

dale. At each of these places the river makes a bend, the land projects and causes the bends in the form of a snout. In ancient charters these place-names are written "Troun-tales."

6th APRIL, 1892.

At a meeting of the Society held on this date, a paper was read which was contributed by Mr Alexander Macpherson, solicitor, Kingussie, on "The Old Castles of Ruthven and the Lords of Badenoch."

13th APRIL, 1892.

At this meeting the Secretary read a paper contributed by Mr Alexander M. Mackintosh, London, on "Clan Chattan Genealogies." Mr Mackintosh's paper was as follows :—

CLAN CHATTAN GENEALOGIES.

The Clan Chattan is perhaps second to none in the number and value of its genealogical and historical manuscripts. Of its three principal divisions in modern times, the Mackintoshes and Farquharsons have two each, and the Macphersons one, all of distinct importance, while several of the families of the smaller septs have preserved pedigrees, carrying them back step by step to their respective stems, from which they struck out two or three centuries ago. Perhaps I may be allowed to refer as an example to the pedigree of my own branch of the Shaws. This came to me from a great-grand-aunt, who was daughter of Angus Shaw of Tordarroch, an officer of the Mackintosh regiment in the '15, and wife of Farquhar Macgillivray of Dalcrombie, one of the three officers of the Mackintosh regiment who survived the battle of Culloden. It gives the descent of the family in eight generations from Adam, youngest son of James Mackintosh (or Shaw) of Rothiemurcus, who was killed at Harlaw in 1411, and was the son of Shaw Mor Mackintosh, the leader of the Clan Chattan champions in the clan battle at Perth in 1396. Except as regards the omission of one name—that of Adam's son, Robert—in the line of descent, this pedigree is perfectly correct,¹ as I have proved by

¹ There is one other omission, that of Adam, grandson of the Robert here mentioned, but he was not in the line of descent, which was carried on by his younger brother Angus. Of this Adam I propose to say more hereafter.

sasine and other records, and as Mrs Macgillivray had no possible means of compiling so correct a pedigree for herself, it is obvious that she must have obtained her information from some record kept in the family. This record, however, is not now to be found.

It is with the genealogies of the more important septs, however, that I propose now to deal, and after a brief description of those belonging respectively to the Mackintoshes, the Macphersons, and the Farquharsons, I propose to confine my attention to the genealogy of the first-named clan.

I. The Latin MS. "History of the Mackintoshes," by Lachlan Mackintosh of Kinrara, of date about 1670, which I will call the Kinrara MS., is contained in a leather covered book of small 8vo, or large 12mo size, preserved in the charter chest of The Mackintosh. Its writer was brother of William, 18th Chief of Mackintosh, and for some years managed the affairs of both his brother and his nephew, the 19th Chief, so that he would have had full access to the charters and other records of the family. This MS. traces the history and genealogy of the family of Mackintosh from the settlement in the north of Shaw, son of the Earl of Fife, in the second half of the 12th century. Down to 1550 it is professedly founded on three earlier MSS., the first written by Ferquhard, 12th Chief, in 1502, giving the history from the Earl of Fife down to the death of the 11th Chief, in 1496; the second, by Andrew Macphail, parson of Croy, giving the history also from the Earl of Fife down to the murder of William, the 15th Chief, in 1550; and the third, by George Munro of Davochgartie, giving the history of Ferquhard, the 12th Chief, and his three successors. These earlier MSS. are not known to be in existence now, and it is to be feared that they shared the fate of many of the family documents and evidents during the temporary occupation of Moy Hall by a party of Grants in 1746; but Lachlan of Kinrara states that he actually embodied their subject matter in his own MS., and as he seems to have been a man of strict honour, and could have no object in drawing on his imagination, there can be no doubt that he states what was an absolute fact. He was, besides, one of the most accurate and precise of men, as is evidenced by the traces of his hand among the family papers that are left, and we may feel certain that every mention which he makes of date, charter, or bond was verified, whenever possible, by reference to original documents. Indeed, many of his statements, made presumably on the authority of the earlier MSS., are corroborated by the records of other families. As might be expected, the Kinrara

MS. is particularly full in its account of affairs during the writer's own time and immediately preceding it.

II. The next Mackintosh MS. genealogy is entirely in the handwriting of the Rev. Lachlan Shaw, author of the "History of the Province of Moray," published in 1775. It is entitled "Memoirs Genealogical and Historical of the Family of Mackintosh, with an Introduction concerning the Families of Macduff and Clan Chattan," and bears the date 1758. It is unsigned, but has the same motto—"Antiquam exquirite matrem"—as the "History of Moray." So far as the Mackintoshes are concerned, it brings down the genealogy of the chief family and the several branches from the Earls of Fife to the writer's own time. Like the Kinrara MS., it belongs to the Chief of Mackintosh, but cannot now be found. I have not seen it since the year 1872, when it was lent to me for a few days by the late Mackintosh, during one of his visits to London, and was returned into his own hands. Possibly this notice of it may lead to its restoration to the family. According to my recollection, it is a quarto book of some 80 or 100 pages, with rather close but very clear writing. The pedigree of the Mackintosh Chiefs down to 1770 is given at page 44 of the "History of Moray."

III. The MS. genealogy of the Macphersons is the work of Sir Aeneas Macpherson, second son of William of Invereshie and Margaret, daughter of Robert Farquharson of Invercauld. He was an advocate during the reign of Charles II., when he received the honour of knighthood, and for some years after his elder brother's death acted as tutor of Invereshie. He was well versed in the family and clan history of his country, and, like Mackintosh of Kinrara, had exceptional facilities for tracing the genealogy and history of his own clan. To this work he brought considerable legal acumen and a great capacity for taking pains, and his genealogy for several generations down to his own time may, perhaps, be accepted as generally trustworthy. But most of the earlier portion, particularly that treating of the old Clan Chattan, is too palpably fabulous, and one only wonders that a writer usually so careful and judicious should have been carried away by the stories of sennachies. It is extremely likely, however, that in the main his genealogy from about the 12th century was based on either some written record or well-founded tradition. For example, he gives Muirich, Parson of Kingussie, as father of Gillicattan and Ewen Baan early in the 13th century, and there can be little doubt that Muirich was a progenitor of the clan, as it was called by his name. He also speaks of the three sons of Ewen

Baan by the names of Kenneth, Ian, and Gillies, and there can be no doubt that persons bearing these names were of importance in the clan, as we find the three main branches—of Cluny, Pitmean, and Invereshie—called respectively Sliochd Kynich, Sliochd Ian, and Sliochd Gillies. The MS. is in the possession of Cluny Macpherson. I have not seen it, but I have had the loan of a copy belonging to the late Dr John Stuart.

With the Macpherson genealogy in Douglas' "Baronage," which is followed in Burke's "Landed Gentry," I do not propose to meddle. It has already been shown by Mr Fraser-Mackintosh to be seriously incorrect, and it is clear that the compiler, whoever he was, did not confine himself to Sir Æneas' MS.

IV. The first Farquharson genealogy of which there is trace, was written probably about 1680, as it speaks of John of Invercauld, who succeeded his father, Alexander, in that year. I am not aware whether it is now in existence. It properly deduces the Farquharsons from the Shaws of Rothimurcus, but brings these direct from the Earls of Fife, instead of through the Mackintoshes, making the Mackintoshes the off-spring of the eldest, and the Shaws the off-spring of the third son of one of the Earls. Who its author was does not appear, but whoever he was, he seems to have had a very hazy idea of the family history, and to have jumbled up his information in a most extraordinary manner. His main object seems to have been to glorify the family of Invercauld, then rapidly rising in importance, and he goes so far in his obsequiousness as to make the head of that branch of the Farquharsons chief, not only of all the Farquharsons, but even of the Shaws, although a little inquiry would have shown him that there were still Shaws in Rothimurcus descended from Shaw Mor, and that among the Farquharsons themselves the family of Invercauld was junior to the family of Craigniety and the numerous descendants of Donald of Castleton. His misstatements, whether due to ignorance or servility, appear to have aroused the ire of Sir Æneas Macpherson, whose mother was a daughter of Robert of Invercauld. In a "Letter to a Friend" that worthy knight handles the would-be genealogist most unmercifully, pointing out, in the plainest terms, his many errors and their absurdity, and utterly demolishing his pseudo-historical house of cards. Sir Æneas' letter, which is in the possession of Sir George Macpherson-Grant of Invereshie and Ballindalloch, is headed "Vantie Exposed, or, a Plain and Short Answer to a late Peaper, Intituled the Genealogie of the Farquharsons, wherein the Authour's Ignorance and Self-contradictioun are sett in their true light, and the Right

Genealogy of that modern Family briefly hinted at from the concurring Testimonies of the Shaws, the Farquharsons themselves, and all their neighbour families. In a letter to a Friend by No Enemy of theirs, but a friend to Truth, Sir Æneas Macpherson of Invereshie, knight."

V. A more trustworthy genealogy of the Farquharsons is one compiled in 1733 by Alexander Farquharson of Brouchdearg. I do not know where it is to be found, but some twenty years ago I had the loan of a copy belonging to the late Dr John Stuart of the Register House. The writer, evidently having in view the genealogy last referred to, begins by stating that he leaves "all that's controverted or obscure about their descent from the Thanes of Fife . . . their actions and alliances at their first appearance, to such as can find clearer evidence for them than [he is] able to get by conversing with the oldest men, and comparing what has been wrote before on the subject." He gives the descent of the families of Farquharson from "Farquhar Shaw, whose name first gave rise to this surname, and who came over from Rothimurcus, and took up his residence near the Liinn of Dee," down to the year in which he wrote.

Of these several genealogies, the last mentioned is the only one which, to my knowledge, has never been called in question, so that I propose to treat it as accepted, and dismiss it from our consideration, together with the other Farquharson genealogy. With the genealogies of the Mackintoshes and Macphersons the case is different. They have been not only questioned, but even declared to be without support—so far, at least, as down to the middle of the 15th century—and that by no less an authority than the Historiographer-Royal for Scotland, Mr W. F. Skene.¹ Mr Skene does not mention the recognised Macpherson genealogy, that of Sir Æneas, in his writings, but in his "Highlanders of Scotland" he gives the Macphersons a widely different descent, from a Gaelic MS. of 1450 (or 1467), so that if he then knew of the existence of the recognised genealogy, we may assume that he considered that to be the one which could not be supported. But the descent which in the "Highlanders of Scotland" he gives to the Macphersons, he hands over in "Celtic Scotland" to some "older Mackintoshes," whom he identifies with the Mackintoshes or Shaws of Rothimurcus, so that we scarcely know where we are so far as the Macphersons are concerned, and therefore I propose to confine my remarks to what he says on the Mackintosh genealogy. As

¹ Mr Skene has died since this paper was written.

his views on this subject have been brought under the notice of this Society by one of its leading and most valued members, Mr Alexander Macbain, in his paper of the 5th of March, 1890 (*Transactions*, vol. xvi.), I need perhaps offer no apology for asking the members to hear a few words on the other side.

Both Mr Skene and Mr Macbain are men of well-earned reputation and position in the world of Celtic research, but it does not follow that everything they say on Highland history is absolutely correct, or that all their theories and opinions are such as can safely be accepted, or are even founded on common sense. Since the appearance of Mr Skene's elegant volumes entitled "*Celtic Scotland*," it has, unfortunately, become the fashion among writers on Highland subjects to refer (and defer) to that gentleman as the final authority on any question relating to the clans and their early history, and to regard whatever he is pleased to say or think as unimpeachable. This is a fashion which I, for one, cannot understand; I can only suppose that those who thus bow down and worship him cannot have read his utterances very carefully, or have observed the contradictions which they contain, the worthlessness of the testimony on which some of the arguments are based, and the insufficiency or incorrectness of the premises on which some of the conclusions are reached. Mr Macbain in his paper accepts, and endeavours to fortify, Mr Skene's views on certain matters of importance in the Mackintosh genealogy, and, therefore—for the convenience of the Society's members who possess the *Transactions*, but may not all possess Mr Skene's book—I will in the main restrict my remarks to the points dealt with in that paper:—

(1st). Considerable weight is allowed by both Mr Skene and Mr Macbain to the genealogies given in the Gaelic MS. of 1467 in the Advocates' Library, and Mr Skene goes so far as to declare that they "may be held to be authentic" as far back as the common ancestor from whom each clan takes its name, though he does not support his declaration by reasons. Let us now see what this MS. is. At page 338 of Vol. III. of "*Celtic Scotland*" Mr Skene says:—"There is ample evidence that during this period [*i.e.*, the 14th and 15th centuries], a great proportion of the Highland seannachies were Irish, and that all reverted to Ireland for instruction in their art. It could hardly have been otherwise than that, with the disappearance of the old Highland pedigrees, every presumption and analogy would have driven these seannachies to the better-preserved Irish pedigrees, to replace what had been lost, by connecting them more directly with the Irish tribes.

. . . For the clan genealogies at this time we must, therefore, refer to the Irish MSS., and they are, in fact, the oldest pedigrees which have been preserved. The MS. collections in which we first find them are, first, the Book of Ballimote, compiled in the year 1383; the Book of Leccan, compiled in 1407; and a MS. belonging to the Faculty of Advocates, bearing the date 1467, but the genealogies in which are obviously derived from the same source as those in the Book of Ballimote." At p. 8 of Vol. II. of his "Highlanders of Scotland," published in 1847, Mr Skene mentions that he discovered this MS. of 1467 in the Advocates' Library, and "after a strict and attentive examination of its contents and appearance, came to the conclusion that it must have been written by a person of the name of Maclachlan as early as the year 1450, and this conclusion with regard to its antiquity was afterwards confirmed by discovering upon it the date of 1467." It gives pedigrees—or, at anyrate, strings of names purporting to be pedigrees—of most of the Highland clans, from the Macgregors and Macnabs in the south, to the Mathesons in the north, and carries back some of them to periods when the centuries were numbered with only three figures. For example, it takes back the Campbells to King Arthur, son of Uther Pendragon, who, if he ever existed at all, save in the imagination of French romancers of the age of chivalry, was contemporary with the Roman occupation of Britain.

I have already intimated my inability to regard Mr Skene's statements and opinions as infallible, and before I can accept these pedigrees for which he stands sponsor, or any one of them, as correct, I should like to know who the supposed Maclachlan was, and to have some valid reason why his testimony, or even that of the Book of Ballymote, is to be preferred to the testimony of the clans themselves. Was an Irishman of the 14th and 15th centuries more honest or less liable to error than a Scots Highlander of the same period? If the Highlander could be guilty of manufacturing a string of names to connect his family with some notable person in Scottish history, might not the Irishman adopt a similar course in order to glorify the legendary heroes of Ireland? Irishmen in our own century have not been slack or shy in holding up their country as the home of valour and worth in ancient times, and I do not suppose that Irishmen of four or five centuries ago were less patriotically inclined. Again, the fact of which Mr Skene says there is "ample evidence," although he does not indicate where—that in the 14th and 15th centuries many of the Highland seannachies were Irish, or that Irish seannachies of that

period were better informed than those of the Highlands—does not prove that the descents which they give during previous centuries are more correct than those of the clans themselves, or even that they are correct at all. How are the Irish seannachies supposed to have obtained their information? How, for example, did they ascertain the names of the heads of Clan Campbell, or Clan Duff, or any other clan, back from son to father, successively, to the 3rd or 4th century of the Christian era, or even back to the time when the representative of the clan had landed in Scotland? Are we to believe that during all these hundreds of years special correspondents in Scotland had notified every change of leadership to a college of seannachies or other central office in Ireland, and that the pedigree books in such establishment were regularly posted up like the Peerages and Directories of the present day? It is not enough to say, as Mr Skene does, that the pedigrees are “in general tolerably well vouched” as far back as the eponymus or common ancestor whose name was adopted by the clan, and that this later portion “may be held to be authentic.” The vouching given by Mr Skene in the notes to his pedigrees in the appendix to vol. iii. of “Celtic Scotland,” is very slight indeed; in thirty-five main pedigrees, some of which include two or more subordinate pedigrees, the references to documents do not exceed a dozen, and they mostly relate to names of the 14th and 15th centuries. If the pedigrees are not trustworthy before, say, the year 1000 or 1100, I cannot see why they should be held to become so after that date. To my mind it appears only reasonable to believe that the heads of a clan would be likely to know their descent from their eponymus far better than any Irish seannachie, however learned he may have been in the history of the ancient Kings of Ireland, imaginary or real, and if the matter is regarded from a common-sense point of view, I think it must be admitted that, whether the ordinarily accepted genealogies of the clans themselves are correct or not, no sufficient ground appears for believing that the Irish genealogies of the Highland clans, given in the Book of Ballymote and the MS. of 1467, are correct. I am not aware that inspiration has as yet been claimed for them.

(2nd). Coming more particularly to the Mackintosh genealogy, we find in Mr Macbain’s paper (on p. 164 of the Transactions, 1889-90), three lists—one giving the pedigree of the Mackintoshes, as contained in their own recognised genealogy, from Ferchar, 12th Chief, back to the Earl of Fife, the others giving two lines of pedigree, taken from the MS. of 1467, back to two

persons named respectively Neill and Nachtain, supposed to have been sons of a certain Gillicattan. For convenience I reproduce these lists here, slightly altering their order:—

(a) <i>Mackintosh History.</i>	(b) 1467 MS.	(c) 1467 MS.
(12) Ferchar, d. 1514	William & Donald	Lochlan
(9) Ferchar (11) Duncan, d. 1496	William	Suibne
(8) Lachlan & (10) Mal- colm, d. 1457	Ferchar (1382)	Shaw
(7) William, d. 1368	William	Leod
(6) Angus, d. 1345	Gillamichol	Scayth (1338)
(5) Ferchar, d. 1274	Ferchar (1234)	Ferchar
(4) Shaw, d. 1265	Shaw	Gilchrist
[(3) Ferchar] William	Gilchrist	Malcolm
(2) Shaw, d. 1210	Aigcol	Donald Camgilla
(1) Shaw, d. 1179	Ewen	Mureach
Macduff, E. of Fife	—	Suibne
	—	Tead (Shaw)
	Neill	Nachtain
	(Gillicattan ?)	Gillicattan

Of the two lists of 1467 that marked *b* is supposed by Mr Skene and Mr Macbain to represent the actual and true line of the Mackintosh Chiefs, while that marked *c* is thought by Mr Skene to represent some "older Mackintoshes," whom he identifies as "*beyond doubt* the Shaws of Rothiemurcus and the Farquharsons of Strathdee . . . whose head in 1464 was Alexander Keir Mackintosh"! In his previous work, as Mr Macbain properly points out, Mr Skene had assigned the honours of this older line, as being a matter "*beyond all doubt*," to the Macphersons, but now, for some unexplained reason, and without a word of apology, he leaves the Macphersons out in the cold.¹

Our concern here, however, is with line *b*, which Mr Macbain regards as affording proof of the incorrectness of the Mackintosh genealogy contained in the family histories. In this list the representatives of the direct line of the Mackintoshes, at the date of the MS. (1467), are given as William and Donald, sons of William, son of Ferchar. This Ferchar is obviously identical with the Ferquhar given in the family history as the 9th Chief, who, according to that history, was not acceptable to his clan, and resigned his Chiefship in favour of his uncle, Malcolm. He may or may not have been the Ferquhard MacToshy who, in 1382,

¹ The reader of "Celtic Scotland" and "The Highlanders of Scotland" cannot fail to observe the frequent occurrence of such expressions as "*beyond all doubt*," "*undoubtedly*," and "*must have been*," in many matters which obviously admit of very considerable doubt. The quotations here given afford a good sample of their value.

had molested the Bishop of Aberdeen and his tenants in the lands of Brass or Birse. These lands are far distant even from Rothiemurcus, the nearest point of the known Mackintosh country, and the name Ferquhard was by no means confined to the Mackintoshes at the time; that it happened to belong to a descendant of the thane or tosbach of Birse, who had been supplanted by the Bishop of Aberdeen,¹ while at the same time it was also the name of the son of the Chief of Mackintosh, appears to me to be a mere coincidence.² The point, however, is not of importance. A more important matter is the omission in the Mackintosh History of any mention of such a person as William, son of Ferchard, 9th Chief, or of his two sons, William and Donald, and it seems obvious that either that History or the 1467 MS. is wrong. The names of the 9th Chief's sons are given in the History as Duncan, Malcolm, and Ferquhard, each of whom had issue. As has been mentioned, the earliest of the MSS. used by Lachlan of Kinrara in compiling his history was written by Ferquhard, the 12th Chief, within forty years of the date of Mr Skene's 1467 MS., and one would think that he must have known who his own second cousins were, although it is of course possible—though perhaps hardly probable—that Kinrara made a mistake. Whether he did so or not is hardly likely to be discovered now, but even if, in the middle of the 15th century, the representatives of the 9th Chief were really named William and Donald, there is no question that at the time the actual Chief of the Mackintoshes was Malcolm Beg, and, so far, Mr Macbain and the Mackintosh History are at one.

(3rd). But although Mr Macbain admits the correctness of the history as to the chiefship of Malcolm in 1450, he contends that that history must be wrong in the matter of Malcolm's genealogy. He says (Transactions, p. 164):—

“Malcolm, 10th Mackintosh, who dies in 1457, is grandson through William 7th (died 1368) of Angus, who married Eva in 1291, the three generations thus lasting as chiefs from 1274 to 1457, some 183 years! Malcolm was the son of William's old age, and his brother [really *half*-brother], Lachlan 8th, was too old to take part in the North Inch fight in 1396, sixty years before his younger brother died! This beats the Fraser genealogy brought

¹ Chartulary of Aberdeen i. 360.

² Mr Macbain says (Trans. p. 164), “He is doubtless the same person, for he is given also in the 1467 MS. genealogy.” I must confess my inability to follow Mr Macbain's reasoning here.

forward lately by a claimant to the Lovat estates. It is thus clear that there is something wrong in the Mackintosh genealogy here."

This at first sight seems a truly formidable indictment, but I venture to think that a little examination will prove that there is really not much in it. "The three generations lasted as chiefs for 183 years!" says Mr Macbain; and as Angus was a child of about 6 years old when he became chief on his father's death in 1274, the three lives extended over 189 years. There is thus an average of 61 years for the chiefships, and 63 years for the lives. These are no doubt good averages, although, so far as the lives are concerned, not particularly extraordinary. Mr Macbain will probably recollect the name of Field-Marshal Sir John Burgoyne. Sir John, who was on the staff of the army in 1868 and died in 1871, was the son of General John Burgoyne, who was born as long ago as in 1722, and entered the army in 1738, serving as captain in the 13th Dragoons at Culloden. Here we have the *two* lives of father and son extending over 149 years¹, and their army services over 130 years—or an average of 74½ years for the lives, and 65 for the services! Looking at these figures, the correctness of which can easily be ascertained, there does not seem to be much difficulty in regard to the 189 years for *three* generations of Mackintoshes.

If we look at the matter in another way, I think we can further reduce the difficulty, if there is one, or even remove it altogether. Thus—

Angus, 6th chief, born 1268, married 1291.

William, his son, born (say) 1300, died 1368, aged 68 years.

W. married 1st wife (say) 1325.

Son *Lachlan*, born (say) 1326, would in 1396 have been 70 years old.

W. married 2nd wife (say) 1360, when he was 60 years old.

Son *Malcolm* born (say) 1361.

Malcolm at his death in 1457 would thus be 96 years old.

The dates of William's marriage and of the birth of his two sons are necessary hypothetical, but they are probably near the mark, and anyhow show the possibility, which Mr Macbain seems to doubt, of the covering of a period of 183 years by three generations of chiefs, and of the inability, through age, of Lachlan, 8th chief,

¹ Supposing that General J. B.'s father had been 51 years old at his son's birth in 1722—as is quite conceivable—the three generations would have lived through two centuries!

“to take part in the North Inch Fight in 1396, sixty years before his younger brother died.” So far, then, there seems to be nothing impossible, or even improbable, in the recognised Mackintosh genealogy from 1291 to 1457, and the confusion alleged by Mr Macbain to be in it has no existence.

(4th). The next point to be considered relates to the descent of the Mackintoshes from the old Earls of Fife, which, if the 1467 MS. and the Irish Book of Ballymote are correct, evidently cannot be maintained. Mr Macbain gives the Mackintosh account of the descent of the early chiefs, but declares that it “sadly lacks verisimilitude,” and suggests that those who support it are wanting in intelligence.¹ To my humble intelligence the verisimilitude—or likeness to truth—of the account is one of the most conspicuous things about it. A son of one of the greatest nobles of the kingdom accompanies the king, Malcolm IV., in an expedition against the rebellious tribes of Moray; he distinguishes himself, and is rewarded for his services by a grant of land, being also made custodian of the Castle of Inverness. There is surely nothing here that looks unlike truth; the fact that the king’s expedition actually took place is undoubted, and the presence of a son of the Earl of Fife in the king’s train, and his being rewarded by some of the lands previously occupied by the rebels, are things which one would almost expect as a matter of course.

Then Mr Macbain makes a great point of the use of the word “Thane” by some writers on Mackintosh history when speaking of Macduff Earl of Fife. He says:—“The Mackintosh genealogies, dating from the 17th century, represent the family as descended from Macduff, *Thane* of Fife, as they and Fordun call him. . . . Macduff was not *Toiseach* of Fife. In the Book of Deer he is called Comes, the then Gaelic of which was *mormaer*, now *moirear*.” The Mackintosh genealogies referred to are, I presume, that of Lachlan of Kinrara, and that given at page 44 of the Rev. Lachlan Shaw’s “History of Moray” (edition of 1775). So far as the Kinrara MS. is concerned, I assume that Mr Macbain has verified his statement by reference to it; I shall not be able to do so before the date for the reading of this paper. But even granting that Kinrara does use the word, I do not see that it in any way throws discredit on his account of facts; as well refuse to

¹ His words (Trans. p. 162) are:—“With those who support the Macduff genealogy no argument need be held; like the humorist of a past generation, one would, however, like to examine their bumps.” This seems a somewhat novel method of conducting an argument—in cold blood, at all events, for I believe it is not unknown in Courts of Law.

accept Macaulay's account of the Battle of Killiecrankie because he speaks of Viscount Dundee as *James Graham*. I do not suppose for one moment that Lachlan of Kinrara even knew the difference between a *mormaer* and a *toiseach*, or that either he or John of Fordun or Holinshed or any other chronicler during the Scottish Middle Ages attached any other meaning to the term *thane* than that of a person of noble rank.

But now let us look at the other Mackintosh genealogist, to whom, I presume, Mr Macbain refers—that is, the historian of Moray, who wrote a full century after Lachlan of Kinrara. He is actually so ignorant of old Celtic institutions that he makes a *mormhaor* synonymous with a *thane*.¹ After a quotation from Fordun, he says (p. 180)—“Probably these Thanes were at first the king's servants (so the word signifies) or officers in provinces and countries, and during pleasure only, or for life. But afterwards the title and the lands granted to them were made hereditary. In the Highlands they were termed *mormhaor*, *i.e.*, a great officer. They were likewise called *Tosche* (from *Tus*, *i.e.*, first), that is, ‘Principal Persons, Primores.’”

If Shaw in the 18th century was under the impression that *thane*, *mormaer*, and *earl* were convertible terms, meaning one and the same kind of person, might not Mackintosh of Kinrara, in the 17th century, have been equally mistaken, especially when he had the authority of the national chroniclers for the error? The fact is, that writers of past centuries cannot fairly be gauged by the standard of our own day in these matters; it must be remembered that when Kinrara and Shaw wrote thanages had long been extinct, and that those writers had no possible means of learning anything about them, except from the old chroniclers; while the “Book of Deer” was still unknown, and no Innes, or Robertson, or Skene had yet arisen to explore and explain the intricacies of old Celtic institutions. When they speak of a thane of Fife, they mean an Earl of Fife, and any writer on Scots history or law, down to the early part of the present century, would have attached the same meaning to the term. Gilbert Stuart, in his “Observations concerning the Public Law and Constitutional History of Scotland” (Edin. 1779), expresses the general view when he speaks of the thanes as preceding earls and barons, and as being converted, though not universally, into nobles bearing those modern titles.

¹ He speaks on p. 44 of “the Macduffs, Thanes and Earls of Eife.”

On all this, I submit, it is evident that if Kinrara uses the words "*thane* of Fife," when speaking of his remote ancestor, he means "Earl of Fife," and his use of the term, therefore, affords no argument that his general statement is incorrect.

So much for Mr Macbain on this head. Mr Skene does not argue from quite the same premiss, but confines himself to the name Mackintosh, which, he says, can only mean "son of the thane," and arguing upon this he lays down in his usual dogmatic manner that because the old Earls of Fife never bore the title of Thane, therefore the Mackintoshes cannot have sprung from them. I make bold to believe—and I am not singular in my belief—that the name does not mean only what Mr Skene says, and that "tus" or "toseach" has other meanings than the restricted and academic one which he assigns to it—a leader or principal person, for example. In fact, Mr Macbain says in his paper ("Transactions," p. 161) that "Toiseach is the true Gaelic word for chief." But let us for a moment accept Mr Skene's derivation, and admit that "Mackintosh" can only mean "son of the thane"—that is, son of one beneath the rank of noble, who occupied lands for the performance of certain services. Even then I cannot see that Mr Skene is justified in jumping to the conclusion that the Mackintoshes cannot be descended from the Earls of Fife. May not some of the early Mackintoshes have been "thanes" or "toshachs," in the ordinary acceptation of the term? A thane, according to Sir John Skene, was "ane freeholder holding of the king," and this definition is accepted as correct by Mr W. F. Skene in "Celtic Scotland" (iii., 244). According to Professor Cosmo Innes, an authority of not less weight than Mr Skene himself, "the administrator of the Crown lands, the collector of rents, the magistrate and head man of a little district, was known among his Celtic neighbours as the Toshach;" taking "a charter of the whole district from the sovereign, he became, under the Saxon name of Thane, hereditary tenant" ("Sketches of Early Scotch History," p. 396). If the statement of the Kinrara MS. that Shaw, son of the Earl of Fife, received from Malcolm IV., a grant of lands in Moray, is correct, he would have been "ane freeholder holding of the king"—that is, a Thane, and his descendants would have been "sons of the Thane," according to Mr W. F. Skene's meaning. The MS. says also that the grants to Shaw Macduff were confirmed to his son and successor, who was made chamberlain of all the king's revenues in these parts, and who thus performed one of the main functions ascribed to the toshach by Professor Innes. Mr Macbain

tells us in his paper that one translation of "toiseach" is steward or seneschal, and that ballivus (bailie) is a title of equal import. Chamberlain of Revenues is precisely the same thing.

Thus the fact stated so positively by Mr Skene, that "the name of Mackintosh clearly implies that they were descended from a thane," even if correct, in no way necessarily affects the question of descent from the Earls of Fife, and so Mr Skene's argument falls to the ground.

(5th). The fifth and last point which I propose to consider has still to do with the origin of the name Mackintosh and of the family. We have just seen that Mr Macbain and Mr Skene reject the account given by the family historians; we will now see what they propose to substitute for it.

Mr Macbain suggests that the name arose with Fercard, son of Seth or Shaw, who is found recorded in 1234 as Seneschal or Steward (otherwise "toiseach") of Badenoch, and whose name appears in both the recognised genealogy and the 1467 MS. Mr Macbain, then, is willing to admit that, as regards Fercard and Shaw, the recognised genealogy may be correct, because it is corroborated by other records; but if he believes or accepts nothing which is not so corroborated, why does he prefer the genealogy of 1467 to that of the Kinrara MS.? The 1467 genealogy is entirely without corroboration, except where it agrees with the recognised genealogy. If Mr Macbain had consulted the Kinrara MS., he would have seen that both Ferchar's father and grandfather had performed the functions pertaining to a toiseach.

Now, let us examine Mr Skene's ideas on the subject; and here, I think, we shall see what a broken reed that gentlemen is to lean upon, how inaccurate and careless he is, with all his dogmatism. I should like to transcribe the two and a half pages of his "Celtic Scotland," in which he treats of the origin of the Mackintoshes, and deal with his utterances line by line; but time will not admit of this. He seems to attach some credit to the Knock MS., a fragment of a history of the Macdonalds, written in the time of Charles II., and printed in *Collectanea de Rebus Albanacis*, under Mr Skene's editorship. This MS. is well known to students of Highland history as a monument of inaccuracy, but it suits Mr Skene's purpose to quote from it. Here is an extract from page 357, vol. 3, of "Celtic Scotland"—"In the MS. histories of the Mackintoshes, the whole race, including the old Mackintoshes, is brought from the thane of Fife, but there is another form of it [? of what] which attaches the legend to the later family, the descendent of Malcolm Mackintosh, who, by the

influence of the Lord of the Isles, after the secession of the old Clan Chattan in 1429, acquired the position of Captain of the Clan, for we are told in the Knock MS. that Angus of the Isles had, by the daughter of John Gruamach Mackay, 'the mother of the first laird of Mackintosh, for a son of Macduff, thane of Fife, coming after manslaughter to shelter himself in Macdonald's house, got her daughter with child, went to Ireland with Edward Bruce, where he was killed; by which means Mackintosh is of natural (illegitimate) descent, his progenitor having been got in that manner. Mackintosh in the ancient language signifies a thane's son. The boy was brought up by Macdonald, who, in process of time, procured a competent estate for him in the Braes of Lochaber and Braes of Moray.' This (says Mr Skene) was Callum Beg or Malcolm Mackintosh, whose son Duncan was the first captain of Clan Chattan."

Mr Skene's first mistake is in referring to this MS. at all, and especially in treating or suggesting it as an authority. He next speaks of Malcolm as acquiring the position of captain of the clan, and a few lines afterwards states that Malcolm's son Duncan was the *first* captain. By a third mistake, he makes Malcolm reach the extraordinary age of 138 years, thus:—Edward Bruce was killed in Ireland in 1318, so that if the father of Callum or Malcolm Beg went with him to Ireland and was killed there, the said Callum could not have been born later than 1319, and as he did not die until 1457, it follows that he reached the mature age of 138 years (!), and that his single life was only 45 years short of the period which Mr Macbain seems to think too long for three previous generations.

Just one more quotation from Mr Skene's account of the Mackintoshes in "Celtic Scotland," and I have done with the subject. In the quotation just given, we find mention of two sets of Mackintoshes—one, the "later family," represented by Malcolm Beg and his descendants, whose existence Mr Skene does not call in question; the other, "the old Mackintoshes," represented by the string of names from the 1467 MS. in list *b*, given some pages back. In the following quotation we have a third set, whom Mr Skene calls "Older Mackintoshes" (list *c*). At page 358, volume iii. of "Celtic Scotland," we read:—"The tradition of the Mackintoshes is that Rothiemurchus was their earliest possession, and when Alexander Mackintosh obtains a feudal right to the lands in 1464 he is termed Thane of Rothymurchus. It seems probable that the name [Mackintosh] was derived from the Thanes of Brass, who may also have been Thanes of Rothiemurchus, and from whom the

‘Old Mackintoshes’ were descended. In their genealogy the name of Gillimichael, or the servant of St Michael, appears in the place of the spurious Angus, the suppositious husband of Eva, and St Machael was the patron saint of the parish of Birse. As possessors of Rothiemurchus they are brought into immediate contact with that branch of the old Clan Chattan whose principal seat was Dalnavert, and no doubt were, as indicated in the older genealogies, a branch of that clan. The representatives of these older Mackintoshes were, beyond doubt, the Shaws of Rothiemurchus and the Farquharsons of Strathdee, &c.” The tradition mentioned in the leading sentence of this question is new to me, and is certainly not held by the Mackintoshes as stated; the Kinrara MS. states that Rothiemurchus was first held by the Mackintoshes in 1236, when the 4th chief took a lease from the Bishop of Moray. Alexander Mackintosh of Rothiemurchus is not termed thane in the feu charter from the Bishop of Moray, dated 4th Sept., 1464; only once, in 1472, is he so styled, and the title is then used apparently without any reference to the special functions of a thane or toseach, as defined by experts; indeed, nothing is known of any thanage of Rothiemurchus. Next, I would call attention to the guessing in the first two divisions of the second sentence, and to the dogmatic assertion which follows in the third division, as indicated by my italics. In the third and fourth sentences the *their* and *they* refer presumably to the “old Mackintoshes,” just before mentioned, and these “old Mackintoshes,” as possessors of Rothiemurchus, meet some “older Mackintoshes,” who, “beyond doubt,” were represented by the Shaws and Farquharsons, and both old and older Mackintoshes were, “no doubt,” branches of the Clan Chattan. Mr Skene does not state the grounds on which he makes one set of these Mackintoshes older than the other, and all he has to go upon for his assertion that a branch of old Clan Chattan had its principal seat at Dalnavert is that, in a charter of the lands of Dalnavert and Kinrara, given in 1338 by Alexander, Earl of Ross, to Malmoran of Glencharney,¹ mention is made of the house of Scayth, son of Fercard, as having stood in a certain spot—“*in qua situm fuit manerium quondam Scayth filii Fercardi.*” How this Scayth, son of Fercard, can be identified with certainty as the owner of the name of the 1467 MS., and how the fact of his having at some time antecedent to 1338 had a residence at Dalnavert, proves that that place was the principal seat of a branch of older Mackintoshes, I fail to see; it is pure guesswork at the best, and

¹ “Spalding Club Miscellany,” vol. iv., Gordon Papers.

quite as much probability can be adduced for the identifying of this same Scayth with a younger son of one of the chiefs in the recognised Mackintosh genealogy.

I have now done—so far at all events as this paper is concerned—with Mr Skene's guesses and contradictions, his "must have beens" and his "undoubtedlys," his old and older Mackintoshes. I do not for a moment question his good faith; I am willing to believe that he has set down what he honestly takes to be the true and most likely explanation of matters which seemed to him obscure. But I do question whether he has ever gone closely into the history of the Mackintoshes, as detailed by the family chronicler in the 17th century, or has even had the desire to do so. He discovered the MS. of 1467 when a young man, and seems to have set that up as his standard and infallible guide. His idea seems to be that it must be right, because it agrees with, or was taken from, certain Irish MSS., and the Irish pedigrees are the oldest in existence, while the Irish sennachies surpassed those of Scotland in information and acquirements (*Celt. Scot.* iii. 337-8). Every Highland pedigree which does not fit his standard must, therefore, be wrong, and undeserving of consideration, and he will have nothing to do with it—"unceremoniously brushing it aside," as Mr Macbain expresses it. When a writer of Mr Skene's position and reputation takes up such a line as this, and writes as if he had studied every original manuscript bearing on the question, it is little short of certain that nearly all his readers will accept what he says or thinks as the last word in the controversy, and it seems but a forlorn hope for a humble individual like myself to attempt to show that he is liable to error, or that our ancestors of two and three centuries ago were not always necessarily liars or dupes, as regards their family history, merely because he implies that they were. I venture to hope, however, that the few remarks which I have made may be sufficient to lead the members of this Society to pause before they unreservedly pin their faith to Mr Skene in matters of Highland genealogy, and, whether the recognised clan pedigrees are correct or not, to examine whether any sufficient ground is shown for believing the pedigrees in the 1467 MS. and its Irish originals to be one whit more trustworthy.

Time will not admit of my dealing with the several minor points affecting the Mackintosh genealogy in Mr Macbain's paper, or with his views regarding the clans concerned in the Battle of Thirties at Perth in 1396. My own views on the latter subject have already been made known, and Mr Macbain's remarks on the phonetics of the names used by the old chroniclers convey to my

mind no justification or incitement for changing them. But there are two matters pertaining to the subject on which I would like to say a few words before I close. First, Mr Skene, at page 314 of volume iii. of "Celtic Scotland," published at the end of 1880, comes round to the view, which I endeavoured to support some years previously,¹ that the clans engaged were the Clans Chattan and Cameron, after having maintained in his "Highlanders of Scotland" that they were the Mackintoshes and Macphersons. Second, in my various writings on the clan battle, the last of which was contained in my "Historical Memoirs of the Mackintoshes and Clan Chattan," printed in 1880, I had founded an argument—or, to be strictly accurate, a suggestion—in favour of the view that the Camerons were the Clan Hay or Kay of Wyntoun and Bowar on the synonymy of *Ay* and *Angus*, referring specially to one of my own ancestors, Ay Macbean (Shaw) of Tordarroch, who, in the band of union among Clan Chattan in 1609, signs "for himself and taking the full burden upon him of his race of Clan Ay," and whom I then believed to have been named Angus. Since 1880, I have had a large number of extracts made from documents in the Register House at Edinburgh relating to the Clan Chattan families in Strathnairn, and from these I soon discovered that I had been wrong in supposing *Ay* to be equivalent to *Angus*, and that I have a collateral ancestor of whose existence I had previously been ignorant. I ascertained beyond doubt that *Ay* equals *Adam*, and that Adam, and not Angus, Macbean of Tordarroch signed the bond of 1609. This is clear from a charter dated at Inverness, 9th December, 1607, which Adam gives of a life rent out of the lands of Tordarroch to his future spouse, Agnes, daughter of Alex. Fraser of Farraline. In this charter Adam is described as Adam M'Bean M'Robert M'*Ay* of Tordarroch, and that the name of Adam's great-grandfather, who is here called *Ay*, was Adam is known from other sources. Again, in a charter by Sir Lachlan Mackintosh of Torcastle, dated at Inverness, 12th March, 1621, Adam's daughter is styled "Margaret nein *Ay* Vc Beane, lawful daughter and heir of the late *Adam* M'Bean of Tordarroch." The same *Ay* or Adam appears in other documents. He is not mentioned in the genealogy of the Shaws of Tordarroch which has come down to me, probably for the reason that he left no son, and was succeeded

¹ In "Notes and Queries" (1869); in "A Genealogical Account of the Highland Families of Shaw" (1877); and in "The Clan Battle of Perth," printed in 1874. Of the last named print I forwarded an early copy to Mr Skene.

as head of the family by his brother Angus, with whom I had confounded him. My mistake has been a weight on my mind for several years, and I am glad to have this opportunity of making public a correction of it.

DISCUSSION—REPLY BY MR MACBAIN.

First as to the MSS. : Mr Mackintosh Shaw is unjust to the 1467 MS., and to what he calls "Irish" MSS. and sources. Surely it is well known that "Irish" here means Gaelic; and the MSS. which he decries are, on Scotch points, of excellent Scotch origin. The "Irish" scribes were the common literary class in Scotland and Ireland. The language and literature, historical and otherwise, were shared in common till the end of the 17th century; a glance at the work of the M'Vurich genealogists and bards, ought surely to keep Mr Shaw right on this point. The "Irish" genealogies are therefore good evidence if contemporary, and for at least two centuries before—as good as, ay, better than, any Kinrara MS. of the 17th century or any MS. of its class. Those 17th century MSS. are a delusion and a snare too often; and I accept the Kinrara MS. for the 15th and 16th century only when it seems according to reason, or is so far corroborated by contemporary documents. It is useless to say that it is made up of two previous MSS.; I know them and their kind too well to be impressed with such statements. The 1467 MS. is surely contemporary with 1467, written by a "Gaelic" seanachie, who knew well what he was doing. William and Donald, sons of William, are the contemporary Mackintosh chiefs, according to the writer; can Mr Shaw get round that? He has the neighbouring Cameron chiefs all right; why should he make a mistake in the case of the Mackintoshes? No, no; he simply does not recognise Malcolm Beg as chief: that is all.

Second, as to the genealogies. Mr Shaw's vindication of the three generations, which cover nearly two hundred years, does not impress me much; I never thought that any genealogist would write himself an ass by giving impossible dates; only he does the next thing to it.

I have to make a correction at this point. Mr Fraser-Mackintosh thought that he had found Angus, the so-called sixth chief's name, in a 1297 list; and I was struck by the similarity. But, on further search, I find that the individual meant—Angus Macerchar—was the head of the Argyleshire Lamonts of the day.

I am glad that Mr Shaw recognises the impossibility of the name *toiseach* applying to the Earl of Fife; it seems to me that it

settles the whole case. It is impossible that a son of the Earl of Fife should be settled in Inverness-shire without at least being as prominent as Adam of Strathbogie was (circ. 1200), who was really a son of the Earl. Besides, it is a pernicious fiction to join the Mackintoshes to Inverness Castle; they never had anything to do with it. Mr Barron has lately traced fully the history of the Castle, and no such connection appears. The whole Macduff and Inverness story is a fable, and a poor one, started in that century of fables—the 17th. It is then we hear of Diarmad O'Duinn as ancestor of the Campbells, and Colin Fitzgerald appears in the veracious pages of the Earl of Cromartie as ancestor of the Mackenzies.

The Mackintoshes are not all descended from one original sept. The Perthshire Mackintoshes, I know, are not of the Clan Chattan stock; they are descendants of the local *toiseachs* of Monivaird and Tiriny. I still adhere to my view that the Inverness-shire Mackintoshes are descended from the *toiseachs* and *seneschals* of Badenoch. In fact, after all Mr Shaw's attack, I am still of the same opinion as to the 15th century break in the Clan Chattan genealogies; and, if Mr Shaw directed his energies and undoubted knowledge to the unravelment of this portion of Clan Chattan history and genealogy, instead of pinning his faith to Kinrara and his Macduff *cum* Inverness Castle absurdities, he would do a real and much needed service to his clan and to mid-Highland clan history.

4th MAY, 1892.

At the Society's meeting on this date, the following were elected members, viz. :—Miss A. E. Macdougall, Woodburn House, Morningside, Edinburgh; and the Rev. Edward Terry, Methodist Manse, Inverness. The Secretary laid on the table the following contributions towards the Society's Library :—“Place Names in Scotland” (Johnstone), from Mr W. G. Brodie, Edinburgh, and “Reliquiæ Celticæ” (Dr Cameron), from the Editors, Messrs Alex. Macbain, M.A., and the Rev. John Kennedy. Thereafter the Secretary read a paper contributed by Mr Charles Ferguson, Gatehouse, on “The Chronicles and Traditions of Strathardle,” Part II. Mr Ferguson's paper was as follows :—