



NE. 26. d. 2(1-4).

National Library of Scotland



\*B000108239\*

362  
10/  
3





---

---

REMARKS ON THE TABLES

OF THE

HEIRS OF THE ROYAL HOUSE OF BALIOL.

BY

ALEXANDER SINCLAIR.

---

---

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF SCOTLAND  
13 MY 1974

## REMARKS, &c.

---

In the first Table, John Baliol makes himself heir to King David I.; but he had no occasion to show that, through that king's mother, Queen Margaret, wife to Malcolm III., he represented the Saxon Kings of England, she being sister and heir of Edgar Atheling, the rightful Saxon King.

As I have reason to think that the fear of being diffuse has led me into the opposite extreme, I propose showing that the subject of the Royal family of Baliol, and their rightful successors, is far from being exhausted by what I have given. I shall proceed to sketch out a brief account of the personages in the main line, who might have been kings and queens, if every one had his (or her) own. But first must come a passing notice of the last two Baliols, who were actually crowned, but were both so quickly relieved of the thorny honour. I. John, fourth, but only surviving son of John Baliol, Lord of Bernard Castle, by the munificent Dervorgilda, foundress of Baliol College, Oxford, and heiress of the kingdom of Scotland, had a decision in his favour by King Edward I., the usurping Lord Paramount, and plausible umpire. He was crowned king at Scone, 30th November 1292, and did homage to his assumed liege Lord, 26th December afterwards, when the amount of fees was fixed for the first time, showing that the service was new. Edward expected unbounded gratitude and subserviency for giving him his own; and when he showed symptoms of uneasiness at the oppressive yoke, he humbled his protégé by injuries and affronts to such an unbearable extent, that he drove his victim into resistance. In 1294 Edward was at war with France, and Baliol and Philip IV., the Fair, next year, made a treaty, the origin of these honourable but ruinous alliances which so long tied Scotland to France, often without a faithful

return. Baliol then contracted his son Edward, very young, to Philip's niece, Princess Isabel of Valois, who was only two years old, and was to have 25,000 crowns, 23d October 1295. But when Baliol sank next year, the king thought this premature match a needless sacrifice, and married her, in 1296, aged three, to John, III. Duke of Bretagne, aged ten! It is amusing to see Baliol stating that he felt "grievously offended at the undutiful behaviour of Edward to the King of France, his liege Lord." Baliol, at the instigation of Parliament, dismissed all the English at Court. He renounced allegiance and fealty to Edward, 5th April 1296, declaring, that "when he made remonstrances, Edward, instead of redressing, had continually aggravated the injuries." But after invading England, both west and east, he was summoned by his irresistible foe, and, after a contemptuous defiance,\* was compelled to implore mercy. He performed a most humiliating feudal penance. "Led by force, and fear of his life," he resigned Scotland to his liege Lord, Edward, 2d July 1296, and Philip beheld his ruin with the indifference of an unconcerned spectator. Thus fell King John Baliol from an eminence which he had bartered his honour, and the independence of his country, unworthily to attain. He died in obscurity in 1314, leaving two sons—1. Edward, of whom afterwards; 2. Henry, killed in the surprise at Annan, 1332.

In December 1331 the young David Bruce was crowned, and the Regent Earl of Moray died next year, under suspicion of poison. Edward Baliol, son of the pseudo King John, was then living at his place in Normandy, where he had begun, in 1330, to intrigue with the English Barons, whom the Bruces had dispossessed of estates in Scotland. In 1332 Baliol was imprisoned and forfeited by the King of France, for executing a Frenchman, but liberated by interest of Lord Beaumont, one of the disinherited party. Edward III. was bound by the treaty of Northampton not to disturb his brother-in-law and sister, but he connived at troops being raised in England, then disavowed and forbade it. They, however, landed in Fife, and in consequence of the defeat of

\* When Baliol refused to obey Edward I., he exclaimed, "Ha! ce fol felon tel folie foict. S'il ne vould venit a nous, nous viendrons a lui."

the Bruce party at the battle of Dupplin, 11th August 1332, Edward Baliol, in three weeks from his landing, was apparently in quiet possession of Scotland. He was crowned at Scone, 24th September 1332. He did homage to his ally and liege Lord, Edward III., in gratitude for the sufferance of our Lord the King, according to a compact, whereby he accepted of a crown upon terms which no gentleman would have agreed to for a private estate. Lulled into a fatal security, he was preparing to keep Christmas near Annan, when, after less than two months reign, he was surprised by the Regents of young King David II.; his only brother, Henry Baliol, was killed, and he fled to Carlisle half drest, on horseback, without bridle or saddle, 16th December 1332. He took refuge at Morholm with his cousin, Christiana de Lindsay, Lady of Lamberton, whose mother was his aunt, Ada de Baliol, of whom afterwards, as carrying on the line of heirs.

Next year, after the bloody battle of Hallidonhill, 19th July, he was restored, and Edward III. had the gratification of learning that King David and his young wife, Edward's own sister, Joan of England, had to take refuge in France.

In 1334, the succession of the Moubray family gradually embroiled Scotland, and, after an accumulation of sudden reverses, Baliol was again a fugitive imploring help, which he got, on the base condition of surrendering a large portion of the south of Scotland, including Edinburgh, to England for ever! He thus got back to his mutilated kingdom in 1335; and it is needless to follow his rapid vicissitudes. Edward III. wished to drop him in 1336, and, suspecting his allegiance, recalled him to England in 1338, when he began the French wars. He had a command against the Scots in their invasion of England in 1344. He was present at the conferences for restoring King David in 1350-1, and protested against it. After this he appears no more. He died 6th September 1365, childless, having married Margaret, daughter of Philip I., Prince of Tarentum. She was niece of his first affianced bride, by her mother Catherine de Valois, titular Empress of Constantinople, who was half-sister of Isabel and of King Philip VI. After his death she allied

herself, contrary to the wishes of her family, to Francis de Baux, Duke of Andria, and had a son, James, who enjoyed the empty title of Emperor of Constantinople. This proves that Catherine d'Artois, Countess of Aumâle, could not be his widow, more especially as she herself did not lose her husband of Aumâle till 1368, three years later!

John Baliol's posterity being now extinct, and his eldest sister, Margaret, having had no family, we now come to the next sister, Ada, and her heirs, as having the right to succeed. The ancient "Bowes' MSS.," which Mr Surtees, the eminent antiquarian and historian of Durham, considered good authority, makes her the second of the four sisters, and wife to Sir William de Lindsay, by whom she had an only daughter, Christiana, who married Ingelram, Sire de Coucy. What puts this beyond a doubt is the recognised claim of her descendant, Raoul de Coucy, as heir in France to Edward Baliol in the Barony of Baliol in Normandy. From the very interesting work of Lord Lindsay, the "Lives of the Lindsays," we find that this Sir William was Lord of Lambertton, and had immense estates for a noble who had only the baronial rank. He was the head of that ancient and great house, and died in 1283, being killed in battle against Llewellyn, Prince of Wales, leaving an only child, Christiana. From successive intermarriages with heiresses, his vast possessions in England extended over 17 manors, besides numberless towns, lands, and hamlets, but in Scotland he had properties in 25 counties!

This great heiress, Christiana de Lindsay, went to the Court of King Alexander III., her cousin, and he married her, two years after, in 1285, to his own cousin-german, Ingelram de Guines, who had been brought up in the Scotch Court. His mother, Alice de Coucy, wife of Arnold III., Count of Guines, being sister of Mary de Coucy, Queen of Scotland, the king's mother.\* They were daughters of Ingelram de Coucy, styled the Great, the most renowned of a race of heroes, who died in 1242, by a fall from his horse, when his sword passed through his body. He invented the family boast,

\* This is proved by an old work, "Le Lignage de Coucy," in 1303.

“ Je ne suis roi ni duc ni compte aussy,  
Je suis le Sire de Coucy.”

His two sons both died childless. Raoul was slain performing prodigies of valour at Massoura in 1250, and Ingelram IV., in 1311, left the Sirerie of Coucy to his nephew, Ingelram de Guines, who consequently founded the second race, almost as distinguished as the first.

From the Preuves it is evident that both races styled themselves Sire de Coucy, whenever French was the language used, but by others they were Seigneur. Ingelram, V. Sire de Coucy, who kept his paternal surname of Guines all his life, died in 1321, and Christiana died in 1335. She is sometimes called de Guines, de Lindsay, and de Bailleul, but never de Coucy. Their son, William, Sire de Coucy, etc., died the same year as his mother, 1335, and, as an alien, got none of the vast British possessions of which she was heiress. In 1311 he married Isabel de Chatillon, daughter of Gui, Count of St Pol, Butler of France, by Princess Mary of Bretagne, a descendant of the Royal family of France, and granddaughter of King Henry III. of England. The contract was made in the presence of King Philip IV., the dowry 20,000 livres tournois. He died in 1335. She was still living in 1351. They had two sons—1. Ingelram VI.; 2. Raoul, Seigneur de Montmirail, who, on the death of Edward Baliol in 1365, claimed the barony of Bailleul en Vimeu, and obtained it “comme plus proche heritier,”—his elder brother having then been dead 18 years, though leaving a son. In his pleadings he stated that Christine de Bailleul, his grandmother, was niece to John de Bailleul, King of Scotland, father of the said Edward. He was afterwards styled Dominus de Ballolio, or Baillolio. He proved what was not true, Christiana being not niece by her father, but by her mother.\*

Ingelram, VI. Sire de Coucy, etc., succeeded his father in 1335, and soon after King Philip VI. procured him, as his cousin, a great marriage with a Princess of Austria, and became answerable for her dowry to the extent of 40,000 livres tournois, in January 1337. She was Cathe-

\* History of the House of Chatillon, p. 298.

rine, daughter and co-heir of the deceased Leopold, Archduke of Austria, and granddaughter of Albert I., Emperor of Germany. He lived not long afterwards, dying prematurely in 1344, leaving, by Catherine, his wife, a child, Ingelram VII. She married, 2dly, a German, Count Conrad, and died in 1350.

Ingelram, VII. Sire de Coucy, etc., succeeded very young. The renewal of the connection of the house of Coucy with England in his time, arose from John, King of France, having been taken prisoner at the battle of Poitiers in 1356. On a treaty for his release in 1360, the Sire de Coucy went as one of his hostages; and King Edward III. was so taken with him, that he gave him in marriage his second daughter, Princess Isabel. He created him Earl of Bedford in 1365, and Knight of the Garter, and gave him large grants of land, most of which were bestowed on him as the king's son-in-law, and as heir to Christiana de Lindesey. In 1367, with leave of King Charles V., he bought the county of Soissons, in France, from its Count, Gui de Blois, another hostage. After this he is indiscriminately called Earl of Bedford, Count of Soissons, and Sire de Coucy, according to the place of the transaction. When war broke out between England and France he retired to Italy, and fought there. In 1378 he claimed the Duchy of Austria by force of arms, but unsuccessfully. Afterwards he sent his wife, Isabel, to England, where she died.

The king intended him to be Constable of France, but he declined it in favour of Oliver de Clisson. He afterwards married his second wife, Isabel, daughter of John, I. Duke of Lorraine. He was made Grand Butler of France in 1384. The Duke of Burgundy prayed him to take the command of an expedition against the Infidels, with the charge of his sons, as he was "le plus usitè et constumier en toutes choses sur tous les Chevaliers de France." The army departed in 1395, but were entirely defeated by the Turks at Nicopolis, and the Earl of Bedford and most of the chiefs were taken prisoners. He died in February 1396, leaving three daughters, of whom only the eldest, Mary, had descendants in 1411. The second was Philippa, wife of Robert de Vere,

Earl of Oxford and Duke of Ireland, the great favourite of King Richard II. She carried to him the English lands which had been granted as her mother's dowry; but he deserted her for a mean rival, and she had no issue. The third daughter, Isabel, was by his second wife. She was married to Philip, Count of Nevers, and their only child, Margaret, died young, in 1411.

Mary, Countess of Soissons, Dame de Coucy, was chief heiress, and her son became sole heir to her father. She married, in his lifetime, Henry de Bar, eldest son of Robert, I. Duke of Bar, by Princess Mary of France, daughter of King John. He died in the expedition into Hungary with his father-in-law in 1396, leaving an only child, Robert de Bar. She survived, and in 1400 sold Coucy, la Fere, and Marle, to Louis, Duke of Orleans, for 400,000 livres tournois. She died in 1404, the same year as her mother-in-law, the Duchess of Bar.

Robert de Bar did not succeed to Coucy, as his mother had sold it; but the Chatellanie of Marle having been found to belong to his aunt, Isabel, he inherited it from her daughter, Margaret of Nevers, and King Charles erected it into a county in 1413. Except the barony of Oisy, Robert got no part of the inheritance of the House of Bar when the Duke, his grandfather, died in 1411, because his father having died before him, the Duke's second son, Philip, was nearer in blood, and succeeded to the Duchy—another instance of privation being added to misfortune, and of longevity being rewarded, as by the common law continued to be the case in Scotland to our own time.

Robert, Count of Marle and Soissons, in 1409, married Jeanne de Bethune, Vicomtesse de Meaux, an inheritance from a branch of the House of Coucy. He died in 1409, leaving an only daughter, Jeanne de Bar.

Jeanne de Bar, Countess of Marle and Soissons, married Louis de Luxemburg, Count of St Paul, Brienne, etc., famous as the ambitious Constable of France in the time of King Louis XI., who, according to Quentin Durward, thought *his head* might have been useful at a conference, if it were only separate from the body. He was a partisan of Charles the

Bold, Duke of Burgundy. His sister, Jaqueline de Luxemburg, was wife to the celebrated John, Duke of Bedford, Regent of France, for his nephew, King Henry VI., and who, by her second marriage, was mother of Elizabeth Woodville, Queen of King Edward IV. Louis's exploits terminated as the king wished, by his being decapitated in 1476, leaving a son, Peter, his heir.

Peter de Luxemburg, Count of St Paul, and five other places, was Knight of the Golden Fleece. He married Margaret, daughter of Louis, Duke of Savoy, by Princess Anne of Cyprus, and he died in 1482, leaving only two daughters, of whom the younger, Frances, had no family. Marie de Luxemburg, Countess of St Paul, etc., married—1. her uncle, James of Savoy, Count of Romont, who soon after died, in 1486, leaving only a daughter, Louise, Countess of Nassau, who had no issue. 2. Francis de Bourbon, Count of Vendôme. They had a son, Charles, Duke of Vendôme, father of Anthony, King of Navarre, and grandfather of Henry IV., King of France. It would be utterly superfluous to give his history, or that of his successors, down to Henry V., Count de Chambord. I shall only mention one curious circumstance regarding the marriage of King Louis XIV., that he was present himself, but incognito, not interfering at all with his proxy, Don Louis de Haro, the Spanish Ambassador.

In the succession to Cicely de Baliol, another curious question arises twice in one family, viz., What are the rights of nearer heirs of the half blood, in preference to more remote relations of the whole blood? Without going through the proof of the whole line, I shall come at once to Joan de la Warre (in the Table, fifth from Cicely), daughter of Roger, III. Lord de la Warre, who was one of the captors of King John at Poitiers, in 1356, and got an addition to his arms. She was his only daughter by his second wife; but he had by his first wife two sons, John, IV. Lord; and Thomas, V. Lord, who both died without issue. Thomas was a priest, and on his death, in 1426, the succession opened to his only sister, Joan, who was married to Thomas, Lord West; but, because she was not by the same mother as her brothers, though the question was simply as to the father's heritage, John

Griffin, descended from her greataunt Catherine, under the plea of being related by the whole blood, was found to be heir of Thomas. Nevertheless, Reginald West, the son of Joan, was summoned to Parliament, and rightfully became VI. Lord de la Warre.

The next case arose thus:—Thomas, VIII. Lord de la Warre, had two wives. By the first he had a son, Thomas, IX. Lord, and four daughters. By the second he had a large family of sons and daughters. Thomas, IX. Lord, only son of the first wife, died without issue in 1554, when his sisters, or their children,\* were found to be his heirs of the whole blood; but they, again, did not get the title, which went to the children of the half-brother. The next brother was Sir Owen West, who was next in the entail by Act of Parliament, in 1549, but died before him, in 1551, leaving an only daughter, Mary, who, as the peerages were female inheritances, should have succeeded her uncle. She was married to Sir Adrian Poynings, who is alleged to have been an alien, and they had only three daughters, who were entirely passed over, though two of them had descendants. The next brother, Sir George West, also died before the peer, leaving a son, William, who ultimately became the heir. It is remarkable that he was brought up by his uncle, Thomas, as his heir, but, weary of waiting for the succession, he prepared poison to hasten the wished-for event. Being, on this account, discarded by his uncle, he procured an Act of Parliament to prevent his succession; but he afterwards recovered character so far as to be created Lord de la Warre, by a new patent, in 1568, and was also restored in blood. From this it might be supposed that his title, as heir-male, was not completely recognised, on account of his nieces' claims. But in pardoning his misconduct, the mistake was of service in making him appear to be the rightful heir but for his crime, and his son, Thomas, the next Lord, got the precedency of his ancestors by an erroneous judgment of Parliament, and his lineal heir-male is now Earl de la Warre.

\* One of these was Joan, wife of John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, daughter of Eleanor, Lady Guldeford.

The succession of the title of De la Warre for nearly 600 years, sufficiently proves this pedigree.

The next great line is from Dervorgilda de Burgh, and is fully given in the first part by many authorities;\* and the descent of the Lords Morley for 300 years, to Catherine Parker, Countess of Rivers, establishes the succession down to her father, the celebrated Lord Monteaule, the inadvertent vehicle of the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, in 1605.

There is usually a mistake made as to the wife of Thomas, IV. Lord Morley, as it is impossible from chronology that Robert, his eldest son, could be by Anne le de Spenser, as she was not a widow, free to marry Lord Morley, till 1386, long after the birth of Robert, in 1370. The wife of Thomas, V. Lord, was sister of William, Duke of Suffolk. The descendants of Catherine, Countess of Rivers, were very numerous, but appear now to be limited to the three branches given in the Table.

The heirs of Mary Baliol, through the Cumyns, Lords of Badenoch, were long restricted to the two main lines. She married the 1st Black John Cumyn; and her son, who married a relation of King Henry III., was the Red John, slain in the church at Dumfries by Robert Bruce, on account of his being an unswerving adherent of Baliol. The elder line split on the death of Thomas, V. Lord Burgh; and I have limited myself to the direct heirs of his three daughters who had issue.

The Strathbolgy Earls of Athol were not very steady in their allegiance, but were generally on the Baliol, or English side, and sat as Earls in the Parliament of England.

The last line is that which comes to the renowned John Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, whose heirs continued the representation till 1616. It then went to Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel (the dukedom of Norfolk being suspended), and is now divided between Lords Stourton and Petre. The present Earl of Shrewsbury is heir-male of that heroic Earl, and the Duke of Norfolk is heir-male of the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, and of the Talbot heiress.

\* Salmon's History of Herts, p. 192; Clutterbuck's do.; Pere Anselme; Histoire Genealogique, etc., Article Clare.

THE recent re-creation of the Dukedom of Gordon has led to a discussion as to who had the best claim to have an extinct title renewed, whether in the direct heir-of-line or a collateral heir-male.

In ancient times, there is no doubt that everything was descendible to heirs-female whenever they happened to represent a family either in the Crown, the greatest office of Constable, or the original thirteen Earls, five hundred years ago. These were all inherited by heiresses (many of them repeatedly) except the very ancient Earldom of March, which was destined to heirs-general by settlement, in 1368, but was forfeited before an heiress had ever occurred.

About the time of the Bruces, 1306-1370, a change began, arising from the pride of some of the chief families, who wanted to keep their properties in their own names, and make restrictive limitations to heirs-male.

Of these, which were, in fact, for a long period the exceptions, I shall now slightly advert to a few instances, chronologically, to show how the new system crept in.

1. Bruce, Earl of Carric, about 1313.
2. Keith (afterwards Earl Marischal), 1324.
3. Douglas, afterwards Earl of Douglas, 1342.
4. Lindsay, afterwards Earl of Crawford, 1381.

I propose to reserve for the present the sketches of these four cases, and proceed with a summary of the interesting historical adventures and character of the Earls of Huntly, Marquises of Huntly, and Dukes of Gordon, showing the succession of perils they surmounted, even down to Alexander, 2nd Duke.

The Charters of the lands and Earldom are discussed separately. The detailed descent and connections have been also already given, and this, therefore, is only a selection of romantic events.

Died 1470.—Alexander, the 1st Earl of Huntly, was created in 1445, to assist King James II. against the unruly Earls of Crawford, Douglas, and Ross, Lord of the Isles.

He fought the battle of Arbroath in 1445–6 against the Earl of Crawford, who was killed, but his son was victorious. He again, at Brechin, encountered the Earl, who succeeded and defeated him with great slaughter. The King gave him many lands for having kept the Crown on his head. He had three wives.

Died 1501.—George, 2nd Earl, supported King James IV., was King's Lieutenant in the North, and High Chancellor. He also had three wives, and was proverbially fickle.

Died 1524.—Alexander, 3rd Earl, succeeded in 1501. He got the King's consent to restore the settlement of the Earldom to heirs-general in 1505; and Strathbogy was henceforth to be the Earldom of Huntly. Some of his old Charters were soon after burnt in his lodging in Edinburgh, and the King gave him a renewal. He, and his wife and son, agreed with John, the Earl of Athol, to surrender Balveny, the last heritage of the Earls of Douglas, which should have descended to them from her mother, the Earl of Athol's first wife. He escaped the slaughter of Flodden, 1513, and became the chief leader in the North. He died in 1524.

His eldest son, John, Lord Gordon, died seven years before him, having married Margaret Stewart, natural daughter of King James IV., by Margaret Drummond, whom the King wished to marry, but who was poisoned in 1501. By her he had a son, George, who succeeded his grandfather as 4th Lord in 1524, when he was still young.

George, 4th Earl, was the greatest man in the North. When he was Lieutenant-General he defeated the English

at Haddenrig in 1542, was made Chancellor in 1546, taken prisoner at Pinkie 1547, escaped 1548. He was made Knight of St Michael in France. When asked to favour Queen Mary's marriage to Edward, son of King Henry VIII., he said "he did not mislike the match so much as the way of wooing." He was imprisoned, but speedily released. He joined the Lords of the Congregation, but was not with them. He was courted and feared by both the contending parties, so they connived at his encroachments. When the Queen Regent made a royal progress to the North with Monsieur D'Oysel, the French Envoy, he treated them in so princely a manner that he advised her to humble him. Queen Mary afterwards carried out this plan, and took from him the Earldom of Moray and gave it to her natural brother James, soon afterwards her Regent and her jailer. Earl George was highly exasperated, but his treatment in the feud with the Ogilvies was the crowning blow. He took up arms, and was defeated and slain at Corrichie, and his body ignominiously carried to Aberdeen.

George, 5th Earl, became heir to his father in 1562, when the family was struck down in rebellion, and he had to fly. He had been married in 1558 to Anne Hamilton, daughter of James, Duke of Chatelherault, so he took refuge with him after Corrichie, but he sent him to Dunbar, where he was imprisoned. He was tried, convicted of treason, and sentenced to be executed 8th February 1562-3. But Queen Mary sent him back to perpetual imprisonment in Dunbar, and he was soon liberated and appointed High Chancellor as Earl of Huntly, 20th March 1565, though his own and his father's forfeitures were not then rescinded, which was not till 19th April 1567, when the whole family were restored by Act of Parliament. He was reconciled to the Earl of Moray, and at his first Parliament as Regent he carried the sceptre. Next year he joined the Association for Queen Mary, but after the defeat at Langside he again made peace with the Regent. On his assassination he armed again, and the Regent Lennox proclaimed him a

traitor. He submitted in 1573, on a pacification with the Regent Morfon, and had an indemnity. He retired to Huntly, where he died suddenly in May 1576. His death was mysterious. He never was merrier or better in health than that morning, when he had a passing visit from the Earl and Countess of Sutherland (his sister, formerly the wife of Bothwell, divorced from him to make way for his marrying Queen Mary). After their departure in the afternoon, at a game at bowls, he became violently ill, and in a very few hours he was dead. No inquiry followed. His son George, 6th Earl, was then a minor. His marriage belonged to the Chancellor John, 4th Earl of Athol (the husband of his aunt), but who was poisoned at an entertainment he gave at Stirling in 1579. The young Earl was free to marry Lady Henrietta Stuart, daughter of Egme, Duke of Lennox, King James's cousin, and greatest of all his favourites, 21st July 1588. She must have been then very young. He entered into the Popish Spanish plot—raised the standard of rebellion in the North with the Earls of Angus and Errol. When the King marched against them he surrendered, and again his Sovereign would not allow sentence to be passed against a Huntly. He was liberated, and employed against the Earl of Bothwell, but took the opportunity to burn his enemy the Earl of Moray's house at Dunibersel, when that Earl was slain in 1591-2. He was so handsome that the King was jealous of him, and he certainly let off his lieutenant very easily for his death. The young Earl of Moray was inhibited to pursue the Earl of Huntly for his father's slaughter, because he was then wardit in the Castle of Blackness to abide his trial, as he had only acted on the King's Majesty's commission. Nothing further followed, but the Earl was liberated without trial, and James, Earl of Moray, married in 1601 Huntly's eldest daughter Anne. Next year he and the Earl of Errol, being Popishly affected, were cited, and denounced rebels, but they were reconciled soon after to the King's favour. In 1594 they refused terms, and were

again forfeited for the Spanish plot. They raised a large force, which routed the King's army, under the Earl of Argyle, at Glenlivet, 3rd October 1594. The King came with an army; Huntly submitted, and accepted banishment; and on his way abroad was received by the King, first at Falkland, August 1596, and again at Holyrood House, on the 19th December 1597. The forfeiture of the three Popish Earls being repealed, the King went in state to Parliament. Angus bore the crown, Huntly the sceptre, and Errol the sword, 5th March 1597. In a proclamation on Papacy, and the negotiations with the Earl of Huntly concerning Dunibersel, the Ministers inhibited to speik of the King nor of the Court, "and nae man to troubill the Earl of Huntlie, nor none of his." He got a grant of the dissolved Abbey of Dunfermline, and was created Marquis of Huntly 15th April 1599. He was summoned and excommunicated by the General Assembly for encouraging Popery, committed to Stirling Castle in 1609, but liberated on engagement next year, 1610. He was again imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle, but freed in three days. He was absolved by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1616, which, after long negotiation, the General Assembly confirmed. In 1630, the Earl of Moray complained to King Charles that the greatness of the family in the North was insupportable. King Charles took this insidious and selfish counsel, deprived him of the Sheriffships of Aberdeen and Inverness, which were given to the Earl, his enemy, for £5000. But what embittered the last years of his life, and, indeed, caused his death, arose from the mysterious burning of the house of Frendraught, on the 8th October 1630, when his son John, Viscount Melgam, whom he had directed to convoy Crichton of Frendraught home, and his party, were the sole victims. Even Frendraught himself was suspected, as he and his wife saw the Viscount at the window, and did nothing to help. In revenge the Gordons plundered Frendraught repeatedly. He tried to make the Marquis responsible, and obtained a decret for 200,000 marks for

skaith, and another 100,000 pounds for spoliation, but little followed upon these charges.

“The Marquis took the death of his lawful brother’s son and brother’s oy to heart, but in all his life, do his best, he could never get trial of this murder, who extended his moyan to the full thereanent; so he died without revenge. Some thought this strange, that the great Marquis of Huntly should see his blood destroyed without trial or reparation.”

The Marquis, in his old age and infirmity, had several times to travel to Edinburgh, once even during a long continued storm. He was ordered to enter his person in ward in Dumbarton Castle. He was stormstaid in his own house of Melgyne, but reached Edinburgh in February 1635. He compears before the Council, and is ordered, under pain of a hundred thousand pounds, to stop the course of their broken men, and to pay Frendraught for his skaith.

Upon the 16th May he at length got home.

15th July starts for Edinburgh, reports to the Lords, who are pleased.

25th August gets home, and is again summoned to appear.

The Marquis set himself to obey, and in the dead of the year, in tempestuous weather, he and his lady went by chariot to Edinburgh, and again compeared before the Council. He was confronted, face to face, with Captain Adam Gordon (chief of the broken men), who had confessed anent the wrongs done to Frendraught. He was made responsible for the broken men, because they were Gordons. The Marquis came out discontented. The Chancellor (Archbishop Spotswood) had him to dinner, and then the Chancellor commanded him to enter his person in ward within the Castle of Edinburgh, to be kept in close prison, not seeing daylight, but served with candlelight. The Lords refused to let the Lady Marchioness go to the Castle with her husband unless she would ward also, and with great entreaty had the favour to Yool (Christmas) with

him, but to stay no longer. In March he made moyan to be removed out of the Castle, and dwell in his lady's lodgings in the Canongate, and within two miles, during the King's pleasure. In June the Earl of Traquair came, as Treasurer, with a letter from the King to the Council to set the Marquis and those with him at liberty, since he understood them to be innocent, after being a prisoner for six months, at the age of seventy-three! When King Charles allowed such cruelty to be perpetrated against one of the greatest and most loyal of his subjects, at the age of seventy-three, he little thought of Carisbrook and Whitehall. The Marquis disdained all matters with Frendraught *simpliciter*, but Frendraught got decreets against him for 200,000 marks for skaith, and 100,000 pounds for spoliation.

The Marquis, finding himself getting weaker, desired to be at home, and was carried from his lodging in the Canon-gate in a wand bed, in his chariot, to Dundee, in Robert Murray's house. But now his hour is come; further he could not go, and having declared his mind to his lady and friends, recommends his soul to God, and, on 13th June 1636, departed this life—a Roman Catholic, aged seventy-four,—to the great grief of his friends and lady, who had lived with him many years, both in prosperity and adversity.

“This Marquis was of a great spirit, for in time of trouble he was of invincible courage, and boldly bare down all his enemies; he was never inclined to war himself, but by the pride and influence of his kin, was diverse times drawn into troubles, whilk he did bear through valiantly. He loved not to be in the law contending against any man, but loved rest and quietness with all his heart, and in time of peace he lived moderately and temperately in his diet, and fully set to building and planting of all curious devices; a good neighbour in his marches—disposed rather to give than take a foot of ground wrongously; he was heard to say he never drew sword in his own quarrel; in his youth, a prodigal spender; in his old age, more wise and worldly, yet never counted for cost in matters of credit and honour;

a great householder; a terror to his enemies, whom he ever with his prideful kin held under subjection and obedience; just in all his bargains, and never heard for his true debt; he was mightily envied by the kirk for his religion, and by others for his greatness, and had thereby much trouble; his master King James loved him dearly, and he was a good and loyal subject unto him during the King's lifetime; but now at last in his latter days, by means of Fren draught, he is so persecuted by the laws (which he ay studied to hold in due reverence), that he is compelled to travel without pity so often to Edinburgh, and now end his days out of his own house, without trial of the fire of Fren draught, whilk doubtless was an help to his death; the Lord Gordon, his eldest son, with his lady and two sons, and his daughter Lady Ann, being at this time in France."

Four months afterwards, his son George, now 2nd Marquis of Huntly, came from France, and went home. He had married, in 1607, Lady Ann Campbell, daughter of Archibald, 7th Earl of Argyll, whom his father had defeated at Glenlivet in 1594. She was then thirteen. He was involved in all the troubles of King Charles's reign. George, 2nd Marquis, was declared a rebel, because the King, then in the hands of the real rebels, had ordered him to lay down his arms, and he would not obey. He was excepted from pardon, and soon afterwards taken prisoner, sent to the Castle and Tolbooth of Edinburgh in December 1647, tried 16th March 1649, condemned and beheaded on the 22nd, two months after his master. He had also to resist the hostility of Fren draught, who got the decrees against his father revived and renewed, but he made very little progress as to payment. He and his son, George, Lord Gordon, were imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle in May 1639, but released in June. As King's Lieutenant in the North he took up arms, and was excommunicated in 1645, taken prisoner in 1647, and beheaded 22nd March 1649, two months after the King.

His eldest son, George, Lord Gordon, was killed at the battle of Alford in 1645.

James, Viscount Aboyne, second son, but eldest after his brother's death. He was declared a traitor, excommunicated, and died in France upon hearing of the King's execution.

Lewis, third son, succeeded.

Charles, fourth son, was created Earl of Aboyne.

The 5th Earl, his great-great-grandson, succeeded, as heir-male, as 9th Marquis.

Lewis, 3rd Marquis, succeeded in the troubles, and was proclaimed a traitor in 1649, but restored by King Charles II. during his brief rule in Scotland in 1651.

Regarding Lewis, Marquis of Huntly, a curious piece of history is recorded by James Gordon of Letterfurie—that Archibald, Marquis of Argyll, invited him to an interview at Castle Finlurge, to settle family affairs, when they were not to have more than eighty attendants each; but when he got there he found Argyll had several hundreds close at hand. Huntly was coerced into signing several "writs, to the great prejudice of his interest and family." He married Isabel, daughter of Sir John Grant of Grant, and had a son, George, his heir. He was, like the rest of his family, in many trials before and after 1651, till his death. In a letter from his brother George, 8th November 1644, he is called "my foulische brother," when he had heard of his being engaged in an unpromising adventure.

George, 4th Marquis, aged three, nominally succeeded in minority when the affairs of the family were still at the lowest, the debt to the Marquis of Argyll being, in 1650, a million of merks, the rent being 50,000 merks, of which 10,000 went to the family. Charles II.'s temporary restoration of his father was nullified by the defeat at Worcester, 1651; and Archibald, Lord Lorn, son of the Marquis of Argyll, lived in Gordon Castle as proprietor for many years, from 1653 to 1661. The restoration saved the family from this ruinous debt, as King Charles II., in 1661, on Argyll's

forfeiture, remitted the whole. Like many of his predecessors, he spent much of his youth in France. In October 1676 he married Lady Elizabeth Howard, daughter of Henry, 6th Duke of Norfolk, and *Earl of Norwich*.

I conclude with the graphic account of him in Macky's "Memoirs," written for the information of the Electress Sophia, in case she had survived Queen Anne, and become Queen:—

"DUKE OF GORDON.—Is grandson to the Marquis of Huntley, who was beheaded for King Charles the First. The estate of the family was then forfeited, and given to my Lord of Argyll, and the family divided, with a design of extirpation; but on the restoration of King Charles the Second, the honour, with the estate, was restored to this gentleman.

"He was bred up in the religion of his family, who had been always Roman Catholicks, and still showed his dislike to the measures of King James, for bringing that religion into Scotland again; especially the taking off the Penal-Laws and Tests.

"He was created a Duke, and Knight-Companion of the Thistle; and had the command of Edinburgh Castle, which he maintained at the Revolution against King William, till he obtained the gift made by King Charles, of his estate, confirmed and ratified also by King William, with a general pardon for all his family, and then surrendered it; having never received any order from King James, either for holding or giving it up.

"He came to London, and made his submission to King William, but not being received as he thought his service and the great power of his family deserved, he went privately into France, where he was also very coldly received, being denied admittance till he justified his conduct as to the surrender of Edinburgh Castle. He printed 'A Journal of that Siege,' in French, for the satisfaction of that Court; but this did not entirely reconcile him, therefore he left St Germain en Laye, and retired into Switzerland,

where he was taken prisoner, sent into Holland, and from thence transported into Scotland; where he hath led a very uneasy life ever since, being oftener a prisoner than at liberty.

“ He hath a great many good links in him, but they do not all make a complete chain.

“ He is certainly a very fine gentleman, and understands conversation, and the *Belles Lettres*; is well bred; made for the company of ladies; but is very covetous, which extremely eclipses him.

“ The priests, and new converts in King James’s reign, represented him to be a libertine and a fop, because he would not concur in their measures for ruling the kingdom; but his character coming from people of his own profession, made it pass current with those who did not know him.

“ He is a Roman Catholic, because he was bred so, but otherwise thinks very little of revealed religion.

“ He hath a good estate, which, notwithstanding his turns, he improves.

“ He is very handsome, and taller than the ordinary size; thin, dresses well, but is somewhat finical, resembling the French. Past fifty years old.”

With Alexander, 2nd Duke, ends the adventurous history of the family. Being, like his predecessors, a staunch supporter of the Stuarts, he took up arms for them, and was seized and imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle, but he was liberated without being tried. He succeeded his father the same year, and died in 1728. I refer to my sketch of the history of the family for the later descents, which are all explained in Burke or Lodge; but I give, in conclusion, an interesting anecdote as to the change of religion at this Duke’s death from Roman Catholic to Protestant.

A Protestant, who rented a small farm under Alexander, 2nd (Popish) Duke of Gordon, having fallen behind in his payments, a vigilant steward, in his Grace’s absence, seized the farmer’s stock, and advertised it to be sold by auction



on a fixed day. The Duke happily returned home in the interval, and the tenant went to him to supplicate for indulgence. "What is the matter, Donald?" said the Duke, as he saw him enter with sad downcast looks. Donald told him his sorrowful tale in a concise natural manner. It touched the Duke's heart, and produced a formal acquittance of the debt. Donald, as he cheerfully withdrew, was staring at the pictures and images which he saw in the Ducal hall, and expressed to the Duke, in a homely way, a wish to know what they were. "These," said the Duke, "are the saints who intercede with God for me." "My Lord Duke," said Donald, "would it not be better to apply yourself directly to God? I went to muckle Sawney Gordon, and to little Sawney Gordon; but if I had not come to your good Grace's self, I could not have got my discharge, and both I and my bairns had been turned out from house and home."

The Duke may have been impressed by this view of his tenant. His wife was a Protestant, Lady Henrietta Mordaunt, daughter of the celebrated Earl of Peterborough, whom he appointed guardian of his children, then all minors, and she educated them all in the Protestant faith. By descent from her mother, the estate of Durris descended to George, 5th Duke, after a prolonged lawsuit.

## CHRONOLOGICAL ABSTRACT OF THE CHARTERS OF HUNTLY.

---

IN early times patents were not invented. King James VI. first introduced them, when they were made additions to charters of lands, about 1581; and some time afterwards—within less than twenty years—they began to stand alone. While they were component parts of charters to lands, they were involved in all the capricious or political changes in family destinations, when each successor could, with the consent of the Sovereign, call in or leave out any of the heirs. The destinations in the Huntly family, from 1408 to 1505-6, were fluctuating and irregular, but afterwards the remainders to the Earldom remained unchanged from 1505-6.

1. Owing, apparently, to some scruples about the eldest son of the 1st Earl being disinherited, the first Charter of Strathbogy (afterwards Huntly) was to Alexander de Setoun, Lord of Gordon, himself for life, and then to George de Setoun, his son, born by Elizabeth, his spouse, and his heirs-male to be procreated; whom failing, etc., to Alexander's heirs whatsoever. This was confirmed to him 15th October 1446, as now Earl of Huntly.

2. But, three years afterwards, some change occurred, and Alexander, Earl of Huntly, surrendered his lands and Earldom to the King, and got a different Charter, with limitation to the children and heirs, born or to be born, by him and his wife Elizabeth, Countess of Huntly; whom

failing, to his heirs whatsoever, of the whole and entire Earldom of Huntly and the Lordship of Strathbogy, 29th January 1449. Thus lands and title were destined to heirs-general.

It should be mentioned here that the lands of Badenoch, granted by King James II. in compensation for a gift to Alexander, 1st Earl, was granted to heirs-male, the King reserving the possibility of its reverting to the Crown. It seems to have been the provision for the eldest son on his marriage, and, being in a distant part of the country, was kept distinct from Strathbogy.

3. The next important Charter of the Earldom was on the resignation of George, 2nd Earl of Huntly, after his separation from the Princess Annabella, his wife. It is to his and her eldest son, Alexander Gordon, his heir-apparent, and his heirs-male, born or to be born; whom failing, to the said Earl's heirs-male whatsoever, according to the form and tenor of the Charter of Entail made to the deceased Alexander, Earl of Huntly, and his heirs-male, by the deceased James II., King of the Scots; on Earl George's resignation. There is a singular piece of history involved in this reference. King James II.'s Charter was to "*prolibus et heredibus suis*," and there is not a word about *males*. It is an entire misquotation, and should be interpreted the other way. This was on the 13th January 1490. What makes it seem a mistake is, that Alexander, as Lord Gordon, or Master of Huntly, had several other Charters of lands to him and his heirs, such as Strathown, seven months afterwards.

4. The most important Charter was that he got four years after he succeeded his father in 1501, being the last, and consequently the regulating, Charter of Succession to this day for three hundred and seventy years, from 12th January 1505-6. It is, as usual, on the resignation of Alexander, 3rd Earl, to him AND HIS HEIRS, of the lands and barony of

Strathbogy, and “creating, uniting, annexing, and incorporating, the foresaid lands into one free Barony and Earldom, to be named the Barony and Earldom of Huntly, and the principal messuage of the same, which was formerly called Strathbogy, to be in all future time named the Castle of Huntly,” dated at Striveling, 12th January 1505. He had several other Charters to him and his heirs within three years before and after—one of Cullairlies, to be incorporated with the Earldom of Huntly; but it is needless to recite them, as they cannot affect the Earldom *itself*.

From that remote period till the death of George, 5th Duke of Gordon, in 1836, the male line continued unbroken, and the remainder, to heirs-general, emerged from abeyance, and came to the heir-female—the Duke of Richmond, whose son is now also Duke of Gordon, and, I contend, Earl of Huntly from 1445.

This descent of the Earldom of 1505 is not affected, in any way, by the subsequent creation of the 6th Earl to a Marquisate in 1599, about a century afterwards, by King James VI., by patent limiting the destination to heirs-male, which brought that title to George, 5th Earl of Aboyne, in 1836, but *leaves the Earldom to the heir-of-line*, the present Duke of Richmond and Gordon, under the last Charter in 1505.

47

## H A R V E S T.

---

Don't lose a day (or part of one) upon any pretext such as not beginning on a Friday, or the end of a week, or before it is all ripe, which is in fact producing one other evil. The great excuse for delay is the want of hands. The answer to that is, you should begin the sooner. Some people are grieved by their own head man. An obstinate man of the old school will trust to getting through somehow with his own hands. He will not secure people waiting to be hired. He gains a small sum in wages at the expense, or at least the risk, of the crops. He leaves ripe crops to stand exposed to bad weather, and the best part to be shaken, because it is not his way to pay wages he can keep in his pocket. He does not think of giving a premium to his own people to encourage them to extra exertion, and a later hour. Good weather seldom lasts when people play fast and loose with it. He won't begin till he can go through with

the cutting and reaping. Other excuses are—"Ou! it's no ready," "It will be better o' standing some days langer," and so it is landed in disastrous showers, making it far worse.

Sir David Hunter Blair said to his grieve "You are hiring twenty men for two days, get forty for one day." What an example! If farmers understood that when there is a morsel of yellow at the root of oats, it can gain no more by exposure, and that that species of crop and wheat also does not require to be dead ripe, but will get every good in the stook, they would surely be more diligent.

When Conacher the Distiller at Pitlochry, year after year, had his whole crop housed, and those around were arrested by bad weather, or some other source of delay, surely his neighbours had been negligent.

Mr Pople of the Birnam Hotel had his whole crop safe before this long batch of rain, damp, and fog began on the 21st, which stopped so many, and was so disastrous. When formerly a question arose about carrying before the cutting was finished, the manager was quite in favour of losing no time. He said, "One day's leading is worth two of cutting." In Forfarshire, long ago, were two neighbouring lairds. One had say 1200 acres, the

other had 300. They both began cutting on the same day. The smaller one reaped his whole crop, carried it, and went abroad. The other continued cutting without carrying, and when his neighbour came back, he found the whole crop still out—not a sheaf was carried. The great man had continued cutting till the rain began, and he had not had a chance since. If he had given a few hands from the cutting, and had thereby got the use of his horses and carts, he might have carried at least as much as his neighbour before the weather broke.









