

THE WOLF OF BADENOCH

Alexander Grant

Some six hundred years ago, on 17 June 1390, the province of Moray experienced the most dramatic of the acts of violence which punctuate its history. 'The men of lord Alexander Stewart, son of the late king [Robert II] ... in the presence of the said lord Alexander, burned the whole town of Elgin and the Church of St Giles in it, the hospice beside Elgin, eighteen noble and beautiful mansions of canons and chaplains, and — what gives most bitter pain — the noble and beautiful church of Moray, the beacon of the countryside and ornament of the kingdom, with all the books, charters and other goods of the countryside preserved there.'¹ As well as being the son of Robert II, the lord Alexander was earl of Buchan, lord of the earldom of Ross and lord of Badenoch; but, as the chronicler Walter Bower put it in the early 1440s, he 'was vulgarly called The Wolf of Badenoch'. We cannot be sure if that was a contemporary nickname, but it certainly sums up his effect on the province of Moray. Although Elgin cathedral was subsequently repaired, so that its present state cannot be blamed on the Wolf, viewing the modern ruins does help bridge the six centuries and gives a vivid sense of the outrage which he and his men — 'wyld wykkyd Heland-men' — committed.²

Alexander Stewart first appears in Badenoch, the main Highland part of the province of Moray, twenty years earlier, when he was probably in his late teens. On 14 August 1370 he issued letters patent from Ruthven (the *caput* of Badenoch) in which he undertook to protect all the men and lands of the bishop of Moray, especially in Strathspey and Badenoch, and ordered his friends and men to look after the bishop's men and lands as if they were his own. Surprisingly, the document is dated about six months before Alexander's formal grant of Badenoch. The explanation is probably that (judging by the review of landholding after David II's 1367 Act of Revocation), Alexander's father, Robert Stewart, himself held Badenoch in the 1360s. He had probably acquired it through his second marriage, in 1355, to the widow of the last Randolph earl of Moray; since Badenoch was part of the Randolph earldom, it may have come to Robert as her widow's terce. Despite the query about it in 1367, it apparently stayed in Robert Stewart's hands for the rest of David II's reign — and Robert presumably allowed his third son Alexander to exercise lordship in it on his behalf.³

In 1370 Alexander's position in Badenoch was unofficial; he is plain 'Alexander Senescallus' in his undertaking to the bishop. But once his father had succeeded David II on the throne (22 February 1371), his position was formalised. On 30 March 1371 he was granted the lordship of Badenoch together with the lands, forest and castle of Lochindorb.

That constituted a major part of the earldom of Moray, but Alexander perhaps wanted more. The first chamberlain's account for Robert II's reign records receipts of only £11 from Moray, 'and no more from the fermes or grains of the said earldom because lord Alexander Stewart, the son of the king, has taken possession of them.'⁴ Three of his brothers were already earls; Alexander may have had designs on the earldom. It would have been difficult, however, for his father to give it to him, because of the claims of the Randolph heirs-general. In 1371 these were George Dunbar, earl of March, and his brother John. Both had supported Robert II significantly at the beginning of his reign and deserved to be rewarded; accordingly, Robert made John Dunbar earl of Moray in March 1372. But John did not get the whole Randolph earldom: Alexander's extended lordship of Badenoch was excluded, and so were Lochaber (held by John MacDonald, lord of the Isles) and Urquhart, a large barony stretching westwards from the southern half of Loch Ness, which went to Alexander's younger brother David. John Dunbar was compensated with land in Aberdeenshire, and married one of King Robert's daughters.⁵

The division of the Randolph earldom of Moray which began when Robert Stewart acquired Badenoch was thus consolidated. The 1372 earldom consisted of the southern coastal plain of the Moray Firth, from the mouth of the Spey to Inverness, plus the region around upper Loch Ness; but within this all the land of the sheriffdom of Nairn was held by the earls of Ross.⁶ Thus in practice John Dunbar's territory was restricted to the fairly small modern shire (now district) of Moray, and the area around Inverness and Loch Ness. This was the most fertile and economically valuable part of the province of Moray; but politically and strategically, without most of its hinterland, it looks extremely weak, open to attack from the Highland areas to the south, and especially from the lordship of Badenoch. (The loss of Lochindorb, formerly the earldom's main stronghold, no doubt explains why John Dunbar built the great hall at Darnaway, discussed elsewhere in this volume by Mr Stell.)

Badenoch was the first in a series of grants made to Alexander in the early part of his father's reign. During the 1370s he expanded his lands to the west of Loch Ness by leasing Urquhart from his brother, and extended his Grampian possessions eastwards with the barony of Stratha'an, which is the valley of the river Avon, on the eastern side of the Cairngorms running down to the river Spey.⁷ Then, following several smaller acquisitions from Caithness to Aberdeenshire and Perthshire,⁸ in June 1382 he more than doubled his territory by marrying Countess Euphemia of Ross, a few months after the death of her first husband. On his marriage, he was granted the earldom of Ross, then the largest earldom in Scotland, for life, and joint ownership of the rest of Euphemia's inheritance: chiefly the Isle of Skye, the thanage and castle of Dingwall, the barony and sheriffdom of Nairn, and the barony of Kinneddar in Aberdeenshire. He became an

earl: Kinnedar consisted of part of the lands of the old earldom of Buchan, to which Euphemia was an heiress, and therefore Alexander took the title earl of Buchan.⁹ These territories carried great administrative and judicial powers, especially Badenoch, which Alexander held with the semi-royal powers of regality. In addition, he was sheriff of Inverness, which covered the modern (pre-1975) shire and the whole area to the north of it. And, in October 1372, Robert II appointed him royal lieutenant north of the Moray Firth and in Inverness-shire outside Moray; that placed him above the earls of Ross, Sutherland and Caithness, and (at least in theory), the Gaelic chiefs of the north and west.¹⁰

This accumulation of territory and offices clearly made Alexander Stewart supreme in the North. With Badenoch, Ross, Nairn, Urquhart and Stratha'an he had far more territory than the earl of Moray, and he had his official positions, sheriff of Inverness and royal lieutenant, as well. Consider also his main castles: Ruthven, dominating the main north-south route through the Highlands; Lochindorb, dominating Strathspey; Urquhart, dominating the middle of the Great Glen; Inverness (held as sheriff), dominating 'the hub of the Highlands'; and Dingwall, dominating the routes to the north. All in all, Alexander's position in the early 1380s looks to have been as powerful as, or even more powerful than, that held by anyone else in the whole history of the Highlands, at least since the time of Macbeth.

It is reasonable to assume that Alexander's rapid rise to such power would have been resented by the other local magnates. His main neighbours, however, were equally new arrivals on the scene. In the 1370s Ross was held by Euphemia Ross's first husband, Sir Walter Lesley, formerly a courtier of David II, who had no firm base in the region. Similarly the slimmed-down Moray had gone in 1372 to the southern incomer John Dunbar. Both men's interests probably lay elsewhere: Walter Lesley spent much of the 1370s abroad, while John Dunbar was prominent in Border warfare.¹¹ Neither seems to have mounted — or to have been able to mount — any challenge to Alexander Stewart.

He was challenged, however, by the local ecclesiastical potentate, Bishop Alexander Bur of Moray. In the medieval Highlands, bishoprics were generally closely linked with earldoms: Dunblane and Strathearn, Dunkeld and Atholl, Rosemarkie and Ross. On the other hand in Moray, where there was no earldom in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the bishops were much more independent, like their colleagues of St Andrews and Glasgow. In the Wars of Independence Bishop David Murray — whose famous support for Robert Bruce may partly have been due to antipathy towards the Comyn lords of Badenoch — is an example of this. But when Robert I created the great earldom of Moray for Thomas Randolph, the bishopric of Moray, like all the other ecclesiastical and lay lordships in the province, was put under the earl's overlordship, regality jurisdiction, and

military leadership.¹² Robert I's grant, however, was limited to the heirs-male of Randolph's body, and so technically it lapsed when the male Randolph line died out in 1346. That is almost certainly what Bishop Bur believed; throughout a long episcopate (1362-1397), he seems to have been obsessed with asserting his bishopric's former independence. Aspects of this, for instance 'following the earl's banner', were issues in his quarrel with John Dunbar, earl of Moray, during the 1380s. Earlier, in 1365, he persuaded David II to allow him to have full (in practice, regality) jurisdiction over his tenants in Strathspey and Badenoch, to the exclusion of the royal justiciar and other officers. And when he in effect recognised Alexander Stewart as *de facto* lord of Badenoch in 1370, he insisted on Alexander's promise not to summon the bishop's men to his courts, nor to impose exactions on them, nor to raise them for any army — all points which echo Thomas Randolph's superiority over the bishopric.¹³

The agreement with Alexander Stewart, however, was made before the formal grant of the lordship of Badenoch in March 1371. According to Robert II's charter, Alexander was to hold the lands of Badenoch in regality and in every way as Thomas Randolph, earl of Moray, had held them, which presumably included superiority over the episcopal territories.¹⁴ No doubt Bishop Bur protested, and that might explain the curious fact that the version of the grant of Badenoch recorded in the *Register of the Great Seal* has no mention of regality rights nor of Thomas Randolph's powers; instead, Alexander was to hold Badenoch simply as John Comyn and his predecessors had held it, in the thirteenth century.¹⁵ But since that more limited grant did not stop Alexander from exercising regality jurisdiction, it is reasonable to assume that it likewise did not inhibit him from regarding himself as having the same powers as Thomas Randolph. At any rate during the 1370s Alexander seems to have been trying to force Bishop Bur to recognise his superiority over the episcopal lands in Badenoch and Strathspey. This caused a long-running struggle, which can be partly reconstructed from documents recorded in the *Register of the Bishopric of Moray*.

The evidence starts with the notarial account, produced for the bishop, of a 'test case' in Alexander's chief court for Badenoch, held on 10 October 1380 at the standing stones of Easter Kingussie.¹⁶ Bishop Bur had been specially summoned, to show on what grounds he held certain episcopal lands in Badenoch. He turned up with a sizeable following, but remained outside the court and made the following declaration: his appearance did not mean that he recognised Alexander Stewart's jurisdiction, but he happened to have heard that he had been cited, and wished to protest; he held his lands directly of the crown, and some months earlier had asserted this before the king and the royal council in Inverness. Alexander replied that he needed proof that the episcopal lands were held directly of the crown; otherwise the case would proceed. The bishop then tried to have

the dispute transferred to the royal courts. He offered a pledge to the sheriff of Inverness; offering a pledge, generally a sum of money, to the convenor of a court was the normal way to initiate a lawsuit. But the sheriff of Inverness was Alexander Stewart himself, and he refused to accept the bishop's pledge. Next the bishop appealed to the justiciary court. The justiciar, then Sir Alexander Lindsay of Glenesk,¹⁷ was not present, but William Chalmers the justice clerk was. Chalmers was also, however, Alexander Stewart's secretary, and once again the bishop's pledge was rejected. The bishop also offered the pledge to Patrick Crawford, sheriff of Banff, who had just arrived; but he was probably one of Alexander Stewart's men, and in turn refused the case. The only other royal representative present was Robert Galbraith, the king's macer, and he did accept the pledge. But that did not stop the case from continuing in the Badenoch regality court, which found against the bishop, and the episcopal lands in Badenoch were declared forfeit. The bishop reacted by declaring that any action against them by Alexander's officials was a trespass against the royal dignity and the liberties of the bishopric of Moray, risking severe royal penalties and, being sacrilege, the most severe ecclesiastical punishments. Nevertheless, the first round had gone to Alexander.

Next day, however, informal procedures replaced formal ones. The bishop had long discussions with Alexander in Ruthven castle. Eventually, Alexander declared that he was now 'fully informed' about the case, and on the advice of his council — including William Chalmers, Patrick Crawford, and another of Alexander's followers, Sir William Fotheringham — he agreed that the judgement against the bishop should be revoked. William Chalmers cut the record of the case out of the court roll, and ceremonially burned it before a crowd of local landowners and clergy. Round two had gone to the bishop, and the previous day's formal proceedings are revealed as largely shadow boxing. The bishop would have known his appeals were futile, but had to go through the proper procedures. Conversely Alexander must have known of the bishop's appearance at Inverness before his father and a council headed by his two elder brothers; it is hard to believe, indeed, that Alexander himself would not have been present, or at least near-by, at the time.

Moreover, Bishop Bur was probably successful in the royal council, at least informally (the council did not have formal jurisdiction over lawsuits concerning land tenure). This is indicated in a statement by Alexander dated 28 October 1381. He said he had occupied certain lands in Badenoch, believing them to belong to the lordship; but now he had been persuaded by his legal experts and councillors, and by documents produced by the bishop of Moray, that the lands really belonged to the bishop. Therefore he instructed them to be delivered to the bishop, and ordered his officers never to claim them again. If Alexander had accepted the bishop's docu-

ments, no doubt the king and council had, too; Alexander had probably simply been stalling. And crown sympathy for the bishop is demonstrated by letters patent of 7 March 1382 giving him supreme jurisdiction over all crimes, including pleas of the crown, committed by the bishop's tenants; this re-enacted the similar grant made by David II in 1365, and cancelled any regality jurisdiction which Alexander Stewart might have claimed over the episcopal territories.¹⁸

Yet while round three had gone emphatically to the bishop, to see Alexander as surrendering absolutely is an oversimplification. What he had claimed in 1380 and acknowledged as the bishop's in 1381 appears to have been the original ecclesiastical lands in the region, held by the bishops of Moray before there was a feudal lordship of Badenoch, and (in some cases at least) quit-claimed by the first Comyn lord of Badenoch in the early 1230s.¹⁹ Bishop Bur's defence in 1380, on the other hand, included not only these lands but also the territory of Rothiemurchus. Now Rothiemurchus had been granted directly to the bishops of Moray by Alexander II, which means it was outside the lordship of Badenoch, certainly as defined under the Comyns; that perhaps explains why Alexander did not claim it in 1380.²⁰ In round four of their contest, however, Bishop Bur actually conceded Rothiemurchus. On 20 April 1383 it was leased for the lifetimes of Alexander and two heirs of his body; in return Alexander promised to protect the bishop and the bishop's lands, and keep them free of malefactors. This was a significant gain for Alexander; Rothiemurchus was considerably larger than the other lands at dispute, covering six davochs (compared with a total of sixty davochs for the whole of Badenoch).²¹ It also contained Loch an Eilean, on the island of which lies 'the most famous castle of Badenoch', traditionally attributed to the Wolf of Badenoch;²² if the attribution is valid, that would help to show the importance Alexander attached to Rothiemurchus. Be that as it may, things do seem to have been swinging back towards Alexander. He had perhaps also been pressurising Bishop Bur in the Inverness sheriff court; in October 1383 the bishop appealed to the justiciary court, challenging the judgement given against him by the sheriff of Inverness (Sir William Fotheringham, presumably Alexander Stewart's deputy), because the bishops of Moray had always been exempt from citations to the Inverness sheriff court.²³

After this, the *Register* indicates a three-year lull. Then, on 2 February 1387, Alexander met the bishop in the house of an Inverness burgess, and made an agreement over the rent of Rothiemurchus, which he had not been paying in full; but other issues, including the episcopal teinds due from the proceeds of the justiciary and sheriff courts held by Alexander, were not settled. As that indicates, by this time Alexander was justiciar — chief justice — of Scotland north of the Forth. The office had been vacant since the death of Sir Alexander Lindsay in 1381. We do not know when Alexander Stewart was appointed, but circumstantial evidence suggests it

was not until after 1385, and that the office had been vacant until then. The reason for the hiatus is unclear. Perhaps the vacancy suited Alexander — for example, there would have been no justiciar to hear the bishop's appeal in 1383 — but subsequently he decided the office could be advantageous. That may be implied in the letters issued by Bishop Bur after the Inverness meeting. These grant a four-merks feu of the lands of Abriachan and others, north of Urquhart, to 'the magnificent, noble and powerful lord Alexander Stewart earl of Buchan, lord of Ross and Badenoch, lieutenant of the lord our king and justiciar in the land north of the river Forth, in return for the multiple benefits, aids and assistances he has rendered unto us and our church, and will render faithfully in the future.' Bishop Bur, it might seem, had decided he had nowhere else to go for help, and therefore had given up. The contest appears to have ended in a draw, with the bishop maintaining the principle that his lands were outside the lord of Badenoch's overlordship, while Alexander gained Rothiemurchus and Abriachan.²⁴

Thus, judging from the *Moray Register*, the mid 1380s, while not marked by such spectacular gains as the years 1371-82, apparently went well for the lord of Badenoch. Other evidence suggests that, too. In October 1384 Alexander had a royal charter of the barony of Abernethy (now Nethy Bridge) to the north of Badenoch, with regality rights which removed it from the earldom of Moray; and in October 1386 the earl of Moray granted him the barony of Bona (now Dochfour), at the head of Loch Ness. These acquisitions, together with those of Rothiemurchus, Abriachan, Stratha'an and Urquhart, are all on or near the fringes of Badenoch, and suggest perhaps a deliberate policy of, in effect, expanding the boundaries of the lordship on the part of Alexander. Meanwhile relations between the earl and bishop of Moray had deteriorated badly — which no doubt helps to explain the bishop's willingness to compromise in 1387.²⁵

The *Acts of The Parliaments of Scotland*, however, tell a very different story. The council-general of April 1385 witnessed a widespread attack on Alexander Stewart, which had probably been facilitated by the partial coup d'état of the previous November, in which Robert II had been made to transfer responsibility for everyday justice to his eldest son John, earl of Carrick. Alexander's brother David complained that Alexander was wrongfully detaining the barony of Urquhart, which had been temporarily leased to him; the king and his eldest sons, the earls of Carrick and Fife, recommended family arbitration, but David's response shows that he did not anticipate an amicable settlement. At the same time, Sir James Lindsay of Crawford pursued a hereditary claim to the lordship of the earldom of Buchan. He stated that King Robert refused to deliver Buchan to him at pledge — in other words give him temporary possession while the question of ownership was settled — and he now sought this from Carrick and the council. It was agreed that this should be determined at the next council-

general in June; that Alexander Stewart was to be summoned to make his counter-claim; but that whether or not he appeared, the question of who should have Buchan at pledge would be decided. Meanwhile it was to be taken into crown hands, and was not to go at pledge to Alexander; if the king had sent contrary instructions, these were to be overridden. Thirdly, following a complaint by the earl of Moray, Carrick was instructed to order Alexander to search his lands for Finlay 'Lauson' and the sons of Harald 'Foulson' (both surnames are presumably anglicised forms of Gaelic patronymics), who had killed some of Moray's men. Finally, the council-general ordered that because of the general lawlessness of the north, Carrick should go there in person with enough manpower to ensure that justice was properly done. Although that was not aimed specifically at Alexander Stewart, as the king's lieutenant in the north he was probably being indirectly blamed for the breakdown of law and order. All four measures demonstrate a widespread perception that Alexander could not be bothered with the due processes of law; and, from the Buchan case, there is an inference that King Robert was favouring him.²⁶

Three years later, in November 1388, Alexander was again attacked in a council-general. 'It was decided ... that whereas Alexander Stewart son of the king, to whom the king had granted and committed the office of justiciar for the parts north of the river Forth, has at various times been accused before the king and before the council of being negligent in the execution of his office, in that he did not administer that office where and when he should, but wherever justice ayres were held he was useless to the community, and that having often been summoned and expected he did not appear, he deserved to be removed and ought to be removed from that office.'²⁷ Unfortunately, as discussed above, we do not know when Alexander became justiciar, but it was almost certainly after 1385. It should follow that King Robert personally appointed Alexander as justiciar *after* the initial attack on him, and indeed after the king had given up his judicial responsibilities. This indicates that Robert II was not the aged cipher so often described. But it also shows his continuing favouritism towards Alexander, who no doubt saw the justiciarship as a means both of out-flanking the cases brought against him in 1385 and of gaining an advantage in his dispute with the bishop of Moray.

Yet if things seem to have gone Alexander's way in 1386 and 1387, it is now clear that that was only temporary; he suffered a major reverse in November 1388. Not only was he strongly censured and dismissed from the justiciarship, but his elder brother the earl of Fife — the ablest of all Robert II's sons — became warden of the kingdom. Under Fife, the effort to bring justice to the north which Carrick had been told to make in 1385 does seem to have started. In April 1389 his son Murdoch Stewart became justiciar, on condition that Fife himself gave assistance with sufficient power. Accordingly Fife led an expedition to Inverness the following

autumn. On 27 October 1389 he settled the bishop of Moray's other long-running dispute with Earl John Dunbar. Among many items, Bishop Bur purged himself of complicity in the killing of Sir David Barclay, almost 40 years earlier, which suggests he may not have been a completely blameless character; and, more relevantly here, the earl agreed to take no action against the bishop for making some of the earl's men swear an oath to lord Alexander Stewart, 'because he [the bishop] did this for the best'.²⁸

Less than a week later, on 2 November, another important quarrel was apparently settled, again in Inverness, this time concerning Alexander Stewart himself.²⁹ Alexander had abandoned his wife, Euphemia Ross, and was living with a lady called Mairead daughter of Eachann ('Mariota filia Athyn', or 'Mariette Nighean Eachainn').³⁰ Now he promised to return to Euphemia as her man and husband and with her possessions, to treat her honourably without threat of death, and not to use his men³¹ illegally against her. Euphemia seems to have been treated badly, and it might seem surprising that she wanted Alexander back. The phrase about her possessions may be the key; Alexander had probably been denying her any of the revenues of Ross. Whatever the case, it was no doubt a political settlement rather than a marital one, involving not only Alexander but also the earl of Sutherland, who agreed to be the chief surety that Alexander would keep his promise.³² And, although he is not expressly mentioned, the earl of Fife was no doubt involved too, for he had dealt with the earl and bishop of Moray only a day or so earlier. But marital discord was a Church matter, and the actual settlement was ordered by the ecclesiastical authorities: the bishops of Moray and Ross. Since Alexander Stewart's previous dispute with Bishop Bur had been over superiority in secular affairs, it is hard to believe that the bishop did not relish asserting his spiritual power — albeit, presumably, with the backing and perhaps at the instigation of the earl of Fife.

Alexander must have been humiliated. And within a few months Bishop Bur rubbed salt in the wound. On 22 February 1390 he made an indenture with Thomas Dunbar, eldest son of the earl of Moray, who had replaced Alexander as sheriff of Inverness. Thomas undertook to defend the bishop's possessions and men, for the rest of the bishop's life, against all malefactors, caterans (Highland bandits), and everyone else except the king; in return the bishop was to pay Thomas an annual fee. The indenture does not mention Alexander by name, but it obviously related to him. The bishop may have been seeking protection against Alexander's revenge for his humiliation at Inverness; or he and Thomas Dunbar may have been indulging in one-upmanship at Alexander's expense. Whatever the explanation, the indenture was the last straw for Alexander. The *Moray Register* describes it as 'The useless and damnable provision for the lands and tithes of the church of Moray, from which followed their final destruction'. Thomas Dunbar proved incapable of fulfilling his promises (and indeed

the indenture was annulled by Robert III six months later). In late May 1390 — not long after the death of Robert II, which may have been another consideration — Alexander Stewart attacked Forres, destroying the town, the choir of St Lawrence's church, and the archdeacon's house; and, as we have seen, on 17 June the city, churches and cathedral of Elgin were given to the flames.³³

For the past century and a half, the teinds of Rothiemurchus parish had gone to provide the lighting (*'ad luminarie'*) of Elgin cathedral.³⁴ It is tempting to speculate whether, after 1383, Bishop Bur might have emphasised this responsibility to the new tenant of Rothiemurchus Alexander Stewart — and whether, in June 1390, Alexander grimly saw himself as fulfilling the responsibility once and for all. The fire destroyed the cathedral's interior and the roofs of the nave, choir and chapter house. Surviving masonry in the nave and choir shows scorch marks and evidence of extensive repairs to the upper levels, while the west front, central crossing and great tower were all damaged and had eventually to be rebuilt. The canons of Moray were summoned, together with expert masons, to decide on the repairs and their financing. The Avignon pope Clement VII was approached, and gave some of his revenue from the Scottish Church for the next ten years. Bishop Bur also petitioned the parliament following Robert III's coronation in August 1390. He may have hoped for a tax, but found parliament unresponsive. In December an appeal to the king was more successful, for Robert III provided £20 a year to the Elgin building fund from 1391 until 1397, when Bishop Bur died. Much more was no doubt raised from other sources, and the cathedral was gradually repaired — though the central tower was only completed in about 1420, and the west front a decade or so later.³⁵

Bishop Bur wanted political support as well. On 19 August Robert III, with the advice of his council, cancelled the protection agreement with Thomas Dunbar because the bishop's lands had been devastated. At the same time he prohibited Alexander Stewart and the earl of Moray from seizing the bishop's castle of Spynie. But there is no written evidence of more positive action against Alexander. The explanation probably is that the sacrilegious attack on the cathedral was a matter for Church courts, and given the bishop's quarrel with Alexander over jurisdiction he would not have wanted to go to the lay courts. Instead the full ecclesiastical penalty of excommunication was pronounced upon Alexander. Then, in his December appeal to Robert III, Bishop Bur put his case in the king's hands. This, however, was not so much a criminal prosecution as a suit for damages; what the bishop wanted (in addition to finance) was political pressure to make the perpetrators of the outrage provide reparation.³⁶

That, it appears, was what happened. 'And after this [the burning of the cathedral] lord Alexander Stewart, on the special commission of the lord Bishop Alexander Bur, and in the presence of the lord king, the earl of

Fife, and lords William Keith, Malcolm Drummond lord of Mar, Thomas Erskine, and many others, in Perth before the doors of the church of the Friars Preacher, and afterwards before the high altar, was absolved by lord Walter Trail, bishop of St. Andrews, from the sentence of excommunication; on condition that he at once made satisfaction to the church of Moray and sent to the Pope for absolution, otherwise the former sentence of excommunication would apply again.³⁷ This clearly indicates that combined ecclesiastical and secular pressure had been applied effectively to Alexander. He perhaps appears to have got off lightly; in presumably the most widely-read account of the affair his absolution at Perth is depicted as an empty charade.³⁸ But he was eventually buried in Dunkeld cathedral, which indicates that the excommunication was not reimposed, and so the conditions must have been met. Unfortunately, we cannot tell what the 'satisfaction to the church of Moray' amounted to. What is striking, however, is the way the settlement at Perth corresponded with traditional methods of settling feud in medieval Scotland.³⁹ In return for submission and compensation by the offender, peace was made without involving the secular law courts. Since ecclesiastical law had been broken, however, the Pope had to agree to lifting the excommunication; that parallels the Scottish crown's practice of pardoning those who broke its laws on condition that their victims were satisfactorily compensated.

The evidence of the later parts of the *Moray Register* suggests that the ceremony at Perth did settle the feud between Alexander Stewart and Bishop Bur. After 1390, it contains only one direct reference to Alexander, a royal command to him to hand over Spynie castle to Bishop Bur's successor in 1398. Alexander is unlikely to have held Spynie in 1390, because Bishop Bur's protests would surely have been recorded; he probably only had it (on the king's behalf) during the episcopal vacancy. There is one other echo of the previous conflict, an appeal to the justiciar by the new bishop against a judgement by Sir William Fotheringham, lieutenant of 'the lord sheriff of Inverness' — perhaps Alexander Stewart — that he owed suit to Inverness sheriff court. But this dispute did not escalate; the justiciar, Murdoch Stewart, appears to have sympathised with the bishop, and no more is recorded on the matter.⁴⁰

Between 1391 and 1397, Bishop Bur may have been afraid to provoke Alexander Stewart. But what did re-emerge was the problem of Alexander's marriage, one of the stimuli for the attack on Elgin cathedral. In 1392, following Euphemia Ross's petitions, papal letters stated that 'the marriage has been the cause of wars, plundering, arson, murders, and many other damages and scandals, and it is likely that more will happen if they remain united'; therefore the bishops of St Andrews, Glasgow and Aberdeen were commissioned to investigate Alexander's adultery and grant Euphemia her separation.⁴¹ The ending of his marriage lost Alexander the earldom of Ross and the accompanying territories.

At much the same time he lost Urquhart, which was in crown hands from 1391. Also, the earl of Moray's grant of Bona barony was cancelled; in 1394 Thomas Dunbar, earl of Moray following his father's death in 1391, granted it and other lands to Alasdair MacDonald of Lochaber, in return for seven years' protection. Why Thomas Dunbar wanted this is not spelled out; the obvious guesses are either that he needed it against Alexander Stewart, or that Alasdair simply forced it on him (the latter is more probable, since Alasdair had also made an agreement with and received lands from Sir William Fotheringham). In either case, this clearly indicates a change of power in the region; Alexander's star was waning fast. The last years of his career may even have seen his withdrawal from the Moray region. In 1402 he appears as baillie of the earldom of Atholl; in 1404, when some Inverness-shire territory was mortgaged to him, the transaction took place in Perth; and when he died in 1405, he was buried behind the high altar of Dunkeld cathedral — an ironic resting-place for the Wolf of Badenoch.⁴²

Yet while the feud between Alexander Stewart and the bishop of Moray died down in the 1390s, dramatic Highland violence did not. Early in 1392 according to Walter Bower, 'there was a fight at Glen Brerachan [near Pitlochry] where the noble Sir Walter Ogilvie sheriff of Angus and his brother Walter de Lychton were killed by caterans whose leader was Duncan Stewart a bastard son of Sir Alexander earl of Buchan. Some sixty of the sheriff's worthy men were slain with him while resisting acts of robbery in Angus.' As the fuller account by Andrew Wyntoun shows, this fight (located by Wyntoun at Glasclune, near Blairgowrie) was virtually a full-scale battle. The government took it extremely seriously, outlawing twenty-two of the raiders and their followers, including, in first place, Duncan and Robert Stewart. There is no reason for not identifying these with two of Alexander's sons by Mairead the daughter of Eachann — and they may also surely be identified with 'the thre sonnes of Schir Alisander Stewart the qwylkis ar now in prisoun in the castel of Stryuelyng' in January 1399, who were to 'be kept fermly and nocht be deliuerit but consail general or parlement'. They were indeed, probably among the 'certain prisoners' held in Stirling from 1396 to 1402. The violence by Alexander Stewart's sons was thus, in the end, dealt with effectively, just as Alexander's own violence was — something that is often forgotten in accounts of 'weak' Scottish government in the 1390s. And the fact that his sons were in crown captivity in the later 1390s might help account for Alexander's own quiescence during that decade.⁴³

But what lay behind the raid by Alexander's sons? Did Alexander encourage them, as retaliation for his enforced submission at Perth? Were they acting on their own initiative, taking over their father's challenge to the political community? Or was it simply that, after Perth, their father could no longer hold them and other local chieftains in check? No certain

answers can be given. But according to Wyntoun, the raid originated not with Alexander or his sons but in a 'hey grete dyscorde' between Sir David Lindsay of Glenesk, who was wounded in the battle and whose lands included Strathnairn to the north of Badenoch, and the 'Duncansons', that is Clan Donnachaidh or Robertson. Although Wyntoun was reticent about Alexander Stewart — he did not name him in the account of the burning of Elgin, for example — his explanation seems plausible, since Lindsay had inherited much of his lands from his mother, whose sister was married to 'Robert of Atholl', a chief of Clan Donnachaidh, and one of the first named among the twenty-two outlawed in 1392.⁴⁴ Thus it may be considered unlikely that the initiative for the raid came from Alexander himself. Yet whatever the case, it seems clear that Alexander either would not, or could not, restrict his sons; he had, in other words, simply opted out of any responsibility for maintaining peace in northern Scotland. Such a conclusion is indicated, too, by the other Highland drama of the 1390s, the clan fight at Perth in 1396. This judicial battle settled a feud between two clans from the Moray/Badenoch region. Had Alexander Stewart been exercising regional lordship at all effectively, the feud should have been pacified earlier; and he should at least have been involved in its bloody dénouement at Perth. But he is conspicuous by his absence; the fight was arranged by two other local magnates, Thomas Dunbar, earl of Moray, and Sir David Lindsay of Glenesk.⁴⁵

Perhaps, in the 1390s, Alexander deliberately chose not to exercise effective regional lordship, in order to show how bad the situation would be without him: *après moi le déluge*, so to speak. But there is no clear evidence of his acting as an effective lord at any time in his career.⁴⁶ And indeed the fact that, having acquired Ross through marriage in 1382, he allowed the marriage to collapse and thereby lost the largest earldom in Scotland, suggests gross incompetence by normal magnate standards. Marriage was the common way for late medieval nobles to acquire extra land; once married, the heiresses did not usually slip from their husbands' grasps, no matter how unhappy the marriages were. Thus the first earl of Douglas (d. 1384) married the heiress to the earldom of Mar, deserted her in favour of her sister-in-law, but still remained earl of Douglas and Mar until his death. Or consider the first earl of Huntly (d. 1470), who had his first marriage to an heiress annulled, but made her grant him most of her lands. By comparison, Alexander Stewart of Badenoch does not cut a very effective figure. Indeed the only late medieval Scottish parallel for his loss of Ross is the case of Thomas Fleming, second earl of Wigtown, who surrendered his earldom in 1372 because he could not control its inhabitants.⁴⁷

Was that, perhaps, Alexander Stewart's problem, not just in the 1390s but throughout his career? What, for instance, went wrong for him in Ross? There may have been a belief within the earldom that it should

rightfully have been held not by Euphemia's husband but by the male representatives of the Ross kindred. In the 1360s Euphemia's father, the last earl of the original line, tried to entail the earldom on his brother, the laird of Balnagown, but David II refused to allow it. In reaction, the Rosses of Balnagown seem to have looked to the MacDonalds of the Isles, and, later, even to have supported Donald of the Isles at the time of Harlaw in 1411.⁴⁸ Euphemia's father had already married a sister of John MacDonald, lord of the Isles, and subsequently her daughter by Sir Walter Lesley married John's son Donald. That marriage gave Donald his claim to Ross, but it was almost certainly contracted in the 1380s or '90s, and probably reflects Ross opposition to Alexander Stewart. Now the early seventeenth-century *Brieve Cronicle of the Earlis of Ross* states of Euphemia's son that he 'was callit Alexander Ross als lang as his mother leivid, and theirfter was callit Alexander Leslie.' And although her daughter had a Lesley father and a MacDonald husband, on her seal she called herself 'Margaret de Ross domina insularum', while on her tomb she is 'Mariota de Ross Insularum Domina'.⁴⁹ There are, here, strong signs of identification with the Ross kindred by Euphemia and her daughter. It is worth speculating that this identification reflects the attitudes within Ross in the late fourteenth century — and that it was coupled with hostility towards Alexander Stewart of Badenoch. No doubt Alexander's treatment of Euphemia made things worse — but the evidence of this comes from Euphemia's side, and it could have been provoked by difficulties which Alexander may well have encountered in the earldom.

The fundamental problem with Alexander's situation in Ross was that he (like Sir Walter Lesley before him) had no kinship base within the earldom. But that also applied to the lordship of Badenoch — and indeed he may have had problems of control there as well. For how long had the great feud which culminated in the 1396 clan battle at Perth been running? When, in 1385, Alexander was told to have his lands searched for Finlay 'Lauson' and the sons of Harald 'Foulson', who had killed men of the earl of Moray, does this imply that Alexander was behind the killings, or does it mean that Alexander had done nothing about them? Similar letters had already been sent to him in 1382 by the king and the earl of Carrick, following complaints by the bishop of Aberdeen about attacks on his lands by Farquhar Mackintosh ('Farchardo Mctoschy'), who probably came from Badenoch (and perhaps Rothiemurchus). Again, does that mean that Alexander was feuding with the bishop of Aberdeen, or that he had failed to respond to the bishop's demands for action against one of the inhabitants of Badenoch? Since there is no other evidence of feuds between Alexander and the earl of Moray or the bishop of Aberdeen (and in the latter case, at least, it could reasonably be expected to survive in the episcopal muniments), it is probably safer to assume that in both cases Alexander was simply being negligent. And that, of course, tallies not only

with the examples of his inaction later in the 1390s, but also with the evidence from the *Acts of the Parliaments*: in both 1385 and 1389 the general burden of the attacks on Alexander is not that he actively did wrong, but that he normally did nothing at all.⁵⁰

In fairness to Alexander, it should be emphasised that it was an exceptionally difficult task which he had undertaken (or had been given: we do not actually know whether Alexander positively wanted to be a power in the Highlands, or whether he had in effect been sent there by his father). Badenoch would have been a particular problem, because it cannot have experienced effective on-the-spot lordship since the destruction of Comyn power by Robert I during the Wars of Independence. As with the original regality of Moray and with other similar lordships and earldoms, the purpose of Alexander's regality powers was probably to compensate for his lack of any kin-based authority over it; but that must have been significantly weakened by the bishop of Moray's refusal to accept his superior jurisdiction. That, no doubt, is why he quarrelled with the bishop rather than with the earl of Moray. With their separate regality jurisdictions, Alexander Stewart and John Dunbar were no threat to each other, and could exist side-by-side in peace; but Bishop Bur's insistence on the liberties of Elgin cathedral must have undermined both men's positions. It is not surprising that they both quarrelled with him — but the problem for Alexander, in Badenoch, was probably much more serious, just as his reaction was eventually much more devastating. It is ironic that the chapel in Elgin cathedral's northern transept was dedicated to St Thomas Becket; Becket had died two centuries earlier over much the same kind of issue.⁵¹

Nothing, of course, can excuse what Alexander did at Elgin six hundred years ago. But the implication of the preceding paragraphs is that the attack was made out of weakness, not strength. For all the difficulties involved in controlling the Highland regions, it could be done, as was demonstrated by his own son, Alexander, earl of Mar, who according to Bower 'ruled with acceptance nearly all the north of the country beyond the Mounth'. The MacDonalld lords of the Isles, too, seem very different as Highland potentates to Alexander Stewart.⁵² It is worth adding that the MacDonalld advance eastwards began with Alasdair of Lochaber in the 1390s along the shores of Loch Ness, into an area which Alexander had either lost or relinquished. Thus it may be concluded that the 'Wolf of Badenoch' was a failure as a Highland chief, just as he was a failure as a Scottish earl; perhaps he simply did not understand how to exercise effective power. But his obvious pride and furious temper naturally exacerbated his failures — and, as so often happens in such cases, it was a physically defenceless target that was hit. Little wonder that Walter Bower described him as 'insolent and malign', and that all subsequent historians have echoed that comment in one way or another. But the most accurate

summing-up of the 'Wolf of Badenoch' is probably the scathing dismissal made by the 1388 council-general: '*Inutilis fuit communitati*' — 'he was useless to the community'.⁵³

Notes

1. *Registrum Episcopatus Moraviensis* (Bannatyne Club 1837) [*Moray Reg.*] p.381.
2. *Scotichronicon ... Walteri Boweri*, ed. W Goodall (Edinburgh 1759) [*Chron. Bower* (Goodall)] ii, 416 (lib. xiv, cap. lvi); Andrew of Wyntoun, *The Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland*, ed. D Laing (Edinburgh 1872-9) [*Chron. Wyntoun* (Laing)] iii, 55. It should be added here that my suggestion, in A Grant, *Independence and Nationhood: Scotland 1306-1469* (London 1984) 208, that the nickname 'Wolf of Badenoch' 'was self-bestowed, ... for his heraldic crest was a wolf', is incorrect; as various friends have pointed out, the crest is a boar's head, not a wolf's.
3. *Moray Reg.* no.154, and pp.472-3; *The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland* (Edinburgh 1814-75) [*APS*] i, 528-9; *Regesta Regum Scottorum* [*RRS*] v, *The Acts of Robert I* (Edinburgh 1988) no.389. But Robert II's possession of Badenoch did not include the regality jurisdiction which the Randolphs had had; that was controlled by David II in the 1360s: *RRS* vi, *The Acts of David II* (Edinburgh 1982) nos.348, 374.
4. *Moray Reg.* 472-3, in which the grant of Badenoch is stated to be in regality, but cf. *Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scottorum* [*RMS*] i (Edinburgh 1912) no.558; *The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland* (Edinburgh 1878-1908) [*ER*] ii, 363. For the association of Lochindorb with Badenoch in the 13th century, see G W S Barrow 'Badenoch and Strathspey, 1130-1312. 1: Secular and Political', *Northern History*, VIII (1988) 8-9.
5. *RMS* i, nos.405, 389, 627. For Dunbar support for Robert II in 1371 see *Chron. Wyntoun* (Laing) iii, 8. David was Alexander's half-brother, son of Robert's second wife, the widow of the earl of Moray; does the grant of Urquhart represent her wish that part at least of Moray should go to her child? Interestingly, Urquhart was entailed on the heirs of David's body, with reversion to Alexander.
6. Cf. *RMS* i, app. I, no.8.
7. *APS* i, 553; *RMS* i, nos.559, 600; Scottish Record Office [SRO], MSS Register House Charters, RH6/167.
8. *RMS* i, nos.601, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678; *Illustrations of the ... Antiquities of the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff* (Spalding Club 1847-69) iv, 376.
9. *RMS* i, nos. 736, 737, 741, 742. There was, however, no formal grant of the earldom of Buchan, nor of any of the small bits of territory and superiorities which were still associated with that title; that, presumably, is why Sir James Lindsay of Crawford, a descendant of the Comyn earls, brought a lawsuit over Buchan in 1385: *APS* i, 551-2, and see below, p.149.
10. *Moray Reg.* no.185; *RMS* i, no.556. He was sheriff in 1380, but when he was appointed is unclear.
11. *The Scots Peerage*, ed. J B Paul (Edinburgh, 1904-14) vii, 239-40; vi, 298-301.
12. *RRS* v, no.389.
13. *Moray Reg.* nos.169, 163, 147, 154.

14. SRO, MSS Register House Transcripts, RH1/s.d. 30:3:1371; printed, 'ex apographo in archivis publicis Edin.' in *Moray Reg.* pp.472-3.
15. *RMS* i, no.558.
16. *Moray Reg.* no.159.
17. See the list of justiciars in H L MacQueen 'Pleadable Brieves and Jurisdiction in Heritage in Later Medieval Scotland' (Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis, 1985) appendix B, at p.331.
18. *Moray Reg.* nos.161, 186 (wrongly attributed to Robert III's reign).
19. Alexander challenged the bishop over lands in Laggan ('Logachnacheny') and Insh ('Ardinche'), the kirkland of Kingussie, the lands of the chapels of Raitts and Dunachton ('Nachtan'), and the bishop's land of Kincardine; and he conceded the bishop's possession of Laggan, Insh, and the chapel lands. Laggan, Insh and the Kingussie kirkland must correspond with the davochs at 'Logykenny' and 'Ardynch' and the six acres beside Kingussie kirk which Walter Comyn quit-claimed and granted to the bishop of Moray (*ibid.*, no.76), while Kincardine will be the bishop's half-davoch, the bounds of which were agreed by Comyn in 1234 (*ibid.*, no.85). The chapels at Raitts and Dunachton are part of the pre-parochial structure, and so, no doubt, is the attachment of lands to them. Cf. the bishop of Moray's reservation of (among others) the davoch of Laggan and the half davoch of Kincardine '*pertinente ad mensam nostram*' from his endowment of the canons of Elgin cathedral in 1239 (*ibid.*, no.41). For a general discussion of early medieval ecclesiastical structures in the region, see G W S Barrow 'Badenoch and Strathspey, 1130-1312. 2: The Church', *Northern History*, IX (1989) 1-15. As this article indicates, the episcopal lands in the region seem to have consisted of half-davochs in the various parishes (or, earlier, shires and thanages). In the four parishes which, strictly speaking, made up Badenoch, however, the bishop had a whole davoch in Laggan and another in Insh, and very little in Kingussie and Alvie; but the total of two davochs to four parishes is consistent with the overall pattern, and so this might represent some earlier rearrangement.
20. *Moray Reg.* no.29. Unlike the neighbouring parish of Kincardine (also outside Badenoch proper), Rothiemurchus had not been held by the Comyns.
21. *Ibid.*, no.162, and (for the davochs), no.29 and p.473. The rent was £8 a year for Alexander's life, £16 a year for his two heirs; and (a face-saver for the bishop?) Alexander also owed suit to the bishop's chief court.
22. Barrow 'Badenoch and Strathspey: Secular and Political', p.9 and note 99.
23. *Moray Reg.* nos.162, 164.
24. *Ibid.*, nos.167, 168. If Alexander had been justiciar much earlier, that would surely have been mentioned in the bishop's 1383 appeal (*ibid.*, no.164), and in the parliamentary attacks on him in 1385 (*APS* i, 551-3) which are described later in this paper; cf. MacQueen 'Pleadable Brieves' 331.
25. *RMS* i, no.790, and SRO, MSS Maitland Thomson Transcripts, GD212/11/1, s.d. 7:1:1384, for the regality over Abernethy; SRO RH6/184; *Moray Reg.* nos.163, 169.
26. *APS* i, 550-3; and, for the political dimension, Grant, *Independence and Nationhood* 180-1.
27. *APS* i, 556.
28. *APS* i, 557; *Moray Reg.* no.169.

29. *Ibid.*, no.271.
30. G W S Barrow 'The Sources for the History of the Highlands in the Middle Ages' in *The Middle Ages in the Highlands* ed. L McLean (Inverness 1981) 16-17. There is no evidence for the identification in *Scots Peerage* vii, 159, of Eachann with Iye Mackey of Strathnaver.
31. These are described as '*homines suos natos nobiles et alios*', which presumably means 'serfs, nobles and others' — but if so, it is probably the last specific reference to *nativi* as serfs in Scotland. Could it perhaps mean 'natives', i.e. Gaelic Highlanders?
32. Sutherland was probably by then Alexander's son-in-law, married to a daughter of Mairead (*Scots Peerage* viii, 329-30). The only other evidence for Alexander's dealings with the earls of Sutherland is a crown payment of £7 5s. 4d. in 1373 'pro expensis faciendis versus Dunrebyn' (*ER* ii, 414).
33. *Moray Reg.* nos.170, 172, and p.381.
34. *Ibid.*, no.65.
35. *Ibid.*, nos.298, 266, 173; *ER* iii, 276, 316, 348, 376, 403, 430; H B Mackintosh and J S Richardson, *Elgin Cathedral* (guide book, 2nd edn. HMSO 1980); see also D MacGibbon and T Ross, *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland* (Edinburgh 1896-7) ii, 121-45.
36. *Moray Reg.* nos.172, 173, and cf. p.382.
37. *Ibid.*, pp.382-3.
38. See chapter XXV of Nigel Tranter's historical novel *Lords of Misrule* (London 1976), the first in his *A Folly of Princes* trilogy.
39. See J Wormald 'Bloodfeud, Kindred and Government in Early Modern Scotland' *Past and Present* 87 (1980) 54-97.
40. *Moray Reg.* nos.178, 179, 180.2
41. *Calendar of Papal Letters to Scotland of Clement VII of Avignon* (Scottish History Soc. 1976), 174, 181.
42. *ER* iii, 274, 277, 317, 376; *Moray Reg.* no.272; W Fraser, *Memorials of the Family of Wemyss of Wemyss* (Edinburgh 1888) ii, no.33; SRO, MSS Mar and Kellie, GD124/1/1128; *ER* iii, 634; MacGibbon and Ross, *Ecclesiastical Architecture* iii, 45-6.
43. Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon* ed. D E R Watt, viii (Aberdeen 1987) [*Chron. Bower* (Watt)] 7; *Chron. Wyntoun* (Laing) iii, 58-60; *APS* i, 579-80; *ibid.*, i, 573; *ER* iii, 436, 490, 553.
44. *Chron. Wyntoun* (Laing) iii, 58; W F Skene, *Celtic Scotland* iii (2nd edn, Edinburgh 1890) iii, 309-10. Skene's analysis of the 22 men outlawed in 1392 links most of them with various parts of Alexander Stewart's territories, but not completely convincingly, and places more emphasis on the Lindsay inheritance. For the view that Alexander Stewart was the raid's main organiser, see I F Grant, *Social and Economic Development of Scotland before 1603* (Edinburgh 1920) 482-3, but there is no strong evidence for this. For Lindsay possession of Strathnairn, see *RMS* i, no.764, and SRO, MSS Forbes, GD52/1044.
45. *Chron. Bower* (Watt) viii, 7-8; *Chron. Wyntoun* (Laing) iii, 63-4. Cf. Skene, *Celtic Scotland* iii, 310-18. Lindsay's involvement was probably in support of the opponents of 'Clan Qwhele', who as '*omnes Clanqwevil*' had been outlawed

- for taking part in the 1392 raid. The identification of 'Clan Qwele' and their enemies 'Clan Kay' does not seem to have been settled satisfactorily.
46. The only evidence of any constructive act of lordship by Alexander in the Highlands is the remission he gave in November 1372, as 'justiciar within the *abten* of Dull' (North Perthshire), to Andrew Baxter and 20 others who were accused of crimes in Glencairnie and Drummochter against Robert Duncanson and his men, presumably Clan Donnachaidh; this was probably a piece of local dispute settling, though it might not have endeared him to Clan Donnachaidh (SRO RH1/2/134). Otherwise the few documents in his name which survive are merely routine. The contrast with his mid-15th century successor as the dominant power in the Highlands, Alexander MacDonald, earl of Ross and lord of the Isles, is striking; see *Acts of the Lords of the Isles*, edd. J and R W Munro (Scottish Hist. Soc., 1986) nos.21-50.
 47. *Scots Peerage* iii, 152-5; iv, 524; viii, 523-4. Fleming's surrender of Wigtown is in *RMS* i, no.507.
 48. *Scots Peerage* vii, 236-43; *Ane Account of the Familie of Innes* (Spalding Club 1864) 70-2; SRO, MSS, J. and F. Anderson, GD297/194, 195. See also, more generally, J Munro 'The Earldom of Ross and the Lordship of the Isles' in *Firthlands of Ross and Sutherland* ed. J R Baldwin (Edinburgh 1986) 59-67; and A Grant 'Scotland's "Celtic Fringe" in the Late Middle Ages: The MacDonald Lords of the Isles and the Kingdom of Scotland' in *The British Isles 1100-1500* ed. R R Davies (Edinburgh 1988) 127, 138.
 49. *Ane Brieve Cronicle of the Earlis of Ross* ed. W R Baillie (Edinburgh, 1850) 9; K A Steer and J W M Bannerman, *Late Medieval Monumental Sculpture in the West Highlands* (Edinburgh 1977) 148-9.
 50. *APS* i, 550-3, 556; *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis* (Maitland Club, 1845) i, 136-8.
 51. Mackintosh and Richardson, *Elgin Cathedral* 14; W L Warren, *Henry II* (London 1973) chapter 13.
 52. *Chron. Bower* (Watt) viii, 293. For the dynamics of MacDonald lordship, see J W M Bannerman 'The Lordship of the Isles' in *Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century* ed. J M Brown (London 1977) 209-40.
 53. *Chron. Bower* (Goodall) ii, 383, *APS* i, 556.