By the constitution, the Scottish Genealogy Society exists "to promote research into Scottish Family History" and "to undertake the collection, exchange and publication of information and material relating to Scottish Genealogy by means of meetings, lectures, etc." By the expressed desire of the Original Members, the Society was to remain an academic and consultative body, and was not to engage itself professionally in record searching. Arrangements will be made by which the Society can supply a list of those members who are professional searchers but any commission of this kind must be carried out independently of the Society.

Monthly meetings of the Society are held from September to April in the St. Andrew Society Rooms, 24 Hill Street (Castle Street end), Edinburgh, at 7 p.m. on 15th of the month. (In the event of the 15th falling on Saturday or Sunday, the meeting is held on the following Monday.)

Membership of the Scottish Genealogy Society is by election at an annual subscription of £1 10s. 0d. ($4.50) (inclusive of *The Scottish Genealogist*). This subscription which is payable on 1st October entitles members to receive the Magazine during the following year beginning with the January issue. Inquiries may be made to the Hon. Secretary, 28 Pitbauchlie Bank, Dunfermline, and subscriptions paid to the Hon. Treasurer, 74 Brunstane Road, Joppa, Midlothian.

The Scottish Genealogist will be published quarterly. Subscription is 11/- ($1.75) per annum (post free). Single copies are available from the Hon. Editor at 2/9 ($0.50) post free.

All material for publication must be sent to the Hon. Editor, c/o Messrs. Shepherd & Wedderburn, W.S., 16 Charlotte Square, Edinburgh, 2, in a form ready for immediate use. MSS. must be fully referenced, signed and previously unpublished.

Publication in *The Scottish Genealogist* does not imply that all views therein are accepted or admitted by The Scottish Genealogy Society. Authors, and not the Society, are to be held responsible for errors of fact.

All communications submitted should be accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope (or by other means of return). Published matter will not be returned; but will become the property of the Society and filed for reference in the Library.

THE SCOTTISH GENEALOGY SOCIETY

At a General Meeting of the Scottish Genealogy Society, the following Constitution was adopted on Saturday, 4th July, 1953 :—

1. The objects of the Scottish Genealogy Society are :—

   (a) To promote research into Scottish Family History.

   (b) To undertake the collection, exchange and publication of information and material relating to Scottish Genealogy by means of meetings, lectures, etc., etc.

2. The Society will consist of all duly elected Members whose subscriptions are paid. A President, and one or more Vice-Presidents may be elected at the Annual General Meeting.

3. The affairs of the Society shall be managed by a Council consisting of Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Honorary Secretary, Honorary Treasurer, Honorary Editor, and not more than twelve other Members. A non-Council Member of the Society shall be appointed to audit the accounts annually.

4. Office-Bearers shall be elected annually. Four Ordinary Members of Council shall retire annually in rotation, but shall be eligible for re-election.

5. At meetings of the Council, a quorum shall consist of not less than one-third of the members.

6. An Annual General Meeting of the Society will be held at or about the end of October, on a date to be determined by the Council, at which reports will be submitted.

7. Members shall receive one copy of each publication issued by, or on behalf of the Society, but these shall not be supplied to any Members who are in arrears.

8. No alteration of this Constitution shall be made except at the Annual General Meeting of the Society, when a two-thirds majority will be required.

THE SCOTTISH GENEALOGY SOCIETY

Printed for the Scottish Genealogy Society by The Fifeshire Advertiser, Ltd., Kirkcaldy.

The Urquharts of Cromarty

(Continued from Vol. VI, No. 2)

IT is as faithful followers of the Earl of Ross that the Urquharts first appear upon the scene. In 1338, Earl William, son of Earl Hugh who was killed at Halidon Hill in 1333, granted to Adam Urquhart the lands of Inchrory.[10] As an earnest of his gratitude to his patron, Adam Urquhart presented annual rents and lands to the chaplain of Inchrory in 1348 for prayers for the soul of Earl William and his progenitors. This charter opens, significantly: "Omnibus hoc scriptum visuris vel audituris, Adam de Urquhart dominus de Incherore *et vicecomes de Crommerty* . . ."[11] This suggests that on or after the death of William Mowat, either Earl Hugh or Earl William conferred the sheriffship of Cromarty upon Adam Urquhart.

But the position of the sheriff *vis a vis* his superior was still anomalous, and it was to rectify this that David II confirmed a charter of 1358 relating to the sheriffdom of Cromarty. By this, William Earl of Ross granted the sheriffdom in fee to Adam Urquhart with, significantly, the concurrence of Richard Mohaut. Richard, described as *capellanus filius et heres Willelmi de Monte Alto*, resigned all rights to the subjects concerned. An abridged version of this interesting document, taken from the charter-chest at Meldrum, is printed in *Antiquities of Aberdeen and Banff, III*, 530-31.

Now, if this source had been used instead of the scrappy, inadequate entry *Reg. Mag. Sig., I*, App. 2, 597, which merely records the transaction without mentioning Richard Mohaut's concurrence, the supersession of the Mowats by the Urquharts would not have troubled Dr. Mackay Mackenzie who, in his *Old Sheriffdom of Cromarty* (p. 18) remarks that, "What happened in the case of the Monte Altos we cannot definitely say." As to the future of the Mowats Richard's vocation is highly suggestive. Only the concurrence of Richard, William's son and heir, was required to keep the transaction right, and Richard was in holy orders, thus effectively preventing him from begetting legitimate heirs. The evidence is insufficient to prove the case but it looks very much as if the Mowats lost Cromarty because of the failure of the direct line of William de Mohaut. The name certainly continued in the North-East after 1358 and close investigation of those who bore it would be highly desirable.

The point for us to seize upon, however, is that for over three centuries after the confirmation of this charter of 1358 the Urquharts were firmly established in Cromarty, and soon waxed prosperous in other parts of the North-East as well. Numerous charters bear witness to this, but it would be misplaced knowledge to recite them here in detail.[12] All that we are concerned with is the result of these grants and acquisitions. By the

beginning of the 16th century the Urquharts were not only barons and heritable sheriffs of Cromarty but also lairds of Brae, Inchrorie, Fisherie, Clochorby, Culbo and Craigston—which four last were situated in the sheriffdom of Aberdeen. These accessions were gained in the usual way, either by "conquest" or by inheritance as a result of fortunate marriages. A late, but prominent example of the latter mode was the acquisition of Meldrum in Aberdeenshire in 1635. The Setons of Meldrum then died out, and the last Seton laird had devolved the estate upon Patrick Urquhart, who was the son of John the Tutor of Cromarty and Seton's niece Elizabeth.[13] John the Tutor was a somewhat rare bird in the later Urquhart family tree, he being an expert at estate management and augmentation, as Sir Thomas the genealogist wistfully vaunted—although, later, in the course of a quarrel with the Tutor's grandson he hinted darkly that the Tutor's notable increase in gear was not unrelated to peculation from the estates of Sir Thomas' father.

At this point, the Urquharts were prolific and seemed in no danger of sharing the fates of the Mowats or the Setons. Thomas Urquhart, for example, who died in 1557, had 36 legitimate offspring, 25 sons and 11 daughters.[14] The Tutor (who died in 1631) was married three times, but in him the blood seems to have been running a bit thin, for he only managed to sire 9 children. At the beginning of the 17th century, then, the Urquharts were flourishing both in numbers and in prosperity. The Reformation had redounded to their profit, especially through the activities of the last popish Dean of Ross. This was Alexander Urquhart who cannot be fitted into the family tree but who was most likely a blood relation of some sort. Through him the family managed to filch from the old patrimony of the Church lands, teinds and manses.[15]

Everything, then, in the Urquhart garden seemed to be lovely, but Kenneth Mackenzie, the famous Brahan Seer of the early 17th century, saw fit to include the family in his raven croakings. Of the land-grasping Urquharts of Cromarty, as they seemed to him, he predicted "that extensive though their possessions in the Black Isle now are, the day will come—and it is close at hand—when they will not own twenty acres in the district."[16]

Whether this was the exercise of the *second sight* or merely a shrewd application of a commonsense observation we cannot tell. It could easily have been the latter, for the factor which led to the ruin of the Urquharts, and likewise to their principal claim to glory in the person of Sir Thomas the genealogist and author, had already appeared in the family. This was a marked vein of eccentricity, to put the best face on it, or to put the worst, of mental instability. It had showed itself as early as the 16th century in the person of another Thomas—he who had sired 36 children. The eccentricity did not consist in this, however, but in the odd attitude to death which he evinced in his old age. Of him it is written that "having attained old age, he began to consider himself as already dead, and derived comfort from the

daily repetition of a ceremony which consisted in being brought out of his bed, about sunset, to the base of the tower of the castle, and being raised by pulleys, slowly and gently to the battlements, which ascent he deemed emblematical of the resurrection."[17]

Perhaps the wild strain even appeared, too, in the admirable Tutor, for he has found his niche in Pitcairn.[18] In 1615 he was tried at the instance of his spouse Elizabeth Seton for the slaughter of her father, Alexander Seton of Meldrum in 1590. The charge, however, was dropped and the whole affair is surrounded in mystery.

The unfortunate *genes* in the hereditary constitution of the Urquharts grouped themselves disastrously in the Sir Thomas who was knighted in 1617. He was not the genealogist, with whom he is often confused, but the latter's father. Of him the great Sir Thomas for once contented himself with the bare truth when he ruefully wrote that " all he bequeathed unto me, his eldest son, in matter of worldly means was twelve or thirteen thousand pounds sterling of debt, five brethren, all men, and two sisters almost marriageable to provide for, and lesse to defray all this burden with, by six hundred pounds sterling a year (although the warres had not prejudiced me a farthing), than what he (my father) inherited for nothing."[19]

Indeed, Sir Thomas senior was hopelessly incompetent as an estate manager, and long before the outbreak of the Civil Wars he had undermined the strong position built up by his grand-uncle, the capable Tutor. His one acquisition was the lands of Dunlugas in Aberdeenshire in 1624[20] which he subsequently conferred upon his second son, Alexander. This seems to be the sole item on the credit side of Sir Thomas' muddled business career—and significantly it came by inheritance.

In numerous ways his weak, ineffectual nature played havoc with the family fortunes. This appeared at its worst in November 1623 when, evidently prevailed upon by his kinsmen, the Urquharts of Burdisyards, he personally helped them to prosecute a feud. More than a score of Urquharts, aided by a few Ogilvies, then stormed into the kirk of Forres " without respect to the day or the place, when the third bell was ringing to the sermone " and there grievously assaulted Robert Tulloch, and would probably have slain him but for the intercession of the outraged congregation. In attempting to stop the fracas the minister, Patrick Tulloch, was assaulted and wounded. The upshot was that the Sheriff of Cromarty, Sir Thomas Urquhart no less, was found guilty of the attack upon Robert Tulloch and committed to ward in the Castle of Edinburgh. He was also ordered to pay all the expenses of the litigation, and bound over on surety of £1,000 to make good the damage to the kirk.[21]

In other ways Sir Thomas senior managed to waste his inheritance, notably through losses incurred by an over-readiness to undertake rash cautionary obligations. It may, as has been suggested, have been on

account of this propensity that in December 1636 he was held in durance in the Inner Dortour of Cromarty Castle by his two eldest sons. On the other hand he was at the same time put to the horn by the Privy Council for non-payment of a debt of 5,000 merks and for failure to surrender his house of Cromarty and place himself in ward in the castle of Blackness. Sir Thomas thereupon appealed to the Council claiming that it was to "the undewtifull cariage and behaviour of his children" that he owed his present troubles. Is it not possible that the forced restraint had prevented Sir Thomas from compearing when required? However this may be, the family differences were settled by arbitration, and this is the sole fact recorded in the *Register of the Privy Council* on 25th July 1637.[21a]

In that same year of misfortune, 1637, Sir Thomas senior was obliged to appeal to the King for a letter of protection from his creditors, and this was granted for the space of one year.[22] It is plain that the creditors were moving in upon the ruined family, and indeed already the Crown had confirmed charters of reversion upon parts of the lands of Cromarty in favour of certain of the leading creditors, notably William Rig of Aderne, James Sutherland, Tutor of Duffus, and Robert Leslie of Findrassie.[23] These were three of the *usurious cormorants* whom Sir Thomas the younger later bitterly accused of devouring his patrimony. Indeed, so desperate were the circumstances that the genealogist frankly admitted that the political turmoils of the time came to his father as a relief from the apprisings, reversions and hornings of the piping times of peace. As he put it in his own inimitable way—"The disorderly troubles of the land being then far advanced, though otherwayes he disliked them, were a kind of refreshment to him, and intermitting relaxation from a more stinging disquietnesse. For that our intestin troubles and distempers, by silencing the laws for a while, gave some repose to those that longed for a breathing time, and by huddling up the terms of Whitsuntide and Martinmass, which in Scotland are the destinated times for payment of debts, promiscuously with other seasons of the year, were as an oxymel julip wherewith to indormiate them in a bitter sweet security."[24]

As if this were not trouble enough, to cap it all, the family, though in the words of Gordon of Rothiemay, "environed with Covenanters, ther neighbours," elected to support the King's cause.[25] But although a staunch Episcopalian and Royalist old Sir Thomas was too feeble in health to take an active part in the turmoils, and he died early in 1642 before the outbreak of the Great Civil War in England. His eldest son Thomas, however, an interesting and attractive character over whom one would willingly linger, played as usual a rather extraordinary part. He was present, bursting with enthusiasm at the Trot of Turriff in May 1639 when Covenanters and Malignants first came to blows, to the sad discomfort of the former. The fortune of war soon swung, however, and on the recovery of Aberdeen by the Covenanters under Montrose young Thomas prudently left by sea for

London, bearing with him important despatches for the King—or so at least *he* says. In recognition of his outstanding services he was, again on his *ipse dixit*, knighted by Charles I in the Gallery of Whitehall on 7 April 1641.[26]

Yet throughout the Great Civil War Sir Thomas played a curious part. Despite the extravagance of his writings, he was a rationalist and had no use for Divine Right, whether of Kings, Bishops or Presbyters. Indeed, those he lumped together with "pious frauds,"[27] quite unworthy of the serious attention of a gentleman of literary and scientific genius, which character he felt he could honestly confer upon himself. True, largely for personal reasons, he hated the Presbyterians and many a passage of excoriating prose he devoted to the exposing of what seemed to him their proud, lustful and avaricious projects. Yet he did not hate them to the extent that he would place his redoubtable sword at the service of King Charles I. Indeed, until 1644 he lived, and thought his great thoughts, in London, which was the very nerve-centre of the opposition to the King. But in that crucial year for both King and Parliament Sir Thomas was chased from this intellectual refuge by the prospect of being assessed at a £1,000 for a forced loan for the Parliamentarians.

Forthwith he returned to Scotland full of brilliant schemes not only to rescue his estates but also to revolutionise the economy of the entire barren north. Among other things, the port of Cromarty was to become a premature Darien. To be fair to Sir Thomas, however, he had some good ideas, especially in agriculture where it is interesting to find that he seems to have anticipated many of the measures of the 18th century improvers. But he shone purely in the realms of ideas, for "his eccentric overcrowded brain," as Miss Wedgwood describes it in *The King's Peace*, was better adapted to squaring the circle or inventing a universal language than to the grim realities of estate management. Soon his troubles were enough, as he put it, "to appall the most undaunted spirits, and kill a very Paphlagonian partridge, that is said to have two hearts."[28] The detested Leslie of Findrassie continued his petty tyrannies, and Sir Thomas ascribed to his attentions the quartering of troops upon the Cromarty tenants and the stationing of a garrison in the Castle for over a year. This, of course, was the usual covenanted solution to the problem of the Malignants. But though he smarted under all those grievances Sir Thomas never seems even to have considered joining Montrose in his meteor-like campaigns for the King. There is nothing strange in this, for the devoted Royalists of the North-East did not see in Montrose the *preux chevalier* of Buchan or Wedgwood, but merely an old enemy who, for reasons of his own, had turned his coat.

The execution of the King, however, shocked Sir Thomas Urquhart out of his political indifference, and with characteristic impetuosity he joined the futile and little-chronicled Highland revolt of 1649 which was headed by Mackenzie of Pluscardine.[29] Sir Thomas acted for a time as Pluscardine's

not have his lands restored to him. Twice, in an effort to engage the great man's sympathies further, he turned pamphleteer in Cromwell's service.[34] At the same time he cautiously restricted his literary output so as not to confer an unearned and undeserved benefit on the Commonwealth. In such matters, payment by results was Sir Thomas' motto. As he stated in no uncertain terms in the preface to *Logopandecteision*—" there being no possibility of the Author's publication of excellent Treatises, unless he be reseated in the estate of his predecessors . . . what can the Author and his posterity suffer of damage by the want of his estate comparable to the prejudice sustainable by the many Readers and their successors through lack of his writings?"[35] The extent of the reader's loss can be roughly gauged, for elsewhere he writes—" betwixt what is printed, and what ready for the presse, I have set forth above a hundred severall Bookes, on Subjects never hitherto thought upon by any."[36] And, again, he informs us that but for the importunity of " Flagitators," he " would have emitted to publick view above five hundred several Treatises on inventions never hitherto thought upon by any."[37]

At any rate, Sir Thomas faithfully kept his word and returned to captivity, but at some subsequent date, of which there seems to be no clear record (but which was most probably in 1653), he was either released or escaped, most likely the former. He then retired to Holland where he died at some time between 1st July 1658 and 1660, although hardly, as the old Rabelaisian story has is, of a fit of excessive and unwonted laughter at the irony of the events which culminated in the Restoration. In his last extant letter, written on 1st July 1658, there is clear evidence that he was ill, and suffering from want and privation. Typically, he denies this as mere rumour, but this was just Sir Thomas' conception of himself triumphing over reality. He liked to be depicted as the young and beautiful poet on Parnassus and refused to represent himself in any other light. But there is too much reason to fear that extreme poverty and hardship hurried on his end before his fiftieth year.

Before going on to consider the subsequent history of the family it may not be amiss to say a few words on the literary productions of Sir Thomas. Apart from his brilliant translation of Rabelais (which, with the Authorised Version of the Bible, still holds the field as the best translation in the English language), Sir Thomas has been unduly neglected as a writer, although the last twenty years have seen a marked revival of interest in his work. This is largely, I think, a side product of a wider appreciation of 17th century English prose authors, mainly Sir Thomas Browne, with whom Urquhart has certain obvious stylistic and perhaps even psychological affinities. Both wrote in a copious, euphuistic strain which, by some amazing feats of verbal dexterity, never lost the thread of an argument. Both were " word-intoxicated " men who had no use for the Shakespearean maxim that " brevity is the soul of wit." Both were egotists and saw little or nothing if not through their own eyes. Both reflected the curious mental attitudes of their age; they were

rationalists and would-be scientists, yet not without a large residue of superstition and gullibility. Both were prone to speculation, although here Urquhart was the more fantastic.

Sir Thomas Urquhart's extant writings are not bulky—considering, at any rate, his awe-inspiring facility with words. They go quite comfortably into a volume of the Maitland Club's publications which appeared in 1834 and is still the best edition available, although a better could now be desired. The *Epigrams* are poor stuff, no more than conventional exercises in a literary form then much favoured. They prove conclusively that Sir Thomas was not, in the popular and perhaps restricted sense of the word, a poet. They are highly moral but also highly prosaic, which would suggest that the mechanics of verse pinioned Sir Thomas' soaring sense of words. In them nothing of the real Sir Thomas is to be found, except evidence of his own deep and sincere conviction that he was a genuis.

A strong element in Sir Thomas' complex character appears in "The Trissoteiras: or A Most Exquisite Table For Resolving all manner of Triangles, whether plain or Sphericall, Rectangular or Obliquangular, with greater facility, than even hitherto hath been practised—Published for the benefit of those that are Mathematically affected" (1645). It is clear from the preface to this work that Sir Thomas was out to rival Napier of Merchiston, whom he lauds to the skies. But a supposedly disinterested person, whose diction most curiously resembles that of Sir Thomas, then introduces that pundit's work by saying that he deserves all the encomiums he has just passed on Napier! However, even the non-Mathematically affected of the 20th century soon discern that *Trissoteiras* is merely exquisite gibberish, traipsed out with, and largely disguised by, an extraordinary vocabulary which the author seems to invent as his arguments advance. It is derived mainly from mutilated Greek, which language, for reasons that go back to Esormon, was with our author an obsessional monomania. Take, for example, the following simple phrase: "The Loxogonospherical Triangles whether Amblygonospherical or Oxygonospherical are either Monurgetick or Disergetick." True, our author thoughtfully, if not really very helpfully, provides "A Lexicidion of some of the hardest words that occurre in the Discourse of this Institution Trigonometricall." But finally, conscious perhaps in a rare moment of introspection of certain gaps in his mathematical equipment, Sir Thomas ends this work with a fine exhortation which it seems to me that critics of any subject might well lay to heart. "But as such, who, either understanding it not, or vain-gloriously being accustomed to criticise on the works of others, will presume to carp therein at what they cannot amend, I pray God to illuminate their judgments and rectifie their wits, that they may know more and censure less."[38]

Sir Thomas Urquhart, wrong-headed but amusingly vivid and on occasion poignantly wise, is the most quotable of authors: but already we have

exceeded our licence. There is a fine selection from his works which was published by the Saltire Society in 1942, edited by John Purves. For those who operate on the same wave-length as the worthy knight of Cromarty this is a priceless little book, including all that is best from the best of Sir Thomas, notably the *Jewel* and the *Logopandecteision*. Perhaps we may be allowed one last word on Sir Thomas as a writer of English. In some ways this is the most mysterious and tantalising thing about him. As Francis Jeffrey exclaimed at his first sight of the young Macaulay's offerings to the *Edinburgh*: where did he get that style? His English, though complex in structure, is clear and flowing, neither hampered by Scotticisms[39] nor yet frigidly correct. It is obviously the English of a man who has mastered the language and can take with it whatever liberties his rich fancy dictates. As such it was uncommon for the times and not easy to account for now. Myself, I believe that it reflects the Golden Period of Aberdeen University, which Urquhart attended (King's College) in the hey-day of the Aberdeen doctors.

We turn now to the fate of the Urquhart lands. From 1650 onwards the Register of the Great Seal bears testimony to the dire straits of the family, and not just of Sir Thomas but of his younger brothers as well. Thus on 7th February of that year, 1650, a charter was granted conveying under legal reversion to Robert Petrie, writer in Edinburgh, the cadet lands of Lethintie and Dunlugas in the shire of Aberdeen.[40] Then there was an interesting charter granted by the Protector on 1st March 1655 conveying the lands and barony of Cromarty to Sir Robert Farquhar of Mounie, from which it appears that the assignee was a principal creditor who had acquired the interests held on the estate by Leslie of Findrassie and Rig of Aderne.[41] This was the culmination of a series of apprisings and, despite the political beliefs of the apprisers, a perfectly normal transaction consequent upon the expiry of the legal term for repayment. Then emerge some curious and obscure operations. Alexander Urquhart, old Sir Thomas' second son, received a charter from Cromwell in August 1658.[42] Alexander seems to have been more worldly wise than his brother Thomas, for he began as a Covenanter, became an Engager, made his peace with the Protector whom he served as a J.P. in Banffshire,[43] and lived to be right Royalist again in 1660. Miss Tayler, though, seems to be mistaken in accepting this charter as a conveyance of the entire lands and barony of Cromarty. It is clear from the charter itself that all that Alexander had secured was half of the apprising made on the lands of Cromarty in 1636 by James Sutherland, Tutor of Duffus. The reversion to the greater part of the estate was bought by a cousin of Thomas and Alexander, John Urquhart of Craigston, from Sir Robert Farquhar of Mounie.[44]

That Sir Thomas Urquhart was at this stage still very much alive is proved by a furious letter which, on receiving news of this transaction, he dashed off to his cousin John of Craigston on 1st July 1658 from Middelburgh in Holland.[45] It is a late example of the old Scots flyting genus, but by no

means an academic exercise. Sir Thomas had heard of the transactions between John and Farquhar, and between John and Alexander. The figure cut by John in this business he stigmatised as "more like a cheating cosner than a loving cosen." He had also heard of John's treatment of old Lady Cromarty's remonstrances, he throwing himself out of the room like a "Surly Jackanapes" without so much as taking leave and vowing that if Sir Thomas had spoken to him in this way he would have called him out. Sir Thomas' letter is a challenge, which if John declined his cousin would publicly brand him as a poltroon. As he had done formerly at the Mercat Cross of Turriff with a laird who had angered him and yet refused to fight, so now would Sir Thomas treat John, though not at the cross of Turriff "but at the pryme mercat places of the cheiff tounes in Europe, where printed manifestos shall be affixed and posted on postes declaratorie of your being a rogue, a skelme, and a perfideous knave, ane impudent villane, usurious, lowe and unnaturall destroyer (what lyes in yow) off the honor of that famillie, which hath been disgraced by a descent thence, off so vile a snaike as yow are." Sir Thomas defends his choice of a duel (which ordinarily his superior mind would scorn) upon the grounds that no arbiter could be fixed upon, since John would not submit the matter to King Charles, "for that from your Infancie yow have bein ane enemie to him and the wholl Royal race and that I on the other pairt am not lyke to receave great favour from that Protectoriall authoritie under whose wings yow have hitherto founded your pernicious actings." Consequently, there can only be recourse to the law of arms, although Sir Thomas felt keenly that he was demeaning himself in challenging one "so many hundreth steps beneath myself." Nonetheless, he concludes, "I sall to that effect provyde a couple of sourdes whereof you sall have your choyse." Had Sir Thomas lived, or left behind him any heir worthy of his body, the history of the Urquharts might have been adorned with a few more wild tales. As it is, the meeting never took place and Sir Thomas died, so far as is known, unmarried and childless.

Alexander made over his interest in the estate to his cousin, doubtless for help in redeeming his own lands of Dunlugas, and in 1661 the barony and sheriffship of Cromarty were ratified to Sir John, as he became in the following year.[46] He was a trimmer 'par excellence,' as Wodrow noted in his *Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*. Having lately counterfeited the protester he now became an ultra-Royalist and prelatist, becoming one of Middleton's close associates. With gloomy satisfaction, Wodrow noted that he did not thereafter prosper and came to a fitting if horrible end.[47] He was Sir Thomas senior all over again, suffering from chronic financial embarrassment and for lengthy periods unable to venture to Edinburgh except under letters of protection from the Council.[48] By 1665 the proud inheritance of the Urquharts was breaking up and in that year George Dallas (the author of the once famous *System of Stiles*) was infeft in the lands of St. Martins.[49] In all, ten sasines on Urquhart lands are recorded

in favour of Dallas between 1665 and 1684. Dallas, however, who was a prominent lawyer, was a bird of passage and in 1694 sold his Cromarty lands to Gordon of Dalpholly, the progenitor of the Gordons of Invergordon.

There is not much call for enumerating here the many instances of Sir John Urquhart's poverty. These accumulated, preyed on his mind, and in 1678, to the horror of his pious Covenanting friend, the laird of Brodie, Cromarty committed suicide.[50] Jonathan Urquhart, Sir John's heir, was as incapable as his father and according to a later kinsman he was ruined by *Sharpers or Drunken Company*.[51] However this may be, the barony of Cromarty was apprised from him in 1680 by Sir George Mackenzie of Tarbat.[52] The affairs of the Urquharts continued to deteriorate and in 1684 Sir George Mackenzie of Tarbat purchased the lands, barony and sheriffship of Cromarty at a judicial sale.[53] Through the machinations of Tarbat (later created first Earl of Cromartie) his sheriffdom of Cromarty was enlarged by the addition of his lands in Ross.[54] The estate of Cromarty itself he devolved upon his second son, Sir Kenneth Mackenzie.

But the Urquharts were a tenacious, if erratic lot, and they were not yet finished with their ancestral home. The Cromarty Mackenzies were soon heavily burdened with debt and in 1741 they had to part with the estate of Cromarty.[55] It was snapped up by Captain John Urquhart of the Craigston line who managed to combine the eccentricity of the family with a flair for making money, although by rather shady means. He was a Jacobite who had suffered exile for the cause, had turned Papist and entered the service of Spain. As a privateer in the Spanish service, or pirate perhaps would be a better description, he amassed considerable wealth. Although he remained a convinced Jacobite and wrangled furiously with the local Presbyterian ministers he took no active part in the Rebellion of 1745-46.[56] This worthy died in 1756 and his son sold the estate of Cromarty to Lord Elibank in 1763. It was purchased to serve a 'political job,' as the term then ran. The advertisements in the press lauding the virtues of the property for sale made great play with the fact that by dexterous manipulation of its superiority enough votes could be created to carry the next county election in 1768. This was the lure that led to Elibank's purchase, which was made on behalf of his nephew, William Johnstone of a well-known Dumfriesshire family. It was Johnstone, later better known as Sir William Pulteney, who made the actual purchase. After an epic election contest Johnstone or Pulteney did just manage to win the election of 1768, narrowly beating the county's old tyrant, Sir John Gordon of Invergordon, whose father had wrested the representation of the county from the Cromarty Mackenzies in 1741.[57] But once his election was secured Pulteney sold the estate to George Ross, an army agent impaled by *Junius* for murky dealings in public offices and public funds.[58]

Some of the cadet branches of the family, notably that of Meldrum,

continued to flourish but are now virtually extinct. The most remarkable of these later Urquharts came of the comparatively minor branch of Braelangwell, although, characteristically, that did not prevent him from claiming to be the senior representative of his stock. His claim was this far justified; the career and character of David Urquhart (1805-77), self-styled diplomatist, propagandist and extraordinary crank, was highly reminiscent of Sir Thomas of Rabelaisian fame. Even to look at a list of his published works establishes the connection. Only a man with a bee in his bonnet could have churned out such a mass of writings on such a curious assortment of topics, doubtless "never hitherto thought upon by any." His life was devoted to hatred of Russia, and, after a Philhellenic false start in the Greek War of Independence, love of Turkey.[59] He had other curious ideas, strikingly reminiscent of Sir Thomas. In his book *The Pillars of Hercules* (1850) he wrote, "That the Celts came from the East all history attests, and philology has confirmed its verdict." This was too good an opportunity for a hostile reviewer to miss, and in the *Quarterly*, some wretch who had never read or paid any attention to Sir Thomas' fine counsel for such cases, ripped David to shreds, coupling him with his great kinsman. The reviewer says of the book that it was written "to prove that the Highland clans, with clan Urquhart at their head, marched from Achaia to their present localities in Inverness, Cromarty, etc., via Canaan, Egypt, Morocco and Andalusia, and that accordingly the most marked traces of identity are still 'clear and evident' between the said clans and the Moslem, but especially the Moors." Incidentally, it was this book, *The Pillars of Hercules*, that introduced the Turkish bath into Britain.

It should not be thought, however, that David Urquhart was merely an eccentric bore. He had real abilities as a publicist and some understanding of the complexities of the Europe of his day. He was adept at ferreting out supposedly secret information and splashing it about in the most unscrupulous but telling way. In particular, he was a gad-fly to Lord Palmerston whom he rather improbably conceived to be in Russian pay. Urquhart was for some time M.P. for Stafford burgh and one of the persistent critics of British foreign policy. In his Ford Lectures, A. J. P. Taylor has given a brief but revealing glimpse of him at work.[60] The redoubtable David died in 1877 and with his passing we may fairly close these remarks on the Urquharts of Cromarty.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

10 **Fraser**, *op. cit.*, **II, 317-19.**
11 *Ibid.*, **319-20.**
12 **For a convenient list of the main documents, see Charles Fraser-Mackintosh** *Antiquarian Notes*, **2d. ed.,** *The Titles of the Urquharts of Cromarty*, **202-18.**
13 **Henrietta Tayler,** *History of the Family of Urquhart*, **132.**
14 *Ibid.*, **20.**
15 **W. Mackay Mackenzie,** *Cromarty : its Old Chapels and Parish Church*, **11,**

16 A. Mackenzie, *Prophecies of the Brahan Seer*, 57-8.
17 Tayler, *op. cit.*, 21
18 R. Pitcairn, *Ancient Criminal Trials in Scotland*, Bann. Club, 1833, III, Pt. II. 379.
19 *Works*, 340.
20 R.M.S., VIII, No. 610; that it came by inheritance, Tayler, *op. cit.*, 58-9.
21 R.P.C., XIII, 173-4, 177-8.
21a R.P.C., VI, N.S., 485-6.
22 R.P.C., VI., N.S., 430.
23 R.M.S., IX, Nos. 534, 543. From Gordon of Rothiemay's *History of Scots Affairs*, II, 239-40, it appears that Rig of Aderne (or Athenrie) was a well-known bailie of Edinburgh and "the chief Ring-leader of the Non-conformitants in Edinburgh." Leslie of Findrassie seems to have been of the same persuasion and was a special object of Sir Thomas Urquhart's vituperation. See, *e.g.*, *Works*, 382.
24 *Works*, 346.
25 *History of Scots Affairs*, I, 61.
26 Willcock, *Sir Thomas Urquhart of Cromartie*, ch. II.
27 *A Challenge from Sir Thomas Urquhart*, Luttrell Reprints No. 4, 1948, XVI: "there is no government (whether Ecclesiastical or Civil upon earth that is *jure divino*." Also Mackay Mackenzie, *Cromarty: its Old Chapels and Parish Church*, 15.
28 *Works*, 346.
29 On this, see *More Culloden Papers*, ed. Warrand, I, 90 sqq.; and Willcock, *op. cit.*, ch. III.
30 For a brief discussion of Roger Williams, see Clinton Rossiter, *Seedtime of the Republic*, 179-204.
31 *Works*, 409; Willcock, *op. cit.*, 91, errs in giving the reference to Urquhart's *Works*, as p. 410.
32 R. S. Paul, *The Lord Protector*, 383.
33 *Works*, 408.
34 *A Challenge from Sir Thomas Urquhart*, intro., XVII-XX.
35 *Works*, 410.
36 *A Challenge etc.*, XII.
37 *Works*, 326.
38 *Works*, 146.
39 It is difficult to see how Kurt Wittig, *The Scottish Tradition in Literature*, 159, could substantiate his thesis that Sir Thomas' writing "is Scots speech rendered into English."
40 *R.M.S.*, IX, No. 2170.
41 *R.M.S.*, X, No. 400; Fraser-Mackintosh, *Antiquarian Notes*, 202 sqq. Farquhar of Mounie was a wealthy Bailie of Aberdeen who speculated in land; he was also Treasurer to the Committee of Process and Moneys to which he had advanced sums and in return was allowed to retain fines to the equivalent value. For these activities, see Fraser-Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, 326 sqq.
42 *R.M.S.*, X, No. 665.
43 C. H. Firth, ed., *Scotland and the Protectorate*, (S.H.S.), 310.
44 Tayler, *History of the Family of Urquhart*, 56.
45 Printed in part in 6th Report of H.M.C., 1877, and in full with critical introduction in Luttrell Reprints No. 4 (1948), *A Challenge from Sir Thomas Urquhart of Cromartie*.
46 *A.P.S.*, VII, 70.
47 R. Wodrow, *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, ed. 1721, I, 28. See, too, Jas. Kirkton, *Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland, from the Restoration to the Year, 1678*, ed. 1817, p. 95.
48 For illustrations of this, see *R.P.C.*, 3d. ser., II, 575, 586.
49 James Dallas, *History of the Family of Dallas*, chapter on Dallas of St. Martins, 321-56.
50 The precise year has puzzled many; but on 11th and 12th April 1678 Brodie wrote in his diary of his horror at "Cromarti his dreadful death in stabbing himself with his own hand." *Diaries of the Lairds of Brodie, 1652-85*. Spalding Club, 1843, 399;

and on 13th April 1678, the Marquis of Montrose wrote to his brother-in-law, the Laird of Cromarty, *i.e.* Jonathan Urquhart, Sir John Urquhart's son and heir, see *H.M.C.*, Var. Coll. V., 256.

51 Mackay Mackenzie, review of Tayler's *The History of the Family of Urquhart*, *S.H.R.*, 1947, 175.

52 *A.P.S.*, VIII., 514.

53 *A.P.S.*, VIII, 513-16.

54 An Act of 1685 (*A.P.S.*, VIII, 484) was rescinded on protests from the Earl of Seaforth; the project was accomplished by an Act of 1690 (*A.P.S.*, IX, 194).

55 Fraser, *Earls of Cromartie*, II, 415. Mackay Mackenzie, *S.H.R.*, *op. cit.*, makes difficulty as to whether the estate was sold to William Urquhart or John. William Urquhart of Meldrum purchased the estate for his cousin John who was a Roman Catholic and therefore forbidden by law to be a proprietor.

56 For Captain John Urquhart, see Tayler, *op. cit.*, 192 sqq.

57 Information on these matters is to be found in several volumes of *Old Session Papers* in Signet Library, notably vols. 133, 139, 684.

58 Fraser, *Earls of Cromartie*, II, 450. *The Letters of Junius*, ed. C. W. Everett (1927), p. 132, f.n. 4.

59 *D.N.B.*; Tayler, *op. cit.*, 259 sqq.

60 A. J. P. Taylor, *The Troublemakers*, Chapter II.

Campbell of Craignish: Two Documents

IN 1926, the Scottish History Society published an account of the Campbells of Craignish in Argyllshire (sometimes called the oldest legitimate cadets of the Duke of Argyll)[1] written about 1722 by Alexander Campbell, advocate (*b. c.* 1670, *died* 26th February 1726), younger brother of George of Craignish, and edited by the late Herbert Campbell (*Publications*, 3rd series, vol. IX, Miscellany vol. IV; cited hereafter as *MSHC*). With the account itself are printed an undated letter from the Advocate to his nephew Dugal (George's eldest son) concerning the family history, and abstracts of numerous writs in the possession of Lt. Col. Ronald Campbell of Craignish, Mr. J. A. Campbell of Achanduin and Barbreck, the tenth Duke of Argyll, H.M. Register House, and Mr Robert Ronald Campbell (a Craignish cadet); most of which documents had been examined by Herbert Campbell himself, and some by the Duke. However, for some unknown reason, Herbert Campbell did not investigate the charter chest of the Campbells of Inverneill, who are held by tradition to be descended from Craignish; and it was not until the contents were calendared, in 1949-1951, parts I to III being done by Mr R. C. Reid, and parts IV and V by Miss M. F. Moore, that a number of documents relating to Craignish were found, some of which Alexander Campbell had

before him when writing his history in 1722, but which were lost to sight by 1926.[2]

The two earliest Craignish writs, discovered by Mr R. C. Reid, have been transcribed and translated by Miss M. F. Moore, and are published by kind permission of Mr J. L. Campbell of Canna. As both are quoted incorrectly in the Advocate's history, it will be worthwhile to give the texts complete.

I.—Venerabili in Christo patri Dei gracia episcopo Ergadien uel eius vicario in spiritualibus Johannes miseracione diuina episcopus Prenestin apostolice sedis nuncius ad regem et regnum Francie destinatus salutem et sinceram in Dominum caritatem. Sedis apostolice prouidencia circumspecta non nunquam rigorem iuris mansuetudine temperans quod sacrorum canonum prohibent instituta de gracia benignitatis indulget prout personarum et temporis qualitate pensata id in Deo salubriter expedire cognoscit. Sane ex parte Malcolmi filii Malcolmi de Cragynis et Hawys filie McLaghman vestre diocesis nobis oblate peticionis series continebat quod ipsi racione prolis suscepte inter eosdem desiderant inuicem matrimonialiter copulari, sed quia idem Malcolmus quamdam mulierem dicta Hawys in quarto consanguinitatis gradu attinentem carnaliter cognouit una vice tantum eorum desiderium non possunt adimplere dispensacione super hoc non obtenta, quare supplicari fecerunt nobis humiliter eis in hac parte de oportune dispensacionis gracia misericorditer prouideri. Nos. igitur eorum supplicacionibus inclinati auctoritate domini pape cuius primacie curam gerimus et de eius speciali mandato super hoc viue vocis oraculo nobis facto circumspectioni vestre committimus, quatinus si est ita et dicta Hawys propter hoc ab aliquo rapta non fuerit cum ipsis Malcolmo et Hawys quod impedimento affinitatis ex dicta consanguinitate proueniente non obstante matrimonium inuicem libere contrahere et in esse postquam contractum fuerit licite remanere valeant, misericorditer dispensetis prolem e matrimonio huiusmodi — — — — — sustinendam legitimam decernendo. Dat. Parisiis iii non. Junii pontificatus domini Clementis pape vij anno primo. [Campbell of Inverneill Mss., part II, no. 1. Seal tag — seal gone. Endorsed, in an 18th century hand, "Dispensation by Pope Clement VI. [*sic*] For Marrying Malcolm Mac Molcalm of Creginish To Halvijs Mac Lachlan — dated at Paris June [blank] 1343 years." There are other endorsements in earlier hands, faded and hardly legible.]

Abstract. John, Bishop of Palestrina, Nuncio to the King and Kingdom of France, to the Bishop of Argyll or his vicar in spirituals (on the petition of Malcolm son of Malcolm of Craignish and Alice Lamont narrating that they have had children and wish to marry but may not do so because Malcolm once had intercourse with a woman related in the fourth degree to Alice) giving permission to grant a dispensation for the marriage and legitimatize the issue thereof, provided that the

statements are true and that the said Alice was not taken by force. Dated at Paris, the third day of the Nones of June, in the first year of the pontificate of Pope Clement VII (*i.e.* 3 June 1379).

This dispensation in mentioned on page 223 of *MSHC*, where a brief and garbled abstract is given, the lady is called MacLachlan, and the date assigned is 4 June 1343, the Advocate having misread the papal numeral as "6te" instead of "vij." The pontiff referred to is the anti-pope Robert of Geneva (Clement VII), elected 20 September 1378, who appointed John de Cros (Bishop of Palestrina or Praeneste, 1376) to be Nuncio in France on 30 December 1378 (*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, New York, 1913, XIII, 96; Eubel, *Hierarcha Catholica Medii Aevi*). Of Malcolm, Alice's husband, nothing else is certainly known except that he was evidently the father of "Ronald Malcome of Craignish" who was alive on 18 June 1412 (*MHSC*, p. 292, appendix D, 4). The Advocate (p. 223) says that he had been married before, without issue, and calls him uncle of Christian of Craignish, 1361 (pp. 209, 222; and see footnote 3 here) but he was probably her cousin. It is with his father that the connected part of the Craignish pedigree begins.

In Sheriff Hector McKechnie's *The Lamont Clan, 1235-1935* (1938) Alice's marriage to Malcolm is mentioned, and she is described (p. 61) as a daughter of Duncan, 4th chief of Lamont, who was alive in 1356 and 1381, the reference given being *MSHC*, p. 223; with the comment (p. 500, note 10) that the date assigned, 1343, is "surely too late." Sheriff McKechnie, whose attention I have called to the original dispensation, tells me that the words "too late" were probably written by mistake for "too early." Duncan Lamont of Lamont, alive in 1356, may well have had a daughter married in 1379.

II. In Dei Nomine Amen per hoc presens publicum instrumentum cunctis pateat euidenter quod anno incarnationis dominice millesimo quadringentesimo secundo [*sic*], mensis vero Maii die decimo, indictione decima quinta, pontificatusque sanctissimi in Christo patris et domini nostri domini Alexandri diuina prouidencia pape Sexti anno primo in meique notarii publici et testium subscriptorum presencia personaliter constitute Affrica Nekegile, Katrina Nekegile, Mariota Nekegile et Fynvola Nekegille [*sic*] germane sorores personaliter non vi ducte aut errore lapse set earum voluntate et utilitate preuisis accesserunt ad presenciam nobilis et prepotentis domini Colini comitis Ergadie domini Campbel et Lorne etc. et eidem presentauerunt unam antiquam cartam grossam patri earundem super terris de Bargabey prout in eadem carta plenius continetur allegantes se esse quatuor filie quondam suarum [*sic*] patris et legitime nate et de jure hereditario quatuor partes dictarum terrarum eis pertinere dinoscuntur, super quibus quatuor partibus literam saisine dicto domino comiti tanquam domino superiori dictarum terrarum de Bargabey ostendebant et postquam dicta carta

et litera saisine perlecte et promulgate existebant dicte quatuor sorores non vi aut metu ducte magno juramento super hoc prestito tactis sanctis Dei ewangeliis set earum utilitate et comodo preuisis singillatim earum partes dictarum terrarum de Bargabey cum pertinentiis in manibus dicti comitis domini superioris ut supra per fustum et baculum a se et earum heredibus pure et simpliciter resignarunt ac sursum dederunt in perpetuum. Qua resignacione sic facta in manibus dicti comitis domini superioris antedicti dictus comes dictas quatuor partes de Bargabey cum pertinentiis Donaldo Johannis McCoul Cragnich pro deliberatione dicta fusti et baculi et heredibus masculis dedit, contulit et pro perpetuo deliberauit. Super quibus omnibus et singulis dictus Donaldus Johannis McCoul Craignich a me notario publico subscripto sibi fieri petiit unum seu plura, publicum seu publica, instrumentum seu instrumenta. Acta erant hec apud Carnaserych hora nona ante meridiem vel eacirca sub anno, mense, die, indictione et pontificatu quibus supra. Presentibus ibidem testibus :—Johanne McCoul Cragnich de Corbara, Gillecallum McEver de Largaquhonzie, Alexandro McAne, Donaldo McEsak et dominis Johanne Campbell, rectore de Kilmartin, et Negello McYllipeder, capellanis, cum multis aliis testibus ad premissa vocatis pariter et rogatis.

Et ego Johannes Dewar, presbyter Ergadiensis diocesis, publicus imperiali et regali actoritatibus notarius, dum his [*sic*] ut premittitur, sic fierent et agerentur, una cum prenominatis testibus presens fui sic fieri vidi, sciui, et audiui et in hanc publicam formam redigi ac per alium supradictum instrumentum scriptum signoque meis et subscriptione solitis et consuetis signauimin fidem et testimonium premissorum rogatus et requisitus. [Campbell of Inverneill Mss., part 1, no. 1. Endorsed, in the same hand as the principal endorsement of the marriage dispensation, " Instrument of Resignation of the lands of Barrichibyan by Effrick, Catrine, Marian and Finovall Mackegiles in favour of Donaldo Johannis MacCoul Craignish " ; and below, written more faintly, " May 1402."]

Abstract. At Carnassery, on 10 May " 1402 " in the first year of Pope Alexander VI (*i.e.* 1493), Effreta, Katrina, Mariota and Fynvola MacGeill, sisters german, presented to Colin Earl of Argyll, Lord Campbell and Lorne, superior of the lands, an ancient charter granted to their father of the lands of Barrichbeyan, alleging that they were the four lawful daughters of their deceased father ; which charter and letter of sasine thereupon being read, they resigned their shares of the said lands to the Earl, who then granted the same to Donald, son of John McCoul Cragnich, and his heirs male. Witnesses, John McCoul Craignich of Corvorran, Gillecallum McEver of Largaquhonzie, Alexander McAne, Donald McEsak, and Sirs John Campbell, rector of Kilmartin and Neill McYllipeder, chaplains. Notarial clause (in a different hand)

by John Dewar priest and notary of the diocese of Argyll, that he has signed the aforesaid instrument, "written by another."

This document has been the occasion of even more confusion than the former, the year, of course, being wrongly given in the original. *Nonagesimo* has been omitted after the first word of the second line. It is less easy to understand why the scribe wrote *secundo* instead of *tertio*. The Advocate also inserted in his quotations from it a good deal of extraneous material (*MSHC* pp. 230, 239, 258). He also refers (p. 238) to another resignation which he says was made by the eldest sister (Effreta) alone, dated 13 November 1481. The original of this is not extant, and it is more likely that the document was a charter of precept of sasine from the Earl of Argyll. Donald (probably the grandfather of the man in whose favour the sisters resigned in 1493), son of John McDugal Cragnich, had a charter of the lands in question on 10 December 1481 (*MSHC* p. 288, appendix C, 6). But there is another resignation by a fifth MacGeill daughter, Margaret, to "Colin Earl of Argyll," of one-fifth of Barrichbeyan for regrant to Donald, on 13 December 1497, misdated 1407 in the original (*ibid.*, appendix C, 7). In this document, according to Herbert Campbell, *nonagesimo* is omitted at the end of a line. The papal year given is the sixth of Alexander VI. The scribe must have been extraordinarily absent-minded; Colin, first Earl of Argyll, so created 1457, Lord Lorne, 1470, died on 10 May 1493, the day of the earlier resignation (*The Scots Peerage*, I, 334). The Earl in 1497 was Archibald. In both resignations the papal year gives the correct date. Alexander VI (Rodrigo Borgia) was elected on the 11th and crowned on the 26th August 1492 (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, I, 293).

According to the Advocate's history (p. 215) Barrichbeyan (which lies on the north side of the Craignish peninsula below Largiechonimore) was feued "for military services" to Duncan MacGeill (or MacIgheill) in the "younger days" of Sir Dugal Campbell who is said to have succeeded to Craignish *c.* 1290 (p. 210). This Duncan[4] is called, by the Advocate, grandfather to the four sisters who resigned in 1493 (p. 237), but this is obviously impossible. The first reference to "the Baron MacGeyll" holding the property right of Barrichbeyan is dated 4 June 1414 (pp. 292-3, appendix D, 5). Donald, in whose favour the four sisters resigned in 1493, was evidently the second son of the witness John McCoul Cragnich of Corvorran, the latter being, according to Herbert Campbell, the same person as "Johanni Donaldi Makcowlkragynys" who had a dispensation to marry "Effrete Duncani Nekgeyll" (the eldest sister) on 30 June 1486, at which time the couple already had children (p. 283, appendix B, 101; and see Herbert Campbell's pedigrees at the Lyon Office, Edinburgh, vol I, fol. 29). Donald may be the same as the Donald M'Ane V'Donil (or V'Douil), who succeeded his father by 12 June/22 July 1532 (p. 289, appendix C, 8; Inverneill Mss. V, 34) and was dead by 27 November 1544 (*MSHC*, p. 289, appendix C, 9). The date of death of his father, John (who was, apparently, the great-great-grandson

of Malcolm, 1379) is uncertain. The male line of the MacGeill family failed in 1480, according to the Advocate (p. 257).

Of the other witnesses, Gillecallum McEver of Largaquhonzie was presumably ancestor of the McIver Campbells of Asknish (cf. Douglas's *Baronage of Scotland*, pp. 537-9; Herbert Campbell's pedigree of the family, vol. I, 45, begins with the year 1573). Alexander McAne, not identified. For the McEsaks or MacIsaacs, later MacCallums or Malcolms, and bailies of Craignish in the sixteenth century see *MSHC* pp. 210, 215, 224-6, 269 and 277. A John Campbell (but perhaps a different man) was rector of Kilmartin in 1540 (p. 295). For the patronymic of Sir Neill McYllipeder, Mr J. L. Campbell suggests *Mac Ghille Peadair*, son of the servant of (St.) Peter, perhaps later anglicised to Paterson.

John Dewar was also notary to the misdated resignation of 13 December 1497, by Margaret the fifth MacGeill sister, mentioned above. He may be the same person as the rector of Lochawe, 10 December 1481 (p. 288).

It is not known at what date the Craignish documents came into possession of the Inverneill family, but it was probably during the latter part of the eighteenth century. Commissary Duncan Campbell (1742-1822) writer in Inveraray and later designed of Ross, younger brother of the first Inverneill, compiled in 1785 a history of the Craignish and Inverneill families, entitled *Craignish Geneology* (Inverneill Mss. part III, no. 12)[5] in which he makes direct quotations from the Advocate's history of 1722 and mentions having had access to the Craignish charter chest. In August 1800, John Leydon visited Duncan at Taynish, his home in Knapdale (until 1779 the seat of the MacNeills) and was shown "various copies" of sixteenth and seventeenth century documents including bonds of manrent between the Craignish family and the MacRaws (James Sinton, ed., *Journal of a Tour in the Highlands and Western Islands of Scotland in 1800, by John Leyden*, Edinburgh, 1903, pp. 66, 73). A bond dated 26 August 1593, by various MacRaes, in favour of Ronald Campbell of Cregnish, acknowledging that they are really Campbells descended from Craignish, is no. 15 of part I of the Inverneill Mss.[6] Duncan of Ross may have obtained these writs from the Craignish family before 1800. It is proposed to examine the genealogical import of the above and some other documents in a future article.

COLIN CAMPBELL.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1 See Lyon Register, XXXVI, 48; and *The Coat of Arms*, October, 1957, p. 314.

2 The collection contains 33 Craignish documents, 1379-1760, besides two rentals for the estate, 1698 and 1780; rentals for Braelorne (held by the family) for various years between 1591 and 1626; two 18th-century inventories of which one lists 125 items, 1361-1614; and an 18th-century transcript (part III, no. 25) of the Advocate's history

of 1722, which throws important light on the question of "forgeries" raised by Herbert Campbell on pp. 181-182 of *MSHC*.

3 McCoul, Makcowl, McDouil : MacDugal, the patronymic of the Craignish family, alluding to their traditional descent from Dugal, said to have lived *c.* 1130-1190 and to have been third son of Gillespic Campbell of Lochow, ancestor of the Argyll family. (The first documented appearance of the Campbells, however, is in Ayrshire, 1263 ; *Scots Peerage*, I, 319 : a fact not noticed in many clan accounts). The lands of "Dugalli de Craginis" were included in the sheriffdom of Argyll or Lorne, 1292 (*Highland Papers*, II, 115). Between 1361 and 1510 no head of the Craignish family was called Dugal, but some were called Donald, and the patronymic derived from this, McDonil, sometimes makes for confusion. Corvorran, or Corvorranmore, lies on the south side of the Craignish peninsula below Barrfad. The barony of Craignish had been resigned to Sir Colin Campbell of Lochow by Christian, only surviving child of Sir Dugal Campbell, on 11 November 1361 (*MSHC* p. 292, appendix D, 3). Ronald, son of Malcolm of Craignish, had a precept of sasine of Corvorranmore on 18 June 1412, and of the superiority of Barrichbeyan on 4 June 1414 (pp. 292-3, appendix D, 4, 5). In the sixteenth century Corvorranmore was held by the descendants of Archibald (the eldest son in 1497 of John M'Coul Cragnich of Corwarran—p. 288, appendix C, 7) whose legitimate descendants, according to the Advocate, died out by 1547 (p. 236). The Donald of the resignations of 1493 and 1497 was evidently Archibald's younger brother, and to his posterity Barrichbeyan descended. They later re-acquired Craignish, and their descendants are recognised by the Lyon Court as the representatives of the family (see references in note 1, above).

4 According to the Craignish account in Tweed's book (see note 5 below) Duncan MacGeill married Effreta, younger daughter of Sir Dugal (Tweed, p. 92 and 101) but the Advocate's history does not mention her.

5 This survives in a copy which purports to have been made, with additions dated 13 February 1795, by Sir James Campbell of Inverneill, Duncan's elder brother. It appears to be written in the same hand as the endorsements on the documents presented here. A very inaccurate transcript (lacking the appendixes) unfortunately found its way into print in *The House of Argyll and Collateral Branches of the Clan Campbell*, published by John Tweed (Glasgow, 1871); for example, "killed in Java by the slaves" (Tweed, p. 119) should read "killed in Jura by the Shaws" (cf. *MSHC*, p. 242) ; "Eliza daughter of James Foster of Dunoon" (Tweed, p. 116) should read "Elizabeth, eldest daughter of James Fisher of Durren" (fol. 32 of the ms.) ; nor is there any evidence that "James Campbell, a major in the army" (*i.e.* Sir James himself, who was a major in the West Fencibles) was the father of twins ; his youngest son was named Lorne, not John, and his youngest daughter, Anne (b. 8 August 1783) was not married to Campbell of Succoth (Tweed, p. 117) ; her husband (m. in Bengal, 1803) was Wigram Money (Inverneill family mss.). The passage in Tweed on pp. 111-112 concerning the origins of the "Clan Chairlich" Campbells, from whom the Inverneills descend, is, in particular, a most notable misquotation and twisting of the original passage in *MSHC*, p. 208 ; it is given much more correctly, although not entirely so, in Commissary Duncan's "Geneology." The Craignish tree reproduced in Tweed appears to be a copy of one belonging to the Inverneill family and drawn up about 1785. Archibald Macnab, of Penmore, Isle of Mull, who supplied Tweed with materials for his book, including this tree, was probably a relative of the Inverneills.

6 See also *MSHC*, pp. 214 and 282, appendix B, 97 ; and, for the MacRaes' version of the relationship, *Highland Papers*, I, 206.