

article in the edition of Burke's *Landed Gentry*, published in that year, in which he rode rough shod over many of the older pedigrees, he said—

“Nor have they yet learnt that Ernulf, the alleged ancestor of the Swintons, was not descended from his ‘Saxon’ predecessors.”

Now even then this was somewhat sweeping, for let us consider on what the claim rested. In these charters there may be no mention of relationship, but there is much of hereditary possession of the same lands under the same conditions, and if there was no blood connection surely it was curious to record not only the name of the previous owner but his pedigree. This is not done in the second charter, why should it have been thought necessary to do it in the first? I can find no Scottish charter containing such a pedigree save in the case of hereditary succession. Family tradition again, and pedigrees written out long after the dates to which they refer, are, of course, not proof, but that this particular tradition was not coined yesterday is shown by reference to a pamphlet, printed and published in 1690, in which John Swinton of Swinton, in pursuit of his successful attempt to have his father's “pretended forfeiture” reduced, says,

“During all which time, the true proprietors have been debarred from access, to an inheritance transmitted to them from their ancestors, by an uninterrupted succession of above 600 years.”

Six hundred years from 1690 would carry us back through Hernulf to the time when we know that Liulf was holding Swinton. Lastly the opinions formed by experts must carry weight, and the pedigree has gone uncriticised up to now, while we have Alexander Sinclair writing in a manuscript preserved at Kimmerghame of “the old Saxon family of Swinton,” and Sir Robert Douglas saying in the *Baronage*—

“And though in the above charters Hernulfus is not designed son of Udwardus, yet, as fees were then begun to be hereditary in Scotland, it is highly probable he was either his son or heir-male; for certain it is, he was possessed of the same lands which were heretably enjoyed by the three preceding generations his predecessors.”

Now remember that these opinions were given when there was nothing to prove that Udard had not died unmarried.

Mr. Round started us on the right track and helped us much when he identified Udard of Swinton with Odard of Bamborough, and, finding for him two sons, William and John, showed that in or about 1132 Odard was succeeded in all his lands by William. But it is from the new *History of Northumberland* that we get our last and greatest assistance. Following Mr. Round, Mr. Bateson has gone a step further as far as we are concerned, for he has not only called attention to the facts that the lands of Swinton were included in the inheritance of William, the son of Odard, but he has printed a document from the Durham Treasury, which shows that this William did not live long, and which adds two more sons to Odard's family.

Durham Treas. Cart. Misc. 6,895.

“Omnibus baronibus comitatus Northumb(rie) Francis quam Anglia et cognatis et amicis suis Adam Vicecomes Northumbrie (deed damaged)
 . . . fratrem meum Wilhelmum concessisse et dedisse Deo et Sancto
 Cuthberto, propter elemosinam et (pec)uniam ipsius Sancti Arkil de