reproductions. One lacuna is the scattershot way they record purchases made by Catholics in the Restoration period, they record the Restoration land settlement over a period of about twenty years but so much of the land of Galway changed hands over this period that it only provides a glimpse of one piece of land at one particular time, the date of which is not noted in the books. A careful reading of the general introduction by Robert Simington is essential to their correct usage, with added information from Geraldine Tallon’s article on the Books of Survey and Distribution of County Westmeath, which while dealing with Westmeath in particular, is useful to understanding the books in general.

Trinity College, Dublin has published The Down Survey Project online, plotting the landholders detailed in the Books of Survey and Distribution onto the surviving Down Survey maps or simply onto Google Maps. The limitations of the website and the sources in question can be illustrated by two examples. The website shows a Martin Blake owning Toneglish, Barony of Moycullen, County Galway in 1641 and while there was more than one Martin Blake alive in 1641 and involved in landholding in County Galway, a Martin Blake owning land here would fly in the face of both the research done for this thesis and the work of Brendan Ó Bric about landholding of the Galway townsmen as landholders pre-1641.

One of the conventions in the Books of Survey and Distribution is that while a series of dashes can refer to what has immediately preceded in the column above, it can also show that something is unknown. In this case, the entry in the Books of Survey and Distribution shows, immediately before the entry in question, the owner of Shanonveige as Henry Blake and immediately below the owner of Tonelegish simply states ‘Martin’ with a number of dashes after. The Down Survey Project website takes this to mean Martin Blake

9 www.downsurvey.tcd.ie
11 Ó Bric, ‘Galway townsmen’.
was the owner in 1641 of Tonelegish, however, this is a misreading of the source, and the
dashes simply show that the rest of the name was unknown. The easiest way to confirm
this is the index of the printed *Books of Survey and Distribution* where under ‘Blake’ there
is no mention of Martin Blake for the page in question but under the surname Martin is
shown, ‘Martin, [ ]’ owning land in Moycullen Barony.\(^{12}\) So a member of the Martin family
owned Tonelegish in 1641, as the Martin family would own vast tracts of Connemara in the
later seventeenth and into the nineteenth century.\(^{13}\)

This example shows the care needed for dealing with the sources in question where
each entry needs to be taken on its own terms and none are straightforward. The owners
noted in 1670 also need to be treated with caution as Martin Blake’s landholdings are only
partially noted.\(^{14}\) Most notable here is the confusion around the largest landowner in
Restoration Galway, the earl of Clanricard, who is listed in TCD’s *The Down Survey Project*
as being a Protestant. This again shows the difficulties of dealing with the *Books of Survey
and Distribution* because it was the early eighteenth century before the heir to the earldom
of Clanricard was brought up as a Protestant but recording the family as anything but
Catholic before that date gives a very distorted picture of Galway in the seventeenth
century.\(^{15}\)

Thankfully they can be supplemented by the *The eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth,
fourteenth and fifteenth reports of the commissioners appointed by his majesty to execute
the measures recommended in an address of the House of Commons respecting the Public
Records of Ireland* (Dublin, 1821-25), which is a calendar of various rolls, grants, decrees
and certificates from the period, outlining landownership changes throughout the
seventeenth century. Giving an index of the certificates of Adventurers and Soldiers; an
index of the 1649 Officers; an index of the decrees of innocence; the full abstracts of
enrolments of grants under the *Acts of Settlement and Explanation*, 1666-84, as well as an
index of these grants; an index of the enrolments of Connacht Certificates; and abstracts
of conveyances from the trustees of the estates forfeited in 1688. Taken together with the
Ballyglunin Papers this enables us to follow the change of landownership, for many
townlands, throughout the century.

The historiography of Galway is dominated by James Hardiman’s *History of the
town and county of the town of Galway from the earliest period to the present time* (Dublin,
1820), which follows the history of the town and the surrounding area from its foundation to

\(^{12}\) *Books of Survey and Distribution*, Galway, 58, 355.
\(^{14}\) http://downsurvey.tcd.ie/landowners.php#l4=Blake,+Martin&mc=53.459616,-8.913258&z=12
(accessed 5 Nov. 2016).
\(^{15}\) http://downsurvey.tcd.ie/landowners.php#l4=Clanrickard,+Earl+of&mc=53.272488,-
1820. Many Irish towns and counties received extensive treatment during the nineteenth century, however Hardiman’s history is unique, as Hardiman worked in the Public Record Office of Ireland from 1812-30 and was for a time a sub-commissioner with the Irish Record Commission, few, if any, had the breadth of sources and access to the original records that he had. Indeed Hardiman was at pains to emphasise the need of such extensive urban histories, especially in comparison to the numerous histories of British towns, ‘where every city and town, nay almost every village and hamlet…can boast of its history’. 16 Though there are a number of valuable exceptions, including Maurice Lenihan’s *Limerick: its history and antiquities* (Dublin, 1866), William Healy’s *History and antiquities of Kilkenny (county and city)* (Kilkenny, 1893) and Philip H. Hore’s, *History of the Town and County of Wexford* (6 vols, London, 1900-11). Healy Dutton’s *Statistical Survey of the County of Galway* (Dublin, 1822) appeared two years after Hardiman’s *History of Galway* and complements the depiction presented by Hardiman, in particular it gives an account of conditions in the county at the time, and while dealing with a date range fifty years after this thesis concludes it still retains its relevance for the century before it was written.

No one has written more about the various families that made up the tribes of Galway than Martin J. Blake. His many articles in numerous journals, most notably for the *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society*, provide a vital framework for any discussion of Galway. 17 His two-volume *Blake Family Records* collects a series of documents relating to the Blake family from a deed granting Kiltolagh, County Galway to Ricard Cadel in 1315 to documents down to the end of the seventeenth century. The collection itself was handed down through lineal descent until John Blake of Mullaghmore, County Mayo died without issue in 1788, the collection ended up with Martin J. Blake who published his calendar of a selection from it. Martin J. Blake deposited the original documents that were printed in the two volumes of *Blake Family Records* in the Public Record Office of Ireland in 1915. 18 The parts of the collection that were not deposited at the time are currently in the National Library and continue down to the end of the eighteenth

---

Both volumes contain much more than just this narrow collection and it is an invaluable resource for Galway history in general.

The framework for this study is dominated by Brendan Ó Bric’s thesis on the Galway townsmen’s landholding throughout Connacht before 1641. It gives a very detailed account of individual townsmen’s involvement in purchasing and mortgaging land throughout Connacht in the century before 1641. It is a trailblazing examination of the relevant sources, remains the touchstone in any discussion on landownership in the period and has a relevance far beyond its limited geographical confines. There have been a number of studies of landowners in Galway, most notably Karen Harvey’s *Bellews of Mount Bellew* which follows a more substantial Catholic gentry family in Galway and their links with the continent. Joseph Murphy’s *The Redingtons of Clarinbridge* focuses on the period immediately around the Great Famine while Ronan Lynch’s *The Kirwans of Castlehacket* gives a good overview of the family in question, with a unique insight through the lens of horseracing, whether through popular history, folklore or mythology. Lynch presents his work as redressing the emphasis on the economic relationships between landlord and tenant by exploring cultural and social affairs surrounding the estate. That being said there is little or no discussion about the financial basis of these estates; that is the acquisition, maintenance and defence of land through the second half of the seventeenth century and throughout the eighteenth century: the basis on which all else was built. At most rumours and local legends are repeated to explain the arrival of certain families on their estates, but there is no discussion of how they built their estates in the face of anti-Catholic proclamations and legislation, or how they retained that land in the face of the penal laws. Even where families conformed there is no examination of why this was necessary beyond the bald fact of it being to safeguard the estate or enter a profession, particularly the law.

Patrick Melvin’s work has looked at the landed gentry of Galway en masse, in particular, following his thesis, ‘The landed gentry of Galway, 1820-1880’. His main

---

20 Ó Bric, ‘Galway townsmen’.
concentration throughout his articles, thesis and book has been on the nineteenth century and while he has a very good grasp of the wider secondary literature on the families of Galway prior to this period, the lack of extensive use of family papers and his ambitious wide-ranging focus, has meant he has missed some of the finer details of the Galway gentry prior to the nineteenth century. Most notably in reference to the Blakes of Ballyglunin the fact that after the surrender of Galway in 1691 they only returned to live in the town by the 1750s, whereas Melvin saw their residence in the town in the 1760s as a continuation from the seventeenth century. This clearly gave him a different view of the experience of the family both in rural Galway and in the town of Galway itself.25

ii. The Catholic ‘New Interest’

Two over-riding issues dominate the discussion of this thesis. One is the creation of a Catholic ‘New Interest’ during the Restoration as a direct result of the Restoration land settlement and Catholics’ efforts to re-enter the land market. The other is the penal laws, the series of anti-Catholic laws enacted primarily over the course of the first two decades following the Williamite victory in 1691.

The idea of an old interest versus a new interest hides a multitude of attitudes but ultimately the cleavage between those who prospered and those who did not, was as important as that between Catholic and Protestant. This ‘new interest’ had good reason to uphold the Restoration land settlement, as their land titles were based on the Acts of Settlement and Explanation, and resisted all attempts to see it overturned. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew while prospering under the Restoration still yearned for his old estate and while we can be fairly confident aligning him with the ranks of the ‘new interest’ there is no doubt that he himself was conflicted.

During the 1660s, 1670s and 1680s the growing Catholic confidence saw the development of a specifically, and identifiably, Catholic ‘new interest’.26 The idea of an identifiable ‘Catholic interest’ and ‘Protestant interest’ was common currency during the

However, from the concept of a ‘new English interest’ of those settlers who arrived in Ireland after 1649, there developed the identification of an all-encompassing ‘new interest’, referring to those who had prospered either under the Cromwellian settlement or under the Restoration settlement. This was those merchants, lawyers and men of affairs who prospered primarily in the unsettled Restoration land market. Though it is important not to reduce this to a simple Protestant versus Catholic dichotomy, as some of both religious persuasions prospered and failed, nonetheless there was a subtle difference between the experience of members of both faiths. Similar conditions existed pre-1641 where those who benefited from the dissolution of the monasteries and gained church land as a result were at odds with their co-religionists during the 1640s. William Petty advanced the thesis that the old difference between the Gaelic Irish and the Old English had disappeared in the face of a common enemy. Though expanded further that the real distinction was between those ‘vested and divested’ of the lands held in 1641 and again that ‘the Irish vested by restoration seem rather to take part with the divested’. Petty at the time could not reduce the complexities of loyalties to a simple formula and clearly chased his tail trying to.

Nevertheless, within this ‘new interest’ there was an identifiable definitively Catholic element. This was primarily those Catholics who were able to recover their estates using the courts of claims and through the influence of patrons such as Richard Talbot, the duke of Ormond or Theobald Taaffe, earl of Carlingford but also included merchants, lawyers and other businessmen who had done well out of the Restoration and the unsettled land market, or at the very least had been able to adapt and prosper during these years. A ‘new interest’ that was contemptuously described at the time as, ‘soe called because they purchased from Usurpers the Inheritance of their own Countrymen’ who preferred ‘theire private Gain before the general Interest of Religion and Country’. Or as Tyrconnell described them, ‘these Acts of Settlement, and this new interest are damned things’.
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31 Charles O’Kelly, Macariae excidium; or, the destruction of Cyprus, ed. J.D. O’Callaghan (Dublin, 1853), 71.
On 11 November 1685, a letter from Connacht addressed to Colonel Richard Grace, a prominent royalist appointed Jacobite governor of Athlone in 1689, set out, in a greatly exaggerated manner, the feelings of the disgruntled against the ‘new interest’ in the town of Galway,

I know none of this province but the merchant race of Galway who got by the new settlement; and, indeed, in a well-governed country they should not be allowed to purchase so much land, and give over the traffic at sea, which hath absolutely impoverished this province beyond any other part of Ireland: for those of Galway have more land than all the townspeople in the whole kingdom put together, and consequently more land than all the merchants in France and Spain. And is it not a preposterous thing, that the inhabitants of a little town, not altogether so big as Ostend, should have more land than all the townspeople in two or three flourishing kingdoms?  

The influence of this ‘new interest’ reached its apotheosis during the War of the Two Kings. In particular, in Galway’s case in the push for a negotiated settlement with General Ginkel. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew may not have had a patron in such a direct sense that he could attempt to regain his old estate, nevertheless his dealings with Lord Arran (Chapter 3.i below) show that such relationships were a common currency at the time and were important in any attempt to secure his holdings. This idea of a Catholic ‘new interest’ remained an important factor in the post-war years for Martin Blake Fitz Peter. In a 1693 petition of his and sixty-eight other claimants to the articles of Galway, they emphasised that as their estates were all ‘new estates’ they would have all been dispossessed by the repeal of the Restoration land settlement enacted by the parliament of James II.

iii. The Penal Laws

The penal laws were built on the foundation of Restoration, early seventeenth century and, even, sixteenth-century anti-Catholic legislation but refer specifically to those anti-Catholic legislative measures enacted from the 1690s up to the mid-eighteenth century. There was no one overriding purpose nor one framer but the system of laws evolved in reaction to specific events and threats, or perceived and pretended events and threats over the course

33 D.I.B., iv, 185-6.
35 Petition of Sir Robuck Lynch and other Articlemen of Galway, with orders and reports, June-July 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 2/119/1-2).
The penal laws against property began with the 1704 *Act to prevent the further growth of popery*, strengthened with the 1709 *Act for explaining and amending the Act to prevent the further growth of popery*. In many ways, these acts simply legislated for the reality of the harsh conditions of the 1690s for Catholics. Both acts abrogated the various articles of surrender, particularly affecting the artificemen of Galway and Limerick, only the right to bear arms was never completely revoked, though at times of danger it was suspended. They were modelled on those that had already passed the English Parliament against the small minority of Catholics residing in England. Similar laws seeking to prevent the growth of Popery were enacted in 1704 in Maryland.

The 1704 act imposed inheritance by gavelkind, that is ‘inherited by, all and every the sons of such papist any way inheritable to such estate, share and share alike’, though if the eldest son or heir at law converted he could inherit by primogeniture. It barred Catholics from inheriting from Protestants or purchasing land and limited leaseholds to thirty-one years. Any lease had to be at a rent of at least two-thirds the yearly value of the land. If an eldest son converted his Catholic parent would become tenant for life and the reversion would be vested in the convert. Catholics could not become guardians of children under twenty-one years of age and the Protestant guardian appointed by the court was required to use his utmost care to educate the minor in the Protestant religion. As the ‘peace and safety’ of Ireland, according to the act, depended ‘on the security of the towns Limerick and Galway, and on their being in possession of your Majesty’s protestant subjects’, no Catholic could take or purchase any house or tenement in the cities of Limerick or Galway or their suburbs and any Catholics who still resided within those towns had to become bound with two sureties before the chief magistrate, if not they had to depart before 24 March 1705, except seamen, fishermen and day labourers in houses worth 40 shillings or less. A protest was made to the parliament on behalf of those claiming the benefit of the
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articles of surrender but was overruled on grounds of security and the argument that the articles did not specifically debar future legislation to the disadvantage of Catholics.\textsuperscript{42}

The 1709 act was intended to close loopholes as it had been eluded, by among other means, making settlements and granting annuities for lives, but was if anything even more comprehensive, introducing 'the discoverer'. Catholics were barred from annuities for life chargeable on any lands and any judgments or statutes of the staple entered into as security for such annuity were null and void. Converts now had to explicitly receive the Eucharist according to the usage of the Church of Ireland, make the declaration against transubstantiation, take the oath of abjuration and file certificates thereof in the Four Courts. Converts also had to educate any children under fourteen as Protestants. No person could teach in a private house unless they first took the oath of allegiance and subscribe to the declaration against transubstantiation and the oath of abjuration. If caught both the teacher and the person employing him would be fined £10 and whoever informed on them would get half the fine. The 1704 and 1709 acts were the key elements of the penal code.\textsuperscript{43} A barrage of other acts were enacted from the 1690s on, these were more periodically enforced, depending on the local situation. Those against property were severely enforced until their final repeal from 1778 on.\textsuperscript{44}

Numerous methods were devised to evade the two acts, ranging from pressure being put on younger sons to ensure they would not exercise their rights under the gavelling clause to collusive actions to secure purchases and leases. The examination of the laws in this thesis expands our understating of Catholic methods, not so much to evade, but to manage the effects of the acts on their estates. The laws not only affected Catholics but Protestants as well, as any land originally held by a Catholic which subsequently came into whoever's possession, the title would be at peril from a Protestant discoverer. To secure the title, a collusive discovery between Protestants would secure it by the same method as a common recovery. Many discoveries may, therefore, have had little to do with the penal laws in the strict sense.\textsuperscript{45}

The enforcement of the penal laws varied greatly around the country and at various periods of time. By mid-century, the laws specifically aimed at the Catholic Church in Ireland and in particular the visible practice of the Catholic faith, had by and large fallen into abeyance, but they could always be revived if the need arose and in any difference of opinion between Protestants and Catholics the threat of their enforcement soon resolved matters. G. E. Howard, whose \textit{Several special cases on the laws against the further growth...}
of Popery (Dublin, 1775) gives a summary of the penal laws as they were actually put into force in the various courts, was in no doubt that they greatly strengthened the Protestant interest but that by the time he was writing saw them, at the very least, as an anachronism. He was of the opinion, that they tend to reprobate the mind by encouraging informers, those horrid pests to society, and to preserve eternal jealousies and enmity between the subjects to the same prince, and in the same country; nay, and in families, between father and son, and brother, is (I believe) as undoubtedly true, as it is also, that they considerably prevent the improvement and increase of its husbandry, commerce and trade...there is not the same good reason for continuing as there was for making these laws...the strength of the party which was the cause of these laws is almost entirely broken to pieces in this kingdom...besides there is scarcely any landed property left among them.46

The flourishing of research on the penal laws in recent years has seen some notable additions to the voluminous literature on the subject. In many ways this has seen a retreat from the overreaching concerns of earlier literature to a concentration on what exactly was legislated for (or against). The work of J.G. Simms has been expanded to explore the actual details of individual laws.47

S.J. Connolly has presented a compelling view of the penal laws. However, his opinion that ‘social pressures and a sense of family loyalty seem in many cases to have ensured that younger sons simply refrained from asserting their claims under the Act’, missed the vital element of estate management that Catholic landowners increasingly used to manage and evade the influence of the penal laws.48 The settlements on the estate were designed not only to ensure the transfer of the estate safely from one generation to the next and to look after the family’s younger children but also to ensure any attempt on the estate by the younger children, or even the extended family, would result in little or no benefit to the litigant.

Ian McBride’s exploration of the penal laws from intellectual, political, social, religious and cultural perspectives in both their Irish and European context has seen him conclude that ‘there is something missing from the more optimistic accounts of Catholic Ireland typical of recent historiography’.49 This is reinforced by James Kelly in his recent

46 G. E. Howard, Several special cases on the laws against the further growth of Popery (Dublin, 1775), v-vi.
49 Ian McBride, Eighteenth Century Ireland: the isle of Slaves (Dublin, 2009), 217.
account of the historiography of the penal laws where he has concluded is that ‘the current understanding is incomplete’. This study of one Catholic landowning family presents an important addition to our understanding of how the penal laws actually functioned and particularly how they remained of concern to Catholic landowners right up to their repeal, taking not only the traditional viewpoint of their rural estate but also their urban holdings.

The examination of the penal laws in Galway ranges widely from the views of Cardinal Patrick F. Moran and W.P. Burke’s description of the ‘unparalleled sufferings and national humiliations’ to Raymond Hughes’s thesis on Galway town. Hughes discounts them as having any major influence on the town, in fact, he concludes that the town’s authorities rarely interfered in matters of religion. As a result of this, he fails to grasp the wider influence the penal laws had on the Catholics of Galway. This is vividly demonstrated by the various petitions to Parliament in 1761, which were a result of the growing confidence of the Catholic and covert interest in the town but which Hughes sees as solely an attempt to reduce charter duties and local taxes. The individual pieces of evidence which show the persistence of persecution throughout the penal era show that a much more nuanced exploration of the penal laws is required to understand the situation of Catholics in the eighteenth century. There was no consistent enforcement of the laws against Catholics throughout the period, especially after the early years of the century, but neither was there consistent toleration or even connivance. As the local, national and European situation changed so did the experience of the Catholics of Galway.

The treatment presented here is in many ways more in line with earlier writings on the penal laws and somewhat at variance with some of the more recent writings on the subject, as it treats the penal laws and how they affected Catholics solely in terms of ‘the land’. On the other hand, the resistance of the family to any thought of conversion does fit into the new historiographical framework, particularly by the 1760s when a threat to the estate saw the family appeal to Rome for guidance. There is no doubt that it is important to understand the penal laws beyond a simple focus on the land, to look at conversion by
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conviction. Similarly, the Blakes of Ballyglunin remained Catholic out of a deep belief in their religion, they themselves looked beyond their worldly belongings, they even considered emigrating if that was what it took to retain their religion. That is the experience of the Blakes of Ballyglunin, nevertheless, there is no denying the positive influence the convert interest in Galway, in particular converts in their extended family, had on their experience throughout the period. While there may be some discussion about how overstated the idea of a convert interest acting on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland, in Galway, in particular, it is hard to over-estimate the important role converts played in the political and social life of the county and in the town.

It is clear then that the experience of Catholics in Ireland saw a gradual change through the eighteenth century. The experience of the laity was radically different by mid-century, with no more visible evidence of this than the fact that the family began to return to live in Galway town from the middle of the eighteenth century. The penal laws began to be repealed with the relief acts of 1778-82 and 1792. Though it has been argued that even these acts were simply a means of updating the penal laws to meet the challenges of the late eighteenth century and ensure their overarching aims were still met.

iv. Blakes of Ballyglunin's family genealogy

The following study revolves around four heads of the family in the hundred and thirty-six years from 1641 until 1777 (see Appendix Genealogy). A brief biography of each head of the family over that period gives a framework around which the rest of the text can be more easily followed. At the start of the seventeenth century, Andrew Blake Fitz Patrick of Galway had established himself as a wealthy merchant and landowner within Galway town. He married Julianne Martin and was one of the bailiffs of Galway in 1597. By 1617 he held three quarters in the Barony of Tirawley, County Mayo. His extensive merchant dealings can be seen when, on 12 November 1620, he entered into a bond for £600 as creditor with Nicholas Fitzsimons, gent of Grandgemore, County Kildare. He died c.1624-30.
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Blake Fitz Patrick’s eldest son Walter Blake Fitz Andrew of Dunmacrina, County Mayo, burgess, was sheriff of Galway town in 1633, and a member of the town council in 1643, he amassed land in his own right mostly between 1617 and 1625 before succeeding to his father’s holdings.

a) Martin Blake Fitz Andrew c.1620- 8 August 1689

The figure of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew dominates this thesis. He was the middle of three sons of Andrew Blake Fitz Patrick and was in his early twenties when the 1641 Rebellion broke out. By this time, he had already amassed a considerable fortune, including extensive urban holdings in Galway town and land in both Counties Galway and Mayo. He was a commissioner of the excise and one of the sheriffs of Galway town in 1648. In the aftermath of the Parliamentary victory he forfeited his property in Galway town and elsewhere, was expelled from the town and was transplanted to 425 acres around Cummer, County Galway. He was able to return to live in the town by 1663 but was restricted to only wholesale trade. Conditions in the town and in Ireland more generally ensured that it was only in 1677 that he was again able to purchase a house within the town walls. However, during all this time, from the moment he was expelled from the town, he continued to function at some level as a merchant and all the while he was slowly rebuilding a landed estate.

b) Peter Blake Fitz Martin, c.1641- 21 September 1691

Peter Blake Fitz Martin was the only son of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s first marriage. He had little influence on the estate. This was compounded by the fact that he married in private without the approval of his father and most egregiously married without his new bride bringing any marriage portion to the match. For his father, after spending the years of the 1650s and early Restoration rebuilding the family’s fortune and estate, it was a significant betrayal. Nevertheless, even in the nineteenth century, the family retained stories about what a loving couple they were, made all the more noteworthy by the fact they died on the same day. He only survived his father by little over a month so his effect on the estate was negligible. Yet he still left substantial legacies of £1,400 to his younger children.
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c) **Martin Blake Fitz Peter, died 6 September 1737**

Even before the death of his father Peter, Martin Blake Fitz Peter was set up by his grandfather as his heir. He was among the numerous Catholics who were able to gain their freedom of Galway corporation during the 1680s and he was well positioned to take over the running of the estate after the deaths in quick succession of his father and grandfather in little over a month. He spent much of the 1690s preoccupied with getting his grandfather found within the articles of Galway and spent the rest of his life focused on consolidating his rural estate by the only means that were then available to him; beneficial settlements of the estate, primarily through his own and his eldest son’s marriage settlements, engaging on a local level with the legal processes available to him to safeguard his estate and expanding his holdings where possible by leasing small but increasing amounts of land.

d) **Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, c.1704 - 9 August 1771**

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin married Mary, daughter of John French of Rahassane in 1724 which brought the family into a much wider network of Catholic landowners, including the Nagles of Ballygriffin, County Cork. He continued his father’s careful management of the estate and began the extension of their leasehold interest. He was in bad health for the last years of his life and left the running of the estate to his eldest son from the early 1760s. His death in 1771 was noted in the *Dublin Gazette*, ‘Died… At Ballegloonin in the County of Galway in the 67th year of his age, Edmond Blake, esq.’

e) **Martin Blake Fitz Edmond, died 16 November 1777**

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond was the first head of the family to return to Galway town. He played an active part in the management of the estate and ultimately took over the running of it during the final ten years of his father’s life, formalised by a lease of the whole estate in 1766. Despite the fact that he was in charge of the estate just prior to the first Catholic relief act, the penal laws dominated his time in control of the estate. First, with a cousin of his enquiring about gavelling and then in his correspondence with contacts in London.

As the main focus of this study is the land, the accumulation, defence and development of the estate, there has been little attention paid to anybody outside of the males of the family. In early modern Ireland, females would only become directly involved
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with the estate if they were heiresses, if their husband died without issue or when the heir was a minor. This did not happen for the Blakes of Ballyglunin until 1781 and so lies outside the scope of this study. Therefore, little attention has been paid to female members of the family beyond their marriage articles, the portion they brought to the estate and how these affected the estate. The same goes for servants and tenants with some minor exceptions. Nevertheless, these exceptions, focusing primarily on how they related especially to the estate, expand our knowledge of their experience in early modern Ireland.
Chapter 2
Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and the establishment of the Ballyglunin estate, 1652-60

‘Irish and popish rebels...have justly forfeited all their rights, titles and estates in this kingdom’

i. Introduction

The life of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway town, a Catholic burgess, merchant and landowner of minor gentry status illuminates a section of Irish life in the seventeenth century that is little understood. He belongs to a stratum of society below the leaders of the country, the gentry and lords who dominated politics, but well above the vast majority of the populace. Within Galway town, he inhabited a similar place within the urban hierarchy, below the exceptionally wealthy few but established enough to play a role in the corporate government of the town. Though he was of a similar status to someone like John Bellew, who was transplanted from Louth to Galway, Bellew’s experience under the patronage of Theobald Taaffe, earl of Carlingford was very different to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, who had to establish a secure estate without the advantages of a patron. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew entered the Eleven Years war as a merchant and he exited the Restoration period as part of the minor gentry, though still retaining his merchant dealings.²

ii. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Cummer, County Galway

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew came from a well-established merchant family long resident and trading in the town. His father had amassed considerable land in Counties Mayo and Galway by the reign of James I. His elder brother, Walter Blake Fitz Andrew inherited this land and considerably expanded his holdings, particularly in Mayo, during the 1620s and 1630s.³ The outbreak of rebellion, on 23 October 1641, was the date defined by law to determine the penalty of confiscation and all landholding in the seventeenth century, within documents referring to confiscation, refer to the landowners in 1641 and those after. For the majority of the country the 1641 landowners as set out in the Books of Survey and Distribution were surveyed in the 1650s by the Down Survey, however as Galway and other counties in Connacht had only been surveyed in the 1630s, as part of Thomas Wentworth,
earl of Strafford’s attempted plantation of Connacht, a new survey for these counties was not deemed necessary. The 1641 landowners for these counties are, therefore, in fact the landowners from some years prior to this date. In Galway the Strafford Survey was initiated from 1636. This is important for an understanding of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, as he was born c.1620 and so had not come of age by the time of the Stafford Survey of County Galway. He is not noted as owning anything in 1641 by any official documents and his landholding has to be established by means of the family papers alone.

The merchant families of Galway traded as a close unit with their hinterland as well as abroad. The sheep walks of Galway and its surrounding area supplied wool and other merchandise, while the timber trade was important with Spain in the early seventeenth century. The return trade from the continent consisted largely of wine, primarily with Spain but at least as far afield as the Canaries. Irish merchants were involved in trade with the West Indies from the English occupation of St Kitts in 1624 when a number of Irish were among the original colonists and during the second half of the seventeenth century the trade between Galway and the West Indies took on a considerable proportion. The youngest son of Andrew Blake Fitz Patrick, Andrew Oge Blake, owned a ketch trading between Galway and Montserrat in 1674. This usually entailed conducting business in concert with other members of the tribes of Galway, thus finding the actual owner or owners of any traded goods is a very hazardous task. Their relationship with the local Gaelic Irish can be seen by the vast number of mortgages entered into between the Gaelic Irish and the townsmen, either because the Gaelic Irish were using the Galway merchants as a primitive banking system in order to gain access to credit facilities or the merchants were availing of an opportunity to invest in land. Familial links between these two groups existed, mostly through fosterage and other childrearing relationships. Nothing more clearly indicates this than the numerous younger sons with the sobriquet ‘Oge’, including Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s younger brother Andrew Oge Blake.

The main evidence remaining for this period for the actual trade conducted is the statute staple, which while giving the amount of money involved does not usually give any details of the trades involved. Earlier in the century the Dublin Staple Book recorded the father of the family Andrew Blake Fitz Patrick of Galway, merchant, as a creditor who entered into a bond for £600 with Nicholas Fitzsimons gent of Grandgemore, County Kildare.
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on 12 November 1620. The absence of further details limits the usefulness of this but it does illustrate the substantial funds available to the family and the wide ranging reach of their merchant activities. Not long after the surrender of Galway, on 5 April 1652, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, with Andrew Bodkin, both of Galway, merchants, petitioned the commissioners of Parliament for the affairs of Ireland asking for the confirmation of a statute staple of £1,200, securing a debt of £600. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew on his own behalf also, on the same day, requested that a bond for £500 owed him to be likewise confirmed. The commissioners of the Parliament for the affairs of Ireland in Dublin referred the matter to the commissioners for the administration of justice at Galway on 10 December 1652, ordering them to conduct the matter ‘according to justice and equity’. No outcome is recorded. The commissioners for the administration of justice for the precinct of Galway, John Eyre and Charles Holcraft, conducted their business as a normal court and on the presentation of sufficient proof gave judgements in justice in favour of the plaintiffs concerned. Therefore the survival of the referral from the commissioners of Parliament for the affairs of Ireland to the commissioners for the administration of justice at Galway does point to a positive outcome for Martin Blake Fitz Andrew. The possession of substantial specie, including the amount in these two cases of roughly £800, on the eve of the transplantation meant that Martin Blake Fitz Andrew stood in a very favourable position in his attempts to resist his transplantation from Galway town, and while this ultimately proved unsuccessful, he was able to influence the commissioners at Loughrea to such an extent as to be able to be transplanted to the Barony of Clare, County Galway, within a short distance of land he previously held there.

The position of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew as a commissioner of the excise 1647-8, petitioning the Parliamentary commissioners for £800 in December 1652 and in January 1653 having no trouble organising a bond for £1,000 to ensure the covenants of a marriage settlement for his second marriage to Ann Joyce, the widow of Patrick Bodkin, gives an illustration of the extent of his wealth at this period. The devastation of eleven long years of war had destroyed much of the economy of the country but the merchants of Galway, and merchants around the country, were able to continue on trading and were still in a position to raise money to fund the war, albeit in much-reduced circumstances.
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Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was born c.1620 and married for the first time in 1640 to Margaret Martin. Their first child Peter was born c.1640-1. Margaret was with child in July 1642 but both she and the child died by the end of the year. Martin made his first will as a young man on 27 July 1642 as the full effects of the war began to be felt in Galway and relations with the forces in St Augustine’s fort deteriorating badly, directing that he be buried in St Francis Abbey and leaving his estate to his son Peter.\textsuperscript{13} Martin Blake Fitz Andrew emerged from the Eleven Years War on a relatively secure footing. He held extensive urban property and land both in the Barony of Clare, County Galway and in County Mayo. His merchant dealings continued throughout the war years becoming a commissioner of the excise for the town and County of Galway, along with his elder brother Walter Blake Fitz Andrew and three others in 1648.\textsuperscript{14} He was elected one of the sheriffs of the town in the same year.\textsuperscript{15} He was a burgess of the corporation of Galway in 1652 and 1653, though when the Parliamentary authorities in Dublin attempted to impose alterations on the signed articles of Galway, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was listed as being absent from the town.\textsuperscript{16} His continued role in the corporation of Galway, as well as his merchant dealings within the town, indicates that his absence on this occasion was a deliberate action.

His first wife Margaret died \textit{circa} 1642, but he did not remarry until August 1652 to Anne, \textit{née} Joyce the widow of Patrick Bodkin.\textsuperscript{17} His eldest child Peter was born c.1640-1, from whom the main Blakes of Ballyglunin descended. Peter only survived his father by a month, dying in September 1691. By his second wife, Anne, Martin had a further son and two daughters. Patrick, who died in 1676. Margaret, who married in 1672, Joseph Lynch of Ballycurren, County Mayo. Finally, Julia, who married Francis Blake of Moyne, County Galway.

Martin was transplanted from Galway town by the Parliamentary commissioners to lands around Cummer, County Galway. Notwithstanding the continued unsettled land market of the Restoration period, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew lost little time in re-establishing an estate by purchasing land where he could, though his first major purchases were a decade later. He accumulated holdings throughout Galway during the Restoration period, with a steady stream of lease and release deeds and short term leases (see appendix Table vii & viii). Charles II initially promised the Galway townsmen that they would receive the full benefits of the articles of Galway, but ultimately they had to wait until 1676 for a commission to be appointed to confirm even their transplanted acres on a secure title, as well as whatever other lands they had accumulated in the intervening period. They received no

\textsuperscript{13} Will of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, merchant, 27 July 1642 (N.A.I., T17175).
\textsuperscript{14} Galway Corpo. Mss, Liber A, f. 189; \textit{A.T.G.}, 495.
\textsuperscript{16} Galway Corpo. Mss, Liber A, ff 205-6; Hardiman, xxxiii.
\textsuperscript{17} Blake, \textit{II}, 214; M6931/2.
compensation for their urban property. Any townsman who retained or regained property in the town would appear to have done so by entering into private arrangements with the new owners rather than gaining benefit from the articles of Galway.

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew still styled himself ‘of Galway, burgess’ on his marriage to Ann Joyce, on 13 August 1652, and was still styling himself in this manner as late as 12 July 1656. He became Martin Blake Fitz Andrew ‘late of Galway, burgess’ early in the 1660s. He only seems to have accepted his new reality by the mid-1660s and styled himself of his new transplanted lands, ‘of Killinbegg, gent’. By 1669 he was finally ‘of Cummer, gent’, this townland is situated alongside Killinbegg, where he first began to consolidate a new estate. It was only early in the eighteenth century that the family moved south-east to the townland of Ballyglooneen, though the eldest son of each generation and his family remained on the lands and house at Cummer until he succeeded to the Ballyglunin estate.

Martin’s business sense does not seem to have been inherited by his eldest son Peter, who married Sybilla Joyce, niece to Martin’s second wife Anne, privately and without any marriage portion in 1667. Peter’s disregard for his familial duties caused something of a rift between father and son, which is a clear enough reason for Peter’s absence from any of his father’s deeds, leases or bonds. As well as this, Peter was the only child from Martin’s first marriage to Margaret Martin who died c.1642 and so would have been substantially older than the children of Martin’s second marriage of 1652. Any disapproval on Martin’s part did not extend to his grandchildren. In his lifetime Martin Blake Fitz Andrew married off his granddaughter Margaret and left sufficient funds for the use of Peter’s younger children. Whatever animosity lingered between father and son may also account for Martin’s dying intestate. For a businessman so careful in all his other dealings, it seems out of character. The will he made earlier in his life in 1642, as a young man on his way to war, had been made redundant by the events of the intervening years.

---

18 Marriage articles, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess and Ann Joyce, 13 Aug. 1652 (M6931/2); Robert Forstall, late of Ballifrank, Co. Kilkenny and William Fanning to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess. Bond in £500, 12 July 1656 (M6931/4).
19 Robert Forstall of Kilferagh, Co. Kilkenny, William Fanning of Farrenrory, Co. Tipperary and William Forstall of Kilkenny, gent to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, late of Galway, burgess, 19 June 1664 (M6931/6).
20 Lease and release, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Killinmore, Co. Galway, gent to Richard, earl of Arran, 2 & 3 Apr. 1666 (M6931/7).
21 Mathew Martin of Galway, burgess to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, 17 Sept. 1669 (M6931/9&10).
22 State of Martin Blake of Ballyglunin’s estate, 26 July 1773 (M6935/66); Blake, II, 214.
23 M6935/66; Blake II, 214.
24 M6935/66.
25 Will of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, merchant, 27 July 1642 (N.A.I., T17175).
iii. Internal transplantation within County Galway

‘...being totally destroyed in our personal fortunes, caused by the length of the wars, decay of trade, the present pestilence and so many late payments by us made...’

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, c.1652

On the eve of the surrender of Galway to the Parliamentary forces under Sir Charles Coote on 5 April 1652, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew had established himself in the town of Galway as a wealthy merchant and retained extensive property within the town and throughout Counties Galway and Mayo (see Appendix Table i). He owned three houses, ten acres and a plot of ground within the town and liberties of the town of Galway, and the fishing rights of a weir adjacent to the town walls. In County Galway, he owned five quarters of land and in County Mayo he owned eight quarters and one cartron, as well as on the lands of Castlekeel, County Mayo he owned half the fishing rights and half a Corn and Tucking Mill.

Galway merchants had begun accumulating land in their hinterland from the late sixteenth century, primarily for the practical reason of securing a line of supply for the town. By the seventeenth century, it is clear other considerations took over with the recognition of rural land as a relatively secure investment, particularly with the need to provide security for marriage articles and younger children’s portions. The prospects offered by the growing indebtedness of the old landowning families provided opportunities for a good return on investments.

A quarter is generally held in Connacht to equal 120 acres and a cartron 30 acres, given this his rural estate prior to the surrender of the town in 1652 was in excess of 1,590 acres, excluding the value of the precious urban property. On their own, the six quarters of Grange, County Galway were found in the Books of Survey and Distribution to contain 1,323 acres unprofitable and 958 acres profitable, of which Martin held half by a mortgage from Sir Richard Blake. This total is far removed from any kind of accurate figure, and if anything is an underestimate, but it does illustrate the significant real estate Martin held in 1652 and the substantial reduction in estate he underwent as a result of his transplantation by the Parliamentary commissioners.

As can be seen by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s statement of his confiscated estate (see Appendix Table i) the vast majority of his property outside of Galway town was held...

---

26 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the ‘commissioners according to the capitulation of Galway’, [c.1652] (M6935/64/c).
27 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s ancient estate on 22 Oct. 1641 and by purchases and conveyances since [c.1676] (M6931/1); Hardiman, 146.
30 *Books of Survey and Distribution, Galway*, 104.
by mortgages. Brendan Ó Bric’s study of Galway townsmen’s landholding throughout Connacht illustrated the fundamental importance of mortgages to the acquisition of land from the sixteenth century up to 1641.\textsuperscript{31} Martin Blake Fitz Andrew further emphasises this point that mortgages formed a vitally important and often underestimated element of land ownership and land acquisition in this period. Merchants facilitated the borrowing requirements of existing landowners and as a direct result of this acquired land in vast amounts as the existing, primarily Gaelic Irish landowners, got further and further into debt. The lenders, like Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, ultimately became landowners themselves as mortgagers defaulted.

The articles of Galway guaranteed the townsmen the retention of their property within the town and its liberties and two-thirds of their estates outside the town and liberties of Galway.\textsuperscript{32} These were held to be too lenient by the commissioners for Parliamentary affairs in Ireland at Dublin who tried to prevent the ratification of the articles, writing to Sir Charles Coote, ‘that in duty and honour to the Parliament, we cannot consent unto the Articles’ but they were too late.\textsuperscript{33} They immediately, on 11 April 1652, sent ‘qualifications and limitations’ to the articles of Galway to the Parliamentary forces in Galway in an attempt to get the beneficiaries of the articles to agree to them. Among other limitations, they insisted that the townsmen could only retain two-thirds of their urban property, on any inhabitant being removed from the town.\textsuperscript{34}

On 6 May 1652, the commissioners of the Parliament in Ireland wrote to the council of state in London outlining ‘some explanations made by the committee of the articles of Galway and the concessions of the Galway men to those explanations’. According to this the ‘main article concerning their residence in the town and the enjoyment of their houses and estates they as yet adhere unto’. While they had ‘great need’ of the £5,000 the townsmen were to pay by the articles ‘as a composition for their personal estate’, the commissioners felt that once they received this money they ‘shall thereby be constrained to confirm the articles’.\textsuperscript{35} Ultimately the 1652 Act for Settling of Ireland and the 1653 Act for the Satisfaction of Adventurers made the articles of Galway, as well as articles received elsewhere in the country, redundant for the vast majority of those who claimed their benefit.

\textsuperscript{31} Ó Bric, ‘Galway townsmen’, passim.
\textsuperscript{32} Articles for the surrender of Galway in R. Dunlop (ed.), Ireland under the Commonwealth (Manchester, 1913), i, 163-6; Hardiman, appendix, xxix-xxxiii; see John Cunningham, Conquest and Land in Ireland. The Transplantation to Connacht, 1649-1680 (Woodbridge, 2011), 57-63.
\textsuperscript{33} Commissioners to Sir Charles Coote, 10 Apr. 1652 (Dunlop, Ireland under the Commonwealth, i, 163).
\textsuperscript{34} Hardiman, appendix, xxxi-xxxi.
\textsuperscript{35} Commissioners of Parliament to the Council of State, Kilkenny, 6 May 1652 (Charles McNeill (ed.), Tanner Letters (Dublin, 1943), 363-4).
Concerns over security overrode all other considerations, including any articles of surrender.\textsuperscript{36}

A draft petition from the summer of 1652 by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, acting for a section of the townsmen, to the commissioners according to the capitulation of Galway, sets out the uncertain state of the townsmen’s affairs at this time, and could conceivably be the concessions of the Galway men referred to above in the letter of 6 May 1652.\textsuperscript{37} Finding that the commissioners were ‘not satisfied without further explanations on the Capitulation of Galway’, the petition proposed they surrender that part of their estate within the town and liberties of Galway, their ‘houses, house rooms, lands, mortgages and interest within the town of Galway, liberties and fishing thereof’ in exchange for the ‘full value thereof without diminution or deduction of any third part thereof in profitable lands in the country, contiguous to their existing estates or lands, or money in lieu thereof at the election of the person’ transplanting, with the ‘Parliament of the Commonwealth of England ratifying and confirming all other’ parts of the articles of capitulation. They continued, ‘not doubting but this cheerful submission of ours in that which is most dear unto us’ would ensure the ‘fruits of your honour’s favour and future care of us’. Setting out that the town of Galway had for ‘upwards of four hundred years performed the English interest in this corporation notwithstanding the several rebellions in this nation’. Hoping that this would ensure the discharge of the ‘payment of our monthly contribution’ and other demands, ‘which payments we are unable’ to satisfy, ‘being totally destroyed in our personal fortunes, caused by the length of the wars, decay of trade, the present pestilence and so many late payments’.\textsuperscript{38}

By October 1652, attempts to impose the ‘limitations and qualifications’ on the Galway townsmen had failed. Only eight signed these with 104 being named as refusing to sign and another eighty-one were listed as absent from the town. Among these eighty-one who were absent were Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, his elder brother Walter Blake Fitz


\textsuperscript{37} Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the ‘Commissioners according to the capitulation of Galway’, [undated but likely Summer 1652] (M6935/64/c); Cunningham states that this document relates to proceedings in 1655 but with internal evidence dating it no later than Aug. 1654, as it was addressed to ‘the commissioners’ rather than to the lord deputy and council. (Cunningham, Conquest and Land, 91-2). This appears to be too late and is more likely to date from the immediate aftermath of the signing of the articles in May if not early Summer 1652, and contemporaneous with the Aug. 1652 Act for the Settling of Ireland but before the attempt to get the townsmen to sign the ‘qualifications and limitations’ in Oct. 1652, dealing as it does with ‘explanations on the capitulation of Galway’, complaining of the ‘present pestilence’ and ‘houses and real estate in Galway’, see Commissioners of the Parliament to the Parliament, 6 May 1652 (Dunlop, Ireland under the Commonwealth, i, 186) & Commissioners of Parliament to Speaker Lenthall, Kilkenny, 6 May 1652; Commissioners of Parliament to the Council of State, Kilkenny, 6 May 1652 (Tanner Letters, 359, 363-4); see Hardiman, xxxii-xxxiii for Certificate of assent returned to the Commissioners of the Commonwealth, 20 Nov. 1652.

\textsuperscript{38} M6935/64/c
Andrew, and Andrew Oge Blake, the last their younger brother Andrew Blake of Furbough, who was noted in the municipal archives of Galway as Andrew Oge Blake.\(^\text{39}\) Both Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and Walter Blake Fitz Andrew were still involved with the corporation of Galway as well as with what little merchant dealings remained for them, so their absence was a deliberate act.\(^\text{40}\)

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew married for the second time in August 1652 to Ann Joyce, the widow of Patrick Bodkin. She brought a marriage portion of £700 (See Appendix Table ii). This consisted of two quarters of land in the Barony of Clare, as well as mortgages and houses in Galway town, the house of Sir Richard Blake in Sander’s Lane and the shop under Sir Valentine Blake’s house in Great Gate St.\(^\text{41}\) Martin passed a bond to Ann’s brother Richard Joyce for £1,000 to secure the covenants of the marriage articles in January 1653. At this stage Martin was still calling himself burgess of the town of Galway.\(^\text{42}\) It does not appear that Martin ever received any financial benefit from this marriage. He never received any recompense from any of his property in the town and the land in the Barony of Clare was never subsequently mentioned in any petition for the restoration of his confiscated estate. The fact that he retained the resources to enter into a bond for £1,000 is a clear indication of his healthy financial standing at this critical juncture.

As a result of the articles of surrender, the Catholic corporation survived in Galway until 1654. The corporate officers in Galway were still elected as normal for 1653 and 1654. Walter Blake was elevated to being an alderman and Martin Blake was one of the burgesses of the council for the first time in 1652 and again in 1653.\(^\text{43}\) It is unlikely they wielded any power other than to organise the payment of the monthly contribution required. The military governors showed the corporation little respect in any case. After the election, in August 1654, of mayor Thomas Lynch Fitz Ambrose and the other corporate officers, the ‘English Protestant inhabitants’ of Galway protested on 29 September, the day the new mayor and other corporate officials took office, to the Lord Deputy and Council against the government of the town being in the hands of the ‘Irish and Papists’ and that it ‘might be put into the hands of the English and Protestants’. This was immediately granted. On 24 October the mayor and sheriffs were removed and the old members of the corporation were

\(^{39}\) *An accompt of the foregoing names of each person was returned into the commissioners of the commonwealth for the affairs of Ireland, the 26th November, 1652, by Sir Charles Coote. Edward Watts, Town Major of Galway, in Hardiman, appendix xxxii-xxxiii; A.T.G., 507.*

\(^{40}\) *Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and Andrew Bodkin, of Galway, merchants to the Commissioners of Parliament for the affairs of Ireland. Referred by the Commissioners of Parliament for the affairs of Ireland, Dublin to the Commissioners for the administration of Justice at Galway, 10 Dec. 1652 (M6935/64/a).*

\(^{41}\) *Marriage articles, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess and Ann Joyce, 13 Aug. 1652 (M6931/2).*

\(^{42}\) *Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway to Richard Joyce of same, 29 Jan. 1653 (M6931/3).*

\(^{43}\) *Galway Corpo. Mss, Liber A, ff 193-206; Blake, II, 168.*
disenfranchised. A new Protestant corporation was instituted and the governor, Colonel Peter Stubbers, was appointed mayor.\textsuperscript{44} In this way, the old townsmen of Galway were replaced with a new urban ruling elite.

The April 1652 articles of Galway guaranteed the property in the town except 'upon just grounds and good proofs of their future misdemeanour, which may endanger the security of the town. Using the fact that some of the townsmen had 'quitted their habitations and removed their stocks', the parliamentary commissioners used their withdrawal from the town to portray their intention as solely 'out of their disaffection to the Parliament and their forces' and ordered the confiscation of their houses on 15 March 1653.\textsuperscript{45} Soon after Colonel Stubbers was ordered to clear out of Galway those he considered dangerous.\textsuperscript{46} Article five of the articles of the surrender of Galway guaranteed their urban property except where it was contiguous to any considerable castle, fortification or place of strength, in such case any person deprived of their urban property would receive the 'full value of such castles and houses'. The Council of the Commonwealth declared in 1655 that the whole of Galway was a garrison, place of strength and fortification, therefore the Lord Deputy and Council on 23 July 1655 ordered all Catholics to leave the town by 1 November and pursuant to the articles for them to receive the full value of their property left behind. This was carried out on 30 October.\textsuperscript{47} Martin Blake Fitz Andrew did not receive any 'compensation for his interest in Galway', including 'satisfaction' for his two houses in the town.\textsuperscript{48} Few, if any, received compensation for their lost property in the town of Galway or for their property in the town and liberties of Athenry.\textsuperscript{49}

By 7 November 1655, Sir Charles Coote reported on 'clearing the town', assuring the government that he had 'dispensed only with a few persons, who, through extreme age and sickness, and the unseasonableness of the weather, were unable to remove, but that the security of the place was well provided for'. The efficacy of this is to be questioned as similar orders were issued over the next four years on a regular basis, whether through the


\textsuperscript{45} Hardiman, appendix, xxx; Dunlop, \textit{Ireland under the Commonwealth}, ii, 326; Cunningham, \textit{Conquest and Land}, 59.

\textsuperscript{46} O’Sullivan, \textit{Old Galway}, 340.


\textsuperscript{48} Certificate, 31 Aug. 1657 (M6935/73/2 [Calendar listing]); Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare, [c.1676] (M6935/64/b).

wealth of the individuals remaining, enabling them to come to an arrangement with the local military, or others returning to the town to work. Nevertheless, these were the exceptions. While the expulsion of Catholics from towns during the 1650s was never completely achieved, their exclusion from trade and municipal government was more successful. Similar prohibitions on Catholics residing in towns around Ireland were proclaimed throughout the 1650s but they seem to have been rarely implemented in full and of little concern to the Catholic lower classes who worked and lived within the towns.

Map 2.i: Land in the Barony of Clare to which Martin Blake Fitz Martin was transplanted

Sources: Commissioners at Loughrea to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, 31 August 1657 (M6935/64/b); Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners for executing the Act of Settlement and Act of Explanation (M6935/64/b); Ormonde, O.S., ii, 125; Simington, Transplantation to Connacht, 89.

It is to be questioned if reports of the expulsion of Catholics from the town meant every single Catholic as, especially in Galway, it is unlikely the day to day functions of the town could have operated without them. The repeated reporting of the expulsion of Catholics, particularly in the 1650s, would indicate the military authorities in Galway were either

50 ‘Commonwealth Records’, Arch. Hib., vi (1917), 186-7, 190; Hardiman, 137-9; Henry Cromwell to secretary Thurloe, Dublin, 14 Nov. 1655 (John Thurloe, State Papers ed. T. Birch (7 vols, London,1742), iv, 198); The Council to Secretary Thurloe, 7 Apr. 1756 (Dunlop, Ireland under the Commonwealth, ii, 661-2); Dunlop, Ireland Under the Commonwealth, ii, 706.
51 Barnard, Cromwellian Ireland, 52.
52 Cunningham, Conquest and Land, 76; Dickson, Dublin, 75.
singly ineffectual in their duties or that the expulsions only targeted specific groups, namely wealthy Catholic merchants and clerics, at specific times and with specific intent.

Map 2.ii: Detail showing Clare Barony taken from William Petty, *Hibernia Delineatio* (1685)

The cost of subduing Ireland was to be met with Irish land, those that had advanced money and those that were owed wages were to be paid by this means. The August 1652 Act for the Settling of Ireland set out the various ‘Qualifications’, detailing the levels of guilt and detailing the penalties envisaged, most notably,

> to Transplant such persons from the respective places of their usual Habitation or Residence, into such other places within that Nation, as shall be judged most consistent with Publique Safety, allowing them such proportion of Land or Estate in the parts to which they shall be Transplanted, as they had or should have enjoyed of their own other where, in case they had not been so removed.\(^{53}\)

The province of Connacht and County of Clare, as the destination for the transplanters, were decided upon well in advance of the official proclamation by the council of state in July

---

1653.\textsuperscript{54} It would take further legislation in 1653 and 1657 to clarify matters. Instructions to the Loughrea commissioners were dated 6 January 1654 and the transplantation can be said to have begun on this date though it was not until December that the Athlone court of qualifications was established to determine the proportion of land to be allotted to transplanter.\textsuperscript{55} In June 1655, the Loughrea commissioners were given additional instructions which included details of what to do with resident ‘Popish Recusants’ possessed of lands or houses in Connacht or Clare. These internal transplanter were to enter their claims with the commissioners like all other transplanter, finding them entitled under ‘what qualifications they fall’, setting out what proportion of land they owned and allotting them ‘such part and portion thereof’ they were to enjoy ‘as indifferently as you may’, ‘without any picking or choosing to be made by the party himself’, beginning in one barony in each county, picking one point to begin and setting down each person ‘one to another without intervals’ until each barony was full, in whatever part of the province was being allotted to transplanter as from any other county.\textsuperscript{56} County Galway was assigned to transplanter from nineteen counties, but there was no specific provision made for resident proprietors, their fate was left to the commissioners of the court of qualifications at Athlone.\textsuperscript{57}

On 23 May 1656 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway by a decree by the commissioners at Athlone and pursuant to the articles of Galway, was granted 425 acres, this was held by the commissioners to be two-thirds of his previously held estate outside the town and liberties of Galway. This was set out by the commissioners at Loughrea on 23 July 1657 in the parish of Belclare, Barony of Clare, consisting of 353 acres of Killinmore [Culleen], 51 acres of Killinbeg [Culleen] and 21 acres in Ballagh (see Appendix Table iii & Map 2.i).\textsuperscript{58} As can be seen from Map 2.i the three tracts of land that Martin was transplanted to were directly adjoining each other and constituted a compact landholding from which he began the re-establishment of his fortunes. The supposedly arbitrary nature of the distribution of land by the Loughrea commissioners was clearly open to influence. Internal transplanter received an average of 275 acres each, 393 transplanter received estates of between 201 and 500, while 139 transplanter received more than 1,000 acres.\textsuperscript{59} Martin

\textsuperscript{54} Simington, Transplantation to Connacht, vii; Cunningham, Conquest and Land, 33-7.
\textsuperscript{55} Dunlop, Ireland under the Commonwealth, ii, 387-9; Simington, Transplantation to Connacht, ix, xi.
\textsuperscript{56} Dunlop, Ireland under the Commonwealth, ii, 522-3.
\textsuperscript{57} Simington, Transplantation to Connacht, xiii.
\textsuperscript{58} Commissioners at Loughrea to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, 31 Aug. 1657 (M6935/64/b); Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners for executing the Act of Settlement and Act of Explanation (M6935/64/b); Omonde, O.S., ii, 125; Simington, Transplantation to Connacht, 89.
\textsuperscript{59} Cunningham, Conquest and Land, 89, 107.
Blake Fitz Andrew was situated well below the upper tier of the landholders who were transplanted but retained more than the majority of ordinary transplanters.

As noted above Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s rural estate prior to 1652 consisted of thirteen quarters in Counties Galway and Mayo (see Appendix Table i). A quarter is generally considered to equal 120 acres in Connacht, a rough conversion of this would come to 1,590 acres. By this measurement his transplanted estate represents less than one-third (27%) of his previous estate, despite being guaranteed two-thirds of his ancient rural estate. This calls into question the method by which the commissioners calculated the extent of property forfeited. In Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s case, this would only make sense if the property he held by mortgage was excluded, and that at a bare minimum. These figures are no way an accurate representation of his landholding as quarters cannot be converted directly. Nonetheless, they do give a rough idea. The letters patent Martin Blake Fitz Andrew received in 1677 contained 12 quarters amounting to 1,170 acres.⁶⁰

John Blake Fitz Nicholas of Mullaghmore, County Galway owned 950 acres in 1641 according to the Books of Survey and Distribution and had 668 acres set out to him by the commissioners at Loughrea, representing 70% of his ancient estate, at first sight, a very

---

⁶⁰ I.R.C.R., 239.
favourable outcome. However, in his petition to the commissioners for settling the transplanter in 1676, he set out his confiscated estate as containing 1,372 acres in County Galway as well as extensive urban property, including twenty-one houses in Galway town and another seven in Athenry. This represented the confiscation of half his old estate. Again this could only make sense if land held by mortgages and all urban property, whether in the town and liberties of Galway or the town and liberties of Athenry, were excluded.\(^\text{61}\)

Nevertheless, this does give an illustration of the dramatic loss suffered by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and those who were forced to transplant. It also does not take into account his urban property, which was if anything, and Martin certainly considered it, more valuable than his rural holdings. Despite the articles of Galway guaranteeing the urban property of those entitled to their protection, it does not appear that Martin received any benefit from the sale of his property within the town. He complained in 1657 that he had received nothing for ‘his stone house and a ruinous house’ in the town of Galway.\(^\text{62}\) Claims in petitions early in the 1660s against confirming the transplantation that the transplanter ‘have not in value the eight part of their own estates’, taken in this light, do not seem the gross exaggeration it might appear at first examination.\(^\text{63}\) The acute shortage of Irish land to pay for the war years, with the Commonwealth soldiers and adventurers being given priority over all other interests, the corruption involved in the transplantation and the general bad faith of the Parliamentary regime towards the signed articles of surrender around the country, all accounted for this shortfall.\(^\text{64}\)

Maps 2.ii and 2.iii give an idea of the terrain that Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was transplanted to. While in the detail from Clare Barony taken from William Petty’s *Hibernia Delineatio* (1685) Culleen and Ballagh appear to be surrounded by a lake or turlough, the detail showing Culleen, Rusheens and Cummer from a map of the county of Galway by William Larkin of 1819 shows Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s land clear to the west of the turlough. That this was the situation in the seventeenth century is confirmed by map 2.iv, the fragment of a survey set out in 1658. Coquebert de Monbret described the area in 1791, in particular, the lake of Turlough More which stretched over seven or eight leagues but varied in width from Claregalway to Claretuam. When the rain came sheep, cattle and horses were withdrawn and when the water retreated plenty of eels and small trout were caught in the remaining marshes.\(^\text{65}\)

\(^{\text{64}}\) Simington, *Transplantation to Connacht*, vii; Cunningham, *Conquest and Land*, 87-8.
Martin Blake Fitz Andrew immediately set about restoring his fortunes becoming part of the fluid land market that surrounded the transplantation. Even before land had been set out to transplanters in a specific barony, the acreage they were to receive in Connacht changed hands. Robert Forstall of Ballyfrunk, County Kilkenny was transplanted from County Kilkenny and was among the nominees of the duke of Ormond to be restored in 1664. On 23 May 1656 the commissioners at Athlone issued a decree that he was entitled to 200 acres (the same day that Martin Blake Fitz Andrew receive his decree); two months later he sold this ‘two hundred acres of land in Connacht or County of Clare’ to Martin, passing

---

a bond of £500 to secure the covenants of the agreement. Forstall only received his decree of final settlement on 8 August 1657 which set out this land in the parish of Belclare, Barony of Clare, County Galway and in the parish of Tuam, Barony of Dunmore, County Galway. This transaction was not finalised until 1664 when Forstall passed a bond of £600 to secure the conveyance of lands in the Barony of Clare to Martin.

Attempts to put some order to their new estates began almost immediately. In 1658 William Kirwan surveyed and drew a map of the quarter of Rusheens, delineating the divide between Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and James Cuffe’s respective proportions, and surveyed the quarter as containing 287 acres (see Map 2.iv and Appendix Table xvi). Only a fragment of the map survives but shows Culleen, Cummer and Rusheens as distinctive townlands. Cummer is clearly indicated to the south, depicted as a series of three buildings, one a two-story house with a roof, indicating a substantial settlement relative to the area at the time. Kilinbegg is to the south-west. The fragment that remains of the survey does not differentiate between Cuffe’s and Blake’s respective holdings, simply surveying the land itself. There is no mention of Rusheens in the surviving deeds of the Ballyglunin estate until the eighteenth century, nor of the acquisition of Cummer but Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was clearly already in possession of land in both townlands before the end of the 1650s.

Brendán Ó Bric has calculated that thirteen members of the Blake families of Galway town, including Walter Blake Fitz Andrew, owned 11,775 profitable acres in County Mayo, 799 in County Clare and 13,343 in County Galway in 1641. In the transplantation they were awarded 23,306 acres or about 10% less than the whole 1641 holding. In total, the Galway townspeople in general held 115,534 unprofitable and 105,850 profitable acres totalling 221,384 acres in 1641 and were granted 117,776 in the transplantation. These figures give a favourable impression of the townspeople’s holdings emerging from the 1650s before they had the chance to enter the Restoration land market. They must, however, be treated with caution as a few major landowners’ holdings skew the figures. A comparison between the estates in 1641 with the transplanted holdings, given the turbulent 1640s and 1650s, Ó Bric concludes to be ‘most hazardous and unsatisfactory’, since some of the large awards from the Parliamentary commissioners bear little relation to the lands held by the Galway townspeople or their ancestors pre-1641, whether this takes account of the changes of ownership of the 1640s and 1650s, land held in Galway town or other interests, or indeed

---

67 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners for executing the Act of Settlement and Act of Explanation (M6935/64/b); Omonde, O.S., ii, 164; Simington, Transplantation to Connacht, 84, 111; Robert Forstall, late of Bailfrank, Co Kilkenny and William Fanning to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess. Bond in £500, 12 July 1656 (M6931/4).
68 Robert Forstall of Killergagh, Co Kilkenny, William Fanning of Farrenrory, Co Tipperary and William Forstall of Kilkenny, gent to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, late of Galway, burgess, 19 June 1664 (M6931/6).
69 Fragment of map of Rusheens by William Kirwan, 12 July 1658 (M6932/11).
could in some cases be rewards for services to Parliamentary forces or officials. 70 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew is not recorded in the Books of Survey and Distribution as holding any land in 1641 and thus did not play a part in Ó Bric’s calculations.

iv. The ‘49 Officers

‘...officers who were engaged in our service in Ireland, and eminently acted and suffered therein...at any time before the fifth of June 1649, other than those who have received lands or money, for their pay due unto them ...shall be satisfied [in] their respective personal arrears’

Charles II’s Gracious Declaration (1660) 71

Galway officers were among the so-called ‘49 Officers’.72 There is much confusion over who constituted the ‘49 Officers and at different times it referred to different groups. In the Restoration period they can be divided, primarily, into the royalist officers who served in Ireland before 5 June 1649, the Protestant officers who fought in Ireland for the parliamentary cause before 5 June 1649 and the parliamentary officers who arrived after. The importance of the date was that Oliver Cromwell received his orders on 5 June 1649 for transporting troops to begin the reduction of Ireland.73 Charles II in his letter to the town of Galway on 17 June 1661 acknowledged the service of the town, in particular holding the town in his name against the siege of nine months, and that he intended to ‘make good unto the said inhabitants, freemen and natives, the benefit of the’ articles of 5 April 1652.74 Both Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and Walter Blake Fitz Andrew were enrolled in the ‘49 Lots’, ‘the Commissioned Officers who served' Charles I 'in the wars of Ireland before' 5 June 1649.75 Neither would have received anything. Both because they were Catholic and having, in the strict interpretation of Charles II’s Gracious Declaration and the Act of Settlement, ‘as an act of their own’, ‘taken out decrees for lands in the province of Connacht, or county of Clare, in recompense of their former estates,’ they would have been held to be ineligible to any royal favour.76 In the instructions to the trustees for the (1649) Officers, the

---

71 His Majestie’s Gracious Declaration for the Settlement of his Kingdom of Ireland (London, 1660), section ix.
72 Act of Settlement, 14 & 15 Car. II. c. 2, s. ix, x, xx, xxi.
75 I.R.C.R., 611, 622.
76 His Majestie’s Gracious Declaration, section xii.
trustees were required to satisfy the arrears due, except those ‘who have received lands for their pay due unto them since the 5 June 1649’.77

Kevin McKenny in his thesis ‘A 17th century “real estate company”: The 1649 officers and the Irish land settlements, 1641-81’ and his article based on this ‘Charles II’s Irish cavaliers’, identifies the ‘49 Officers as ‘the label specifically given to those Protestant royalists who had supported Charles II or his father in Ireland’.78 He makes a compelling argument for this identification of the ‘49 Officers. Noting that while there was no specific mention of religion when these officers were mentioned in Charles II’s Gracious Declaration of 30 November 1660, they were specified as Protestant officers in the Act of Settlement.79 And when Ormond obtained a legal opinion as to the working of the ’49 security they were again referred to as those Protestant Officers that served the King.80 He does acknowledge a number of problems with the definition, including that the Act of Explanation contained contradictory clauses in relation to the ’49 Officers and most importantly the existence of at least nineteen parliamentary officers who gained benefit from the ’49 security, the funds and lands set apart to pay the arrears due.81 He has identified the 1,030 people who were to receive satisfaction for their arrears from the ’49 security, which broke down into 100 lots, 97 of which he was able to identify.82

However, as both Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and his elder brother Walter Blake Fitz Andrew, not to mention Ulick, earl of Clanricard among many others in Galway, as well as from other counties including John Lattin from Morristown, County Kildare, mentioned in the ‘Index nominum to the inrolments of adjudications in favour of the (1649) Officers’, were Catholics, there is clearly a problem.83 McKenny reproduces the first adjudication of ‘the inrolments of adjudications in favour of the (1649) Officers’ which was printed in full in the Irish Record Commission’s report, so he was familiar with this list but is silent as to how it affects his wider thesis.84 His quoting of Karl Bottigheimer’s call for a ‘structural’ approach to the Restoration land settlement is apt, as looking beyond the ‘personal conduct of various dignitaries’ is a nice idea in theory but ultimately one extreme is as bad as the other and

77 I.R.C.R., 32.
can lead to missing the finer details.\textsuperscript{85} McKenny is referencing solely those officers who were held to be eligible for the financial reward promised for the pay of arrears in Charles II’s \textit{Gracious Declaration} of November 1660,\textsuperscript{86} the legal basis of which was set out in the \textit{Act of Settlement} of 1662 and the \textit{Act of Explanation} of 1665.\textsuperscript{87} This does not mean that those who were held to be ineligible to benefit from the ‘49 Security were not still ‘49 Officers. They were just not beneficiaries to the funds and lands set apart to pay the arrears due. The strict enforcement of the terms of the \textit{Acts of Settlement and Explanation} did preclude many from the benefit of the ‘49 Security, but as has been noted, the contradictory aspects of many of the sections of the two acts, as well as the judicious use of the right influence, meant strict enforcement did not always hold sway.

Ulick, fifth earl of Clanricard died a Catholic in 1658 leaving no male heir. His daughter Margaret had married Charles MacCarthy, Viscount Muskerry who petitioned Ormond for the arrears due to his father-in-law before 5 June 1649.\textsuperscript{88} This was allowed, being enacted in the \textit{Act of Explanation} and Margaret, wife of viscount Muskerry was allocated £11,000 out of the ‘49 Security.\textsuperscript{89} Clanricard was obviously an exception to the norm, nevertheless, this confirms the problem inherent in McKenny’s identification of the ‘49 officers.

What position Martin, Walter and the other townsmen held as ‘Commissioned Officers who served his Majestie’ is unknown. Service under the earl of Clanricard, as the representative of the Crown in Connacht, is conceivable. His continued loyalty to the royalist cause entitled him to Charles’s favour and Galway townsmen at various times did fight alongside him. However, the tensions between the town and Clanricard meant that this was never a longstanding arrangement and so it is perhaps more likely that the townsmen were considered due payment for service under the command of the town itself. The duke of Ormond assured the King that the ‘inhabitants, freemen and natives, have in a more

\textsuperscript{86} His majesties gracious declaration for the settlement of his kingdome of Ireland, and satisfaction of the several interests of adventurers, soldiers, and other his majesties subjects there (Dublin, 1660).
\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Act of Settlement}, 14 & 15 Charles II, c. 2 (\textit{Statutes at large}, ii, 239- 348); \textit{Act of Explanation}, 17 & 18 Charles II, c.2 (\textit{Statutes at large}, iii, 2- 137).
\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Act of Explanation}, 17 & 18 Car. II, c.2, s. ccvi; \textit{I.R.C.R.}, 294, 302; McKenny, ‘A 17\textsuperscript{th} century “real estate company”, 225.
eminently manner than others, and in the worst of times, given testimony of their loyalty and affection.\textsuperscript{90}

v. Conclusion

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew survived the turbulent transplantation years and by the final years of the 1650s was in a relatively secure situation. His resources had reduced dramatically and he was forced from the relative opulence of the town of Galway to a modest rural estate, which going by William Petty’s map and the fragmentary survey of 1658 was part turlough, but the evidence of substantial buildings on the land he held in the area indicates that his situation should not be exaggerated. The importance to the urban merchants of Ireland of mortgages in their accumulation of land prior to 1641 is emphasised by the experience of the Galway merchants. That mortgages retained their importance throughout the war years is illustrated by the petition of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners according to the capitulation of Galway, where he explicitly requested that mortgages be redeemed in full in any confiscation of their urban property. Mortgages would once again be of importance for them during the Restoration.\textsuperscript{91}

The articles of Galway while never confirmed in full did ensure that the Galway townsmen retained substantial rural estates, if not their urban property. Numerous townsmen were able to gain assignments of land out of their existing estates in Counties Galway and Mayo.\textsuperscript{92} The land Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was transplanted to retained buildings of some sort. He was not among the majority of the Irish population, who were in a desperate situation. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was able to retain a somewhat dignified existence, he was either transplanted to land that retained some sort of habitation, or he remained in a position to quickly fix or erect a new one.

Within two years of his transplantation the demands of estate management quickly came to the fore and he and his new neighbours were forced to call on the services of a surveyor in order to put some sort of order on their new estates. The emergence of men like Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, who on their transplantation immediately re-entered the land market, began the initial stages of the development of a ‘new interest’. A ‘new interest’ which was to develop throughout the Restoration period, but which clearly had its roots in the initial stages of the transplantation.\textsuperscript{93} Many of those who purchased land in Connacht were Protestants but as can be seen from Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s purchase of land between the allocation of acreage at Athlone and the setting out of where that land was to

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{90} Hardiman, 141.
\textsuperscript{91} See Chapter 3.iv.
\textsuperscript{92} Cunningham, Conquest and Land, 114.
\textsuperscript{93} See above Chapter 1.ii.
\end{flushright}
be located at Loughrea, there was nothing stopping Catholics purchasing land from their fellow transplanter, once they still retained sufficient resources to do so. The adaptability of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, especially the rapidity of his acclimatisation to his new situation, and similar transplanters, who managed to weather the transplantation and the years of the Parliamentary regime, and who entered the 1660s in a position to benefit from whatever new settlement emerged, was a remarkable achievement.
Chapter 3
Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and the establishment of the Ballyglunin estate, 1660-85

‘He hath always been inoffensive in his deportment and ever faithful and loyal to His Majesty, and suffered much for adhering to his Royal government and authority’

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew

i. Introduction
The Restoration land settlement followed the template set down by the Cromwellian settlement splitting the country into, in effect, urban, county and regional spheres. For the townsmen, or by this stage the ex-townsmen of Galway, as for the Catholics of Ireland in general, the Restoration was to be a bitter disappointment. Charles II’s *Gracious Declaration* of 30 November 1660 set out the broad outline of his envisaged settlement of the land question in Ireland where he acknowledged the affection and obedience shown by his Irish subjects entitled them to his ‘protection, justice and favour’. However, for the ancient inhabitants of the boroughs of Ireland, any Catholic dispossessed of their estates within corporations were to be reprised in forfeited lands nearby, except in the case of innocent Catholics, for whom Charles II retained the power of restitution. Those who had transplanted were to stand bound by their decision, and were ‘not to be relieved against their own act’. A year after his restoration Charles II issued an order, on 17 June 1661, directing the lords justices to ensure the ‘ancient inhabitants, freemen and natives of our towne of Gallway’ enjoy the benefits of the articles of surrender of 5 April 1652. This may have been his wish, however, political realities ensured that his declarations and orders had little effect. The townsmen gained no benefit from the King’s best intentions. Around the country a similar fate met the inhabitants of the old borough towns.

ii. The Restoration land settlement in County Galway, 1660-6
The *Act of Settlement* aimed to settle the various conflicting claims of the ancient landholders and the current holders. It provided for the restoration of ‘innocents’ and a number of prominent Catholics who had remained loyal to the royalist cause, for their part

---

1 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners of the court of claims for settling the transplanters in Connacht, c.1676 (M6935/64/b).
3 *His Majestie’s Gracious Declaration for the Settlement of his Kingdom of Ireland* (London, 1660), s. iv, xviii, xxii.
5 For attempts to put the King’s orders into effect in Galway see, Hardiman, 140-3; HMC Hastings, iv, 142-3
6 David Dickson, *Old World Colony. Cork and South Munster, 1630-1830* (Cork, 2005), 47.
the Cromwellian settlers were to be compensated by grants elsewhere. Unfortunately for
the townsmen, even if found to be an ‘innocent papist’, if the land claimed was within a
corporate town they were to receive equivalent land elsewhere.\(^7\) The first court of claims
set up to administer the *Act of Settlement* sat at King’s Inns, Dublin from 13 January to 21
August 1663.\(^8\) Generally, those who had received land in Connacht had their cases
defered until other claims had been settled, those claiming innocence and who had not
petitioned for a decree of transplantation were given precedence. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew
‘exhibited his claim to the … commissioners for executing the *Act of Settlement* but did not
come to a hearing’, claiming that he had always been inoffensive in this deportment, ever
faithful to His Majesty and suffered much for adhering to his Royal government and
authority.\(^9\) It is hard to see how Martin could have been found innocent under the strict
terms of the court of claims, though the same could be said about just about any Catholic
applying to the court. Ultimately about forty individuals who underwent transplantation
managed to obtain decrees of innocence.\(^10\) In some cases ‘the letter of the law was not
strictly complied with’ and there were complaints that people were found innocent despite
not falling under the terms set out in the instructions. With this in mind, and with the right
influence, there was clearly some chance Martin might have been found innocent.\(^11\)

The failure of the first court of claims to deal adequately with so many claims made
it clear that a new ‘explanatory’ act was needed. In preparation for this, lists were compiled
which gave levels of innocence under ten different categories for named individuals in each
county broken down by province. The lists were compiled by Sir Nicholas Plunkett, Lord
Athenry and most likely other leaders of the catholic interest.\(^12\) All three Blake brothers,
Walter Blake Fitz Andrew, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and Andrew Oge Blake were named
on the list for Connacht compiled by Lord Athenry and delivered to the duke of Ormond on
28 May 1664. They were noted as having submitted to the cessation of 1643, to the peace
in 1646, to the cessation with Inchiquin, submitted and adhered to the peace of 1648 and
on all other occasions manifested their good behaviour to the crown. The elder brother
Walter Blake Fitz Andrew was listed under a further qualification as having opposed the
Papal Nuncio, Cardinal Giovanni Rinuccini and his party and endeavoured to proclaim the

\(^7\) *Act of Settlement*, 14 & 15 Charles II, c. 2, s. iv, v, Gracious Declaration, s. xvi, xviii, xxiv-xxvii,
Instructions, s. xi, xxiii, l, cxli, clxxxvi & passim (*Statutes at large*, ii, 239-348).
\(^8\) Arnold, *Restoration Land Settlement*, 53.
\(^9\) Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners of the court of claims for settling the transplanter
in Connacht, c.1676 (M6935/64/b).
\(^10\) Arnold, *Restoration Land Settlement*, 57-8; Cunningham, *Conquest and land*, 128; Creighton,
‘Catholic interest in Irish politics’, 56.
\(^11\) Simms, ‘Introduction to *Court of Claims*’, in Geraldine Tallon (ed.), *Court of Claims. Submissions
and Evidence, 1663* (Dublin, 2006), xi.
\(^12\) Creighton, ‘Catholic interest in Irish politics’, 159-60.
peace of 1646. The disagreements within the town at various times throughout the 1640s is illuminated here, the three brothers agreed on most things but when it came to the disagreements over the peace of 1646 and Rinuccini the wealthier elder brother took a slightly different line than his younger brothers.

Map 3.i: Land sold by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to Richard, earl of Arran and sold back by Richard, earl of Arran to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, April 1666

Sources: Lease and release, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to Richard, earl of Arran, 2 & 3 Apr. 1666 (M6931/7); Lease and release, Richard, earl of Arran to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, 4 & 5 Apr. 1666 (M6931/8).

1665’s Act of Explanation made no provision for the Connacht transplanters but directed that all Protestants who purchased lands in Connacht or Clare from any transplanted person, while losing one-third, were to be confirmed in two-thirds of their purchases and to receive letters patent to secure their remaining lands. They may have lost one-third of their holdings in Connacht but the Protestant purchasers were thereafter able to gain secure title to their estates. Catholic purchasers, like Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, may not have had

---


14 17&18 Charles II, c.2, s.36 (Statutes at large, iii, 29-30).
to retrench one-third part of their estate in Connacht, however, their whole landholding in Connacht remained on an unsecure footing. As no further claims to innocence were to be heard only those who could benefit from the personal grace of the King or who could claim under other articles of the act, could expect to recover anything further. The great mass of the dispossessed Catholic Irish could only hang on to what they held. The ability to retain whatever land they held on a secure title assumed a new importance over any chimaera of regaining their ancient estates.

One of the ways to achieve the restoration of an estate was through arrangements worked out by patrons and their clients, what L.J. Arnold calls the ‘inner workings of the Irish land trade’ during the Restoration. In the cases he notes a bond, or some other form of security, was entered into by both parties in return for the restoration of the client. The patron received in return a portion of the restored estate or an income deriving from it for a set period. Similar arrangements could be seen around Ireland.

These arrangements concerned large amounts of money and land. Lower down the social ladder occupied by ordinary merchants a slightly different method held sway and can be seen by an arrangement between Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and Richard, earl of Arran, the second surviving son of James, duke of Ormond, who had built up extensive holdings in Galway town and county and from 1663 was a member of the Irish privy council. On 2 and 3 April 1666, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew entered into deeds of lease and release for 625 acres in Galway with Richard Butler, earl of Arran (see Appendix Table iv & Map 3.i). Then, on 4 and 5 April 1666, Richard, earl of Arran entered into deeds of lease and release of the same lands back to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew. This is land Martin had been transplanted to, or had accumulated himself over the previous decade, and was clearly an attempt to gain secure title to this land against any attempt to question his ownership. The importance of a compact estate is clearly visible from map 3.i which shows that the majority of land Martin Blake Fitz Andrew had accumulated over the previous few years directly adjoined the land he was transplanted to. However, the outlying lands of Carrowreagh and Lackagh indicate that if land was for sale and funds available to purchase it, location took on a secondary importance.

Failure to receive a favourable judgement ensured that the critical factor in the survival and prosperity of individual Catholic landowners changed from the ability to receive

16 Arnold, *Restoration Land Settlement*, 76.
19 Lease and release, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to Richard, earl of Arran, 2 & 3 Apr. 1666 (M6931/7); Lease and release, Richard, earl of Arran to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, 4 & 5 Apr. 1666 (M6931/8).
a finding of innocence to the ability to benefit from the influence of a politically connected patron.\textsuperscript{20} This arrangement with Richard, earl of Arran only concerned part of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s landholding at the time and shows a specific method of attempting to secure the concerned lands, in the face of whatever deficiencies of title Martin felt these lands to have. A deficiency that was ultimately only to be met by the 1676 commissioners for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare.

iii. The court for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare, 1676-7

‘The petitioner therefore humbly prays your humble decree for his said ancient estate, and until restitution thereof, to be confirmed to him, and his heirs, in his transplanted estate and likewise in his said purchases\textsuperscript{21}

Those forced to transplant were the last to be considered under the various acts and courts. At the end of the 1660s, twenty-nine per cent of the profitable land of Roscommon was held by transplanter with unsecured title to their holdings and similar conditions existed in the surrounding counties.\textsuperscript{22} The Gracious Declaration of 1660 noted the ‘injustice and fraud’ in the decrees of transplantation and recommended a review to confirm the just part but nothing was done to deal with this over the next fifteen years.\textsuperscript{23} The appointment of Arthur Capel, earl of Essex as lord lieutenant (1672-7) marked a renewed vigour in attempting to deal with various problems in Ireland. From his arrival in Ireland, he received petitions from the Catholics of Galway. They included numerous allegations of being beaten and ill-used by the garrison and Protestant population there.\textsuperscript{24} Essex spent much of his time as lord lieutenant attempting to come up with a final settlement for the multi-layered problem surrounding the land of Ireland. While a solution eluded him, as it did all others, his vital involvement in the summoning of the court of claims for transplanter was a testament to the energy and fresh perspective he brought to the role of lord lieutenant.\textsuperscript{25} The return of Ormond as lord lieutenant in 1677 brought a close to the main activities of the court and shows the centrality of Essex to their proceedings.

\textsuperscript{21} Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners of the court of claims for settling the transplanter in Connacht, c.1676 (M6935/64/b).
\textsuperscript{22} Cunningham, Conquest and Land, 134.
\textsuperscript{23} His Majestie’s Gracious Declaration for the Settlement of his Kingdom of Ireland (London, 1660), s. xxxii.
\textsuperscript{24} Earl of Essex to earl of Arlington, Dublin Castle, 26 Oct. 1672 (Essex Papers, 36-7).
\textsuperscript{25} Cunningham, Conquest and Land, 135-45.
The majority of the transplanters were not even taken into consideration until 22 September 1675 when the King appointed commissioners who were to take a new survey of Connacht in order to confirm the transplanters’ titles to their land and to take into consideration outstanding claims, ‘to hear and determine the claims of all transplanted persons’ in Connacht and Clare, as such estates remained ‘subject to much doubt and uncertainty’. The petitioner surrendered their unsecured title to the land concerned and in return for paying a fine received letters patent conferring secure title to the land. Only Protestants who had bought land in Connacht or Clare from transplanters had their claims heard prior to this date, as well as a certain amount of land disposed of by the previous courts of claims.

This court of claims for settling the transplanters in Connacht and County Clare is often confused with aspects of the previous two courts of claims of the previous decade. Also, the letters patent issued by the court are sometimes taken as original grants of land from Charles II to deserving parties or even that they refer to the original Cromwellian transplantation. And while the letters patent can refer to all of these things it is only by an examination of the original provenance of the particular piece of land that one can confirm what individual letter patents confirm. Martin J. Blake in his *Blake Family Records* printed the petition of John Blake (‘alias Caddle’) Fitz Nicholas of Mullaghmore, County Galway but mixed it up with claims to the previous courts of claims and corresponding attempts to be found an ‘innocent papist’, he dated the petition to c.1663. In his introduction to the *Books of Survey and Distribution* Robert Simington described the appointment of commissioners to issue letters patent for ‘lands set out to the claimants or their predecessors by the former Commonwealth Commissioners at Loughrea’. Simingtons’s introduction was quoted by Ciarán Ó Murchadha in his thesis on seventeenth-century Clare, in which he recognised the secure title the 1676 transplanters’ commission granted to the Catholic landowners of Connacht and Clare but was silent on the wider implications of this commission. He also noted the difference between the owners and acreage noted in the abstract of grants and the *Books of Survey and Distribution* but failed to grasp that the letters patent granted by the transplanters’ commission had to be enrolled at some expense to the landowner and so there were many occasions where the landowner did not go to the expense or simply could not afford to enrol their letters patent, whereas the *Books of Survey and Distribution* was an attempt to represent an accurate survey of the landownership of Ireland, being

---

27 Draft claim presented by John Blake Fitz Nicholas to the commissioners appointed to determine claims of transplanted persons in Connacht and Clare, c.1663 [sic.] (Blake, II, 93-7).
28 *Books of Survey and Distribution, Galway*, xvii.
compiled from more than one source.\textsuperscript{29} J.G. Simms chapter in the \textit{New History of Ireland} on the Restoration briefly mentioned the court but only summed it up in two lines to the effect that ‘a large number of decrees were issued...to those...who had not recovered their original estates’. \textsuperscript{30}

The importance of this court to the transplanters was first noted by Harold O’Sullivan in his thesis ‘Land ownership changes in the county of Louth in the seventeenth century’ (Ph.D. thesis, T.C.D., 1991), in which he outlined how John Bellew, after being transplanted to Connacht, had secured the restoration of part of his ancient estate in Louth by way of an arrangement with Theobald Taaffe, earl of Carlingford but who had to wait like all other transplanters for the appointment of commissioners in 1676 to gain secure title to his land in Connacht, land that he had been transplanted to as well as land he had purchased subsequently. In his subsequent biography of John Bellew this was quickly dealt with in the final four pages of the main text, as John Bellew was in ill health by this stage in his life (he died in 1679) and it was son Patrick who appears to have been involved in these transactions.\textsuperscript{31} L.J. Arnold, in his study \textit{The Restoration Land Settlement in Dublin, 1660-88}, noted that a few Dublin claimants obtained letters patent in 1677 for their transplanted estates in Connacht but the importance of the appointment of commissioners in 1675 for the transplanters in general was relegated to a footnote. Of course, as he was only dealing with the settlement as it related to County Dublin that is perfectly understandable.\textsuperscript{32} The full importance and mechanics of the court of claims for transplanters has only fully been teased out by John Cunningham in his study of the transplantation as a whole.\textsuperscript{33} The experience of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew gives additional detail to this important but neglected court, particularly over the composition of the lands for which patents were granted.

The commissioners appointed to the court of claims for transplanters were to have ‘no interest in any lands in Connacht or Clare’ and they were ‘to be restrained from purchasing directly or indirectly any estates or titles subject to their enquiry’.\textsuperscript{34} A proclamation was issued on 26 June 1676 by the lord lieutenant setting out, as per the royal letter of 22 September 1675, that no claims of transplanted persons in Connacht and Clare had been adjudicated on nor had they been ‘reprized for their lands’ according to the King’s declaration of 30 November 1660. Commissioners were appointed to hear all claims, they were to meet on 21 August ‘at the late court of claims in the King’s Inn’. All claims had to

\textsuperscript{29} Ó Murchadha, ‘Land and society in seventeenth century Clare’, 100, 118, 151.
\textsuperscript{32} Arnold, \textit{Restoration Land Settlement}, 110, 181 (fn.2).
\textsuperscript{33} Cummingham, \textit{Conquest and Land in Ireland}, Ch. 6.
\textsuperscript{34} The King to the lord lieutenant, Whitehall, 22 Sept. 1675 (\textit{C.S.P.D. 1675-6}, 307-9).
be in by that date. Four days later, on 30 June 1676, the commissioners for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare issued their own proclamation setting out the rules for the court. Restating that all claims had to be in by 21 August whereupon the claimant had to request a hearing. The claims had to be in a uniform manner setting out the decrees of land set out by the commissioners of Athlone and Loughrea, and those lands claimed by purchase or inheritance. Ten gentlemen were appointed attorneys to the Court and the claimants had to choose one of these to be their attorney. County Clare was to be dealt with first, each barony after that to be given notice in advance in order ‘to prevent unnecessary attendance’.

The transplanted descended on Dublin for the court of claims for settling the transplanted persons in Connacht, where numerous decrees were issued to internal transplanted within Connacht and those who had transplanted from other provinces, confirming their possession of the lands they were transplanted to as well as any lands they accumulated in the intervening period. The demand was so great that the deadline for entering claims had to be extended until 1 April 1677 and then again until 30 April 1678. It was reported that the court proceeded very well in favour of the transplanted, especially those who at the time were in possession of the lands claimed.

Sir George Rawdon described Dublin in December as being full with Irish as a result of the court, the extent of the task before the commissioners forced them to ‘sit morning and evening’.

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew petitioned ‘as one of the inhabitants of the town of Galway in whose behalf his Majesty by his letter of the 17 June in the 13th year of his Majesties reign was graciously pleased to signify his Royal pleasure and intention for restoring them to their estates in respect of merit and sufferings’. He set out the ‘several houses, lands, tenements and hereditaments’ he held on 22 October 1641 (see Appendix Table i), and declared that he had no compensation for his interest in Galway town. He complained that he was compelled by mean necessity to exhibit his claim to the ‘pretended court of Athlone’.

---

35 Whereas His Majesty by his gracious letters, bearing date the two and twentieth day of September last … 26 June 1676 (Dublin, 1676); James Kelly and Mary Ann Lyons (eds), The Proclamations of Ireland, 1660-1820 (5 vols, Dublin, 2014), i, 361-3; Proclamation by the lord lieutenant and council, Dublin, 26 June 1676 (Ormonde, O.S., ii, 348-50; Steele, Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, ii, 109).

36 By the commissioners appointed for hearing and determining the claims of transplanted persons in the province of Connaught and county of Clare (Dublin, 1676); The Proclamations of Ireland, i, 364-5; Copy of a proclamation issued by the commissioners for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare, 30 June 1676 (Blake, II, 114-16); Steele, Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, ii, 109.

37 Whereas by our proclamation, bearing date the twenty sixth day of June last, all persons concerned in any of the transplanted lands in the province of Connacht, and county of Clare…19 February 1676[7] (Dublin, 1677); The Proclamations of Ireland, i, 377; Steele, Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, ii, 112).

38 Ignatius French to Thomas Blake Fitz John, Dublin, 17 Sept. 1676 (Blake, II, 117).

The ‘court of Athlone’ decreed he was to have satisfaction for two-thirds of his former estate which was set out ‘by the pretended commissioners of Loughrea’. He listed his purchases after the transplantation of lands from Robert Forstall, Sir Richard Blake and Walter Blake which he confirmed that he had since possessed. He declared that ‘he hath always been inoffensive in his deportment and ever faithful and loyal to His Majesty and suffered much for adhering to his royal government and authority’, he now petitioned ‘in respect of merit and sufferings’, for a decree restoring his ancient estate, but the realities of the day meant that he clearly saw little chance of this happening, appending these lost lands as a type of legal formality in the forlorn hope that some future change in the political situation in Ireland, and indeed England and Scotland, would someday mean there might be some realistic chance of this happening. In the meantime, he faced the stark reality and added to his petition that until his ancient estate was restored to him, he wished to be confirmed in his transplanted lands and the lands he had purchased since.\textsuperscript{40}

\textbf{Map 3.ii: Land in patent granted to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew under the Acts of Settlement and Explanation, 22 July 1677. Enrolled 9 August 1677.}

Sources: \textit{I.R.C.R.}, 239; Martin Blake is patentee to the following lands, Petition 17 Mar. 1677 (M6935/65); \textit{Books of Survey and distribution, Galway}, 90, 103, 113, 117-8; Martin Blake to the commissioners for executing the \textit{Act of Settlement} and \textit{Act of Explanation} (M6935/64/b); Grant to Martin Blake, patent dated 26 July 1677, enrolled 9 Aug. 1677, 29 Charles II (Blake II, 282).

\textsuperscript{40} Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners of the court of claims for settling the transplanters in Connacht, c.1676 (M6935/64/b).
Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was in Dublin to ensure the successful navigation of his petition through the court of claims. He was involved in the transactions that surrounded the court. In January 1677 he loaned four pounds fifteen shillings secured by a bond of £11 to Richard Martin of Dublin, who had set himself up as an intermediary between the various claimants and the nominated attorneys of the court of claims.41 There was money to be made from the dealings involving the court and Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s ability to lend money at this critical juncture was essential to securely maintaining and expanding his estate. As had been the case with the previous courts and commissions a brisk trade in Connacht land arose.42

On 26 July 1677, under the Acts of Settlement and Explanation, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew obtained a grant by letters patent of 1,170 plantation acres (or 1,895 statute acres) of profitable land in the Barony of Clare. These were the lands he was transplanted to and accumulated in the intervening period. The King now granted secure title to these lands (Appendix Tables v & vi & map 3.ii).43 Grants under these acts are generally held to be simply the confirmation of lands set out by the commissioners at Loughrea or Protestant purchasers of these lands, as is clear from the above decree, the lands Martin was transplanted to consist of slightly over a third (36%) of the lands to which he obtained the confirmation of his title by letters patent, the rest he had accumulated himself in the intervening period, purchasing from Catholics and Protestants.44 A similar situation can be seen in the letters patent of John Bellew, who having regained part of his ancient estate in Louth by means of an arrangement with Theobald Taaffe, earl of Carlingford, gained secure title to his landholding in Galway by making a petition to the commissioners of the court of claims for settling the transplanters in Connacht. Bellew was awarded 793 acres by the Athlone and Loughrea commissioners in 1656, the patent he was granted in March 1678 was for 1,628 acres: a doubling of his transplanted acres by means of purchases, primarily from internal planter families. The opportunities open to Catholics of means in the Restoration land settlement, whether the merchant Martin Blake Fitz Andrew or the lawyer John Bellew with access to a steady cash flow from fees, money lending or trading profits,

---

41 Richard Martin of Dublin, gent to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, bond in £11, 30 Jan 1677 (M6931/19); John Cantwell of Clunory, Co. Tipperary and Richard Martin of Dublin, 18 Aug. 1676 (M6931/21).
43 I.R.C.R., 239; Martin Blake is patentee to the following lands, Petition 17 Mar. 1677 (M6935/65); Books of Survey and distribution, Galway, 90, 103, 113, 117-8; Martin Blake to the commissioners for executing the Act of Settlement and Act of Explanation (M6935/64/b); Grant to Martin Blake, patent dated 26 July 1677, enrolled 9 Aug. 1677, 29 Charles II (Blake II, 282).
44 Harvey, Bellews of Mount Bellew, 38; William F.T. Butler, Confiscation in Irish History (Dublin, 1917), 197-8; 207; Simms, 'The Restoration', 426; Books of Survey and Distribution, Galway, xvii; Cunningham, Conquest and Land, 147.
enabled them to rapidly expand their transplanted holdings. The access to ready specie was of fundamental importance. Not all claimants to this court of claims went to the trouble of getting their certificate enrolled on the patent rolls. The extra expense put a lot of claimants off. While this did not pose any legal issue in the future, those at the time did not know this and illustrates the strained financial status of many landowners.

Over the next two years 580 certificates were issued. Catholics had held 95% of the land in Galway in 1641, by this period they held 70%. The only other counties where Catholics retained over half of the land were Antrim and Kildare. The Catholics of Galway did particularly well, between the wealth of the Galway townsmen and the influence of the earl of Clanricard, they were able to ensure their survival as substantial merchants and landholders.

The deficiencies in land title that the court of claims for transplanters resolved were of a very specific nature. The absence of Kilmoylan [Ballyglooneen] from Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s patent illustrates this. John, lord baron Kingston was specifically mentioned in the instruction for the execution of Charles II’s Gracious Declaration as one of the protestant purchasers who on payment of one year’s value of the profits of the land was to have their title confirmed. This land subsequently came into the possession of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and as secure title was already confirmed there was no need to go to the extra expense of getting it included in the letters patent granted by the court of claims for transplanters.

A considerable proportion of the land of Ireland was held by way of mortgages prior to 1641. The two courts of claims spent a considerable amount of their time attempting to resolve how these mortgages affected the estates concerned. On the other hand, the commissioners for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare, with some minor exceptions, dealt exclusively with land in fee simple. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew mentioned land he held by mortgage in his description of his ancient estate, but as this was more of an aspirational document; it only represented a best case scenario that at some future date he might be restored to. By his marriage articles

45 O’Sullivan, John Bellew, 7-8, 137-8.
46 Nicholas Blake of Kiltollah, Co. Galway mortgage to Thomas Blake, 2 Jan. 1677 (Blake dates this as 1676 but is 1676/7, Blake, II, 113); I.R.C.R., 329, 580.
48 Instructions for executing Gracious Declaration of 30 Nov. 1660, L, CXCV, CXCVII, printed as part of Act of Settlement, 14 & 15 Charles II, c. 2 (Statutes at large, ii, 282).
49 Arnold, Restoration Land Settlement, 107.
50 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s ancient estate on 22 Oct. 1641 and by purchases and conveyances since [c.1676] (M6931/1)
on his marriage to Ann Joyce in 1652 further mortgages were mentioned, but this was the last that is heard of them. While the letters patent awarded under the Acts of Settlement and Explanation did include saving clauses that mentioned mortgages and jointures, there is no evidence any of these were ever enforced. The patents granted in the late 1670s were, therefore, confirmations of existing holdings rather than any attempt at a wider reopening of the land settlement.

iv. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s establishment of the Ballyglunin estate: the accumulation of land and property, 1652-85

‘...the tyrannical usage and uncharitable proceedings of Martin Blake [Fitz Andrew]

Before and during the Eleven Years War Martin Blake Fitz Andrew owned land in both Counties Galway and Mayo, as well as his urban property in Galway town. Prior to 1652 Martin had purchased land from both his elder brother Walter Blake Fitz Andrew and Sir Richard Blake of Ardfry, County Galway. In the late 1650s, after they were transplanted, he again purchased land from both of them, land that he described as 'part of their ancient estates', and they can be identified as the owners in 1641 and their descendants the owners of certain parts of this land c.1675. The lands concerned had been previously mortgaged to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew by both men and again indicates that the commissioners at Loughrea did not recognise the mortgages, only taking into account land held in fee simple. This must have presented an intolerable extra burden on the Galway townsmen, as well as merchants throughout Ireland, who had built up their extensive landholding in Connacht primarily by way of mortgages.

In his statement of his ancient estate (see Appendix Table i) Martin set out the lands he had mortgaged from Sir Richard Blake and his brother Walter Blake Fitz Andrew that he was petitioning for the restoration of, but in the petition itself to the commissioners for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare, c.1676, he stated that after the transplantation, he purchased land from Robert...

---

51 Marriage articles between Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess and Ann Joyce of Galway, widow, 13 Aug. 1652 (M6931/2).
52 I.R.C.R., 239.
53 John Blake Fitz Nicholas to his son Henry Blake at Montserrat, 8 Jan. 1675 (Blake, II, 110).
54 Petition of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare, c.1676 (M6935/64/b); Books of Survey and Distribution, Galway, 104; Books of Survey and Distribution, Mayo, 51-3; I.R.C.R., 241.
Forstall, Sir Richard Blake and Walter Blake. This was clearly two different sets of transactions, one occurring before the transplantation and one after, and concerned, certainly in regards the lands purchased from Sir Richard Blake and Walter Blake, land purchased after the transplantation that, while not identical, certainly appears to be in the general vicinity of the previously purchased lands. In 1641 Sir Richard Blake held half of the six quarters of Grange, in the parish of Lackagh, Barony of Clare, County Galway, the six quarters were described as half the parish. Sir Richard Blake, prior to the transplantation, mortgaged the three quarters he owned to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, but by the 1670s the six quarters were held by Marcus Lynch, Thomas Lynch and Robert Blake.56 By 1666 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew had acquired land in Lackagh, in the parish of Lackagh just north of Grange. This was only forty acres of Lackagh and clearly far less than Martin had held in the parish prior to the transplantation, but does show the attempt by the transplanter to re-establish their former estates as best they could.

Map 3.iii: Extent of main Ballyglunin estate by the end of seventeenth century in the Barony of Clare, Ballymoe and Tiaquin, County Galway

From the moment of his transplantation, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew purchased land as and where he could. In the first decade after his arrival on his transplanted lands, he added at least two hundred additional acres to the 425 acres he was transplanted to (see Appendix 56). 

56 Books of Survey and Distribution, Galway, 103-4; I.R.C.R., 259.
Tables iv-vi).\textsuperscript{57} These 200 acres would appear to be the land he had purchased from Robert Forstall in 1656 but did not include the land he purchased from Sir Richard Blake and Walter Blake, which had been part of their ancient estate and were set out to them by final settlement of the commissioners at Loughrea.\textsuperscript{58} That this land was located in the same area as Culleen and Ballagh where Martin Blake Fitz Andrew received his transplantation acres, indicates that he was able to influence the commissioners at Loughrea to grant land in a certain location. Martin certainly held land in the Barony of Clare before he was transplanted there and his purchases after were clustered around Culleen and the new main landholding centre of Kilmoylan or Ballyglooneen as it became known. Though ultimately the estate was far from compact as land was accumulated piecemeal when and where it became available. The ability of the Galway merchants to re-enter the land market in force was enabled by their continued ability to function as merchants at one level or another, even to being able to call in loans due prior to the 1660s. In 1661 Martin Blake, along with several ‘of the ould inhabitants and freemen’ of Galway, including Mark Browne, Anthony French, Marcus Lynch, Charles French, Thomas Browne and Anthony Lynch, appointed Geoffrey Browne their agent to compound with Edward Somerset, marquess of Worcester for the repayment of a bond of £1,000 due them.\textsuperscript{59}

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was involved in at least sixteen individual purchases of land in the period from the transplantation until the mid-1680s (see Appendix Table vii & Maps 3.iii & iv). These ranged from a precarious, and in many ways, a speculative investment in 200 acres of land that he might obtain at some future date, in purchasing the interest in Robert Forstall’s Athlone decree setting out that he was entitled to 200 acres in Connacht but before the commissioners at Loughrea had set out where exactly these 200 acres were to lie.\textsuperscript{60} It included large purchases of land including 278 acres of Ardnasodan and directly to the north of Arndasodan, 95 acres of Ballyglooneen, around which purchases the main Ballyglunin estate evolved.\textsuperscript{61} His stewardship of his estate meant that not even the chance to add a spare four acres to his growing landholding in the townland of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{57} Lease and release, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to Richard, earl of Arran, 2 & 3 Apr. 1666 (M6931/7); Lease and release, Richard, earl of Arran to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, 4 & 5 Apr. 1666 (M6931/8).
\item \textsuperscript{58} Robert Forstall, late of Ballifrank, Co. Kilkenny and William Fanning to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess, bond in £500, 12 July 1656 (M6,931/4); Petition of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare, c.1676 (M6935/64/b).
\item \textsuperscript{59} Authority to Geoffrey Browne, 19 Mar. 1661 (N.L.I. Report on private collections No. 496, Synnott Papers, 3).
\item \textsuperscript{60} Robert Forstall, late of Ballifrank, Co. Kilkenny and William Fanning to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess, bond in £500, 12 July 1656 (M6931/4).
\item \textsuperscript{61} Peter Power of Loughrea, Co. Galway, bargain and sale to Martin Blake of Cummer, 7 Nov. 1670 (M6931/11); Charles Holcraft, Cloonnagashel, Co. Mayo to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, 3 May 1671 (M6931/14).
\end{itemize}
Bunoghanaun was ignored. Deeds of sale included the proviso, ‘that if the said transplantation may at any time hereafter be broke and the said Martin evicted out of the premises or any part’ he was to be refunded ‘pro rata any part of the lands so evicted’. On at least one occasion he received compensation for land he was evicted from by the court of claims.

Map 3.iv: The Ballyglunin estate in Counties Galway and Mayo c.1685

There is no mention of when Martin acquired Rusheens or Cummer, but he had clearly purchased lands in both townlands before the end of the 1650s. The lands he was transplanted to were quickly added to and were concentrated in the same area, showing a concern on Martin’s part to consolidate a compact landholding. The majority of his purchases were within a ten-kilometre triangle from Cummer and Rusheens in the north to Ballyglooneen and Ardnasodan in the south-east, across to Bunoghanaun in the west of the Barony of Clare.

63 Booklet in newspaper cover containing sketch maps of parts of the Ballyglunin estate and notes of deeds affecting it, 1658-1771 (M6935/65/5); Walter Cheevers, late of Mountown, Co. Dublin and now of Iskercleran, Co. Galway to Patrick Netterville of Legane, Co. Galway, 3 Nov. 1658 (M6931/5); Patrick and Nicholas Netterville, Lecarrow, Co. Galway to Martin Blake, Cummer (M6931/15).
64 Fragment of a map of Rusheens, 12 July 1658 (M6932/11).
Martin Blake Fitz Andrew built up an estate in Galway purchasing primarily from other internal transplanters but not exclusively. There was no restriction on Catholics purchasing from Protestants. In other parts of the country, New English Protestants were the people with money to invest in land and so were the primary purchasers, in Galway, it was the ancient inhabitants of Galway town who retained sufficient funds to re-enter the land market in force. The land purchased in many cases passed through a number of hands before it reached its final owner. So any assumption that the land in question was land that a transplanter was allotted by the Loughrea and Athlone commissioners, must be treated with caution.

Peter Power of Loughrea sold Martin Blake Fitz Andrew 278 acres of profitable land in the two quarters of Ardnasodan, Barony of Clare for £139 in 1670, to which his father Richard Power had been transplanted to. Six years later Richard, earl of Arran claimed an interest in the lands previously held by Peter Power in Ardnasodan, instead of going to the courts, arbitration would appear to have been the preferred method in the seventeenth century, and continued on into the eighteenth century, where possible, of resolving differences over various pieces of land. Samuel Pepys wrote in his diary, on 6 March 1662, over his impatience with his uncle’s inability to choose whether he would ‘go to law or arbitration’ over a disputed inheritance. Differences over where exactly the boundaries were between the various landholders of each townland were ever present, given that 68% of Galway was forfeited during the 1650s. Where arbitration was agreed between the parties a large sum of money was guaranteed by a bond on the part of both parties, in this case for £1,000. An arbiter was appointed, to whose judgement both parties agreed to defer, or else risk losing the £1,000 bond.

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew purchased Ballyglooneen, at this time still known as Kilmoylan, in 1671 from Charles Holcraft. Holcraft was captain-lieutenant in the regiment of Colonel Richard Graves of the New Model Horse during the English Civil War, one of the Parliamentary signees of the articles of Galway, a Loughrea commissioner as well as a commissioner of the revenue for the precinct of Galway, in 1677 he was mayor of the guild.

65 Peter Power of Loughrea, Co. Galway, bargain and sale to Martin Blake of Cummer, 7 Nov. 1670 (M6931/11).
66 Peter Power of Loughrea, Co. Galway (on behalf of Richard, earl of Arran) to Martin Blake of Cummer, Mar. 1677 (M6931/20); Walter Blake Fitz John of Galway, merchant to John Blake Fitz Nicholas, of Galway, bond in £100, 22 Nov. 1621 (Blake, ii, 25-6); Deed of award by Richard Joyce, Patrick Browne, and John Lynch of Galway, merchants, and Francis Blake of Moyne, gent, the arbiters in a dispute between (1) Alderman John Blake and (2) the orphans of Martin Blake and Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, of Cummer, 5 July 1671 (Blake, ii, 103); Joseph Lynch, Ballycurrin, Co. Mayo to Martin Blake, Cummer, bond in £1,000, 4 Aug. 1688 (M6931/45).
of merchants of the staple and high sheriff of county Galway. Kilmoylan was held in 1641 by a number of people. Half a quarter was held by Richard McWilliam and Moyler Macwilliam Bourk and two gneves of Kilmoylan were confiscated from the earl of Clanricard and Lawrence Bodkin, with the earl of Clanricard holding three-quarters of this. In the Restoration land settlement, the earl of Clanricard and Ambrose Bodkin regained sections of this land, but parts were also awarded to Sir John Bourke, Thomas Lynch and Lord Kingston.

Sir John King, 1st Baron Kingston (c.1620-76) was awarded 95 acres of Kilmoylan. The eldest son of Sir Robert King of Boyle Abbey, County Roscommon, Sir John was an officer in the parliamentary army, he accumulated an estate in Sligo and Roscommon but by marriage gained a vast Munster estate, heavily involved in the Restoration land market he became one of the largest landowners in Ireland. His grandfather John King was secretary to Sir Richard Bingham, governor of Connacht, in 1585 and obtained many grants of the dissolved monasteries. His interest in Kilmoylan passed on to Charles Holcraft who initially leased 95 acres to Donnogh O'Bryne of Cullagh, County Galway. A month later Holcraft sold the reversion of the lands to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew for £120. On the back of this deed an exchange of forty acres of land by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew with Sir James Cuff of Ballinrobe, County Mayo, of forty acres of Kilmoylan with forty acres of Rusheens was endorsed. Both families retained landholdings in both areas of the Barony of Clare and leased land in the same areas between each other in the next century. This is clearly just simply a case of housekeeping, all landholders were vigilant to retain as compact an estate as possible. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was already concentrating on expanding his acreage surrounding what would become the main part of the Ballyglunin estate.

Between his arrangement with Richard, earl of Arran in 1666 and the granting of letters patent for his estate in 1677 Martin accumulated further land that no deeds survive for. Like his other acquisitions during this period, they were concentrated around the land he was transplanted to in Cummer: 120 acres of Ballagh, 15 acres in Bunoghanaun, 10 acres in Carrowreagh and another 10 acres in Garraun. The completion of much of the business of the commissioners for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare in the period 1676-8 placed the title to much of

---

69 Burke, Landed Gentry Ireland, 50; Burke’s Irish Family Records, 117; Sir Charles Firth, The Regimental History of Cromwell’s Army (2 vols, Oxford, 1940), i, 105, 107; Blake II, 214; O’Hart, Irish Landed Gentry, 235; Hardiman, xxxi, xlv, i; Charles Holcraft, Dublin to Gerrard Dillon, 7 Nov. 1689 (N.L.I., Westport Estate Papers, MS 40,899/2/7).

70 Books of Survey and Distribution, Galway, 90-1; Blake, II, 6-7; D.I.B, v, 205-6.

71 Charles Holcraft, Cloonnagashel, Co. Mayo to Donnogh O’Bryne, 15 Apr. 1671 (M6931/13).

72 Charles Holcraft, Cloonnagashel, Co. Mayo to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, 3 May 1671 (M6931/14).
the land of Connacht on a new secure footing. Purchases accelerated in the period immediately following. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew again soon added to his estate.\textsuperscript{73}

v. Mortgages: a long established method of estate accumulation

‘Provided always and upon condition that at what time or times so ever hereafter the [mortgager] or his heirs shall satisfy and pay or cause to be satisfied and paid to the said Martin Blake, his heirs or assigns the [principal] sum…together with the interest thereof…’\textsuperscript{74}

Galway townsmen began acquiring land throughout Connacht from at least the middle of the sixteenth century, initially just to ensure a secure line of provisions for the town.\textsuperscript{75} In the first quarter of the seventeenth century, smaller freeholders were getting into financial difficulties and mortgaging their lands or simply selling out throughout Ireland. In this era of economic difficulties and the introduction of English notions of law and order, the Galway townsmen were in prime position to take advantage of the situation to the disadvantage of the inhabitants of the rest of Connacht. They did this to great effect. The merchants of Galway were not the only ones to benefit from these circumstances. In a poem by the Kerry poet Muiris mac Dáibhí Dhuibh Mhic Gearailt, he lambasted merchants who took control of mortgaged land while the original owners were left penniless.\textsuperscript{76} In Roscommon, where Galway merchants had only a minimal presence, the Old English of the Pale as well as some New English exploited the decaying Gaelic order, while the merchants of the cities of Cork and Kilkenny did the same in the areas surrounding them. Around the country, the exploitation by way of advantageous mortgages and leases granted by distressed Gaelic Irish and Old English landowners to both Old and New English led to a transformation of landholding in the early seventeenth century, expanding on trends that had begun the previous century. Urban merchants dominated these transactions, though merchants from Dublin expanded their holdings countrywide with a reach and extent by 1640 that was unique. These mortgages entailed usufruct possession for the duration of the mortgage and often the mortgagee ended up with the actual possession of the land on default or simply

\textsuperscript{73} Lease and release, Robert Kirwan, Castle Hackett, Co. Galway to Martin Blake, Cummer, 5 & 6 Sept. 1678 (M6931/27a&b); I.R.C.R., 244, 272; Lease and release, 13 & 14 May 1697, Robert Blake of Ardfry and Richard his son to Martin Blake, Cummer (M6931/31.a&b); Elizabeth Taaffe to Martin Blake, Cummer, 27 May 1678; Madam Elizabeth Taaffe to Martin Blake, Cummer, 28 Oct. 1678 (M6931/24&30); Abstract of bargain and sale, 28 & 29 Oct. 1678 (M6931/65/11); Lease, Peter Martin of Galway to Martin Blake of Cummer, 7 Oct. 1681 (M6931/36); Bond in £400, Peter Martin of Galway to Martin Blake of Cummer, 8 Oct. 1681 (M6931/37).

\textsuperscript{74} Mortgage, John Bodkin of Johnstown, Co. Galway, esq, and Mary his wife, to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, 15 & 16 June 1681 (M6931/34/a&b).

\textsuperscript{75} Ó Bric, ‘Galway townsmen’, 224.

\textsuperscript{76} Marc Caball, ‘Cultures in conflict in late sixteenth-century Kerry: the parallel worlds of a Tudor intellectual and Gaelic poets’, I.H.S., xxxvi, no. 144 (2009), 499.
bought out the mortgager. It was only from the 1690s that it started to become normal for
the mortgagor to pay interest while retaining possession of the land in question.\textsuperscript{77}

Those with ready money in early seventeenth century Connacht were the Galway merchants. It was in this context that mortgages assumed importance, especially since the contemporary mortgagee held the land and its profits until the loan was repaid. Many, if not most, were never in a position to repay their mortgages, leaving the title to the land ultimately to demise onto the merchants of Galway. By 1617 the Galway townsmen already owned three-quarters of the land they were noted as holding in 1641.\textsuperscript{78}

That mortgages retained their importance throughout the war years is illustrated by
the petition of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the commissioners according to the capitulation of Galway, where he explicitly requested that mortgages be redeemed in full in any confiscation of their urban property.\textsuperscript{79} Mortgages were part of a series of transactions which the \textit{Act of Settlement} made provision for the recovery of. However, the incumbrancer would have to obtain a decree of innocence to be enabled to recover the sums owed, a level of proof that all but obliterated all interest in mortgages, statute staples and similar financial transactions pre-1660.\textsuperscript{80}

From the 1660s this practice resumed, the legal expenses arising from attempts to
regain or simply retain landholdings represented a serious drain on landowners’
resources.\textsuperscript{81} Again the merchants of Galway, with their access to specie, began to enter into mortgages with the current holders of the land. Very little evidence remains of anything but fee simple land transactions by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, showing the fundamental importance of these transactions to the establishment of the estate (see Appendix Table viii). The secure title granted to a large part of Connacht and Clare by the court of claims for transplanter gave a further spur to the land market with a marked increase in transactions. Also, the expense incurred in applying to the court forced many to resort to mortgages to raise money to gain their secure letters patent. Mortgages took the form of a normal deed of lease and release enacted over two days but with the added proviso,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{78} Ó Bric, ‘Galway townsmen’, 460, 700-1.
\textsuperscript{79} Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to the ‘commissioners according to the capitulation of Galway’, [Summer 1652] (M6935/64/c); see also C.S.P.I. \textit{1660-2}, 576.
\textsuperscript{80} O’Sullivan, ‘Land ownership changes in the county of Louth’, 247-63.
\textsuperscript{81} Arnold, \textit{Restoration Land Settlement}, 139.
\end{flushright}
‘Provided always and upon condition that at what time or times so ever hereafter the
[mortgager] or his heirs shall satisfy and pay or cause to be satisfied and paid to the said
[mortgagee], his heirs or assigns the [principal] sum...together with the interest thereof’.

An initial stage in a mortgage between Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and John Bodkin
of Johnstowne, County Galway was initiated in 1676 when John Bodkin leased
Lecarrowreagh [Carrowreagh] to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and enacted a bond for £60 to
secure the lease. Then on 16 June 1681, John Bodkin of Johnstown and his wife Mary
mortgaged 147 acres to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew for £350. John and Mary had received
their patent for this land, as well as much more totalling 1,790 acres, on 29 May 1677.
The excessive amount paid for this land and a lease concerning the same lands, indicates
this transaction was not a simple outright purchase, the deed of transaction was in effect a
lease and release but with the proviso that at any time John Blake or his heirs could repay
the principal plus the interest then owing and regain possession of the lands concerned.
The lands do appear to have come into the possession, of the Blakes of Ballyglunin for a
period and on that basis have been included in the total acreage held by Martin Blake Fitz
Andrew at the end of the seventeenth century (see Appendix Table ix and Maps 3.iii & iv).

In 1684 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew leased 43 acres of Clondahamper for twenty years
from Patrick Burke of Carrowntryla, County Galway for five shillings a year. Patrick’s
brother, William Burke, also of Carrowntryla, County Galway passed a bond for £100 to
secure the lease. Bonds entered into in regard to leases were usually entered into by the
lessee in order to secure the payment of the rent involved, not to mention that a bond of
this amount would have been excessive even if the transaction involved purchasing the
land outright, indicating that Patrick Burke was either spectacularly untrustworthy or that
there was a lot more to this transaction than a simple lease.

William Burke of Carrowntryla, County Galway was involved with Martin Blake Fitz
Andrew in two mortgages. The first on 7 and 8 February 1683 where William mortgaged
190 acres in the Barony of Ballymoe to Martin for £110 and passed a bond for £300 to
secure the mortgage. They entered into another mortgage on 11 and 12 June 1684 for a

---

82 Mortgage, John Bodkin of Johnstown, Co. Galway, esq, and Mary his wife, to Martin Blake of
Cummer, gent, 15 & 16 June 1681 (M6931/34/a&b).
83 John Bodkin of Johnstowne, Co. Galway to Martin Blake, 15 Sept. 1676 (M6931/22).
84 John Bodkin of Johnstown, Co. Galway and his wife Mary to Martin Blake, Cummer, 15 & 16
June 1681 (M6931/34 a&b); I.R.C.R., 239-40.
85 John Bodkin of Johnstown, Co. Galway and his wife Mary to Martin Blake, Cummer, lease of
same date for 11 years at £35 per annum (M6931/35). [Calendar entry only, lease could not be
found in N.A.I.].
86 Patrick Burke, Carrowntryla, Co. Galway, to Martin Blake, Cummer, 12 June 1684 (M6931/39).
87 Bond in £100, William Burke, Carrowntryla, Co. Galway to Martin Blake, Cummer, 12 June 1684
(M6931/40).
88 William Burke of Carrowntryla, Co. Galway, to Martin Blake of Cummer, 7 & 8 Feb. 1683 (Claim
of Martin Blake Fitz Peter, 1701. P.R.O.N.I., Annesley MS 19, Trustees for the Sale of Forfeited
further 230 acres in the Barony of Ballymoe for £80. William Burke remained as a tenant on the majority of these lands up to the 1690s paying Martin Blake Fitz Andrew rent on the lands concerned as well as interest on the mortgage, other parts of the land mortgaged had already been leased prior to the mortgage. The above bond of £100 William entered into in favour of his brother was then, part of a wider transaction between himself and Martin Blake Fitz Andrew. The rent Martin Blake Fitz Andrew had to pay on the 43 acres of Cloondahamper at five shillings per annum was nothing more than a token rent, at times in leases of the period, five shillings was substituted for the figurative peppercorn to be paid as rent, especially in deeds of lease and release. The use of the 43 acres of Cloondahamper was then part of the repayment of the various mortgages.

The upheaval of the War of the Two Kings meant that the tendency of the sixteenth and early-seventeenth century where mortgages ultimately resulted in a fee simple ownership of the land by the mortgagee was not replicated. The mortgage to John Bodkin of Johnstown and his wife Mary, which had all the trademarks of the initial stages of a mortgage which would evolve into fee simple possession for Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, in reality, went no further than the 1690s. By 1700 Mary Bodkin, by this time a widow, and her eldest son John Bodkin, sold the land concerned, as well as much more, amounting to almost 400 acres in the Barony of Clare to John Blake of Mullaghmore, County Galway. The mortgage with William Burke of Carrowntryla, County Galway ended up with the trustees for the forfeited estates, where at least Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s grandson Martin Blake Fitz Peter received a judgement in favour of the value of the initial mortgage, if not the full interest owed or the land itself (See Chapter 4.ii).

Another arrangement can be seen in the loan Martin Blake Fitz Andrew made to his distant relation Martin Blake Fitz Nicholas, second son of Nicholas Blake of Galway. Martin Blake Fitz Nicholas died still owing Martin Blake Fitz Andrew £388. Martin Blake Fitz Nicholas’s elder brother John Blake Fitz Nicholas of Mullaghmore, County Galway administered his estate, and in the ensuing arbitration over the dispute between them over the money owed, the arbitrators awarded Martin Blake Fitz Andrew a £30 yearly rent charge on the lands of Mullaghmore, with power to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to levy distress on the

---

89 William Burke of Carrowntryla, Co. Galway, to Martin Blake of Cummer, 12 June 1684 (Claim of Martin Blake Fitz Peter, Blake, II, 290).
90 Mary Bodkin of Carrowbeg, Co. Galway and John Bodkin to John Blake of Mullaghmore, Co. Galway, 28 June 1700 (Private collection, Synnott Papers 7 [microfilm, N.L.I. p.6960]).
91 For John Blake Fitz Nicholas of Mullaghmore and his four sons see pages 176-7.
lands upon non-payment of the rent charge.\textsuperscript{92} Four years later John Blake Fitz Nicholas complained in a letter to his son Henry at Montserrat that as a result of ‘the tyrannical usage and uncharitable proceedings of my cousin Martin Blake [Fitz Andrew] I was necessitated to sell my few cows to make him payment, and my poor tenants (excepting four) all destroyed and broken by his means these two years past’.\textsuperscript{93} John Blake Fitz Nicholas had presumably failed to pay the £30 rent charge to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, who had then distrained on the lands of Mullaghmore.

Any attempt to arrive at an average price of land is a precarious undertaking and must be treated with caution. With this significant caveat in mind, some indications of the price of profitable land can be teased out. If you exclude the first and last purchases from the seventeenth century in Appendix Table x, the 12 July 1656 and June 1681 purchases, where there is some question about the accuracy of the price concerned and the fact that the June 1681 transaction was in effect a mortgage, the remaining eleven transactions give an average of 13s. 6d. per acre for profitable land in the Barony of Clare during the Restoration. The large fluctuations in land prices shown in Appendix Table x shows the caution with which any attempt at an average must be treated. Though clearly, the quality of the land was obviously the main determining factor in the value, nevertheless land prices clearly varied erratically throughout the Restoration period.

\textbf{vi. Conclusion}

There were numerous, though severely restricted, opportunities for the pre-1641 landowners of Ireland to attempt to restore their ancient estates. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew never missed an opportunity to petition the various courts and even possible patrons in his various attempts to either restore his ancient estate or confirm his existing holdings. The \emph{Gracious Declaration} raised the hopes of the Catholics of Ireland but the vast majority were to be disappointed by both the \emph{Act of Settlement} and the first court of claims. Whatever slim chance he may have had, this did not put Martin Blake Fitz Andrew off petitioning the first court of claims and attempting to make the most of the \emph{Act of Settlement}. No matter what the financial cost may have been. Further financial outlays were entailed in petitioning to be included in the adjudications for the ‘49 Officers, despite a highly unlikely positive outcome. The \emph{Act of Explanation} provided a further opportunity and despite the fact that Martin Blake Fitz Andrew got himself on Lord Athenry’s list of those seeking restoration in Connacht, it was to prove a fruitless endeavour. There is no evidence that he petitioned the

\textsuperscript{92} Deed of award by Richard Joyce, Patrick Browne, and John Lynch of Galway, merchants, and Francis Blake of Moyne, gent the arbiters in a dispute between (1) Alderman John Blake and (2) the orphans of Martin Blake and Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, of Cummer, 5 July 1671 (Blake, \textit{II}, 103)

\textsuperscript{93} John Blake to his son Henry Blake at Montserrat, 8 Jan. 1675 (Blake, \textit{II}, 110-1).
second court of claims but despite the fact that he would have had no reasonable expectation to anticipate a successful outcome, there is every likelihood he again petitioned for his restoration.

The move away from depending on the outcome of Parliamentary dictated solutions, to attempting to use a politically connected patron did furnish him with a positive outcome, but his continued efforts to procure a secure title to his estate show that he acknowledged this was only ever a temporary solution to a much wider problem of the insecure title to the land of much of Connacht. Even the court of claims for transplanter, while on the surface granting secure title did not solve the overriding land problem and soon again during Ormond’s final lord lieutenancy the land question was reopened and the Commission of Grace granted secure title to lands not already granted letters patent. The continued importance of the land settlement came to the fore anew during the Parliament of James II, when the Catholic majority forced James II to accept the repeal of the Acts of Settlement and Explanation. The only opposition within the Parliament was from the ‘new interest’ MPs, particularly those from County Galway.

At the close of Charles II’s reign Martin Blake Fitz Andrew had accumulated an estate of in excess of two thousand acres in fee simple consisting of twenty-one quarters of land in Counties Galway and Mayo and property in the town of Galway, consisting of a house in Middle St, containing at least a front and back house, cellars and a yard, and a half interest in three mills on Bridge St (see Appendix Table ix). The series of land purchases that Martin Blake Fitz Andrew accumulated throughout the Cromwellian and Restoration periods gives a good illustration of the methods by which Catholics who were forced to undergo transplantation were able to re-establish themselves by the end of the seventeenth century. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew by entering into substantial mortgages from the late 1670s shows the recommencement of a trend seen the previous century, whereby the Galway townsmen were able to accumulate the vast amount of land they had throughout Connacht. The mortgage Martin Blake Fitz Andrew entered into with William Burke of Carrowntryla is a striking example of this. William Burke of Carrowntryla was quickly behind in his repayments to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and had to use other land in his and his brother’s possession, in order to keep up with his debts and retain possession of the land. Without the tumultuous years of the War of the Two Kings, it is almost certain that these lands would have come into the possession of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, as the rent on the leases was already in arrears by this date. Instead, William Burke’s son John was able to claim before the trustees of the forfeited estates for part of the estate that was held in tail

95 See Chapter 4.i.
male, while he was able to repurchase the land that was mortgaged to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, which had been forfeited on the attainder of William Burke of Carrowntryla. For his part Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s grandson had to settle for the outstanding debt owed on the mortgage (see Chapter 4.ii).

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew clearly benefited from the fractured land market that followed the Restoration, using his wealth to buy and lease land, as well as to lend money to other local families. Through these mortgages to impoverished owners and buying up and leasing whatever land was available, no matter what the source, whether the holdings were under the transplantation scheme from the New English, transplanters or local families, even his own extended family, Martin became part of the ‘new interest’. The experience of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew confirms that the history of seventeenth century Ireland is very much a history of specific areas, of corporate entities and of specific groups. The townsmen of Galway experienced the tumultuous years of the century similarly to urban dwellers elsewhere in Ireland, yet with specific characteristics unique to Galway. They never regained even a semblance of their previous holdings or even the full ability to re-enter and trade in Galway, except for a brief window under James II.

The acquisition of land from his first purchase of the interest in the Athlone decree of Robert Forstall was always focused on the attempt to acquire a compact estate. He managed to get Robert Forstall’s decreed land allocated alongside his own and his further purchases were focused to this end. This was not always possible and certain of his acquisitions were at some distance from his new home in Cummer. His ancient estate never lost its attraction, which certainly explains his purchase of Lacagh, only 40 acres and at some distance to his other holdings, but alongside his old land of Grange. The court of claims for transplanters reinvigorated the Restoration land market in Connacht, and again he attempted to purchase a compact estate but had to settle for land in another barony, purchasing two substantial tracts of Brierfield. Unsurprisingly the majority of land was purchased from his fellow transplanters but there was neither hindrance nor hesitation to purchasing from Protestants, either long established in Ireland or Cromwellian newcomers. The often underestimated importance of mortgages in land acquisition and ownership in this period shows a remarkable similarity with the events of the previous century and earlier in the seventeenth century pursued by his father and brother. That Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and his grandson Martin Blake Fitz Peter were unable to benefit to the extent they had was only down to a new war and new confiscations putting a halt to these developments.

The most glaring fact that emerges from the list of deeds affecting the establishment of the Ballyglunin estate (Appendix Table vii) is the gap in purchases from 1681 when Martin Blake Fitz Andrew purchased his last piece of property, the interest in the Mill in Galway town, until 1789 when Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s great-great-great-grandson Walter Blake
Fitz Martin purchased twenty acres of Bunoguanaun. The enactment of the penal laws in the 1690s and early part of the eighteenth century meant that estates in fee simple that Catholics were able to reconstruct during the Restoration could be expanded no further. The estates could simply be retained as best they could by Catholic inheritors unless they wished to conform to the established church.
Chapter 4

Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s securing and maintaining of the Ballyglunin estate
1685-1737

‘I know none of this province but the merchant race of Galway who got by the new settlement’

i. Introduction

Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Cummer and subsequently of Ballyglunin, County Galway was like his grandfather Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, a Catholic burgess, merchant and landowner of minor gentry status. His life and career highlights a neglected side of eighteenth century Ireland. He inherited the Ballyglunin estate in 1691 after the deaths in quick succession of his grandfather, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, and his father Peter Blake Fitz Martin. None of the family played anything other than a minor role in the town during the War of the Two Kings. Martin Blake Fitz Peter subsequently spent much of the 1690s in an endeavour to safeguard the family’s estate. He secured his inheritance within the family, got his grandfather found within the articles of Galway and, where possible, recovered whatever debts were due to his grandfather, whether from the debtors themselves or from the trustees for the Williamite forfeitures. He made no effort to develop the demesne as his grandfather had done during the Restoration; it was not an option for him. Even before the enactment of the 1704 Act to prevent the further growth of popery prohibited the purchase of land by Catholics, he made no attempt to expand his holdings. Securing and maintaining the Ballyglunin estate were the only options available to him.² His business dealings were centred in Galway town, even if he himself had been forced to move full time to his estate in the country, but also encompassed Dublin, Cork, London and the West Indies, where his brother Patrick Blake Fitz Peter and his second son (Major) Martin Blake Fitz Martin, were located.

ii. The Blakes of Ballyglunin in Jacobite Galway

The accession of James II, on 6 February 1685, gave rise to great dreams of hope and despair. Soon after his accession James II directed the lord lieutenant, the earl of Clarendon to ensure the readmission of Catholics to the freedom of corporate towns. The mayor of

² 2 Anne, c. 6., An Act to prevent the further growth of popery (Statutes at large), iv, 12-31; see also Edmund Curtis & R.B. McDowell (eds), Irish Historical Documents: 1172-1922 (London, 1943), 188-94.
Galway, Colonel Theodore Russell on 25 June 1686 received orders to admit such Catholic merchants who should desire it, being only required to take the oaths of allegiance and of freemen. This met serious resistance from the Protestant Corporation of Galway but in the end they had to give in to the King’s prerogative and the following July 160 Catholics were sworn in.\(^3\) Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was sworn a freeman on 2 July and Andrew Oge Blake on 30 July.\(^4\) This ensured the election, in August 1686, of the first Catholic mayor since 1654, John Kirwan Fitz Stephen.\(^5\) Two years later Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s grandson Martin Blake Fitz Peter was admitted to the freedom of Galway on 11 July 1688.\(^6\) The absence of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s eldest son Peter is a clear indication of his lack of involvement in the family business.\(^7\)

Whatever else may have been occurring in the wider world, estate management continued as normal. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew may have been a successful merchant and landlord by the beginning of the reign of James II but he still had to keep a steady stream of revenue coming in. Like all businessmen, this occasioned loans to cover his own expenses at times. Cummer remained the centre of his estate and it was only in the next century that the family moved to the townland of Ballyglooneen. It was these lands around Ballyglooneen and Arnasodan, as well as Tarmon [Bunoghanaun], that he was forced to mortgage in 1686 in order to raise some needed ready money.\(^8\)

His financial difficulties, or more likely short-term liquidity problems, are illustrated by a protest by John Brown, of Galway, merchant, made before Robert Shaw, notary and tabellion public in August 1686. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew had guaranteed a bill of exchange for £20 of his son-in-law Francis Blake of Moyne, County Mayo by way of Thomas Clark, of London, merchant. Despite the bill being accepted by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew on 28 July 1686, a month later he had still not paid the amount to John Brown. John Brown requested that both Francis Blake of Moyne and Martin Blake Fitz Andrew be held responsible for the amount of the bill of exchange and for any and all sums incurred in recovering this amount.\(^9\)

---


\(^8\) Martin Blake of Cummer, gent to Robuck French of Cloghballymore, Co. Galway, gent. Mortage for £600 of Ballyglyoonene, Ardnasodan and Tarmon, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway, 2 Nov. 1686 (M6931/41).

Various recommendations were made early in James II’s reign to deal with the land settlement but the birth of James II’s son in June 1688 brought things to a head leading to James’s eventual flight to the continent. Louis XIV, sensing an opportunity to disrupt William of Orange’s war effort on the continent, pressed James to return, which he did, landing at Kinsale on 12 March 1689. The land question was the preeminent concern for the majority of the people of Ireland and this, as well as his desperate financial situation, forced James to summon a parliament even before the fighting had begun. Meeting on 7 May, it had a Catholic majority and proceeded to pass a declaratory act, proclaiming that the English parliament had no power to legislate for Ireland. While James was able to block the repeal of Pynings’ law he was unable to do the same for the repeal of the *Acts of Settlement and Explanation*, though it took the threat of the withdrawal of support from him for him finally to acquiesce, the act restored the lands to those who held them in 1641, extinguishing all land titles based on the *Acts of Settlement and Explanation*. Those dispossessed were to be compensated out of confiscated land, but its implementation was delayed until after the war.\(^{10}\) This would have represented nothing short of a Catholic reconquest of Ireland. James himself was not to be left empty handed as he was to be allocated Lord Kingston’s ancient estates.\(^{11}\) As leading figures in the Catholic ‘new interest’ the representatives for County Galway in the 1689 Parliament opposed the majority who voted to repeal the *Act of Settlement*. Judge Denis Daly, the brother of Charles Daly of Dunsandal, was nearly impeached for advising that those who lost their estates with the repeal of the *Acts of Settlement* could not be expected to fight for James II.\(^{12}\)

The Galway townsmen had built up substantial holdings since the Restoration all depending on the Restoration land settlement, it was no wonder then that they opposed the Jacobite parliament’s repeal of the *Acts of Settlement and Explanation* and that they were interested in a negotiated surrender that would secure them their estates. William III’s overriding concern was to finish the war in Ireland as soon as possible in order to be able to return to the main war against Louis XIV on the continent. This ensured that he and his Generals were willing to make concessions to the Jacobite forces. As early as the winter of 1690-1 the townsmen had played a prominent role in responding to General Godard van Reede, Baron de Ginkel’s peace offers, advising that they would submit if concrete assurances were given over their estates and religious practice. Patrick Sarsfield and the Jacobite commanders quickly put a stop to this line of communication by dismissing the

---


leading members of the peace party and putting Judge Daly under arrest, though the peace party also had little confidence that an Irish Parliament would confirm the concessions made by Ginkel, especially over landownership. After the defeat of the Jacobite forces at Aughrim on 12 July 1691, a group from Galway approached General Ginkel at his camp in Athenry, looking for terms of surrender. Most importantly for the townsmen they secured guarantees for their estates and religion,

Article 8. That the Governour, Constable, Mayor, Sheriffs, Aldermen, Burgesses, Freemen and Natives of Galway, and the inhabitants thereof, or the reputed ones by any former charter, or reputed charter of King James the second granted before his abdication, or any of his ancestors shall have a general pardon of all attainders, outlawries, treasons, felonies, premunires, and all manner of offences committed since the beginning of the late King James’s reign to the date thereof.

Article 9. That all and every of the Garrison, Officers, Governours, Constable, Mayor, Sheriffs, Aldermen, Burgesses, Freemen and Inhabitants aforesaid, shall enjoy and possess their estates real and personal, and all other liberties and immunities, as they held, or ought to have held, under the Acts of Settlement and Explanation; or otherwise by the laws of this Kingdom freely discharged from all Crown Rents, Quit Rents and all other charges to the date hereof.

Article 10. That the names of the Roman Catholic clergy of the town of Galway be given to the General on or before Tuesday next, and that they as well as the laity of the said town; shall have the private exercise of their religion; and that the said clergy shall be protected in their persons and goods.

The gentlemen of the town also retained the right to ‘wear a sword and case of pistols if they think fit’ and the Catholic lawyers ‘free liberty of practice, that they had in King Charles II’s time’. As had happened thirty-nine years earlier the commander of the besieging forces, in this case, the Dutch General Ginkel, was criticised for granting too favourable terms. Ginkel was of the opinion that one month of war would cost more than any resulting forfeitures combined.13

The articles of Galway were signed on 21 July 1691 and those of Limerick on 3 October 1691. The articles signed in 1652 had been ‘set aside’, those signed in 1691, while never fully implemented, were to a certain extent honoured. Certainly, those in regard to landownership were on the whole honoured, though they remained the subject of

13 The Articles of Galway, exactly printed from the letters-patents: wherein they are ratified and exemplified by their Majesties under the Great Seal of England (Dublin, 1692), 5-6; A full and further account of the surrender of Galway, with the articles contained therein (Edinburgh, 1691); Simms, Jacobite Ireland, 190-2, 231-4; Simms, ‘The war of the two kings’, 504; Simms, ‘Williamite Forfeitures’, 29, 51; J.G. Simms, The Williamite Confiscation in Ireland, 1690-1703 (London, 1956), 26-8, 66.
controversy for several years before any claims were heard. Again there were problems getting the articles agreed with the governments in Dublin and London, not to mention passed through the Parliaments in Dublin and London. Both Ginkel and William III generally tried to honour the articles but were under pressure from the Protestant Parliament in Dublin. Ultimately William III’s intentions in Ireland as in England mattered little, as his one overriding concern was to raise money to enable him to continue the war on the continent. 

iii. Martin Blake Fitz Peter and Williamite Galway

'In compassion to their great losses of which your petitioners had a great share being out of their estates during the late troubles, and their personal estates consum’d by the armys, and your petitioners estates being new estates were dispossessed thereof by the pretended act of repeal'

After the surrender of Galway in 1691 for a Catholic to even leave the town required the permission of the local authorities, for a Catholic to remove himself, his family and his possessions out of the town and to move to their rural property in County Galway or elsewhere in Connacht required the permission of the authorities in Dublin and their explicit orders to the authorities in Galway to allow the removal of persons or goods from the town. Conditions for the native merchants became increasingly difficult with the mass quartering of soldiers, as well as their wives and families, on the Catholic population. The exodus of the Catholic families from the town worried the new authorities to such an extent that fearing the depopulation of the town, the reconstituted Protestant corporation assembled, on 3 April 1693, in order to address the matter. The corporation forbade the granting of passes to any inhabitant wishing to leave the town but in a conciliatory gesture ordered that measures be taken to control the conduct of the garrison and ‘prevent their outrageous conduct towards the town’s people’. Appeals to the Dublin administration were still successful and were necessary for any Catholic merchant retiring to the country who wished to take even his ‘bedding and household goods’ with him.

---

15 Petition of Sir Robuck Lynch and other artificemen of Galway, with orders and reports, June-July 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 2/119/2).
16 Petition of Robert French Fitz Mathew of Galway & permission granted by lord lieutenant viscount Sydney, 16 Sept. 1692; petition of Anthony French Fitz Peter of Galway & permission granted by lord lieutenant Sydney, 20 Mar. 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 1/5/6 & 55).
18 Petition of Mark Lynch, late of Galway, merchant & permission granted by lord lieutenant viscount Sydney, 12 June 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 1/5/72).
A corporation by-law of 1696 explicitly prohibited anyone except freemen to keep a shop in Galway or the liberties thereof, except on market days, seemingly the final nail in the coffin for the Catholic merchants of Galway but again in 1705 the Corporation ordered all Catholic shopkeepers before the council to show why they should not pay quarterage. The Catholic merchants of Galway were continuously thrown out of the town from the 1650s on but they always returned. Their numbers and wealth ensured they were indispensable to the economic health of the town. This ensured that even the most rabid anti-Papist official within the town had to face reality and deal with them at some level.

At an advanced age, whether the war had anything to do with the death of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew on 8 August 1691 is unknown. The death on the same day, 21 September 1691, of Peter Blake Fitz Martin and his wife Sybilla, is more suspicious. Martin Blake Fitz Peter was granted letters of administration for his grandfather Martin Blake Fitz Andrew in 1691. He spent much of the next decade securing the estate on a local level and also succeeded in getting his grandfather found within the articles of Galway.

Martin Blake Fitz Peter was involved with the other claimants in petitions to the administrations in Dublin and London seeking to be found entitled to the articles of Galway. A petition of sixty-nine persons who claimed benefit of the articles of Galway, including Martin Blake Fitz Peter, was taken into consideration by the lord lieutenant, Henry, viscount Sydney on 9 June 1693. The petitioners all claimed to be within the articles of Galway but admitted that as the hearings to determine this had been deferred, none of them, at that time, had been adjudged to be entitled to the articles but they stood ready to prove themselves comprehended within the articles. Nevertheless, they quoted the ninth article of Galway, guaranteeing them their real and personal estates free from all crown rent, quit rents and all other taxes to the date of the signing of the articles. They claimed the King had further remitted the quit rents for 1692, ‘in compassion to their great losses’. The petitioners emphasised that as their estates were all ‘new estates’ they would have all been dispossessed by the act of repeal enacted by the parliament of James II and

---

19 Hardiman, 163-7, 221.
20 Copy will of Alderman Andrew Blake Fitz Patrick of Galway, 20 Nov. 1624, and prerogative grant 9 Feb. 1630 (M6935/T17171); Blake, II, 211, 214; A. Vicars (ed.), Index to the prerogative wills of Ireland (Dublin, 1897), 38.
21 M6935/66; Blake, II, 215.
22 Petition of Sir Robuck Lynch and other Articlemen of Galway, with orders and reports, June-July 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 2/119/1-2); Petition to Henry Lord Viscount Sydney, lord lieutenant of Ireland and the privy council from articlemen of Galway, June 1693 (P.R.I. rep. D.K. 57, 480).
23 The document is damaged, obscuring a number of names. The first name is missing for this particular Blake, all that is visible is ‘Blake of Cumer’, but there can be no doubt this is Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Cumer.
24 Eoin Kinsella numbers the petitioners as 67, seemingly discounting two named wives, but as they would not have been named in a petition without good reason there would appear to be no reason to discount them (Kinsella, ‘Col. John Brown’, 86).
25 The Articles of Galway, article 9.
that they had all suffered great losses in quartering not only the English army but also the Irish army before them. The commissioners of the revenue had demanded four and a half years’ quit rent but the articlemen asked for a compromise of only one year’s quit rent.\textsuperscript{26}

The petition was referred to a committee of the privy council on 9 June.\textsuperscript{27} The committee confirmed the ninth article remitted all crown rents, quit rents and all other taxes to the date of the signing of the articles and so advised that they should be discharged from the payment of the rents up to that date. The committee also confirmed the truth of the petitioners’ allegations about the army, reporting that the English army foraged upon their corn both before and after the perfection of the articles, whereby they were deprived of any benefit from their estates. In regards to the King’s proclamation of 7 July 1692, by which he forgave the quit rent and hearth tax arrears of his ‘loving subjects’ due at Lady-day 1692 since the petitioners had taken the oath of allegiance they left it to the lord lieutenant and privy council’s discretion.\textsuperscript{28}

The lord lieutenant and privy council further referred the matter to the commissioners of the revenue to see whether the petitioners should have to pay the year’s rent or if they could pay it in four payments.\textsuperscript{29} The revenue commissioners had given the rent rolls to their collectors in Connacht and Clare in order to recoup all rent on land held by Catholics, taking no account of any articles of surrender. They accepted that anyone found within the articles of Galway would be excused from all arrears up to the signing of the articles but that in their opinion two years rent was still due since the signing of the articles. The only compromise they were willing to make was to receive one full years’ quit rent at each subsequent gale day, instead of the normal half years rent due, until the full two years’ rent was paid in its entirety.\textsuperscript{30} The lords justices, Sir Charles Porter and Sir Cyril Wyche, and the privy council accepted the revenue commissioners report and ordered the commissioners to give directions to their collectors in Connacht to act accordingly.\textsuperscript{31}

The petitioners were able to attain strict observance of the articles of Galway but no more, despite not being formally found within the articles of Galway until the late 1690s the Williamite officials in Ireland clearly acted on the assumption of the good faith of the king’s, and of his generals’, word in Ireland. While the government clearly accepted that the petitioners had lost all profits from their estates for long periods before and after the signing

---

\textsuperscript{26} Petition of Sir Robuck Lynch and other Articlemen of Galway, with orders and reports, June-July 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 2/119/1-2).

\textsuperscript{27} Order of reference to Committee of Board, 9 June 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 2/119/2).

\textsuperscript{28} Report of Committee, 13 June 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 2/119/3); Proclamation, 7 July 1692 (\textit{The Proclamations of Ireland}, ii, 297-8).

\textsuperscript{29} Order of reference to the commissioners of the revenue, 19 June 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 2/119/3-4).


\textsuperscript{31} Order of the lords justices and council, 10 July 1693 (N.A.I., Wyche papers, 2/119/4).
of the articles, if it was not strictly noted in the articles of surrender they felt no obligation to oblige the petitioners in their attempt to recoup some of their losses. The King’s two proclamations discharging tax arrears due, the first of 3 March 1692 was explicitly for the benefit of his Protestant subjects, while the second of 7 July 1692 was for the benefit of his ‘loving subjects of the kingdom of Ireland’, were taken by the commissioners of the revenue to in no way encompass the Catholic petitioners claiming benefit of the articles of Galway. The loss of the majority, if not all, or their revenue from their estates for the period of the war as well as for a long time after, while at the same time being forced to pay taxes on unproductive land for at least two years after the war, left Martin Blake Fitz Peter and the other articlemen heavily encumbered, and forced them to rely on whatever reserves of cash they retained.

Throughout the 1690s the various governors of Ireland were instructed that the articles of surrender granted ‘be constructed according to their strict meaning upon all questions or doubts which may arise, without allowing any favour to the persons comprehended in them, or extending them further than in justice and honour you are obliged to do’. A number of hearings took place in 1694 but the majority of the hearings under the articles of Galway were delayed as a result of disputed interpretation of the articles, particularly over the wording of articles eight and nine, which guaranteed the estates of the garrison and inhabitants of Galway. The question was whether this extended to inhabitants who were not actually in the town at the time of the capitulation, though several claimants were granted royal pardons, despite their absence from Galway town. In June one of the lords justices of Ireland, Henri de Massue, Marquis de Ruvigny, Earl of Galway confirmed that, ‘nous avons déjà déclaré au conseil la décision du roi dans son conseil sur les deux articles de la capitulation de Galway’. Nevertheless, by August William III’s decision had to be re-
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32 Proclamation, 3 Mar. 1692; Proclamation, 7 July 1692 (The Proclamations of Ireland, ii, 291, 297-8).
34 N.A.I., Wyche papers, 2/106-118; N.L.I., MS 174.
35 King’s letter declaring the eighth and ninth articles of Galway to extend only to freemen and natives of the said town, 23 Apr. 1697 (P.R.O.N.I., Annesley MSS, xxvii, 159 [microfilm, N.L.I. p.264]); Sir William Trumbull to the lords justices of Ireland, Whitehall, 6 May 1697 (C.S.P.D. 1697, 144); Simms, ‘Williamte forfeitures’, 133-41.
36 Lord Galway to Mr Vernon, Dublin Castle, 15 June 1697 (N.A.U.K., State Papers Ireland 63/359/20 [microfilm, N.L.I. p.3275]).
sent to the lords justices of Ireland as it was still being queried and it was reported that the King’s instructions had not been received in Ireland.  

Martin Blake Fitz Peter was not taken into consideration until the second series of adjudications sitting from 27 October 1697 to 1 September 1699. Claimants were required to produce three, sometimes four, witnesses, one of whom a Protestant. Martin Blake of ‘Russiney (for his grandfather Martin Blake deceased)’ was adjudged within the Galway articles on 17 January 1698 by the court of claims, he was one of the 124 beneficiaries of the articles of Galway, and one of the 141 claims from County Galway allowed under the various articles, nearly all from one of the families of the ‘tribes of Galway’. Many more Catholics retained their estates under one of the articles of surrender but left no record of their claim, of the 124 beneficiaries of the articles of Galway almost two-fifths were never declared so before the court of claims but assumed their protection. The artificemen of Galway were never deprived of their estates and the majority were never even outlawed. More than 500,000 profitable acres were restored or protected by the articles. All this was consistent with William III’s directions to deal with the articles ‘according to the strict meaning and intention of them upon all questions or doubts’.  

Martin Blake Fitz Peter moved quickly on the death of his grandfather to consolidate his interests. He married, on 28 November 1691, Margaret, daughter of Edmund French of Boyle Abbey, County Roscommon, brother of Dominick French of Dungar (Frenchpark), County Roscommon. She brought a jointure of £700. Martin and Edmund enacted two deeds on the marriage day to settle this and the portions for future children. This was secured by a bond of £1,000 passed by Edmund. Having been left ready money by his grandfather, Martin was able to immediately pay off the portions of his surviving brother and three sisters. He was thus able to secure his whole estate through the fluctuating aftermath of the War of the Two Kings. 

Estates were made of more than lands held in fee simple and the Blakes of Ballyglunin rebuilt their fortunes after the Restoration by more than landholding and trade.

---

37 Charles Talbot, duke of Shrewsbury to the lords justices of Ireland, Whitehall, 3 Aug. 1697 (N.A.U.K., State Papers 67/2/176 [microfilm, N.L.I. p.4027]).
38 J.G. Simms, ‘Irish Jacobites’, Anal. Hib., xxii (1960) 106; Simms, ‘Williamite Forfeitures’, 91-2, 94, 96-7, 105-6, 132-3; Simms, Williamite Confiscation, 72; Kinsella, ‘Col. John Brown’, 28, 87-9. [The previous figure of those benefiting from the Articles of Galway was Simms’s 78, this has been revised by Kinsella to 124, this presumably distorts the total claims from Co. Galway under both articles given by Simms as 141, however as this is the best available figure it has been left as is].
39 Instructions for the lords justices of Ireland, 23 Apr. 1697 (N.A.U.K., State Papers Ireland 67/2/149 [N.L.I. microfilm p.4027]).
40 Marriage settlement on marriage of Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Cummer, gent and Margaret, daughter of Edmond French of Abbyboyle, Co. Roscommon, merchant, 28 Nov. 1691 (M6931/46); Edmond French of Abbyboyle, Co. Roscommon, merchant to Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Cummer, gent, bond in £1000, 28 Nov. 1691 (M6931/48); M9635/66/3; Burke, Landed Gentry, 246.
41 M6935/66.
The ready money Martin Blake was left by his grandfather made him an exception at the time, where cash was in short supply. This had been the same in his grandfather’s time and enabled Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to serve as in effect a banker to his extended family, and indeed anyone who supplied good security. This is seen most clearly in the claim of Martin Blake Fitz Peter to the trustees for the sale of estates forfeited in 1688.

William III made numerous grants of the estates forfeited from the War of the Two Kings to his favourites and supporters, the majority of whom were foreigners, whether Dutch or French. Sixty per cent of the land granted was divided among seven foreigners. The English Parliament for its part was keen to see some payback for funding the war in Ireland, though xenophobia and dislike of the courtiers played its part. This resulted in a prolonged struggle throughout William’s reign over the right to dispose of the forfeited estates. The House of Commons ultimately prevailed, passing the *Act of Resumption* in 1700, whereby all of William’s grants were revoked. They were purchased primarily by those already resident in Ireland who consolidated their estates. Anyone who claimed an interest in a forfeited estate had to enter their claim by 10 August 1700, being supported by three or more credible witnesses, in all 3,140 claims were submitted and 1,861 were allowed in whole or in part, the majority not for the restoration of estates but for mortgages, jointures, maintenance and debts.42

On 8 February 1683, William Burke of Carrowntryla, County Galway mortgaged land in the Barony of Ballymoe, County Galway to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew for £110 (see above Chapter 3.iv and Appendix Table viii). The following year William mortgaged further land for £80. William found it difficult to meet these obligations and so entered into another bond, on 3 April 1687, granting a rent charge for three years of £74 1s. 3d. to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew. Both mortgages were held by deeds of lease and release which could only be redeemed by the payment of the principal sum involved in each mortgage as well as the full arrears due of the yearly interest at ten per cent. William remained in possession of these lands as tenant, he therefore was obliged to pay to the Ballyglunin Blakes both the interest on the mortgages as well as the rent on the mortgaged land he occupied, until May 1690, when he was attainted and outlawed for treason. As a result the lands were confiscated.

Martin Blake Fitz Peter in 1701 made a claim to the trustees for the sale of estates forfeited in 1688 setting forth his case to the lands mentioned, listing the mortgages of 1683 and 1684, continuing,

---

42 Simms, ‘Williamite Forfeitures’, 160, 175, 183, 230-1, 280, 283, 285, 325; *A list of the claims as they are entred with the trustees at Chichester House on College Green Dublin, on or before the tenth of August, 1700* (Dublin, 1701).
That said William Burke remained in possession of all said premises as tenant until May, 1690, since when he paid no rent therefore; that said Martin Blake of Cummer died in 1691, and was adjudged within the benefit of the articles of Galway; that Peter Blake was his eldest son and heir, and died soon afterwards; that the claimant Martin Blake is the son and heir of said Peter Blake, and grandson and heir of Martin Blake of Cummer, deceased; that said William Burke was attainted and outlawed for treason; the claimant prays that his title to said premises as mortgagee may be preserved from forfeiture.\(^{43}\)

**Table 4.i: Report on claim of Martin Blake Fitz Peter to trustees for the sale of the forfeited estates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Owed to Martin Blake Fitz Peter</th>
<th>Deducted from money owed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 &amp; 8 Feb.1683 Mortgage</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on principal due 1 Nov. 1691 - 1 Nov. 1701</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from Mrs Burke 1691-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent received by claimant out of Carrowntryla let to Edmond Crow</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total due out of 7 & 8 Feb. 1683 mortgage: £125

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Owed to Martin Blake Fitz Peter</th>
<th>Deducted from money owed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 &amp; 12 June 1684 Mortgage</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest due to Nov. 1701</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent received from Constantine Mitchell out of Levally</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total due out of 11 & 12 June 1684 mortgage: £150

**Total due to claimant: £275**

Source: Report on claim of Martin Blake Fitz Peter, 1701, claim no. 801 (P.R.O.N.I., Annesley MS 19, Trustees for the Sale of Forfeited Estates. Entry of reports on claims 3, f. 138 [microfilm, N.L.I. p.263])

The trustees ordered a report be made on the claim of Martin Blake Fitz Peter on 6 February 1701. It took until 16 December 1702 for William Spry to give his report on what was due to him (see Table 4.i). Spry confirmed the two mortgages made by William Burke to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and that the interest in the mortgages descended on the death of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to his son Peter Blake Fitz Martin and on his death to his son Martin Blake Fitz Peter but found that there existed various charges on the lands concerned.

\(^{43}\) The claim of Martin Blake of Rusheens, Co. Galway, gentleman (Claim No. 801, Book G, fols. 137-139, Custom House Collection, printed in Blake, II, 290); Mortgage, William Burke of Carrowntryla, Co. Galway to Martin Blake of Cummer, 8 Feb. 1683 (M6931/38); Deed of rent charge, William Burke of Carrowntryla, Co. Galway, to Martin Blake of Cummer, 3 Apr. 1687 (M6931/43); A list of the claims as they are entred … on or before the tenth of August, 1700, 87.
and he deducted all interest for the period of the war. Despite the fact that Martin Blake Fitz Peter claimed that he had received no rent on the premises since May 1690, William Spry found that, making allowance for the war, William Burke’s wife had paid the interest on the mortgages from November 1691 up to May 1695, during which time she had continued to occupy the majority of the land concerned. In an attempt to recoup some of the money owed, Martin Blake Fitz Peter had leased parts of the mortgaged land to other parties but as a result any rent received by Martin Blake Fitz Peter was deducted from the principal and interest owed, in direct violation of usufruct possession that the initial mortgages were taken out under. There was also no mention of the rent due as the Burkes continued to occupy parts of the mortgaged land. In total Martin Blake Fitz Peter was found to be owed £275 out of the two mortgages. The claim was noted as being allowed by the trustees but in actual fact what Martin Blake Fitz Peter received out of the two mortgages was such a partial, and absolutely bare minimum, amount as to negate to a large extent the trustees’ finding in his favour. The conventions in general of landholding, of mortgages and of business dealings in Ireland in the seventeenth century were ignored by the trustees.

The same lands which had been mortgaged to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew were sold to John Bourke by the trustees on 31 June 1703, the estate that his father had forfeited. He purchased 441 acres in fee simple for £200. The enrolments of the trustees’ deeds of sale also detail William’s estate of 580 acres settled on John for life, John claimed for this before the trustees and had his claim allowed. By the trustees’ decision the mortgage was fully recognised but with the large caveat that the usufruct usage of the mortgaged land was not recognised by the trustees. Money lent by his grandfather twenty years earlier benefited Martin as he was attempting to re-establish his financial security, but what he received was far less than what he theoretically should have received, that is, the ownership of the mortgaged land. The trustees only allowed claims relating to the post-war years, making 1691 a new origin date as 1641 had functioned half a century earlier. The Restoration settlement obliterated the vast majority of financial transactions pre-1660, the Williamite land settlement was conducted on a similar basis, though on a much-reduced scale.

The Williamite Confiscations, while on a vastly smaller scale than the Cromwellian Confiscations, reduced the proportion of land held by Catholics even further. J.G. Simms

---

45 I.R.C.R., 382; Books of Survey and Distribution, Galway, 113, 164, 167, 292, 296-8, 302; Simms, ‘Williamite Forfeitures’, 390, 400 [The Books of Survey and Distribution list James Burke as well as John Burke as the purchaser of various parts of the estate, whereas I.R.C.R. lists John Burke, eldest son of William Burke of Kilcnogher, Co. Galway as the purchaser. In the Books of Survey and Distribution index p.348, the land purchased by James is listed as ‘Bourke, James (?recte John)’ the lands purchased are the same so it confirms that this is the same person].
calculated the decrease as being from 59% in 1641 to 22% in 1688 to 14% in 1703. While Galway retained one of the highest proportions of Catholic ownership it still fell from holding at least three-quarters of the land in 1641, to 50-100% of land held in 1688, when it was only in Galway that Catholics held the majority of the land, to 25-49% in 1703. The articles of Galway and Limerick facilitated this, with about half the land remaining under Catholic ownership in 1703 being held by persons adjudged within one or other of the articles, a further fifth accounted for by claims made to the trustees for the sale of estates forfeited in 1688 or pardons. Seven-eighths of the land lost by Catholics in Galway consisted of the Clanricard estate. An act of parliament vested the estate in trustees for the benefit of the Protestant children of John Bourke, Baron Bophin, 9th earl of Clanricard. Only one-eighth was actually forfeited.47

Simms’s figures have only seriously been challenged recently, though some small lapses have been teased out.48 Kevin McKenny has completed a computer analysis of the *Books of Survey and Distribution*, which amends Simms’s figures to show Catholic landownership in 1641 at 66% and then by c.1675 at 29%. On a county level, he has shown that Galway in 1641 had 1,002 Catholic landholders, owning 798,772 acres representing 95% of the county’s land, whereas by c.1675 there were 369 Catholic landholders holding 584,846 acres representing 70% of the land in the county. He has also broken down the amount of land forfeited and unforfeited in the 1650s, in Galway, this represented 573,867 acres forfeited equalling 68% of the county, 222,368 unforfeited equalling 26% of the county, 11,320 acres undisposed equalling 1% and 33,489 acres unknown 4%. William Burke, earl of Clanricard is shown as holding 147,546 acres c.1675, the aristocrat with the third largest landholding in the country, only James Butler, duke of Ormond and Donagh MacCarthy, earl of Clancarthy, held more.49 However, it must be noted that McKenny has only published the results of his research without going into detail about his methodology, and given the limitations inherent in the sources (discussed above in Chapter 1.i), a note of caution must remain about such definitive percentages.

The introduction of the penal laws in the 1690s and early eighteenth century led to a steady decline in Catholic landownership over the next century, primarily as a result of Catholic landowners conforming to the Established Church in order to safeguard their estate. No firm figures exist for this decline until the nineteenth century, the best available as explicitly quoted by J.G. Simms was the estimate made in 1776 by Arthur Young of a

Catholic landholding of five per cent. He was quoting from Young, ‘The last forfeitures were incurred in that war which stripped and banished James II. Upon the whole nineteen twenties of the kingdom changed hands from catholic to protestant. The lineal descendants of great families, once possessed of vast property, are now to be found all over the kingdom in the lowest situation’. From this, it is not even clear if Young was referring to the land that changed hands with the Williamite forfeitures or over the next century. This figure sometimes gets lumped in with Simms’s firm statistical figures for 1641, 1688 and 1703 but was simply the best available to him at the time to get some illustration of the next hundred years, as it remains to us now. As S.J. Connolly has noted ‘that hardly supports the weight placed on it by repeated quotation’, yet until there are firmer figures for Catholic landownership in the later eighteenth century, it will undoubtedly be requoted. As Breandán O’Bric showed for landownership changes in the early years of the seventeenth century so it remained through the century, the biggest losers were the small landholders, those with money and influence were able to survive at a much greater rate. The major element this does not reflect is the substantial land held by Catholics on long leases, this is much more difficult to tease out, reflected later in the eighteenth century in the invective hurled at ‘middlemen’.

iv. Management of the estate, 1685-1737

‘…my grandfather [Martin Blake Fitz Peter] very foolishly, to save trouble, being indolent [settlement]…and from indolence lost some fractions and sold another.’

In 1691 Martin Blake Fitz Peter settled 1,699 acres on himself as well as a stone house in Middle St, Galway town and his interest in half of three mills on the West Bridge of Galway. After passing his marriage articles and getting his grandfather found within the articles of Galway, there was still his extended family to worry about. He retained a power of encumbrance of £1,200 and retained sufficient funds from his grandfather with which he

---

50 Simms, Williamite Forfeitures, 338-41; Simms, Williamite Confiscation, 160.
51 Arthur Young, A Tour in Ireland, 1776-1779 (2 vols, London, 1780), ii, 133.
53 Connolly, Religion, law and power, 147 fn. 10.
55 State of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond of Ballyglunin’s situation relative to his real estate, July 26th 1773 (M6935/66/4-5).
56 Marriage settlement on marriage of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin and Mary French, 27 Mar. 1724 (M6931/64a&b).
immediately paid off his brothers’ and sisters’ portions. Even after taking care of his brothers and sisters he still had £1,400 to £1,500 on hand to settle on his own children, three daughters and a younger son. He gave his younger son (Major) Martin Blake his child’s portion and sent him to the West Indies.\(^{57}\) (see Chapter 8.ii)

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s eldest daughter Margaret married Joseph Lynch of Ballycurrin, County Mayo, in 1672, with a £300 portion. Sometime after the death of Martin’s wife Ann, his daughter Margaret and her husband contested parts of Ann’s will, in relation to the marriage articles of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and Ann, and the inheritance Margaret was entitled to under these documents. As was common at the time, an attempt was made to find an amicable resolution by the appointment in 1688 of arbiters agreeable to both parties with whom both parties deposited bonds for £1000 to secure their adherence to the arbiters’ judgement.\(^{58}\)

Twenty years later Joseph Lynch’s eldest son Maurice was in a similar disagreement with his Blake of Ballyglunin relations. Whether it was the influence of the creeping accumulation of penal laws, the fact that Martin Blake Fitz Andrew had died intestate, or the general unsettled state of the country, Maurice saw a chance and ‘made a demand’ of Martin Blake Fitz Peter, in relation to sums he felt himself entitled to under the will of his mother Margaret. In Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s ‘State of Martin Blake of Ballygluin’s situation relative to his real estate, July 26\(^{th}\) 1773’ where a future threat to the Ballygluin estate made seventy years later, led Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s grandson to lay out in detail the land transactions, marriage articles and bonds on the estate, he gives his view that his grandfather ‘very foolishly, to save trouble, being indolent, gave him £250 and got his and his brothers’ discharges in full in 1709’.\(^{59}\) Martin Blake Fitz Peter passed bonds totalling £500 to secure this agreement on 22 April 1709. Later the same year Maurice’s brother and sister, Ignatius Lynch and Joan Lynch claimed they too were similarly entitled to part of the inheritance. In this instance, Martin Blake Fitz Peter was able to get Maurice to take responsibility for any amounts his brother and sister were held to be owed. Maurice Lynch Fitz Joseph passed Martin Blake Fitz Peter a bond of £400 to secure his discharge from any liability in the disagreement between the siblings.\(^{60}\)

This occurred between the enactment of the 1704 and 1709 acts to prevent the further growth of popery and gives a clear indication that the strict application of these laws were in many ways operating at different level for the ordinary landowner, even a fairly

\(^{57}\) M6935/66/3.

\(^{58}\) Joseph Lynch of Ballycurrin, Co. Mayo, esq to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, bond of £1000, 4 Aug. 1688 (M6931/45).

\(^{59}\) M6935/66/4-5, 15.

\(^{60}\) Maurice Lynch of Ballycurrin, Co. Mayo, gent to Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Rusheens, Co. Galway, bond in £400, 28 Oct. 1709 (M6931/50/a&b).
substantial one like the Blakes of Ballyglunin, in comparison to the large aristocratic families. Local politics and local justice did not necessarily follow the letter of the law as it supposedly did in Dublin. The resort of a Catholic landowner like Martin Blake Fitz Peter to the upper courts of law, never mind the House of Lords in order to press his legal rights, was simply unrealistic from both a monetary as well as confessional standpoint. The influence of the penal laws on this stratum of Catholic Irish society was on the day to day relationships, where a brother-in-law and the brother-in-law’s brothers could make a claim, a demand, even a hint of future trouble on an estate, however tenuous, and see the landowner pay out. This was before the 1709 act even created the ‘discoverer’.61

In this period from settling the estate on himself in the early 1690s to the enactment of the acts to prevent the further growth of popery in 1704 and 1709, Martin Blake Fitz Peter alienated part of the estate he had settled on himself. This was the lands of Brittas in the Barony of Kilmaine, County Mayo which his grandfather, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, had acquired in 1669 from Mathew Martin of Galway.62 Martin Blake Fitz Peter sold Brittas to John Vesey (1638-1716), Church of Ireland Archbishop of Tuam, who in turn sold the lands on to Mr Stewart.63 His grandson Martin Blake Fitz Edmond gave the reason for this that it was ‘from indolence’ he lost some of the estate and sold other parts, despite being under settlement and being only tenant for life in equity. Indolence would appear to be an unlikely reason. The pressure of getting letters of administration for his grandfather, getting him found under the articles of Galway, the claims on the estate from near relatives and setting up his children resulted in an unrelenting pressure on his resources, despite being left in a comfortable position by his grandfather, funds had to be found. Disposing of part of the estate was an obvious solution, if somewhat dangerous as it opened up all manner of legal difficulties if ever challenged.64 The access to law and lawyers was vital to these transactions. Galway had a rich legal tradition and numerous members of the extended Blake family were lawyers.65

Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s eldest son Edmond married Mary, daughter of John French of Rahassane, County Galway on 14 December 1724. Edmond was not party to these articles as he was not then of age, being only nineteen years old, so further articles had to

62 Mathew Martin of Galway, burgess to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, 17 Sept. 1669 (M6931/9&10); M6936/1/28A.
64 M6935/66/5.
be enacted in August 1726.\textsuperscript{66} Martin Blake Fitz Peter died intestate on 6 September 1737. He had no reason to make a will as the estate was already settled on Edmond and he died £1,000 in debt. This debt was a legal contrivance to forestall any attempt on the estate on his death, and indeed his son Edmond honoured the payment of it, though he had no legal compulsion to do so, Martin being bare tenant for life.\textsuperscript{67}

**Map 4.i: Division of Tarmon as desired by Martin Blake Fitz Peter before sheriff and jury, 1715**

Source: M6935/65/2

Martin Blake Fitz Peter only got back into the land market in 1711, when he enacted his first lease and added to land he already held in Rusheens, Barony of Clare, but primarily

\textsuperscript{66} Settlement on marriage of Edmond Blake and Mary French, 27 Mar. 1724 (M6931/64/a&b); M6935/66/5-7; M6935/65/13.

\textsuperscript{67} M6933/66/5; Blake, \textit{II}, 215.
he leased his own land to other parties. The expansion of their leasehold interest would have to wait for later on in the century (see Appendix Table xi & xiv). The noteworthy attempts to get a secure handle on the estate began in earnest from mid-century, nevertheless, Martin Blake Fitz Peter inherited an estate on which there were numerous disputes that required careful attention. These disputes ensured that new surveys of various parts of the estate were carried out (see Appendix Table xvi).68 These borders were generally secured by stone walls and witnessed the profound creation of the landscape of Connacht.69

The defects in the surveys of the seventeenth century and the consequent granting of overlapping land and division of townlands into profitable and unprofitable land led to many disagreements. While arbitration seems to have been common during the Restoration, by the early eighteenth century the local grand juries were more commonly used. In 1715 a case was brought to a local jury to decide the division of Tarmon (part of the townland of Bunoghanaun) between; Sir John Kirwan of Castlehacket, a wool merchant head of another Tribal family transplanted from Galway town who built their estate through trade with the West Indies; 70 Brabazon Newcomen of Calliaghstown, County Louth MP for Kilbeggan 1713-14 and 1715-27,71 and Martin Blake Fitz Peter. Ambrose Bodkin, a land surveyor, was directed by the jury to survey the land and to allocate it in proportion to the patents granted in each case.72 Ambrose, in the company of other surveyors, found that under the Strafford Survey Tarmon was judged to contain 210 acres but in reality contained 236 acres. By their patents the three men owned the full 210 acres, breaking down to Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s 105 acres, Sir John Kirwan’s 21 acres, and Brabazon Newcomen’s 84 acres, so he awarded the extra acres in proportion to these holdings, two and a half acres to Sir John Kirwan, ten and a half acres to Brabazon Newcomen and 13 acres to Martin Blake. Tarmon was divided between good arable land to the south, rough and smooth land in the middle and mountainous land to the north, described as ‘a good pastoral dry mountain, intermixed with some stones’, so how these extra acres were divided out was of considerable importance to parties involved. Martin Blake ‘earnestly desired...from the jury and sheriff’ to divide the extra land so that it would be contiguous to their adjoining estates so each would have his proportion of the ‘course

68 Two fragments of a map of Martin Blake’s land in Culleen, Garraun, Ballagh and Rusheens, [n.d., early eighteenth century] (M6932/15).
69 M6933/26/CD, 21; see below Chapter 5.ii.
70 Melvin ‘The Galway tribes as landowners and gentry’, 346; Lynch, The Kirwans of Castlehacket, Ch.1.
71 John Lodge, The Peerage of Ireland (2nd ed., Dublin, 1789), ii, 357; E.M. Johnston-Liik, MPs in Dublin: Companion to History of the Irish Parliament, 1692-1800 (Belfast, 2006), 111. Tallaghstown as per Lodge but Calliaghstown is where the Newcomen family lived in Louth.
72 M6935/65/11.
with the fine land’, in effect a straight line down the middle from north to south, with Martin’s land to the East, Brabazon Newcomen’s to the north and north-west, while Sir John Kirwan held his land to the North-East (see Map 4.i). The jury and sheriff ‘did not think fit to grant’ this ‘but divided the said land by another line which took away about eleven acres of the said Martin Blake’s fee simple land’.

Martin ‘protested against’ this and ‘all other proceedings that would take away any part of his fee simple acres’ but ‘seemed to be satisfied’ to receive the allotted land ‘to avoid trouble with his neighbours’. This was the land to the south, ‘the best or arable part of the land’, so he may have protested the principle of having fee simple land taken from him but must have been quite happy with the outcome.\footnote{Copy of three maps with notes by Ambrose Bodkin, 1715 (M6935/65/1-3).}

v. Conclusion

The Blakes of Ballyglunin played only a peripheral role in the momentous events of the 1690s. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was too old, his grandson Martin Blake Fitz Peter was too young, while Peter Blake Fitz Martin appears to have had little to do with the family’s affairs. Nevertheless, the deaths in quick succession of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and his son Peter Blake Fitz Martin in 1691 left Martin Blake Fitz Peter scrambling to secure the family’s affairs. The vagaries of the 1690s took a heavy toll on the Blakes of Ballyglunin, Martin Blake Fitz Peter, like so many of the articlemen of Galway, spent the best part of a decade attempting to be found within the said articles.

He succeeded in having his grandfather found within the articles and thus secured the Ballyglunin estate. He also succeeded in having his claim heard before the trustees of the forfeited estates. However, their reading of the articles, as well as the pre-1688 mortgages and financial dealings, were so strictly to the letter of the law that as a consequence Martin Blake Fitz Peter failed to see the full benefit of the judgment in his favour. The mortgages his grandfather, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, had entered into had already fallen into default before the war years, and in the normal run of events the family would have become owners of the lands concerned, instead all they could hope to enjoy was the initial principal that was lent plus the interest due from the end of the war. Arrears before the war were not taken into account, and the rent the mortgagor owed to the mortgagee for the privilege of remaining on their own land was not even considered. The fact that a claim was allowed by the trustees of the forfeited estates did not mean that the petitioner enjoyed the full benefit of the claim, the restrictions placed upon this by the severe reading employed by the trustees could negate any benefit even from a successful claim. Contemporary claims by Protestant pamphleteers of the partiality of the trustees in favour...
of Catholic claims or even that Catholics succeeded in claims before the trustees which would not have been allowed by a jury are certainly not borne out by the cases given here.74

The priority of Catholic landowners changed from expanding their estates by purchasing land in fee simple, to gaining advantageous leases of desirable land, preferably adjoining their current holdings. The Act to prevent the further growth of popery prohibited Catholics from taking long leases and it was really only long leases of extensive amounts of land that were drawn up in formal deeds. Leases for lesser periods of time and of small quantities of land were much more informal, at most, being entered in account books used to keep track of individual townlands, where leases, money owed and stock held were all entered into the account books.75 The existence of the few leases entered into by Martin Blake Fitz Peter detailed above and in the appendix does give some example of leases entered into by the lower Catholic gentry of the period.

The restrictions placed on the Catholic merchants of Galway meant that the family moved full time to their rural estate in the immediate aftermath of the War of the Two Kings, first to Rusheens, then Cummer, and finally in the early years of the eighteenth century to Ballyglooneen. For the rest of the first half of the eighteenth century, the family remained centred at Ballyglooneen, where they had erected a house early in the century, while the eldest son and his family remained at the old house at Cummer. It was only with the more relaxed confessional situation in Ireland by mid-century that the family began the move back to Galway town. The family may not have lived in Galway town any longer, despite owning extensive property there, including a house and mills, but they retained their business dealing in the town. Their business there was conducted by way of their extended family, just as their merchant dealings in the West Indies were also conducted by their family who were based there (see Chapter 8).

What is striking is that while his grandfather was quickly able to get back into the land market, Martin was unable to do the same. There was plenty of land available, notably with the sale of parts of Col. John Browne’s vast estate in Mayo and Galway. Up until the 1704 Act to prevent the further growth of popery, Catholics could still purchase land and indeed both Catholics and Protestants purchased parts of Browne’s estate.76 It was complained of in 1701 that the Catholics of Connacht would bid higher for the available land in order to keep their hold on the province.77 However, Martin enacted no lease or even

75 Account book of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, 1727-62 (M6933/16); Account book of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond, 1754-71 (M6933/16).
bond between his marriage settlement in 1691 and a bond to secure a loan in 1706, \(^{78}\) while his first lease was not until 1711.\(^{79}\) As long as Martin remained Catholic simply holding on to the estate was trying enough, adding to it was simply not an option. The attempt by those claiming under the articles of Galway took until 1697 to even start to get the majority of claims heard, this was a considerable drain on the estate. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew had managed to overcome all the obstacles of the Restoration period and managed to thrive. His grandson in much more restrictive circumstances struggled simply to survive. Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s inability to capitalise on the new land market, as his grandfather had after the confiscations of the 1650s, is testament to the new reality the Catholics of Ireland faced.

\(^{78}\) Martin Blake of Rusheens and Richard Lynch Fitz Richard of Galway, to Nicholas Lynch Fitz Ambrose of Galway, 13 Sept. 1706 (M6931/50).

\(^{79}\) Francis Cuffe of Ballinrobe to Martin Blake of Cummer, 16 Apr. 1711 (M6931/54).
Chapter 5
The Management of the Ballyglunin estate 1737-77

‘The distress of this season has left some of my tenants £200 in arrears… I therefore send you enclosed my bill… which you must allow to be as good as any bank note in Ireland. I shall beg it as if the greatest favour that you send me cash for it.’

Dominick Blake to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, 9 Jan. 1771.

i. Introduction

On the death of his father in 1737 Edmond Blake Fitz Martin inherited the Ballyglunin estate. He had already been involved in the management of the estate and in the slowly growing leasehold interest the family were accruing. What had been a slow process in the early years of the century, with so much time spent simply securing the estate, now took on an added impetus. This could only be achieved when the family possessed excess financial means to spend on acquiring leases. This involved small amounts of land on the whole for much of the century, the large-scale accumulation of leasehold acres had to wait. From mid-century, there was a general upturn in these activities but on the whole, it was only from 1778 in the wake of the relaxation of the penal laws against landholding that this took off to any large scale extent. The easing of the penal laws against the Catholic Church and against the practice of the Catholic religion began in earnest by mid-century. However, there is no doubt that seeds of this were sown from the 1730s. The laws against property and professions, on the other hand, remained in force for as long as they were on the statute books. The experience of Catholic landholders and leaseholders as they attempted to expand their holdings and how they accomplished this has been little explored, primarily as the sources available rarely allow anything but a cursory investigation. The Ballyglunin papers have many of the same limitations, nevertheless, they do allow a glimpse of this aspect of Catholic life in eighteenth-century Ireland.

Patrick Melvin in his examination of landed society in Galway has argued that land was held by the gentry of Galway to be of more importance as security for loans and mortgages rather than any specific agricultural value. On the whole, he was referring more to the nineteenth century but also as Galway had the most extensive resident gentry on the island, this, of course, is a broad generalisation. In any case, the Blakes of Ballyglunin did not correspond to this viewpoint. They were the ones who on the whole advanced loans and mortgages to other landowners and their careful cultivation of their estate shows their
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1 Dominick Blake to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, 9 Jan. 1771 (M6936/1/B).
2 Melvin, Estates and Landed Society in Galway, xvi.
marked attention to agricultural earnings. Whether this attention to agricultural activities was as intense as their attention to merchant and banking activities is arguable, but it was certainly not far off. Melvin has also argued that the gentry of Galway were not primarily farmers, that cattle and wool sales simply supplemented their income in the eighteenth century and that rent remained their predominant income, though he acknowledges numerous exceptions where stock raising was vital to their fortunes. This argument has a lot more to do with the religious persuasion of the local gentry and the divergent opportunities available to Catholic and Protestant landowners. It is certainly true that Protestant landlords tended to gain the majority of their income through their rent roll.

The studies done on the local Catholic gentry of Galway the Bellews of Mount Bellew, and the Redingtons of Clarinbridge, as well as the Frenches of Monivea who converted early in the century, have emphasised the importance of stock farming and particularly wool to the successful expansion of their estates during the eighteenth centuries, without, of course, lessening the importance of rental income to all landlords. The experience of the Blakes of Ballyglunin echoes this. This says a lot about the differences between the landowners of Galway both in terms of the extent of landownership and their personal involvement in the management of their estates. The Blakes of Ballyglunin and the Bellews of Mount Bellew were equally heavily involved in the day-to-day running of their estates, and while farming only amounted to one part of their income, it was a vital part.

This chapter examines the experience of the family and their estate from the initial relaxation of religious persecution in the 1730s until the first major Catholic relief act in 1778. It will examine the personal experience of individual family members, how the estate was run, the income streams available and the main financial earnings from the estate. Secondly, the expansion of the estate through a growing leasehold interest will be explored. Finally, how the estate entail and the leasehold estate was improved will be examined, discussing whether this was simply a matter of the normal operation of an estate or whether a Catholic family in the west of Ireland was in any way influenced by the politics of improvement.
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3 Melvin, Estates and Landed Society in Galway, 115.
ii. The Blakes of Ballyglunin’s financial affairs, 1737-77

Prior to his father Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s death in 1737 Edmond Blake Fitz Martin situated himself and his family on the family lands around Rusheens which he preceded to farm. He married Mary, eldest daughter of John French of Rahasane on 14 December 1724. The marriage articles had been set out the previous March, which settled the estate in tail male for the use of Edmond Blake and his issue male, subject to provisions for younger children. The articles were only enacted in 1726 when Edmond came of age. In the early 1730s he had an annual farm income of £200-£300 (see Appendix Table xiii). His farm income came from many sources, butter, oats, corn, malt, beer, rental income and cattle sales, but primarily wool. Whereas in other counties at the period cattle raising, dairying and cereal farming were expanding, in Galway sheep farming expanded and continued to up to the 1750s. Of his annual farm income of £203 in 1731, £141 came from one large transaction disposing of his year’s main wool crop. Smaller amounts of wool were sold throughout the year but were of little significance in comparison to the main wool transaction which represented in any given year for the next twenty years over half his total income from his farms. In 1732 £193 of his annual farm income of £337 was from wool, in 1733 £150 of £206, in 1734 £125 of £191, and in 1735 £96 of £159. His whole year’s accounts depended on this one transaction. He sold his wool to agents in Galway to the highest bidder in that particular year to Alderman Simpson, Mr Martin, Robin Darcy of Tuam, Thomas Lynch, Andrew Lynch, or Thomas Blake of Menlough, eldest son of Sir Walter Blake. This was primarily bought for the Dublin and Cork market, there was no export market from Galway port. Having been the third port in the country in 1664, by the end of the seventeenth century Galway was the seventh and in the eighteenth century the port of Galway went into terminal decline. While the amount of wool Edmond sold rose and fell in any given year, the variations in his income for these years were primarily a result of fluctuations in the price of wool. A stone of wool sold for ten shillings in 1731, increased to ten shillings six pence in 1732 but the price declined dramatically over the next three years, in 1733 markedly reduced to seven shillings two pence and in 1735 again decreased to six shillings per stone.
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6 Marriage articles between Martin Blake of Cummer on behalf of his son Edmond of the first part, John French of Rahasane on behalf of himself and his eldest daughter Mary of the second part, and John Burke of Lismore and Robert French of Derry of the third part, 27 Mar. 1724 (M6931/64/a&b); Abstract of marriage articles, 27 Mar. 1724 (M6935/65/13); Blake, II, 215.
7 Martin Blake of Cummer, deed of settlement, 12 Aug. 1726 (M6931/65); Abstract of deed, 12 Aug. 1726 (M6935/65/13); Abstract of deed of settlement, 13 Aug. 1726 (M6935/65/14).
10 M6935/26/7.
The fluctuations in the price of wool can be seen from Appendix Table xiii, the price collapsed in the early 1730s, from a high of ten shillings six pence in 1732 it dropped to six shillings in 1735 and did not recover fully until 1743. This slump in prices was countrywide, the price in Dublin in 1739 was still only six shillings.\(^{11}\) The 1730s were seen by contemporaries in Ireland as a period of economic crisis, the mid-1730s saw a cyclical slump in prices, though it is also a telling reflection of contemporary difficulties in the period leading up to *bliain an áir*, the great frost and famine of 1740-1.\(^{12}\)

The dramatic drop in wool prices led to a short term, significant upsurge in smuggling by landowners and merchants from Galway during these few years, in particular 1736-7, conducted in addition to, and alongside, their legal trading activity. This has been extensively documented by Louis Cullen, particularly in relation to the kidnapping of the revenue informer Bryan McDonogh from Galway town in 1737.\(^{13}\) McDonogh gave evidence on wool smuggling conducted from Galway before the commissioners of the customs in London at the end of 1736 and returned to Galway on Christmas Eve in order to get corroborative testimony. On 7 January 1737, he was kidnapped by a gang employed by Thomas Blake of Menlough, who had purchased Edmond Blake Fitz Martin’s main wool crop in 1736.\(^{14}\) Over the next four months McDonogh was constantly moved around properties owned by Thomas Blake and his relatives in Counties Galway and Clare until he finally escaped at the end of April. He sought refuge with the garrison at Galway until the case against his kidnappers was heard at the next assize but as the jury, according to McDonogh, were either themselves, or their relations, involved in wool smuggling, they acquitted Thomas Blake and all others involved. McDonogh even alleged that Thomas Blake and his accomplices had bragged to him before and after the trial that they could have murdered twenty persons without fear of the government as they were to be tried by a jury from their own part of the country, ‘as it is in the interest of every one of them that has estates or farms to encourage the running of wool and destroy everybody that takes any step to hinder it’. McDonogh was not a reliable witness, his initial evidence to the customs commissioners most likely arose from an attempt at blackmail and the Irish
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commissioners of the revenue were concerned about his suspicious behaviour but the affair does give an indication of the extent of smuggling for these few years.  

A Martin Blake was prominently involved in both the smuggling and the kidnapping of McDonogh and Louis Cullen has suggested he might have been a member of the Ballyglunin family or of a collateral branch. \(^{15}\) Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Ballyglunin only died on 6 September 1737 and conducted business with Thomas Blake of Menlough’s father Sir Walter Blake, especially in relation to Martin’s younger brother Patrick Blake Fitz Peter’s plantations in the West Indies. \(^{16}\) Sir Walter Blake himself had extensive interests in both Galway and Clare and leased land in both counties, though he lamented to Sir Donough O’Brien earlier in the century that he could not help out with electoral affairs in County Clare as most of his relatives and tenants were unqualified to vote. \(^{17}\) When the local merchants involved in smuggling attempted to bribe the Captain of a revenue sloop they used a local banker, Andrew Lynch, who was intimately involved with the Ballyglunin Blakes’ financial affairs. \(^{18}\) Therefore it is possible Martin Blake Fitz Peter was involved. However, the lack of any evidence from his son’s account book beyond selling wool to Thomas Blake of Menlough, and in particular the consistent amounts of wool sold, with little left over that could have made anything but a minor stake in an illegal smuggling operation, makes him an unlikely suspect. His cousin Martin Blake Fitz Francis of Merlin Park, County Mayo would appear more likely. He conformed twice in 1709 and 1710, according to family tradition to save his estate, though in 1732 Strafford Eyre reported that the friars of Ross had removed from the abbey to Kilroe, County Mayo on his estate. \(^{20}\) He also leased land adjoining the main Ballyglunin estate from Sir William Scawen. \(^{21}\) Thus the involvement of the Ballyglunin Blakes in attempts to maximise their profits from their wool crop, whether by legal or illegal means, cannot be discounted, albeit not by a direct involvement. As the Galway merchants and landowning gentry were a small intermixed group there were very few not involved in the smuggling trade during its short boom in the late 1730s. \(^{22}\)

\(^{15}\) *The Daily Post*, 2 Aug. 1738; Cullen, ‘Galway Smuggling trade’, 7-40; Cullen, ‘Five letters relating to Galway Smuggling in 1737’, 22.

\(^{16}\) Cullen, ‘H.M.S. Spy’, 38.

\(^{17}\) Sir Walter Blake of Menlough, Co. of the town of Galway, bart. to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, bond in £2000, 26 Oct. 1710 (M6931/53); Declaration of Sir Walter Blake, bart. indemnifying Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, 26 Oct. 1710 (M6931/52).

\(^{18}\) John Ainsworth (ed.), *The Inchiquin Manuscripts* (Dublin, 1961), 84, 114.

\(^{19}\) Cullen, ‘H.M.S. Spy’, 38. For Lynch see below.


\(^{22}\) Cullen, ‘Galway smuggling trade’, 22.
Edmond Blake Fitz Martin would not administer for his father, as he feared that this would leave him legally liable for what his father died owing and while he intended standing by his father’s debts, he did not wish to be compelled to do so. As a result he left it to his brother-in-law Andrew Blake of Fartigare (otherwise Castlegrove), County Galway, to administer Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s estate. Andrew Blake was married to Martin’s eldest daughter Sibilla and conformed on 9 December 1727.\(^{23}\) Andrew Blake was still owed half of the £600 marriage portion agreed with Martin. Martin Blake Fitz Peter had passed a deed to Andrew in 1727 assigning to him the power of encumbrance of £500 that Martin retained on his estate, or as much of this as would remain in force on his death, as well as a bill of sale of what stock he would own on his death. Andrew, on Martin’s death, possessed himself of whatever stock Martin had held. It was not until 1742 that Edmond Blake Fitz Martin paid off all that was owed to Andrew out of the marriage portion. Andrew returned the deed of encumbrance with his discharge in full to Edmond, this all being witnessed by Andrew’s eldest son Counsellor Dominick Blake of Fartigare (Castlegrove).\(^{24}\)

After Edmond Blake Fitz Martin succeeded to the estate, his first full year’s accounts for 1738 witnessed a doubling of the amount of wool sold and of his farm income, so he was farming at least half of the Ballyglunin estate prior to his father’s death. Initially he still sold his wool crop locally, in 1738 to Robin Darcy of Tuam.\(^{25}\) The Blakes also functioned as wool buyers for their tenants, taking wool off their tenants at a reduced rate to what the tenants could potentially achieve in Dublin or Cork, if they had the contacts to sell it and means to transport it there, and allowing their tenants the amount off their rents, though scrupulously deducting even the cost of getting the wool weighed.\(^ {26}\)

By 1740 Edmond sold his main wool crop in Dublin to Robin Wainwright of Dublin after what he complained was a dreadful season.\(^ {27}\) The wool crop continued to be sold to Dublin merchants over the next decade, either to agents in Galway, usually at the assize, or directly to merchants in Dublin, Robin Wainwright or John Nickson. The transaction was made earlier in the year and the wool subsequently delivered in late August or September to Dublin. The delivery was made from numerous wool sellers at the one time. The sellers would make up full bags of wool, between their individual crops, to be delivered en masse to Dublin. Affairs in Dublin or Cork were usually conducted by a local resident agent, who

\(^{23}\) O’Byrne, *The Convert Rolls*, 297.
\(^{24}\) M6935/66/6-7.
\(^{25}\) M6933/26/8.
\(^{26}\) M6933/26/23.
\(^{27}\) M6933/26/38.
was generally a member of the extended family, though Edmond’s younger sons were also constantly in the cities dealing with either the woollen business or wider financial affairs.  

In 1750 Edmond’s main wool crop was sold to John Hearn of Cork. By mid-century, John Hearn was noted as a linen-draper at the sign of The Roll of Holland in Hammond’s Marsh to the west of the city and was still trading there on his death in March 1770. Cork had established itself as an important port in the Atlantic trade early in the century. Wool, in particular, was sourced by the merchants of Cork from regions well outside their hinterland. Connacht with its extensive sheep-walks proved an important source of raw materials for Cork’s expanding foreign trade. The main wool crop for the rest of the decade continued to be sold to merchants in Cork (see Appendix Table xiii). Lesser, though growing, amounts were still sent to Anthony Lynch or Augustine Bodkin in Dublin, where a slightly better price was to be had.

The access to such funds in Dublin and Cork was a useful convenience for the family, although it meant that the actual sums returning to Galway were usually much less than the total they received for their wool. In January 1752 Edmond Blake Fitz Martin was able to draw £88 in Dublin of what he called his ‘wool money’ on Anthony Lynch, having sold 269 stone of wool to him for £143, in order to allow his eldest son Martin buy a watch, some silk, buckles and other fineries in order to fit him out for his newly married life in Galway town (see Chapter 7.iv). Later in 1752 only £72 out of the total of £136 paid by Augustine Bodkin in Dublin was actually received by Edmond. The rest was drawn on Bodkin in Dublin to pay for various expenses there, including an apothecary bill for his youngest son Peter. Both Leinster and Cork saw the expansion of worsted yarn spinning for the English market, this as well as the growth of Ballinasloe’s great wool fairs ensured that there was a more stable market for farm produce from Connacht and a consequent rise in prices.

Wool fairs at Ballinasloe became notable by the 1750s and by the 1760s, Ballinasloe had established itself as the main wool market for the country, with Cork buyers the single most important group. Even before that date, Munster had overtaken Dublin as the
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28 M6933/26/40; Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin to Peter Blake at Messrs. Dillon and Cahill merchants, Dublin, 11 Feb. 1752 (M6939/1/14); Sibilla Blake, Dublin to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, 25 Feb. 1752 (M6936/1/15).
29 J.C., ‘Dr Caulfield’s notes on Cork events in the years 1769 and 1781’, Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society, xi (1905), 139; Rev Wallace Clare, ‘A Brief Directory of the city of Cork, 1769-70’, The Irish Genealogist, i (1940), 258.
30 Dickson, Old World Colony, 123.
31 M6935/26/42-3.
32 M6933/26/15.
33 M6933/26/5, 43.
35 Cullen, Economic History of Ireland, 66; Dickson, Old World Colony, 134.
primary market for wool from Connacht. The great cattle fairs of Ballinasloe existed from an early period, the Blakes sold sheep there as early as 1734, however it was only in 1757 that Richard Trench of Garbally obtained a patent for holding town fairs every year, on 15 May and 13 July, with the fair in July being the main woollen fair. In order to encourage the fair Trench gave four years free from toll duties at the fair and got the main wool producers of Galway, including Edmond Blake, to sign an advertisement in the Dublin Gazette promising to send their wool to the fair at Ballinasloe and sell it there on the same terms as in Dublin and Cork.

Getting the fleece to the buyer was an important step in this trade and involved the employment of ‘carmen’ to bring the fleece to the buyer, great numbers of carts thronged the roads from Connacht to Dublin and Cork, as well as to smaller inland markets, at the end of the summer. An entry in Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s account book shows a template for an invoice given to a group of carmen bringing fleece wool to a buyer in Cork, using one such transaction as an example but without the carmen’s names or details. It details the undertaking these carmen had to give in order to take charge of this valuable commodity. Dated 6 August 1753, the invoice for three bags of wool belonging to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, ‘weighted, marked and numbered’, totalled twenty-one stone. The carmen in the invoice acknowledge the receipt of the three bags of fleece wool and ‘faithfully and severally promise and engage to deliver to Mr John Hearn of the city of Cork, merchant’ to his warehouse on or before 24 August. They were to be paid two shillings and seven pence for each hundred weight, receiving an English crown each in part payment. For the ‘true performance’ of this they bonded themselves, their ‘heirs, executors and administrators in the penal sum of one hundred pounds sterling...as also to forfeit our houses’.

The extent of the Blakes’ stock holdings can be seen early in the century by an account of the stock on each individual farm. The farm of Cummer which was run by Edmond Blake Fitz Martin had at least two shepherds who each took in charge on average a thousand sheep during the 1730s. A more accurate representation of their stock holding can be seen when Edmond Blake Fitz Martin stepped away from the day to day running of the Ballyglunin estate in 1766. He sold the majority of his stock to his son Martin and made plans to either live with Martin or live in his house in Galway town. The bill of sale included 3,241 sheep of different kinds and ages, 68 head of cattle and 8 plow garrans (small horses). This did not include all his stock as Edmond subsequently sold another 125 full stock...
wethers (a castrated male sheep), nor does it include the stock his son Martin held on his own account which would have been a couple of thousand for his own farms, but it does illustrate the extent of their substantial sheep rearing and how it played an important part in their financial affairs.  

On Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s marriage to Bridget Joyce in 1751, for her part bringing a marriage portion of £1,600, his father passed two bonds to secure the covenants of the marriage articles, the first was for £6,000 and was a penal bond to ensure the enforcement of the articles, the second was also for £6,000 but the interest of this second bond was to be used for the exclusive employ of Martin and his family, ensuring him a yearly sum during the life of his father of £210 (see Appendix Table xv). In an effort to give the two bonds legal security the trustees to the settlement sued Edmond Blake the next March and received two judgements against him for £6,000 each. These judgements remained central to Martin Blake’s economic security for the next twenty years, in 1764 he got the family lawyer in Dublin James O’Hara to obtain copies of both judgments from the Auditor General’s Office at a cost of 15s. 11d. each. The lands settled on him netted him £345 between 30 October 1751 and 12 May 1753.

In addition to the extensive amounts of money that Edmond Blake Fitz Martin spent refitting the family home in Galway town for his son Martin and his new bride from their marriage in 1751, during their first three years of marriage he also spent in excess of £1,280 on setting him up on the various parts of the estate promised him under his marriage articles. Stocking the farm of Brierfield alone cost £200. Martin Blake Fitz Edmond took care of his own and his father’s business at the various fairs around County Galway long before he took over the actual running of the estate. In 1759 the few days at Ballinasloe fair in October cost him two pounds, as he was there for the family’s business his father paid the majority of this expense, allowing him £1 5s. 9d.

Despite his marriage articles guaranteeing him £210 he only received a half yearly maintenance of £97 10s. from his father. The marriage articles remained vital to his economic wellbeing and he retained copies of the various bonds passed to secure the marriage. The discrepancy between the marriage articles and the account book is not too hard to understand as father and son constantly loaned small amounts between each other
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42 Account book of Martin Blake, 18 Mar. 1766 (M6933/16/94).
43 Settlement on marriage of Martin Blake and Bridgett Joyce, 30 Oct. 1751 (M6931/74 a&b); M6933/16/18; M6935/66/7.
44 M6933/16/76.
45 Diary and account book of Martin Blake (M6933/16/1).
46 See Chapter 7.iv.
47 M6933/26/16.
48 M6933/16/64.
49 M6933/16/18.
as well as guaranteeing bonds passed by either one of them, especially if they were in Galway or Tuam on business. A portion also consisted of the lands leased from Edmond to Martin. Martin took over the farm of Brierfield in May 1754, taking a reduction in his maintenance to £125, but this did not last long and his father soon again took the farm in hand himself. Not to mention the numerous cattle and sheep Martin was involved in purchasing on his father’s account. The marriage articles remained a vital part of his life. In March 1755, he got Alex Lynott to provide a copy of the articles on parchment, paying him six shillings six pence. By 1760, Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s maintenance had been increased to £250 per annum, as a result of his father choosing to keep for himself various lands he had promised Martin on his marriage, as well as Martin’s constant requests.

The money lending that was part of the mix of merchant activity, land acquisition and leases that enabled the Blakes to re-establish themselves in the Restoration continued on through the eighteenth century. In the seventeenth century, the only banks in Dublin were those which specialised in mortgages. Irish banks during the eighteenth century were primarily concerned with the exchange business which left much of small scale lending to privately arranged loans within inter-related loan networks. While the 1704 and 1709 Acts to Prevent the Further Growth of Popery prohibited Catholics from purchasing land, they continued to lend money on the security of the borrower’s estate. It might have been illegal for them to enter into possession of the estate on default of the loan, nevertheless, by prior agreement, it was still legal for them to enjoy the profits of the estate until the loan had been repaid. The Catholic Church’s usury laws do not appear to have had any influence on their financial affairs, money was continually lent by the passing of bonds to be paid at a future date at a set percentage rate.

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew regularly passed bonds in £1,000 and was a creditor to many of his fellow merchants. His grandson Martin Blake Fitz Peter was not so lucky and while he had been left in a relatively secure financial position by his grandfather, the expense of securing the estate in the aftermath of the War of the Two Kings took a heavy

50 M6933/16/5.
51 Copy of receipt, 30 Oct. 1751 (M6933/16/18).
52 M6933/16/73.
53 M6933/16/66-8.
55 2 Anne, c. 6, s. 6, An Act to prevent the further growth of popery (Statutes at large, iv, 17); 8 Anne, c.3. s.27, An Act for explaining and amending an Act intituled, An Act to prevent the further growth of popery (Statutes at large, iv, 207-8); Maureen Wall, Catholic Ireland Ireland in the Eighteenth Century: Collected Essays of Maureen Wall, ed. Gerard O’Brien (Dublin, 1989), 188, fn. 27.
56 David Dickson, ‘Catholics and trade in eighteenth-century Ireland’, 92-3.
financial toll, thus he was in the unfortunate position of having to borrow from other merchants. The family managed to re-establish themselves at the centre of this nascent banking sector by their ability to pass bonds and bills between Galway, Dublin and further afield. When a rumour was widely reported in 1749 of William Burke’s inheriting five or six hundred pounds from Fr Nicholas Fynn in Paris with instructions to use the funds for his poor relations in Ireland, it was said that the bonds for the sums involved were sent to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin of Ballyglunin to handle. William Burke denied the whole affair and went so far as to take out notices in *Pue’s Occurrences* on a number of occasions in order to set the record straight. He admitted that he knew Fynn twenty years before in Paris but continued that he was ‘not worth a crown’ at any time of his acquaintance and that when he died he was buried at the public’s expense. Nevertheless, the fact that Edmond Blake Fitz Martin was associated in the public’s mind with the ability to deal with bonds from France for such sums illustrates his central position in the Galway, and indeed Irish, bond and bill market.

The family’s position in Galway and the links they had around the country and abroad ensured their bonds were widely accepted, their bonds were passed around as good as paper money (see Appendix xv). When Dominick Blake tried to get Edmond Blake Fitz Martin to accept a bond for £50 on Peter French of Tuam payable to Matthew Burke, merchant of Tuam in six months, he assured Edmond that he ‘must allow [it] to be as good as any bank note in Ireland’. On one day, 15 August 1758, Martin Blake Fitz Edmond passed five bonds worth £600, Myles Burke, Mark French and Anthony French owed him by bond and warrant £100, Robert Blakeney and Samuel Simpson by bond and judgement £100, Patrick Blake and Francis Blake by bond £200, Francis Blake and Shamus Blakeney by bond £100, and Robert French and Nicholas French by bond and warrant £100.

Financial affairs between Edmond Blake Fitz Martin and the Frenches of Rahasane, County Galway revolved around the marriage portion of £1,300 that Mary, daughter of John French of Rahasane, brought on her marriage to Edmond in 1724. Twenty-five years later the portion was still outstanding and the bonds securing the portion ensured a constant flow of interest to Edmond Blake. By 1759 this was paid by John French’s eldest son Robert French of Rahasane. The inter-related nature of their business affairs meant that this
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57 Martin Blake of Rusheens, gent and Richard Lynch Fitz Richard of Galway to Nicholas Lynch Fitz Ambrose of Galway, merch., 13 Sept. 1706 (M6931/50).
58 M6933/16; M6933/26.
60 M6933/26/21.
61 Dominick Blake to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, 9 Jan. 1771 (M6936/1/B).
62 Diary and account book of Martin Blake (M6933/16/1).
63 Marriage articles, 27 Mar. 1724 (M6931/64/a&b)
interest was rarely paid in full, as Edmond leased land from the Frenches, wool was purchased between them and bills were forwarded to one another or to other parties on the basis of outstanding debts. This ensured a constant to-and-fro between them throughout the year. The marriage portion of £1,300 broke down into three bonds, two of £500 and one of £300, all three were held at different interest rates. Edmond held one bond of £500 at 7.5% which gave a yearly interest of £37 10s., the other bond of £500 returned a year and a half’s interest of £25, while the bond for £300 gave £18 yearly at 6%, in all the marriage portion brought in £80 10s. in 1760. While two years later the three bonds brought in two years’ interest due of £136, which was well below what the actual figure should have been but was reduced by the near continuous passing of bills and cash between the two men, whether it was Edmond giving Robert French £3 in cash on his way to Cork in September 1762 or Robert taking into account the rent and quit rent due on his land from Edmond.

This money lending and the day-to-day passing of bonds between merchants, landowners and bankers necessitated a regular recourse to the courts. The evidence of this resort to the law is particularly noteworthy from mid-century and while this has a certain amount to do with the scarcity of sources for this type of activity from earlier in the century, there is no doubt that there was a marked upturn in this activity from the late 1740s. From mid-century, Bartholomew Hanly of Loughrea was the local Galway lawyer who dealt with the Blake’s financial affairs before the courts. Hanly was admitted to King’s Inns in 1740, was a member of the common council of Galway town in 1764 and died in 1774. Samuel Hanly, most likely Bartholomew’s son, continued as the local family lawyer in the 1780s.

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin held a bond of the principal of £86 18s. 1d. dated 8 April 1749 from Francis and his son Thomas Blake of Furbough, County Galway which was guaranteed by Robin Martin. This was in effect Edmond lending the money to Francis and Thomas at a yearly interest of six per cent but instead of any formal deed for the loan they simply used a bond. Edmond assigned this bond to his son Martin Blake Fitz Edmond in payment for the stock of the farm of Brierfield in 1756. In order to recoup the principal and interest due on this bond, Martin employed Bartholomew Hanly to sue the concerned parties. This entailed three individual actions against the three men. The court found in favour of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond and each judgement was entered separately. Hanly thus charged for each judgement independently. To enter the judgement at the Court of King’s Bench cost £1 18s. 8d., to certify the judgement there cost 2s. 8 ½d., and the
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execution cost 8s. 6d. Robin Martin covered all three debts payable on the bond. He paid the initial principal due of £86 18s. 1d., interest for seven years and two months due to 19 June 1756 at six percent came to £37 7s. 2½d., the costs of Bartholomew Hanly amounted to £7 9s. 7d. and in addition, he paid Hanly a further 4s. 6d., presumably in appreciation of the job he did despite being the opposing lawyer. In all, the principal, interest, lawyer’s costs and one or two other minor expenses came to over £136 which was covered in full by Robin Martin. 67 This was a very healthy profit from one bond over seven years and shows the efficacy of the local courts in securing the payment of debts.

The residence of the Blakes of Ballyglunin’s younger sons abroad, either in the West Indies or England, as well as contacts with English merchants and gentry who had invested in land in Galway, meant that for much of the eighteenth century the family had access to contacts in both places where they could draw bills. 68 For day-to-day business, the emerging local banks in Galway were used. Provincial banks were generally founded by merchants whose banking activities were simply a complement to their main merchant dealings, with no real demarcation between their merchant and their banking activities. 69 The Lynch bank of Galway was the first provincial bank outside of Cork and Limerick. By 1736 Andrew Lynch was described as a banker in Galway and was the point man of a group of merchants involved in smuggling wool who made an attempt to bribe the Captain of a revenue vessel off Galway. 70

By the 1750s it was supplemented by the house of John French Fitz Andrew when in the early 1750s Galway became the only town outside of Dublin and Cork with two banking houses. 71 The continued link between merchant activity and banking can be seen in 1756 when Messrs John and Andrew French published a notice thanking the public for their indulgence during their recent credit troubles and asked that anyone who was indebted to them would settle their accounts but at the same time advertised the arrival of a ‘large parcel of timber, deals, French and Lisbon wines, tobacco, iron, window glass, bottles and several other Sorts of goods’. 72

The ability of these banks to deal with bills of exchange drawn on London, especially to remit rent to absentee landowners, was of vital importance to the local and national economy. This is seen in the mid-century expansion in the amount of paper in circulation, whether private bankers’ notes or promissory notes. 73 Their notes held a wide circulation
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within Ireland and abroad.\textsuperscript{74} The Blakes of Ballyglunin used the Lynches as bankers from an early date. Their dealings began as normal merchant transactions, usually buying and selling wool, as well as letting land but included remitting money to younger sons in Paris or acting as executors to wills.\textsuperscript{75}

The willingness of merchants and landowners to stand as executors to friends and relations was not simply a feeling of familial obligation. The access to the funds that they were to dispose of as executors and the control of the purse strings, could be a lucrative activity for those involved and well worth the time and effort required.\textsuperscript{76} This activity as local bankers continued throughout the eighteenth century, lending usually relatively small sums of one to two hundred pounds, with good security, and then receiving a steady stream of interest of six to eight per cent a year. This business by mid-century was undertaken by both Edmond Blake Fitz Martin and his son Martin Blake Fitz Edmond.\textsuperscript{77}

Dealings with the West Indies continued through the century. Foreign trade was an important source of fluid assets and a significant outlet for local agricultural produce, whether the landlord’s own or paid to them in kind for rent.\textsuperscript{78} Galway conducted little direct trade during the eighteenth century, but the merchants there were still involved in the wider Atlantic trade. Transactions between the Blakes in Galway and their relations in the West Indies or in England were usually of a more personal nature. Twenty guineas Edmond advanced in Galway on instructions from his brother Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin from London to their uncle Nicholas Blake was to be paid back to him by way of Major Martin’s banker his ‘kinsman’ Mr Ahmuty of Dublin.\textsuperscript{79} Likewise a month later Major Martin still in London, got Andrew Bodkin to settle Mr Burke’s affairs with him and got a bill for what was due ‘payable 1 November next’. If Edmond was not satisfied with this Martin would calculate the exchange rate between England and Ireland and order Mr Ahmulty in Dublin to pay it to Mr Burke’s account.\textsuperscript{80} Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin lived in England by mid-century, between London and York, and took care of his interests by post, whether in the West Indies, Galway or England. In Galway, though, he expected his brother Edmond to take
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care of his affairs, as he called it, ‘your side of the Shannon’. Edmond had other contacts throughout the West Indies with whom he was in constant contact and gives a glimpse of their extensive business interests.

The financial affairs of a rural Irish landowning family presented here illustrates the wide-ranging and intricate nature of their business dealings. The visible nature of their activities represented by their farming and rent receiving demonstrates only one part of their wider economic undertakings. Wool sales made up the major part of their agricultural income, but what percentage this represented of their wider income is more difficult to clarify. Their banking activities saw a steady income from interest payments. Disentangling this from their other income streams is impossible as a result of their inter-related nature, but can with some certainty be put in the hundreds of pounds yearly.

iii. The extent of the Ballyglunin estate

As Catholics were prohibited from purchasing land in Ireland until 1782 there was no increase in the ownership of land in fee simple by Catholics during this period, any individual Catholics who managed to acquire land by means of methods such as a collusive purchase by a Protestant family member or friend were the exception. Where Catholics were able to advance was in terms of a leasehold interest. The accumulation of a leasehold interest can be seen on the Ballyglunin estate, with a slowly increasing addition of acres held by leases throughout the eighteenth century. The family held numerous leases during the second half of the seventeenth century but there is no doubt the priority of the family was on the accumulation of land in fee simple. The penal legal framework of the eighteenth century changed Catholic priorities in this regard by pure necessity. The investment of money earned from trade or simply as surplus income from their farms needed an outlet, as the purchase of land was not possible, the accumulation of a leasehold interest was the next best thing.

In Patrick Melvin’s examination of the Galway tribes as landowners, he states that the Ballyglunin estate comprised nearly 3,000 acres by the mid-1760s, however, the deed he refers to is part of a series of enactments of fines and recoveries enacted by Edmond Blake Fitz Martin which refer to the acreage in only the most summary fashion. This was the standard language of these documents referring only to ‘forty acres of land, sixty acres
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of meadow, and seventy acres of pasture’, as the deeds themselves were part of a fictitious
writ conducted with the knowledge of the court in order to bar the entail, the actual acreage
was not noted with any detail, only detailing the lands in the most general sense. A more
accurate measure of the estate held in fee simple can be gauged from when Edmond retired
from the estate and leased his lands to his eldest son Martin for £510 in 1766. The lease
consisted of their ‘front stone house…with back yard, offices, cellars and all and singular
the rights and appurtenances thereunto belonging’ in Middle St, Galway town, where
Edmond and Martin both then resided, as well as 1,610 acres. This represented 89 acres
less than the estate Martin Blake Fitz Peter settled on himself in 1691. While this reduction
can be explained by any number of reasons, it is likely a combination of the fact that Martin
Blake Fitz Peter sold at least sixty-seven acres he owned in County Mayo, despite being
part of the settled estate, fifty-one acres of Killinmore were left out of the lease by mistake
and also the fact that much of the estate was resurveyed over the previous few years and
by William Downey early on that year. Accurate surveying certainly contributed. This, of
course, represents only the bare minimum of the estate, referring as it does solely to the
estate settled in tail male but no single document would give one the total figure. The
estate held by lease is even harder to estimate, as it was constantly fluctuating throughout
the century. The primary aim of the accumulation of these leases was to have land adjoining
the existing estate. From the existing surveys, it is clear the additional leased land was at
times in excess of double the freehold land it adjoined so that a leasehold estate at mid-
century at least equal to the freehold land would be a conservative estimate. Therefore, the
Ballyglunin estate at mid-century was conservatively in excess of 3,000 acres. Melvin may
have been correct in his description of the estate, but not for the right reasons.

For the first thirty years of the eighteenth century, it was usually Martin Blake Fitz
Peter who leased land to other families. This changed from the 1730s on. Initially, they
leased only small amounts of land adjoining their existing holdings, but from mid-century
larger and more far-flung amounts of land were leased. The leases 1737-77 are listed in
Appendix Table xiv, however, they only tell part of the story. Formal deeds were only
entered into, particularly pertaining to the lease of land, if the transaction concerned
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involved large amounts of land or for large amounts of money. Some were even entered in the Registry of Deeds but they were the exceptions earlier on in the century. Most leases were entered into by both parties on a more informal footing, usually simply a verbal agreement with the only remaining evidence of their existence being the entries in surviving account books. This was particularly acute among Galway families as the land was usually leased to and from their extended family (see Genealogy: Marriage links of the Blakes of Ballyglunin).

From a leasehold perspective, the Catholic landholding position was much more favourable than from simply a fee simple standpoint. This began to improve long before the 1780s. This, of course, carries the major caveat of the penal law prohibition on leases longer than thirty-one years, or that too favourable a lease could be discoverable. This was tempered by favourable landlords or the tenant’s own economic position when attempting to renew leases or offering to take out new ones. Galway tenants were clearly in a favourable position in this regard. Catholic wealth in the eighteenth century was created out of these conditions. From the 1750s leasehold wealth sharply increased, tilting the balance of Catholic wealth from fee simple to leasehold. 90 A substantial group of Catholic gentry survived as head-tenants. The O’Donnells of Larkfield, County Leitrim held no land except those they rented, despite this, it did not impact on the family’s social status in the area, they were able to socialise with the local Protestant gentry, retained their Irish identity, but also possessed links with the continent. 91

On inheriting the estate in 1737 Edmond Blake Fitz Martin continued his father’s dealings immediately leasing further lands adjoining his own. Interest in the exact makeup of the estate was a constant for the family. On 23 February 1762, they obtained a copy of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew's original patent from 1677.92 The lease of the farm of Drishigan [Brierfield] was made informally between Edmond Blake Fitz Martin and Josias Brown for twenty-one years at the yearly rent of £70. There was no formal document as such, nevertheless, they deposited the agreement for the lease with the local parish priest William Burke, rector of Kilmoylan.93 Brown set about repairing the house, barn and stable on the farm of Drishigan and he was initially allowed £4 off his rent for his efforts, but by 1742 he was given a full £10, which gives some idea of the work he put into the house and land he leased from Edmond.94 Rent could be paid in kind. For example, when Josias Brown paid
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part of his half years rent of £35 in 1746 in the form of a hundred wethers at 6s. 9d. each, totalling £33 15s. 0d or getting Robert French, to whom Josias had sold wool, to pay off the rest of his year’s rent.95

While it was usually Edmond who requested favours from his brother Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin in the West Indies for his extended family and friends, the traffic went both ways. Dr Michael Tully of Tuam was a creditor in the 1723 settlement by Bryan Mahon of Oughtercloony, gent on Ross Mahon of Castlegarr, esq.96 Dr Tully’s mother lived on part of the Ballyglunin estate at Cloondahamper, County Galway. Early in 1738, Dr Tully wrote to Major Martin on Antigua and informed him that Edmond had leased land to a troublesome tenant who did not pay his rent punctually. He requested, by way of Major Martin on Antigua, if he could by some means dispossess this troublesome tenant and let it to Dr Tully’s brother John. Dr Tully assured Major Martin that he would secure the payment of the rent by Mr Humphrey Hill, merchant, in London and Major Martin in turn assured his brother that he himself would guarantee the payment of the rent.97 Edmond agreed to his brother’s request and John Tully continued to farm the land throughout the next twenty years.98 Major Martin’s wealth acquired in the West Indies enabled him to have a certain say on the estate back home and while that clearly did not mean a day to day involvement, the evidence of his involvement in his brother Edmond’s marriage settlement as well as more minor affairs such as the lease of the farm to John Tully shows the back and forth that existed between them, despite the distance between Galway and the West Indies. A few years later when Major Martin was as often resident in London or York as in the West Indies his concern for affairs back in Galway continued (see Chapter 8.ii).99

From the mid-1760s Edmond Blake Fitz Martin took a step back from the running of the estate, as a result of bad health, and effectively retired, leaving his son Martin to take over. He bought out his father’s stock and took over his leases where possible.100 Some merchants did retire to the country and become country gentry, however, Edmond remained resident, both on the rural estate and within Galway town, as the social season dictated.101

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond took a regular lease of the Ballyglunin estate and their house in
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Galway from his father for thirty-one years from November 1765. Martin took the estate in hand and employed surveyors to map his new estate.¹⁰²

The leasehold interest acquired by the family saw a modest increase in the forty years from 1737-77. It was a reflection of the wider wealth of the family which developed over the period by means of their various strands of income. This was achieved by an attention to detail to all aspects of their estate. Nowhere is this better illustrated than by the means the family used to develop and improve their land and the estate in general.

iv. The improvement of the estate, 1737-77

The normal management of an estate required a continuous attention to how the estate was run, initially this required a certainty of the exact boundaries of the estate, whether land held in fee or leased, a constant concern for the state of the land and what was farmed on it and the building of walls, bridges and buildings. From the moment of his transplantation, Martin Blake Fitz Andrew commenced ‘improving’ his estate by getting his new holdings surveyed and constructing buildings. Even the Jacobite author of ‘A light to the blind’ was concerned with developing the country’s economy, with one of his other pamphlets from c.1698 entitled, ‘The Improvement of Ireland’, which took a wide-ranging view of matters of improvement, from woods and orchards to wool and foreign trade.¹⁰³ So it is difficult to differentiate between this normal estate management and the concept of a concern with the improvement of Ireland which evolved during the seventeenth century, was further inspired by the literature of the Enlightenment and given impetus by the buoyant economy from the mid-eighteenth century. Nevertheless, this concern for improvement led to a more formalised movement and the establishment of such organisations as the Dublin Society in 1731 and the Physico-Historical Society in 1744. This idea of ‘improvement’ ranged over a wide spectrum of activities, centred on rebuilding the demesne on defined lines, improving the land, how it was farmed and what was farmed, all focused on an improved income stream from land. This resulted in the introduction of new crops and breeds of animals, the reclamation of wasteland, the construction of estate villages and roads, the founding of fairs and local markets and the enclosure of common land. Though the question remains of whether all the work was worth the effort.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Lease of house and lands, Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin to his eldest son Martin, 2 Jan. 1766 (M6931/66/a&b); M6935/66/9; M6933/16/93.
¹⁰³ Patrick Kelly, ‘ “A light to the blind”: the voice of the dispossessed élite in the generation after the defeat at Limerick’, I.H.S., xxiv, no. 96 (Nov. 1985), 455-6, 461.
The consequences of the land confiscations of the seventeenth century ensured that Protestants, as holders of the vast majority of the land of Ireland, took the leading role in attempting to improve Ireland. However, where Catholics retained a landed interest they acted like any other conscientious landowner.\textsuperscript{105} Toby Barnard has dealt extensively with what he calls ‘the cult and cultures of improvement’, and has published one of the two studies on the most prominent example of ‘an improving Galway squire’, Robert French of Monivea.\textsuperscript{106} The experience of Galway as a whole in terms of improvement was very mixed and the landlords who were noted as being at the forefront of an attempt to improve the land of Ireland were noted because of their very exceptionality. Nevertheless, there were a number of the gentry of Connacht profoundly involved in the improvement of their estates.\textsuperscript{107} This concern for improvement is seen with increasing importance by each succeeding generation on the Ballyglunin estate as the eighteenth century went on.

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin was heavily involved in the management of the estate long before his father’s death. Whether paying masons for building a new bridge in 1733 or paying the same masons for other general building works on the estate.\textsuperscript{108} He also paid for the sanding of marshy land. The leases on the estate generally contained provisos in relation to improvements made to the land leased, which gave a lump sum at the termination of the lease in return for specified improvements of the land or a yearly deduction to rent for verified improvements.\textsuperscript{109}

The Boundaries Act of 1721 sought to encourage the building of proper boundaries between adjoining lands where there was no dispute about ‘mears and bounds of land’ for three years then past, where the neighbouring proprietor, occupier or tenant, ‘on reasonable request’ was ‘obliged to be at equal expense’ in making ‘good and sufficient’ ditches, stone wall or mud wall and if they refused, would be compelled by ‘bill in equity’ to be at equal expense to build and maintain them.\textsuperscript{110} This seemingly little-evoked act did not pass Martin Blake Fitz Edmond by and he composed a draft letter in his account book in order to create a template to contact the other landlords adjoining his estate,

Sir, I hereby require you forthwith that you join me making the walls ditches and fences mearing betwist you and me, pursuant to the statute in that case made and

\textsuperscript{105} Toby Barnard, *Improving Ireland?*, 16.
\textsuperscript{108} M6933/26/LM.
\textsuperscript{109} M6933/16/83.
\textsuperscript{110} 8 Geo. 1 c.5, *An act to oblige proprietors and tenants of neighbouring lands to make fences between their several lands and holdings* (1721) (Statutes at large, v, 21-6).
provided. And in failure thereof, I do hereby give you notice that I will proceed in building and making the said walls, fences and ditches pursuant to the said statute and make you liable pursuant to the same whereat I gave you the notice, dated and given under my hand this day.\textsuperscript{111}

This draft letter in his account book readied in the 1750s was part of a more general attempt to get the estate under control, even before his father handed over most of the day to day responsibilities to him. Walls were a constant occupation on the estate, in order to fix the borders between estates or for basic estate management. Generally, the head tenant was paid to organise both the drawing of stones from a local quarry and then for masons to build the walls.\textsuperscript{112} The construction of these walls witnessed the profound formation of the rural landscape of Connacht that is visible to this day.

The townlands of the main demesne, Ballyglooneen alias Kilmooylan and Arnasodan, were surveyed numerous times, with the underlying map usually based on the map from 1637’s Strafford Survey (see Appendix Table xvi). Familiarity with and the ability to accurately copy the Down Survey and for Connacht the Strafford Survey maps were the defining attributes of eighteenth-century surveyors.\textsuperscript{113} Landowners usually retained the services of a group of surveyors throughout their life in order to keep their estates in order.\textsuperscript{114} John Hamilton, a surveyor working in Galway, Mayo and Dublin, surveyed Arnasodan and Kilmooylan for Edward Blake Fitz Martin in 1760 showing it consisted of 610 acres.\textsuperscript{115} These 610 acres were the main Ballyglunin demesne where they built their main house.

On 28 April 1766, William Downey, a surveyor working in Galway and Mayo, surveyed the whole of Kilmooylan and Arnasodan and outlined the difference between the ‘true’ extent of the lands and those set out in the Strafford Survey.\textsuperscript{116} A portion of Ballyglunin was surveyed by Martin Doyle in 1768 showing 58 acres adjoining the lands of Annagh, taking specific care to show the two roods twenty-two perches of a new garden, even though they were not part of the lands being surveyed.\textsuperscript{117} Other landowners at the time were doing likewise and confirming the exact extent of their holdings, this is where a lot of the disputes arose. Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s neighbour Ambrose Dean of Coolflowerbeg
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was doing the same thing and Martin got a number of maps copied from Ambrose including of the parish of Kilmoylan and one of just Martin’s estate in Kilmoylan. Both were copied by Patrick Mullen from Ambrose Dean’s maps for Martin. On both, you can see the parish church on Martin’s estate at the west end of Kilmoylan. Kevin Whelan has illustrated the importance of Catholic, and liberal, landlords to the location of chapels, and in particular noted that Catholic landowners located chapels near to their demesnes, here the Catholic chapel was not far from Ballyglunin house itself, right at the heart of the estate. Emphasising the vital role Catholic landlords played in the survival and progressively more assertive role the Catholic Church played in Ireland as the century progressed.

Surveys were also set down to confirm the agreement of some dispute over where exactly the border between two pieces of land was situated. The actual amount of land involved could be tiny but equal importance was afforded to it, with a specific survey completed. Edmond Blake Fitz Martin and Ambrose Deane of Balrobuck, County Galway disagreed over the border of their respective estates in Bunoghaunaun and Tomnahulla, Annaghdown parish, Barony of Clare. The land involved consisted of eleven acres and fourteen perches. Using a survey of the land done in August 1756, Edmond and Ambrose agreed to just divide the land into two equal parts. This was done in the presence of Edmond, with Ambrose’s agent John Kirwan of Bunatobber witnessing for him. The agreement was then surveyed and mapped out by James Morris on 26 October 1758.

The sheer volume of surveys conducted on the estate from the moment of the transplantation right up to the end of the eighteenth-century points to their importance to the family. For many, if not most, surveys conducted there appear to have been similar ones conducted by neighbouring landowners. So it is hard to make too strong of a case that the Blakes were in any way exceptional in the management of their estate in this respect. They were certainly among the many other enthusiastic improvers, whether Catholic or Protestant. Nevertheless, the attention to detail by each successive head of the family, with the notable exception of Peter Blake Fitz Martin, is most definitely noteworthy. Even this saw an intensification when Martin Blake Fitz Edmond took over the running of the estate from the late 1750s. With only the survival of a handful of letters to him and only glimpses of his education it is hard to place him with certainty within any tradition of improvement, beyond the consequences of increased agricultural and merchant
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productivity, with the drainage, reclamation and enclosure of land and the general estate improvement that inevitably came in its wake. Nevertheless, with the extent and ever-present nature of his involvement in the estate, even long before he took it over, there is a case to be made for him being listed among other notable improvers, such as Robert French of Monivea.

By mid-century the family had advanced to such a degree of respectability that the marriage of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin’s youngest daughter to John Darcy of Houndswood, County Mayo was reported in the *London Magazine and Monthly Chronologer* and by the time Edmond Blake Fitz Martin died in 1771 his death was noted in Dublin newspapers including the *Dublin Gazette* and the *Freeman’s Journal*.122 His son Martin, despite all his work, to get the estate in shape prior to his father’s death and in the few years after, only lived until 1777. His son Edmond again only lived a few years passing away on 28 March 1781, leaving his infant son, Martin Stephen Blake, as the heir of the Ballyglunin estate. Their neighbour Christopher French of Brooklodge, County Galway was appointed by the High Court of Chancery as his guardian, being the administrator of Edmond’s will and Martin Stephen’s granduncle. The minority of Martin Stephen Blake also brought a host of legal difficulties for his guardian Christopher French of Brooklodge, so it is no wonder he also commissioned surveys of parts of the estate.123 It was lucky this minority did not happen earlier in the century when the penal laws were in full force, as the minority resulted in a case in Chancery filed in 1782.124 This was the first of many lawsuits concerning the estate notably in the early nineteenth century. Martin Stephen Blake only lived to see his seventh birthday dying on 9 April 1788, the estate passing on to his uncle Walter Blake Fitz Martin.125

The Brooklodge Demesne and house adjoins the townland of Ballyglooneen and is just north of Ballyglunin House. Brooklodge House was built by Christopher French. In total, the construction, planting and improving of Brooklodge House 1786-1794 cost £11,084 17s. 7.126 Later in the nineteenth century, Brooklodge was bought by Martin Joseph Blake of Ballyglunin. The main house of the Blakes of Ballyglunin on the Ballyglunin demesne was constructed in the eighteenth century, it was initially a two storey house with three bays, but subsequently with major mid- to late-nineteenth century additions.127 The elaborate expenditure on the house of the Protestant French family adjoining the more modest
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123 Plan of Garraun and part of Culleen, 1782 (M6932/33).
124 For the dangers posed to Catholic estates by minorities see Connolly, Religion, law and power, 309; Chancery answer, Martin Stephen Blake and Christopher French v Bridget Blake, filed 1782 (M6934/4).
125 Account book of Martin Blake 1754-71, with some genealogical notes added to 1792 (M6933/16).
126 Volume of accounts relating to the building of Brooklodge House, 1775-1805 (M6933/57/a-d).
Catholic Blakes can be seen as a further effect of the penal laws. This can be seen with the O’Conor’s of Ballinagare, County Roscommon and the three houses associated with them, Ballinagare Castle, Mount Allen and the Hermitage, all three, it has been argued, were built to look deliberately more modest when viewed from afar, especially when viewed from the front, from the avenues leading up to the main houses and from the main road.\textsuperscript{128}

\textbf{v. Conclusion}

The forty years from 1737-77 witnessed the transformation of the Ballyglunin estate. It was a slow gradual process of careful estate management. There may have been some influence of a wider philosophy underpinning this development but on the whole, it is hard to distinguish it from the normal process of farming and trading on an estate. The expansion of their leasehold interest was only made possible by the financial activities of the family, whether based on directly farming their estates, their rent roll, merchant dealings or nascent banking conducted by them. The interlinked importance of these activities to the continued vitality of a Catholic interest in the eighteenth century has been given scant attention. The Blakes of Ballyglunin remained merchants, farmers and bankers, each activity fed into the others and each remained interdependent on the other activities. The courts played an important role in this, guaranteeing the payment of any loan conducted by a deed or simply by a common bond. That the Catholic Blakes made such a widespread use of the courts opens up a further avenue of exploration on how Catholic landowners increased their wealth during the penal era. The activity of similar gentry as bankers has only begun to be explored. The examination of the Blakes of Ballyglunin demonstrates the wider world that Catholic Ireland inhibited, with no better illustration of this than the widespread activity they engaged in not only in Galway but with links in Dublin, London and the West Indies.

The accession of the eldest son to the estate gave great impetus to these developments, the youth and vigour of the new owner of the estate is clearly evident with each new generation. In each case the son had a distinct effect on the estate prior to the death of the father, particularly on the parts of the estate the sons farmed themselves but also on the wider estate management. Martin Blake Fitz Peter spent the first few years in control of the estate simply defending it by getting his grandfather found under the articles of Galway and securing as many debts owed as possible. His son Edmond Blake Fitz Martin began to have a distinct effect on the estate from the 1730s. His son Martin Blake Fitz Edmond had a much more profound effect, from his marriage in 1751 and over the next twenty years until his father’s death he increasingly became the dominant force in the

\textsuperscript{128} Kieran O’Conor and Jeremy Williams, ‘Ballinagare Castle, Co. Roscommon’, in Gibbons & O’Conor (eds), \textit{Charles O’Conor of Ballinagare}, 69.
family. To what extent this reflects the individual personalities of the men in question or rather reflects the opportunities available to Catholics in the individual time periods is a much wider question. The negligible amount of personal correspondence that remains for the Blakes of Ballyglunin prior to the nineteenth century does not allow any kind of definitive answer to this question.

The methods by which Martin Blake Fitz Andrew established and expanded his estate in the Restoration period, by purchases, mortgages, leases, trading, lending money and farming were on the whole replicated by his descendants. The big differences between the methods used to manage the estate were the penal laws. That is not to say that similar restrictions did not exist in the seventeenth century, however, the penal laws enacted from the 1690s presented a much more far-reaching and complex series of legal disabilities. There were few parts of estate management which were not affected by them. Purchases were precluded, leases were restricted, merchant activity had to be conducted within the restraints of a Protestant corporation, loans could not be freely guaranteed by land, only farming, on the whole, remained free from any direct restriction. It is here that the lack of a more pronounced and visible attention to improvement is to be found. There was no estate village built or any great attention to modernising the demesne in line with the then current fashions of visible improvement by tree planting or more superficial improvements. Catholic landowners were forced to remain as unassuming as possible.

These restrictions were widely complained of by Catholics in eighteenth century Ireland, yet these same Catholics had no problem involving themselves in the Atlantic trading world, built as it was on the slave trade and slave labour. While there were few living in Ireland who were directly involved in these activities, the younger sons who emigrated amassed plantations and owned numerous slaves. Slavery had little direct impact on the estate in Ireland but it clearly had an influence. This unsavoury, but nevertheless central, facet of the Atlantic trading world which the Galway merchants were a part of is discussed in Chapter 8.

As this chapter has illustrated the Blakes of Ballyglunin were able to overcome many of the disabilities the penal laws theoretically put in the way of their financial affairs. Only the purchase of land was completely out of their reach, unlike some other Catholic gentry and merchant families, there is no hint of any collusive purchases by Protestant friends or family. Their leases were widespread and lucrative but whether they contravened the acts to prevent the further growth of popery is another matter. The layers of leases on individual lands and the interlinked nature of them, in particular between the old merchant families of Galway town, makes it impossible to disentangle the financial realities of leases on a townland basis, never mind by barony or county. The question remains whether such leases were a deliberate attempt by Catholics to evade the law or simply a by-product of the
seventeenth century's massive transfer of property. Individual glimpses of attempts to use leases to build up a new leasehold interest would certainly indicate that the evasion of the penal laws was a factor. The preoccupation of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin with the penal laws in the late 1760s gives further credence to this view.\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{129} See Chapter 6
Chapter 6
‘The Cannibal Popery Laws of Ireland’: The Blakes of Ballyglunin under the penal laws

‘The Cannibal Popery Laws of Ireland...a disgrace to human nature, children are encouraged to fly in the face of their parents, a neighbour betraying his bosom friend, helpless people plundered by unconscionable litigations, and by cruel and severe disappointments, doused up by resentments, to murders and other act of desperation’

John French Lynch, Richmond to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, in Middle St, Galway, 10 Dec. 1772

i. Introduction

Galway, as the county with the largest Catholic landownership remaining of any county of Ireland during the eighteenth century, would appear to give the best chance for the survival of a Catholic interest during the period. As a counterweight to this Galway was also, after Dublin, the county with the largest number of conversions registered during the eighteenth century. The series of letters addressed to Dublin by governor Strafford Eyre at mid-century does give the appearance of the Catholic religion and Catholic adherents under siege but, on the whole, he was a lone voice. From the perspective of Catholic landowners, leaving aside those of a military and security nature, the penal laws broke down into three main areas, religion, land and the professions. This chapter will deal with the first two; the religious experience of the family and how the penal laws affected the estate. Only by placing the Blakes of Ballyglunin within local as well as wider Irish and European Catholic culture, with the continued and lingering influence of the counter-reformation dominating the relations between the confessions, can an understanding of the refusal of the family to conform to the established church emerge. From this perspective, we can treat of the main threat the penal laws posed to the estate, the methods used by succeeding generations to attenuate the effects of the penal laws and observe how the penal laws impacted on wider family relationships.

The penal laws continue to cast a pall over any attempt to understand eighteenth-century Ireland. They evolved from a series of laws of a primarily defensive nature of the
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1 John French Lynch, Richmond, England to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, in Middle St, Galway, 10 Dec. 1772 (M6936/1/33).
2 Power, ‘Converts’, 104; problems of identification of location for converts means that the preeminent position of Dublin as the location of the most conversions is not without major problems. Therefore, it is possible that Galway could easily be the county with the most conversions, see Power, ‘Converts’, 103-4.
3 Burke, Irish Priests in the Penal Times, 419-22.
4 See Chapter 1.iii.
1690s to those enacted in the early eighteenth century intended to eat away at the remaining Catholic landed interest. Scholarship since the 1950s has replaced the idea that the penal code was a monolithic edifice in full force for the majority of the eighteenth century with a more nuanced approach, with the recognition that there was a great variation in how individual laws were enforced and also great regional differences in how they were experienced by the Catholics of Ireland. Aligned to this is the debate on the issue of whether Ireland was a colonial society or simply formed part of an ancien régime European society. Some laws were rarely enforced after mid-century but others remained in force for as long as they were on the statute books and influenced legal cases long after. However, as Ian McBride has noted this more optimistic view of Catholics' experience during the penal era appears to be somewhat incomplete. An examination of the Blakes of Ballyglunin as Catholic gentry and their experience with the penal laws will give a more rounded perspective of a Catholic landed family during the eighteenth century in an attempt to fill in some of these deficiencies.

ii. The Blakes of Ballyglunin's religious experience under the penal laws
The general religious experience of the Blake family throughout the eighteenth century is central to an understanding of the changing fortunes of the family through the century. The family adhered to their Catholic faith throughout the turbulent penal era and remained at the centre of religious life on their estate and in Galway town. This followed on from the seventeenth-century experience of the family. As sheriff in 1648 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was involved with the corporation granting the Poor Clares land to erect a nunnery and in 1678 he had a silver chalice inscribed with a dedication to pray for the souls of himself, his two wives and their children. Despite the articles of Galway of 1691 guaranteeing the freedom for the private exercise of the clergy and laity of the town of Galway, the Irish parliament from the 1690s enacted a series of measures curtailing both the pastoral functions of the Catholic Church and the freedom of the laity as well. The 'Bishop’s Banishment Act' of 1697 decreed that all members of the Catholic clergy who exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction and all regular clergy should be expelled from Ireland. Some 170 members of the clergy were transported from Galway to the continent shortly after the enactment of this legislation, including Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s nephew Fr Nicholas, who

7 Galway Corpo. Mss, Liber A, f.198; Hardiman, 274-5; Blake, 'Some Old Silver Chalices', 33.
was a Dominican friar (the third son of Andrew Oge Blake Fitz Andrew). Despite this Fr Nicholas was soon after able to return to Galway, where he was living in concealment in 1702.\footnote{9 Will. III, c.1, An Act for banishing all papists exercising any ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and all regulars of the popish clergy out of this kingdom (Statutes at large, iii, 339-43); J.G. Simms, 'The Bishops' Banishment Act of 1697', I.H.S., xvii, no. 66 (Sep., 1970), 185-199; Blake, ii, 222; John O'Heyne, The Irish Dominicans of the seventeenth century, ed. Fr Ambrose Coleman (2 vols, Dundalk, 1902), i, 155, ii, 73-4.}

The Ballyglunin estate stretched over numerous different Catholic parishes with different clergy in each parish. There were four main parishes though; the townland of Ballyglooneen was in the parish of Kilmoylan; Ardasodan in the parish of Abbeyknockmoy; the lands Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was transplanted to and had accumulated around Cummer in the parish of Cummer; and their urban property within the town of Galway in the parish of St Nicholas. From an early date, a number of the parish priests who would have dealt with the family can be identified. Edmond Burke was ordained in 1678 at Clonkelagh by Teige Keogh then bishop of Clonfert, he was the parish priest of Kilmoylan when he was listed among the executors of Peter Blake Fitz Martin’s will in 1691 and also proved the will a year later in the Tuam Consistorial Court. In 1704 he was about fifty years old, resident at Currysirm and parish priest of Cummer, when he was among the priests registered at Loughrea.\footnote{Blake II, 258 [listed as P.P. of Kilmacrean, but this is a misreading of Kilmoylan]; A list of the names of the Popish Parish Priests throughout the several counties in the Kingdom of Ireland (Dublin, 1705), 29.}

In 1712 Hubert Burke was parish priest of Annaghdowne and prebendary of Kilmoylan. By 1738 William Burke was rector of Kilmoylan.\footnote{Fenning, 'Parish Clergy of Tuam', 157, 161.}

The devotion of the Blake of Ballyglunin family to their Catholic faith cannot be doubted. The numerous sons and daughters who became priests and nuns are adequate testimony to this. It might be argued, perhaps cynically, that by mid-century they had little other choice, however, the devotion of the family, and many others like them, who could have easily conformed without too much pressure from their friends and family, shines through their papers. From the beginning of the eighteenth century, at least one member of the family from each generation’s children entered the church. Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s youngest daughter became a nun, two sons of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin became priests, and two more sons of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin entered the church, one of them, Martin, becoming a Franciscan.\footnote{Blake, ii, 215-6.}

Numerous members of the family retained the desire to be buried in the vault of their ancestors in Galway.\footnote{Will of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond, probate granted 6 Feb. 1778 (N.A.I., T17176).} The cemetery of the abbey of St Francis remained the burial place
of the Blakes of Galway, among other tribal families, down to the nineteenth century. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew in his will of 1642, his son Peter Blake Fitz Peter who died 1691, and their relation Andrew Blake of Dunmacrina, County Mayo, in his will of 1703 among many others of the extended family, all wished to be buried in St Francis Abbey, Galway. This continued adherence to the ancestral burial place, even after the tombs themselves were either completely destroyed or violently defaced, and after the family themselves had moved out of Galway town, shows how committed the family remained to the faith of their forefathers and how important it remained for the ancient families of Galway town to retain a direct link to their ancestral home.

However, there is a conflict in the fact that whereas those that stayed in Galway remained devout Catholics, the two younger sons who emigrated soon converted. Both Patrick Blake Fitz Peter and Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin were ultimately practical businessmen who recognised the necessity of conformity to the continued success of their business ventures in the West Indies. Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin converted in the West Indies, was married in the Anglican parish of St John on Antigua in 1735, where four of his children were baptised and soon lived part of the year in England, where he put his sons in the care of a local Protestant clergyman where he was living near York but it did not stop him taking an interest in his nephew Robert’s progress at the seminary in France. He examined Robert on the progress of his education when Robert visited him in London. For Major Martin, the boundary between the faiths was not critical but he did live in a much larger world to his family back in Galway.

Being a Catholic family of distinction carried its own responsibilities, foremost financial, but also as the local Catholic landowner the potentially dangerous responsibility of hosting clerics and churches on their land or even in their own house. Catholic chapels were usually located close to the demesne of Catholic estates. The parish church of Kilmoylan was situated on their land to the west of the main Ballyglunin estate. The church of Cummer is visible on their lands in Cummer Park from a survey in 1741, though is unlikely

13 Blake, I, 17; Blake, II, 246-58; Abstracts of Irish Prerogative and Diocesan Wills by Martin J. Blake (N.L.I., MS 4139-43); Hughes, ‘Galway town’, 144.
14 Will of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, merchant, 27 July 1642 (N.A.I., T17175); Blake, II, 258; N.L.I., MS 4139/3; N.L.I., MS 10,792.
15 Vere Langford Oliver, The History of the Island of Antigua: One of the Leeward Caribbees in the West Indies, from the First Settlement in 1635 to the Present Time (3 vols, London, 1894-1899), i, 56; Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, Wheldrake Hall (seven miles south-east of York) to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, 27 Nov. 1747 (M6936/1/11).
18 Plan of the parish of Kilmoylan, [c.1772] (M6932/3); Copy of portion of parish of Kilmoylan, 20 July 1772 (M6932/4).
to have been anything but what a tenant on the estate would have lived in - a thatched, mud-walled cabin, without any visible proof of its true purpose.\textsuperscript{19} The absence of anything but a minor mention of religion or of money given to priests in Edmond Blake Fitz Martin’s account book from the 1730s up to mid-century is striking. While it is primarily an account book of his farms, most other activities he was involved with are mentioned.\textsuperscript{20} One of the only references is in 1739 when there was a sum left over between the various bonds used to pay rent or buy beer and oats, Peter French told Edmond to give the money to the local Dominican nuns.\textsuperscript{21} From mid-century, more significant sums were noted being spent on the upkeep of the local clergy.\textsuperscript{22}

The account book of his son from the 1750s, on the other hand, is full of references to money spent on the religious obligations of the family and certainly indicates a change of attitude as to what could be written down in full.\textsuperscript{23} In the period from September 1752 to January 1753, as well as the £1 5s. 5½d. spent on the christening of his son, Martin paid 11s. 4½d. into a collection for the clergyman Taaf, another 5s. 5d. for the nuns at Loughrea, his wife Bridget when sick, after having a difficult birth, promised £2 5s. 6d. to charity and when ‘brought to bed’ to give birth another 11s as well as £1 2s. 9d. ‘to give prayers within two months and confessing’.\textsuperscript{24} On 6 May 1753, Martin lent 2s 8½d. to lay on the altar.\textsuperscript{25} Every year Martin Blake Fitz Edmond paid a guinea to the Franciscans of Galway.\textsuperscript{26}

Patrick Robert Kirwan was the rector of Annaghdowne in 1738 and in 1749 was a priest in Tuam, canon of the cathedral church, parish priest of Annaghdowne and vicar general of the late archbishop of Tuam, Michael O’Gara. In a postulation of the clergy of Tuam of 1749 which recommended him for the vacant see of Tuam, they relate that ‘he has formed sodalities for teaching catechism to young and old, so that the cabins of the poor seem like so many seminaries’ and that the landlords of his parish freely gave him alms for the poor.\textsuperscript{27} The parish of Annaghdowne adjoins the parish of Cummer to the west, while the parish of Tuam is to the north of Cummer. Fr Kirwan baptised four of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s children who were born in the family home in the townland of Ballyglooneen in the 1750s which shows that parish boundaries were not strictly adhered to. The four boys were born at Ballyglunin, Walter in 1754, Martin in 1756, Pierce Ignatius in 1757 and Robert

\textsuperscript{19} Plan of Cummer, 1741 (M6932/28); Whelan, ‘The Catholic parish’, 6.
\textsuperscript{20} Account book of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, 1727-1762 (M6933/26).
\textsuperscript{21} M6933/26/13.
\textsuperscript{22} M6933/26/16.
\textsuperscript{23} M6933/26/16.
\textsuperscript{24} M6933/16/27.
\textsuperscript{25} M6933/16/1.
\textsuperscript{26} M6933/16/70.
\textsuperscript{27} Fenning, ‘Parish Clergy of Tuam’, 161.
in 1758 and all were baptised by Kirwan who was subsequently appointed bishop of Achonry in 1758 after being recommend for various vacant sees since 1740.\footnote{M6933/70; Patrick Fagan (ed.), \textit{Ireland in the Stuart Papers} (2 Vols, Dublin, 1995), i, 297 & ii, 130, 195.}

On 26 September 1761, Martin Blake Fitz Edmond loaned £50 to the prior and fathers of the order of St Dominick in the west suburbs of Galway. The interest on the loan, and most likely the loan itself, was to be repaid in masses.\footnote{Receipt by prior to Martin Blake, 26 Sept. 1761 (M6935/73/3).} Martin Blake Fitz Edmond on his death in 1777 left the eight Dominican friars in residence in Galway three shillings and three pence each to say masses for his soul.\footnote{Hugh Fenning, \textit{The Irish Dominican Province} (Dublin, 1990), 507-8.} The family thus remained central to the survival of the Catholic Church on their estate and in the area surrounding it, as well as in Galway town. The evidence of the money spent on the upkeep of the clergy complemented the visible fact of locating a church close to the main family home and gives clear evidence of the vital role Catholic landowners played in helping the Catholic Church adapt and ultimately flourish during the years of the penal laws. Similar families in Galway and other Irish ports with their links to the continent and the West Indies were central to the survival and revival of Irish Catholicism.

iii. Inquiry about gavelling made by John Blake Fitz Martin

\begin{quote}
\textit{I could not prevail on [my father] to suffer a recovery as he would not cut short the remainders on his father’s settlement, that is his brother Martin and his children’s chance, though I had a number of children, but when he heard of my uncle Martin’s death …and that he disinherited his eldest son John who was then in jail, when the father died, and heard how vicious and extravagant John was and when I showed him the letter received from Counsellor Dominick Blake of Fartigare (who was then in London and with my uncle at his death) mentioning that John was making enquiries if he could gavel with my father, then he got angry and said, “I will show the chap he has no right and I will cut him short of any chance of remainder he might have, little as his chance is”, accordingly in 1768 he levied fines and suffered recoveries for all his estate.’}
\end{quote}

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond\footnote{State of Martin Blake of Ballyglunin’s situation relative to his real estate, 26 July 1773 (M6935/66/9.).}

Soon after the death of his uncle Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, on 8 October 1767, Martin Blake Fitz Edmond received a letter from his cousin Counsellor Dominick Blake of Fartigare (Castlegrove), who was then in London and who had been in touch with Major Martin’s
family after his death. In his letter, Dominick reported to Martin Blake Fitz Edmond that Major Martin’s eldest son John told him he ‘intended suing for a gavel’. The sense of panic that gripped the family and the seriousness with which the attempted gavelling was taken by their neighbours, wider family and business contacts gives a unique view of the influence of the penal laws even at this late date in their history.

Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s eldest daughter Sibella married Andrew Blake of Castlegrove, who converted on 9 December 1727. She kept in contact with her brother Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin on Antigua, who having heard her son Dominick intended going to England to study, signified his intention of writing to him often to encourage his progress. Dominick Blake was admitted to the Middle Temple, London on 3 August 1739 and to King’s Inns, Dublin in 1744. He was in London a decade later, when Major Martin Blake arrived there on business from the West Indies.

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond received the letter from Dominick reporting that John Blake Fitz Major Martin ‘was making enquiries if he could gavel’ during the legal term. As a result, all the lawyers were away in Dublin, so in the meantime, while waiting for responses to his own letters, Martin had to make do with the opinions of whoever he could trust in Galway. He first turned to a family friend for advice, Thomas Lynch, who did not believe Dominick Blake’s letter. He told Martin that he believed it was an invention of Dominick’s, that Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin and his family knew very well there was a settlement on the Ballyglunin estate and as a result any attempt to gavel would be fruitless.

Notwithstanding this, Martin could not believe that Dominick Blake could make up such a story and so he looked for further advice. He visited Marcus Lynch of Barna, of the well know legal family, who was then in Galway town, ‘who was deemed very knowledgeable in law’ and got his opinion. Marcus Lynch was part of the extended family and had been party to Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s sister-in-law’s marriage articles.

32 For Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin see Chapter 8.ii.
33 M6933/66/8.
34 O’Byrne, The Convert Rolls, 11, 297; Blake II, 201.
35 Major Martin Blake to Edmond Blake, Antigua 25 June 1738 (M6936/1/5).
36 H.A.C. Sturgess (ed.), Register of Admissions to the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple: From the Fifteenth Century to the year 1944 (3 vols, London, 1949), I, 326; Edward Keane, P. Beryl Phair & Thomas U. Sadleir (eds), King’s Inns Admission Papers, 1607-1867 (Dublin, 1982), 39; Blake, II, 201; In King’s Inns Admission Papers he is listed as the son of Ambrose Blake of Fartigare, Co. Galway, but all other sources give him as the son of Andrew Blake of Fartigare so there no question that this is the same person.
37 Major Martin Blake, London to Edmond Blake, 7 Sept. 1749 (M6936/1/7).
38 M6935/66/15.
40 M6935/66/16; Burke, Landed gentry, 423; Admissions to the Middle Temple, I, 241; Hazel Maynard, ‘The Irish legal profession and the Catholic revival 1660-89’, in James Kelly, John McCafferty and Charles Ivar McGrath (eds), People, Politics and Power (Dublin, 2009), 31, 38.
41 Settlement on marriage of Mark Lynch of Garracloone, Co. Mayo, esq and Margaret, daughter of Walter Joyce of Galway, merchant, 6 Sept. 1746 (M6931/72).
laid out the situation for Lynch, told him he was sure a suit would commence against himself, or more accurately his father, who was still alive and well, and asked him how he could prepare for such an eventuality. Marcus Lynch advised Martin to prove the handwriting of the witnesses and parties involved in the various articles and deeds affecting the estate.\footnote{M6935/66/16-17.} Martin could prove a number there and then, and Marcus Lynch himself was related to a number of the persons involved and provided proof of their handwriting. For the rest Marcus advised Martin to ‘send to the country, to search the family papers of all the gentlemen that were anyway concerned’.\footnote{M6935/66/16-17.} Martin sent his servant Andrew Morris to counties Mayo and Roscommon, where Martin’s grandmother’s family lived, and Andrew’s son George Morris to search the town of Galway and part of the county, while Martin put the word out through his family and business connections.\footnote{M6935/66/17-18.} He received a flurry of letters from Galway’s hinterland and further afield, with his contacts searching through their own family papers or even their neighbour’s, to see if they could be any use.

Arthur French wrote from Tuam on 9 February 1768,

\begin{quote}
Pursuant to your letter, I have viewed the articles of the 28\textsuperscript{th} day of November 1691, entered into on the intermarriage of your grandfather, Martin Blake of Rusheens with Margaret French, daughter of Edmond French of Abbyboyle and also of Edmond French’s bond for one thousand pounds of the same date to Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Cummer. I have likewise viewed the witness’ names of both. I am quite a stranger to the handwriting of any of the parties or of the witnesses. I see that Christopher French is subscribed as a witness to the bond but I am sure it is not the handwriting of my father Christopher French. I compared it with a letter made by my great-grandfather, Christopher French, dated in the year 1675 [to] his son Arthur French my grandfather, but here is not the least similitude of handwriting between them.\footnote{Arthur French, Tuam to Martin Blake, Ballyglunin, 9 Feb. 1768 (M6936/1/25).} Over the next few months, Martin received correspondence from his contacts throughout Connacht in relation to deeds going back to the previous century, including from the mayor of Galway who trawled through the records of the town in order to get documents Martin could use.\footnote{Andrew Blake, Ballinafad to Martin Blake, Ballyglunin, 30 Feb. 1768 (M6936/1/20); Maruice Blake of Ballinafad to Martin Blake in Galway, 12 Mar. 1768 (M6936/1/29/B); John Henly to Martin Blake, 15 Mar. 1768 (M6936/1/26); Mrs Dillon to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, 15 Mar. 1768 (M6936/1/27); Anthony French Fitz Edward and Edward French Fitz Anthony of Callow, Co. Roscommon, gens to Jasper French Fitz John of Clogher, Co. Galway, gent, 1 Aug. 1678 [note on back by John Henly, 4 Apr. 1768] (M6931/26); John Gibson, mayor to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, in Galway, 9 May 1768 (M6936/1/29); Charles Westlake to Martin Blake, Galway 9 May 1768 (M6936/1/29); John Henly to Martin Blake, Galway, 27 May 1768 (M6936/1/30); Mr Connellan to Martin Blake, 28 May 1768 (M6936/1/31); Hardiman, 226.} The extended family from around the country were also importuned. Martin
sent Peter Hillary to Julia French living in Britain St, Dublin to inquire about her grandfather Edmond French of Boyle Abbey, County Roscommon whose daughter Margaret married Martin Blake Fitz Peter. Peter Hillary brought a number of documents for her to compare her own family papers with. Martin, in an accompanying letter, apologised for the condition of a number of them particularly the marriage articles perfected by their respective grandfathers, ‘which was so abused by being carried about the country in search of witnesses, that it must be handled tenderly’. Other documents were so badly damaged from similar usage that he could not even send them to Dublin for fear they would meet a similar fate. Martin explained to her that he wished her ‘to compare their handwriting with my deeds and if they are alike, to write me a few lines in the same manner’. Nevertheless, Martin had enough testimonies from people writing to him and from family papers forwarded to him that he could prove all the perfecting parties involved in the important deeds affecting the estate, including the handwriting of Martin Brown and Robert Shaw by forty different people.

With more than sufficient proof Martin intended to go on the legal offensive on two fronts, in Galway and Mayo in the first instance and then in London. He wrote back to Dominick Blake in London setting out what he had done and let him know he was ready ‘for that gentleman, whenever he chose to attack’. He got no answer. He wrote a second time and six weeks later got a ‘flemish’ answer from Dominick, claiming that he had shown his letter to various parties in London and that he was sure that would be the end of the matter. By which time Martin came around to Thomas Lynch’s opinion, that John Blake Fitz Martin’s enquiry about gavelling was simply an invention of Dominick’s.

Fired up Martin was determined to get satisfaction. He was intent on commencing a suit against both his cousin John Blake Fitz (Major) Martin and Dominick Blake grounded on the letter Dominick had sent him and intended to give notice of it in London. It was only when Counsellor Thomas Kelly returned to Galway and told him he would be mad to commence such a suit that he was dissuaded. Martin later reflected that he was glad he took this advice because soon after things took another turn when Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin’s daughter Jane, who would marry Mr Kentrop of Antwerp, made a visit to Ireland to see her relations. When they met Martin showed her Counsellor Dominick Blake’s letters. She said the report about her brother’s enquiry about gavelling the estate was all a lie and invention of Dominick’s. The question remained, whether Martin believed his cousin John

---

47 Great Britain St is currently Parnell St, see Colm Lennon and John Montague, *John Rocque’s Dublin: A guide to the Georgian city* (Dublin, 2010).
48 Martin Blake to Miss Julia French in Britain St, Dublin, 12 Apr. 1768 (M6936/1/28).
49 M6935/66/18; Hardman, 230.
50 M6935/66/19.
51 M6935/66/20.
Blake Fitz (Major) Martin, the black sheep of his family who was disinherited and spent time in prison; Counsellor Dominick Blake, described a few years later as ‘a red hot Protestant’; the possibility they were working together; or neither one. Martin does not give a definitive answer, though he clearly came around to Thomas Lynch’s way of thinking that Dominick Blake played a leading role in the attempted deception.⁵²

That one letter from London could set off such a series of events in one family and entangle the surrounding families, both Catholic and Protestant, into their affairs, gives a good indication of the far-reaching effects of the penal laws at even this late date. Only a few years later in 1777 Charles O’Conor of Ballinagare, County Roscommon had to deal with his younger brother filing a bill of discovery which Charles was only able to evade by way of an expensive settlement.⁵³ Every aspect of the estate’s management had to be seen through the lens of the penal laws. This is not to overstate their effect as by this date their day-to-day influence had diminished considerably, but it is clear they were far from a dead letter. That Martin Blake received such a response from his extended family, friends and business contacts throughout Connacht indicates that it was not simply paranoia on the part of Martin. His correspondents took the matter as seriously as he did. The threat to the estate was very real, if undertaken in the correct manner and backed with the right legal experience and financial means. The estate’s saving grace was that the Blakes of Ballyglunin retained the documentation to prove conclusively their ownership of the estate and the legality of any and all settlements on that estate.

iv. The settlement of the estate

‘My brothers Robert and Jack will never attempt to gavel, if they should, my fines, that I levied, will help to bar them after 5 years. The lease that my father gave me of his lands will bar them, of the profit rent during the term the annuities they signed to will help bar them and the bonds of £6,000 passed by my father on my marriage will bar them. There is no danger they will have children, as my brother Jack took his Book oath before my wife and me that he would never marry. And as to remainder men … [they] are cut short by the recovery my father suffered.’⁵⁴

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond, 26 July 1773

---

⁵² John French Lynch, Richmond to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin in Middle St, Galway, 10 Dec. 1772 (M6936/33); M6935/66/19.
⁵⁴ M6935/66/14.
The management of an estate was conducted on many fronts. However, the importance of ensuring the continuation of the estate with its inheritance by the eldest son of each succeeding generation meant that strict settlements became ubiquitous by the eighteenth century. The methods by which this was enforced by marriage settlements, wills, fines and recoveries, provisions for younger sons, and just the general day to day management of the estate were similar for all estates. What differentiated the management of estates between Catholics and landowners of other confessions were the penal laws. The penal laws impacted on the estates of Catholic landowners primarily in the area of the settlement of the estate, particularly family settlements. The preservation of an estate by Catholic landed families during the era when the penal laws were in force depended on numerous eventualities. Some families were lucky enough to have only one male heir in one or more generations, thus ensuring there could be no attempt to gavel the estate. Otherwise, settlements would have to be entered into in order to provide for younger sons and the wider family. The extra finance involved plus the repeated resort to these methods of estate management were an almost intolerable additional burden on Catholic landowners.

The use of marriage articles was the main method by which the Ballyglunin Blakes, and all other landowners, entered into a strict settlement of their estate. The passing of bonds to ensure the adherence of younger children to the settlement of the estate is another vital element of estate management and is dealt with in Chapter 8 dealing with younger sons. Strict settlements had emerged by the seventeenth century as a means for landowners to control and manage their estates over the generations to ensure the estate passed to the eldest son, without dispute or litigation, while protecting the entitlements of the wider family. Marriage settlements were the main means by which this was achieved and made provision for wives and younger children but primarily were for the protection of the estate.

Given the centrality of land to the history of Ireland and the importance of strict settlements, and the marriages and marriage settlements these entailed, to the continuation of estates within the same family it is somewhat surprising the lack of attention paid to either marriages or marriage settlements by Irish historians. In comparison there has been a rich debate in England going back to H.J. Habakkuk from 1940 and continuing on to more recent times, revolving around his argument of marriage being a major factor in the rise of great

56 Harvey, Bellews of Mount Bellew, 47.
57 Dickson, Old World Colony, 86-7; Jane Ohlmeyer, Making Ireland English: The Irish aristocracy in the seventeenth century (New Haven, 2012), 195.
estates. Different elements of this argument have progressively been teased out but continue to concentrate on marriage and strict settlements and how they relate to landed estates and landed families, including Lloyd Bonfield on marriage settlements, Eileen Spring on women and property and Amy Louise Erickson on non-aristocratic women and property but who gave the further insight that bonds could be a form of marriage settlement. No specific Irish study of these topics has appeared but there have been important contributions to aspects of this debate. Art Cosgrove’s edited volume of essays on *Marriage in Ireland* gives a good overview of marriage in Ireland from early to modern times, of particular relevance is Patrick J. Corish’s essay on Catholics and marriage under the penal laws. There have been good contributions on marriage and the Irish aristocracy by Jane Ohlmeyer on the seventeenth century and Anthony Malcolmson’s study of the economic aspects of aristocratic marriage in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Over roughly the same period as Malcolmson, 1750-1850, Deborah Wilson has looked at women’s experience of property in twenty aristocratic families. While marriage from a female perspective has been explored by Mary O’Dowd, her discussion of portions is limited to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and as primarily a synthesis of previously published work she emphasised the paucity of discussion of this subject. David Dickson’s regional study of Cork has touched on strict settlements but mostly concerned himself with primogeniture and how estates were passed on through the generations.

Catholic landowners have played little or no part in this debate, which is surprising as it will be shown the strict settlement and all it entailed became an important method by which Catholic landowners managed the penal laws and how they related to their estates. For Catholics in eighteenth century Ireland the strict settlement of their estate gained an added importance with the accumulating influence of the penal laws from the 1690s onwards. The strict settlement became one of many methods by which Catholic landowners sought to manage their estates, to protect their holdings for, and from, their immediate and extended family from any attempt on their estate under the penal laws.

60 Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English*, Ch.6 Marriage; Malcolmson, *The Pursuit of the Heiress*.
61 Wilson, *Women, marriage and property*.
63 Dickson, *Old World Colony*, 86-94.
Marriage portions varied wildly even within similar socio-economic levels of society. Potential great heiresses in the period 1740-1840 could have marriage portions of between £5,000 to £10,000.\(^{65}\) In Deborah Wilson’s examination of a sample of twenty wealthy landed families in Ireland over the period 1750-1850 marriage portions varied from £1,000-20,000 and could include land, investments and cash, but she concluded that variations in family wealth were only one aspect in any attempt to explain the amount of portion provided in the marriage settlement.\(^{66}\) Wealthy Cork merchants at mid-century gave their daughters dowries of £3,000-£5,000.\(^{67}\) In Tipperary before c.1750 marriage portions were less than £1,000 for smaller families, £1,000 or £1,500 for middle-ranking families, while leading families could range from £2,000 to £6,000. In the 1760s, for the leading families they range from £2,000 to £3,000, with one or two of £6,000 but few in excess of that. In 1765 Francis Mathew, heir to the vast Thomastown property, on his marriage to Ellis Smyth of County Wicklow received £10,000. While in 1783 Anne Roche, daughter of a leading Limerick merchant brought £5,000 to her marriage with George Ryan of Inch.\(^{68}\)

Table 6.i: Marriage portions affecting the Ballyglunin estate in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Portion £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1652</td>
<td>Martin Blake Fitz Andrew &amp; Ann Joyce, widow of Patrick Bodkin</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Margaret, dau. of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew &amp; Joseph Lynch of Ballycurrin</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Martin Blake Fitz Peter &amp; Margaret, dau. of Edmond French of Abbyboyle, Co. Roscommon</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Mar. 1725</td>
<td>Edmond Blake Fitz Martin &amp; Mary dau. of John French, Rahasane, Co. Galway</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Martin Blake Fitz Edmond &amp; Bridge, dau. of Walter Joyce, Galway town</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Jan. 1754</td>
<td>Margaret, dau. of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin &amp; John Darcy of Houndswood, Co. Mayo</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Edmond Blake Fitz Martin &amp; Mary, dau. Nugent Aylward, Ballnegar, Co. Galway</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Apr. 1789</td>
<td>Walter Blake Fitz Martin &amp; Mary, only dau. of Elizabeth Archdeacon, Galway town</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: M6931/1, 16, 46-7, 64a&b, 74a&b, 80, 98, 105.

Table 6.i gives a breakdown of the marriage portions that affected the Ballyglunin estate in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. As has been pointed out numerous other factors went into determining the amount of the portion but the amounts involved for the Ballyglunin Blakes are higher than you would expect from a similarly landed family in the eighteenth century. They amounted roughly to £1,500 up in the first half of the eighteenth century, with

\(^{65}\) Malcomson, *The pursuit of the Heiress*, 5.
\(^{66}\) Wilson, *Women, marriage and property*, 49.
\(^{67}\) Dickson, *Old World Colony*, 163.
the amount rising dramatically in the second half of the century. Where there is a definite exceptional usage is in the bonds passed to guarantee the enactment of the marriage articles (see Appendix Tables xii & xv). The function a marriage settlement could be used for is illustrated on the marriage of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond, where the marriage portion, despite being only £1,600, was guaranteed by two bonds for £6,000 each. Bonds used to guarantee debts were usually double the amount of the debt or potential debt due, here the bonds were over seven times the amount. The settlement was used to guarantee the continuation of the estate in the eldest son, but here far greater efforts had to be used to ensure that there could be no possible influence of the penal laws on the descent of the estate.

The marriage pattern of the Blakes of Ballyglunin, as for the majority of the late townsmen of Galway, remained within the ranks of the tribes of Galway (see Marriage links of the Blakes of Ballyglunin in Genealogy Appendix). Beneath the upper gentry and political elite the norm remained provincial endogamy but for the surviving Catholic landowners in the rest of Ireland it was more usual to seek potential spouses further afield, from a lower social status or from a different religion. The only other area where a substantial Catholic interest survived and where a similar pattern of marriage alliances was found, was around south Tipperary and north Cork. The survival in Galway of such a large proportion of Catholic landowners, relative to the rest of Ireland, ensured that there were more numerous marriage possibilities. The family in Ireland looked overwhelmingly to the other families of the tribes of Galway. They married other members of the extended Blake family but also members of the Frenches, Lynches, Joyces and Bodkins in Galway as well as throughout Connacht.

Those that emigrated initially married within fellow migrant families, primarily Galway ones, but by the second generation it was more common to seek partners from their new homes. Major Martin Blake Fitz Peter emigrated from Galway and ultimately settled on Antigua and in Sevenoaks, Kent. He established himself in London society, having a wide range of friends and family. He married a Burke then resident on Antigua. Yet when it came to thinking about his four daughters’ future he told his brother, in 1746, he intended to send them to him in Galway ‘when ripe’, believing ‘it will be the best place to get them husbands’. He told his brother that, ‘if you can get your daughter happily disposed of you may sing Te Deum, you have but one, I have three to look out for, and I fancy in a few years, will look me full in the face’. As it turned out, not one of them even

---

69 Dickson, _Old World Colony_, 92-3.
71 Major Martin Blake, London to Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin, 20 Sept. 1746 (M6936/1/10).
72 Major Martin Blake, York to Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin, 10 Jan. 1749 (M6936/1/6).
married an Irishman, never mind a Galwegian. The eldest daughter Margaret married first Robert Mandeville and secondly John Thomlinson Jnr. of East Barnet, Hertfordshire. John Thomlinson Jnr. was MP for Steyning 1761-67. His father traded with the West Indies and New Hampshire, held considerable Government contracts for victualling troops, and had numerous business links and a friendship with Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin (see Chapter 8.ii). Margaret and John Jnr. married at St Mary’s, Bermondsey, London on 3 June 1763. The same year John Jnr. was appointed, jointly with his father, agents in London for New Hampshire. Two of Margaret’s daughters were educated at Mrs Terry’s boarding school at Camden House, London. Major Martin’s second daughter Jane married Mr Kentrop of Antwerp. Sarah Town married John Masterson and Penelope married, on 6 November 1760, John Sober a sea captain of Barbados.73

The other method by which the Blakes of Ballyglunin used existing methods of estate management as a means to manage the effect of the penal laws on their estate was by the enactment of fines and recoveries. Those wishing to break the fee tail were forced to employ ‘collusive actions’ called fines and recoveries, employed by a lawyer and his client in order for the client to enjoy their entailed estate free from any restrictions imposed by holding the land entail. William Cruise in an essay on common recoveries from 1783 claimed that ‘it is well known that the title to almost every estate in the kingdom depends on the validity of this assurance’, he was referring to England but the same was true for Ireland.74 The common or feigned recovery was available only to the tenant-in-tail in possession who by a feigned suit in the Court of Common Pleas, could bar the entail and cut off any remainders and reversions, so as to dispose of his property as he wished and for the better assurance of lands and tenements. This necessitated at least three persons, the defendant or tenant of the land against whom the writ is brought, the plaintiff who brought the writ and the vouchee or vouchees, whom the tenant calls to warranty the land. The tenant in tail offered no defence, admitting he had no good title, the vouchee appears to defend the title but on the day appointed to make his defence does not turn up. Thus the judgement is given against the tenant. The plaintiff to recover the value goes in a writ of seisin but as this is only fictitious, the tenant is ultimately able to suffer a recovery of the property. Though the suit was fictitious the writ issued from it was a judgement according


to common law, subject only to whatever fees and bribes were necessary to secure the cooperation of the other parties in the case.

The term ‘fine’ has numerous legal meanings, whether a simple payment or an entry fine as an upfront payment to secure a tenancy. In its legal sense as a means to bar an entail, a fine was, like a recovery, a collusive legal action worked out by the parties, approved by the court and then registered with the court to bar entail, it supposes a controversy over the property where in reality there was none. The fine would be sent to the justices of assize and justices of the peace where the property lay, to be openly proclaimed, and if there was no claim against it after a set period, the fine was engrossed. Both fines and recoveries involved fictitious actions in court to circumvent the entail. The common recovery was a more complicated and more expensive action but produced a fee simple absolute. Fines and recoveries remained the standard practice which, bar an act of parliament, were used to circumvent the entail until the Fines and Recoveries (Ireland) act 1834. This was attractive to landowners as it enabled them to enjoy their property free from all conditions and limitations, including all charges, reversions, encumbrances and remainders.  

Fines and recoveries were a common method of estate management that tied into the strict settlement of the estate. Hamlet, talking to a skull, wondered if ‘this fellow might be in’s time a great buyer of land, with his statutes, his recognizances, his fines, his double vouchers, his recoveries’. A year after the 1687 marriage of Sir Walter Blake of Menlough to Anne, daughter of Sir John Kirwan, of Cattlehacket, County Galway, Sir Walter Blake executed a post-nuptial settlement, settled the estate on himself for life with the remainder settled on his heirs in tail male and suffered a common recovery. In Swift’s first letter of 1710 in his Journal to Stella, he related that the first man he met on arriving in Chester was Rev Anthony Raymond, rector of Trim, who was there with his wife in order to levy a fine in order to have the power to sell their estate.

The use of fines and recoveries as a means to frustrate the 1704 Act to prevent the further growth of popery was immediately identified by Catholic landowners and led to a specific section dealing with fines and recoveries in the 1709 Act for explaining and amending an Act, entitled, an Act to prevent the further growth of popery. The act noted

76 William Shakespeare, Hamlet, Act V, Scene I.
77 N.L.I., MS 10,791/2; Blake, Il, 124-6, 146.
79 2 Anne, c. 6., An Act to prevent the further growth of popery (Statutes at large, iv, 12-31); 8 Anne, c.3., An Act for explaining and amending an Act intituled, An Act to prevent the further growth of popery (Statutes at large, iv, 190-216).
that ‘as many Irish papists of this kingdom in order to defeat and elude the said act of Parliament, to prevent the further growth of popery did ... levy and suffer fines and recoveries of their several estates, whereof they were seized in tail, in order to bar all remainders that were then vested, or afterwards might vest, in any protestants’, as well as other conveyances and dispositions in order that the estate would never demise on ‘any Englishman or protestant, or any that should turn protestant’. It was therefore enacted that all such conveyances, fines and common recoveries entered into since 1 January 1703 with the deliberate intention of evading the 1704 act were null and void.\textsuperscript{80} This was only an impediment to Catholics entering into fines and recoveries on their estates if it could be proven that it was done with the specific intent of evading the 1704 act, a level of proof that was unlikely ever to have been met. Karen Harvey has taken this to have ‘expressly invalidated’ the practice.\textsuperscript{81} In fact there was no specific bar to Catholics suffering a common recovery or levying a fine, once it was not attempted to alienate any of the land concerned, or could be proved the intention was to evade the penal laws, as it was ‘only a new modelling of the estate, and not a purchase or acquisition within the act’, the landowner was ‘capable of taking a new fee, at least for the benefit of his heirs and posterity’.\textsuperscript{82} Though it was strongly argued against in some cases that came before the courts, it remained central to estate management for landowners of all confessions and proved instrumental in Catholic landowner’s management of the penal laws.\textsuperscript{83}

In the penal era, the wider settlement of the estate was not available to Catholics. Nevertheless, marriage settlements, as well as fines and recoveries, remained a vital element in estate management. The marriage settlement entered into on the marriage of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin and Mary, daughter of John French of Rahasane, included the proviso that the Blakes of Ballyglunin would suffer a common recovery of the whole estate held in tail male on Edmond reaching twenty-one years of age in order to secure the perfection of the articles agreed. Edmond was not to receive the marriage portion of £1,300 until the recovery had been enacted.\textsuperscript{84} Numerous other fines and recoveries were enacted on specific lands of the estate over the course of the century (see Appendix Table xii &

\textsuperscript{80} 8 Anne, c.3, s.6.
\textsuperscript{81} Apparently missing the vital clause in T.P. Power’s article she quotes: ‘conveyances made by Catholics to circumvent the 1704 act were void’ (Power, ‘Converts’, 108-9) and despite later recounting how the Catholic Henry Dillon intended to use a ‘fine and recovery’ (Harvey, Bellews of Mount Bellew, 44, 49).
\textsuperscript{82} Referring to the English case of Lord Derwentwater under 11 & 12 Will. Ill [Eng.] (Howard, Several Special Cases, 305).
\textsuperscript{83} Howard, Several Special Cases, 291, 304.
\textsuperscript{84} Marriage articles between Martin Blake of Cummer on behalf of his son Edmond of the first part, John French of Rahasane on behalf of himself and his eldest daughter Mary of the second part, and John Burke of Lismore and Robert French of Derry of the third part, 27 Mar. 1724 (M6931/64/a&b).
Martin Blake Fitz Edmond from mid-century, when he played an increasing role in the estate, wanted his father to suffer a recovery of his whole estate to put everything on a more secure footing, for him and his family in any case. Edmond Blake Fitz Martin would not, as he would not cut short his own father’s settlement, particularly in relation to his brother Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin and the remainders in favour of Major Martin’s children. This all changed on the death of Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin on 8 October 1767 (as discussed above, Chapter 6.ii). Major Martin and his family by this time were living in London and were in constant communication with their relations back in Galway. The sordid details regarding the exploits of Major Martin’s eldest son John were reported back to Galway; he was described as a ‘vicious and extravagant’ character who had been disinherited by his father. At the time of Major Martin’s death, he was serving time in gaol, most likely for debt. Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s cousin, Counsellor Dominick Blake of Castlegrove, was in London and with his uncle Major Martin on his death. Counsellor Dominick Blake wrote to Martin Blake Fitz Edmond informing him that John Blake Fitz Major Martin was making enquiries with him, wondering if he could gavel with Edmond Blake Fitz Martin. Martin showed the letter to his father who ‘got angry and said, “I will show the chap he has no right and I will cut him short of any chance of remainder he might have, little as his chance is”’. Accordingly, in 1768 Edmond levied fines and suffered recoveries for all his estate.86

This ensured that the remaindermen, or the distant relatives who could potentially claim some part of the estate on the death of a relative, as per various marriage articles or wills, as the last living relative in a line listed within those documents, the very thing the fine and recovery cut short, could now have no claim whatsoever on the estate. This was aimed primarily at the children of Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, who were now cut short by the recovery suffered by Edmond. Despite all this, on his father’s death in 1771, Martin Blake Fitz Edmond set about levying fines for the whole estate and house in Galway and so in 1772 he levied a fine with James O’Hara of Dublin for both the Ballyglunin estate and the urban property.87 These methods of estate management, while common for all landowners, were adapted by Catholics in order to manage the effects of the penal laws. The other

85 Fine of Cullurty [Brierfield] and Cloondahamper, Co. Galway, Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin to Marlborough Sterling of Dublin, 3 Nov. 1754 (M6931/81); Fine of Ardasoden, Killmoylan [Ballyglooneen] and Culleen, Co. Galway, 2 May 1756 (M6931/82); M6933/66/8.
86 M6935/66/8-9; Fine, Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin to James O’Hara of Dublin, gent, 30 May 1768 (M6931/90); Fine, Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin to James O’Hara of Dublin, gent, 30 May 1768 (M6931/91); Recovery suffered by Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin & James O’Hara of Dublin, Michaelmas 1768 (M6931/92 & 93); Recovery Book, 1748-74 (N.A.I., 2/447/36, f. 86); Recoveries Index, 1739-1839, A-K (N.A.I., 2/447/39, f. Co. Galway, B).
87 Fine, Martin Blake of Ballyglunin to James O’Hara of Dublin, 16 June 1771 (M6931/94 & 95); M6935/66/10.
aspect of these settlements, those settled on the younger children, are discussed in Chapter 8.

v. The Blakes of Ballyglunin's experience of the penal laws in the wider world

Case ... of Edmund Blake and his son Martin, for submission to the papal court, inquiring as to whether, in view of the situation of Catholic proprietors under the penal laws, he ought to sell his estate and emigrate. 23 Dec 1769

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin was ill for the last few years of his life. As a result, he handed over the running of the estate to his eldest son Martin from the mid-1760s. The subsequent query about the gavel by members of the extended family set in motion a re-settlement of the estate over the next few years and culminated in him suffering a common recovery of the whole estate. Nevertheless, the prospect of the family losing the estate, or their religion, weighed heavily on him. The culmination of all these factors led Edmond, in December 1769, to write to Rome to request an official Church judgement on his situation. 88

Edmond requested a papal opinion on his inquiry as to ‘whether, in view of the situation of Catholic proprietors under the penal laws, he ought to sell his estate and emigrate’. The report of the case to Propaganda described Edmond as ‘a Catholic noble, who is close to death’ and continued that if any of his three sons, Martin, Robert or John, converted within a year of his death they could claim his entire property. On 10 March 1770, Cardinal Castelli, Prefect of the Congregation of Propaganda, gave his opinion that there was no such obligation on Edmond to sell his estate or emigrate and added a further note to tell Edmond not to worry. 89

The inquiry about the gavel made by John Blake Fitz (Major) Martin or by Counsellor Dominick Blake, or both, had a profound effect on Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, particularly as he was in ill health in the final few years of his life. The majority of the estate was settled

88 Descriptive list of the Ballyglunin Papers, M6935/73/4-7; the envelope containing these documents is misplaced within the National Archives; Martin Blake’s request of the opinion was quoted by L.M. Cullen, ‘Martin Blake, a propertied Catholic in co. Galway, old and envisaging the successions of his son and grandson to the estate, sought ecclesiastical opinion in Rome as to whether the family should not sell and emigrate, for fear the pressures might not be irresistible for an heir inheriting the estate’, giving reference: PRONI [sic], Blake papers, M6935/73/(5), copy of the case sent to Rome 23 Dec. 1769 (L.M. Cullen, The Emergence of Modern Ireland, 1600-1900 (London, 1981), 196).
in fee tail, each son and daughter in succeeding generations had large settlements charged on the estate to ensure their portion (see Chapter 8). Edmond had been on good terms with his only brother Major Martin, who was a wealthy merchant in his own right, and while Major Martin’s sons were not all paragons of virtue, Edmond’s son Martin had taken extensive steps to ensure any attempt to gavel would be fruitless. Of Edmond’s four sons two were priests and the fourth had a generous arrangement settled on the estate, even swearing an oath on the Bible that he would never marry.\(^9\) In spite of the extensive steps they took, the Blakes, father and son, obviously felt they were still insufficient. Religion was the primary motivation. The conversion of his heir was inconceivable to Edmond.

There was nothing too unusual about Catholics selling up and emigrating in order to save their fortunes or their religion.\(^9\) A few years later in 1774 Charles O’Conor, in a letter dealing with his disapproval of the 1774 Oath of Allegiance and referring to the Quebec Act of the same year, which allowed Canadians freedom of religion, wondered if ‘Good Catholics’ who lived under a regime where ‘the penalties of law on men guiltless of any civil crime are grievous’ would be left with little choice but to emigrate, he hoped, ‘may they not find repose in Canada’.\(^1\) A year later he was still despairing that as a result of the penal laws, ‘we will be forced to emigrate into Canada’.\(^3\) Even prior to this in 1765, O’Conor was exasperated that what he saw as good sense, in terms of leniency to Catholics, prevailed in the King’s other dominions, that is in Canada and in his German territories, but not in Ireland or Britain.\(^4\) In one of his pamphlets, he wondered ‘are Irish Catholics alone irreclaimable’?\(^5\)

The establishment of the Catholic Association in 1756, while a ‘weak beginning’, did lead to the formation of a Catholic Committee four years later.\(^6\) The despondency and passivity of the previous half century gave way to the emergence of a slow building Catholic resurgence, particularly around Catholic landowners and merchants who had managed to

---

\(^9\) State of Martin Blake of Ballyglunin’s situation relative to his real estate, 26 July 1773 (M6935/66).

\(^9\) W.P. Burke, History of Clonmel (Waterford, 1907), 393-4; Harvey, Bellews of Mount Bellew, 11.


\(^9\) Charles O’Conor to Dr John Curry, 26 Oct. 1775 (Letters of Charles O’Conor of Belanagare, 330).

\(^9\) Charles O’Conor to Edmund Burke, 25 Apr. 1765 (Letters of Charles O’Conor of Belanagare, 175-6).

\(^9\) Nicholas, Lord Viscount Taaffe, Observations on Affairs in Ireland from the Settlement in 1691, to the Present Time (Dublin, 1666), 25; Matthew O’Conor, The history of the Irish Catholics from the settlement in 1691, with a view of the state of Ireland from the invasion of Henry II to the revolution (Dublin, 1813), 317; Ó Catháin, ‘Some account of Charles O’Conor and literacy in Irish in his time’, 37.

retain some semblance of their wealth. Edmond Blake Fitz Martin saw this emerging quest for equal rights but despaired of this ever happening and wondered would it not be better for their religion and the future prosperity of their family to simply emigrate. This was evidently a widespread feeling among Catholics of substance despairing of there ever being any change made to the penal code. Few, if any, other families went to the trouble of getting a papal opinion on their situation. The penal laws have long been shown to not be the monolithic legal code nationalist Catholic apologists of the nineteenth century saw them as. However, this should not be an excuse to underestimate their influence on the Catholics of eighteenth century Ireland. Landowners, in particular, felt the claustrophobic influence of the penal laws on a regular basis and had to use their remaining wealth and a considerable portion of their time in efforts to mitigate their effects. No decision made in relation to their estate escaped from the influence of the penal laws.

The deadlock over the 1774 oath of allegiance that Charles O’Conor condemned and which divided Catholic opinion was broken by the actions of Lord Trimleston and subsequently by the approval of some of the Catholic hierarchy. Edmond Blake Fitz Martin ‘(the younger)’ in light of this had no problem with it and took the oath of allegiance, on 24 October 1775, at the quarter sessions in Loughrea before Peter Kilkenny, clerk of the peace for the County of Galway.

The continued influence of the penal laws remained a constant presence for the Catholic landowners, merchants and professionals of Ireland right up to their repeal and in some cases for some time after. Given the international trade links Galway merchants retained, it is no wonder their experience of the penal laws had not only an Irish dimension but also a European and wider Atlantic aspect. One of the many contacts the family had abroad, in both the West Indies and particularly in London, was John French Lynch. John had inherited his uncle, Anthony Lynch’s plantations in the West Indies and conducted an extensive trade with his brothers, Anthony French in London, Francis French in Dublin who later ran a counting house in Madeira and another brother Andrew French who leased his brother John’s plantations in St Kitts. When John French Lynch died in 1788 he held stock

100 Copies of all the lists which have been returned to the clerk of the Privy Council, or his deputy, of such papists as have taken and subscribed the oath prescribed by the statute of the thirteenth and fourteenth of His present Majesty, intitled “An Act to enable His Majesty’s subjects of whatever persuasion to testify their allegiance to him” (Dublin, 1786?), 16-17; P.R.I. rep. D.K. 59, 67.
in the Bank of England worth £40,000 and left legacies in excess of £20,000. John was a friend and business associate of Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s second son Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin of Antigua and of Sevenoaks, Kent as can be seen by the fact that, on 26 November 1758, John and Major Martin were taking a stroll in Hyde Park and down Constitution Hill, London, where they bumped into the lawyer and fellow member of the West Indian London circle John Baker.

John French Lynch had close links with the Blakes of Ballyglunin and the extended Galway merchant network in the wider Atlantic world. This included both the French and Blake extended families conducting business with William Kelly and his family in London and the West Indies, with business links going back to at least the 1730s. William Kelly had been involved with Major Martin Blake in the West Indies and was the person who let the cat out of the bag in relation to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin’s inquiries about setting up his youngest son, Peter, on St Kitts (see Chapter 8.iii).

By 1772 John French Lynch had a problem. He was administering the estate of William Kelly but the different expectations of the various heirs had left him completely at a loss about how to proceed. He wrote from Richmond in 1772 to Martin Blake Fitz Edmond and hoped he could help him out. John French Lynch told Martin that ‘our kinsman Mr Dominick Blake’ (the same one that had caused Martin so much trouble just a few years before), ‘is such a red hot Protestant’ that he ‘dare not in good manners send him’ the letter that he enclosed to Martin explaining why he wished to take leave of William Kelly’s affairs. He proceeded into a tirade against the ‘Cannibal Popery Laws of Ireland’,

I give a dash against the Cannibal Popery Laws of Ireland. They are indeed in my eye, a disgrace to human nature, children are encouraged to fly in the face of their parents, a neighbour betraying his bosom friend, helpless people plundered by unconscionable litigations, and by cruel and severe disappointments, doused up by resentments, to murders and other act of desperation. Treachery and baseness nourished by laws, that even Hottentots would shudder at and blush to curse their country and stain the morals of the people with.

William Kelly had left eight heirs and they were all now lining up to get their share, using whatever means they could, and all imploring John French Lynch to take their side, especially to urge the Widow Kelly to take their view of things. What John French Lynch

103 M6933/26/TV, 15; Major Martin Blake, York to Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin, 10 Jan. 1749 (M6936/1/6); [Robert Brown], Antigua to Edmond Blake, 10 Sept. 1762 & [Robert] Brown to Edmond Blake, 31 May 1763 (M6936/1/23).
104 John French Lynch, Richmond to Martin Blake (of Ballyglunin), in Middle St, Galway, 10 Dec. 1772 (M6936/1/33).
was asking Martin Blake Fitz Edmond was for him to take over not only his father’s function as an agent in Ireland for the various beneficiaries of the estate of William Kelly, the position left vacant by the death the previous year of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, but also certain of John French Lynch’s own dealings conducted from London.

John French Lynch went further into the various problems the management of the various beneficiaries of the estate were creating for him. Mrs Gardiner wrote him a ‘well put together letter’ hoping to arrange relations, while Dominick Blake ‘on the other hand writes me severely’ to request him to write to Mrs Gardiner to sign over the power of attorney to him. John knew ‘nothing of the good woman, nor’ did he think it proper for him ‘an entire stranger to them all, to recommend her to an act, that she and her own relations disapprove’. He was ‘very sorry for the plague and trouble Mr Dominick Blake...had in this matter’, though he insisted it must be by ‘his good nature, for I will not be made to believe otherwise’. The problem becomes clearer when he explains that if Dominick ‘had proposed a gentleman of their own family to be joined with him in the sham sale in trust, it would have been quieter for him and prevented their’ suspicions. The heirs’ attempts to claim the inheritance and however they ran afoul of the penal laws left John French Lynch exasperated,

I am no lawyer therefore can be no judge but I must own the very idea of the popery laws interfering in the distribution of this money, among the eight representatives of the late Mr Kelly frightens me out of all relish of meddling more in their concern, when everything is done on this side for the benefit of the unhappy people up starts a wicked relation, supported by those fire brand laws, to confuse and perplex matters afresh; which will put things in worse confusion than where they began.

He was happy just to lay out the case to Martin and asked him to explain all this to the parties concerned. He explained to Martin that he laid all of this on him as ‘you are the head of the family and that I find your dear father was in high estimation with Madam Gardiner’, repeating to him that, ‘nothing on earth shall prevail on me to meddle in their affairs’. Their money which he had in his control ‘is all safe, and it rests with themselves, to agree among each other...before they can come at it’.

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond wrote back to John French Lynch care of Messrs French and Joyce, merchants, London on 29 December 1772. In the short letter, Martin touched on numerous matters but stayed well away from the estate of William Kelly of Antigua, other than to say he commiserated with John French Lynch over the extravagancies of their relations on John’s side of the water and wished they would listen to his advice. Martin did

105 John French Lynch, Richmond to Martin Blake (of Ballyglunin), in Middle St, Galway, 10 Dec. 1772 (M6936/1/33).
not elaborate further about the ongoing troubles over William Kelly’s heirs. The survival of this draft letter shows the care Martin took to respond to John French Lynch’s letter. While he might have wished to remain on cordial terms with this wealthy London merchant he had no intention of immersing himself in such a delicate case. 106

vi. Conclusion

The scope of the popery acts against property began to be restricted from the 1760s but the first major repeal of the penal laws was 1778’s Act for the relief of his majesty’s subjects of this kingdom professing the popish religion, which enabled Catholics to take leases for up to 999 years. 107 While 1782’s Act for the further relief of his majesty’s subjects of this kingdom professing the popish religion repealed all the major laws in relation to Catholics purchasing and disposing of land. 108 The main penal laws were thus repealed, however, their effects were felt long after and influenced law cases for years to come. 109

The religious aspects of the penal laws may have begun to atrophy by mid-century, once no ostentatious or too visible evidence of Catholic worship was seen by members of the Protestant Ascendancy. The letters of governor Strafford Eyre at mid-century say more about the weakness of his own perceived, and to some extent actual, local influence than they do about the situation of the Catholic Church in Galway. The resurgence and visible reality of Catholic Church infrastructure from mid-century is very evident from the experience of the Blakes of Ballyglunin. It is only from this period that churches are visible on maps of the estate, though they must have existed prior to this date, and financial affairs are regularly noted of what the family spent on their local priests and chapels. Their financial obligations as local Catholic landowners represented a constant expense for the family throughout the century, though often not recorded in the early decades.

The penal laws relating to property were a different matter, they were most definitely not that part of the penal code which ‘was left largely unenforced and tacitly moribund’. 110 The superficially simple act of managing an estate created added layers of difficulty for Catholic landowners. The settlement of an estate by Protestant landowners may have occurred once on the accession of each generation’s elder son to the family estate. For Catholics there was not a simple strict settlement enacted once every generation but numerous settlements; the management of the estate under the penal laws required a

109 Harvey, Bellews of Mount Bellew, 52.
nearly continuous attention to the settlement of the estate. Marriage settlements have been seen as pivotal to estate management during the period and the use Catholics made of them has been well established. The Blakes of Ballyglunin certainly follow the normal usage of these marriage articles, though the use the accompanying bonds passed to ensure their enforcement have not been given the attention they deserve. Also, fines and recoveries have been overlooked as central to any attempt to enforce a settlement of an estate. The continual resort of Catholic families to these fictitious legal devices illuminates one important way they were able to manage the effects of the penal laws on their estates.

The expenditure of time and money for Catholic landowners far outstripped that of similarly landed Protestants. The remaining Catholic landed interest did not enter into a strict settlement of their estates, they conducted continuous settlements of their estates, as and when the necessity arose, dictated by a real or perceived danger to their estates by the penal laws. It is telling that the Irish barristers, whose profession was primarily built on dealing with the 1704 and 1709 Acts to prevent the further growth of popery, were one of the indirect losers of the Catholic relief acts of 1778 and 1782 by reducing the business available to them. The attitude of contemporaries to the effects of the penal laws particularly on land tends to give the impression of seeing the experience of Ireland as somewhat apart from the norm of other European countries and would certainly, from this perspective, give the impression of a seeing Ireland as more of a colonial society rather than a classic ancien régime European country but ultimately there is neither an easy option between the alternatives nor are they mutually exclusive.

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s reaction to his cousin’s alleged inquiry about gavelling can be seen as an overreaction, indeed the fact that he accumulated forty different proofs to two signatures does give the impression of overreaching. Nevertheless, the letters to Martin from the hinterland of Galway, from further afield and from both confessions never give anything but the impression of the fact that the writers were taking the matter with the utmost seriousness. The Protestant mayor of Galway, members of the Protestant Ascendancy in Galway, Catholic gentry in Connacht and members of the extended Blake family, all took the inquiry about gavelling the Ballyglunin estate with complete sincerity. The expense in money and time from the moment that Martin Blake Fitz Edmond received his cousin’s letter about the inquiry about the gavel gives a very different perspective about the idea of the penal laws being in any way in abeyance. Martin Blake Fitz Edmond spent months making sure he would inherit the Ballyglunin estate intact, while a couple of years later John French Lynch became entangled in an inheritance dispute with labyrinthine
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112 McBride, Eighteenth Century Ireland, 194-5, 213.
complexities as a result of the penal laws. If they and their contemporaries considered the penal laws to be of such importance in their day-to-day lives there is little reason to doubt the continued relevance of the penal laws in relation to property. In this light, the desperation and exasperation evident in Edmond Blake Fitz Martin’s request for a papal opinion on his obligation to emigrate to save his and his family’s religion is perfectly understandable.
Chapter 7
The Blakes of Ballyglunin’s experience as Catholic merchants in Galway town in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries

Querimonia solitaris Monachi in absentia fratrum suorum incarceratorum.
Solus ego vivo, solus mea tempora sumo;
Solus ego timeo, solus ad astra gemo.
Passer ego solus sub tecto, solaque hirundo,
Et lugubris meditor, maesta columbae sono

Fr Nicholas Blake

i. Introduction

Fr Nicholas Blake, the third son of Andrew Oge Blake Fitz Andrew, wrote the poem Querimonia solitaris Monachi in absentia fratrum suorum incarceratorum (Lament of a friar left alone by the imprisonment of his Brethren) in the first few years of the eighteenth century while in hiding among his relatives and fellow townspeople in Galway town. He studied at Louvain, taking the Dominican habit and returned to the Dominican convent in Galway. After the enactment of the ‘Bishops’ Banishment Act’ of 1698 he was exiled to France and lived for a time in Nantes but by 1702 he returned to his hometown. When he wrote the poem the only other Dominican left in Galway, Fr Gregory French, was in prison, so the whole of the Dominican’s pastoral care of the town fell on him alone. During his first few years back in the town he was forced to hide during the day and was only able to visit his congregation by night, by 1705 it was feared Fr Nicholas himself was in prison, as it was reported that ‘the Protestants are using extraordinary pains in the search of religious this year’. Despite the position of the Catholic townspeople of Galway, their wealth and influence did not stop the persecution of the early years of the eighteenth century. Fr Nicholas Blake may have been surrounded by friends and family, nevertheless, the conditions in the town still made him feel that in his words, ‘Alone I live, alone my days I spend’. Fr Nicholas Blake remained in the town. He became part of the recovery and re-establishment of the Catholic Church in Ireland and he was the prior of the Dominican convent in Galway in 1713. There is no doubt that those exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the friars and the nuns came off

1 Lament of a Friar left alone by the imprisonment of his Brethren. Alone I live, alone my days I spend: The heavens receive my lone and fearsome sighs. ‘The lonely sparrow on the roof’ am I. Like to the lonesome dove, of mate deprived [Translated by Fr Ambrose Coleman] (O’Heyne, Irish Dominicans, ii, 74).
2 O’Heyne, Irish Dominicans, i, 155, ii, 74; Fenning, Irish Dominican Province, 31, 127; for the Bishops’ Banishment Act see Chapter 6.i.
3 O’Heyne, Irish Dominicans, i, 155, ii, 73-4; Fenning, Irish Dominican Province, 126-7.
worse in the persecution of the 1690s and early years of the eighteenth century, nevertheless, Catholics in general faced a difficult few decades. Many, including the Blakes of Ballyglunin, were forced to flee the town to the safer environs of County Galway. Fr Nicholas Blake is representative of the wider Catholic experience, and of his relations the Blakes of Ballyglunin; he underwent persecution but ultimately he kept his head down and survived within Galway town, laying the basis for the Catholic revival in Ireland.

The experience of the Blakes of Ballyglunin in Galway town is inter-linked with their experience as rural landlords. In the mid-1650s Martin Blake Fitz Andrew removed himself and his family from Galway town before Catholics were expelled but it was only in 1677 that he was able to repurchase a house in the town again. However, at no time was he truly isolated from the town, in the early 1650s he was a member of the corporation, and during the Interregnum and early Restoration he had family, friends and business associates at all times resident there. As soon as it was possible for Catholics to gain permission to return to trade and live in the town he did so and rented property, at the very least a cellar, long before he repurchased a house and other urban property there. However, it was not until 1677 that he was again able to purchase property within the town walls. From then on, he began to accumulate property within the town, a house and then a series of interests in mills.

Conditions in the 1690s again forced the family to move to their rural estate, to their lands at Rusheens and Cummer initially, where they lived in the second half of the seventeenth century, before moving definitively to the townland of Ballyglooneen. On this occasion, however, the family did not lose possession of their property, they simply leased out their houses and mills. They still retained their business interests and they often received their rents in the town, either for their urban or rural property, or even for their relatives’ plantations in the West Indies. It was only at mid-century that the family returned in any permanent capacity to the town. There were numerous reasons for this. The leases on their urban property were falling in. Catholics backed up by a vibrant convert interest, ‘all protestants but none of them in any great or conspicuous way’, were increasingly playing a part in the town’s affairs and were challenging the dominant Protestant oligarchy which controlled the corporation. In addition, Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s new bride Bridget was reluctant to leave her family on Abbeygate St, particularly after numerous difficult births. For the most part, however, the easing of the penal laws and of the anti-Catholic ordinances of the corporation meant that Catholics were able to participate more fully and visibly in urban

4 N.A.I., Wyche papers, 1/5/6, 55, 57, 72.
6 The quote about converts is by George O’Malley of Snubgorough, Co. Mayo talking about the O’Malleys of Mayo in 1776 (Sir Owen O’Malley, ‘O’Malleys between 1651 and 1725’, *J.G.A.H.S.* xxv, nos. 1 & 2 (1952), 35).
life and this was the main spur to entice the young and newly married Martin Blake Fitz Edmond to re-establish a presence in the town. Initially for a number of months each year but by the time his father handed over control of the estate to him in the mid-1760s he was primarily resident in the town. Martin Blake Fitz Edmond spent lavishly to re-establish the family home in Middle St for his wife and children and fit out the house on a level commensurate with his position as the elder son of one of the most notable Catholic minor gentry families of County Galway.

The history of urban areas in Ireland received its classic treatment with Constantia Maxwell in 1940 but since the 1980s there has been a flowering of work centred on the Royal Irish Academy’s *Irish Historic Town Atlas* series and an attempt to place the development of Irish urban areas within a wider European context. Numerous general histories of towns have appeared concentrating mainly on the political history of corporations and boroughs. Where specific studies of individual towns have appeared they have concentrated on the ruling oligarchies and their opponents, both Protestant. The urban history of Dublin has dominated this discussion, where among others Louis Cullen has shown that numerous Galway merchants moved in order to retain their interest in the wine distribution in Connacht and thereby established a Catholic role in the city’s Protestant wine trade, but there has been an increasing focus on provincial towns. Provincial towns in Ireland have been explored in notable works by Eamon O’Flaherty on Limerick, David Dickson on Cork, N.G. Neely on Kilkenny, Jean Agnew on merchant families in Belfast, D.A. Fleming on Sligo and Limerick and William Roulston on Restoration Strabane. Galway town has received its share of attention with examinations of its topography, of its place names and of the politics of the town. What is lacking, with the notable exception of
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10 Jacinta Prunty and Paul Walsh (eds), *Galway c.1200 to c.1900: From Medieval Borough to Modern City* (Dublin, 2015); Jacinta Prunty and Paul Walsh (eds), *Irish Historic Towns Atlas*.
O’Flaherty's work on Limerick, is an exploration of how Catholics fit into to these discussions.\textsuperscript{11} A unique perspective of eighteenth-century urban Ireland then is presented with the examination of the Blakes of Ballyglunin in Galway town, their urban property and their involvement with local politics.

**Map 7.i: Detail of Middle St, 1612**


The work of Maureen Wall, David Dickson and Louis Cullen in relation to the creation of a Catholic middle class from mid-century is central to this discussion.\textsuperscript{12} In particular, Wall's

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{11} O’Flaherty, ‘An urban community and the Penal Laws: Limerick 1690-1830’, 196-225.

\textsuperscript{12} Maureen Wall, ‘The rise of a Catholic middle class in eighteenth-century Ireland’, *I.H.S.*, xi, no. 42 (Sep. 1958), 91-115; Dickson, ‘Catholics and trade in eighteenth-century Ireland’, 85-100; Cullen, ‘Catholic social classes’, 57-84; Cullen ‘Catholics under the Penal Laws’, 23-36; see page 174.
The examination of the quarterage dispute throughout the eighteenth century has shown the importance of the issue in allowing urban Catholics to organise effective committees, which required constant attention over a number of years and thus gave invaluable experience for the major political campaigns later on in the century. Individual studies illustrate the regional differences in each province, county and town in Ireland. The development of a Catholic interest whether it was in Dublin, Cork, Limerick or indeed Galway, evolved at different paces and under singular conditions, reflecting the distinctive urban situations in each town and city. The political realities in each individual urban area reflected not only the confessional realities but also the political battles between different groups in each town. This impacted on the ability of Catholics to re-establish themselves in each town in a slightly different manner. Nevertheless, it is clear that the state of affairs by mid-eighteenth century was markedly different from that of the years after 1690 and enabled the slow emergence of an engaged Catholic middle-class determined to improve their situation.

The opaque nature of urban life of similar Catholic families, like so much of Catholic Ireland in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is difficult to penetrate. This chapter presents an exploration of one Catholic family’s experience under a Protestant corporation through the second half of the seventeenth century and first three-quarters of the eighteenth century. An examination of what exactly the Blakes owned in the town is initially presented. The absence of the Blakes of Ballyglunin from the town was never absolute, on the other hand, neither were they permanently resident in Galway for the first half of the eighteenth century, the reasons for this in terms of the penal laws and anti-Catholic regulations of the corporation are examined. Members of the family returned to live in the town from mid-century, the impulse for this and the easing of restrictions that enabled this, are detailed. Finally, the financial outlay this entailed and how this impacted on the estate are explored.

ii. The urban property of the Blakes of Ballyglunin in Galway town

Galway town is depicted in a small number of seventeenth century maps but of particular note are two illustrated maps, John Speed’s 1610 map (see Map 7.i) and the seventeenth century pictorial map (see Appendix Map 7 and Map 7.ii), which according to James Hardiman, was commissioned as part of the marquis of Clanricard’s 1651 negotiations with the duke of Lorraine but completed during the Restoration. According to Hardiman the
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The pictorial map was finished and engraved after the Restoration at the expense of the corporation, ‘when the ancient inhabitants were restored, by the Crown, to their freedoms and estates’. The ancient townsmen were never restored to either their estates or to their freedoms, a fact which Hardiman goes into in detail later on in his history of Galway, so it is hard to understand his attribution of the pictorial map to the reformed corporation. The pictorial map is titled in the body of the map as ‘an historical delineation of the town of Galway’ and it shows details that existed before and after the war years, in effect an idealised representation of the town. Over the previous few centuries most, if not all, of the buildings and features detailed in the map existed, but never all at the same time. Even the town walls themselves were never in a complete state of defence as is represented in the pictorial map. The pictorial map was clearly produced by the ancient Catholic inhabitants during the Restoration and was thus more likely commissioned as part of an attempt by the townsmen to express their loyalty to Charles II as they attempted to regain their urban property. They presented this idealised version of Galway under their control to the King in order to compare it with the ruinous condition Galway was then in under the new Protestant corporation. Middle St, where the Blakes of Ballyglunin owned urban property in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is visible on both maps.

The maps depict houses of two, three or four stories with garrets and cellars, as well as buildings to the back. Each property consisted of a complex of buildings with a yard in between. This is confirmed by subsequent surveys and grants of land of urban property in Galway which noted slated and thatched houses of two, three and four stories with yards, gardens, and dwelling houses behind the main buildings, basically a central square surrounded by buildings in each individual premises. The more substantial houses were three or four stories of grey hewn stone orientated around a central courtyard, the entrance to which was by a common arched opening, with finely carved balconies and windows, shops at ground level facing onto the street and cellars below. When the Bishop of Killala, Francis Kirwan was hiding in Galway after the surrender of the town to Parliamentary forces, he reproduced in Hardiman, 30, has been digitised by U.C.G. at http://archives.library.nuigalway.ie/citymap/ and see Appendix Map 7.

15 Hardiman, 23.
17 Ó Máille, ‘Place names from Galway Documents (con.)’ (1950), 69.
in 1652, he took refuge ‘in the topmost stories of the houses, aneath the tiles’ and when forced to move he did so walking across the roofs ‘as most of the houses of Galway are connected’. Leases of the Blakes of Ballyglunin’s urban property in the eighteenth century also substantiate this, as it was not simply a house which was leased, but a front house and cellars, a back house and cellars and a kitchen.

Map 7.ii: Detail of Middle St (elenchus no. 60) from seventeenth-century pictorial map, 1660s, with Dominican convent on Middle St (elenchus D)

Prior to the surrender of the town in 1652 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew owned or mortgaged three stone houses in Galway town, land in the liberties as well as a weir and its fishing rights, and leased further property in both the town and liberties (see Appendix Table i).

20 C.P. Meehan (ed.), *The portrait of a pious bishop, or, the life and death of the Most Reverend Francis Kirwan, Bishop of Killala. Translated from the Latin of John Lynch, archdeacon of Tuam* (Dublin, 1848), 123.

21 Lease, Martin Blake of Cummer, gent to Ignatius Kirwan of the town of Galway, merch., 24 Mar. 1722 (M6931/61); Lease, Martin Blake of Cummer, gent to Ignatius Kirwan of the town of Galway, merch., 27 Aug. 1722 (M6931/63).

22 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s ancient estate on 22 Oct. 1641 and by purchases and conveyances since [c.1676] (M6931/1); Hardiman, appendix, xxxviii, xl.
The nine months siege, from 8 July 1651 to 12 April 1652, did much to undermine conditions in the town and while there was no frontal assault or bombardment to blame the conditions in the town on, the events of the previous eleven years, and in particular the activities of the parliamentary forces holed up in St Augustine’s Fort in the early years of the war, had left much of the town destroyed.\textsuperscript{23} In the wake of the Parliamentary victory all of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s property was confiscated (see Chapter 2.ii). Urban Ireland was initially administered and leased out on short term leases, where possible, by Parliamentary commissioners in the 1650s but by the Restoration was mostly granted to trustees for the ‘49 Officers, who over the next twenty or so years disposed of the properties as and when they could.\textsuperscript{24}

Urban property in Ireland in the early years of the Restoration was in a desperately poor state. Much of urban Ireland was allocated to the ‘49 Officers Security but as it took a long time to allocate specific pieces of property, any which remained uninhabited, or which were badly let, quickly deteriorated.\textsuperscript{25} This was complained of especially in Galway where by 1665 the houses were described as being ‘fallen to utter ruin and decay’.\textsuperscript{26} Individual descriptions of houses during the Restoration show houses, thatched houses, plots of houses, plots of houses being used as gardens and plots of houses with just the ruined walls. Fifteen years after the surrender of the town to the Parliamentary forces, much of the town remained in ruins. Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was only able to purchase a house in Galway town again in September 1677, situated on Middle St.\textsuperscript{27} In addition, in 1681 he bought an interest, ‘the moiety’, of a castle and double mill on Bridge St at either end of the West Bridge, this was in effect half of three mills for about £200 secured by a bond of £400 from Peter Martin of Galway town (see Map 7.iii).\textsuperscript{28}

There was extensive rebuilding in the town during the Restoration but the town never regained its former grandeur. Even by the end of Charles II’s reign, wills still recorded waste plots rather than houses.\textsuperscript{29} The siege of 1691 was not on the scale of 1652 but it still profoundly affected the town and again numerous buildings were left, or had remained, in

\textsuperscript{24} For the ‘49 Officers see Chapter 2.iii and McKenny, ‘A 17\textsuperscript{th} century “real estate company” ’.
\textsuperscript{25} Entry of the King to the lord lieutenant for Lord Berkeley, 12 Feb. 1663 (\textit{C.S.P.I.} 1663-5, 21).
\textsuperscript{26} Entry of the King to the lord lieutenant and [treasurers of the ’49 Officers] for John, Lord Berkeley, 10 Sept. 1665 (\textit{C.S.P.I.} 1663-5, 639-40).
\textsuperscript{27} 24 & 25 Sept. 1677, Lease and release Marcus Lynch Fitz Peter, of Galway, merch. to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent (M6931/23).
\textsuperscript{28} 7 Oct. 1681, Lease of Peter Martin of Galway, esq, to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent (M6931/36); 8 Oct. 1681, Bond in £400 to secure conveyance, Peter Martin of Galway, esq, to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent (M6931/37). [Only the lease of the sale of the mills survives but both the lease and the subsequent bond make it clear the transaction was a lease and release conducted over two days].
\textsuperscript{29} \textit{C.S.P.I.} 1663-5, 639-40; Will of Andrew Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, merch., 20 Oct. 1681 (N.L.I., MS 10,792/1).
ruins.\textsuperscript{30} Descriptions of Galway throughout the eighteenth century retold of its former glory and then current dilapidated condition.\textsuperscript{31}

\textbf{Map 7.iii: Detail of Bridge St (elenchus no. 55) from seventeenth-century pictorial map, 1660s}

\begin{center}
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\textit{Source:} Hardiman, 30.

The property the Blakes of Ballyglunin owned within the town then was a series of buildings located around a central courtyard, described later on in the eighteenth century as ‘one messuage or front stone house and three back houses adjoining with the cellars, back yard and other the appurtenances situate in Middle St’.\textsuperscript{32} The property as a whole was likely to have been in desperate need of repair when Martin Blake Fitz Andrew bought it in 1677 but in common with the rest of the town, those who had the resources soon set about rebuilding and repairing their urban holdings so that when his grandson was forced to leave the town in the 1690s he left behind a substantial townhouse in good repair. The family lived in the upper two stories of the building fronting onto Middle St with the ground floor either employed by the family as shops or let out to traders, in addition, the cellars were partly used by the family itself and partly leased.\textsuperscript{33} In addition to this, the family owned a half-share in three mills in the town. The details of leases throughout the eighteenth century all

\textsuperscript{30} I.R.C.R., 393.
\textsuperscript{31} Dr Richard Pococke, \textit{Tour in Ireland in 1752}, ed. G.T. Stokes (Dublin, 1891), 104; \textit{The letters of Lord Chief Baron Edward Willes}, 83-4.
\textsuperscript{32} Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin to James O’Hara of Dublin, gent, fine of house in Middle St, Galway town, 30 May 1768 (M6931/91); Recovery suffered by Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, of house in Middle St, Galway town, Michaelmas 1768 (M6931/93).
\textsuperscript{33} N.L.I., MS 10,792/1.
stipulated that the mills were to be kept in pristine condition throughout the term of the lease and enumerated penalties which had to be paid on default of any of the terms. They were working mills and played an important role in the economy of the town, illustrating the central part the Blakes of Ballyglunin continued to play in the town, even if they were not resident there for much of the century.

iii. The expulsion and re-establishment of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew in Galway town

The continued participation of Catholics in urban life or even their continued residence in urban areas during the 1650s is a matter of debate. There is no doubt that the majority of Catholics were expelled from all urban areas and that their ability to work or trade was prohibited. The question remains how extensively this was enforced or if there were exceptions made, either for the very wealthy or for those who gave evidence of loyalty to the parliamentary regime. Much of this discussion is confused and stems from a basic misunderstanding of the period, despite Toby Barnard’s *Cromwellian Ireland* and in particular the section on the government of the boroughs.  

One example is W.G. Neely’s urban history of Kilkenny which presents a very confused picture of the 1650s. The examination of Galway town during the 1650s suffers from similar problems, the only real effort to get to grips with the ancient inhabitants was attempted by Raymond Hughes, whose thesis while dealing with 1692 to 1750 primarily, he himself admitted in his preface that, ‘I have found it necessary to write a chapter dealing with the upheavals of the Cromwellian period and its aftermath’. Unfortunately he failed to get to grips with the wider history and as a result, this colours the rest of his thesis. Like Neely, he lacks an understanding not only of the 1650s in particular but of seventeenth-century history in general. While he deals with the expulsion of Catholics from Galway in the early to mid-1650s, he subsequently talks about their commercial presence, ‘unbroken during the Cromwellian period’. This misunderstanding of seventeenth century Galway led Hughes to misinterpret eighteenth century Galway. During the Restoration, Galway corporation remained resolutely Protestant and pursued an anti-Catholic agenda, with a few minor exceptions. This, despite the fact that few corporation regulations were enacted to ensure it remained so. Any further need was met by proclamations issued by the mayor or military governor. Despite this, he does

36 Hughes, ‘Galway town’, ii.
not dispute that Catholics suffered numerous outbreaks of persecution during the period. However, by the eighteenth-century, the failure of the corporation to enact anti-Catholic regulations was seen by Hughes as evidence of toleration on their part. Again the corporation did not need new legislation to enforce its agenda and retain its primacy, the existing powers of the corporation were sufficient for any eventuality, and on any occasion that it was not, the military governor was able to ensure compliance.

There is no doubt that there were exceptions to the expulsions of Catholics from urban Ireland, whether the poor or the very rich, but this in no way mitigates the experience of Catholic Ireland during this period. In Galway the few very rich families that dominated trade and finance before 1641 were able to retain some presence in the town, but this did not compare to their previous situation in the town and most certainly did not allow them any involvement in the town’s government. Nevertheless, it was the base upon which the resurgence of the Catholic interest during the Restoration was built.

The position of Catholics during the Restoration remained largely undefined for much of the period. At its most extreme this has allowed W.G. Neely, continuing on his misunderstanding of 1650’s discussed above, to describe Kilkenny during the Restoration until the Popish Plot in 1678 as enjoying ‘a period of complete toleration’.38 In Drogheda Harold O’Sullivan saw a somewhat more contradictory situation and one equally difficult to agree with, where the old inhabitants, he maintained, recovered their rights as freemen ‘without much difficulty’, but the enforcement of the oath of supremacy excluded them from playing a part in corporation affairs.39 Charles II made attempts to enact or enforce toleration in his kingdoms, but all attempts to put this on a legal basis failed.40

The initial months of the Restoration saw the hopes of the Catholics of Ireland exhibited in manifestations of their strength and expectations throughout Ireland. The corporate towns of Ireland were one of the many areas where this played out. In their attempts to regain their positions within the towns and within the corporate governments therein, they described themselves to be ‘his Majesty’s only true subjects’ with the attendant expectations this entailed. A year after the Restoration of Charles II ‘divers’ Catholic merchants were still excluded from Galway and the other towns of Connacht on account of their race and religion. As this was seen as an impediment to trade and a situation which led many merchants being forced to trade abroad, the King ordered that any merchant who

38 Neely, Kilkenny, 123.
40 Tim Harris, Restoration: Charles II and his kingdoms, 1660-85 (London, 2005), 247.
formerly had the right to trade could return and enjoy the right regardless of national distinction or religion. It was ordered that the mayors, sheriffs and other officers of the various towns, cities and corporations were to be notified of the order and it was to be published in each municipality.\footnote{The King to the lords justices concerning trade in Ireland, 22 May 1661 (C.S.P.I., 1660-2, 338-9).}

Catholics who attempted to return to their native towns were required to obtain a licence from the lord lieutenant. The duke of Ormond received numerous petitions from Galway townsmen and their heirs, asking to return to the town either from the country or from abroad, this was the case primarily in Galway, but also in Kilkenny, Ross and Waterford, though unlike the other towns it remained the case in Galway in the years to come. This began to be dealt with on a local level as the 1660s went on, however, in Galway it still took a direct petition to the lord lieutenant to enforce their return over the objections of the mayor and military governor of Galway until the end of the 1660s. Catholics could not resettle in the town unless they received a licence and then upon giving sufficient security to the mayor of Galway ‘that he shall carry himself quietly and peaceably’, they could return to inhabit and trade in the town.\footnote{H.M.C., Eight Report, Appendix I (London, 1881), 501, 511.}

Martin Blake ‘a native of Galway’\footnote{The transcript of the petition does not note Martin with the qualification ‘Fitz’ nor of a particular place other than ‘a native of Gallway’ so it is impossible to be sure which Martin Blake is referred to. Nevertheless, internal evidence from the petition makes Martin Blake Fitz Andrew the most likely of the few Martin Blakes living in Galway town and county at the time. In any case, all merchants wishing to return to Galway at this period had to petition in a similar manner, so if it is not the actual petition of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, he would have had to have petitioned in a similar manner.} requested leave from the lord lieutenant Ormond to ‘reside and trade in Galway’, setting out that he ‘lived there by his trade of merchandize, until expelled by the usurped power’. He appealed to Ormond that he ‘doth not know how to maintain his wife, family and great many children, if he be not admitted to make use of the same trade’, he asked Ormond ‘to grant him license to live in Galway and make use of his trade, he being ready to give security for his loyalty to the King and good behaviour in the said town’. On 20 May 1663, Ormond granted him ‘liberty to reside and follow his trade in the town of Galway by wholesale and not by retail or in open shop, he giving sufficient security to the mayor of Galway not to act anything’ to the prejudice of his Majesty or his service ‘but to behave himself loyally and inoffensively’.\footnote{Petition of Martin Blake, native of Galway & Vice-regal order of Ormond, 20 May 1663 (N.L.I., Petitions and Answers, James 1st duke of Ormond, Vol I: 1663, Ms 2,511/77); H.M.C., Eight Report, Appendix I, 511.} Members of his immediate and extended family had already returned to the town by this stage so he had access to accommodation and links within the town to begin the slow process of re-establishing himself within the merchant community of Galway.
Attempts were still made by the deputy governor of the town of Galway to expel ‘all persons of Papist religion, hitherto residing within the said town of Galway, upon great penalties’.\(^{45}\) Some had even managed to have ‘of late dwelth and traded in the town of Galway’ but were expelled by the deputy governor. All applied to Ormond.\(^{46}\) Despite the limitations imposed on the Catholics of the town of Galway, it was the only port in Ireland where Catholic merchants recovered the majority of the trade.\(^ {47}\) Requests to the lord lieutenant or his deputy petered out by the end of 1665 indicating the normalisation of the process by which this was dealt with on a local level, not requiring the administration in Dublin’s interference to enforce the return of native merchants to the town. The conditions for the Catholic merchants may have improved but the port went into terminal decline. The concentration of the port on a few items, in particular, the import of tobacco from the West Indies and wine from France, meant that the effective implementation of the English Parliament’s restrictions on direct imports from the colonies to Ireland from 1685 had a disproportionate effect on Galway. Nevertheless, this only made matters worse as the port’s decline had clearly begun much earlier, changes in the conduct of wider Atlantic trade and the concentration on the larger ports ensured Galway continued to decline.\(^ {48}\)

The ban on Catholics purchasing property in corporate towns was lifted in 1672 but it took another five years for Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to buy a house in the town on Middle St.\(^ {49}\) All the property on Middle St had been granted to the ’49 Officers Security. The street was described early in the Restoration as consisting of houses, ruined houses, parts of houses, walls of houses, plots of houses that were then being used as gardens, yards and walls, so it is quite possible that the house Martin purchased was simply the ruins of a house or even simply a plot of ground.\(^ {50}\) The hysteria surrounding the Popish Plot (1678-81) forced the lord lieutenant, in March 1679, to issue orders to remove all Catholics from Galway, and the other main Catholic towns in Ireland.\(^ {51}\) Catholics were also prohibited from assembling or celebrating mass ‘within and without the walls of the said corporations’. This had such a detrimental effect on the trade of the town that in July several Protestant inhabitants of Galway petitioned to allow those who would give good security for their peaceful behaviour to return to the town but Charles II would not get involved.\(^ {52}\)

\(^{45}\) Petition of Patrick Keerivan & Vice-regal order, 14 July 1663 (N.L.I., Ms 2,511/178); Petition of Ambrose Bodkin & Vice-regal order, 14 July 1663 (N.L.I., Ms 2511/178).

\(^{46}\) Petition of Nicholas Bodkin & Vice-regal order, 24 May 1663 (N.L.I., Ms 2,511/312); Petition of Ambrose Bodkin & Vice-regal order, 23 Nov. 1663 (N.L.I., Ms 2511/312).


\(^ {48}\) Cullen, ‘Tráchtáil is baincéaracht i nGaillimh san 18ú céad’, 44-54.

\(^ {49}\) 24 & 25 Sept. 1677, lease and release, Marcus Lynch Fitz Peter, of Galway, merchant, to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent (M6931/23).

\(^ {50}\) *I.R.C.R.*, 122-3.

\(^ {51}\) For the Popish plot see John Gibney, *Ireland and the Popish Plot* (Basingstoke, 2009).

\(^ {52}\) *H.M.C. Ormonde, N.S.*, v, 29, 163.
Nevertheless, by the end of 1681 Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was able to obtain an interest in half of three mills in Bridge St on either end of the West Bridge, ensuring that no matter what happened in the wider world the family would remain at the heart of the economy of the town during the next century and given that these were most likely flour mills, their importance to the town cannot be underestimated.53

iv. Catholic merchants under a Protestant corporation

The penal laws loom large in every aspect of the examination of the family throughout the eighteenth century and nowhere is this more evident than in the exploration of their experience within Galway town. Galway, along with Limerick, had the distinction of having specific clauses dealing with them in 1704’s Act to prevent the further growth of popery and this was reinforced in Galway’s case by 1717’s ‘Galway Act’, which was intended to strengthen the Protestant interest in the town.54 There were numerous attempts through the century to enact further legislation to deal with the Catholics of both towns, thus they remained a continuous issue within the town until their final repeal. The numerous proclamations to expel the Catholics from the town from the first half of the century give additional proof of this. Local politics, as evidenced by the struggle for control of the corporation, impacted on the wider population of Galway town, in particular on the Catholic population, most visibly in terms of the quarterage imposed on merchants in the town and the duties imposed by the corporation. This led to political friction throughout the century but reached peak levels around elections.55 These local conflicts represented the early mobilisation of Catholics. These advanced over the century until they developed in the 1760s into a kingdom wide, though centred on Dublin, movement for the repeal of the penal laws.

The surrender of Galway with the signing of the articles of Galway on 21 July 1691 and the subsequent mistreatment of the Catholic population by the Williamite soldiers, forced numerous Catholic families to flee from the town.56 This worried the new authorities to such an extent that fearing the depopulation of the town, newly reconstituted Protestant

53 Lease, Peter Martin of Galway to Martin Blake of Cummer, 7 Oct. 1681 (M6931/36); Bond in £400, Peter Martin of Galway to Martin Blake of Cummer, 8 Oct. 1681 (M6931/37); Marriage settlement on marriage of Martin Blake Fitz Peter, of Cummer, gent and Margaret, daughter of Edmond French of Abbyboyle, Co. Roscommon, merchant, 28 Nov. 1691 (M6931/46); Lease, Martin Blake, Rusheens, Co. Galway and Augustine Blake, Killmcnally, Co. Galway to Bartholomew and Hugh Fallon, 1 Mar. 1715 (M6931/58).
54 2 Anne, c. 6. s. xxiii An Act to prevent the further growth of popery; 4 Geo. I, c.xv, [1717] An act for the better regulating the town of Galway and for the strengthening the Protestant interest therein.
56 N.A.I., Wyche, 1/5/55, 57, 72.
corporation assembled, on 3 April 1693, in order to address the matter. The corporation forbade the granting of passes to any inhabitant who wished to leave the town and in a conciliatory gesture, to prevent the licentiousness of the soldiers, ordered that measures be taken to control the conduct of the garrison and prevent their outrageous conduct towards the town’s people. Conditions in the town soon returned to attempting to enforce an anti-Catholic agenda. A corporation by-law of 1696 explicitly prohibited anyone except freemen to keep a shop in Galway or the liberties thereof, except on market days. This was aimed at the Catholic merchants of the town. They petitioned the lord justices and council against it but no avail. Despite these restrictions, Catholics continued to inhabit and to trade within the town, albeit in a much-reduced state.57

Galway town, as well as Limerick, were specifically mentioned in the 1704 Act to prevent the further growth of popery as, according to the act, the peace and safety of Ireland depended on the security of both towns and on their being in possession of the Queen’s Protestant subjects. The act prohibited Catholics purchasing any urban property in either town and those who wished to remain within the towns had to become bound to the crown with two sufficient sureties or leave the town before 25 March 1705. Only seamen, fishermen, or day labourers inhabiting houses worth forty shillings a year or less ‘within the suburbs of the city of Limerick, or of the town of Galway’ were exempt.58 An earlier draft of the bill proposed to limit Catholic trading merchants to ‘not more than twenty’ in Limerick or Galway once licensed by the Government, but was held to encroach too far upon the articles of Galway and Limerick.59 The Catholics who remained in the towns accordingly presented themselves before their respective municipal authorities and provided security for their good behaviour. In Galway 756 Catholics gave security and shows the continuing vitality of the Catholic community within the town.60 The aim of the laws in respect of Galway and Limerick was to restrict, or at the very least, control to some extent the Catholic merchants of the towns.61 Nevertheless, the restrictions on Catholics residing in Galway and Limerick do not ever seem to have been fully enforced.62

Over the next half century, the Catholics of Galway suffered the continuing fate of experiencing the suspicions of the local and central authorities at times of international crisis, resulting in their expulsion from the town or at the very least reaffirming their loyalty to the crown. It seems unlikely that reports of the expulsion of Catholics from the town meant

57 Hardiman, 167, 221; Dutton, Statistical survey of Galway, 302-3.
58 2 Anne, c.6, sec. xxiii & xxviii (Statutes at large, iv, 27-29, 31).
60 ‘Report on the state of popery in Ireland, 1731: Connacht, Arch. Hib., iii (1914), 146-7.
every single Catholic as, especially in Galway, the day to day functions of the town could
not have operated without them. This is seen the previous century where the repeated
noting of the expulsion of Catholics, particularly in the 1650s, would indicate the military
authorities in Galway were either singularly incompetent in their duties or that the expulsions
only targeted specific groups, probably Catholic merchants and clerics, at specific times
and with specific intent. Even by the time of the Popish Plot of 1678 proposals to expel all
Catholics from the towns were recognised as unrealistic.63 As has been noted of Limerick
in 1707, when during a Jacobite scare Catholics were expelled from the city, this meant
most likely only those who had given security under the Act to prevent the further growth of
popery, rather than 75% of the town’s population.64

Every rumour or even actuality of a Jacobite descent on Ireland or on Britain led to
the re-enforcement of the laws against Catholics in the town.65 In addition, continued local
tensions led to further anti-Catholic legislation specifically formulated for Galway, most
notably with 1717’s ‘Galway Act’. 66 The act asserted that the Protestant interest and the
security of Connacht depended on the loyalty of the inhabitants of Galway and the execution
of the laws against Catholics. The great numbers of Catholics and lack of sufficient
Protestant freeholders meant that the laws could not be put into effect against Catholics, as
a result great numbers of ‘popish priests, fryers and dignitaries of the church of Rome,
frequently land from foreign parts’. To remedy this the bill enacted that the sheriffs of the
town could summon any Protestant freeholder of County Galway to serve on any grand or
petty jury, the lord chancellor could appoint four inhabitants of Galway as justices of the
peace, and any tradesman wishing to reside in Galway would be a freeman of the
corporation, once he was a Protestant for at least seven years and had taken the oaths of
allegiance, supremacy, abjuration and the declaration against transubstantiation.67 While
wrapped up in the language of Protestant versus Catholic interests, the Galway act was

63 Connolly, Divided Kingdom, 168.
64 Eamon O’Flaherty, ‘An urban community and the Penal Laws’, 205.
65 John Brady, Catholics and Catholicism in the eighteenth century press (Maynooth, 1965), 9;
Hardiman, 168-70; Dutton, Statistical Survey of Galway, 306; P.R.I. rep. D.K. 23 (1891), 59;
Handlist of Proclamations issued by Royal and other constitutional authorities 1714-1910, George I
to Edward VII (Wigan, 1913), 7; see Ó Ciardha, Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-
1766. A fatal attachment (Dublin 2002).
66 C.J.I., 26 Sept. 1717, iii, 136-7; 10 Oct. 1717, iii, 151; 11 Oct. 1717, iii, 152; 5 Dec 1717, iii, 176;
The Post Man and the Historical Account, 10-12 Oct., 22-24 Oct 1717; Evening Post, 8-10 Oct.
1717; Weekly Journal or British Gazetteer, 12 Oct 1717; Post Boy, 8-11 Feb., 23-26 Aug.& 23-25
Oct. 1718; 4 Geo. I, c.xv, [1717] An act for the better regulating the town of Galway and for the
strengthening the Protestant interest therein.
67 4 Geo. I, c.xv, [1717] An act for the better regulating the town of Galway and for the
strengthening the Protestant interest therein.
primarily about the political control of the town and the country. At the same time a similar bill was enacted for Kilkenny.68

Catholics in Galway and in Ireland continued to experience various forms of persecution over the next thirty years.69 Martin Blake Fitz Peter may have no longer lived in the town but he still retained significant links with Galway town, not to mention the property he continued to hold there. He let his front house and cellars and the back house, cellars and kitchen in Middle St, Galway town in 1722 to Ignatius Kirwan of Galway, merchant, for seventeen years at £12 per annum. Ignatius Kirwan was already living in part of the house and Peter French another part.70 Kirwan was a local merchant based in the town who sold malt by the barrel, including to the local Augustinian friary.71 A hearth money roll of 1724 lists the Catholic Ignatius Kirwan living in Middle St, Galway in a house consisting of six hearths. This hearth money roll shows that the Blake's house was one of the larger houses in the town. Interestingly the average number of hearths in houses occupied by Catholics and Protestants was almost identical: the average Catholic house had 3.486 hearths, while the average Protestant house had 3.480 hearths.72

There were thirty-one houses listed with hearths on Middle St, nine Protestant and twenty-two Catholic. On Middle St, only two houses inhabited by Catholics were noted as containing more hearths than the Blake’s house inhabited by Ignatius Kirwan, while one house contained the same number of hearths, that of Anthony Bodkin. It was in a warehouse owned by Anthony Bodkin, merchant, situated in Middle St, that the warden and vicars of Galway first re-established a chapel within the town in 1725 and publicly celebrated mass. The Catholic houses broke down as follows: four contained one hearth, four contained two hearths, one contained three hearths, five contained four hearths, four contained five hearths, two contained six hearths, and two contained seven hearths. The Protestant houses broke down as follows: two contained ten hearths, two contained seven hearths, one contained three hearths, two contained two hearths, and two contained one hearth. The religious composition of the street is well illustrated here, with a few (four)

68 4 Geo. I, c. xvi. An act for the better regulating the Corporation of the City of Kilkenny, and strengthening the Protestant Interest therein, and punishing Alderman Robert Connell, for withdrawing himself with the Books and Papers belonging to the said Corporation.
69 Proclamation published in The Dublin Courant, 11 Apr. 1719; Pue’s Occurrences, 28-31 Mar., 11-14 Apr. 1719.
70 Lease, Martin Blake of Cummer, gent to Ignatius Kirwan of the town of Galway, merch., 24 Mar. 1722 (M6931/61); Lease, Martin Blake of Cummer, gent to Ignatius Kirwan of the town of Galway, merch., 27 Aug. 1722 (M6931/63); N.A.I., Quit Rent Office Ledgers, No. 189, Co. Galway, 1717-22, f. 57.
71 Hughes, ‘Galway town’, 128.
Protestant households tending to be more prosperous but most (five) with an average, taking the town as a whole, or below average number of hearths.\textsuperscript{73}

By this time although the Blakes of Ballyglunin were firmly ensconced on their country estate, they never left the town completely; they retained numerous interests there, but they could not class themselves as ‘of Galway’. They were decisively of Cummer and of Ballyglunin. Of the 756 Catholics who had given security under the 1704 \textit{Act to prevent the further growth of popery} by the \textit{Report on the state of Popery of 1731} there were 176 still living in the town, 376 had died, 176 were dispersed or gone into foreign parts, and no information could be got on 28. This meant that of the 1,037 heads of Catholic families then resident in the town and suburbs of Galway only 176 gave security as required by the 1704 \textit{Act to prevent the further growth of popery}, giving a clear indication that the act remained strictly aimed at the wealthy Catholic merchants and tradesmen that stayed in the town, not the majority of Catholics, whether labourers, servants or fishermen. Even 176 wealthy Catholic families remaining in the town gives a very optimistic picture of the Catholic population there and indicates that while the act did not apply to Catholics of all ranks it did apply to any Catholic who rose or even aspired to rise above the mass of urban poor.\textsuperscript{74}

Individual acts of persecution and attempts to advance the protestant interest continued throughout the period. In 1732 the common council of Galway town advanced money to the mayor Charles Morgan, for prosecuting Simon Lynch and other Catholic inhabitants of the town for not being registered. Aldermen Simcocks, George Gerry and Charles Gerry were ordered to inspect the laying out of the money.\textsuperscript{75} Charles Rivett, apothecary was granted £30 by the corporation in 1734 to enable him to furnish his shop with drugs, ‘proper for supplying the Protestants’.\textsuperscript{76} The promotion of a Protestant interest continued to be strongly felt within the town right through the first half of the century.

By 1737 Mary Kirwan, most likely Ignatius’s widow, had taken over the lease on the Blake’s house on Middle St still at £12 \textit{per annum}, she paid her rent by a bill in her favour by Ulick Burke of Galway. She continued doing so until 1739 when the original seventeen-year lease expired. Edmond Blake Fitz Martin then chose to let the premises in lots, dividing up the property into apartments and cellars.\textsuperscript{77} These leases were unlikely to have represented the totality of their urban property, not to mention the already leased mills, and it seems likely that they retained some presence in the town, if only with in-laws. The Blakes of Ballyglunin may not have lived in the town full time but they retained business interests there and at times leased rooms in the town where they conducted business and received

\textsuperscript{73} Hardiman, 255; Cunningham, ‘A Galway Hearth Money Roll for 1724’, 60-74.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{L.J.I.}, iii, 172.
\textsuperscript{76} Dutton, \textit{Statistical Survey of Galway}, 312.
\textsuperscript{77} M6933/26/31.
interest on money they were owed or interest they owed on bonds they held from other people.\textsuperscript{78}

The Blakes of Ballyglunin took on numerous apprentices throughout the eighteenth century offering ample evidence that the head of the family and the eldest son, at the very least, were quarter brothers. While Catholics were never explicitly excluded from the freedom of chartered towns, only from holding municipal office, the Protestant corporations of these towns enacted by-laws excluding Catholics from becoming freemen and imposing oaths on freemen and guild members that Catholics could not swear to. As only guild members were allowed to trade within corporate towns, the ability of Catholics to carry on as merchants could potentially be restricted and their goods liable to confiscation. A \textit{modus operandi} developed from the 1670s where Catholics could be admitted as quarter-brother of a guild on payment of his quarterage. Quarterage was the quarterly charge paid by non-freemen who were admitted as a quarter brother of a guild and who thus remained free of the guild as long as they paid their quarterage. Once admitted as quarter brothers they could trade and take on apprentices as other guild members, with some restrictions, most notably for Catholics their exclusion from politics. In Dublin, there is evidence of this from 1670 while in Cork this method of admitting Catholics to guilds as quarter brothers was adopted in 1697. Quarterage was not restricted to Catholics or non-freemen, some Protestants were put off by the expense of becoming full brothers, but it is doubtful if freemen paid, especially in the smaller towns. This charge became a cause of agitation for Catholics throughout the century, and as Maureen Wall has noted, ‘may even be said to have given life to’ Catholics’ demands for repeal of the penal laws.\textsuperscript{79} The payment of quarterage remained a contentious issue throughout the century, though it has been argued that it was not the payment as such that was complained of, as this was not excessively burdensome, but that Catholics were excluded from the full benefits associated with guild membership.\textsuperscript{80} In 1705 the corporation of Galway ordered all Catholic shopkeepers before the council to show why they should not pay quarterage.\textsuperscript{81} An accommodation was reached with the corporation which was not challenged until the 1760s.

Apprentices were usually taken on for seven years but Catholics were known to take them on for shorter periods.\textsuperscript{82} For the Blakes, the term for their apprentices was usually

\textsuperscript{78} M6935/26/12; Bond of £400, William Kelly of Cummer, Co. Galway, gent to John Johnson, Snr., of the town of Galway, burgess, 12 Feb. 1738 (M61931/68); Hardiman, 176


\textsuperscript{80} Dickson, ‘Catholics and trade in eighteenth-century Ireland’, 91; Hill, \textit{From Patriots to Unionists}, 38.

\textsuperscript{81} Galway Corpo. Mss, Liber E, 1704-16, f.27; Hardiman, 163-7, 221; Dutton, \textit{Statistical survey of Galway}, 302-3, 305.

\textsuperscript{82} Webb, \textit{Guilds of Dublin}, 248.
five years, on completion of which the apprentice was guaranteed a lump sum, usually about £5. The apprentices were usually involved in all aspects of the Ballyglunin estate, not solely in Galway town, so clearly the term was applied quite broadly, as a result there was a large turnover in apprentices, many only lasted two years. The family also paid for their tenants to become apprenticed to guild members in the town, most notably those sent to the blacksmith James Bane in Galway town, in order to ensure the presence of a blacksmith on their rural lands.\(^{83}\)

The family was involved in foreign trade in the seventeenth century but only a remnant of this remained for the town as a whole by the eighteenth century, despite having numerous links with Britain, Europe and the Atlantic trade in general. By the eighteenth century the trade in bills, as nascent bankers, continued to offer them a steady source of revenue.\(^{84}\) There is ample evidence of their sale of agricultural produce from their rural estates or the receiving of rents in the town. Primarily this was the sale of wool discussed above (Chapter 5.i) but also bushels of meal, barrels of beer and numerous other products at the fairs and markets in Galway town.\(^{85}\) Mills performed an important function in early modern towns and Galway contained enough of them to have a craftsman, Tobias Covey, who advertised to build ‘most of the conveniences required for the clothing trade as tucking mills, either falling or poaching mills, cottoning mills and twisting mills, presses hot or cold’.\(^{86}\)

The Blakes continued to lease their interest in three mills in the town throughout the century.\(^{87}\)

It is clear that throughout the early years of the eighteenth century Catholics in Galway town led a very unsettled life. There is no doubt that they were never fully expelled from the town, even at times of crisis there remained substantial numbers within the town’s walls. Once the wealthy Catholic merchants and landowners who retained their property within the town gave sufficient security for their good behaviour they came to a *modus vivendi* with the Protestant authorities of the town. Indeed, the continued viability of the town as a working port, declining though it may have been, depended on the continued presence of the descendants of the ancient freemen of the town with their links to merchants in the main ports of Ireland, England, the Continent and further afield. However, by mid-century, there was an unmistakable change in the treatment of lay Catholics at both a national and regional level. The changed situation is illustrated in 1755 when the rumour of a French

\(^{83}\) Account book of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond, 1753-71 (M6933/16/30, 83, 105-6, 113).

\(^{84}\) See Chapter 5.i.

\(^{85}\) M6933/26/JK, 7.

\(^{86}\) *Dublin Intelligence*, 8 Sept. 1711.

\(^{87}\) Lease, Martin Blake, Rusheens and Augustine Blake, Killmcnelly, Co Galway to Bartholomew and Hugh Fallon, 1 Mar. 1715 (M6931/58); George Thomas of the town of Galway to Francis Blake of Furboagh, Co. Galway, gent and Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, Co. Galway, gent, 23 May 1739 (M6931/70).
descent on the west coast led the principal Catholic gentlemen and inhabitants of the town, in a body, to wait on the governor of Galway, Stratford Eyre ‘to assure him of their inviolable attachment and sincere affection to his Majesty’s sacred person and government and their utmost detestation to all his enemies’. This is a radically different experience for the wealthy Catholics of Galway from what occurred earlier in the century when attempts were made to expel them from the town and any remaining were forced to give sureties for their good behaviour. The experience of the clergy, however, remained precarious at times of international friction. Later the same year governor Eyre arrested Michael French, the Augustinian Provincial General and Fleming, the prior of the Augustinians in Galway, in their beds at one o’clock in the morning, much to the astonishment of the people of Galway. No evidence was found against the friars and they were soon set free, but it is illustrative that even at this late date the religious situation of the town was occasioned by the connivance of the local authorities rather than any form of toleration.

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew may not have lived full time in Galway but there is little doubt he gave security to continue trading and leasing out his urban property there. Similarly, his grandson, Martin Blake Fitz Peter, continued on in the same manner living at Ballyglunin but continued to have numerous interests in the town. It was only with his grandson, Martin Blake Fitz Edmond that the family had the will, and the ability, to return to live in their property in the town.

v. The return to Galway town

The gradual easing of the enforcement of the penal laws by mid-century allowed Catholics a visibility that simply was not possible earlier in the century. There is no greater illustration of this than the actual physical return of the heir to the Ballyglunin estate to Galway town from 1752. The first indication that family returned to the town for any considerable period of the year was in 1741 when Edmond Blake Fitz Martin paid the interest due on a bond he held to Molly Burke at his lodgings in Galway town, a year later the same interest due on the bond was paid at Ballyglunin. As the family home in Galway was rented out at this time, Edmond leased other property in the town. The trade they conducted throughout the century in the town indicates that they retained some sort of presence in the town at all times, even if just a cellar, but the allusion to Edmond’s lodgings, makes it clear they rented out an apartment for part of the year, most likely living in the town during the assize to settle

---

88 *Dublin Gazette*, 22-26 Apr. 1755.
90 M6935/26/12.
their accounts and to receive their rents, and the interest on the bonds, mortgages and
general loans they held.91

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s eldest son Edmond was born on 5 December 1752 in
Abbeygate St, Galway. This was the house of his wife’s father, Walter Joyce of Abbeygate
St, Galway ‘an eminent wine merchant of Galway’, who had married Jane Aylward on 3
September 1724.92 So the family still had not returned to live in their own house in Galway
town. They did so shortly after this date. The birth places of the family members by mid-
century show how the family were living in both Galway town and Ballyglunin at the time.
The children of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond were born as follows: Edmond Blake Fitz Martin
was born in Abbygate St, in Galway town on 5 December 1752, Walter was born on 23
November 1754 at Ballyglunin, Martin was born on 8 February 1756 at Ballyglunin, Pierce
Ignatius Blake was born on 31 July 1757 at Ballyglunin, Robert Blake (died in infancy) was
born on 28 November 1758 at Ballyglunin, Mary Blake (died in infancy) was born at
Ballyglunin on 4 July 1760 and John Blake was born in Galway town on 11 September
1764.93

Early in 1752 Edmond Blake Fitz Martin fitted out his son with a watch, some silk,
buckles and other fineries in order to ready him for his newly married life in Galway town
and soon after gave him a present of a Post Chaise.94 Martin Blake Fitz Edmond and his
family lived in the town for only part of the year, usually at least four months in the early
years of his marriage, the rest of the year he and his family spent on the outlying farm at
Rusheens.95 He began noting his expenses incurred in Galway town from the end of 1752.
He kept three servants there; Redmond Common was paid £3 8s. 3d., Molly Higgins was
paid £1 for half a year and Jack Hogan was paid £3 10s yearly. Keeping a horse in the town
for four months cost £4, ‘house money in Galway’ amounted to 11s. and washing in the
town for four months £2. The arrival of his new son, Edmond Blake Fitz Martin who was
born in Abbygate St, in Galway town on 5 December 1752, incurred numerous costs, and
his wife’s wish to remain near her family for this first child is a likely reason for remaining in
the town during this period. Initial expenses for the child cost £2 5s. 6d., his christening by
the Warden of Galway, Anthony Blake cost £1 2s. 9d. and another 2s. 8½d. for his clerk. In
all around the birth and christening, Martin spent £7 5s. 2½d. on his new son.

Along with the money Martin Blake Fitz Edmond spent on the house and his
expenses in Galway, Martin spent 11s. 4½d. on his ‘assembly subscription’, which is an

91 M6935/66/3; M6933/26/15.
93 Genealogical notes (M6935/70/a).
94 M6933/26/15, 59.
95 M6933/16/27&72.
intriguing reference to an organised body that the Catholic Martin could join in Galway town.\textsuperscript{96} Most provincial towns had assembly rooms where the town’s social life was centred. This was where the local gentry met for balls, concerts, card-playing and salons, and paraded their wealth, taste and fashion. There were regular, even weekly, events, though activities took on an added level of extravagance during the assizes and Galway races.\textsuperscript{97} The assembly room in Galway was on the same street as the Blake’s townhouse on Middle St, where early in the nineteenth century James Hardiman described, ‘an assemblage of native beauty, elegance and fashion, which would grace the drawing rooms of a court’.\textsuperscript{98} This was in addition to political and improving associational activity that emerged throughout Ireland during the eighteenth century, but it has been pointed out that lack of evidence for the existence of such clubs and societies in individual towns should not lead us to consider that they did not exist.\textsuperscript{99} The lack of any surviving newspapers for Connacht, until the final years of the century, means any associational activity can only be glimpsed through fragmentary evidence.\textsuperscript{100} Nevertheless, there were both lodges and knots, respectively, of freemasons and of the Order of the Friendly Brothers of St Patrick in Galway by mid-century. Even with these supposedly non-denominational societies there is some question over the ability of Catholics to become members, certainly the membership of the Order of the Friendly Brothers of St Patrick appears to have been exclusively Protestant in Munster. At the very least substantial Catholics rarely took the lead in these societies.\textsuperscript{101}

During the sickness of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s wife Bridget in March 1759, she remained in the town to be taken care of and the rest of the family remained with her. Martin seems to have become quite agitated when his wife became very sick and worried about his children’s future, as most of his dealings with his father were secured only by verbal agreements. He wrote to his father in an attempt to sort this out but his father would only promise to come into Galway town to visit the next day. Edmond Blake Fitz Martin arrived the next morning and gave his daughter-in-law Bridget a present of £100 to cover the costs of her illness, and as he told his son, to keep her spirits up. However, he would not make any change to their arrangements in the short term.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{96} M6933/16/27.
\textsuperscript{97} Maxwell, \textit{Ireland under the Georges}, 242, 251, 254; Barnard, \textit{A new anatomy of Ireland}, 73.
\textsuperscript{98} Hardiman, 315.
\textsuperscript{99} David A. Fleming, ‘Clubs and societies in eighteenth century Munster’, in James Kelly and Martyn J. Powell (eds), \textit{Clubs and societies in eighteenth century Ireland} (Dublin, 2010), 427.
\textsuperscript{100} See \textit{Newsplan database} (http://www.nli.ie/en/catalogues-and-databases-printed-newspapers.aspx)
\textsuperscript{101} William Smith, \textit{A pocket companion of free-masons} (Belfast, 1764), 92; \textit{Grand Lodge of Freemasons of Ireland Membership Registers, 1733-1923} (www.ancestry.com) [accessed 29/8/16]; Fleming, ‘Clubs and societies in eighteenth century Munster’, 427-46.
\textsuperscript{102} M6933/16/63.
It took them until May 1759 to come to an agreement. Edmond Blake Fitz Martin was to give his son half a year’s profits of the entire estate, as well as the profits of their various leases. In return Martin was to give up his maintenance as well as take on half the rents, quit rents, and half the expenses of the house.\textsuperscript{103} The harsh realities of business faced by Martin, as he experienced the difference between the sum he was guaranteed by his marriage articles and the variable, but potentially lucrative, value of the profits from the estate, meant that the next year, in May 1760, he broke the agreement with his father. His father, however, agreed to give him an increased yearly maintenance of £250 in return for retaining certain lands that he had promised to pass on to Martin at his marriage, though he still would not formalise this by having a deed drawn up, much to Martin’s displeasure.\textsuperscript{104}

In March 1761, Martin Blake Fitz Edmond received £100 from his father to repair the house in Galway town and his father, Edmond, promised to cover any extra cost above the £100 he gave him. With this Martin outfitted the house with a pair of mahogany dining tables, mahogany chairs with crimson and white check, card tables, tea tables, sideboards, oak beds, curtains, cases of knives and forks, cups and saucers and numerous other odds and ends for the house, costing in total £31.\textsuperscript{105} Further furnishings were purchased from Isaac D’Olier and Son, Goldsmiths and Jewellers at the Bear and Hammer, Cork Hill, Dublin.\textsuperscript{106} This consisted of two pairs of candlesticks purchased for £37 13s. 10d., a case of knives and forks for £17 14s. 9d., a dozen teaspoons for £1 19s. 1d, a pair of gravy spoons for £2 10s. 7d., a soup ladle with a shell snake’s head for £3 12s. 5d. and a French plate dish stand for 11s. 4½d., in total paying Isaac D’Olier and Son £64 2s. 0½d. He took delivery of the items on 8 June 1761. With carriage and customs, the internal furnishings altogether came to £97 and this was before he even set about repairing the house.\textsuperscript{107} The normal expenses of the house came on top of this, mostly groceries and numerous hogsheads of Claret white wine.\textsuperscript{108} By August, his father had taken over responsibility for repairing the house and as a result, Martin had to repay him the £100 he received earlier in the year. Martin paid his father rent in kind which included the money he spent on his eldest son ‘Nedy’s’ education and upkeep, which his father had promised to cover the expense of and estimated at £18 yearly, plus a guinea yearly to the Franciscans of Galway, which roughly made up the £20 rent he owed his father. Martin was not happy that he only retained

\textsuperscript{103} M6933/16/63.
\textsuperscript{104} M6933/16/66.
\textsuperscript{105} M6933/16/41, 69.
\textsuperscript{107} M6933/16/41, 68-9.
\textsuperscript{108} M6933/16/68.
the house by a verbal agreement with his father which he took to mean ‘during my father’s pleasure’, his father had promised to give him a formal lease of the house for the duration of his life but as this was not binding in law it remained a sore point between the two men until Martin took over the running of the estate four years later.\textsuperscript{109}

While the situation of Catholics within the town improved greatly by mid-century there is no denying they remained subject to numerous disabilities. Even the quartering of soldiers was a subject of controversy. When objections were made to the mayor John Eyre in 1749 about the quartering of soldiers, he threatened the Catholic inhabitants with the enforcement of the penal laws against the residence of Catholics in the town unless they complied, upon which, according to Eyre, ‘they consented to quarter the soldiers’. Petitions to Parliament in 1762 alleged that if Catholic inhabitants did not give a newly elected mayor a ‘present’ on his election they were assured to have two to four soldiers quartered on them for the majority of the year or that the inhabitants were afraid to complain about the corporation for the same reason.\textsuperscript{110}

The continuing easing of the conditions of Catholics and the emergence of a significant convert interest in the town led, on the accession of George III, to a petition by the Catholic merchants of Galway to parliament against the ‘partial and illegal proceedings’ of the corporation of Galway. This was tied up with internal political affairs and the emergence of the Dalys as a significant force in the politics of the town.\textsuperscript{111} Similar moves were made in Limerick which followed on there from a campaign of the protestant freeholders in the 1740s and the contemporaneous campaigns of Charles Lucas in Dublin. In Limerick the opponents of the corporation there were able to get a bill through the Irish House of Commons for a far-reaching reform of the corporation, only to have it fail at the British privy council.\textsuperscript{112}

The corporation of Galway responded to the attack on its privileges with the so-called ‘Black Petition’ of November 1761\textsuperscript{113} in which the mayor, sheriffs and Protestant inhabitants of Galway petitioned parliament to pass an act to prevent Catholic shopkeepers

\textsuperscript{109} M6933/16/70.

\textsuperscript{110} A report from the committee appointed to take into consideration the petition of the freeholders, merchants, and inhabitants of the town of Galway (Dublin, 1762), 14-15; C.J.I., vii, appendix cxi-cxix.


\textsuperscript{113} The manuscript copy in the Ballyglunin Papers is titled the ‘Black Petition’ and it is noted as such by Hardiman. It is dated 13 Nov. 1761 in the copy in the Ballyglunin Papers but 10 Nov. 1761 in Hardiman and Dutton.
from manufacturing or selling their goods or employing journeymen for this purpose.\textsuperscript{114} Counter petitions by those opposed to the controlling interest of the corporation, particularly those led by the house of John and Andrew French, led to the appointment of a committee of the House of Commons the next year. The committee produced a damning report which found that the duties collected by the corporation on ships’ pilotage, quayage and anchorage, on salt, kelp, beer, malt, oats and wheat, on the fisheries and in relation to the quartering of soldiers were all either oppressive, not warranted or illegal.\textsuperscript{115} Nevertheless, the committee resolved that despite the dubious methods employed by the corporation to raise funds, the expenses of the corporation on repairs and upkeep of the town, as well as their salaries, were ‘highly conducive to the preservation of peace, order and good government in the town’.

While there may not have been a completely positive outcome for those merchants opposed to the corporation; it did lead to a compromise. Before the House of Commons could proceed to take into account the committee’s report and the various petitions in full, Robert French of Monivea, at the time MP for Carrick, presented to the house a new schedule of duties and customs which had been agreed between the merchants and the corporation.\textsuperscript{116} That the issue went so far does attest to the growing confidence of the Catholics in Galway and their ability to organise themselves to advance their interests.

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond continued outfitting the house in Middle St in the 1760s. He purchased dishes, plates, a coffee pot, pans and more candlesticks in 1763.\textsuperscript{117} By the end of 1763, he had spent over £355 on the house over the previous few years.\textsuperscript{118} He spent further large amounts on setting out the house. New beds were bought in Galway from Shaughnessy, brought from Dublin or swapped with his father with ones he had left at Ballyglunin.\textsuperscript{119} By the time Edmond Blake Fitz Martin made his will, on 12 August 1765, he described his eldest son and heir apparent, ‘Martin Blake of Ballyglunin but now of the town of Galway’.\textsuperscript{120} The eldest son was permanently settled in the town.

\textsuperscript{114} ‘Black Petition’: Memorial of the mayor, sheriffs and sundry resident freemen and burgesses of Galway, to John Eyre, MP for Galway town, 13 Nov. 1761 (M6935/59); Hardiman, 183-4; Dutton, \textit{Statistical Survey of Galway}, 315.

\textsuperscript{115} \textit{Address by the merchants of Galway presented to Robert French, M.P. of Monivea, in 1762} (M.D. O’Sullivan, ‘Some Documents relating to Galway’, \textit{J.G.A.H.S.}, xviii (1938-9), 178-82); \textit{A report from the committee appointed to take into consideration the petition of the freeholder, merchants, and inhabitants of the Town of Galway} (Dublin, 1762); \textit{C.J.I.}, vii, 139-40.


\textsuperscript{117} M6933/16/44.

\textsuperscript{118} M6933/16/45.

\textsuperscript{119} M6933/16/45&51.

\textsuperscript{120} Abstract will of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, 12 Aug. 1765, proved Prerogative Court 17 Oct. 1771 (N.L.I., MS 4139/50).
On 2 January 1766, Edmond Blake Fitz Martin leased his whole estate in the town and county to his son Martin for £510. Both their families lived in the front stone house in Middle St, with the back yard, offices and cellars. This urban property was, as has been described above, more than simply a house but was a series of buildings both fronting out onto Middle St and backing out onto the lanes behind. These were the strict terms as laid out in the formal lease. In reality father and son came to a more informal agreement as set out in Martin’s account book. The total yearly rental for the estate was £510 minus Martin’s maintenance of £210, meant in reality £300 a year. If his father was going to live with him this reduced the rental another £150 for ‘his living and family’, making a yearly rental of just £150. The influence of the penal laws can be seen here again, the supposed rent set out in the formal deeds of lease was nowhere near the actual rent Martin paid. This was technically discoverable under the Acts to prevent the further growth of popery but shows the way in which every transaction in relation to the estate was impacted upon by the penal laws. The specific restrictions on the Catholics of Galway town were only repealed with the 1782 Act for the further relief of his majesty’s subjects of this kingdom professing the popish religion by which time a guardian held the estate in trust for the minor Martin Stephen Blake, it was only early in the nineteenth century the Blakes of Ballyglunin could fully benefit from the easing of restrictions on Catholics in Galway town.

vi. Conclusion

Religion played a large role throughout the penal era and on how the different denominations interacted with each other. Inter-marriage outside of defined family groups may have been rare but day to day business continued on as normal, no matter what the law in force at the time. The confiscations of the seventeenth century ensured that the ownership of land and property in towns and counties changed hands. Subsequent leases, particularly layers of leases, often meant the continuation of usage by the initial owner or their descendants. Just as the Blakes of Ballyglunin withdrew from a permanent residence within the town, their business interests and leases there ensured they were always in some way associated with Galway town.

Continuous attempts to expel Catholics from the town of Galway, while on the whole ineffective, had an accumulating detrimental effect on the Catholics of the town. This impacted not only on the Catholics resident in the town but those who wished to trade there. The uncertainty around the continued ability of Catholics to live and trade in the town added

121 Lease, Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin to Martin Blake his eldest son, 2 Jan. 1766 (M6931/86 a&b).
122 M6933/16/93.
123 21 & 22 Geo. III c.24, s.15.
another element to the claustrophobic effect of the penal laws. This was a further element of the penal laws that needed to be, not so much evaded, but managed. Financial affairs within the town suffered as a result of this, as they did throughout Ireland, indeed this was one of the arguments used to lobby in favour of the repeal of the penal laws.

The experience of the family in Galway town echoes the experience of Catholics nationwide. The restrictions and limitations of the first half of the century gave way to a more relaxed legal situation from mid-century on. The burgeoning interest in political affairs by an emerging and growing Catholic middle class particularly from the 1760s was a testament to their growth in confidence and in wealth. This revealed itself initially on a local level and through local politics, from the quarterage disputes of earlier in the century, to complaints about the level of duties from mid-century and finally to deal with national affairs from the late 1760s.124 The amount of money spent by Martin Blake Fitz Edmond on their house in Middle St from the 1760s was a very visible demonstration of the family’s prosperity and prestige within the town. This ostentatious display of their wealth simply would not have been possible early on in the century and attests to the changing fortunes of Catholics in the town and in Ireland in general. The growth in the confidence of Catholics which enabled them to demand the repeal of the penal laws from this period was initially demonstrated by their visible engagement within their wider communities. To begin with, this was displayed in their own homes, in outward displays like their elaborate post-chaise for the family to use in the town or at the local assembly rooms. The experience of the Catholic Blakes returning to live in the town from mid-century represents a unique insight into trends that have been indicated on a national level but as a case study gives a singular viewpoint on these wider issues.

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond illuminates this reassertion of Catholic confidence from mid-century and ties into the wider emergence of a confident national Catholic movement for repeal of the penal laws.125 Despite this their concerns remained local. There was little engagement with the emerging Catholic Committee, which while it was dominated by Dublin merchants, had numerous links to Galway.126 Where local conditions allowed the family to engage in political affairs whether, with the quarterage dispute, local political affairs or complaints about the high levels of duties demanded by the corporation, they engaged fully. That this did not translate into an interest in national affairs may have had more to do with the relatively short time from 1771 on that each succeeding son spent in charge of the Ballyglunin estate rather than any lack of interest or ability but then again, on the whole,

---

124 See above page 157-8.
125 See above page 132-3.
there were few provincial Catholics involved in the struggle for the repeal of the penal laws, the majority involved were resident in Dublin. The continued possession of the property bought by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew during the Restoration by the family a century later and their continued function within Galway town as nascent bankers, merchants, mill owners and landlords, despite all the restrictions placed on Catholics is testament to their resilience and adaptability. It was only by this flexibility and endurance that the family transplanted from Galway town to Galway County remained townsmen at heart and returned to live there as soon as conditions allowed.
Chapter 8

‘What right has an elder son to a large fortune and annual settlement and a younger son begrudged even necessary’: The effect of younger children on the Ballyglunin estate, c.1700-77

We have such an unhappy kind of pride in our country, that we never give any kind of trade to the boys. If we had, that and the little fortune parents are able to give them, would enable them in some measure to live independently. I hope none of that pride reigns in you.

Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, Antigua to his brother Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 25 June 1738

i. Introduction

Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin was a younger son who left the Ballyglunin estate in 1720 and sailed for the West Indies. He became part of a Galway, and Irish, expatriate community, made his fortune, owned plantations on numerous islands and lived between the West Indies and England. Thirty-three years after he left home he wrote to his brother Edmond back in Galway, ‘what right has an elder son to a large fortune and annual settlement and a younger son begrudged even necessary’. He was talking about his brother’s children, nevertheless, his treatment as a younger son clearly still bothered him all those years later. The younger children of each generation of the Ballyglunin family placed an enormous strain on the estate’s finances, as all had to be provided for. For the first two generations of the eighteenth century the second son of the family was given his child’s portion and sent to the West Indies, where they integrated into a pre-existing Galway (and Irish) community within West Indian planter society. Both became wealthy, anglicised plantation owners who lived between the West Indies and England.

The importance of younger children, particularly of younger sons, to a successful strict settlement of the estate has been well established. Marriage articles and settlements of the estate had to be financed by succeeding generations, at times with little regard how they were to be paid for in any realistic setting. Emigration was an already established
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1 Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, London to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 21 Sept. 1753 (M6936/1/17).
2 Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, Antigua to his brother Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 25 June 1738 (M6936/5).
3 Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, London to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 21 Sept. 1753 (M6936/1/17).
safety valve for younger children. The eldest son inherited the family estate, females were married off or became nuns and younger males, if they were not set up in a profession, in the Church or on a nearby estate, emigrated. Emigration served a dual purpose of providing for younger children who could not be provided for in Ireland but also gave the possibility of restoring or expanding a family’s fortunes and can be seen as a lingering effect of the confiscations of the seventeenth century. The economic survival and advancement of Catholic families like the Blakes of Ballyglunin would have been threatened if these sons remained in Ireland and claimed the part of the estate which they were legally entitled to.

Of course it is a simplification to link the emigration of all younger children of Catholic families to the effects of the penal laws, the poverty of Ireland was a large push factor in their migration, nevertheless, the penal laws, particularly the threat to the estate from gavelling, were a decisive influence. Jane Ohlmeyer has argued that noble families shared a communal duty to their wider families which was illustrated by the generous provisioning of younger children. This argument can be expanded to encompass all landowning families, with the large caveat that Catholic landowning families had the additional incentive of the penal laws to ensure a generous provision for their younger children. In the age of the penal laws, motivations beyond simple familial obligation meant that arrangements for younger children took on an added importance. The threat to the estate by a younger son, or even a relation, gavelling was a constant worry for the family. Every settlement, marriage portion and child’s portion had as its primary motivation, beyond mere familial affection, the threat of the gavel.

The financial outlay that this entailed was extensive. Jane Ohlmeyer, talking about the Irish aristocracy of the seventeenth century, described the allowances bestowed on aristocratic children and the encumbrances they entailed as putting intolerable pressure on the estates concerned. If this pressure was intolerable for the seventeenth-century aristocracy, by the eighteenth century Catholic landowners of every level had the additional pressure of the penal laws. By this stage the strain children put on Catholic estates can only be described as nearly insupportable. The initial outlay to set up a younger son in a mercantile career or in the Church was a substantial drain on the estate’s finances. Equally, for female children the cost of a marriage portion had to be borne by the estate. It was in the interest of landowners to ensure their children married well, as these connections were vital to the wider success (or failure) of all wealthy families. Marriage portions for Catholics

5 Dickson, ‘Catholics and trade in eighteenth-century Ireland’, 96.
6 Cullen, ‘Catholic social classes’, 71.
7 Cullen, Emergence of Modern Ireland, 116-7.
8 Ohlmeyer, Making Ireland English, 181.
9 Ohlmeyer, Making Ireland English, 194, 411-16.
10 Ohlmeyer, Making Ireland English, 206.
tend to be larger than for similar Protestant landed families as marriage settlements were one of the means by which Catholic families managed the effects of the penal laws on their estates. They have been discussed in detail above and so will only be touched on here in so far as they directly affected the day-to-day financial settlements for younger children.\textsuperscript{11} Beyond marriage settlements, the family accounts illuminate the experience of a number of wives and daughters, in this way the female experience in eighteenth century Ireland, particularly in how they relate to the estate, is explored.

By the eighteenth century, it has been estimated that it could cost £200-£300 to set up someone in a military career on the continent, while wholesale trade required from £400-£600.\textsuperscript{12} By mid-century, the entry of an apprentice into an export house could cost up to £200 while setting up in the commission trade required several hundred pounds. However, it has been argued that familial, friendship and trade relationships were ultimately more important to the survival and expansion of business ventures than the value of the initial investment capital.\textsuperscript{13} Obviously, these are very rough estimates, as can be seen when a nephew, set up in the West Indian trade by Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, died. Major Martin estimated that he lost at least £1,200 as a result, after having advanced him over £1,700.\textsuperscript{14} Whereas another nephew he intended on setting up as an apprentice on a ship, he estimated would cost him £50.\textsuperscript{15} The gulf between these general estimates and the actual experience of Major Martin Blake’s expense in setting up his nephews in the West Indian trade shows the danger in over generalisation. Far from it costing a couple of hundred pounds to set someone up in the provisions trade in the West Indies, for a substantial merchant, it was more like a couple of thousand pounds. On the other hand, to simply place a child on a suitable ship for experience, still entailed a relatively substantial sum.

Those already established abroad were expected to reciprocate the help they received establishing themselves and contribute to the outlay needed for education or simply travel. The Blakes, particularly Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin financed and encouraged numerous relations from Galway attempting to establish themselves in the West Indies. For the families of the ancient townsmen of Galway, service in continental armies was less important than for similar families in other counties. In Connacht, the comparatively rich Galway families like the Blakes, Martins, Frenches and Kirwans did not

\textsuperscript{11} See Chapter 6.iii.
\textsuperscript{12} Dickson, ‘Catholics and trade in eighteenth-century Ireland’, 94; Cullen, ‘Catholic social classes’, 73-4.
\textsuperscript{13} Dickson, \textit{Old World Colony}, 161.
\textsuperscript{14} Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, York to Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin at Messrs Andrew French and John French & Co merchants in Galway, 24 Aug. 1751 (M6936/1/12).
\textsuperscript{15} Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, London to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 7 Sept. 1749 (M6936/1/7).
have a similar military tradition as the poorer landed families from north Connacht, like the Taafs, MacDermotts, O’Conors, O’Rourkes, O’Dowds and Plunketts. The Catholic Church during the eighteenth century grew to have over a thousand parish priests in Ireland, as well as numerous regular clergy, and more remained on the continent; a larger number of positions that could be filled than the available army commissions. The priesthood was then, in effect, a career choice, like any other and as the career opportunities for the younger sons of the Blakes of Ballyglunin contracted each generation saw more siblings turn to the church.\textsuperscript{16} Of course, it is important not to discount a true religious calling, as the Blake family were devout Catholics, but the tendency towards treating the church as a career is evident.

Research into the Irish abroad has been dominated by Louis Cullen. In his examination of Irish merchants, and in particular of Galway merchants, he has dealt mainly with the continent but early on recognised the importance of London and the West Indies as a destination for Galway migrants. He has sketched out, what he called, a ‘Galway mafia’ in London, and showed how initial success in the West Indies led to investment and further migration and settlement to London or farther afield in Europe.\textsuperscript{17} London was a central element in Irish overseas trade.\textsuperscript{18} The full extent of the development of Irish communities within London during the eighteenth century has recently begun to be explored, primarily focusing on the aristocracy, gentry, lawyers and merchants and how they constructed interlinking relationships with each other and with London society in general. This London Irish community played a central role in Irish trade and financial affairs with Britain, the Continent, the West Indies, North America and further afield.\textsuperscript{19} These

\textsuperscript{16} Cullen, ‘Catholic social classes’, 73-6; Brian de Breffny, ‘Letters from Connaught to a Wild Goose’, \textit{The Irish Ancestor}, x, no. ii (1978), 81-98.


\textsuperscript{18} Richard B. Sheridan, \textit{Sugar and Slavery: An economic history of the British West Indies, 1623-1775} (Barbados, 1974), 328-38.

migrants played a pivotal role in the expanding role of London and also within the wider British Empire in the West Indies, America and the Far East. The younger sons who left the Ballyglunin estate during the first two generations of the eighteenth century fit into this network of relationships. Patrick Blake Fitz Peter and Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin both established themselves in West Indian planter society, but once they had accumulated sufficient funds they also established themselves within London, and within English society in general. Major Martin, in particular, fits into this section of London society, but also shows how too narrow a focus on either simply Ireland or England or both, restricts the viewpoint on these individuals who saw no such limitations. His business and personal relationships encompassed spheres far beyond simply London or Galway or England or Ireland. He epitomised the triangular relationship between Ireland, the West Indies and England, but was also part of a wider Atlantic economy and society.

This business world created a space where different nationalities and people of different religions interacted to further their own affairs. Even within Galway there was little difference between landed and mercantile families, but that was more to do with the seventeenth-century origins of much of the landowning gentry of Galway, many the ancient townsmen of Galway. The West Indian planter families recognised the importance of London to the successful running of their West Indian affairs and all either had members of their extended family located in London or spent part of the year there themselves.

These Irish emigrants found welcoming expatriate communities in many of the places they travelled to. The first generation of emigrants retained strong links with Ireland. What has not been appreciated is how quickly subsequent generations assimilated into their host countries. Craig Baily has argued that Irishness remained central to Irish middle-class migration in relation to the Irish in London and that pre-existing relationships were vital to their success. Where his argument becomes somewhat tenuous, is his contention that this remained so beyond the first generation of migrants in their new home countries. Protestant Irishmen, and those who conformed, were much more likely to become anglicised and merge into the existing West Indian-London milieu. Existing relationships continued on down the generations within interconnected families but had little to do with Irishness or Englishness. Nevertheless, it is clear from the experience of the younger sons of the Blakes of Ballyglunin and other Galway families that there was a clear break with Ireland by the second generation. That is not to say they cut all ties with Ireland, they visited their relations in Ireland and retained their existing friendships and connections but the

20 Cullen, 'Merchant communities overseas', 170.
second generation had become part of their new countries, whether English, or French or whichever new nationality.

The influence of slavery on the Ballyglunin estate and on Irish estates in general is another understudied topic. Irish involvement with slavery has received scant attention until relatively recently. In Donald Akenson’s examination of Montserrat in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries he showed that there was no difference between this ‘Irish Colony’ and any other English colony in relation to the conduct of plantation owners. Karen Harvey followed the experience of a younger son of the Bellews of Mount Bellew, Francis Bellew from his arrival on St Kitts to his failed attempt to set himself on a plantation in Dominica sometime after 1765 but found that by this late date, Galway landowners and merchants did not have the funds or the credit to overcome the harsh environment. Nini Rodgers has attempted to set Ireland’s place in the wider history of slavery from early modern Ireland up to its abolition in the nineteenth century. She illustrated the numerous Galway migrants involved with slavery and the importance of the sojourner, a migrant who intended to work abroad for a period before returning home, which ensured the continual presence and turnover of Irish abroad.

There were many links between Galway and the West Indies with the implicit involvement in slavery which this entailed. Irish involvement usually revolved around direct participation in the West Indies or else Irish firms in London. To suggest any further culpability would be to condemn anybody involved in world trade in the eighteenth century, though there may very well be an argument for that. The Ballyglunin estate did not in any significant material way benefit from the activities of migrants in the West Indies. The access and links arising from contacts in the West Indies and more importantly London were important for wider streams of income for the family but they were never anything but supplemental to their main sources of income. This was not the same for all families in Galway or even Ireland. Indeed, migrants did return having made their fortunes and establish extensive estates and spent lavishly on their new holdings, whether men such as Henry Blake Fitz John of Renvyle, County Galway who returned from Montserrat in the late seventeenth century or nabobs who returned from India in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. However, they were the exceptions. If anything, younger sons who migrated, even those who prospered, never fully repaid the initial outlay required to

23 D.H. Akenson, *If the Irish ran the world: Montserrat, 1630-1730* (Liverpool, 1997), 173-4 and passim.
25 Rodgers, *Ireland, slavery and anti-slavery*, 82.
27 For Henry Blake Fitz John see below; Melvin, *Estates and Landed Society in Galway*, 3, 44, 51, 81, 148, 153, 222, 400; *Dublin Gazette*, 31 Aug.-3 Sept. 1771.
establish them abroad. Both Patrick Blake Fitz Peter and Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin continued to have links back in Galway, were involved in their families’ business affairs and helped members of their extended families establish themselves in the West Indies but none of this ever equalled what was extracted from the estate in Galway in order to set them up in the first place.

Those younger sons who remained in Ireland fit into the model of the rise of a Catholic middle class first advanced by Maureen Wall and developed by David Dickson and Louis Cullen. Wall argued that the eighteenth century witnessed the financial improvement of Catholic townspeople and that this increase in the situation of Catholic merchants was in stark contrast to their political eclipse. Dickson has questioned elements of this, querying whether this improvement in the Catholic position was not simply a part of the development of the Irish economy as a whole rather than the Catholic share improving as a proportion of the economy. He acknowledged that Galway was an exception, as Catholics had always retained a large proportion of the town’s trade. Both Nicholas Blake Fitz Peter earlier in the century and John Blake Fitz Edmond from about mid-century lived and traded in Galway town. Little more is known about them but it is evident from the funds settled on them by their fathers and elder brothers and the legacies they left, that they were both relatively wealthy merchants who belonged to this nascent middle class, but they were certainly not newcomers to trade, the family had been merchants for centuries.

ii. Peter Blake Fitz Martin’s younger children

Peter Blake Fitz Martin’s second son Patrick was set up by his grandfather and emigrated to the West Indies where he acquired an extensive estate on the islands of St Kitts, Antigua and Montserrat. His plantations produced sugar and rum for export back to Europe. Peter left extensive further bequests to his younger children in his will, including, £300 to Nicholas, £200 to Patrick, £400 to Margaret, £300 to Anne, and £200 to Sibilla. One of the first things that Martin Blake Fitz Peter did on inheriting the Ballyglunin estate was to pay off the portions to his brothers and sisters; Patrick who emigrated to the West Indies; Nicholas who remained in Galway town; Margaret, who married twice and the two youngest daughters, Margaret, who married twice and the two youngest daughters,

---

28 Wall, ‘The rise of a Catholic middle class’, 91-115; Dickson, ‘Catholics and trade in eighteenth-century Ireland’, 85-100; Cullen, ‘Catholic social classes’, 57-84; Cullen ‘Catholics under the Penal Laws’, 23-36; see page 142.
30 Dickson, ‘Catholics and trade in eighteenth-century Ireland’, 88-90.
31 Blake, II, 218.
32 Extract of probate of will of Peter Blake, son and heir of Martin Blake of Cummer, lately deceased, will dated 17 Sept. 1691, proved in Tuam Consistorial Court, Sept. 1692 (Blake, II, 258).
Anne and Sibilla, of whom nothing is known beyond the fact that they received their child’s portions. Patrick Blake Fitz Peter thus arrived in the West Indies with substantial funds and received further amounts when his brother was able to secure the estate in his first few years there. He was one of the exceptions.

Irish involvement in the West Indies began with the English occupation of St Kitts in 1624 when a number of Irish were among the original colonists. Galway merchants and planters were established there from at least the 1630s and became the largest Irish group in the West Indies. They were involved at every level of society, from plantation owner to indentured servant in the seventeenth century and to overseer in the eighteenth. Tobacco was the original cash crop but as time went on sugarcane became more important, and became the main crop by the eighteenth century. Both of these crops were labour intensive so demand for workers was always acute, the solution for this was by indentured (white) servants or else (black) slaves. In the aftermath of the Cromwellian victory, royalist forces were transported to the West Indies, first in 1648 when Scottish troops were transported after the battle of Preston and English royalists after the siege of Colchester. In Ireland, the remaining royalist forces at Drogheda were ‘shipped to the Barbadoes’. Between 1652 and 1655 many orders for transportation were issued, mainly those deemed dangerous to the state, priests or the poor. As late as 1658 those convicted for not transplanting into Connacht or Clare were transported to ‘Barbados or other English plantations thereabouts in America’. In the Restoration period convicted prisoners could be granted reprieves on making arrangements for their own transportation for life to the West Indies. Once they could show they had agreed with the Captain of a ship to act as his servants on the voyage and after their arrival, they could embark. Commercial considerations soon put a stop to large numbers of whites being shipped to the West Indies as African slaves ‘yielded better returns’, though the planters had a particular dislike for the Irish bondsmen who were considered as politically unreliable and troublemakers. Except for a few years during the Interregnum, forced migration was never the dominant factor which brought new arrivals from Ireland to the West Indies. Relatively well portioned younger sons and voluntary indentured servants made up the vast majority. The children of the ancient Galway townsmen, like the majority of wealthy migrants, were a different class. They had money
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33 M6935/66.
35 T. Herbert to Sir Charles Coote, President of Connacht and Col. Tho. Sadler, Gov. of Galway, 26 Oct. 1658 (Dunlop, Ireland under the Commonwealth, ii, 686-7).
36 H.M.C. Ninth Report, ii, 128.
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and could trade like any other merchant. It was relatively common for the younger sons of Galway families, particularly the second son of wealthy families to be given their child’s portion and sent to the West Indies.\(^{39}\)

The most notable, and much quoted, example of Galway merchants re-establishing their fortunes by trading with, and emigrating to, the West Indies during the Restoration were the younger sons of John Blake Fitz Nicholas. John was mayor of Galway in 1646, transplanted to Mullaghmore, whose descendants were the Mullaghmore and ultimately the Renvyle Blakes, and who was mentioned above\(^ {40}\) complaining of the tyrannical usage by his cousin Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Ballyglunin.\(^ {41}\) His eldest son Thomas remained in Galway as a merchant and farmer, while his three younger sons, Henry, John and Nicholas, emigrated to the West Indies. Henry made it very clear in his letters home that he only remained in the West Indies in order to recoup his great losses and to pay his debts.\(^ {42}\) As soon as Henry had made enough to clear his debts and purchase an estate in Galway he did so. He left Montserrat in May 1676, the next year purchased an estate of 600 acres in Lehinch, County Mayo, a further 597 acres in the Barony of Dunmore, County Galway and in 1680 the estate of Renvyle, County Galway.\(^ {43}\) The third son John, even before he left Ireland, led a more unsavoury life. His family’s letters to him are full of complaints about the fact that he brought his, variously called, wench or whore as well as his wife out with him to the West Indies.\(^ {44}\) While John continually professed his wish to return to Ireland, once he had established himself as a prosperous member of Montserrat society he saw no need to do so. By 1678 he was one of the largest slave owners on the island with thirty-eight slaves.\(^ {45}\) In 1684 and 1688 he was a member of the Council of Montserrat,\(^ {46}\) its speaker in 1681, and a member of the Leeward Islands’ general council. When he died in Montserrat in 1692 he left £1,000 and his plantations to his daughter Catherine, who married Nicholas

\(^{39}\) Abstract of Chancery pleadings in Browne v Blake (1712-14) (N.L.I., MS 4143/28-9).

\(^{40}\) See pages 61-2.


\(^{42}\) Henry Blake, Montserrat to his brother Thomas Blake at Galway, 22 July 1673 (Blake, II, 107).

\(^{43}\) Thomas Blake, Dublin to John Blake, Mullaghmore, May 1677 (Blake, II, 119-20, 136); *I.R.C.R.*, 238, 583,586.

\(^{44}\) Henry Blake to his brother Thomas Blake Fitz John at Galway, 29 May 1675 (Blake, II, 112); John Blake to his brother Thomas Blake, merchant at Galway, letter dated ‘Bridge in Barbados’ 5 Nov. 1675 (Blake, II, 112-3).

\(^{45}\) Oliver, *Caribbeana*, ii, 347.

\(^{46}\) Oliver, *Antigua*, i, 53.
Lynch of Antigua. The youngest brother Nicholas’s fate is more elusive but he appears to have had a more peripatetic role, being the link between the two brothers on Montserrat and Barbados and the elder brother, Thomas and father John at home in Galway.

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, the primogenitor of the Ballyglunin Blakes, was involved in the West Indian trade, though exact details of his involvement are sparse. Nevertheless, his younger brother Andrew Blake Fitz Andrew, generally known as Andrew Oge Blake, owned a ketch trading between Galway and Montserrat in 1674. The continuation in land and trade that resulted in the successful survival of Catholic landowners in Galway, particularly the ancient freemen of Galway, ensured that there was a continuation of the established merchant links from the seventeenth century into the eighteenth century.

When Patrick Blake Fitz Peter arrived in the West Indies he, therefore, had access to an already existing network of established Galway merchants, many of whom would have been friends and family. Not long after his arrival on St Kitts, in the first few years of the eighteenth century, Patrick Blake Fitz Peter married Mary Ann, daughter of Andrew Bodkin of Montserrat. Martin Blake Fitz Peter continued to look after his brother’s affairs from Galway. In 1710 he organised a lease of one-third of a plantation on the island of Montserrat held by Patrick in right of his wife Mary Ann, which he leased to Sir Walter Blake of Menlough, County Galway. Communications being what they were, this involved more than a simple lease for while Martin had his brother’s proxy to conduct his affairs, he still insisted that Sir Walter sign a declaration indemnifying himself against any claims which might result if his brother, ‘Patrick Blake of the island of Montserrat’, refused to ratify the lease. Sir Walter then passed a bond for £2,000 to Martin to secure the payment of £100 per annum rent on the one-third of a plantation of Montserrat, the rent to be paid in the Church of St Nicholas in the town of Galway. All this in addition to the lease itself. The payment of the rent in the central church in the town was a very visible manifestation of the links between the West Indies and Galway and would seem to have been an accepted practice. Mary Ann was the only child and heir of Andrew Bodkin of Montserrat and only three or four on the death of her father. On the island of St Kitts, Andrew Tavnet obtained possession of Andrew
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50 Cullen, ‘Galway merchants in the outside world’, 172.
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52 Declaration by Sir Walter Blake, bart., indemnifying Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, 26 Oct. 1710 (M6931/52); Bond of £2,000, Sir Walter Blake of Menlough, Co. Galway, bart. to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, 26 Oct. 1710 (M6931/53).
Bodkin’s plantation there. It was only in 1714 that Patrick and Mary Ann regained possession of this.\textsuperscript{53} So whether Patrick even had \textit{de facto} possession of the one-third of the plantation on Montserrat is another matter.

Patrick was based in St Kitts but his interest ranged over the other islands as well. There was substantial mobility between individual islands, including islands not in the control of Britain and most plantation owners owned plantations on more than one island, Patrick also made numerous trips back to Ireland and England from an early date.\textsuperscript{54} Patrick was one of the executors of the will of Patrick Hynes of St Kitts in 1732, the other executor was Martin Blake of Moyne, County Mayo.\textsuperscript{55} The fact that a Mayo man could stand as an executor in the West Indies emphasises the links between Connacht and the West Indies at the time and the ease of movement between the two locations. Galway port may have sent very few vessels directly to the West Indies, nevertheless, there were numerous ships passing between the two destinations which made transportation between them relatively unproblematic.

A 1733 act to set the limits of the parishes on St Kitts shows Patrick Blake’s plantation to be within the parishes of St Anne and St Thomas.\textsuperscript{56} Patrick suffered from a long illness and eventually died on 7 March 1744. By his will of 5 March 1744, proved in Antigua in 1745, he left substantial legacies to relations and friends in both the West Indies and Ireland, to his brothers and sisters and extended family both in Galway and his new contacts elsewhere. Among his many bequests he left £1,000 to his younger brother Nicholas Blake of Galway town, to his nephew Peter Blake of Antigua £600, £30 to the Protestant Warden of Galway, Rev Samuel Simcock, £30 a year for life to his nephew Rev Stapleton Davis of St Christopher’s, and to his daughter Margaret Blake, the interest of £6,000 for life. In all, he left over £13,000 in cash bequests not to mention further forgiving debts and interest, as well as his interest in the ship ‘St Patrick’ and freedom to four slaves who were to get an annuity of £10 each until they were 15. Besides these bequests he left his personal estate including his plantations on St Kitts and Montserrat, as well as his estate in Langham, Suffolk, in England to his grandson Patrick. He clearly retained close ties with Galway, as many first generation migrants did.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{53} Petition of Patrick Blake of St Christopher’s, esq and Martin Blake his son, received 26 Nov. 1731 (Oliver, \textit{Antigua}, i, 53); Blake, \textit{II}, 218.  
\textsuperscript{54} Cullen, ‘Merchant communities overseas’, 167; Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, St Kitts to his father Martin Blake Fitz Peter, Ballyglunin, 20 Apr. 1720 (M6936/1).  
\textsuperscript{55} Oliver, \textit{Antigua}, iii, 412.  
\textsuperscript{56} The statutes of the islands of Saint Christopher and Anguilla (London, 1857), 27.  
\textsuperscript{57} Will of Patrick Blake Fitz Peter, esq, of St Christopher’s, dated 5 Mar. 1744, proved 1745 (Oliver, \textit{Antigua}, i, 52, 56); Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, Antigua to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 25 June 1738 (M6936/1/5); An act to enable Patrick Blake, Esquire, a Minor, to make a Settlement on Annabella Bunbury, Spinster, and the Issue of their intended Marriage; and for other Purposes therein mentioned (London, 1762), 1-3; Blake, \textit{II}, 218; Bailey, \textit{Irish London}, 174-5.
The Rev Samuel Simcock, Warden of Galway left £30 by Patrick Blake was the Protestant Warden elected in 1734.\textsuperscript{58} Patrick’s nephew Rev Stapleton Davis, the son of John Stapleton, was born on Montserrat, attended Christ’s College, Cambridge, was ordained a priest at Lincoln in 1728 and went as ‘emigrant minister’ to the Leeward Islands.\textsuperscript{59} Whether Patrick converted is unknown, however, given how prominent he became in St Kitts and how he prospered it is a fair assumption. The presence of both Catholic and Protestant legatees certainly attests to his lack of concern over such matters. The lack of widespread established church facilities in the West Indies, in both senses of the word, meant that there was a certain ambiguity over whether actual conversion occurred and numerous Catholics had recourse to the local Anglican Church for baptisms, marriages and burials.\textsuperscript{60}

Such ambiguity was not possible when the family returned to Europe. Patrick’s children seamlessly entered English society supporting the hypothesis that the family had already converted. His eldest son Martin Blake of St Kitts and afterwards of Leicester Fields, London, died in 1743 during his father’s lifetime on the journey between Amsterdam and London, only a few months after marrying the daughter of Dominick Trant of Montserrat. Martin’s will gives a clear indication of the break with Ireland within one generation with no mention of any legacies back to Ireland, in fact the only bequests are some diamonds and gold to his wife Sarah Blake for her life, then these as well as all his residue of his personal estate to his brother Andrew. The only links to Ireland are the witnesses to the will, Da. Plunkett, Dominick Blake and William Sweeney.\textsuperscript{61}

Similarly, his brother Andrew’s main beneficiary was his second son Christopher with legacies for his younger children, the only other persons mentioned are his sister-in-law Sarah, ‘the widow Blake of Paris’ and explicitly for his eldest son, ‘to my son Patrick 1/- only, because of his undutifullness to me and following the advice of a parcel of Irish knaves who mean nothing but to plunder him’.\textsuperscript{62} The eldest son might have been undutiful to his father but his grandfather left plantations to him in St Kitts and Montserrat, as well as the estate in Langham, Suffolk in England.\textsuperscript{63} He became M.P. for Sudbury, 1768-1774 and 22
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March 1775-1784 and was created a Baronet on 8 October 1772, as Sir Patrick Blake, first Baronet of Langham.64

The break with Ireland was not complete as their relatives, like themselves, retained their plantations and business dealings in the West Indies. When Sir Patrick’s first cousin once removed, John Blake of Sevenoaks, Kent, son of Major Martin Blake (see below) was chosen as Master of the Ceremonies at Tunbridge Wells, he was referred to as ‘a near relation of Patrick Blake, Member for Sudbury’.65 News of Sir Patrick was also relayed back to Galway, a correspondent of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond told him in 1772 that, ‘your relation Sir Patrick Blake, his lady and two of his daughters sailed from England...for St Christopher’s’.66 The family remained heavily involved in the affairs of the West Indies, Sir Patrick’s son, Sir Patrick the second baronet, wrote an article ‘The Culture of Sugar in the West Indies’ for Arthur Young's *Annals of Agriculture* in which he discussed the use of the plough, of manuring and various other agricultural issues in West Indian sugar plantations.67

Nicholas, the other younger son of Peter Blake Fitz Martin, lived in the town of Galway. On the marriage of Martin Blake Fitz Peter in 1691, and as part of the settlement of the estate at the time, he paid off the child’s portions of his brothers and sisters, dividing about £1,200 between his four siblings. Nicholas was left a further £1,000 by his older brother Patrick Blake Fitz Peter.68 Nicholas rented land from his brother Martin and from his nephew Edmond and he was involved in passing numerous bonds of from £50 to £100 with both.69 On his death c.1747, Nicholas left substantial legacies to two children, £400 to his daughter Sibilla and £200 to his son Patrick. To his other three children, he only left a nominal sum of £5 and it is clear these other children were catered for by prior settlements. Sibilla was left the interest of the £400 for her life only and on her death it was to go to the sibling of her choosing, confirming that the will was only to take care of unmarried children, the settlements of the married children had been enacted with their respective marriage settlements.70 Nicholas was evidently a relatively substantial merchant and farmer to have access to such funds. Sibilla was still receiving the interest on the bequest of her father thirty years later, by this time she was living in London, after having spent a period in Dublin.
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Her correspondence in London was addressed to Mr Oliver, Linen Draper in High Holborn, again confirming the international links the family continued to enjoy.\textsuperscript{71}

This first generation of the Blakes of Ballyglunin in the eighteenth century saw a continuation of practices from the seventeenth century. The second son of the family was sent abroad, while the remaining son was involved in the wider family businesses of farming, trading and lending money. There is little known about the daughters of the family, particularly the two youngest Anne and Sibilla. The eldest daughter Margaret married twice, first in 1686 to Christopher French of Cloghballymore, County Galway and secondly in 1688 to Dr Patrick Lynch.\textsuperscript{72} All received their child’s portions which had to be paid out of the estate. These trends continued on to the next generation, the children of Martin Blake Fitz Peter.

\textbf{iii. Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s younger children}

(Major) Martin Blake Fitz Martin, the second son of Martin Blake Fitz Peter, later attained the title of Major within the local militia on Antigua and rose to the rank of Colonel but was generally known as Major Martin. Major Martin was about fourteen years old when he left for the West Indies in 1720.\textsuperscript{73} He sailed from Cork, on 12 February 1720, and after six weeks’ passage arrived in St Kitts. He immediately went to look up his uncle Patrick, who unfortunately had left that day for his plantations on Montserrat. News of the new arrival on the island from Ireland travelled fast, John Blake of Basseterre hearing of his arrival went to meet Martin and brought him back to his own house. He sent word to Martin’s cousin Anthony Lynch of his arrival. Anthony, who held a plantation in the parish of St John, Capisterre, straight away went and collected him. He brought him back to his own house, where Major Martin stayed until his uncle returned.\textsuperscript{74}

His first few days on the island gives an indication of the extent of the Irish community there. This was a Galway community within the wider Irish community in the West Indies. The Irish associated within similar socio-economic, cultural and religious spheres, built on pre-existing familial relationships in Ireland. In fact, he only wrote to his father as soon as he did, on 20 April 1720, as Oliver Lynch was sailing for Ireland. Major Martin from the start reported back to his father on the state of various friends’ and relations’
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\textsuperscript{74} Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin at St Christopher’s to Martin Blake, Ballyglunin, 20 Apr. 1720 (M6936/1/1); \textit{The statutes of the islands of Saint Christopher and Anguilla}, 26.
business affairs on the island and how their financial accounts stood between Galway and St Kitts.\textsuperscript{75}

With the network of Galway merchants and relations, many being called cousin, whether an actual relation or in the more figurative usage of the time, and the fact that he had a substantial settlement from his grandfather, he was in an enviable position to establish himself in the West Indies. The fact that he was able to return to Ireland within four years illustrates the ease with which the triangle of Galway-West Indies-London was maintained. Whether on his own behalf, or more likely representing his relations’ and cousins’ interests in Ireland and England, he was present at his brother Edmond’s marriage in 1724 and was involved in the agreement of the marriage articles.\textsuperscript{76} He remained in Ireland for two years before setting out again for the West Indies.\textsuperscript{77}

Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin of Antigua and St Kitts married on 24 December 1735, Elizabeth, only daughter of John Burke of Antigua.\textsuperscript{78} John Burke was a friend and trading partner of John Thomlinson, Snr. of East Barnet and Queen St, Cheapside, London. John Thomlinson, son of William Thomlinson of Howden, Yorkshire, was a wealthy merchant who owned numerous vessels, traded extensively with the West Indies and North America and held lucrative contracts for victualling troops in America. He was the London agent for the trade of New Hampshire.\textsuperscript{79} He was to prove an important connection and ultimately a friend for Major Martin for the rest of his life. Major Martin often instructed his correspondents to send letters addressed to him to ‘Mr John Thomlinson’s, merchant in London’.\textsuperscript{80}

Antigua, where Major Martin had acquired a plantation, was the seat of Government and the centre of financial and social life in the Leeward Islands.\textsuperscript{81} It had a strong Irish presence and was Major Martin’s main base within the West Indies.\textsuperscript{82} The year after he married, there was an island-wide Afro-Creole plot on Antigua, led by Court, alias Tackey, the slave of Thomas Kerby, speaker of the assembly and justice of the peace, and the Creole Tomboy, the slave of Thomas Hanson. One of the other named ringleaders was a Creole slave Toney, owned by Col. Samuel Martin a Creole planter born in Antigua whose
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Royalist grandfather had his estate confiscated in Ireland. Punishment was swift and brutal, in all eighty-eight slaves were executed: five broken on the wheel, six starved to death on gibbets and seventy-seven burned alive. Another forty-eight were banished. All this does not seem to have fazed Major Martin Blake. In a letter to his father, on 10 February 1737, all his thoughts were of his ‘fine boy born yesterday’, he let his brother Edmond know of his plans to go to England the following year, the drought throughout ‘our sugar islands’, though he hoped to get a good price for his crop which would make some amends for his losses and finally the fact that they were still under arms with the trials occurring daily ‘of free nigors, mollatos {...} slaves’, with several being put to death. He assured his father that he was under no ‘apprehensions {of} danger, by the methods’ they had taken and the punishments by law.

The flow of migrants from Galway continued throughout the eighteenth century but decreased markedly as the century went on, after mid-century it was only already wealthy migrants who made the voyage. Nicholas Blake Fitz Peter of Galway town sent out his second son Peter to Nicholas’s brother Patrick on St Kitts in the 1730s. Peter was still residing on Antigua when his uncle Patrick Blake Fitz Peter made his will in 1744 but did not last long in the West Indies and soon after returned to Ireland where he was set up at the merchant house of Messrs Dillon and Cahill in Dublin. Claims of manpower shortages in the West Indies were widespread throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This referred to men of a certain type, of good family, breeding and most importantly, financial liquidity. From the 1730s there were constant shortages of propertied whites to run local civic institutions.

In 1738 a Burke and a Kelly arrived from Galway to Major Martin on Antigua, who set them up on his plantation in St Kitts. This was Burke's second trip to the island, he had
been previously employed there and Major Martin set him up ‘in his former berth’. This shows an element of seasonal migration for work, redolent of the migration from the south coast of Ireland to Newfoundland for seasonal fishing, though there are reports of Galway fishermen doing the same.\textsuperscript{90} Major Martin had intended visiting Europe that year and even let out his estate on the island of Antigua for £900 sterling a year. However, his uncle Patrick was ‘in a very dangerous state of health’ so he decided to remain in the West Indies to help him out in his affairs.\textsuperscript{91} Given that he owned plantations on at least three islands in the West Indies, Antigua, St Kitts and Montserrat, that he could let one of them for £900 a year gives some idea of how wealthy he had become within the first seventeen years there.

The unsavoury lifestyle of some of the new arrivals is well illustrated in Major Martin’s letters. Major Martin did not mince his words when reporting back to his brother Edmond about some friends that had been enquired after. He complained about how they conducted themselves in the West Indies, it made him wish they ‘were never born [in Ireland], neither manners, behaviour or any kind of trade, whereby people could be introduced into a way of life, but lying as burdens upon their friends, who are obliged to labour like horses in this hot part of the world, to get the better of want’. He had as low an opinion of those born in the West Indies as those born in Ireland, whether male or female. Even with certain ladies living in Antigua who had a ‘generous English education’, he was not happy having any of his female acquaintances associate with them. He had by this stage lost patience with the steady stream of Irish arriving with references to him, he asked his brother to recommend as few as possible to him as they were ‘mere encumbrances and no real service’.\textsuperscript{92} His unsympathetic opinions tell its own story of the harsh environment he faced, though clearly he lived in luxury compared to his compatriots, not to mention the slaves he owned.

By 1738 Major Martin had two children and resided on Antigua, though he still went to St Kitts for periods to live in order to look after his plantation there.\textsuperscript{93} From at least 1743 Major Martin spent part of his year in London and by 1747 he also resided in Wheldrake Hall in Yorkshire for part of the year, where he rented a house for a number of years.\textsuperscript{94} It became the norm for those who had found success in the West Indies to spend several
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months each year in England. In addition many aspired to purchase a townhouse in London while renting a country home. The manor and estate of Wheldrake were at the time the property of Thomas Scawen of Carshalton, Surrey, MP for Surrey 1727-1741 and heir to the vast wealth and estates of his uncle Sir William Scawen (c.1647-1722). Thomas Scawen was a non-resident landlord who took little interest in Wheldrake. There was an estate house of Wheldrake Hall in the eighteenth century until it was torn down in the 1820s. Sir William Scawen of London, in 1703, purchased 4,729 acres of the forfeited estates of James II in Galway for £10,310, which he paid for with the debentures he had received for clothing Colonel Churchill’s regiment. This included two quarters of Ardnasodan, Barony of Clare, County Galway which adjoined land owned by the Ballyglunin Blakes. So Major Martin could just have easily have made the connection with the Scawens in Galway, the West Indies or London and shows just how at ease he was within the trading world of the Atlantic.

Any thoughts of the Blakes being closet Jacobites or anything other than loyal members of the British Empire, slim though the chances were for a Galway family like this, are given short shrift by Major Martin’s reaction to the crushing of ‘The Forty-Five’.

It is a very great satisfaction to me that the rebellion was put an end to, before I arrived, I assure you it gave me very great uneasiness, much more than the French and Spanish War. The King of Spain’s death, with the late great success the Austrians &c had against the French & Spaniards in Italy will, I hope, bring us an honourable peace.

This was the outlook of the family in the West Indies, at the heart of imperial adventures abroad. At home, they were more ambivalent. The wealthy merchants and gentry of Galway preferred to concentrate on their business dealings and on the whole had a moderate outlook. The satisfaction of Major Martin was most likely not shared by his brother.

---
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Edmond Blake Fitz Martin most likely felt a more resigned expectation of the failure of the rising.  

Major Martin, like most émigrés, always retained the aim of going home, few ever did. Home by now, for the cosmopolitan Major Martin, was London. There was never any suggestion of his returning to Galway. Even in Ireland, he spent most of his time in Dublin or Cork. His plans to visit Ireland in 1747 came to nothing, he complained to Edmond, ‘I shall not have it in my power to go for Ireland next summer’, but he hoped that Edmond and his son Martin would be able to visit him in London. The cost of living in London was a constant complaint for Martin. When he compared the numerous servants and horses Edmond kept in Galway to his own he complained that he could only, ‘keep but one footman, a coachman and four maids, two coach horses and two riding horses, by this you may be a sufficient judge of the difference of living between this and your country’. This was only his house in London and did not include any mention of the staff he kept in York or in the West Indies, which was extensive. It also gives an indirect insight into the household Edmond and his son Martin kept in Galway where the nearly yearly turnover of much of the staff on the estate makes it difficult to give a total number at any given period.

Despite all his protests Martin still continued the tradition of helping relations set up in business in the West Indies, among whom was his relation and another younger son Darcy Blake. Darcy Blake died in 1747 after a few years in the Caribbean. Major Martin had advanced Darcy roughly £1,700 who had not ‘made a single shilling’ till the day of his death. A few years later Major Martin confirmed that he had lost £1,200 by his death though he had not given up hope of being able to recoup some money from the family, he hoped that when Darcy’s brother Dominick succeeded as a lawyer he would repay Major Martin any funds he had advanced. Major Martin himself had fared equally badly for the year, ‘if I lost a shilling in one respect or other this year, I have [lost] upwards of four thousand pounds’. Worse was to come as he had a ship in port in Cork in distress by which he estimated he would lose another thousand pounds. This accumulation of financial obligations meant that Major Martin himself was required on the ground in Antigua, particularly to take care of Darcy Blake’s affairs, so he resignedly informed his brother, ‘I must quit my little family to cross the seas [at] this dangerous time’.
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Major Martin repeatedly emphasised the importance of having a trusted manager dealing with affairs on each individual island in the West Indies.\textsuperscript{107}

Major Martin loved London, the ‘hurry and noise of the greatest city in the world’, but being a country gentleman and enjoying the country life appealed to him, he described his move to York to Edmond,

I here retired to take the country sports, shooting I am vastly fond of, I have a dexterous hand in knocking down a cock or partridge, snipes or black birds seldom escape me, I have brought my hand into so great perfection, I am so delighted with a country life I could wish to spend the remainder of my days in it.

Carrying on a business between York, London, Galway and the West Indies required quite a bit of attention, so while Major Martin had to some extent retired to York and London, day to day business still took quite a bit of time. He complained more than once that, ‘I have been now seven hours writing, I protest I am quite tired’.\textsuperscript{108} He moaned to Edmond, ‘I vow to you I am tired of writing it is now eight o’clock and have been constantly at it since nine this morning. Very few posts that have less than from three to ten letters to answer’.\textsuperscript{109} Major Martin never lost touch with Galway and both his father and brother kept an account of his expenses in Galway in their account books, by 1747 they styled him ‘Martin Blake of London’．\textsuperscript{110}

York contained a modest Catholic gentry and middle class population at the time but the enforcement of the Corporation and Oaths Acts, ensured they did not play a prominent role in the city’s government despite containing some resident country gentry, though their absence from York’s social life had more to do with the local recusant gentry and their own clannishness rather than any active prejudice on the part of the Protestants of the city. There were exceptions, the Catholic George Reynoldson, an upholsterer, was elected as sheriff in 1740 and the Irish Catholic, Henry Benedict Barnewall, viscount Kingsland was involved in city’s affairs later in the 1740s.\textsuperscript{111} Major Martin had converted by the time he arrived in York so his religion was not an issue for him. The stratum he integrated into in York was not the local recusant gentry but the gentry of the Established Church.

Major Martin made the most of his travels and generally took the scenic route to London. In 1749 he landed at Scarborough and as it ‘was the season for all the nobility and
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gentry to come’ to town, he stayed there three days to indulge himself with the diversions of the place. Next, he went to York and spent six days there. Then ‘up to London’, a six-day ride where he spent three weeks before setting out to Bath and Bristol, and then back to London for the winter. He planned the next year to set out ‘and view more of the kingdom down to Liverpool’ before going over to Dublin and meeting up with Edmond. Despite his lifestyle, he was always able to juggle his social life with continued attention to his business interests. He left trusted men in Galway, the West Indies and London, and he kept himself well-informed of his business dealings. He also ensured his brother was current with all his affairs, he went into detail about ‘what I am about in England as you know I do not love being idle’.

Death was ever present in the West Indies but returning to Europe did not let Major Martin escape from this. Another relation who Major Martin had set up, his ‘poor nephew Mark Bodkin’ died in 1751. He again had a ‘very great loss in him’ who turned ‘out a very good lad and would be a credit to his family’. Mark died in June 1751 ‘of an inflammation owing to the drawing a tooth and getting a cold upon it’. About the same time Martin lost his ‘dear little boy and namesake’. The devastation of the death of another son was sadly evoked, he told his brother Edmond that his son’s death, ‘has almost demolished his mother and myself, I have been travelling through different parts of the kingdom ever since in order to divert my grief, which often got the better of reason’. The other children remained, at this time two sons and three girls, and so he planned to move the family to London for the winter and put his young daughters into a boarding school. His professed reason for settling in England initially was to educate his children. To this end he had placed John and his younger son Martin (prior to his death) under the care of a clergyman who lived beside them in York, ‘a man of learning and a moral man’.

By the 1730s York race week had replaced the assizes as the premier event of the social calendar in the city and as Major Martin never let what was going on around him distract him from his social life, he made the most of it. In 1751 he told his brother it was ‘York race week, so you can imagine what little time (one what keeps the large company I do) can have to write, nor could I do so much but that I stole from the fields on purpose to

112 Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, London to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, 7 Sept. 1749 (M6936/1/7).
113 Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, York to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 24 Aug. 1751 (M6936/1/12); Oliver, Antigua, i, 53.
114 Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, York to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 24 Aug. 1751 (M6936/1/12).
do this’. He signed off quickly as he could not face missing anything, ‘I hear the rattling of coaches coming into town from the race ground so must now conclude’.117

It is clear Major Martin conformed to the established church soon after his arrival in the West Indies. Nevertheless, it did not stop him examining his nephew Robert, son of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, ‘narrowly’ on all he was doing at his seminary in France. Robert visited his uncle and aunt in London on a trip home in August 1753 and stayed ‘some time’, since according to his uncle, ‘although France does not agree with him, yet London does very well’. His uncle described him as ‘happy and good natured’, while he quarrelled with his aunt it was ‘not in earnest’. His uncle examined him and assured Edmond that he found his son ‘sound and good’ in his studies. He pleaded with his brother to give Robert some leeway in his allowance, ‘this hint I give you and let me beg of you to take notice of it’.118

Given Major Martin’s financial position and his importance to Edmond’s financial dealings in London as well as in Galway, this was clearly more than a mere hint, and a request to which Edmond would have had to have given due attention.

Writing at the end of the same month when Robert was about to set out for Ireland, Major Martin again urged his brother, ‘to put him upon such a footing in regard to an annual allowance as will be sufficient to enable him to live comfortably, for you know he is tender and unable to undergo the hardships others are capable of’. He feared that his brother ‘brow beat him’. Undoubtedly this younger son reminded himself of his early years and struggles in the West Indies. He proclaimed to his brother, ‘for God sake what right has an elder son to a large fortune and annual settlement and a younger son begrudged even necessary. They are unjust and deserve God’s judgement to fall heavy upon such parents’. Martin reined himself in here for fear that his brother might think he was alluding to something on his own behalf. He assured Edmond, ‘do not imagine that I hint this to you, I should be sorry that anything belonging to me should or was capable of such behaviour’. The penal laws were ever present, even between these two brothers used to very frank and open letters.119

Major Martin was safely settled in London life. The lawyer John Baker, who had property on St Kitts, and had married the Catholic Mary, daughter of Thomas Ryan of Montserrat, was on his way from a walk through Hyde Park in November 1758 when he bumped into Major Martin Blake and another Galway expatriate, John French Lynch, on Constitution Hill.120 A pen picture of Major Martin Blake later in life is given in a letter written
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by John Thomlinson, senior to Dr G. Crump in Antigua. Major Martin, by this time a Colonel, had just returned to England after visiting his interests in the West Indies,

Col. Blake is arrived and is either going to my house in the Country this morning or is gone, in his way to York. You have fed him so well in Antigua, that he will never be able to travel down to York without some places in the road to stop and blow at, though I think his voyage has not spoiled his rattle in the least, and I hope it has not put his hand out of shooting. Flying he has been busy in getting strong shoes made to shoot in when he gets into the country. But as formerly he was obliged to carry one servant with him when he went a shooting to help him over the hedges. I believe it will now be necessary for him to take two, but your good Lady’s indulgence in feeding him, has brought this extraordinary change upon his dimensions as well as another change in measuring his tailor’s bill, by enlarging the quantity of cloth etc. for making his clothes.121

Major Martin Blake of Seven Oaks, Kent, esq died on 8 October 1767.122 In another case where the eldest son was left to one side, Martin’s eldest son John was left only £200 a year which his father charged on his estate, having been described by his cousin Martin as ‘vicious and extravagant’ and spending time in prison it is little wonder.123 Yet, John, it appears, was a success. In 1771 The London Evening Post reported, ‘We hear from Tunbridge Wells, that J. Blake esq; of Sevenoaks, a near relation of Patrick Blake, Member for Sudbury, having offered himself as Master of the Ceremonies, has been unanimously chosen into that office’.124 The third person who succeeded to the position created by Beau Nash, one of the great dandies of the eighteenth century, at Bath who subsequently appointed himself to Tunbridge Wells, as an organiser of the balls and general conviviality of the season.125 Nash’s flame had well dimmed by his death in 1761 but still merited a biography, by Oliver Goldsmith, a year after his death for this ‘King of Bath’.126 His successors found him an impossible act to follow. Nevertheless, it was still a sought after position, lucrative in its control of the various activities available and shows John was well thought of, in certain circles.

Major Martin Blake’s second son Martin Thomlinson Blake was left the plantations in Parham and Willoughby Bay, Antigua, as well as the power to charge the estate with
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£400 a year and £4,000 for younger children. His wife Elizabeth was to have the use of her ‘own negros’. After the will was proved in London it was also recorded at Antigua 29 March 1768. It is unlikely that this was the full extent of Major Martin’s estate on his death and it seems more likely that his plantations on other islands in the West Indies had previously been settled on his second son, the estate mentioned in his will was simply his personal estate at the time of his death.

Major Martin’s youngest daughter Penelope is not mentioned in his will but had already been well taken care of. She made a good match and married John Sober of the island of Barbados on 6 November 1760. When she died he had a monumental inscription erected in Bath Abbey Church,

In Memory of Penelope Sober Wife of John Sober esq of the Island of Barbadoes who departed this Life the 29 Jan. 1774 Aged...Years.

Back in Galway, Martin Blake Fitz Peter’s youngest daughter became a nun but not even her name has been recorded. His second youngest daughter Mary was described by Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin as ‘poor Molly’. Major Martin repeatedly asked after his sister, who he called time and again, ‘poor unfortunate Molly’. Mary married Alexander Bodkin of Anbally, County Galway who conformed in 1720. Major Martin did not hold back when inquiring after them,

You let me know nothing of that good for nothing lousy dogg that ruined my poor sister Molly. I can never think of him with patience. My poor dear father recommended a brother of his to me, you have never seen any in your life that looks like a sheep stealer than him, I took no manner of notice of him, nor never will of any of the breed for no good can ever become of them. God help my poor sister I wish she was single.

Molly remained a constant drain on the estate’s finances and on many occasions her father Martin or her brother Edmond were forced to pay her rent in Galway town, pay for food or to replace her cow that had died. Edmond loaned money to Alexander who conducted

---
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business in Galway and in Dublin, though at the bottom of the account book page dealing with Alexander and Mary Bodkin, Edmond noted that he never received his money back.\footnote{M6933/26/36.}

Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin of Antigua and Seven Oaks, Kent was the last younger son in this line to emigrate to the West Indies. The impact of the penal laws and wider political events on these islands rather than economics in the narrow sense forced Irish Catholics to look to other freer New Worlds.\footnote{Akenson, Montserrat, 118.} Unlike other families, the Blakes of Ballyglunin did not have a tradition of service in foreign armies or of emigration to the continent for education or trade. The estate in Galway could handle the expense of one extra son but there were certainly funds for other prospects. Ultimately, it was not economics or politics but family relationships which restricted the choices of the children of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin. Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin was reluctant to see any of his nephews follow his path to the West Indies (see below). Only the Church remained a definite prospect.

iv. Edmond Blake Fitz Martin’s younger children

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin of Ballyglunin had four sons, the eldest inherited the Ballyglunin estate, the two youngest became priests while the second son remained a bachelor. His father had the luxury of being able to set up his one younger son on a plantation in the West Indies. The expansion of British territories in the West Indies as a result of the Seven Years’ War gave a brief respite to enterprising migrants but conditions quickly reverted to the pre-war situation. Outsiders found it increasingly difficult to break into planter society. Opportunities for advancement in the West Indies had contracted as the century went on.\footnote{William Hickey, Memoirs of William Hickey, ed. Alfred Spencer (4 vols, London, 1913-25), ii, 25-6; for Hickey, his Irish-born father’s working life in London, William’s migrant experience from London to the West Indies and with the East India Company and his accounts of numerous Irishmen, both Protestant and Catholic see his Memoirs, as well as Chenevix Trench, Grace’s Card, 222-3; Bailey, Irish London, 99-157.} Added to this, from the 1740s on, the rise in incomes as a result of the burgeoning livestock trade and textile industries meant that there were more possibilities for employment at home and consequently less reason to emigrate.\footnote{Cullen, ‘The Irish diaspora of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries’, 132.}

The Blakes of Ballyglunin had business links both within Ireland and with London, the West Indies and the continent, but by mid-century without the family having a tradition of emigrating to Europe it would have been unusual for them to start and even here it was increasingly difficult for new arrivals to establish themselves as the trade was more and
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more dominated by a few major houses\textsuperscript{137}. Edmond did look into sending one of his sons out to the West Indies, however, the opposition of his brother Major Martin Blake to this proposal meant it ultimately came to nothing. Instead, Edmond had to resort to a complicated and lengthy series of articles, bonds and settlements in order to secure the estate for his eldest son Martin against any attempt by a family member or stranger, to gavel or discover on the estate.

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin passed bonds of £6,000 to secure the marriage articles of his eldest son and heir, Martin Blake Fitz Edmond and levied fines on the parts of the estate not included in his father’s devise entail of the estate.\textsuperscript{138} His son Martin ‘did not think that sufficient for the uses of the articles’ and Edmond levied further fines on Cloondahamper and other lands in 1754 and 1755.\textsuperscript{139} Despite his son’s entreaties Edmond would not suffer the recovery of his full estate as he did not want to endanger the settlement his father had made on the estate and in particular to ‘short the remainders’ of his brother and sisters and their children, not to mention the additional time and expense this would have entailed. As discussed above (Chapter 6.ii) this changed on the death of his brother Major Martin Blake of Antigua and Seven Oaks, Kent on 8 October 1767.\textsuperscript{140} There followed, over the next couple of years, a series of articles, bonds, fines and recoveries on the estate by both Edmond and Martin, as well as numerous legal opinions and efforts by Martin, to establish the legality of the various marriage settlements, leases and bonds on the estate as well as those enacted by individual members of the family.

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin’s second son John was, by agreement with his father, given a yearly maintenance of £24 in 1758 but as he got older he also got a personal fortune to set him up. In 1760 his father passed to him a bond of Charles Daly’s for £600 which with two years interest would be due the following May amounting to £660.\textsuperscript{141} As he matured his father settled further sums on him, this in the main consisted of bonds of £1,300 to secure an annuity of £100.\textsuperscript{142} Despite these arrangements, the eldest son Martin Blake Fitz Edmond reached an agreement with his younger brother John, in order to secure the settlement of the estate and prevent any future complications on their father’s death. The two brothers agreed on this between themselves, without any communication from their father. John had £100 per annum settled on him by his father and so Martin Blake Fitz

\textsuperscript{137} Cullen, ‘Galway merchants in the outside world’, 187.
\textsuperscript{138} Settlement of marriage of Martin Blake and Bridget Joyce, 30 Oct. 1751 (M6931/74); M6935/66; Blake, II, 216. For a discussion of fines and recoveries see Chapter 6.iii.
\textsuperscript{139} Edmond Blake to Marlborough Sterling of Dublin, fine of Brierfield and Cloondahamper, Co. Galway (M6931/81); Edmond Blake to Marlborough Sterling, fine of Ardnasoden, Ballyglooneen and Culleen Co. Galway (M6931/82); M6935/66.
\textsuperscript{140} M6935/66/8.
\textsuperscript{141} M6933/26/19.
\textsuperscript{142} M9635/66/13.
Edmond passed a bond, 6 April 1771, for £1,300 to secure the punctual payment of the annuity and John agreed to relinquish all claim to Martin or his father’s worldly substance, with the acknowledgment that he would be left out of his father’s will. This did not seem fair, according to Martin, and so they made a further settlement. Despite all this trouble to secure John, he was still left £300 on his father’s death, which was specifically noted, in the deed he passed to his brother, as outside the deed of general release they passed between themselves.143

Robert, the third son of Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, became a priest. He was born in 1728 and travelled to France for his education. He initially enrolled at the University of Toulouse. It was an expensive undertaking. When he left home, on 10 October 1747, his father Edmond gave him £10 for the journey. There followed a steady trickle of money passed on to France to pay for his education, usually by way of the Lynch family. Over the next four years, Edmond forwarded £202 to France to pay for his son’s education. Edmond gave £12 cash to Patrick Lynch on his way to Dublin to advance to Robert for clothes and general expenses. In 1754 Edmond gave £1 to Patrick on his way to Dunkirk to give to Robert and on the same day got Andrew Lynch to pass a bill in his son’s favour for £68, which presumably Patrick Lynch would pass on to him with the ready money he had. In total from 1747 to about the end of 1753, Edmond forwarded £410 18s. 11d. His stay in France became more expensive as the years went on. These bills were forwarded by way of Dublin, England and Dunkirk.144

Robert gained an M.A. in philosophy at Toulouse on 25 June 1749 and then spent two years at Bordeaux studying theology. He was ordained in 1751 and was twenty-four years old when he entered the seminary of St Nicolas du Chardonnet, Paris in July 1752, where he studied for a degree, most likely in theology.145 As discussed above, Robert’s uncle Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, who usually had little sympathy for anyone, described him as ‘tender and unable to undergo the hardships others are capable of’ and as a result of this in 1753 he asked his brother to be a little more lenient with Robert’s allowance to put him upon such a footing as would be sufficient to enable him to live comfortably. He told his brother that ‘France does not agree with him, yet London does very well’, but still at the same time assured Edmond that he found Robert ‘sound and good’ in his studies.146

143 M6935/66/10-13; Abstract will of John Blake of Ballyglunin 24 Sept. 1774 and codicil of will 2 Apr. 1777, proved Prerogative Court 8 Aug. 1777 (N.L.I., MS 4139/76); N.L.I., MS 10,792/3.
144 M6933/26/10; for Galway’s substantial trade with Dunkirk see Christian Pfister, ‘Dunkerque et l’Irlande, 1690-1790’, in Dickson et al., Irish and Scottish mercantile networks, 93-114.
146 Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, London, to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 9 Aug. 1753 (M6936/1/16).
in Galway, his brother Martin Blake Fitz Edmond did his part to fund his brother’s education, ordering ‘Andrew Lynch to remit brother Rob in Paris’ £2 10s. in January 1753.\(^{147}\) His father settled £50 per annum on Robert and gave his eldest son Martin £500 to secure this bequest. Martin passed a deed, 24 April 1767, to secure this annuity and Robert agreed in turn to relinquish all rights to the estate. The brothers did not think this was secure enough and another deed was passed on 7 May 1770. This again was felt to be ‘not full enough in favour of Robert’ so the previous deed was again cancelled and another deed executed, 1 April 1771, for £500 to secure the punctual payment of the annuity. Robert was left £400 in his father’s will but after this was drawn up, his father gave him £500 in lieu.\(^{148}\)

There is a fourth son Peter listed as a priest in the genealogies.\(^{149}\) He is not mentioned in any documents relating to the settlement of the estate. There appears to be a good reason for this, as far as his father Edmond was concerned in any case. The settlements on the estate were all done with the compliance or at the very least the knowledge of Edmond’s brother Major Martin Blake of Antigua and Sevenoaks, Kent. Major Martin’s experiences in the West Indies had scarred him, the deaths of the relations he had set up there Darcy Blake and Mark Bodkin, and these two at the very least, had left a lasting impression on him. Further to this the deaths of his two infant sons, while occurring in England, Major Martin gives the distinct impression of blaming on the time they spent in the West Indies. So when he received a letter from William Kelly from St Kitts inquiring about the arrangements of setting Peter up in the West Indies, he was enraged.

He wrote to his brother informing him, ‘I have been angry for some time past with you but now must vent it’, as he now at last understood why Edmond had not responded to any of his letters about Peter. The letter from William Kelly had let the cat out of the bag. He demanded to know that if Edmond had intended sending his son to the West Indies, why he had not informed him. He insisted, ‘I would not propose it’. He reminded his brother that, ‘I was partly the means of Darcy Blake’s going and he died’ losing not only a relative but £1,200, he maintained that the ‘death of that young fellow’ was the reason he would not encourage him to send Peter there. At that very time another relation that Martin had set up in the West Indies, ‘my poor nephew Mark Bodkin’ had just died not to mention the death of his own ‘dear little boy and namesake’, whose death while in England, he clearly blamed on the West Indies. By the end of the letter, Martin had calmed down. He noted numerous letters from William Kelly of St Kitts about Peter, asking Martin to recommend him going out. Resignedly, he told his brother, ‘I only tell you if you will trust him, I will take care to give such orders about him, that I would if my own son was going, if any accident happens,

\(^{147}\) Diary and account book of Martin Blake, 22 Jan. 1753 (M6933/16/1).
\(^{148}\) M6935/66/10-12.
\(^{149}\) Blake, II, 216; Burke, Landed Gentry, 50.
provided he goes, blame not me, was I afraid, I should be a poor farmer this day, not worth ten pounds or at least, worth as much as I now spend in one year'.

Martin’s tirade had its effect, for Peter never went. As Edmond Blake Fitz Martin had himself settled £50 per annum on his third son Robert, one can only conclude he had already done the same for his fourth son, Peter, before the eldest son Martin took over running the estate. Peter like his elder brother Robert, then left the country for his education and died early in 1758.

Throughout Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s description of these settlements affecting the estate he repeats again and again in various ways, as if to assure himself, that ‘my brothers Robert and Jack will never attempt to gavel’, adding, ‘if they should, my fines, that I levied, will help bar them after five years’, emphasising that the ‘lease that my father gave me of his lands will bar them of the profit rent during the term of the annuities they signed to’ and ‘the bonds of £6,000 passed by my father on my marriage will bar them’. Alluding to the fact that this all started with a disgruntled cousin, Martin then took steps to ensure that his brothers did not have any heirs. With Robert and Peter being priests he was safe. For John, he got him to take a ‘Book oath’ before himself and his wife Bridget, swearing that he would never marry.

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin had at least one daughter Margaret who was educated by the local nuns at £10 a year and who married John Darcy of Houndswood, County Mayo. While in 1752 he wrote about ‘a match made for my Kitty with Mr J. Fleming of Tuam... they are to marry privately’. This was his sister Mary’s, the ‘poor Molly’ of his brother’s Major Martin’s letters, daughter with Alexander Bodkin of Anbally, County Galway. The settlement for this marriage was passed, on 20 January 1753, when Edmond stood as trustee for Catherine to ensure the payment of the marriage portion due to her under her parents’ marriage settlement.

Catherine and James Fleming’s child Christian died aged sixteen in 1770.

One final element in the settlement of the estate was the final settlement: the person’s last will and testament. This concerned mainly the younger sons, as the estate was generally already settled on the eldest son, and wives and daughters were taken care

---

150 Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, York to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 24 Aug. 1751 (M6936/1/12).

151 Account book of Martin Blake, 25 Apr. 1758 (M6933/16/60, 73, 79).

152 M6935/66/14.

153 M6933/26/NO; Memorial of settlement on marriage of John Darcy of Ballakine, Co. Mayo, esq and Margaret, daughter of Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin, 18 Jan. 1754 (M6931/80); Blake, II, 215.

154 Edmond Blake, Ballyglunin to Peter Blake at Messrs Dillon and Cahill, merchs., Dublin, 11 Feb. 1752 (M6936/1/14); Blake, II, 215; Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin, Antigua to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, Ballyglunin, 25 June 1738 (M6936/1/5).

155 Settlement on marriage of James Fleming of Tuam, merch. and Catherine, daughter of Alexander and Mary Bodkin, 20 Jan. 1753 (M6931/77).

of by their marriage settlements. Martin Blake Fitz Edmond made his will, on 25 February 1775, and initially confirmed the agreements he had made with his own brothers Robert and John, and with his wife, who in addition to £2,250 got the use of his furniture and post-chaise during her life. He then proceeded to take care of his younger children. His second son Walter was bequeathed £1,500 and his youngest son John was left £1,000. His third and fourth sons, Martin and Pierce Ignatius, were priests and so were only left life interests in the amounts of £800 and £600 respectively, the residue to go to his eldest son Edmond and his heirs on their deaths. All the younger sons were explicitly named, Walter, Martin, Pierce and John Blake, and collectively they were warned in the will that if any of them should gavel any part of his real estate, in such case they were to receive five pounds only, and any bequests mentioned elsewhere in the will left to any younger son who should gavel, or in his marriage settlement or by any other settlement on the estate, such bequests were to go to his eldest son Edmond Blake Fitz Martin.157

v. Conclusion

One surprising aspect of this investigation of younger children of the Blakes of Ballyglunin in the first three-quarters of the eighteenth century is the lack of any professions or any foreign education, except for religious education. There were restrictions on the education of Catholics in Ireland but numerous neighbours in Galway sent their younger sons to England or the continent to be educated as lawyers, doctors or simply to gain a wider education. The usual reason why this was not attempted is the lack of access to sufficient funds or links abroad, neither were lacking here and so it was a conscious choice by the family.

The various methods by which younger children were taken care of proved to be an enormous drain on the estate. Child’s portions and marriage settlements were the normal methods by which all estates were used to care for the next generation. However, the examination of younger children in this chapter has demonstrated how a Catholic family in the first three-quarter of the eighteenth century went to far greater lengths in order to provide for their children. The meticulous nature of Martin Blake Fitz Edmond’s dealings, whether it be his brothers’ portions or the perceived threat to his father’s estate, is shadowed at every stage by the penal laws. Tying up every piece in land in settlements, backed by bonds, making his brother swear on the bible not to marry, he and his father even asked the advice of the Pope whether they should emigrate ‘in view of the situation of Catholic proprietors

157 Will of Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, 25 Feb. 1775, Codicil 8 Feb. 1776 & Orig. Probate Prerog., 6 Feb 1778 (N.A.I., T17176); Abstract of Will of Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, Co Galway (N.L.I., MS 4139/94), abstract omits any mention of gavel clause.
under the penal laws’. The penal laws remained a constant presence for the extended family of Catholic landowners of Ireland, whether that extended family remained resident in Ireland or elsewhere. This chapter has dealt with the experience of younger children and how they affected the family’s estate, yet it has been necessary time and again to return to the influence of the penal laws, as no action in reference to the estate could be undertaken without making allowance for the penal code. Their experience confirms Louis Cullen’s conclusion that while the land financed the careers of younger sons and the dowries of daughters, the penal laws, far from driving Catholics into trade as a result of their loss of land or restrictions on the professions, in fact limited the profits available to Catholics and thus restricted the amount of money available for direct investment in trade, whether at home or abroad. The estate was able to finance the initial outlay to establish children abroad but further investment in foreign financial markets simply was not possible to any great extent. Too much time, effort and money were spent on managing the penal laws for the full financial benefits of the estate to be invested greatly elsewhere.

Life in Ireland during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was fundamentally affected by anti-Catholic legislation, indeed a large part of this study has been how Catholics were in some way able to mitigate the effects of this legislation. Throughout this chapter on younger children it remains a constant theme. Despite this, there is a disconnect between this fact and the actions of the younger sons who emigrated to the West Indies. Once there they had no difficulty engaging with the slave trade. No part of life during this time in the West Indies escaped from the influence of the slave trade, it was a part of everyday life. Ireland was not prominent in the trade, but this was not because of moral objections but simply the reality of the economics of the trade. There were exceptions to this. The West Indian trade was an important element in the economic development of Belfast. Where Irishmen, and in the context of the penal laws, in particular, Catholic Irishmen, had the chance to profit from the slave trade they did so.

The integration of the Irish abroad into inter-connected merchant networks throughout the Atlantic world, encompassing Ireland, England, the Continent, the West Indies and America opens up the viewpoint of eighteenth century Ireland, in particular, eighteenth century Catholic Ireland that has only begun to be explored. This expands the

---

158 Statement of a case on behalf of Edmond Blake and his son Martin, for submission to the papal court, inquiring as to whether, in view of the situation of Catholic proprietors under the penal laws, he ought to sell his estate and emigrate, 23 Dec. 1769 (M6935/73/4-7. Printed in the Ballyglunin Papers Calendar Guide, but containing folder is missing in the National Archives). See Chapter 6.iv.
159 Cullen, ‘Merchant communities overseas’, 170.
160 Rodgers, Ireland, slavery and anti-slavery, 156.
161 See the online database Legacies of British Slave-ownership (https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/) for compensation paid to former slave owners in Galway in 1833.
worldview of Catholic Ireland far beyond the narrow provincial confines that it is all too easy to limit them to. This expansive worldview has been well illustrated by the influence world affairs played on contemporary Irish poetry.\textsuperscript{162} The family and estate back in Ireland remained connected to these emigrants and their new homes. The estate in Ireland gave the younger sons the initial capital to begin their life in the West Indies but it was only the accumulation of substantial further resources there that allowed them to enter into the wider Atlantic trade.\textsuperscript{163} Ultimately, to set up children at home or abroad entailed a significant drain on the estate. Even when those younger children made good use of their child’s portion, as in the cases of Patrick Blake Fitz Peter and Major Martin Blake, they never repaid the initial outlay.

\textsuperscript{162} Ó Buachalla, Aisling Ghéar; Vincent Morley, Irish Opinion and the American Revolution, 1760-1783 (Cambridge, 2002); idem, Washington i gCeannas a Ríochta: Cogadh Mheiriceá i Litriocht na Gaeilge (Dublin, 2005).

\textsuperscript{163} Truxes, ‘London’s Irish merchant community’, 282.
Chapter 9
Conclusion

i. The Blakes of Ballyglunin from 1777 to the end of the nineteenth century

The repeal of the penal laws, from 1778 on, was slow to have an effect on the Ballyglunin estate. Martin Blake Fitz Edmond, despite having taken on the running of the estate nearly a decade before his father’s death, and being heavily involved in the estate long before that, only outlived his father by six years. His son, in turn, Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, only remained in charge of the estate for barely four years. While his son, Martin Stephen Blake, did not even reach his teens. It was Martin Stephen’s uncle, Walter, who first began to extend the estate beyond its seventeenth-century limits. Primarily this was an extension of their leasehold interest and it was here that a real change was seen for the last decade of the century before the estate was again left adrift during the minority of Martin Joseph Blake. It was during the long tenure of Martin Joseph Blake (1790-1861), MP for the Borough of Galway 1832-57, that the estate began its real expansion. He bought out numerous neighbours in County Galway as well as in the town, including the extensive lands and house of the Frenches of Brooklodge. Martin Joseph Blake played a central role in the political and social life of Galway. He was strong O’Connell supporter and heavily involved in the anti-tithe and emancipation movements. He was a strong advocate for the development of the county, involved with wider issues affecting Galway Harbour, the improvement of Lough Corrib and railway development.

In the nineteenth century, the Blakes of Ballyglunin were among the wealthiest landowners in Galway. During the famine years, even families such as the Blakes of Menlough sought assistance from Martin Joseph Blake of Ballyglunin. By 1878 Walter Martin Blake of Ballyglunin owned 10,336 acres in County Galway worth £3,330 and another 116 acres in Galway town worth £638. In the late nineteenth-century, the family had an income of £20,000, of which rent only accounted for less than half. The family remained committed Catholics and played an increasingly important role in the county, province and country’s political life. When Henry Blake married Adelaide, daughter of Robert French of Monivea in 1827, she abandoned the ‘errors of the Established Church’.

1 M6935/65; M6931/106, 107, 113; Blake, II, 217; Melvin, ‘The landed gentry of Galway, 1820-1880’, 54-6, 97; Melvin, ‘The Galway tribes as landowners and gentry’, 327.
2 M6935/41-54.
3 U.H. Hussey De Burgh, The Landowners of Ireland: An Alphabetical List of the Owners of Estates of 500 Acres or £500 Valuation and Upwards (Dublin, 1878), 38; Melvin, Estates and Landed Society in Galway, xix.
4 Melvin, Estates and Landed Society in Galway, 170.
ii. Conclusions

The present thesis has presented a reinterpretation of the experience of a Catholic landowning family from the mid-seventeenth century until the eve of the repeal of the penal laws by placing the family firmly in its local context in terms of landownership, economic affairs and confessional identity. The experience of one Catholic merchant and landowning family in both rural and urban Ireland over the space of more than a hundred years, from the 1640s on, which is presented here, is a critical analysis of a tumultuous period of Irish history. Key parts of this history have been illuminated in numerous period specific studies discussed throughout, whether it is part of Confederate Ireland, the Interregnum, the Restoration, Jacobite Ireland or the penal era, what this study has done is take these various different strands and tie them together by exploring one family’s experience and by doing so giving a reinterpretation of the history of Catholic Ireland during this period.

It is perhaps an overstatement to describe Catholics as a besieged community, nevertheless, they did have to struggle to adjust to the momentous events of the seventeenth century and then face the labyrinthine complexities of the penal code. The timeframe covered here saw numerous periods of rapid change in Ireland. Taken together it is not surprising the image of a besieged community emerged. This study has examined the defeat, transplantation, survival, expansion, consolidation, resistance and endurance of a Catholic landed family in the period c.1620-1777. The major theme studied throughout has been the expansion and defence of a landed estate, in both its rural and urban aspects.

What then was the experience of a Catholic landed and merchant family from 1641 until 1777? That there was a massive transfer of land during the tumultuous years of the transplantation to Connacht has been widely acknowledged, what has not been explored is the transfer of land between individual transplantees, as shown in Chapter 2, land (or potential land) changed hands even during the year between the activities of the commissioners at Athlone and Loughrea. These land deals and the bonds associated with them took a long time to resolve and their consequences continued well into the Restoration. The importance of those who underwent internal transplantation within Connacht has been expanded; their importance within the transplantation at large has not been fully realised and is a field where further research would expand our knowledge the seventeenth century Ireland. Further to this, the Galway townsmen’s loss of urban property gives a unique insight into urban Ireland.

How transplanters were allocated land and on what basis is still in need of closer study. If it is taken to equal one or two-thirds of the transplanter's former estate this does not make sense and as is suggested in Chapter 2 it only makes sense if land held by mortgage is excluded from the calculations. The extent of land held by mortgage prior to
1641 was extensive and while there are individual cases where mortgages were upheld, particularly in relation to marriage portions and annuities, this represents another layer of the decimation of the pre-1641 Catholic wealth.

The arrangement with Richard Butler, earl of Arran shows a previously unacknowledged method by which transplanters and purchasers of other forfeited land attempted to gain secure title to their new land holdings. That there were recognised flaws in all the different methods used to gain secure title to these lands is seen by the continuous attempts to reopen the land settlement right up to the end of the seventeenth century. The vital role played by the court for hearing the claims of transplanted persons in the Province of Connacht and County of Clare, 1676-7, has been overlooked by most historians and its importance has not fully been realised. For landholders in Connacht and Clare, it was the legal basis for all landholding right up to the land acts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Still, it does need to be emphasised that patents granted in the late 1670s were confirmations of existing holdings rather than any attempt at a wider reopening of the land settlement.

The importance of arbitration on a local level gives a glimpse into the failure of the justice system to supply a need desperately desired and required to settle the innumerable disputes over the boundaries of newly granted or purchased land throughout Ireland. This has not been recognised as an issue. Given the volume of land that changed hands throughout the century, it was only a tiny minority of cases that ended up in the courts and in those cases taken by those with the wealth and rank to pursue such law cases. On a day to day basis in every townland in the country, it was by arbitration that issues of conflict were resolved. This remained the case right into the eighteenth century. This tied into the pursuit of as compact estate as possible, seen by purchases and swaps of land in order to gain as compact a landholding as possible.

Mortgages, were of vital importance pre-1641, during the war years and during the Restoration. This has been realised, particularly in the work of Brendán Ó Bric, but the fact that it remained so until the end of the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth has not. The practice whereby mortgages ultimately resulted in a fee simple ownership of the land by the mortgagee was not replicated post-1691. The trustees for the forfeited estates took a very narrow legal view of all transactions which led to a further forfeiture of wealth by Catholic Ireland. The land forfeitures following the war of 1689-91 have been well documented in the work of J.G. Simms, but the extent of general wealth, outside of fee simple land, lost by Catholics has not been fully appreciated and his work is expanded upon here.

The Blake family saw a rise in their wealth through the eighteenth century. This attests to the extent of farming, merchant and banking activities that the family conducted
in Galway and further afield, and the opportunities this afforded for the immediate family. It is most visibly seen in the dramatic rise in marriage portions enacted on the estate by the second half of the eighteenth century. The key research question has been, by using the Blakes of Ballyglunin as a microcosm, to seek to explain the financial and legal strategies devised and utilised by Catholic landlords to gain, maintain and consolidate their estates. This has illuminated wider financial affairs, such as the use of bonds as part of the banking role they played within Ireland which could be used as a form of lending backed up with guarantees on the bond. The management of the estate, and the budding trend for improvement this entailed, is nowhere better illustrated than in the implementation of the Boundaries Act of 1721, the building of walls as a consequence and the resultant profound creation of the landscape of Connacht it involved.

The effects of the penal laws on a Catholic estate have been traced in Chapter 6 with an important contribution to how Catholics managed the laws’ effect on their wider wealth. Marriage settlements for Catholic landowners were larger as a result of the penal laws. Marriage articles remained a vital part of life, in particular for landowners themselves, but also for the wider family. The importance of this to the day-to-day life of even minor gentry like the Blakes of Ballyglunin cannot be overstressed. Dying in debt as means to forestall an attempt on an estate has also not been acknowledged as one of the methods by which Catholics strove to secure the transfer of their estate intact to the eldest son.

The effects of the penal laws on land have been recognised to have continued right up to the repeal of the individual law concerned. However, their effect on individual Catholic estates has not been sufficiently stressed, particularly in recent studies. As is clear from the dramatic effect the simple rumour of a cousin thinking of inquiring about the gavel had on Martin Blake Fitz Edmond, his family, friends and business contacts in Galway and around the rest of Ireland, not to mention in London at such a late date as 1768, their effect on Catholic estates needs to be reappraised beyond individual law cases that have come to light.

The settlement of the estate and all it entailed became the fundamental method by which Catholic landowners managed the penal laws and how they related to their estates. The settlement of a Catholic estate entailed a much wider range of deeds and arrangements than has been previously recognised. This is a clear influence of the penal laws as similar Protestant families did not go the same lengths in the settlements of their estates. This included fines and recoveries, leases of certain lands set at different rents and using a multitude of different people both Catholic and Protestant, bonds and annuities, as well as oaths taken between brothers. There is also the fact that Catholics carried a lot of debt on their estate in order to make sure any potential discoverer or anyone who attempted to gavel would be stuck with the various demands on the estate. To what extent this
represents another fictitious arrangement, in the mould of a collusive discovery, is a subject worth further study.

In Chapter 7 the urban experience of Catholics has been examined. Urban Catholics had an importance that far outweighed their numbers in both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The thesis has dealt with the Blakes of Ballyglunin’s experience in the town of Galway in a separate chapter and in many ways this reflects accepted historiographical analysis of urban areas as a separate area of study, but, as has been made clear here, there was no appreciable distinction between the Blakes of Ballyglunin’s functions as landowners and townsmen. Both elements of their urban and rural life fed off each other, so the question of when they ceased to be townsmen and became part of the gentry is a misunderstanding of their role in early modern Ireland.

The gradual accumulation of wealth and the reassertion of Catholic confidence from mid-eighteenth century is illustrated by Martin Blake Fitz Edmond. His experience in re-establishing himself and his family in the town illuminates and ties into the wider emergence of a confident national Catholic movement for repeal of the penal laws. The return of Catholics to urban life by mid-century represented not only their rising wealth but also the changed political situation nationwide in which they could put that wealth to a more visible use. The establishment of the heir of the Ballyglunin estate within the town in all his sartorial finery and visible trappings of wealth gives no better illustration of this. This has been seen primarily as Catholics playing a new role in eighteenth century Ireland but should also be viewed as Catholics retaking old roles, it may have been over a century since they played a full visible role in these affairs but the theme of continuation should not be underestimated.

Numerous reasons have been given as to why particular families converted and others remained Catholic. There is no doubt that luck played a part in the continuation of many families as Catholic landowners. In the case of the Blakes of Ballyglunin, it was primarily a meticulous attention to the management of the estate that was the crucial reason for the family’s ability to withstand the pressures resulting from the penal laws. There were at least three major threats to the estate in the period from the 1690s until 1781. In the early years Martin Blake Fitz Peter simply bought off the relevant parties, by 1760s, however, that was not even a consideration and it was only by going over the settlements on the estate, the marriage articles, wills and arrangements for younger children, that the family was able to ensure the security of the estate.

In Chapter 8 the experience of younger children, abroad and at home has been explored. The settlements on the estate ensured that the family was never reliant on younger sons voluntarily forgoing their legal right to an equal share of the estate. It was emphasised time and again to them that any attempt on the estate would result in them receiving significantly less than they stood to gain from the existing settlement of the estate.
A large part of this study has been how Catholics were in some way able to mitigate the effects of this legislation, how younger children were dealt with represented a vital element in this strategy.

The family at home, whether younger sons, uncles, nephews or in-laws were all integrated into the wider family businesses. This was conducted, by-and-large, on a local level, with limited resources and among family and friends, and often times at the expense of friends and family, but it does indicate a modest rise in the family’s fortunes through the century. This attests to the extent of farming, merchant and banking activities that the family conducted in Galway and further afield, and the opportunities this afforded for the immediate family.

The concentration of this thesis on landownership has some inherent limitations. Few aspects of the social or cultural world of early modern Galway have been presented here and the female perspective is only touched on in passing. This is the unavoidable consequence of exploring a landed estate solely from the perspective of the accumulation, defence and use of the land, both rural and urban. However, it is only when this aspect of the estate is firmly developed that other parts of early modern Irish life can begin to be explored in any depth. This ties into the lack of any exploration of Irish language sources or of the intellectual milieu they inhabited. Galway had the reputation of being a centre of learning early in the seventeenth century and at the end of the seventeenth century Roderic O’Flaherty was a very visible representative of this tradition but the reasons for the lack of a more widespread local intellectual tradition, especially of Gaelic poetry, needs to be explored.5

---

### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bond</strong></td>
<td>Written obligation to pay sum of money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entail, estate tail or fee tail</strong></td>
<td>Form of trust established by deed or settlement for restricting succession of estate to specified line of heirs, as a rule to eldest son of each generation. Real property held by entail could not be alienated, the owner was simply tenant for life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dower</strong></td>
<td>Widow's share of estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee simple</strong></td>
<td>Absolute interest in land held free from limitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine</strong></td>
<td>Numerous legal meanings, whether a simple payment, money legally payable, or an entry fine as an upfront payment to secure a tenancy. In its legal sense as a means to bar an entail, a fine was, like a recovery, a collusive legal action worked out by the parties, approved by the court and then registered with the court to bar an entail, it supposes a controversy over the property where in reality there was none. Differed from common recovery in that the issue in tail were barred but not remaindermen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gavelkind</strong></td>
<td>Deceased's land divided equally among male heirs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jointure</strong></td>
<td>Amount settled on widow on death of husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lease and release</strong></td>
<td>Conveyance of freehold estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letters patent</strong></td>
<td>Legal instrument of King sealed with Great Seal confirming a person’s right to something (i.e. land).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portion</strong></td>
<td>Property bride takes into marriage (marriage portion) and provision for younger members of family (child’s portion).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recovery</strong></td>
<td>The common or feigned recovery was available only to the tenant-in-tail in possession who by a feigned suit in the Court of Common Pleas, could bar the entail and cut off any remainders and reversions, so as to dispose of his property as he wished, it produced a fee simple absolute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statute staple</strong></td>
<td>Established to regulate staple goods, evolved into means for regulation of debt. Mayors of staple elected in each staple town to regulate this, having the power to imprison debtor on default.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tail male</strong></td>
<td>Settlement of estate on successive generations of male heirs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Usufruct  In terms of a mortgage, borrower conveyed possession but not ownership to lender until redemption of sum loaned. Lender retained right to use property and enjoy fruits until loan repaid.
## Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s estate on the surrender of Galway to the Parliamentary forces, 5 April 1652.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ruined stone house, with a parlour and a backside room in the Newtown Quarter within the town of Galway in fee simple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stone house, kitchen and backside thereunto belonging in the little Gate Quarter within the town of Galway in fee simple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stone house and castle, commonly called Blake’s Castle, situated in the High St in Great Gate Quarter within the town of Galway, mortgaged to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew by Walter Lynch Fitz George of Galway, merchant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A river weir for fishing by Martin’s mill in fee simple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A field of ground or park in the East Liberties of Galway, commonly called Meadle [Middle Close], by estimation six acres of land with a lease mortgaged by the corporation for £45 sterling, held by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew since at least July 1642.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A field or park of ground in the West Liberties of Galway commonly called Lackenbeggy by estimation 4 acres of land, with a lease mortgaged by the corporation for £30 sterling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A garden plot in the West Liberties of Galway by lease from John Blake late of Galway, esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two quarters of land in the land of Aghill, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway. The two quarters of land were mortgaged by Thomas Nolan the elder of Ballinrobe, esq deceased in the year 1628 to Charles Nolan, alias Darraghane Nolan, deceased, for the sum of £300 sterling. ‘The said lands came lawfully to the petitioner [Martin Blake Fitz Andrew] by conveyance’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The one moiety of six quarters of Grange and Cregmore in the Barony of Clare, Co. Galway being part of the ancient estate of Sir Richard Blake, knight, who mortgaged the said three quarters of land to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two quarters of lands or there about in Castlekeel, Barony of Clanmorris in the Co. of Mayo: viz. the third part of the castle of Castle Poole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two quarters by their several names viz. the quarters of land called Carrow, one third part of a quarter called Drarleone, one third part of one quarter of land in the two quarters of Killraman, one third part of the quarter of land called Carrow Calleragh in Lavally Rosange, parcels of the lands of Castlekeel aforesaid, the one moiety of the corn and tucking mill with the one moiety of the river and fishing of the said land. Purchased by Patrick Martin of Galway merchant for him and his heirs from James McHenry Prendergast of Castlekeel aforesaid and the said Patrick conveyed the said lands to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew and his heirs for ever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four quarters the Castle, town and lands of Dermuyny viz. the three quarters commonly Carrowcaslane, Carroward, Craughifill and the four quarters called Shanballybought with the mill and other appurtenances thereunto belonging in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barony of Clannmorris, Co. Mayo, of the ancient estate of Walter Blake Fitz Andrew gent, the said Walter mortgaged the said four quarters of lands to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew.

One cartron of lands called Ligaterae being in the two quarters of Lavally McRichard in the Barony of Clannmorris, Co. Mayo, mortgaged by Walter McEdmond Fitz Maurice for £20 ster. to James McHenry Prendergast which mortgage the said James past in the body of the deed to Patrick Martin and Patrick to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew in the body of his deed of Castlekeel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Urban Property</th>
<th>Three houses, ten acres, a plot and the fishing rights of a weir.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Rural Property</td>
<td>Thirteen quarters and a cartron, with half the fishing rights and half a Corn and Tucking Mill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Martin Blake Fitz Andrew’s ancient estate on 22 Oct. 1641 and by purchases and conveyances since [c.1676] (M6931/1); Hardiman, 146; Will of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, merchant, 27 July 1642 (N.A.I., T17175).
Appendix Table ii

Marriage articles between Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess and Ann Joyce, 13 August 1652.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Quarters of Yeoghall, hard by Clare, valued at £250 and odd pounds.</td>
<td>£250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Richard Blake’s house in Sander’s Lane.</td>
<td>£200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop under Sir Valentine Blake’s principal residence in Great Gate St.</td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mortgage.</td>
<td>£200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Marriage articles between Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess and Ann Joyce of Galway, widow, 13 Aug. 1652 (M6931/2).*
### Appendix Table iii

**Copy [c.1676] transplantation certificate of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denominations of lands</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Parish &amp; Barony</th>
<th>Sitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Killinmore [Culleen], 3 quarters &amp; ⅛ of a quarter</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>Belclare Tuam Parish</td>
<td>Inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killinbegg [Culleen], ⅔ of a quarter</td>
<td>051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Ballagh one quarter</td>
<td>021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above mentioned lands were by order of the commissioners at Loughrea bearing date the 23rd of July 1657, set forth to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, pursuant to a decree of the commissioners at Athlone of the 23rd of May 1656 under the articles of Galway.

**Copy [c.1676] transplantation certificate of Walter Cheevers, Mountown, Co. Dublin:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denominations of lands</th>
<th>Acre</th>
<th>Parish &amp; Barony</th>
<th>Sitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bunona [Bunoghanaun] ½ quarter</td>
<td>081</td>
<td>Annaghdown parish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garriduffe &amp; Bunona [Bunoghanaun] ½ quarter</td>
<td>031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above mentioned lands were by order of the commissioners at Loughrea bearing date the 31st August 1657 set forth to Walter Cheevers of Mountown in the County of Dublin. Pursuant to a decree of the commissioners at Athlone of the 19th May 1656 under the eight qualification.

*Source: M6935/64/b*
Appendix Table iv

Land in the Barony of Clare, County Galway sold by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew to Richard, earl of Arran on 2 and 3 April 1666, and sold back by Richard, earl of Arran to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew on 4 and 5 April 1666.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land involved, together with all woods, underwoods, bogs, loughs, barren mountains, buildings and fishing thereunto belonging</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Killinmore [Culleen], three and one third quarters</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killinbegg [Culleen], two thirds of a quarter</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballagh, one quarter</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garraun, two thirds of a quarter</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrowreagh, half a quarter</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackagh, half a quarter, being one part of the four quarters of Cloonmore</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>625</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: M6931/7/a & b; M6931/8/a-c.*
Appendix Table v


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Quit-rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardnasodan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>£2 16s. 3d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballagh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4s. 2 3½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballagh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£1 4s. 3½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3s. ½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16s. 4¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrowreagh</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6s. 1d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrowreagh</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2s. ¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garraun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>£1 6s. 3¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garraun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2s. ¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6s. 3¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killinbegg [Culleen]</td>
<td>⅔</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killinmore [Culleen]</td>
<td>3 ⅓</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>£3 11s. 5d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackagh</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8s. 1¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td><strong>£11 16s 10 1/4d</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,895 acres 1 rood 2 perches Statute acres

_Savings clauses contained in the above patent._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in whose favour</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir James Cuffe</td>
<td>in regards to his right to the 40 acres in Lackagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominick Browne, as a nominee</td>
<td>such right as he might have to any part of the premises included in his patent, as part of his 2,000 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Lynch</td>
<td>his right to 120 acres in Ballagh, ten acres in Garraun and ten acres in ‘Lecarrowreagh’ [Carroweogh]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Sources: I.R.C.R., 239; M6935/65/10._
Appendix Table vi

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew's estate by the *Books of Survey and Distribution*, the land being noted as awarded to him by Certificate and Patent of the *Act of Settlement*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardnasodan</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballagh</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrowreagh</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garraun</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killinbegg [Culleen]</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killinmore [Culleen]</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackagh</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1170</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix Table vii
Deeds, abstracts of deeds and bonds relating to the establishment of the Ballyglunin estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 July 1656</td>
<td>Robert Forstall, late of Ballifrank, Co. Kilkenny, esq and William Fanning of Athbally Edmond, Co. Galway, to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Galway, burgess.</td>
<td>Bond in £500 to secure performance of the covenants of an agreement of even date for the sale of 200 acres in Connacht by Forstall to Blake.</td>
<td>M6931/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nov. 1658</td>
<td>Walter Cheevers late of Mountowne, Co. Dublin and now of Iskercleran, Co. Galway to Patrick Netterville of Legane, Co. Galway.</td>
<td>Bargain and sale of the two half quarters of Bunonan (81 acres) and Garyduff (31 acres) in the parish of Annaghdown, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway. Consideration £20. Clauses of warranty and further assurances. All letters patent which Cheevers may obtain for the lands are to be held to the use of Netterville and if the latter's title is successfully attacked of he is ejected in any way, Cheevers is to repay the purchase price or give land of equal value.</td>
<td>M6931/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nov. 1658</td>
<td>Walter Cheevers, Mountown, Co. Dublin now of Iskercleran, Co. Galway to Patrick Netterville of Legane, Lecarrow, Co. Galway.</td>
<td>Bond for £40 to secure above deed.</td>
<td>M6931/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 1664</td>
<td>Robert Forstall of Kilferagh, Co. Kilkenny, William Fanning of Farrenrory, Co. Tipperary and William Forstall of Kilkenny, gent, to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew late of Galway, burgess.</td>
<td>Bond in £600 to secure covenants of a conveyance of even date of lands in the Barony of Clare, Co. Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3 Apr. 1666</td>
<td>Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Culleen, Co. Galway, gent to Richard, earl of Arran.</td>
<td>Lease for five shillings and release for one shilling of Killinmore (1½ quarters containing 353 acres), Killenbegg (½ of a quarter, 51 acres), Ballagh (1 quarter, 21 acres), Garrane (2 parts of a quarter, 130 acres) Carrowreagh (half a quarter, 30 acre) and the ½ quarter of Lackagh, being one part of the 4 quarters of land in Clunmore (40 acres), in all 625 acres, all in the Barony of Clare, Co. Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/7/a &amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &amp; 5 Apr. 1666</td>
<td>Richard, earl of Arran to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew.</td>
<td>Lease for five shillings and release of above lands, to the use of grantee in tail male, remainders to Walter Blake, Andrew Blake, and Francis Blake, successively, in tail male, and finally to grantor and his heirs forever, at rent of £3 per annum, provided that no rent shall be payable during any time when the lands are devastated by war.</td>
<td>M6931/8/a,b,c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sept. 1669</td>
<td>Mathew Martin of Galway, burgess, to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bargain and sale of 67 acres of the quarter of Brittas and twenty and a half acres of the quarter of Boleymellagh, in the Barony of Kilmaine, Co. Mayo, consideration of £90.</td>
<td>M6931/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sept. 1669</td>
<td>Mathew Martin of Galway, burgess to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £200, to secure the covenants of a conveyance of even date 67 acres of profitable land of the quarter of Brittas and twenty and a half acres in the quarter of Boleymellagh, Barony of Kilmaine, Co. Mayo.</td>
<td>M6931/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nov. 1670</td>
<td>Peter Power of Loughreagh, Co. Galway, gent to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bargain and sale of 278 acres of the two quarters of Ardnasodan, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway, consideration £139.</td>
<td>M6931/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Apr. 1671</td>
<td>Charles Holcraft of Cloonygashell, Co. Mayo, esq to Donnogh O’Bryne of Callagh, Co. Galway, gent.</td>
<td>Lease of 95 acres of the half quarter of Kilmoylan [Ballyglooneen], parish of Kilmoylan, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway, for 11 years, at £18 per annum.</td>
<td>M6931/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Apr. 1671</td>
<td>Charles Holcraft of Cloonygashell, Co. Mayo, esq to Donnogh O’Bryne of Callagh, Co. Galway, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £50 to secure covenants of the lease</td>
<td>M6931/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1671</td>
<td>Charles Holcraft of Cloonnagashel, Co. Mayo, esq, to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bargain and sale of 95 acres of the half quarter of Kilmoylan, in the parish of Kilmoylan, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway for £120. The 95 acres were leased by Charles Holcraft to Donnogh O’Bryne of Callagh, Co. Galway for eleven years on 15 Apr. 1671, reversion to Martin Blake.</td>
<td>M6931/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Agreement Details</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Aug. 1671</td>
<td>Edmond McUlick Carragh Burke, Clunmore, Co. Galway to Martin Blake of Cummer.</td>
<td>Bond for £40 to secure sale of 40 acres of Garryduff Bunona.</td>
<td>M6935/65/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mar. 1673</td>
<td>Patrick Netterville, Lecarrow, Co. Galway, esq and Nicholas Netterville, Lecarrow, Co. Galway, gent to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £200 to secure the covenants of a lease and release of even date of 81 acres of the half quarter of Bunona and 35 acres in Garryduff Bunona [four acres evicted by court of claims].</td>
<td>M6931/15; M6935/65/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 1677</td>
<td>Peter Power of Loughreagh, Co. Galway (on behalf of Richard, earl of Arran) to Martin Blake of Cummer.</td>
<td>Bond in £1000 on behalf of Richard, earl of Arran, to secure conformity to decision of John Bodken, esq, arbitrator in a difference between Blake and the earl regarding the lands of Ardnasodan, Co. Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 &amp; 25 Sept. 1677</td>
<td>Marcus Lynch Fitz Peter of Galway, merch., to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Lease and release of a house on the South side of Middle St, Galway, formerly the property of Maurice Lynch, esq, which was allotted to Edward, late earl of Meath and granted to him by patent under the Acts of Settlement and Explanation as part of the '49 Officers arrears, consideration £110.</td>
<td>M6931/23/ a&amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May 1678</td>
<td>Elizabeth Taaffe, alias Stephens, widow of Col. Lucas Taaffe, and John McInerhiny of Dublin, gent attorney on her behalf, to Martin Blake, Cummer.</td>
<td>Conveyance of 123 acres of profitable land in the quarter of land of Cloondahamper, Barony of Ballymoe, Co. Galway for £60.</td>
<td>M6931/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May 1678</td>
<td>Robert Downing and John McInerhiny, both of the city of Dublin, on behalf of themselves and Madam Elizabeth Taaffe to Martin Blake of Cummer.</td>
<td>Bond in £120, to secure covenants of a deed of even date between Elizabeth Taaffe and John McInerhiny to Martin Blake, conveying 123 acres in Cloondahamper.</td>
<td>M6931/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &amp; 6 Sept. 1678</td>
<td>Robert Kirwan of Castle Hackett, Co. Galway to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Lease and release of 107 acres in the two quarters of land of Cullurty and Drisagan [Brierfield], Barony of Tiaquin, Co. Galway, for £60.</td>
<td>M6931/27/ a&amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sept. 1678</td>
<td>John Browne of Kinturke, Co. Mayo, esq to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Conveyance of reversion of sixty-seven acres of the quarter of Brittas, Barony of Kilmaine, Co. Mayo, after the termination of a life interest which Mathew Martin of Galway, gent has in it.</td>
<td>M6931/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sept. 1678</td>
<td>John Browne of Kinturke, Co. Mayo, esq to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £200 to secure covenants of the above conveyance.</td>
<td>M6931/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 &amp; 14 May 1679</td>
<td>Robert Blake of Ardfry, Co. Galway and Richard, his son and heir apparent, to Martin Blake of Cummer, esq.</td>
<td>Lease and release of 185 acres in the two quarters of Coularty and Drisogan [Brierfield], Barony of Tiaquin, Co. Galway for £130.</td>
<td>M6931/31/a&amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 May 1679</td>
<td>Robert Blake of Ardfry, Co. Galway and Richard, his son and heir apparent, to Martin Blake of Cummer, esq.</td>
<td>Bond in £400 to secure above conveyance.</td>
<td>M6931/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &amp; 8 Oct. 1681</td>
<td>Peter Martin of Galway, esq to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Lease and release of the moiety of the castle and double mill formerly the property of William Oge Martin, and the moiety of another double mill formerly the property of Alexander Lynch, in Bridge St, on the bridge south side of the town of Galway. [Lease only extant]</td>
<td>M6931/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Oct. 1681</td>
<td>Peter Martin of Galway, esq to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £400 to secure the above conveyance.</td>
<td>M6931/37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix Table viii
Leases and mortgages affecting the Ballyglunin estate in the seventeenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Sept. 1676</td>
<td>John Bodkin of Johnstowne, Co. Galway, esq to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £60, to secure the covenants of a lease of Lecarrowreagh [Carrowreagh] by Blake to Bodkin.</td>
<td>M6931/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 &amp; 16 June 1681</td>
<td>John Bodkin of Johnstown, Co. Galway, esq and Mary his wife, to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Mortgage of 100 acres of Carroereagh alias Johnstown, and forty-seven acres of Carrowebeg, Turlaghbeg, Ballaghbane, Carrowebane, Leffallykeele, Pollaturk [or Newgarden], Glannenore, Gahergarriffe and Carrowreagh, all in Barony of Clare, Co. Galway, consideration £350.</td>
<td>M6931/34/a&amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Feb. 1683</td>
<td>William Burke of Carrowntryla, Co. Galway, to Martin Blake of Cummer.</td>
<td>Bond in £300 to secure a mortgage of even date</td>
<td>M6931/38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 &amp; 12 June 1684</td>
<td>William Burke of Carrowntryla, Co. Galway, to Martin Blake of Cummer.</td>
<td>Mortgage of 107 acres of Carnroe and 123 acres of Levally, Barony of Ballymoe for £80.</td>
<td>Claim of Martin Blake Fitz Peter, 1701 (Annesley MS 19, Entry of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 June 1684</td>
<td>Patrick Burke of Carrowntryla, Co. Galway, gent to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Lease for twenty years of 43 acres in Cloondahamper, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway, at 5 shillings <em>per annum</em>.</td>
<td>M6931/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 June 1684</td>
<td>William Burke of Carrowntryla, Co. Galway, gent to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £100 to secure the lease by William Burke’s brother Patrick.</td>
<td>M6931/40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Table ix  
**Ballyglunin estate c.1685**  
Land in Barony of Clare, County Galway unless otherwise noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardnasodan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballagh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballagh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballyglooneen</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boleymellagh, Barony of Kilmaine, Co. Mayo</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 ½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittas, Barony of Kilmaine, Co. Mayo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrowreagh</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrowreagh</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloondahamper, Barony of Ballymoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coularty and Drisogan [Brierfield], Barony of Tiaquin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coularty and Drisogan [Brierfield], Barony of Tiaquin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garraun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garraun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killinbegg [Culleen]</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killinmore [Culleen]</td>
<td>3 ½</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackagh</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meelickbeg, Barony of Ballymoe</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollaturk [or Newgarden]</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmon [Bunoghanaun]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>2083 ½</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban Property:  
House in Middle St, Galway and half of three mills in Bridge St, Galway town.
## Appendix Table x

Price of land purchased, with average price per acre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Price per acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 July 1656</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>£250, bond for £500</td>
<td>£1 5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nov. 1658</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>3s 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Sept. 1669</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>£90</td>
<td>£1 6s. 10¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Nov. 1670</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>£139</td>
<td>10s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 May 1671</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£1 5d. 3d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Aug. 1671</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>6s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 1673</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>8s. 3¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 May 1678</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td>9s. 9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1678</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>£60</td>
<td>11s. 2½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1678</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>£110</td>
<td>9s.7 ¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Apr. 1679</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>£4</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1679</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>£130</td>
<td>14s. ½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Aug. 1680</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1681</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>£350</td>
<td>£2 7s. 7¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Apr. 1789</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>£113</td>
<td>£5 3s. 9d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: see Appendix Table vii
## Appendix Table xi

### Leases and mortgages affecting the Ballyglunin estate, 1685-1737

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Nov. 1686</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Cummer, gent to Robuck French of Cloghballymore, Co. Galway, gent.</td>
<td>Mortgage for £600 of Ballyglooneen, Ardnasodan and Tarmon, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nov 1687</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Cummer, gent to Thomas Andrews, late of Galway, alderman.</td>
<td>Lease for 6 years of the half quarter of Kilmoylan [Ballyglooneen], parish of Kilmoylan, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway, at £18 9s. per annum, lessor to have free grinding and tuck at the mill on the premises</td>
<td>M6931/44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Apr. 1711</td>
<td>Francis Cuffe of Ballinrobe, Co. Mayo, esq to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Lease of 125 acres in the quarter of Rusheens, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway for 31 years. Rent £18 15s per annum, together with 1s. per pound receiver's salary half yearly.</td>
<td>M6931/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Apr. 1711</td>
<td>Francis Cuffe of Ballinrobe, Co. Mayo, esq to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Memorial of above deed to the register appointed for registering all conveyances and wills pursuant to an Act of Parliament</td>
<td>M6931/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 June 1712</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Rusheens, Co. Galway, gent to Denis Kelly of Lisduffe, Co. Galway, gent.</td>
<td>Lease of 123 acres in Cloondahamper, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway for twenty-one years. Entry fine £20, yearly rent £16. Previously held by Richard Prendergast. Exceptions in lease: 1) 20½ acres leased to John Carlington where his house stands at £2 per annum and another 20 acres he holds at £4 per annum, 9 years remaining on the leases; 2) John Mullowny and Darby Shaughnessy now living on remaining 80 acres, to have 22 acres at 3s. 6d. for the remainder of the year; 3) Martin Blake Fitz Peter to retain all corn and potatoes then growing on the land, with the right to enter the land to collect at the next harvest and winter as repayment of rent arrears then owing.</td>
<td>M691/56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec. 1712</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Rusheens, Co. Galway, gent to Nicholas Blake of Caherhugh, Co. Galway, gent.</td>
<td>Lease of 292 acres in the two quarters of Cullurty &amp; Drishigan [Brierfield], Barony of Tiaquin, Co. Galway for 21 years at £44 per annum. Exceptions in lease: Nicholas to sow only 15 acres, or to pay 1s. extra per acre. Martin to retain the current harvest growing on the land and in consideration Nicholas to retain the harvest following the expiry of his lease.</td>
<td>M6931/57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mar. 1715</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Rusheens, Co. Galway, gent and Augustin Blake of Killmcnally, Co. Galway, gent, with Bartholomew Fallon of Galway, goldsmith and Hugh Fallon of Galway, carpenter.</td>
<td>Agreement to lease the mills and castle on both ends of the West Bridge of Galway for £16 per annum. Exception in lease: if the mortgage Augustine Blake held of half the mills and castle is redeemed, his part of the lease is void.</td>
<td>M6931/58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nov. 1715</td>
<td>Edward Hosty of Bolinane, Co. Galway, gent to Martin Blake of Rusheens, Co. Galway, gent.</td>
<td>Lease of 20 acres in Killinmore [Culleen], Barony of Clare, Co. Galway for 21 years. Rent for first year and a half: £3 per annum; rent for rest of lease: £4 per annum.</td>
<td>M6931/59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 May 1718</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Rusheens to Edmond Lynch of Toberoe, Co. Galway</td>
<td>Abstract lease of Bunoghanaun for 21 years at the yearly rent of £30 per annum.</td>
<td>M6935/65/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Mar. 1722</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Cummer, gent to Ignatius Kirwan of the town of Galway, merch.</td>
<td>Lease for eleven years of a front house and cellar, a back house and cellar and a kitchen in Middle St, Galway at £12 per annum. Then in occupation of Ignatius Kirwan and Peter French.</td>
<td>M6931/61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Aug. 1722</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Cummer, gent to Ignatius Kirwan of the town of Galway, merch.</td>
<td>Lease for seventeen years of a front house and cellar, a back house and cellar and a kitchen in Middle St, Galway at £12 per annum. Then in occupation of Ignatius Kirwan and Peter French.</td>
<td>M6931/63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Apr. 1733</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Rusheens, Co. Galway, gent to Darby Kelly of Cloondahamper, Co. Galway, gent.</td>
<td>Lease of 123 acres in Cloondahamper for 21 years at £26 per annum</td>
<td>M6931/66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nov. 1737</td>
<td>Edward Hosty of Clunnisgline, Co. Roscommon</td>
<td>Lease of 20 acres in Killinmore [Culleen] which Hosty holds in right of his</td>
<td>M6931/67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin of Ballyglunin,</td>
<td>wife, for 21 years at £5 per annum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co. Galway, gent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix Table xii

**Bonds and various deeds affecting the Ballyglunin estate, 1685-1737**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 Aug. 1686</td>
<td>John Brown of Galway, merch. before Robert Shaw, notary public in Galway</td>
<td>Protest by John Browne about a bill of exchange on Francis Blake, son [in-law] of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, of Cummer, near Galway, accepted by Martin Blake Fitz Andrew</td>
<td>M6931/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Apr. 1687</td>
<td>William Bourke of Carrowntryla, Co. Galway, esq to Martin Blake Fitz Andrew of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Deed of rent charge in consideration of £190, granting an annuity or rent charge of £74 1s.3d. for 3 years. £55 out of the 8 quarters of Barnaderg, in the Baronies of Dunmore, Clare and Tiaquin, Co. Galway, and £19 1s. 3d. out of the quarter of Carrowre, in the half Barony of Ballymoe, Co. Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Aug 1688</td>
<td>Joseph Lynch of Ballycurrin, Co. Mayo, esq to Martin Blake of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £1000, to secure observance of the award of Andrew French of Drumgriffin and James Brown of Ardskea, arbitrators in a dispute between Lynch and Blake regarding the claim of Margaret Lynch, née Blake, wife of Joseph, daughter of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew, as heiress to Anne Blake alias Joyce deceased, late wife to said Martin, under the settlement on the marriage of the said Martin and Anne.</td>
<td>M6931/45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Nov. 1691</td>
<td>Marriage settlement on marriage of Martin Blake Fitz Peter, of Cummer, gent and Margaret, daughter of Edmond French of Abbyboyle, Co. Roscommon, merch.</td>
<td>Marriage portion £700. In settlement Martin Blake Fitz Peter settles his estate in tail male, including land in the townlands of Ardnasodan, Ballagh, Ballyglooneen, Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Cloondahamper, Cummer, Garraun, Killinmore [Culleen], Killinbegg [Culleen], Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Lecarrowreaagh [Carrowreaagh], Rusheens, Tarmon [Bunoghanaun], as well as his property in the town of Galway including the stone house in Middle St and his interest in half of the two mills on the South Bridge of Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Nov. 1691</td>
<td>Edmond French of Abbyboyle, Co. Roscommon, merch., to Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £1000 to secure covenants of marriage settlement of even date.</td>
<td>M6931/47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sept. 1706</td>
<td>Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Rusheens, Co. Galway gent and Richard Lynch Fitz Richard of Galway, to Nicholas Lynch Fitz Ambrose of Galway, merch.</td>
<td>Bond in £200 and warrant to confess judgment, to secure a loan of £100 to Martin Blake Fitz Peter and Richard Lynch Fitz Richard</td>
<td>M6931/50 a&amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct. 1709</td>
<td>Maurice Lynch of Ballycurrin, Co. Mayo, gent to Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Rusheens, Co. Galway</td>
<td>Bond in £400 to indemnify Martin Blake Fitz Peter against any claims which may be made on him by Ignatius and Jean Lynch, Maurice’s brother and sister, once he has repaid to Maurice the sum of £500 due to the latter on five bonds of £100 each, bonds in which Ignatius and Jean claim an interest which Maurice does not admit.</td>
<td>M6931/51/ a&amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Oct. 1710</td>
<td>Sir Walter Blake of Menlough, Co. Galway, bart to Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Bond in £2,000 to secure payment of a yearly rent of £100, being the rent of a third of a plantation on the island of Montserrat held by Patrick Blake Fitz Peter in right of his wife, which was leased by deed of even date by Martin Blake Fitz Peter to Sir Walter Blake</td>
<td>M6931/53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Oct. 1710</td>
<td>Sir Walter Blake of Menlough, Co. Galway, bart to Martin Blake Fitz Peter of Cummer, gent.</td>
<td>Declaration by Sir Walter Blake indemnifying Martin Blake Fitz Peter against any claims which may result if the latter’s brother, Patrick Blake of the Island of Montserrat, shall refuse to ratify a lease of even date of a third part of a plantation in the said island, now in his possession, which Martin has made to Sir Walter on his behalf.</td>
<td>M6931/52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Mar. 1724</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Cummer, gent, on behalf of himself and his eldest son Edmond, 1st part; John French of Rahassan, Co. Galway, esq, on behalf of himself and Mary his eldest daughter 2nd part; and John Burke of Lismore and Robert French of Derry, both in Co. Galway, 3rd part.</td>
<td>Settlement on marriage of Edmond Blake and Mary French. 1) agree to marry before 1 May following; 2) marriage portion £1,300, secured with sufficient security by John French and his eldest son Robert; 3) Martin Blake and his son Edmond, on Edmond reaching 21 years of age, agree to suffer a common recovery of the Ballyglunin estate and to pass a statute staple for £5,000 before the mayor and constables of the staple of the town of Galway to secure the articles of the marriage settlement; 4) estate settled tail male on Martin Blake by articles prior to his own marriage listed in detail; 5) Martin Blake Fitz Peter agrees to provide yearly maintenance for Edmond and his intended bride of £130, including the rent from leases on Ballyglooneen and Ardnasodan at £64 per annum, 3 years remaining on the lease; Cullurty and Drishigan [Brierfield] at £44 per annum, 10 years remaining on the lease; and Cloondahamper at £16 per annum, 9 years remaining on the lease; 6) if only one younger child from the union, to get £1,000; if more than one younger children, to get £1,300 divided amongst them at 21; 7) after paying maintenance of £130 per annum and paying portions, remainder of statute staple of £5,000 to revert to the use of Major Martin Blake Fitz Martin; 8) Martin Blake Fitz Peter to retain power to charge estate with £500, after 3 years to reduce by £50 per annum and the right to lease the lands of Rusheens, Culleen and Carrowreagh</td>
<td>M6931/64/a&amp;b; M6935/65/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Price of wool per stone</td>
<td>Stone weight of wool sold in main transaction</td>
<td>Value of main wool transaction £</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1731</td>
<td>10s.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td>10s. 6d.</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td>9s. 3d.</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>7s. 2d.</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>6s.</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td>7s. 11d.</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td>6s. 11d.</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>6s. 8d.</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>6s. 6d.</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td>7s.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>6s. 4d.</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td>7s. 7d.</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>10s. 3d.</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>10s. 6d.</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>9s. 9d.</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td>8s. 6d.</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>8s.</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>9s. 8d.</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td>10s.</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750 to Cork</td>
<td>11s. 10d.</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750 to Dublin</td>
<td>12s.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751 to Cork</td>
<td>10s. 10d.</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751 to Dublin</td>
<td>11s. 1d.</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752 to Cork</td>
<td>10s. 2d.</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752 to Dublin</td>
<td>10s. 6d.</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753 to Cork</td>
<td>Wool was sold in Cork in batches at different prices, was not all sold by end of year and money was still owed.</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>178 [partial total]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1753 to Dublin</td>
<td>12s. 6d.</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: M6933/26/7-8, 38-43.*

*Note: Some totals have slight discrepancies as a result of: extra wool of other sellers added to fill a bag; note for payment was either accepted at a slightly different figure than amount due or to be paid at a future date; or that the agent in Dublin or Cork deducted their costs.*
## Appendix Table xiv

**Leases affecting the Ballyglunin estate, 1737-77**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Nov. 1737</td>
<td>Edward Hosty of Clunnisgline, Co. Roscommon to Edmond Blake Fitz Martin of Ballyglunin, gent.</td>
<td>Lease of 20 acres in Killinmore [Culleen] which Hosty holds in right of his wife, for 21 years at £5 per annum.</td>
<td>M6931/67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 May 1739</td>
<td>George Thomas of the town of Galway to Francis Blake of Furbogh, Co. Galway, gent and Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, Co. Galway, gent.</td>
<td>Declaration by George Thomas discharging Francis Blake and Edmond Blake Fitz Martin, who have performed the covenant in their lease of the three mills called the Bridge Mills in the town of Galway made by them to Thomas, whereby they were bound to put the said mills into stiff, staunch and tenantable repair, and likewise discharging Martin Fallan, of Galway, goldsmith, the former tenant, who was also bound to repair the same.</td>
<td>M6931/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Mar. 1741</td>
<td>John Bodkin of the town of Galway, esq to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, gent.</td>
<td>Lease of 125 acres of Rusheens, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway, for 31 years at £24 per annum.</td>
<td>M6931/71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Aug. 1744</td>
<td>Edward Eyre to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, gent.</td>
<td>Lease for 31 years of 14 acres of Bunona and Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun] in as full and ample a manner as Dominick Lynch of Tuam, merchant, lately held the same at the rate of forty shillings a year.</td>
<td>M6935/65/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 July 1753</td>
<td>Richard Lynch of Belaughorty, Co. Galway, gent to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin.</td>
<td>Agreement to let 20 acres in Ballagh, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway for 21 years at £4 per annum.</td>
<td>M6931/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May 1757</td>
<td>Peter Kelly of Tuam, gent to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, esq.</td>
<td>Lease of 20 acres in Ballagh commonly called Ballydolly, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway for 7 years at £5 per annum. As borders between Ballagh and Garraun are uncertain, both parties agree to appoint a surveyor to set certain meanings at joint expense.</td>
<td>M6931/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Thomas Bodkin of Carabegs to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin</td>
<td>Lease for 31 years of 20 acres of Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun] at the yearly rent of £6.</td>
<td>M6935/65/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jan. 1766</td>
<td>Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, esq to Martin Blake, his eldest son.</td>
<td>Lease for 31 years at £510 per annum of a house in Middle St, Galway town, and the 1,595 acres in the townlands of Ardnasodan, Ballagh, Ballyglooneen together with the Corn Mill and Tuck Mill erected on the land, Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Carrowreagh, Cloondahamper, Cullurty and Drisogan [Brierfield], Garraun, Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Killinmore [Culleen], Rusheens, Tarmon [Bunoghanaun], in the Baronies of Clare and Tiaquin, Co. Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/86/a&amp;b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mar. 1766</td>
<td>Robert French of Rahasane, Co. Galway, esq to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, esq.</td>
<td>Lease for 31 years of 367 acres of Carrowmary, Carnamore, Carrowboy, Carinard and Carrownegowre, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway at the yearly rent of £120, as well as £3 14s. 1½d. as composition for quit rent to the assigns of Lord Darmouth.</td>
<td>M6931/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May 1767</td>
<td>Robert French of Rahasane, Co. Galway, esq to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, esq.</td>
<td>Lease for 31 years of 367 acres of Carrowmary, Carnamore, Carrowboy, Carinard and Carrownegowre, Barony of Clare, Co. Galway at the yearly rent of £141, as well as £3 14s. 1½d. as composition for quit rent to the assigns of Lord Darmouth.</td>
<td>M6931/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June 1771</td>
<td>Edward Eyre to Martin Blake of Ballyglunin.</td>
<td>Lease for 31 years from the 1 May last of 14 acres Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun] which Eyre has in common with the Ballyglunin’s estate in as full and ample a manner as Edmund Blake lately held the same at the yearly rent of 40 shillings.</td>
<td>M6935/65/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Table xv

### Bonds and various deeds affecting the Ballyglunin estate 1737-77

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 May 1751</td>
<td>Walter Joyce of the town of Galway, merch., to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, esq.</td>
<td>Memorial (dated 2 Apr. 1752), lists separate judgments for £800 each against Robert French of Derry, Co. Galway, esq, Mark French of Rahasane, Co. Galway, esq and Anthony French of the same gent. Judgments found in Michaelmas term 1741 in favour of Walter Joyce, who on 1 May 1751 in consideration of £443 3s. 9d., being the principal interest and costs due, assigned the judgments to Edmond Blake.</td>
<td>M6931/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sept. 1751</td>
<td>1) John Darcy of Ballykine [Houndswood], Co. Mayo, esq; 2) Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, esq, on behalf of Margaret Blake, his daughter.</td>
<td>Memorial (dated 18 Jan 1752) of settlement on marriage (dated 16 Sept. 1751) of John Darcy of Ballykine, Co. Mayo, esq and Margaret, daughter of Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin. £1,500 marriage portion. John Darcy to pass two bonds for £5,000 each, one a penal bond, the other to secure the articles of the marriage settlement. Trustees appointed on behalf of Margaret Blake: Mr French of Colemanstown, Co. Galway and her brother Martin Blake of Ballyglunin; on behalf of John Darcy: Peter Lynch of Ballycurrin, Co. Mayo and Peter Lynch of Gibraltar.</td>
<td>M6931/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Oct. 1751</td>
<td>1) Edmond Blake, esq and Martin Blake, esq his eldest son, both of Ballyglunin; 2) Walter Joyce of the town of Galway, merchant and Bridget Joyce his daughter.</td>
<td>Settlement on marriage of Martin Blake, eldest son of Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, and Bridget, daughter of Walter Joyce of the town of Galway, merch. Marriage portion £1,600. Edmond Blake to pass bond of £12,000 to secure the payment of £6,000, consisting of a yearly allowance for Martin Blake during the life of Edmond Blake of £210. If Bridget survived Martin, she was to get an annuity of £112. Children of the marriage to get portion out of interest on the £6,000 and the principal of £1,600 at rate decided by Martin Blake. On day of marriage Martin to get £250 from his father. Trustees appointed to administer settlement and bonds involved: Dominick Blake of Dublin city, esq and John Darcy of Ballykine [Houndswood], Co. Mayo on behalf of Walter and Bridget Joyce; &amp; Arthur French of Headford, Co. Galway and John French Alyward of Ballynegar, Co. Galway on behalf of Edmond and Martin Blake.</td>
<td>M6931/74/ a&amp;b; M6933/16/ 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Feb. 1752</td>
<td>Patrick and Sibby Blake, son and daughter of Nicholas Blake of the town of Galway, deceased, to the latter’s executors, Edmond Blake and Thomas Lynch, esqrs.</td>
<td>Receipt for £67 15s. 11d., being £35 of capital plus £32 15s.11d. interest due on a bond from Andrew and Dominick Blake of Beaghmore, Co. Galway, to secure a debt of £435 due to Nicholas Blake, secured by a penal bond of £870. Nicholas Blake bequeathed £400 to his daughter Sibby and £35 to his son Patrick.</td>
<td>M6931/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Apr. 1752</td>
<td>Sibby Blake to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin and Thomas Lynch.</td>
<td>Agreement by Sibby Blake to lend £400 bequeathed to her by her late father, Nicholas Blake of Galway town, to Walter Blake of Carnmore and Patrick Kirwan and Maurice Blake of Galway, as arranged by Edmond Blake, and Thomas Lynch, her father’s surviving executors.</td>
<td>M6931/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Legal Action</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jan. 1753</td>
<td>1) James Fleming of Tuam, Co. Galway, merchant; 2) Alexander Bodkin and his wife Mary (née Blake) on the behalf of their daughter Catherine.</td>
<td>Settlement on marriage of James Fleming and Catherine Bodkin. Catherine is entitled to £300, now in the hands of James Brown of The Neale, Co. Mayo, by virtue of the marriage articles of Alexander and Mary Bodkin, and another £150 on the death of Mary Bodkin, also in the hands of John Brown of The Neale, Co. Mayo. James Fleming to enact two bonds for double the sums received to secure the enactment of the marriage articles. Trustees: Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin on part of Catherine Bodkin &amp; Thomas Coleman of Tuam, Co. Galway on part of James Fleming.</td>
<td>M6931/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nov. 1754</td>
<td>Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, gent to Marlborough Sterling of Dublin, gent.</td>
<td>Fine of Cullurty [Brierfield] and Cloondahamper, Co. Galway</td>
<td>M6931/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May 1756</td>
<td>Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, gent to Marlborough Sterling of Dublin, gent.</td>
<td>Fine of Ardnasodan, Killmoylane [Ballyglooneen], and Killinmore [Culleen], Co. Galway</td>
<td>M6931/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June 1762</td>
<td>Margaret Blake of Tuam, spinster to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin, esq.</td>
<td>Judgment on bond of £124 14s. 4d. dated 3 Aug. 1759 found in Hillary Term 1760 against Thomas Blake of Furbough, Co. Galway and payable to Edmond Blake in trust for Margaret Blake. Receipt dated 2 June 1762 by Margaret Blake for £124 14s. 4d. plus interest, due to her from Francis and Thomas Blake of Furbough, Co. Galway to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin and assignment by her of said bond to said Edmond on payment by Edmond of full principal and interest due.</td>
<td>M6931/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 1766</td>
<td>Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin to his eldest son, Martin Blake of Ballyglunin.</td>
<td>Power of attorney to settle boundary between his estate of Ardnasodan and that of Col. Robert Persse of Roxborough, where they have 45 acres in common and not divided.</td>
<td>M6931/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July 1766</td>
<td>Edward Eyre to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin.</td>
<td>Abstract receipt for £1 14s. 3d. being the balance of rent due to Eyre out of his 14 acres of land in Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghananun] with £41 59s. heretofore received in full of all rent to 1 Nov. 1765.</td>
<td>M6935/65/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May 1768</td>
<td>Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin to James O'Hara of Dublin, gent.</td>
<td>Fine of Ardnasodan, Ballagh, Ballyglooneen alias Kilmoylan, Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Carrowreagh, Cloondahamper, Cullurty and Drishigan [Brierfield], Garraun, Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Killinbegg [Culleen], Killinmore [Culleen], Rusheens, and Tarmon [Bunoghanaun], Barony of Clare, Co. Galway</td>
<td>M6931/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 May 1768</td>
<td>Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin to James O'Hara of Dublin, gent.</td>
<td>Fine of a messuage or front stone house and three back houses adjoining with the cellars and back yard in Middle St, Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Nov. 1768</td>
<td>Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin to James O'Hara of Dublin, gent.</td>
<td>Recovery suffered by Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin of land in the townlands of Ardnasodan, Ballagh, Ballyglooneen alias Kilmoylan, Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Carrowreagh, Cloondahamper, Cullurty and Drishigan [Brierfield], Garraun, Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Killinbegg [Culleen], Killinmore [Culleen], Rusheens, and Tarmon [Bunoghanaun], Barony of Clare, Co. Galway</td>
<td>M6931/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Nov. 1768</td>
<td>Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin to James O'Hara of Dublin, gent.</td>
<td>Recovery suffered by Edmond Blake of one messuage or front stone house and three back houses adjoining with the cellars and back yard in Middle St, Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 June 1771</td>
<td>Edward Eyre to Edmond Blake of Ballyglunin.</td>
<td>Abstract receipt for £7 2s. for a fine of a lease for 31 years from 2 May last of 14 acres of land in Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun] at the yearly rent of 40 shillings.</td>
<td>M6935/65/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Term 1772</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, esq to James O'Hara of Dublin, gent.</td>
<td>Fine of a messuage or front stone house and three back houses adjoining with the cellars and back yard in Middle St, Galway.</td>
<td>M6931/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Term 1772</td>
<td>Martin Blake of Ballyglunin, esq to James O'Hara of Dublin, gent.</td>
<td>Fine of Ardnasodan, Ballagh, Ballyglooneen alias Kilmoylan, Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Carrowreagh, Cloondahamper, Cullurty and Drishigan [Brierfield], Garraun, Garryduff Bunona [Bunoghanaun], Killinbegg [Culleen], Killinmore [Culleen], Rusheens, and Tarmon [Bunoghanaun], Barony of Clare, Co. Galway</td>
<td>M9631/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb 1774</td>
<td>Agreement by Martin Blake to raise the wages of his servants Peter Hillery &amp; Hillery's wife Catherine Mannin. Peter Hillery's wages increased from £8, two stone of wool and grazing of four collops; to £10, quarter of an acre of tillage land, grazing of 6 collops, permission to keep one cow to fatten on the park of Cummer and 60 labouring men to work on his land. Catherine Mannin's wages increased in consideration of her agreeing to live full time as a cook and housekeeper in Galway town and on the Ballyglunin estate, from holding a house, garden and the grazing of two collops; to keeping possession of the house and garden, not exceeding two and a half acres of arable land, the grazing of two collops and £4.</td>
<td>M6931/96/ a&amp;b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Dec. 1776 &amp; 1 May 1778</td>
<td>Lease in common with 21 cottagers and agreement to move cabins and stock from the townland of Ballyglooneen to Ardnasdodan.</td>
<td>M6931/97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Table xvi: Surveys of the Ballyglunin Estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 July</td>
<td>Fragment map, ‘The map of the quarter of Russine [Rusheens], surveyed and divided between James Cuffe, esq and Martin Blake according [to] their several proportion and number of acres in said quarter’ by William Kirwan.</td>
<td>M6932/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D. [early eighteenth century]</td>
<td>Two fragments of ‘A map of Martin Blake, his land of Culleen, Ballagh and Rusheens’.</td>
<td>M6932/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D. [early eighteenth century]</td>
<td>Plan of Kilmoylan [Ballyglooneen] and Ardnasodan. Badly damaged.</td>
<td>M6932/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D. [eighteenth century]</td>
<td>Plan of Killererin.</td>
<td>M6932/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>Plan of the quarters of Cullurty and Drishigan [Brierfield] by Ambrose Bodkin. Note on back: ‘Upon my comparing the several bounds of this map with the late map made of Drishigan for Martin Blake, I find the said bounds agree, except …where Martin Blake seems to gain rather than lose ground…as to the rest they perfectly correspond. 1 May 1766, William Downey.</td>
<td>M6932/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1741</td>
<td>Plan of land around Cummer, by Adam Evans.</td>
<td>M6932/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July</td>
<td>Plan of Cloondahamper by Thomas Campbell for Dr John Tully.</td>
<td>M6932/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Plan of Cummer, part of estate of Robert Trench, esq by John Adams.</td>
<td>M6932/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1756</td>
<td>Plan of Bunoghanaun. 'I certify the above figure to be a true map of the controversy...as the same was traced and surveyed in August 1756 in the lifetime of Peter Deane of Balrobuck, esq deceased...which controversy was ordered to be divided in two equal parts...divided October 26, 1758 in the presence of Edmond Blake, of Ballyglunin, esq and Mr John Kirwan of Bunatobber, agent to Ambrose Deane, esq. As witness of my hand James Morris'.</td>
<td>M6932/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Plan of Ardnasodan and Ballyglooneen, by John Hamilton.</td>
<td>M6932/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Apr. 1766</td>
<td>Plan of Ballyglooneen and Ardnasodan, by William Downey.</td>
<td>M6932/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 June 1766</td>
<td>Map of Culleen, Garraun, Ballagh and Rusheens, by William Downey.</td>
<td>M6932/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 June 1766</td>
<td>Plan of Cloondahamper, by William Downey.</td>
<td>M6932/20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Aug. 1766</td>
<td>Plan of Ardnasodan, showing partition between Robert Persse and Martin Blake, by William Downey. Acceptance of apportionment signed by parties, in bottom left corner.</td>
<td>M6932/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 1767</td>
<td>Plan of Rusheens by William Downey.</td>
<td>M6932/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 1767</td>
<td>Map of Rusheens, 42 acres, by William Downey. Note: the turlough is mostly excellent pasture in dry summer.</td>
<td>M6932/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Plan of part of the mountain of Drishigan [Brierfield].</td>
<td>M6932/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Aug. 1768</td>
<td>Plan of portion of Ballyglunin estate, by Martin Doyle.</td>
<td>M6932/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1771</td>
<td>Plan of Ballyglooneen and Ardnasodan, by Patrick Mullen.</td>
<td>M6932/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Jan. 1771</td>
<td>Small sheet showing small portion of a mearing between Martin Blake of Ballyglunin and Nicholas Reddington, by Patrick Mullen.</td>
<td>M6932/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July 1771</td>
<td>Plan of Ballyglooneen, by Daniel Mullen.</td>
<td>M6932/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July 1771</td>
<td>Plan of Ardnasodan, by Daniel Mullen.</td>
<td>M6932/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 July 1772</td>
<td>Plan of Kilmoylan [Ballyglooneen].</td>
<td>M6932/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'I certify that this is a true copy of a map I got from Ambrose Dean of Coolfowerbeg, esq for the use of Martin Blake. Patrick Mullen'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 July 1772</td>
<td>Copy of portion of above plan of Kilmoylan [Ballyglooneen].</td>
<td>M6932/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June 1775</td>
<td>Plan of part of Cloondahamper, by Patrick Mullen.</td>
<td>M6932/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 May 1782</td>
<td>Plan of Garraun and Culleen by Patrick Mullen. On order of Christopher French of Brooklodge, guardian of Martin Stephen Blake, a minor.</td>
<td>M6932/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Plan of Cloondahamper, property of Martin J. Blake, drawn by Richard Burke, from a field note made by William Downey in 1766.</td>
<td>M6932/23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 1. Baronies of County Galway
Map 2. Barony of Clare, County Galway
Map 3. North East Galway and surrounding area, with main locations mentioned in text noted
Map 4: Lands in the Barony of Clare, County Galway to which Martin Blake Fitz Andrew was transplanted in 1657
Map 5: Ballyglunin Estate 1677 patent
Map 7: Seventeenth Century Pictorial Map of Galway Town
Genealogy

Main Descent of Ballyglunin Estate

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew
  c.1620 - 8 Aug.1691

Peter Blake Fitz Martin
  c. 1641 - 21 Sept. 1691

Martin Blake Fitz Peter
  c.1667 - 6 Sept. 1737

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin
  c.1704 - 9 Aug. 1771

Martin Blake Fitz Edmond
  Died 16 Nov. 1777

Edmond Blake Fitz Martin
  5 Dec. 1752 - 28 Mar. 1781

Martin Stephen Blake
  3 Dec. 1780 - 9 Apr. 1788

1 The genealogies are based on the work of Martin J. Blake, primarily Blake, II, 414-6, with additions and clarifications.
Genealogy of Martin Blake Fitz Andrew

Patrick Blake, Bailiff of town of Galway 1562-3

Andrew Blake Fitz Patrick of Galway, alderman, bailiff 1597-8, died c.1624

Walter Blake of Dunmacrina, Co. Mayo, died before 1677
Margaret Martin, noted as being with child in July 1642, died c. 1642.


Patrick, died without issue, vita patris, 1676
Margaret, m 1672 Joseph Lynch, Ballycurrin, Co. Mayo

Martin, of Moreagh, Co. Galway and Moyne, Coolcoon and Ballintubber, Co. Mayo

Maurice Lynch
Ignatius Lynch
Joan Lynch

Martin Blake Fitz Peter, 1st of Rusheens, Co. Galway, afterwards of Cummer and Ballyglunin

Patrick (c.1676-1744) ancestor of Blake of Langham
Nicholas, town of Galway, died c.1747
Margaret, m. 1st in 1686, Christopher French, Clohnballymore, Co. Galway; m. 2nd Patrick Lynch of Galway, M.D.

Margaret, m. 1695 Patrick Blake, Snr. of Corbally

Gylle (Julia) m. Francis Blake of Moyne (afterwards Merlin Park), Co. Mayo. Julia died c.1680. Francis died c.1711

Martin Blake Fitz Andrew

Patrick, died without issue, vita patris, 1676
Margaret, m 1672 Joseph Lynch, Ballycurrin, Co. Mayo

Martin, of Moreagh, Co. Galway and Moyne, Coolcoon and Ballintubber, Co. Mayo

Maurice Lynch
Ignatius Lynch
Joan Lynch

Martin Blake Fitz Peter, 1st of Rusheens, Co. Galway, afterwards of Cummer and Ballyglunin

Patrick (c.1676-1744) ancestor of Blake of Langham
Nicholas, town of Galway, died c.1747
Margaret, m. 1st in 1686, Christopher French, Clohnballymore, Co. Galway; m. 2nd Patrick Lynch of Galway, M.D.

Margaret, m. 1695 Patrick Blake, Snr. of Corbally

Gylle (Julia) m. Francis Blake of Moyne (afterwards Merlin Park), Co. Mayo. Julia died c.1680. Francis died c.1711
Martin Blake Fitz Peter, first of Rusheens, Co. Galway, afterwards of Cummer and Ballyglunin. Married 28 Nov. 1691, Margaret French, died 6 Sept. 1737


Martin (Major), of Antigua and St Kitts, and of Sevenoaks, Kent, m. 24 Dec 1735 Elizabeth, only dau of John Burke, Antigua. Died 8 Oct. 1767

Sibilla married 1723

= Andrew Blake of Fartigare (alias Castlegrove), m. 24 Dec 1735 Mary, dau. of John French of Rahassane, Co. Galway. Died 9 Aug. 1771

Dominick Blake of Castlegrove, admitted Middle Temple 3 Aug. 1739. Died c. 1780

m. 1st c.1750 Frances dau of Nicholas, 5th viscount Nettville

m. 2nd 1770 Elizabeth, 3rd dau. of Sir Joseph Hoare, first Baronet, of Annabelle, Co. Cork

Darcy, died in the West Indies 1747

Christian, died 1770 aged 16

Dominick Edward

Joseph

Samuel

William Martin of Liskeevy, Co. Cork

And married

= Catherine, m. 1753 James Fleming, Tuam

= m.1st c.1750 Frances dau of Nicholas, 5th viscount Nettville

= m. 2nd 1770 Elizabeth, 3rd dau. of Sir Joseph Hoare, first Baronet, of Annabelle, Co. Cork

= Catherine, m. Anthony Atkinson of Ashley Park, Co. Tipperary

= Darcy, died in the West Indies 1747

= Christian, died 1770 aged 16

= William Martin of Liskeevy, Co. Cork

= m.1st c.1750 Frances dau of Nicholas, 5th viscount Nettville

= m. 2nd 1770 Elizabeth, 3rd dau. of Sir Joseph Hoare, first Baronet, of Annabelle, Co. Cork

= Catherine, m. Anthony Atkinson of Ashley Park, Co. Tipperary

= Darcy, died in the West Indies 1747

= Christian, died 1770 aged 16

= William Martin of Liskeevy, Co. Cork

= m.1st c.1750 Frances dau of Nicholas, 5th viscount Nettville

= m. 2nd 1770 Elizabeth, 3rd dau. of Sir Joseph Hoare, first Baronet, of Annabelle, Co. Cork

= Catherine, m. Anthony Atkinson of Ashley Park, Co. Tipperary

= Darcy, died in the West Indies 1747

= Christian, died 1770 aged 16

= William Martin of Liskeevy, Co. Cork

m.1st c.1750 Frances dau of Nicholas, 5th viscount Nettville

m. 2nd 1770 Elizabeth, 3rd dau. of Sir Joseph Hoare, first Baronet, of Annabelle, Co. Cork

Catherine, m. 1753 James Fleming, Tuam

Dary, died in the West Indies 1747

Christian, died 1770 aged 16

William Martin of Liskeevy, Co. Cork
Genealogy of the Blakes of Ballyglunin in the eighteenth century

Martin Blake Fitz Peter, died 6 Sept 1737

Edmond Blake, of Ballyglunin, c. 1704 - 9 Aug 1771 = Mary, dau. of John French, Rahassan

Bridget Joyce = Martin died 1777

John, dsp. April 1777 = Rev. Robert Peter, died c. 1758

Margaret, m. Sept. 1751 = John Darcy of Houndswood, Co. Mayo

Edmond died 1781

Mary, dau of Nugent Sylvester Aylward of Ballinagar, Co. Galway

Martin Stephen Blake 1780-88

Walter died 1802 = Mary Archdekin, sister of Nicholas Joseph Archdekin, R.C. Bishop of Kilmacduagh

Martin Joseph (1790-1861) MP Borough of Galway 1832-57

Henry = Rev. Martin, of the Order of St Francis

Rev. Pierce John

Bridget

Martin Blake Fitz Peter, died 6 Sept 1737

John Darcy of Houndswood, Co. Mayo

Francis, died before 1771

Rev. Robert Peter, died c. 1758

Margaret, m. Sept. 1751

Edmond Blake, of Ballyglunin, c. 1704 - 9 Aug 1771 = Mary, dau. of John French, Rahassan

Bridget Joyce = Martin died 1777

John, dsp. April 1777 = Rev. Robert Peter, died c. 1758

Margaret, m. Sept. 1751 = John Darcy of Houndswood, Co. Mayo

Edmond died 1781

Mary, dau of Nugent Sylvester Aylward of Ballinagar, Co. Galway

Martin Stephen Blake 1780-88

Walter died 1802 = Mary Archdekin, sister of Nicholas Joseph Archdekin, R.C. Bishop of Kilmacduagh

Martin Joseph (1790-1861) MP Borough of Galway 1832-57

Henry = Rev. Martin, of the Order of St Francis

Rev. Pierce John

Bridget
Genealogy of the family of Blake of Cummer and Ballyglunin

Andrew Blake Fitz Patrick of Galway, Alderman, Bailiff 1597-8. Died c.1624

Andrew Oge Blake, ancestor of Blake of Furboagh

Walter Blake of Dunmacrina, died before 251 1677


Bridget

Walter Martin, born 1828, High Sheriff of Galway 1885, died unmarried 25 Sept. 1891. Succeeded by his brother Robert Blake
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