

"Neil 24 of Lainshaw;
 "William 25 of Brigend;
 "James 24 of Dunlap;
 "John 24 of Cockilhie.

"Of these, Neil and his son John in 1654, sold their estates at Lainshaw to his brother John of Cockilhie, and this younger branch thus usurped the place which belonged to the Brigend branch as representatives of the family.

"William 24 Montgomerie married a lady of the same family name, though of what branch is unknown, viz: daughter of James Montgomerie, of Brigend, in Ayrshire. He had four sons, of whom the second and third died without issue, and the youngest, Hugh 5, became ultimately the owner of Brigend.

"John 25 Montgomerie, oldest son of William of Brigend, had a son Hugh 26, styled in the deeds as of Brigend, in 1654, who married Katherine, daughter of Sir William Scott, of Clerkington, and had two sons and two daughters. He died 6th of May, 1710, aged over 80 years. In 1692 he had joined his son William 27 in sale of Brigend to their cousin John. His other son, James 27, had a family, but none of his sons left issue.

"The oldest son and representative of the family was William 27, who married 8th of January, 1684, Isabel, daughter of Robert Burnett, of Lethintie county, Aberdeen and in 1702 he removed to East Jersey, where his father-in-law had a large estate. There he settled on an estate which he named Eglinton, and from this time the family is to be considered American.

"The volume under notice has a very full account of the descendants of William the emigrant, but we will confine our extracts to the line of representation.

"William's oldest son, Robert 28, married Sarah Stacy in February, 1709 or '10, and his heir was James 29, who married Esther Wood in 1746. Their son, Robert 30, of Eglinton, married Margaret Leonard in 1771, and was succeeded by Austin 31 Montgomerie, son of John 30. This Austin 31 died s. p. in 1855. His brother, the Rev. James 31 Montgomerie, rector of Grace church, New York, and St. Stephen's Philadelphia, had a son James 32 T. Montgomerie, a lawyer of Philadelphia, who is the present representative (1865) of the family.

"In reviewing the vicissitudes of the family we notice two salient points. In the first place, the title passed from the Lainshaw branch in consequence of a family feud, carried even to the murder of the fourth earl of Eglinton by the family of the wife of his nearest male heir, Sir Neil Montgomerie of Lainshaw, in 1586. Thus this line was shorn of its honors and estates.

"Again, Hugh of Brigend, father of the emigrant, seems to have

inherited a valuable property, but he lost it all, as letters remain to show, by a lack of business ability, and very possibly by adopting the losing side in religious matters.

"Thus, though quite a number of family papers were brought here to America, the knowledge of the rights of this branch was forgotten and ignored in Scotland, and various junior branches have from time to time claimed the representation.

"After a careful examination of the evidence here presented it seems plain that the case has been made out by the claimants here, and so far as it is a matter of interest to the family, they may be congratulated on their undoubted right to be considered the main line and representatives of a very ancient and distinguished family."

CHAPTER II.

We have seen that the Montgomeries have been prominent in France, England, Holland and Scotland, and we will now take some notice of them in Ireland. At just what time they first made settlements in Ireland as individual settlers we are not prepared to say. Arnulph de Montgomery was in Ireland on some of his warring expeditions in the latter part of the eleventh century. And other Montgomeries doubtless had settled there as well as in other countries. But the first prominent settlement seems to have been made by Sir Hugh Montgomery of Scotland, who was the sixth Laird of Braidstane and grandfather of the author of the Montgomery Manuscript. This Hugh afterward became the first Viscount of Montgomery of the Great Ards. This section of country in Ireland is so called because of the great number of hares or rabbits that were found along the banks of the water-courses that traversed its territory.

This Hugh Montgomery was descended from the earls of Eglintoune, and some of the families were very prominent—viz, Col James and Major, General Robert. Hugh also had three brothers who became men of note—viz, George, who was "for his worth and learning by the late Queen Elizabeth preferred to the parsonage of Chedchec,

and finally became chaplain to the court of King James I, and afterwards made bishop of a large diocese. His brother Partick also, who, by his prowess and conduct, going from Scotland a captain of foot into France, did arise to great credit and a colonel's post under King Henry IV, and was killed in a fight where he had commanded five hundred horse. He had no wife; neither had John, his youngest brother, who was graduated Doctor of Physich in a French university or college. He, returning homewards, came to London, where, having practiced his art with good repute, he died of that sweating, immoveable disease which raged in Queen Elizabeth's reign; 17,800 persons died of this disease in London. All persons attacked by this disease either died or recovered inside of 24 hours. The only remedy found was for the person attacked to immediately retire to bed with their clothes on, or, if attacked while in bed, to remain there, without sleeping, for 24 hours."

This Hugh Montgomery, after leaving the college at Glasgow, traveled in France and attended the court there for some months. Then he settled in Holland and became a captain of foot in a Scotch regiment under the Prince of Orange, great-grandfather of William III. of England. Hearing of the death of his mother and father, which took place about 1587, and also learning that his sisters were married and that his business affairs needed attention, he disposed of his commission and returned to Scotland, and visited the court of Edenborough. He was favorably received "as an accomplished gentleman," and by many noblemen introduced to King James the 6th, and allowed to kiss his hand. The King paid him special attention, which continued to increase on account of a regular correspondence which he had kept up with his brother "George, who was then Dean of Norwich in the Church of England."

The information given in that correspondence was of vast importance to the King. Hugh Montgomery married about this time, and lived in peace with his neighbors and friends until he was insulted by one Mr. Cunningham. Montgomery sought satisfaction, but Cunningham refused to meet him and went to London. Montgomery followed him. Then Cunningham went to Holland. Montgomery found him there and forced him into a combat with swords. A powerful thrust from the sword of Montgomery hit the buckle on Cunningham's belt which threw him on his back. Montgomery, supposing that he had killed Cunningham, put up his sword and started to leave, when he was arrested and placed in prison, from which he escaped by strategy and again reached Scotland; and through the intervention of friends and the King, concessions seem to have been made on both sides and a temporary reconciliation effected. The insult referred to above seems to have had some reference to an old feud that had existed between the Montgomerys

and Cunninghams for a long period of time, which in boldness, desperation and results equaled anything that ever took place between feudalists.

We will here insert an account of this affair, taken from the Montgomery Manuscript, page 17, note 2:

"The author truly describes this feud as 'old,' for it had its origin so early as the year 1366, when Sir Hugh Montgomery, of Eglinton, obtained a grant from the Crown of the offices of Bailhe, in the Barony of Cunningham and Chamberlain Irvine. This grant was renewed and enlarged from time to time, the Cunninghams, however, claiming the offices now mentioned as belonging from ancient and established right to the representatives of their family or clan. In 1448 James the II. renewed the grant to Lord Montgomery, and from that date the feud continued without much interruption for upward of two centuries. In 1488 the strong castle of Kerrielow, a residence of the Cunninghams in the parish of Stevenston, was sacked and destroyed by the Montgomerys under the command of that warlike Hugh, afterwards created first Earl of Eglinton. In the year 1528 the fall of Kerrielow was avenged by the burning of Eglinton Castle, together with all the important family records therein. During the interval between 1488 and 1528 many terrible collisions had occurred, especially in the years 1505, 1507, 1517, 1523 and 1526. Although an arbitration held by the earls of Angus, Argyle, Cassilis, assisted by the bishop of Maray, had decided in 1509 in favor of Eglinton's claims, and although in 1523 the first Earl of Eglinton had been honorably acquitted of the charge of murdering Edward Cunningham, of Auchin-Harrie, the feud continued with increasing fury until the Cunninghams assassinated the fourth Earl at the Ford of Annock. From that date, 1586, the strife began gradually to subside, but had not entirely ceased until the close of the seventeenth century."—Paterson's Parishes and Families, Vol. I., pages 51, 53, 54. Fraser's Memorials, Vol. I., pages 27-31.

About 1602, when James VI. was proclaimed king, and political affairs seemed somewhat improved—and much of Ireland being at the disposal of the King, men who were in favor with him began to cast about to in some way take advantage of those opportunities. Hugh Montgomery began looking toward Ireland for his future, and it has been supposed by some that he sought an opportunity to take advantage of Con Oneil in his distressed situation, in order to obtain the larger part of his large estate in Ireland. We will here give a detailed account of this whole affair.

Con Oneil was of a prominent family and in possession of a very large estate, but it was taken from him once before this, and then restored to him. He is represented as being a very rebellious and a drunken, sluggish man. The trouble out of which Montgomery

delivered him was brought on by forcing his servants into an open conflict with the Queen's soldiers, in which one of the soldiers was mortally wounded. The penalty for this offense was imprisonment and death. On page 37—and note 19—of Montgomery's Manuscript we find the following concerning this affair:

"His life and estate. Among Con's enemies, the most formidable was supposed to be Sir Arthur Chichester.

"The author of the Stewart Manuscript mentions the peril with which Con was threatened from this quarter as follows: This man Con being rebellious, and his land falling to the King, was apprehended by the then deputy Chichester and was laid up in the King's castle at Carrickfergus, a drunken, sluggish man; but he had a sharp, nimble woman to his wife. The deputy thought to have him suffer according to law and to be chief sharer in his lands. But divine Providence had otherwise appointed. For the woman, his wife, in the greatness of her spirit, taking in high indignation that her husband was not only captive but appointed to an ignominious death, soon resolved that the saving of his life with a part of his estate was better than to lose all. Therefore this she strongly intends and diligently endeavors. But in a throng of thoughts how to accomplish her desire she lights on this expedient, viz: To pass secretly to the next Scottish shore and there light if she could on some good instrument for making good her design. And God leading her to Mr. Hugh Montgomery of Braidstane in Scotland, a man sober, kind, humane and trusty, to whom she revealed her husband's case and her own desire, saying if Mr. Montgomery would be on pains, and charge to purchase from the King her husband's life and liberty with a third part of the estate for him and her to live on, the said Montgomery should with their great good will have the other two parts to be purchased by the King's grant. Montgomery, considering the matter wisely and maturely, entertains the gentle woman with all kindness till he was ripe to give her answer, which in short was this: that if she should find the way to deliver her husband Con out of the deputy's hands and let him have the secure keeping of his person, with such assurance as he could give that the articles should be performed which she had proposed in her husband's name, then would he make adventure and labor for the said Con's life and liberty."—Stewart's MS., quoted in Dr. Ried's Hist. First Presbyterian Church, Vol. I. pages 82 and 83.

"The conduct of Hugh Montgomery is very different from that of others who profited also by the confiscation of Con Oniel's estates. Had it not been for his prompt and able interposition, Con would no doubt have met the inevitable doom of land owners at that period who could in any way be found guilty of treason. Con had no means and no friends, and when Montgomery began to

expend money on his behalf the prospect of recompense must have been but very faint, seeing that Chichester was all-powerful in Ulster."

Accordingly Con made his escape by the assistance of his wife and others, and in due time arrived in Scotland and placed himself in the hands of Mr. Montgomery, who endeavored to carry out his part of the contract to the letter. He secured his pardon and liberty, and saw that he was again established in the rights of one-third of his estate.

But other parties interfered and secured to themselves one-half of the estate that Con and his wife had given to Mr. Montgomery, and still Montgomery was faithful to Con as long as he lived. Mr. Montgomery was made secure in the title of one-third of Con's estate in 1605.

Immediately he set about to place a desirable class of emigrants from Scotland on the large possessions he had secured. We find the stateemnt made that in an incredibly short time—five years—after he had obtained possession he reported 1000 men at the service of the King, and it has been supposed by some that these were all Montgomerys; but that was not the case, for we find in the Montgomery Manuscript that of the first 51 families that emigrated from Scotland to Ireland and settled on that Montgomery land only six appear among them by the name of Montgomery. But all of those families were of that sturdy, industrious, honest class that so much improved the society of Ireland, and afterwards their descendants did much to develop and establish a permanent form of government in the United States. The Irish at this time—1603-5, were in a deplorable condition, having been almost continuously engaged in war for more than four hundred years and were treacherously dealt with by King James VI. But, notwithstanding this, it is evident that the Irish as a people were much improved by coming in contact with the settled and industrious habits of the thousands of emigrants that were brought into their country by Hugh Montgomery and other Scotch knights; and out of this amalgamation came the Scotch-Irish family, a large number of whom emigrated to America and largely settled in Virginia and subsequently in every state in the Union.

While Sir Hugh Montgomery succeeded in securing pardon for Con Oniel and getting one-third of his estate restored to him, the stipulations seemed very severe. The Montgomery Manuscript, page 29, note 36, says in regard to this matter that the other Irish, or such of the Irish as had no free or English blood in them, were forbidden by law to purchase land. And Englishmen could not even give or sell to the Irish. This law was modified to some extent from time to time, but finally, "in 1703, the Irish were declared by the English Parliament to be incapable of purchasing at auction

or of taking a lease of more than two acres. Shortly afterward another act disqualified them forever from purchasing or acquiring any lands in Ireland and declared the purchase void. Is it any wonder that the Irish have been a turbulent, dissatisfied, rebellious people?

Sir Hugh Montgomery himself had to obtain "a grant of denization from the Crown by which he was made free of the yoke of servitude of the Scotch-Irish, or any other nation, and made capable of holding and enjoying all the rights and privileges of an English subject."

Sir Hugh seems to have been very fortunate in his selections of families to settle his large possessions in Ireland. He not only encouraged farmers, but mechanics, artificers and chaplains, and soon prepared a place for worship. The farms yielded abundantly, and not only supplied their own wants but soon furnished a good foreign demand.

In 1613 Hugh Montgomery's province was organized into a corporation, with privileges of representing in Parliament and conducting a court. Hon. Hugh Montgomery was the first Provost of this corporation.

In 1610 a grand-nephew of Sir Thomas Smith set up a claim to the estate of Sir Hugh. The first Sir Thomas Smith was a most remarkable man, both as a statesman and in classical attainments. This litigation continued for two years, when Smith's claim was lost, chiefly for failing to keep the contract upon which his claim rested. Hugh Montgomery soon became involved again in litigation with Sir James Hamilton, and again the decision of the court was in his favor, in 1618. Later on the Smiths renewed their suits and some other litigation which also involved Hugh Montgomery the second Viscount, who succeeded his father, which was not settled until the breaking out of the rebellion in 1641. This was a period of almost continued law-suits for thirty-six years, which all together made Sir Hugh Montgomery's lands obtained from Con Oneil's estate a pretty costly affair. In 1634 Hugh Montgomery, second cousin to Viscount Hugh, represented the corporation of Newton Town in the English Parliament, and subsequently by Hugh, Jr., George, and William Montgomery.

The first Viscount, Hugh, died in 1636, at the age of 76 years. He married the second time, which proved to be a very unfortunate affair. She refused to live in Ireland and returned to Scotland, notwithstanding many additional improvements had been made for her especial benefit. This was a great annoyance to Sir Hugh, for his first wife had been a great stay to him; took an interest in all his affairs and in the developing of their country.

† A funeral of Hugh Montgomery, the first Viscount of the Great Ards of Ireland, was conducted according to the custom of that day,

with considerable display as well as with great solemnity.

The history of the second Viscount Hugh having been lost, but little is said of his reign, which was from 1636 to 1642. There were turbulent times in this reign, as it was in 1641 that the Irish rebellion came, and in less than one week a very large part of Ireland was in possession of the rebels. The Ards, however, did not suffer materially during that week. Montgomery Manuscript, page 153, note 4, says: "The second Viscount died suddenly on the 15th day of November, 1642, in the 45th year of his age. In 1637, the year after his father's death, he was appointed a member of the privy council. On the breaking out of the rebellion . . . he received a commission from the Irish government and soon afterward from the King, to be colonel of 1000 foot and five troops of horse, the greater part of which he raised, equipped, and for one year supported at an expense of 1000 pounds. With these forces he joined Colonel Chichester at Lisbon and continued to take an active and successful part in suppressing the rebellion until the time of his death. His oldest son Hugh succeeded him. His second son, Henry, died young. His third son, James, was born at Dunskey in 1639 and died at Rosemount in 1689. . . . His only daughter, Elizabeth, married her cousin, William Montgomery, author of the Montgomery Manuscript."

This third Viscount Hugh Montgomery had received a severe fall, by which a fracture in his left side made an opening that never healed, and exposed the heart to that extent the beating or pulsations were plainly visible; and when he came into the presence of the King, preparatory to entering upon his official duties in Ireland, his old physician was present and informed the King of this peculiar matter. After the King had closely examined it, he said: "I wish I could perceive the thoughts of some of my nobility's hearts as I have seen your heart." To this Mr. Montgomery readily replied: "I assure your Majesty before God here present, and this company, it shall never entertain any thought against your concerns, but be always full of dutiful affection and steadfast resolution to serve your Majesty."

Just here, as we have mentioned several titles of honor which from time to time have been bestowed upon the Montgomerys from the earliest period of their recorded history to the present time, we will explain that a duke stood first, next to the king, sometimes governing a country without the title of king. Earl or count stood second in prestige and influence, and viscount stood third.

In the Irish rebellion, from 1641 to 1652, Sir James Montgomery was the oldest colonel, and Hugh Montgomery was the youngest at the beginning of the war. Hugh the third Viscount was given chief command of all the forces in Ulster, in Ireland, in 1649 and took part

in all those terrible struggles with Oliver Cromwell's forces, and was the last of the generals to surrender, and finally, in 1650, made his way to Cromwell's headquarters and gave himself up. Cromwell treated him respectfully and "made capitulations for their coming home and peaceably living there without deserting the realm or acting against the Parliament, and for being admitted their estates upon composition money to be paid by them as Parliament should think fit: which done, Oliver Cromwell went to England in winter of 1649, leaving Ireton to attend the blockade of Limerick, to which the Irish had retired for their last refuge to obtain conditions of peace."

Soon after this, however, they dealt harshly with him, as he seemed to be a veritable Napoleon Bonaparte. They compelled him to leave his family, relatives, friends, and go to London by way of Dublin, and not through any part of Scotland, and appear before a committee of Parliament "to wit, the Rump," which banished him into Holland. He was forbidden to have any correspondence with Chas. Stewart or to come back to England or Ireland without the council of state license.

"The Rump," so the remnant of the long Parliament was nicknamed after 1648, when the Presbyterian members were expelled by the process known as "Pride's Purge." The Rump Parliament was one of the most distinguished legislative assemblies ever witnessed in England. Among its leading men were Sir Henry Vane, the most practical of statesmen; Thomas Scott, whose speeches are described as among the most eloquent in the English language; Algernon Sidney, a descendant by his mother's side from Hotspur, and as impatient as Hotspur himself of all courtly arts or kingly arrogance, and Thomas Harrison, who carried his daring as a soldier to the most chivalrous extent. The great practical error of this Parliament was its reluctance and delay in dissolving itself, thus giving Cromwell a pretext violently to put an end to its sittings in 1653 after an existence of thirteen years." See note 67, page 194, Montgomery MS.

While the third Viscount Hugh Montgomery was thus banished, he passed the time by visiting in disguise many important cities in Holland, among which was the university town of Holland, where the author of the Montgomery Manuscript was studying. In all these travels he hoped that his disguise would shield him, but his noble visage would betray him and hotels would charge him as a nobleman. In 1653 he was permitted to return home, according to the stipulations made between him and Oliver Cromwell at the time of his surrender. But the lordship placed upon him by the authorities, which kept him passing to and from Ireland, was very expensive and trying on his health; so much so that life was scarcely worth living. But he endured it all and lived to see the Royalist

fully restored, on the accession of Charles the second (1660) to the throne of England, and was made one of the commissioners to adjust landed estates after this date. And be it said to his honor that he was just and merciful in these adjustments.

The third Viscount was created Earl of Mt. Alexander June 20, and received the patent July 18, 1661, and died Sept. 15, 1663.

The author of the Montgomery Manuscript says that in obtaining favors and positions of trust the Montgomeries can never be accused of bartering or paying a money consideration for them.

The most of the Montgomeries in England, Scotland and Ireland were staunch loyalists.

We will here give place to a part of the will of Hugh Montgomery, the third Viscount, or first Earl of Mt. Alexander.

May, 1660. This will . . . which is preserved in the court of probate, Henrietta street, Dublin, was drawn up before his leaving England and intended to confirm a prior arrangement of his affairs. His oldest son, Hugh Montgomery, succeeded to the family estates, his son Henry is liberally provided for, and to his only daughter, Jane, or Jean, he bequeathed only 100 pounds yearly. This lady died unmarried at Chester in the year 1663.

Following is the introductory sentence of this document: "I, Hugh, Lord Viscount of the Ards, being in my full strength and memory, but being now upon a journey into England and desirous to settle my estate, do make my last will and testament. First, I bequeath my soul to the holy and undivided Trinitie, trusting in the alone merits of Christ Jesus my Lord, who came into the world to save sinners, whereof I acknowledge myself to be the greatest; and my body to be decently interred as my executors and overseers, or the greater part of them, shall think most fitting my degree and present condition."

The author of the Montgomery Manuscript says: "The elegy which is inserted in my opera virilio being too long to be herein placed, I have therefore only given the reader the epitaph which I made on his Lordship, as followeth:

" 'Here lies the much-lamented, much-beloved,
One greatly hoped of and one much approved.
Kind to the good he was; to all men just;
Most careful in discharging of a trust;
Compassionate to the poor, devout towards God,
A cheerful sufferer of the common rod
Which scourged thousands; not proud when he was high,
Nor yet dejected in adversity;
Unalterably loyal to his King,
He truly noble was in everything,
Yet died thus in his prime.
But do not pity him who blessed is.' "

Montgomery Manuscript, page 254, in speaking of the most excellent qualities of Hugh Montgomery, first Earl of Mt. Alexander, in Ireland, refers to his reddish curly hair, which denotes vigor of brain to give counsel according to the proverbial advice—namely, "At a red man read thy reed." Note 56 on same page says, "In other words, learn counsel; take advice from a red-haired man, who is supposed to possess peculiar clearness and vigor of intellect." To read in this sense means to learn from. This word is sometimes superseded by "reck," signifying to care for, to take note of. For "read," meaning advice or counsel, some authors have "reade," and others have "rede." The poet Burns uses the proverbial phrase happily as follows:

"In plowman's phrase, God send you speed
Still daily to grow wiser;
And may you better reckon the read
Than ever did th' adviser."

"Another proverbial phrase, not so complimentary to persons having hair of this color, was, when you meet a red-haired man, say your prayers, for he is not to be trusted."

This expression may have arisen from two causes: First, the Danes were a red-haired race and their atrocities had rendered them hateful to the Irish; or, second, it was a general opinion during the middle ages that Judas Iscariot had red hair, and in all paintings he is so represented. Even so late as Dryden's time that poet describes Tonson as like the man

"With left legs and Judas-colored hair."

There has always been a considerable number of red-haired Montgomeries, and we thought best to give this note in full, lest the red-haired ones might set up the claim of being the only true, genuine stock.

We have stated that most of the Montgomeries in the old country were royalists, yet you will observe from the preceding accounts that they had many conflicts with the powers that controlled the governments; and if the uprising in Scotland in 1639 be called a rebellion, "the acknowledged chief of all the families of Montgomery—namely the sixth Earl of Eglinton—was among the leaders of this movement against the arbitrary cause of Charles the first."

CHAPTER III.

"Hugh, second Earl and fourth Viscount Montgomery of the Great Ards, was born 24th of February, 1650," and he was not thirteen years old when his father died. He or his sister Jane, or Jean, were entrusted to the care of William Montgomery, the author of the Montgomery Manuscript, who, with Elizabeth Montgomery, was a sister to the first Earl of Mt. Alexander.

This the second Earl's estate and finances became considerably entangled and involved in the courts to such an extent as to bring almost total financial ruin in 1675.

In connection with the settling of the second Earl's affairs, mention is made of Captain Hugh Montgomery. Note 27, page 267, Montgomery Manuscript, says: "This gentleman was son of James Montgomery the clergyman. He was the first Earl's constant attendant and friend, and known as my Lords, Hugh. At this time there were living six other Hughs, not including the young earl—viz: Hugh, son of Hugh of Gransheogh; Hugh, son of the Seneschal; Hugh of Bollyleson; Hugh of Ballyheny; Hugh of Ballysheogh Hugh of Ballymaclady. Hugh mentioned in the text is styled of Dublin in 1663, but soon afterwards came to reside permanently at Ballymagowan, now Springvale.

Fortune again came to the second Earle in 1685 and he became governor of Charlemount, and it appears that he had become tired of the vexations connected with those unsettled and disturbing times, as note 47, page 271, Montgomery MS., says, "Hugh the second Earl of Mt. Alexander, being in London in the year 1666 and seeing the design of the King against the Irish Protestants, returned to this country having sold a troop of horse which he had obtained from the Earl of Essex a few years before, and retired to his estate in Down resolving to live there in retirement so long as he could honorably do so. This retirement, however, was soon interrupted" by the appearance of an anonymous letter claiming that a general uprising was to take place on Sunday, Dec. 9, 1688, in which man, wife and children of Protestants were to be overpowered and murdered. Episcopalians and Covenanters lost sight of their old quarrels and

joined forces, and chose Hugh Montgomery as general to command the Protestant forces to defend themselves against this expected uprising, which, however, never materialized; but the fear, excitement and consternation were equal to those of 1641, during the Irish rebellion. This, however, served some good purpose. The Protestant churches, which had been so embittered against each other, now joined in one common cause against the Catholic foe, and did not now scruple to "hear of the other way of worship and sermons."

The Protestants made two unsuccessful attempts to capture Carrickfergus, the stronghold of the Catholic party, but finally compelled them to a very reasonable compromise, which was to remain in force as long as no Catholic force was raised nor sent into those provinces.

Note 51, page 274-5, Montgomery Manuscript, says: "Time and the discipline of events had taught both Episcopalians and Presbyterians. After a fierce struggle carried on with slight interruptions from the time of the Reformation until 1660, the Episcopalians remained masters of the situation. In 1661 the Government ordered the Covenant to be burned throughout Ulster by the hands of the common hangman, because it was then adjudged schismatical, seditious and treasonable;" and Presbyterianism not only revived, but was in reality very much relieved by this conflagration. At all events the Presbyterians of 1688 as a body never thought of pledging the Prince of Orange to ends of the covenant, and aimed only at obtaining religious liberty for themselves, sweetened by a very moderate bounty from the state known as "Regnum Donum." And the Episcopalians, although the dominant party, obtaining at the restoration all and perhaps more than they ever expected in the way of power, soon came to understand that they had too hastily adopted their idol Charles II., and that, being so loyal in 1660 as to take no guarantees for constitutional government, they were compelled in 1688 to fight for those guarantees at a tremendous cost.

Both parties were therefore to some extent moderated in sentiments and aims, and had become more charitable toward each other; for such men as Milton and Jeremy Taylor had been reconciling the religious world, in the meantime, to the grand idea of religious toleration. The Episcopalians and Presbyterians not only became more lenient with each other, but more tolerant with the Irish Catholics.

The Protestant forces under Hugh Montgomery and others espoused the cause of William of Orange in 1688-9, and met with disastrous defeat with their unorganized and undisciplined troops against the well-trained soldiers of King James.

Some historians try to throw the entire blame of this defeat on the second Earl Montgomery, but in a lengthy report of this affair

he clearly vindicates himself by showing that the council of war overruled his plan, and that while he had been appointed to the chief command really he only held the rank of a colonel, and that jealous partisan parties disputed his authority to the chief command and thus frustrated his plans.

However, this seems to have lost him his former popularity until 1691, when we find him a member of the Irish Parliament, in the House of Lords, and "From the delivery of his writ in the House of Lords on the 5th of October, 1692, the Earl of Mt. Alexander was a leading and most indefatigable member. He was appointed on all important committees of the House and appears to have been most regular in his attendance at every sitting." See Journals of the Irish House of Lords, volumes 1 and 2.

Hugh Montgomery the second Earl was in 1688 made master of Ordinances and made a brigadier-general, and finally—1701-2-3—was one of a council that ruled Ireland.

This second Earl Hugh Montgomery died in 1617 and his virtues are summed up as follows:

1. Paid all debts contracted by his father and grandfather.
2. Frugality.
3. Christian fortitude.
4. Liberality.
5. Always a true friend.
6. His splendid composition.
7. His abhorrence to public show in devotions.
8. His loyalty to his church.
9. Kind to citizens and soldiers.
10. Agreeable to servants.
11. His hospitality.
12. His poesy.
13. His strength in council.
14. His learning and fearless statement of his convictions in church and state.

It is stated that he obtained all honors and offices purely on his merits, unaided by powerful assistants to present his claims.

Henry Montgomery, brother of Hugh the second Earl, succeeded him to the earldom and became the third Earl of Mt. Alexander in Ireland, in 1716. He is represented as being of "sweet temper and disposition, affable, courteous and complacent." He had one daughter, Elizabeth, who never married. His oldest son was named Hugh, and the other son was named Thomas.

Henry was born at Mellifant, 1656, and died 1731. Nothing remarkable seems to have occurred during the 14 years that he enjoyed the title of an earl.

Henry was succeeded by his eldest son Hugh, who became the