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Abstract - The relationship of the Gàidhealtachd with the rest of Scotland and with Britain was transformed in the period 1540–1630. Having been relatively autonomous, Scottish Gaelic chiefs were now drawn deeper into the orbit of the Scottish and then British crown, particularly during the adult reign of James VI (and I) (1587–1625). Scholarly study of the Highlands and Islands during the period tended to concentrate on crown-clan relationships and the way in which the centre imposed reform on the peripheral Gàidhealtachd (Highlands and Islands). Indigenous (Highland/Hebridean) and maritime perspectives have been less well developed in these narratives. Gaelic Scots and visiting Lowland fishermen had different approaches to the exploitation of marine resources. The approaches of both parties, of Gaelic Scots, as well as Lowland fishermen and merchants, to the maritime environment are examined here: a study which can bring new insights into older debates on crown—clan relations if not plantation, state formation, and colonial approaches to resource appropriation and exploitation.

Introduction: The Hebrides and the Expansion of State Power

The history of the 16th-century and early 17th-century Gàidhealtachd, long-neglected, has received a great deal of attention in recent years. This has focused, as will be outlined below, largely on the political history of the area, particularly on the extension of the control exerted by the Lowland “centre” or “core” on the outlying Gaelic, Highland and Island “periphery”. Recent work by Allan Macinnes and Robert Dodgson has done much in fundamentally re-assessing how underlying socio-economic and environmental factors affected and, perhaps, often drove these political processes. However, such studies have tended to focus on the land rather than the sea (Dodgson 1998, Macinnes 1996). Other, more recent, work has increased our understanding of the nature of the connections between the north of Scotland and northern Europe in this period (Brochard 2010, 2014). This paper examines aspects of the marine environment and peoples’ interaction with it and considers how this impacted on society, the economy, the state and the agendas of various competing parties in northern and western Scotland. Some recent studies for other historical periods and other parts of the world have explored the way in which contested resources, such as water, land, oil or minerals have influenced relationships between “core” powers—which often cast themselves as more “advanced” than those in the “peripheral” areas whose resources they are exploiting. While the focus of this study is firmly on the early modern Hebrides, it is worth bearing in mind that parallels can be drawn between experiences in the Hebrides and other areas which have been (and in some case are still being) subject to resource exploitation and competition in a core-peripheral if not colonial context.1
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James’ attitude was shared, seemingly, by the Scottish political establishment in the Lowlands. Scottish trade was dominated by burghs, Scots-speaking, licensed trading monopolies set up in towns in the southern and eastern lowlands of the Kingdom during the 12th century. Lowland, if not royal, antipathy to the Hebridean (and Highland) components of the kingdom was paralleled by a growing cultural divergence between the Scots-speaking Lowlands, and the Gaelic-speaking Highlands and Hebrides which had become increasingly apparent by the 15th and 16th century (Cathcart 2006:32–39; Dawson 1998:260–61, 268–293; MacGregor 2009:16–39, 43–46). Gaelic society by the later 16th century was by no means as inimical to commerce as its detractors have suggested (and can sometimes still suggest), but was rural rather than urban and, broadly speaking, organised along clan lines with, perhaps, a greater emphasis on kinship than was found in the Lowlands. The forfeiture of the powerful, west coast, Clan Donald Lordship of the Isles by King James IV in 1493 was followed by the appropriation of the title of Lord of the Isles by James V, who famously went on a naval expedition to the Hebrides in 1540, designed to “daunt” his Hebridean subjects. Sporadic royal intervention in the 16th century on the western seaboard exacerbated, rather than alleviated, unrest in the Gàidhealtachd, leading to a series of rebellions, most conspicuously those in support of Dòmhnall Dubh Macdonald (ca. 1490–1546), who attempted to reinstate the Macdonald Lordship of the Isles and drew on wide-ranging support from all parts of the Hebrides (Cathcart 2012).

Only well into the reign of James VI (1587–1625) did a Scottish king, by now (as James I, 1603–1625) also monarch of England, with additional English naval levies to draw on, finally curb his “unruly” Hebridean subjects. James VI (and I)’s recipe for inculcating his “civility” agenda in the Isles was a mixed bag of kidnap, compulsion, imprisonment, expropriation, plantation, colonisation and, failing all else, there was talk of the extirpation of turbulent Hebrideans (Cathcart 2009, Masson and Burton 1877–1898 vol 7:360–362). James’ plans for the plantation of “civile”, non Gaelic-speaking Lowlanders in Lewis (and elsewhere) had limited success. He did, however, succeed in imposing his will throughout the western seaboard and pacifying (if not wholly “civilising”) the area by the end of his reign. Much of the rhetoric emanating from contemporary Lowland Scots, the king downwards, suggested that they were engaged in a high-minded mission to draw a barbarous Gaelic area and culture towards a more “civil” form of living. The “civil” values which the Jacobean state wished to inculcate in the Hebrides were outlined in the Statutes of Iona (1609) where most of the leading Hebridean chiefs were seized by James VI’s emissary, the Bishop of the Isles, imprisoned and then forced to agree to a programme of reform—on Edinburgh’s terms, of course (Goodare 1998, MacGregor 2006).

Those on the receiving end of this “civility”, however, were not always enthusiastic, especially if, like the Macleods of Lewis, they were to be excluded from the benefits. According to a chronicler sympathetic to the Macleods, the lands of Lewis were seized “under pretence” of a civilising mission. The rightful possessions of the ancient inhabitants of Lewis were unjustly, according to a contemporary pro-Macleod chronicler, expropriated and exploited by planters (MacCoinnich 2015a:83, MacPhail 1916:270). The Hebridean perspective is easily overlooked, dwarfed by the number of sources generated by or for the state—sources on which historians must necessarily rely. We tend to perceive the early modern Hebrides through a prism fashioned in Edinburgh.

**Historiography and Perspectives**

If the traditional historiographical concentration on the political processes of control and state formation, outlined above, can overlook indigenous or regional perspectives it can also tend to elide the economic and mercantile if not environmental factors underpinning this (these) process(es). A study by Martin Rorke (2005), largely drawn from Scottish Exchequer and Privy Council records, has convincingly demonstrated that the boom in the late 16th-century Scottish fisheries was driven by the move of the lowland Scottish fleet into northern Hebridean and Highland waters. It is unclear whether this due to atmospheric and oceanographic climatic fluctuations, commercial, and social changes triggered by Reformation, changes in herring distribution, or improvements in ship technology. Whatever the reason, the appearance of a growing number of Lowland fishermen in the north and west of Scotland had a dramatic effect on the Hebrides, adding to political instability in the area. The most dramatic illustration of this was the dispossession of the Macleod clan in Lewis with successive attempts by various groups to plant (seize, control, and colonise) their lands between 1598 and 1638 by, in turn, the Fife Adventurers (1598–1609), the Mackenzies (from 1609), Dutch planters (1628–1631), and the English “British” fishery company (1630–1639). A study (2015), by this writer, focusing on these episodes, has linked all of these attempts at
plantation with the exploitation of fishery resources, although concentrating more on the relationship between these plantations and the land; with more of a focus on the interaction of peoples and political pressures rather than on the marine environment (MacCoinnich 2015a). The various attempts at plantation are well-known, if little examined until recently. Rorke’s study apart, however, the nature of the fishery which provided the economic underpinning for much of this activity has received less attention over the last century. A study of the late 16th-century Crail fishery by Professor Thomas Riis (2016) underscores the importance of the Hebridean and Highland grounds for the Lowland fleet.

Burgesses from Crail and its neighbouring burghs, indeed, played a central part in the attempts to establish a plantation in Lewis, 1598–1607, and maritime resources would have featured prominently in their calculations (MacCoinnich 2015a:91–175, 370–414 and below). In this the Scots were not unique. Fishery was a driver for settlement and development, if not colonisation, which can be seen elsewhere in the early modern Atlantic. For the French, if not the Basques, Portuguese and the Spanish, the expansion of the cod fishery in Newfoundland and the huge expansion in their catching and consumption of cod led to their permanent presence in the North American waters leading, in some cases, to colonial endeavour. The English presence in Newfoundland too was initially a seasonal occupation, tied to the fishery, gradually becoming permanent in the 17th century. While not as celebrated or, perhaps, as prolific as the Newfoundland cod-fishery, the northern and western coast of Scotland nevertheless had remarkably wealthy fishing grounds in the early modern period. It was also ideally placed beside the migratory route of the herring and held important herring spawning grounds in the lochs of south-eastern Lewis (MacCoinnich 2015a:27, 365–368). The Isle of Lewis with its natural harbour at Stornoway, half way between the Shetlands and Ireland, was strategically important for control of the seaways. The remainder of this discussion will concentrate on marine resources in the Hebrides with an eye on how this related to human activity in Hebridean waters.

**Fishery in the Isles: Past and Present**

Captain John Mason, a former governor of Newfoundland, commented in 1630 that the fishery in Lewis was comparable to the fishery in Newfoundland and that the Hebridean fishery was as good as, if not better than, any fishery in Europe. Mason, of course, had his own agenda, not least attracting investors to a newly founded company which aimed to exploit Hebridean waters (MacCoinnich 2015a:304–308, 320–324). Nevertheless, there is no reason to doubt his claims about the prolific nature of the fishery—which—with some peaks and troughs, retained its vitality up until the 1970s. Although a locally important shellfish industry continues, there is now little whitefish and herring fishery in Hebridean waters. What whitefish are caught on the north-west littoral are now mainly taken by boats from outwith the area. The reason for this collapse in the traditional whitefish and herring fishery is contested. Technology and catching ability (and fishing effort) increased exponentially through the course of the 20th century arguably outstripping the ability of target species (if not by-catch) to recover. There are suggestions from fishery organisations, anxious to avoid charges of over-fishing, that the reason for the decline in fisheries may be the migration of species. Current fishery catch quotas are also blamed for the disappearance of the pelagic fishery, together with the (mis)management (at the time of writing) of the European Union’s Common Fisheries policy. There are ongoing tensions between the local, west-coast fishermen and the east coast fishing industry against the backdrop of an increasing interest in Hebridean waters from those promoting conservation and renewable energy (who can, like many external bodies, often seem insensitive to local concerns). The relatively unproductive marine environment of the present can obscure the riches of the past, far less any potential for recovery in the future. The marine environment of the Hebrides, in the present as in the past, remains highly contentious. Fisheries in these waters have always been exploited to some extent, but the 16th and the early 17th century gives some historical perspective on the shape of the marine environment at the very beginnings of a more intensive fishery in the area—a time when the marine ecology was relatively unperturbed. An appraisal of the (relatively) pristine marine environment of the 16th and early 17th century may thus help inform current debates.

**The Earliest Detailed References to the Fishery: The 16th Century**

Hebridean lands and seas, as mentioned above, were contested for much of the 16th and 17th centuries, between indigenous Gaelic-speaking clans and the (non-Gaelic) Scots Crown and merchants and burgesses from the south and east Lowlands of Scotland: the latter seeking to extend their control. Fisheries in the area were also sought after by Dutch merchants and, from the 1630s, English naval and mercantile interests. References to herring and a
variety of other species especially cod, ling, and haddock abound in the documentary record from the mid 16th century onwards. The kings of Scots took the fishing seriously from at least the 15th century. James IV is said to have decreed that

“… for increase of riches within the realm that schippis [ships] and busches [busses or fishing vessels] be maid in every toun to pas to the sey and take fisches …” (Thomson 1830:62)\(^\text{11}\)

James IV’s involvement in naval ship construction is well known (MacDougall 1997:226–243). Yet, according to Bishop Leslie’s history, lords and barons were to assist the merchants in the construction of such vessels. Indeed, the King himself, according to Bishop Leslie, led by example and had his own ships built especially for this purpose (Thomson 1830:62). Details are lacking. However, a pro-Macdonald rebellion in the Lordship of Lewis was put down by royal forces, 1506, and these lands administered by Andrew Stewart, the Bishop of Caithness, on behalf of the King, 1506–1511. The Bishop, indeed, supplied ling and herring caught off the newly pacified Lordship of Lewis to James IV’s kitchens.\(^\text{12}\)

It has been suggested that the policy of a subsequent monarch, James V, in his voyage around the isles in 1540, and his itinerary, related to his awareness of, and interest in, the hitherto neglected fishery of the west coast (Mason 1998:226; Rorke 2001, 2005:159, 163, 165). James V included Lewis and Skye on his itinerary, not normally the stamping ground of Scottish monarchs (Cameron 1998:239–242, 243, 245–246). Indeed, the earliest surviving Scottish coastal navigation aid, Alexander Lindsay’s Rutter, dates to this period (Forte 1998–1999, MacLeòid 1989, Taylor 1980). It has been suggested that the fishery in the west of the kingdom was as substantial, by this point, and as important nationally, as the long-established fisheries on the east coast (Ditchburn 2000:147). Traders from Wigtown may already have been active in the Isles and a small number of documents survive, 1540–1541, suggesting that the Crown was keen to control and tax their activity (Reid 1960:145–146). The royal visit was followed, nine years later, with a survey of the Hebrides by the priest, Mr Donald Monro (alias Dòmhnall Rothach), Dean of the Isles, 1549, who has left us the earliest detailed description of the area. Monro’s motives for collecting this information remain obscure. It is possible that the Dean compiled this for the Bishop, with an eye on Episcopal revenues. Yet his account informed George Buchanan’s History and may have been known to the royal exchequer (Monro [1549] 1999:299–345). The timing of this, coming only four years after the final Dòmhnhall Dubh rebellion, suggests that it may have been a stocktaking exercise with a view to raising revenue from an area which had hitherto contributed little to royal coffers.\(^\text{13}\)

Monro’s account discussed every Hebridean island with special reference to the marine and other resources. Good anchorages on the islands were noted together with the value of each location for fishing. This spoke of a great awareness by the inhabitants of the resources and of an active subsistence fishery, as one might expect, in almost every island. However, Monro also mentions that there was a “gude tak of herring” in three of the sea lochs of Skye, and another fishery in a further thirteen sea lochs on that island, and similarly mentioned three lochs which were being profitably exploited in Lewis for herring. This points at a more systematic exploitation of resources in the mid 16th century than mere subsistence. Vatersay to the south, similarly, was praised for having an excellent anchorage for the many ships “that cumis to fisch thair” and Barra was described as having a rich fishery of keling (cod), ling and other white fish (Monro [1549] 1999:320–21, 323, 325, 327, 331, 334–338). George Buchanan elaborated on Monro’s description by adding the detail that the many who came to fish at Vatersay came not from the distant burghs but “from all the surrounding regions”. It is impossible to be certain what Buchanan understood by this—but if we take this at face value it suggests that Hebridean as well as Lowland fishermen were involved (Aikman 1827 vol 1:39, 49). While the identity of the fisherfolk is obscure, there is more certainty about their target species. Haddock, whiting, flounder, lythe and skate were mentioned in Uist and Lewis. Eriskay had a good white-fish ground and two of the larger sea lochs in Lewis were noted by Monro as having a white-fishery that remained productive all year long (Monro [1549] 1999:320–21, 325, 327–28, 334, 337–38). Monro, coming from a Gaelic-speaking background in Easter Ross (and closely related to the Clan Maclean), was well placed to conduct such a survey, due to his role as a priest at various times in Trotternish, Skye and Eaglais na h-Aoidhe in Lewis.\(^\text{14}\)

**Local Maritime Activity**

It is likely that the tidal trapping of fish was a widespread strategy although the chronological evidence for this in the Hebrides is problematic (Raven 2005:436–437). The references by Donald Monro to cod and ling, in particular, indicate a deep-water line fishery from the early 16th century. These deep-water
fish, together with the herring, could not be caught by tidal traps but by boat and with specialised fishing gear. Archaeological evidence, which could do much to aid our understanding of these issues is sorely lacking for this period from the Hebrides. One recent excavation, however, of a site occupied by Hebrideans during the 16th century has found, from fishbone evidence, that herring formed part of the diet of the people of north Lewis, with lesser amounts of white fish, cod, haddock and saithe. Archaeologists have concluded, due to the size of the fishbones recovered on this site that these fish were caught in inshore waters from small boats (Barrowman 2015:404, Cerón-Carrasco 2015:272–273). The stress on inshore fishing is surprising, on the face of it, given the well-tested maritime expertise of people in the area. This one site, a fortified sea stack, Dùn Èistean, presumably occupied in times of stress or threat, may not have been representative of fish catches and patterns of consumption in more “normal” times. If sites showing longer, more settled, periods of occupancy could be investigated one might have more confidence in the assumption of limited inshore fishing capability given what we know about the abilities of Hebridean seafarers from this period. The same group of people associated with Dùn Èistean, Nessmen, in the Macleod Lordship of Lewis did not, moreover, always hug the coast, conducting an annual guga (young gannet) harvest on Sùlaisgeir, a small island over 40 miles to the north across the open Atlantic recorded by Monro in 1549 but almost certainly a practice of long-standing. Elsewhere in Lewis the sea-connected Macleod lordship encompassed not only Assynt and Còigeach on the western mainland, but Vaternish in Skye, the Isle of Raasay and also the Flannan Isles to the west in the open Atlantic. The neighbouring Macleod clan, to the south, in Harris also held a disparate maritime lordship which stretched from Glenelg in Western Inverness-shire, western Skye and encompassed the islands of St Kilda in the Atlantic to the west. Hebrideans in this period are known to have sailed as far as Ireland to the south and Shetland to the north and were competent mariners, clearly not restricted to inshore waters. Gaels will have been familiar, no doubt, with the fishing technology employed by visiting specialist boats. Yet, while it is probably the case that we underestimate their exploitation of fish stocks, it is evident that a commercial indigenous fishery in the north and west coast did not develop in the 16th century which could compare in any way with the sophisticated fisheries of the south-east of the kingdom.

No household accounts survive from 16th-century Hebridean lordships. However, accounts from estates of Highland clan chiefs from the adjacent mainland show the ubiquity of fish in the daily diet of people in the early modern Gàidhealtachd—and the diets of those living on the mainland are unlikely to have differed too much from those of Hebrideans with whom they were in frequent contact. Accounts of the household of Gilleasbuig Campbell, the 7th Earl of Argyll, 1604, show that fish, of all types, played a centrally important part in the diet of the chief and of the extended household. Similarly, a household account from the first year of the chiefship of Cailean Cam Mackenzie of Kintail, 1568–1569, shows the importance of fish. Purchases were made by the Mackenzie chiefly household in Ross-shire on several occasions of large amounts of haddock and cod, with lesser amounts, of codling, whiting, ling and flounder. These were purchased on at least one occasion from a Thomas Galt from Fisherrow (near Musselburgh, Lothian), presumably either a visiting fisherman or a merchant. Yet it is significant that this Mackenzie account does not refer to the purchase of either herring or salmon. These fish were caught by tenants living locally on the Mackenzie estate to the extent that herring and salmon, and associated excursions, formed part of the mails or rents owed by the tenants of Loch Broom to their Mackenzie chief at this time. Similarly, at least one fisherman working in Loch Fyne, Argyll, Teàrlach mac Èoghnain mhic Alasdair, held his lands of “Glenara Kilbride” by a charter, 1572, which specified such conditions. This stipulated that he should make an annual payment for these lands to his feudal superior, Colin Campbell of Glenorchy, of six small and two great barrels of herring together with another great barrel of red herring. It is likely that landholding on condition of fishing such as this was a common arrangement although evidence is currently lacking. Herring and mussels, the latter another item mentioned in the Mackenzie account, may have been more readily available to poorer people than the larger species of whitefish, particularly if the latter were obtained to some extent by paying visiting specialist fishermen. There may be a connection between the warfare that broke out between the Mackenzies and their neighbours, the Munros of Foulis, and the latter challenging the Mackenzies’ rights by securing a right to farm all the customs of the fishing of Loch Broom in Wester Ross, January 1572–1573. It is not known if there was conflict at Loch Broom over this, but there was intense fighting between the two clans on the east coast, if not the west, at this time. This culminated in the Mackenzie siege of the Munro held castle of Chanonrie (Fortrose). The Mackenzies, who had hired 50 hagbutters, the better to prosecute their war, were ultimately successful in their goal of depriving the Munros of the buildings and lands of the Church at Chanonrie. While the Mackenzie
Different Approaches to the Fisheries: The Haves and the Have-nots

It would seem, then, that Highlanders did undertake more fishery than they are often given credit for—for herring and, perhaps, other species. Yet it is indisputable that incoming Lowland boats formed the most significant presence in terms of catching effort. Why, then, when the seas were teeming with fish, did the Gaelic societies of the north west littoral of the British archipelago in both the Hebrides and, perhaps, Ireland, not exploit this more commercially in a similar manner to that of their southern neighbours? Both Highland and Lowland society in Scotland are traditionally seen as having been organised differently and with taking different approaches to their natural resources. A study of Icelandic society suggests that there may be some parallels with Highland attitudes to fish resources. The rich Icelandic fishery was treated by Icelanders as a necessary food source, subordinate to terrestrial food production. The pursuit of capital from marine resources was not prioritised to the same extent as it was by visiting English fishermen. For Highlanders, as for Icelanders, the fishing effort may “only have been necessary to satisfy the needs of the farming household” (Gardiner 2016:87). The emphasis here differed from attitudes in the south and east of Scotland. Here, fishing had a much stronger commercial imperative with a well-established mercantile and political infrastructure, jealously and rigorously protecting and enforcing in Scotland by a burghal monopoly which had been established in the 12th century. Mercantile interests in Lowland Scotland had, by the late 16th century (if not earlier), sophisticated markets, an accumulation of capital and well-developed fisheries expertise which was geared towards exploiting, controlling, monopolising and marketing fish and other commodities. This commercial strength bought greater political influence: the latter reinforcing the interests of the former. In contrast to this, Gaelic society, for whom kinship remained more important, perhaps, than their non-Gaelic neighbours were by no means inimical to commercial development, but struggled to compete with the well-established mercantile and monopolistic, capitalised interests in Scottish burghs. The Campbells fostered and developed a thriving herring fishery in the seas surrounding their lands from the 1470s onwards (if not earlier). They long had strong links with burghs such as Irvine and Dumbarton. However, in order to better facilitate the economic development of their lands they were able to use their strong political connections at court to establish burghs on their own lands. The Campbells, despite their political capital—successive earls were chancellor of the realm and master of the King’s household—found it difficult to overcome opposition from the Lowland burghs to the establishment of their own licensed trading centres. Yet the Campbells persevered, securing burgh status for Inveraray (1474) and Kilmun (1494). They developed strong connections with Spanish, Breton and French merchants who came to their lands to buy herring, enabling the Campbell lords to fund a substantial building programme of castles, kirks and townhouses, from Argyll through to Lothian (Boardman 2005:146–148; Boardman 2006:292, 294–300). Proceeds from fishing remained an important revenue stream for Clan Campbell lords throughout the 16th and 17th centuries, their influence over the herring fishing stretching as far south as Whithorn. Their assertion of these rights was greatly helped by a series of commissions of admiralty over the waters surrounding Argyll from 1582. These complemented the House of Argyll’s stranglehold on terrestrial jurisdictions and allowed the earls to punish pirates, trespassers, collect herring taxation and hold admiralty courts. This was undoubtedly not only a lucrative position, enabling them to legitimately extract revenue from fishermen, but helped them tighten their control over the area. Indeed, a complaint from a Callum McIntailyeour (Calum mac an Tàilleir) and others from Ardencaple (in Cowal), 1612, alleged that the Campbells “heavily oppressed the poor fishers” in the sea lochs around Argyll and Cowall and that this was done “under the colour of justice.”

From a Clan Campbell perspective things looked rather different. A 16th-century Gaelic panegyric asserting the right of MacCailean Mór (as the chief of the Campbells is known in Gaelic) to “headship” or pre-eminence among the Gael, indeed, included his lordship over the seas as one of his many praiseworthy qualities. Not only did the Campbell chief extract “cios a n-inbhear, iasg a loch” (the tribute of the estuaries, fish of their lochs) from those depend-
The fish of the estuaries are so abundant; That no man sees fit to make a net; Sufficient his praise, a portent of his fitness. The produce of the sea swimming to the shore.

For this Gaelic poet, the control exercised by his chief over a range of resources, including maritime resources, was an integral part of chieftship. The MacDonald Lordship of the Isles (ca. 1336–1493), must, like their Campbell and Irish Gaelic neighbours, have had a similar economic interest in their fishery, given the siting of so many castles on strategically important coastal locations, even though the evidence is currently lacking (Caldwell and Ruckley 2005; Fisher 2005; McNeill 2014:224–226; Raven 2005:284–85, 466). However, the well-attested commercial edge to Campbell operations, as with the Mackenzie clan (above and below) lent financial (and probably political) muscle to their activities. The Campbells and the Mackenzies were exceptional: the economic outlook for most of the other politically marginalised (and thus economically excluded) Gaelic clans was less propitious.

The Campbells, well-known for their ability to skilfully negotiate the Highland-Lowland cultural divide, are regarded as exceptions to the rule of Gaelic estrangement from the Lowland “centre”. The generalisation of Highlanders in Lowland Scotland was as a people who were indolent, backward and uncivil (MacKinnon 2017:34–36). Gaelic speaking Hebrideans were often regarded as the “other” by civil society in the Scottish Lowlands (MacGregor 2009:22–26; Stroh 2016:8–9, 55, 63). Such rhetoric obscures the treatment or presumable reciprocal mistreatment of Highlanders in the Lowlands—something that is often largely omitted, perhaps in official, Lowland-centred narratives. The written record, however, tells us that the Macleans of Lewis were “wyld and sawaige”, exercising monstrous and beastly cruelty upon others, such as “not been h[e]jard [of] amangis Turkis nor infidellis.” They were described as “more barbarous than the very cannibals” by no less than the king himself: albeit at a time, 1602, when Siol Torcaill (as the Macleans of Lewis called themselves) had defeated a royally sanctioned plantation aimed at expropriating them.

The feud between the Macleans of Duart and Clann Iain Mhòir, a southern branch of Clan Donald, at the end of the 16th century is regarded as another of the more egregious instances of Highland disorder. This feud was further complicated by the intrigues of James VI, English agents and the involvement of both clans in Ulster. Contemporaries, such as Dioness Campbell, Dean of Limerick and Robert Gordon, brother of the Earl of Sutherland, followed by subsequent historians, were gripped by the merciless nature of the feuding and fighting between them culminating in the death of Lachlann Mòr Maclean of Duart at the hands of the Macdonalds in Islay, 1598. These clans and their actions have been seen as the epitome of barbarous Highland disorder. The horrified reaction of contemporaries and later writers to the Maclean-Macdonald clash seems justified and the analyses put forward by scholars are undoubtedly correct. Yet while the evidence is thin, might there also have been a maritime dimension to this struggle between the Macleans and the Macdonalds over the lands of Islay? Several of the islands surrounding Islay including Eilean Néimh (Nave I) at the mouth of Loch Gruinneart, Islay, where Lachlan Mór Maclean met his death in 1598, in an attempt to press a claim to lands on the island, had been described by Donald Monro as being excellent for their fishings. While evidence is lacking, it is unlikely this resource became any less valuable between Monro’s survey and Maclean’s death, fifty years later.

Maritime Violence, Fisheries, and Cultural Contact

Although the news cycle was dominated by the Maclean-Madonald feud, ca. 1580–1600, not all the violence in the area was instigated by Highlanders at this time. Indeed, in 1587, a complaint was made to the Privy Council by Rolland Hagt horpin, fisherman of “Tynmoir” (Tynemouth) Shields, England, that he and his fellows had had two ships, with a cargo full of fish, pirated from him by James Forrester, burgess of Pittenweem and a Thomas Davidson, burgess of Crail. According to the English plaintiff his lost ships were now employed at Islay (Masson and Burton 1877–1898 vol 4:216–217). Similarly, Walter Dull, a fisherman of Bristol, was harassed and lost his goods while fishing at Loch Carron in 1570. He had been attacked not by Highlanders, but rival Lowland Scots fishermen, an increasingly assertive presence in Hebridean waters and intolerant of any competition, whether foreign or local. In the Orkneys and Shetlands, the Norn and increasingly Scots-speaking populace and landowners found it expedient to accommodate incoming Scots merchants and James VI’s government attempted to impose control on their northern waters. In the Gaelophone Hebrides, however, it seemed much harder for the local elites to come to a working arrangement with Lowland...
Scots fishermen (MacCinnich 2002:143–144).

It is difficult to gauge the extent of disruption suffered by visiting fishermen at the hands of local populations in the Highlands and how representative of this the complaints are, from English, Dutch or Scots ships who had strayed into Hebridean waters and got into trouble as a result, especially where there was pre-existing unrest in the area. The Eger id est the Hunter, of Emden, a ship of 40–55 tons burthen, came too close to the Macleod Lordship in May 1597, just as internecine conflict in the area was escalating, and was captured by the MacGil-leMhoire clan from north Lewis. The vessel found its way into the hands of the chief of the Mackenzies who negotiated a “sale” of the ship to which the owners “agreed”—having had, presumably, little alternative (MacCinnich 2015b:58). Other vessels in the area fell victim to the violence and disorder which intensified during Lowland attempts to establish a plantation in Lewis, 1598–1613. Similarly there were episodes of maritime violence related to other expropriated clans in the decade that followed: the Macdonalds of Islay and MacIans of Ardnamurchan (Murdock 2010:130–132, 135–140). Further south, Ayr Burgh Accounts contain a payment to two mariners who had been subject to hard handling from “the Clandonnald besyde Pladday”, at a time, 1602–1603, when turbulence in this lordship had escalated (Crawford 2016a:120–122, Pryde 1937:216). A William Nicholas, of Northam, Devon, England, ventured to Mull, in 1579, “as they had done before” with a cargo of wine, salt and other merchandise “with intent to traffic with the people of Mull”. Something went awry on this occasion and the English ship, the White Hart, was seized by Maclean of Duart. The terms of Nicholas’ release were concluded amicably (seemingly); part of the settlement involved Nicholas taking on a young lad, a John MacNeil from Barra, aged 14, as an apprentice. The same strategy, apprenticing kinsmen to Lowland burgesses or traders, possibly with a view to having their “own man” in burghs, was also employed by other Highlanders and Maclean (if not MacNeil) might have had a similar idea.32

An Ayr burgess, “Gilbert McIlDuff” (Gillebrìde Mac’IlleDhuibh), on record as a Gaelic interpreter in the burgh, 1591, had been captured by “Irish” pirates in 1589–1590. Gilbert’s experiences as translator, if not as a captive, indicate some of the ways in which this Lowland, Scots-speaking, burgh interacted with its Gaelophone neighbours. Ayr had long-standing connections with both the Macdonald and the Maclean chiefs, the burgh supplying them wine on a number of occasions, 1548–1578.33 Papers relating to the Burgh of Ayr, indeed, show that one of Macdonald’s tenants in Kintyre, a “lighiche” or physician, purchased wine from an Ayr burgess. There are a number of surviving contemporary references to Ayr burgesses who were trading in “Ilis” (Isles) herring and selling them on to markets in La Rochelle and Bordeaux, taking a cargo of wine and salt back to Scotland. The Ayr men also seem to have been taking aqua vitae to the Islesmen and exchanging this for plaiding.34 The Burgh of Glasgow, similarly, supplied Aonghas MacDonald of Islay and Maclean of Duart with “ane galloun of wyne” in February 1578 and the burgh again supplied Maclean in March 1578 with “twa quarits of wyne”. Gaelic poetry from the period makes reference to French wine but, naturally enough, does not give us humdrum details such as how this was obtained.35 The burgh accounts are mute on why they supplied these lairds in this manner but Glasgow, in common with other Scottish burghs, such as Ayr, had a thriving herring market and these herring—often acquired off Gàidhealtachd shores—and the supply of wine to Hebridean nobles are almost certainly connected. Glasgow, indeed, claimed a monopoly on trade with the Isles in the “West Seas” since 1555 if not earlier although this was often disputed by its neighbours.36

Such peaceful contact tends to get overlooked when Highland-Lowland interaction is discussed with more newsworthy episodes of violence capturing our attention. In 1535, for example, Andrew Muir, a citizen of Glasgow engaged in trade in the Firth of Clyde and with Ireland, lost three vessels within a short period of time. The ships were plundered by the Macdonalds of Dunivaig and the Glens. The Macdonalds are, of course, considered pirates. Yet Muir was almost certainly not the only merchant running ships out of Glasgow, and the targeting of his vessels suggests that he had a dispute with the Macdonalds (Forte 2008:207–214). The Macdonalds of Dunivaig and the MacDuffies of Colonsay were accused of piracy and plundering three Renfrew merchants, William Somervell, Normound MacKynnie and Jhonne Dikie, who claimed that they had been peacefully engaged in fishing at Culdaff, near Lough Foyle, May 1583, when they had been attacked by the Hebrideans. The Renfrew mens’ plea of being innocents abroad is somewhat undermined by the list they provided of the cargo which the Macdonalds and MacDuffies had plundered. This was an extensive list of goods which included wine, whisky, saffron, 12 pieces of ordnance, powder and bullets, 19 swords and armour. The plaintiffs tried to get the clansmen they accused, who appear, indeed, to have been frequent visitors to Dumbarton and Glasgow, arrested (Marwick 1876:103–105). On the face of
it, the accused were simply sea-robbers, yet this masks the complex interaction of Hebrideans with Lowland burgesses who not only frequented Hebridean waters, but also on this occasion may have been supplying arms to the Hebrideans’ enemies in Ireland.

The turbulent nature of inter-clan politics exacerbated unrest. The Macdonalds of Islay had, as mentioned above, a bitter dispute of long duration with the Macleans of Duart intensified by personal and kin enmity culminating in the slaying of Lachlann Mòr Maclean by the Macdonalds in 1598. This dispute was accentuated by political intriguing from outside, not only from the Earls of Argyll, but also from their connections with Ulster, Dublin, Edinburgh and England. Most commentary, understandably, focuses on the sensational and newsworthy nature of the clan conflict. The reason for this (aside from the inherent barbarity and warlike disposition of Highlanders) is taken to be resource competition. Both contemporary and subsequent commentators link this to the terrestrial environment and the sea is overlooked. 37

While these traditional accounts are all undoubt-

edly correct in their emphasis on lands, an additional economic dimension to the Maclean-Macdonald feud might inform one public statement both chiefs made by registering new heraldry in the late 16th century (Fig. 1). This shows that both chiefs shared much common ancestry (both chiefs were very closely related by blood and marriage), something which may be reflected in the similarity in the heraldic design and in the quartering of arms. One of the quartered arms in this heraldic insignia, common to both parties in this dispute, shows a ship placed over a fish. Alasdair Campbell of Airds has referred to these fish as “salmon naiant” (horizontal) and the depiction of these fish, indeed, does resemble salmon more than cod, herring or haddock. The reason for these motifs on the coats of arms of the Macleans, Macdonalds of Islay (and also the Ó Néill, Ó Donnghaile, and Ó Catháin chiefs of Ulster) is not clear. Yet, might the use of fish on heraldry, particularly when a vessel is placed above them, as it appeared in both Maclean and Macdonald coats of arms, have been indicative of a chiefly claim to the control or authority over maritime resources (or in this case, perhaps, an

Figure 1. Coats of arms registered by Macdonald of Dunivaig and the Glens (left) and by Maclean of Duart in the 1590s (right), by Sir David Lyndsay, “secundus”. Reproduced here from Stodart’s Scottish Arms.
inherited claim or a claim acquired through marriage)? The dating of the manuscript which holds these images was tentatively placed by a former Lord Lyon, Thomas Innes of Learney, as being in the early 1590s, at the same time (perhaps coincidentally) as the escalation of the Maclean-Macdonald rivalry in and around Islay. The heraldic devices may be older than this (and reused, perhaps, in the 1590s) but may well be a visual representation of the idea expressed in Gaelic Campbell chief for his ability to exert lordship over seas as well as lands and extract an income from his dominions. It is worth noting in passing that various branches of the Macdonald, Campbell and Maclean families also included a fish as part of their familial insignia—to emphasise, perhaps, their control of maritime resources.

Contrasts and Comparisons with Gaelic Ireland

Yet the idea that Gaelic chiefs were overly concerned with the economic dimensions of lordship runs counter to the weight of historiography. There are some striking parallels between Gaelic Scotland and the neighbouring Gaelic society in Ireland vis-à-vis fisheries and other natural resources and their interaction with a neighbouring anglophone society. Irish interaction with visiting specialist fishermen seems to have involved, to some extent, payment by the visitors to native lords for the privilege of fishing in these waters, as well as for the right to come ashore. Gaelic Irish lords also provided victualling and other services for these fishermen—who arrived in great numbers—some 600 Spanish vessels being reported off the west of Ireland in 1572 (Breen and Raven 2017:159–161). The English coloniser, Fynes Morison, asserted, on encountering Gaelic society in Ireland, that the reason the Irish did not fish was that they were “idle”, slothful and “slovenly” and suffered from “sluggishness”—all symptomatic of their “barbarousness”, comments which some Scots might equally well have applied to the Highlands. If Morison was dismissive of the Gaelic Irish, however, another English observer had noted that Ó Domhnaill, regarded as the “second best” magnate in Ulster in the 1560s, had been “the best lord of fish in Ireland and he exchangeth fish always with foreign merchants for wine for which [he] is called in other countries the king of fish.” This is not, one imagines, a sobriquet acquired by Ó Domhnaill through sloth and indolence, even if he was not an Englishman’s ideal of a merchant prince. There can be no doubt of the importance of marine resources to Gaelic society. Indeed, Micheál Ó Cléirigh, writing in the early 17th century, referred to “a n-inbheara íaisce” (fishful bays) as being one of the assets of which the Gaelic Irish had been deprived after the Flight of the Earls, 1607, and the subsequent Plantation of Ulster.

Traditional historiography has largely followed Morison’s lead, finding it hard to conceive of Gaelic society on its own terms; viewing it and its activities as archaic in comparison to English and Anglo-Irish society and trade structures. Recent scholarship has been more questioning about the claims of no indigenous trade and Gaelic sloth made by the enemies of Gaelic Ulster in the Plantation period and has started to assemble evidence which hints at a different narrative. This shows the extensive connections between Ireland and the mainland of Europe—and perhaps even England in which the fish trade played an important part. An intriguing vessel was discovered in the river Boyne at Drogheda in 2006 which underlines the nature of these connections. This boat was built between 1525–1535 and worked for a considerable number of years before it sank in the mid to later 16th century, operating before English control in north-eastern Ireland tightened. It was built with wood from County Antrim and carried casks made of wood which was grown in south-western France and which showed evidence of organic herring remains. These re-used wine casks holding herring impressively complement patchy documentary evidence of a reciprocal fish and wine trade between Ireland and France and presumably Wales and England (Schweitzer 2012:225–231).

The English in Ireland after their defeat of the Gaelic lords hoped to gain not only from the acquisition of terrestrial resources but also the riverine and maritime fisheries (Horning 2013:23, 66, 200, 203). Indeed, an English description of fisheries which dates from around the years of the Plantation of Ulster 1609–1610, noted that:

“In the north of Ireland, not far from Dunagall [Donegal] there are such multitudes of herring as is hardly to be believed, so large that 3 herring make a yard in length ...”

Similar views of natural bounty in the hands of the undeservingly indolent may have been held by non-Gaelic-speaking Scots when they tried to colonise the Hebrides. Assumptions and prejudice, bound up with distaste of the mores of Gaelic society, fed into the narrative of self-justification for expropriation of other peoples’ resources. Such views as were held by Englishmen of Irish Gaelic society (and by Englishmen of Gaelic Scots) were not, however, shared by (at least some of) the Lowland Scots planters in Lewis—at least not in such a clear-cut manner. Although there was growing
antipathy between Lowland and Highland cultures, such a clear linguistic and cultural demarcation was not always practical in Scotland, if for no other reason that simply too many Scotsmen—possibly up to a third—still spoke Gaelic in this period (Witthers 1996:426–429). In the case of the Lowland plantation of Lewis, the Lewismen—referred to as “Hielandmen”—were, sometimes, at least, regarded simply as rebels who had obstructed fisheries and outlaws who had thus been expropriated (MacCoinnich 2015a:69–70, 151).

Lewis was ideally placed at the entrance to the North Minch as a location from which to monitor and perhaps even intercept shipping. The North Atlantic was a busy place in the 16th and 17th centuries: a major sea-road between northern Europe and the outside world. Its rich fishing grounds were a prized and a disputed resource (MacCoinnich 2002:143, MacCoinnich 2004:334). Lowland Scots fishers were frequent visitors to the North Minch or the “North Yllis” (as the Hebrides north and west of Ardnamurchan were then known) certainly from the 1570s onwards, in increasingly large numbers (Riis 2016; MacCoinnich 2015a:125, 134–36; Masson, D., and J. H. Burton 1877–1898:x, 346). It is significant that the number of complaints from these fishers increased exponentially as they gave vent to their displeasure at their treatment at the hands of locals who sought to exploit these incoming fishers. From the point of view of the local chiefs (and probably those in the community) these fishers were coming to their seas and sea lochs and exploiting their resources (Raven 2005:282–84). Clearly, Hebridean chiefs (as groups like the Ò Drisceoil and others did in Ireland) saw this as an opportunity to raise revenue. The problem was that whereas the chiefs did have a right in law to charge fishers for coming ashore (“ground leave”) and for packing and curing their fish, they were increasingly in dispute with Lowland fishers who resented these exactions.

Highland Hospitality?

It was claimed by visiting fishermen (probably with some basis in fact) that the locals in the isles often resorted to force or intimidation to extract these dues. Hebridean chiefs argued, in turn, that they were merely claiming that which was due to them as they were heritors of the ground and that they had a legal right to ground leave and anchorage charges since time immemorial. This was one of the underlying causes of tension that occasionally flared into violence and which helped build the pressure among the Fife fishermen (and their noble patrons) for plantation in Lewis by the end of the 16th century (Mackenzie 1903:153–4). While James had the wider Highlands and Islands in his sights, the issue of the isles must have been on his mind following the complaints of the fishermen of the burgh of Crail in 1586 to the king and his Council of the “greitt extortionis usit upoun thame” by the inhabitants of the Northern Hebrides (MacCoinnich 2015a 69–71, 81, 95–96, 98, 143–144). The chiefs thought they had a right to lift exactions from visitors, something that appears in a statement from 1634 (a reiteration of an earlier document from 1586), which stated that:

“... it was the ancient custome before the date of the extract efterspecifie (whiche they thinke to be about fourteene years syne or thereby) to everie one of thame in whois bounds the herring fishing fell out to exact off everie shippe and barke resorting there for ankerage and ground leave ane barrel of aill or meall in the awneris option and for ilk anker layd on shore sax shillings aucth pennis and out of everie last of herring slaine there three pounds mony togidder with the benefit of every Saturdays fishing ...”

This deed does not, of course, mention the violence or the implicit threat of violence that accompanied the demands placed on fishermen to supply the chiefs with the whole catch taken on a Saturday together with hefty ground leave charges. The visitors, with some justification, perhaps, thought the demands extortionate and, moreover, they paid taxes to the crown unlike the chiefs. The visiting fishers were also, unlike Hebridean clans such as the Macleods of Lewis, politically well-connected and represented at the court and Privy Council through the representation of the burgh commissioners and the Fife nobility. Disputes between Highlands chiefs and visiting fishers over ground duties, together with the cavalier attitudes of Hebrideans to diktats from Edinburgh, such as King James’ initiatives at reform from 1587 onwards, may have been responsible, at least partially, for focussing James’ mind on plantation as a remedy for his Hebridean problem.

The minister accompanying the Fife Adventurers made the connection between the expropriation of the Macleods and the plantation of Lewis with the former harassment of fishermen between the 1570s and the 1590s. The adventurers went to Lewis in 1598 according to him because they had been

“... greatlie offendit wt the many injures and oppressiones that wer done to ther freindis and to fischemen on the cost syd that yerrie repairit unto the fisching of the Lewes, be the men of the Lewes in spoiling tham and taking ther barkes and strakking and billing some of them ...”

The burghs of the East Neuk of Fife, Crail, Pit-
tenweem and Anstruther, were the most productive centres for fishing in Scotland in the 1580s and 1590s and, even if James VI had been relaxed about the more disorderly parts of his realm, he had to take the burghs’ concerns seriously. The disorder and impediment to trade called for a response.

No Room at the Inn?

The best-known action of Jacobean government with regards to the Hebrides was the Statutes of Iona, 1609. These were a series of nine measures, credited to Andrew Knox, Bishop of the Isles, usually taken as being indicative of the reforms the centre thought necessary to impose on Hebridean society the better to control and civilise the area (MacGregor, 2006). The establishment of a network of inns in the isles was the second item on this agenda after the obligatory expression of an intention to strengthen the church and create a godly society. This has led to some surprise at the centrality placed on the establishment of inns, ahead of other important measures such as disarmament and the education of children in the Lowlands (Goodare 1998:50). Some commentators thought this measure was an expression of the desire to curb Highland society and limit chiefly retinues and idle men or to control drinking and hospitality outwith the chiefly household. Such an interpretation is supported by another iteration of Privy Council intentions towards Hebridean society, 1616, which concentrated on the need to curb drinking in the Hebrides, but did not mention the establishment of hostelries, focussing instead on chiefly households (Goodare 1998:51, MacGregor 2006:140–142, Macinnnes, 1996:67). Excessive drinking and a drinking culture do seem, indeed, to have been a feature of Hebridean society; something that Martin Martin, 1695, claimed had been reformed by his own time (Clancy 2010:111–112, Martin 1999:74).

There is no doubt that hospitality was an important feature of Highland Society in the reign of James VI, yet this was not an aspect of the Gàidhealtachd that visiting Lowland fishermen appreciated over previous decades. If the complaints of the Fife fishermen in Lewis in the late 16th century, discussed above, that they were “greatlie offendit” with “oppressions” by natives, are to be believed, might this be the reason for the prominence of the clause on inns in Bishop Knox’s statutes? There is a dearth of information on the interaction between fishermen and inns in Scotland at this time, but fishermen in France, New England and the Netherlands had a well-established relationship with inns in this period. There is an element of speculation here, but if Scottish fishermen had similar concerns to their French, Dutch and English counterparts, then the Statutes of Iona may have been responding to this need for fishermen’s provision. If so, this may have been designed to ensure that visitors—presumably visiting Lowland fishermen—would be well treated and not over-charged when visiting the Isles. Indeed this, the overcharging and exploitation of visitors, was such a concern that it appears on the parliamentary register as early as 1535, again in a parliamentary proclamation issued against landholders in the Gàidhealtachd in 1597 and in a charter granted to the Fife Adventurers in Lewis, 1600. In Scotland, as in contemporary Ireland and Jamestown, it might have been the case that taverns and inns “were an essential part of the urban package associated with plantation” (Horning 2009:118). Knox, a bishop of the Isles with a newly founded see that was meant to be funded, to a large extent, on the proceeds of the fishery, had a clear vested interest in seeing that the fishermen repairing to the area were well treated and this may have been the reason for the stress on the provision of inns.

These fishermen exploiting Hebridean waters had come to the Hebrides from Lowland Scots burghs in growing numbers from the mid 16th century, if not earlier. While other burghs for whom fisheries were important, such as Leith, Edinburgh, Dundee and Ayr, had a more diversified economy, the coastal burghs of east Fife relied on their income from fishing to a much greater extent. This is reflected in the tax returns from these burghs for the period. Between 1570 and 1580 in particular there seems to have been something of a boom in fisheries for the east coast burghs of Fife, Anstruther, Pittenweem and Crail, which Martin Rorke linked to their activities in waters around Loch Broom and Lewis, in the Macleod lordship (Riis 2016, Rorke 2005:159–165). Clearly, great influence was
exercised over the fishery by the Macleods of Lewis who controlled lands on all sides of the North Minch basin, from Lewis to Raasay and Loch Broom and north to Assynt (MacCoinnich 2008:19–29). The Macleods, though, caught up in factional infighting from the 1570s onwards and branded as “uncivil”, were politically marginalised at a national level. This internal disunity and lack of external political support meant that the lordship of Lewis was vulnerable to outside intervention and attractive to the acquisitive and politically well-connected.

Fishing in Drumly Waters: Lowlanders, Englishmen, and Hebridean Seas

While there was clearly considerable local maritime activity in Hebridean waters, the area was already, as noticed above, being frequented by the relatively highly capitalised Lowland Scottish fishing fleets from the early to mid 16th century. These vessels, with a specialisation in fisheries and markets to service (over which they held a jealously guarded monopoly), will have had a more commercial imperative than local boats and will, presumably, have been much more efficient—and driven—to catching fish in greater numbers, eclipsing local operations. Martin Rorke, as mentioned above, convincingly linked the growth of the Crown’s interest in the “Highland Problem” with this parallel increase in fisheries from the 1570s onwards (Rorke 2001:819–20). This West Highland fishing effort was focussed on herring rich areas such as the sea-lochs of Lewis and Loch Broom: lands and seas controlled by Siol Torcaill, such as a vessel belonging to Perth burgesses John Pullor and Robert Blair, trading in Loch Broom, ca. 1605, both of whom were engaged in the fish trade and both of whom were killed. Loch Broom was doubtless regarded by Siol Torcaill as theirs and hostile interlopers and their associates as fair game. The testament dative and inventory of another of these Adventurers who was killed by Niall Macleod of Lewis and his men in a raid on the plantation at Stornoway in 1601, a Robert Traquhair, merchant burgess of Edinburgh, lists a cargo belonging to him being shipped from Stornoway to the port of Leith, which gives one glimpse of some of the commercial activity in the settlement. Traquhair’s goods included 600 ling, 400 codling, 700 thornbacks (rays/skates), 100 “stail” (possibly “stel”, or net-caught fish). Traquhair was a minor player in the enterprise, albeit probably domiciled in Stornoway as was a contemporary, Thomas Cunningham. Cunningham, a burgess of Crail, attempted to press charges against Mackenzie of Kintail for the loss of 12 lasts of fish and herring in 1599 around the coast of Lewis. Cunningham’s lawsuit was probably unsuccessful, but this shows the nature of the trade he was engaged in at Lewis. The testament of a William Anstruther, mariner burgess of Kilrenny, Fife who died in 1608, listed four lasts of “isles” herring worth £80, probably taken around the Northern Hebrides, in the inventory of his goods. These fragments give us some fleeting glimpses of the way in which the Fife Adventurers hoped to exploit the maritime resources of the area.

Subverting Modern Perceptions? Highlanders as Entrepreneurs

The Fife Adventurer project in Lewis failed by early 1607 for a number of reasons, which need not detain us here. They were followed in the area by the Mackenzie clan from 1610. This has, sometimes, been perceived as a failure of the plantation and civility policy and a reversion to clan (if not barbarous) norms. In fact, the Mackenzies, whose first two chamberlains in Lewis, and managers of their fishery, Alasdair mac Mhurchaidh and his son, Murchadh, were accomplished Gaelic poets, did not take this view and neither did Sir George Hay, one of the former planters in Lewis, a future Chancellor of Scotland and a business partner of the Mackenzies. Cailean Mackenzie of Kintail, first Earl of Seaforth, referred to his clan’s enterprise in Lewis as a plantation. Like the Campbells, discussed above, the Mackenzie clan were politically well-connected and entrepreneurial. Although the Mackenzies never achieved the same levels of judicial and political power as the Campbells (above), the Mackenzies nevertheless sought to commercially develop their new acquisition in Lewis. The debt incurred in buying the island must have been a considerable
stimulus to commercial activity and the most obvious means to recoup their costs was to encourage fishing. Like Sìol Torcaill before them they sought to tax visiting fishermen. Unlike Sìol Torcaill, however, they had the law on their side and unlike Sìol Torcaill they had commercial and political connections and sought to capitalise on these. The Mackenzies successfully took over the failed plantation based at Stornoway and exerted a strong influence on the fishing effort of the North Minch region from around 1610–1611 onwards. While most of the fishing vessels working in the area came from east coast Scottish burghs, the Mackenzies themselves sought to develop the locally based fishing effort. A thriving, although small, mercantile community became established at Stornoway in the decades after 1611, very much focused on the fishery with a regular trade emerging between Stornoway and Leith, often via Aberdeen. Although the Mackenzies subsequently continued to try to develop their fishing industry in the following decades, the number of boats and catching power remained relatively low.

Archibald Campbell, brother to the Laird of Lawers, was granted a Crown licence in 1614 for herring fishing which included a clause allowing him to bring in strangers to improve the fishery. It is not known if he did so but by 1628, the Mackenzies went one better: Cailean Mackenzie the first Earl of Seaforth, aware of Dutch expertise in fisheries, and possibly frustrated by Scottish burghal monopoly and intransigence, sought help from the Continent in order to develop the fishery on his lands (and seas). The Dutch were not only ahead of their competitors in terms of catching herring, they also dominated the processing herring, they also dominated the

Seaforth established a Company of Lewis with Dutch partners, some of whom settled in Stornoway, 1628–1631, in order that they could pursue herring, cod and codling in their “slopes, harring bubysses, pinckes, shaloupes”, in Lewis and all the surrounding seas. A Gaelic poem of the latter 17th century by Murchadh (mac Alasdair ‘ic ‘Mhurchaidh) Mackenzie of Achilty described Lewis as “eithir nan iasg” (the fish coast). Another poem by his father, Alasdair Mackenzie of Achilty, chamberlain of Lewis (ca. 1611–1634), refers to his occupation in “sgrìobhadh nan trosg” (tallying the codfish) (MacCoinnich 2015a:415–19). An account of the Lewis fishery which may have been written (in English) by Alasdair Mackenzie of Achilty describes in detail the herring fishing grounds at Lewis. The sea lochs at the south east of the island running from Loch Seaforth northwards and at Loch Ròg on the west coast, were a rich herring fishery and included herring spawning grounds in the sea lochs off the south eastern coast of Lewis. Banks off the east coast of Lewis were systematically worked for ling and cod, while further ling and cod fishing banks had been identified on the more challenging west coast in the open Atlantic (MacCoinnich 2013, MacCoinnich 2015a:365–368). The fishermen, apparently, started “driving” with their nets for herring from the middle of June until the first of October only five miles away from the port of Stornoway. They then moved their focus to the lochs of eastern Lewis from October until New Year’s Day, switching their effort to cod and ling fishing between January and June (MacCoinnich 2015a:365–368, Mackenzie 1903:585–595).

Aberdeen port records shed a fitful light on the goods being transported out of Lewis, during part of the period of Alasdair’s stewardship of Lewis between 1623 and 1635. This shows the movement of fish, especially cod, ling and herring to Leith, if not Aberdeen, and the movement of salt, beer and wine northwards. By searching for entries in the Aberdeen port records for the names of those known to be active in Lewis, or partially resident there, merchants such as Robert Innes, Iain Mackay of Thurso, Alexander Manson and Raibeart Campbell, the impression of this activity is widened further. A bond made by Edinburgh traders to Alasdair mac Mhurchaidh [Alexander Mackenzie of Achilty] in August 1631, illustrates the type of transactions that were taking place.

... Robert Strauchene servitor to Mr James Strachane merch[and] burges of Edinburg[h] grants me to be justlie adebitit and resten awand to Alex[ande]r Mckenzie of Achiltie the sowm of sevintene hundreth poundis lau[chfu]ll money of Scotland and that for certene dry lingis [ling] and Kelling [cod-fish] guid and sufficient to my contentment bocht and ressavit be me fra the said Alex[ande]r here at Starnoway ...

Although the evidence is fragmentary, a number of ships and skippers that can be seen visiting Lewis in the decades after the start of the Mackenzie plantation show strong, sustained, patterns of trade between Lewis and east coast Scottish destinations, not only Aberdeen and Leith, as mentioned above, but Edinburgh, the Fife ports, Dundee and Orkney, with Englishmen appearing in some numbers in the 1630s (MacCoinnich 2015a:422–454). Alasdair Mackenzie of Achilty, as mentioned above, seems the most likely author of a report on the Lewis fishery in July 1631. If this was so, he drew on his own knowledge of the fishery, no doubt, but also on the expertise and observation of his Dutch partners in compiling this. Seaforth had this report
and information in mind, later that month, when he was in London negotiating with Secretary of State John Coke. Seaforth told Coke that time was of the essence if the fishing were to succeed and that much precious time would be wasted if his English undertakers went to fish without knowing the location of the best grounds.72 Seaforth, at Court in London in the summer of 1631, attempted to fend off a determined and strong challenge to the Mackenzie-Dutch enterprise in Lewis from the Scottish Burghs, who sought to de-rail this challenge to their monopoly. The Burghs did not disagree with the Mackenzie enterprise: they simply thought it should be theirs to enjoy and viewed the Mackenzie association with the Dutch as a threat to their monopoly. Ironically, the heated opposition from the Scots Burghs drew an unwelcome challenge from a naval cabal in England who demonstrated that while in the Scottish State the Dutch as a threat to their monopoly. The scheme was finally laid to rest by the outbreak of the Wars of the Three Kingdoms in 1639.74

Fishing Trade in the Plantation of Lewis and Salt

If the fishing trade was central to the plantation no endeavour could thrive without salt, which was essential for the preserving of fish. The Hanseatic merchants, dominant in Scandinavia and Shetland, owed part of their success to their access to north German salt mines (Holm 1996:178). Other areas, including Scotland, were not so fortunate. Although strenuous and labour-intensive efforts were made to produce salt within Scotland—possibly to a much greater extent than has been previously thought in areas that lacked coal—the supply of salt remained a constant problem (Oram 2012, Rorke 2001:214–230). The supply of expensive imported salt for Lewis fisheries posed different sets of challenges for the various groups active in this area. The Gentle- men Adventurers of Fife were both importers of salt and participants in salt production. A salt-panning industry of long duration had grown up in the east coast of Scotland over several centuries, making the most of the rich coal resources in Fife and Lothian to extract salt from sea-water. One of the Fife Adventurers in Lewis, Sir James Sandilands of Slamannan, was granted a “saltpan houss girnell and yaird” in Pittenweem on 14 June 1599 and other adventurers were similarly involved in salt-panning ventures in the area (MacCoinnich 2015a:101 and notes 35, 36).75 The planned English colony of the 1630s had no such readily available salt supplies. They attempted to address this by using the extensive peat resources in Lewis to fuel salt-panning. This may have been impractical due to the labour-intensive and time consuming nature of peat extraction which the Mackenzies and others did not (as far as is known) emulate.76 In any case pan-produced salt
was not regarded as being of such high quality for fish preservation as the purer imported salt and the Mackenzies, like their predecessors, were reliant on this expensive commodity. The Campbells in the south had acquired the lands of Kintyre and Islay from the rebellious and unfortunate Clan Donald between 1607 and 1615 (Macinnes 2011:60–63, Stevenson 1994:25–31). The Campbells sought (in much the same way as the Mackenzies did in Lewis) to maximise their return from their new acquisition. Gilleasbaig Campbell, Lord Lorne, discovered coal deposits on his new lands on Kintyre and earmarked these deposits to fuel four salt pans, built at (Lochhead) Campbeltown in 1637. This must have been a major boost to Campbell sponsored fishery initiatives and the site was still operational in the 17th century.87

The Seagulls Follow the Buss?: Taxation and the Fishery 79

Wherever wealth is generated efforts are usually made by those in a position of authority to benefit from it and tax levies afford another, indirect, means by which the activities of the fishermen can be discerned. Unfortunately, few detailed records survive. There are indications, nevertheless, that there had been early ecclesiastical attempts to tax fisheries in the Hebrides in the 13th and 14th centuries. The dearth of surviving documentation from the late Middle Ages through into the 16th century may be a reflection of the demise of the largest secular authority in the area, the Lordship of the Isles, from 1493, and the resulting loss of records, rather than evidence of an absence of such levies taken from fishermen.88 An intention, either clerical or lay, to extract revenue from the fishery is implicit in Donald Monro’s survey of 1549, discussed above. It is unknown how Monro gained his knowledge of Man, then under English control. However, Monro’s secular Lord, Ruairidh Macleod of Lewis had been a participant in the rising against the Scots crown led by the Earl of Lennox and Dòmhnall Dubh (1545–1546) which ended at Droghead, across the Irish Sea from Man (Cathcart 2012). This, together with Monro’s kin connections with the Maclean clan, some of whom, including his maternal uncle, were also active in this rising, may have been one means for transmission of information.89 Monro’s account, as noticed above, is a detailed survey of the maritime potential for his diocese and he had a keen eye for fishing activity and for good harbours. By the time of Bishop John Campbell, 1569, the diocese of the Isles had a more explicit interest in the maintenance of trade and fishing which might be taxed for the benefit of the Reformed church. Bishop Campbell complained to the Privy Council that,

“... our Soverane Lordis trew liegis sic as merchandis and schipmen and fishearis dar not resort to the saidis Ylis for fear of their lyvis and spuilyng [spoliation] of their goods ...”

Bishop Campbell’s complaint related to the levies and pressure exerted on visiting fishermen by clan chiefs such as those described above. A more regular system of taxation did not take root in the area: the Scottish exchequer responding to the herring boom in the North Minch, resorted to the expedient temporarily, perhaps, of setting up a cocket or excise station at Loch Broom and Loch Carron in the 1560s and 1570s (Rorke 2005). This seemingly fell into abeyance and the fishermen then had to declare the origin of their catch to custom officers when they landed and processed the fish on their return to their home ports in the Lowlands (below).82

This was augmented, certainly from the 1620s, by the licensing of ecclesiastical tax collection to tacksman, who paid the Bishop an annual fee of 100 merks for the privilege of collecting this with a view to funding the impecunious Diocese of the Isles. An indication of the impact the reinvigorated ecclesiastical taxation can be seen in the “Complaints of the burrowis” before the Scottish Privy Council, 1623, where it was argued that

“... the merchandis of this kingdome ar miechtelie prejudged in the payment of the excyse fysh and also the tithe fysh exact be the Bishope of the Yllis which twa burdens doe press us soe sore as thair is noe gaine of oure fishing and if the same not be reformed and the subiect fred thairof thair is no hoip that the tred of fyshing sall evir tak roote far less to tak our progress ...”83

Despite the lugubrious tone of those taxed, this did not always work efficiently. Bryce Sempill of Cathcart and John Schaw, a merchant burgess of Edinburgh, were granted the right to collect tithes of the Isles fishery for nineteen years in 1621 by Andrew Knox, Bishop of the Isles (MacCoinnich 2015a:241). It seems that Schaw and Semple relied, in part, at least, on merchants to declare their catch when they brought them back to Leith or other Lowland burghs: a system augmented by having agents in the Isles to monitor the fishery.84 By 1633, however, Semple and Schaw were pursued at law for historic non-payment of dues by their successor as tacksman, the much more efficient Alexander Guthrie of Gagie.85 Guthrie’s papers from the 1620s and 1630s have detailed lists of vessels from Fife and Ayr, which include the
names of the skippers and a note of their cargo. Many fishermen resident in Lewis in ca. 1633–1634 are named, giving a taxman’s perspective of a busy ling, cod, and herring fishery in that locality.\textsuperscript{86} The exactions of Hebridean chiefs, which had been a feature of earlier conflict, in the 1570s and 1580s, had been resolved by 1620. A commission of inquiry into the duty extracted by the Islanders, headed by Lord Lorne (who had, himself, a vested interest in the taxation of fisheries) found in 1634 that a grouping of Hebridean chiefs: Macdonald of Sleat, Macleod of Dunvegan, Macdonald of Clanranald, MacNeill of Barra, Maclean of Morverne, Maclean of Lochbuie, Maclean of Coll and MacKinnon of Strath—a roll call similar to those bound by the Statutes of Iona in 1609—gave a joint declaration. They claimed that they had relaxed their earlier demands of monies levied from fishermen for each last of herring. They had reached a deal with east coast Scottish burghs and now charged a flat rate of 36/- for herring fishery and 20 merks for fishermen who came to the gray and white fishing for working in their waters.\textsuperscript{87} While most of the fishing effort came from east coast boats, assertions of indigenous inactivity in the fisheries seem undermined by the rejoinder in a royal missive, 1635, “that no grein or fresh fish be sold be the natives to strangeris to the end we be not defrauded of theis dewtys”: that natives favoured selling to strangers is a backhanded reminder of the difficulties natives faced, perhaps, in dealing with Lowland domination of the fishing industry.\textsuperscript{88} Despite these dynamics, local enterprise did continue in subsequent decades in tandem with the activities of visiting fishing fleets (Kennedy 2014:42–43, MacCoinnich 2015a:248–254, Shaw 1980:159–160).

**Conclusion**

Why then, had Lowland Scottish relations with the Highlands become so strained between 1540 and ca. 1630?\textsuperscript{92} Gaelic Scotland has often been characterised as backward, barbarous and inimical to trade in contrast with a more sophisticated, advanced, Anglophone culture. These crude stereotypes, which had their genesis in the Middle Ages, and which coloured the period discussed in this paper still cast a long shadow. Traditional narrative, both from contemporaneous primary source material and in subsequent historiography, has concentrated on the political tensions arising from the need of the Lowland, Scots-speaking, establishment to impose order, if not law (and Lowland values), on the often chaotic, Gaelic Highlands and Islands, the latter, implicitly, if not explicitly, regarded as a primitive area in need of development. Sanctimonious expressions of the intention to “improve” Hebridean society, as evinced in the Statutes of Iona, are not the whole story. While there is no doubt that King and Council in Edinburgh (if not London) wished to impose their own values on Gaelic society, this was not, necessarily, solely due to a pious or altruistic concern for the welfare and improvement of the Gàidhealtachd. Such a focus on the political and cultural aspects of Lowland-Highland relations has meant that economic motives have been overlooked. The maritime dimensions of this story have been underplayed and what writing there has been has concentrated, largely, on terrestrial matters.

It is suggested here that a study of fisheries and attitudes to intense resource competition from different sectors of society may add to a more nuanced understanding of the complex dynamics between groups of peoples within the early modern Hebrides as well as on the broader interaction between Gàidhealtachd and Galldachd (Highlands and Lowlands). Clan Campbell and Clan Mackenzie, both of whom negotiated the tricky interface between Highland and Lowland worlds with some skill, did manage to establish their own fisheries. The story of their struggle to do so is instructive. While there were certainly differences in approaches to resource exploitation in Highland and Lowland society, the experience of these two powerful, well-connected and entrepreneurial clans who struggled against outside opposition to achieve their aims, points to another factor inhibiting commercial and mercantile development in the Highlands—the zealously protected monopoly on trade and fisheries exercised by the burghs of southern and eastern Scotland. Historiography has, quite legitimately, been exercised by the consideration of a Highland problem. A close study of the nature of Highland and Lowland interaction in a maritime context can help us see this old problem in a new light. Indeed, when viewed from a north-western and maritime perspective, this issue can look quite different. Some acknowledgement should be given to the role of the Lowlands in the making of the “Highland problem” at sea as on land.
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Endnotes

1 For a study on the relationship between the “West” and those they wished (or wish?) to civilise and native, African, responses to European resource-exploitation and related cultural imperialism, see Osterhammel (2006) and Wa Thiong’o (2005:2–3, 34–35, 65–69). Other studies illustrate resource exploitation and competition between “First” and “Third” world interests in different continents (especially over commodities such as oil in the 20th and 21st century rather than fish in the early-modern Hebrides) from Africa to the Middle East: Anderson (2012), Barton, Gwynne and Murray (2008), Borg (1992), Patey (2010), Raphael and Stokes (2011). For specific instances looking at the impact of western resource competition on societies from postcolonial, theoretical and literary perspectives see works by Iain MacKinnon (2017:22–48) and Silke Stroh (2011, 2016). I am grateful to Dr. MacKinnon for discussing these matters with me.

2 The difference in attitudes to kinship in the Highlands and Lowlands was one of degree. There is no doubt that kinship—while more evidently stronger in the Highlands—remained important in the Lowlands too (MacCoinnich 2015a:4; Murdoch 2006:1–48; Wormald 1980:66–75, 87–90).

3 This continued well beyond the period under discussion here. For the Restoration and Jacobite eras, see Kennedy (2014:23–31) and Stroh (2016:50–53, 55–57, 60–62).

4 Karen Kupperman has discussed the pitfalls in historical climatology for Early Modern Europe and North America (Kupperman 2007:163–178). Although we know of extreme weather events, some challenging climatic conditions and there is talk of global cooling, “the Little Ice Age”, from the mid 16th century onwards, we lack detailed information of weather patterns for Scotland for the period considered in this paper (Dodgshon 2005, Dugmore et al. 2007, MacDonald and McCallum 2013). In fact a study of sediments at the bottom of Loch Sunart has suggested that rather than cooling, temperatures were, on average, 1°C warmer, 1540–1610, than they were in the preceding or following periods (Cage and Austin 2010:1634–1645). Scottish Church Records have been mined in a recent pioneering study which put together a pattern of 119 weather events from 1615–1625. This tells us something about the south and east of Scotland but we lack this set of records here. For the Restoration and Jacobite eras, see Cathcart (1980:66–75, 87–90).


8 For a recent consideration of environmental conditions in the late medieval Isles see, Oram (2014:40–61).

9 Bishop Lesley’s claims seem to be supported by the parliamentary record from James IV’s reign, which ruled on this issue 1493 and 1504 (Brown et al. 2007–2017:1493/5/21 and 25. A1504/3/115).

10 The Bishop of Caithness was also in charge of the accounts for the royal household and kitchen and these records show herring and ling from Lewis being extracted at least one, Alasdair Mackenzie of Achility, routinely chartered vessels from Scots and English merchants in the 1630s (MacCoinnich 2015a:142–143, 276–277, 478–479; MacCoinnich forthcoming).


12 The Bishop of Caithness was also in charge of the accounts for the royal household and kitchen and these records show herring and ling from Lewis being extracted from the area in 1511–1512, sold to the royal household by the new chief, Gillearcal Mór Macleod, with some of the surplus ling being sold on to Flanders (NRS, E 32/1/44). We may assume that Scottish Gaels might use the birlinn, the crear or crayer and the buss (Ditchburn 2001:8–21, Dow 1969:127–129, Rørke 2005:154, Riis 2016: xii–xiv, 22, 36–37). Dutch boats also visited the area and while we may assume that Scottish Gaels might use the birlinn, at least one, Alasdair Mackenzie of Achility, routinely chartered vessels from Scots and English merchants in the 1630s (MacCoinnich 2015a:142–143, 276–277, 478–479; MacCoinnich forthcoming).

14 It has been suggested that Monro was not a Gael as he was said by one source (1570) not to be “prompt in the Scottish tongue” (Monro [1549] 1999:295. Thomson 1839:176). This, however, may have referred to his abilities as a preacher (in Scots rather than Irish?) and his reluctance to preach (he was “not so apt to teach”), rather than his linguistic ability in Gaelic. Monro can be contrasted with a contemporary, Mr. Robert Pont, who protested (1563), that, unlike Monro, he was hampered in his duties as a church commissioner in the Highlands by a lack of competence in the “Irish” language (Thomson 1843:244–245). Monro’s text was written in Scots but it is evident from his writing (treatment of names, places and explanations) as well as his appointment as a clergyman in Gàidhealtachd areas, that he understood and spoke Gaelic, which continued to be spoken in his native parish until the early 20th century (McInnes 1940: no. 61, p. 18; Monro [1549] 1999:320–321, 323, 325, 327, 331, 334–338; Munro and Monro 2004). For the incidence of Gaelic speech in Monro’s native Kiltearn parish, mainly Gaelic-speaking in 1791, still 56% Gaelic-speaking in 1891 and now less than 3%, see Duwe (2012).

15 There has been some archaeological work on fish remains in the Hebrides from the Iron Age, Viking Age and modern period respectively, but little hitherto on the late medieval and early modern periods up until recently (Barrett, Nicolson and Cerón Carrasco 1999: 353, 388; Cerón Carrasco 2005; Cerón Carrasco 2015). The earliest documentary reference to the annual guga (gannet) hunt at Ness in Lewis was by Donald Monro in 1549. Monro [1549] 1999:339. See also, MacCinnich, (2015a:72–80), McGeoch et al. (2010).

16 Species named in this account were red herring, cod, saithe, tusk, ling, skate, in “Marion Russellis compt of furnishing of fisches to the Erle of Argyle his houss, saith as gude and sufficient merchandise boucht and ressavit …” (NRS, RD 1/80, fol. 122v). For Campbell involvement in the fish trade, although both focussed on terrestrial rather than maritime matters, see Macinnes (1996) and Dodgshon (1998).


20 Similarly, a note of a sasine issued by the Earl of Argyll, 1603, granting lands of Kilean held by Charles Campbell, alias Maclomhair of Stonsherro referred to Stronsheer as the “fishing land and salmon port” (Inveraray Castle Archive, Argyll Transcripts, viii, 116).


22 For the parallel development of fisheries in medieval England which may have similarities with the Lowland Scottish fishery, see Kowaleski (2003).

23 For traditional historiographical views of Highland-Lowland demarcation see Croft Dickinson (1977:4–7), Donaldson (1965:4, 13–14, 228–232), Nicolson (1974:4–5, 541). For a summary of contemporary, 16th-century Lowland perspectives of Gaelic Scotland see Cowan (1997–1998). For Malcolm Gray, a historian of the later period, the 18th- and early 19th-century Highlands and Islands were, it was held, burdened with “a population not over pre-occupied with industrial pursuits.” The remedy for this was that “improving” landlords needed to “force the people into industrial activity” (Gray 1952:54). Another economic historian, Ian Whyte, seems more nuanced in his approach to the Highlands, yet, attempts to improve and transform the Highlands post-Culloden “came to grief through insufficient funds, unsuitable policies and the intractable nature both of the lands and its inhabitants …” (Whyte 1997:33, 112–114). For detailed, revisionist, and generally more positive views on the Highlands and trade, although both focussed on terrestrial rather than maritime matters, see Macinnes (1996) and Dodgshon (1998).

24 Documentary references to Campbell involvement are found in Inveraray Castle Archive, Argyll Transcripts, v, 166; vi, 43, 56, 188; viii, 8, 276; ix, 137; Bundle 1117. Argyll MSS, Volume 37. National Records of Scotland [NRS], E43/24; GD 112/7/22/2; GD 124/10/110; GD 160/205/3; GD 249/2/1/48; PS 1/85, fol. 38. See also Masson and Burton (1877–1899 vol 6:665 and vol 10:436–439), Dawson (2002:70 and n.118) and Macinnes (2011:51, 79–80, 90–92). Details of the direct involvement of the Argyll family in the fish trade are scarce. However, one deed survives which shows this: an obligation made at Glasgow, 26 January 1600, by Marion Stewart relict of umquhill Hector Stewart, Bailleie of Glasgow, for a debt of 400 merks owed to Mr. James Kirk, servant to the Earl of Argyll, against the price of “thrie lastis of her ritual threes lastis of her nait” (NRS, RD 1/80, fol. 122v). For Campbell rights to the fisheries, see Inveraray Castle Archive, Argyll Transcripts, viii, 148, 276. Campbell of Airds 2002:92. See also Malcolm Gray, a historian of the later period, the 18th- and early 19th-century Highlands and Islands were, it was held, burdened with “a population not over pre-occupied with industrial pursuits.” The remedy for this was that “improving” landlords needed to “force the people into industrial activity” (Gray 1952:54). Another economic historian, Ian Whyte, seems more nuanced in his approach to the Highlands, yet, attempts to improve and transform the Highlands post-Culloden “came to grief through insufficient funds, unsuitable policies and the intractable nature both of the lands and its inhabitants …” (Whyte 1997:33, 112–114). For detailed, revisionist, and generally more positive views on the Highlands and trade, although both focussed on terrestrial rather than maritime matters, see Macinnes (1996) and Dodgshon (1998).

powers on land see Macinnes (2011:48–50, 77, 84 and n.27, 70, 86, 202–203).


27 According to Gordon Donaldson, “... purely Highland families played hardly any part in national affairs in the 16th century....” The exception to this were the Campbells of Argyll and the Gordons of Huntly, but “No Highland chief was of much importance in comparison to these semi-Lowland families” (Donaldson 1965:13–14). For a more nuanced interpretation of Campbell cultural mores see MacGregor (2012:121–157).

28 Proclamation, Privy Council, 15 July 1566, “that none molest the Hieland men”, This was an attempt to halt Lowlanders’ harassment of Highlanders coming to Lowland markets on the grounds that this was deleterious to trade (Masson and Burton 1877–1898 vol 1:470–471).

29 MacCoinnich 2006:214–231, MacCoinnich 2015a:121–122, Stuart 1848:230–233. Turks were, apparently, thought to be especially cruel as well as barbarous (Stroh 2011:80).


31 Eilean Tecsa (Texa I.), Eilean Orasaigh (Orsay I.), Eilean MhicCoinnich lying by the south coast of Islay and the Island of “Usabrust” probably now known as “Frenchman’s Rocks” and Eilean an Tanais-sgeir on the west coast, were all together with Eilean Néimh (Nave I.), were all identified as being either “gude” or “verie gude for fisching” (Monro [1549] 1999:308–313).

32 In this case it was only partly successful. John MacNeil prospered in England, but was caught up in a duel at Exeter, 1595, and was indicted for murder. Maclean remonstrated on his behalf with the English authorities but John’s fate is unknown (Bain et al. 1898–1969 vol 5:668, 699; vol 12:35–37; Maclean-Bristol 1999:167, 173; MacCoinnich 2015a:253–254 and n260).

33 Gilbert McIlдуff and George Kennedy, both Ayr burgess, acted as “interpreters of the Scottis and Ireis towngis between” a Gaelic-speaking Arran man, Donald McIlــhchattane and an Ayr burgess, John Masoun, in 1591 (Pryde 1937:30, 106, 124, 143, 163. Shedden-Dobie 1889:201, 252–253).

34 Donnchadh “Lighiche” (medicinal) Mac’IlleSheanaich and his son, also Donnchadh in Kintyre (in Macdonald’s lands), bought a tun of wine from George Gibson, burgess of Ayr, 1583. The Ayr merchants named as being involved in the Isles herring trade at this time (1583–1584) included John Blair, David Neil, Robert Campbell, George Campbell (mariner, son to Hew in Killloch), James Dalrymple, William Fallusdaill and Thomas Kilpatrick, George Cunnningham, Golas Cochreme, Patrick Glover, John Kennedy, James Lindsay, William Knox, William Hunter, Robert Hunter, John Broun (with his ship the Swallow). Their “Ilis herring” was sold in either La Rochelle or Bordeaux (Shedden-Dobie 1889:149, 223–227, 229, 230, 231). For Ayr and maritime trade see also Mackenzie (1988). For plaiding in the northern Hebridies in the early 17th century, see MacCoinnich (2015a:148, 232–234, 253–254).


36 For Ayr, see Mackenzie (1988). Disputes between Glasgow with Dumbarton (and other Clyde burghs) over issues regarding the river and the right to trade with Argyll and the west dated back at least as far as 1275 and continued well into the 17th century (Marwick 1876:180, 185, 462, 465; Marwick 1894, 17, 145–146, 225–227, 442, 445, 452, 459; Marwick 1897:cccxlv. Dennison and Coleman 1999:23–25).

37 For Dennis Campbell, Dean of Limerick (1595) and Sir Robert Gordon (ca. 1630) the dispute had been about possession of the Rhinns of Islay, “the fertile western peninsula of that island” (Shaw 1980:4. Gordon 1813:188; Masson and Burton, 1877–1898 vol 1:251, 470–471; Robertson 1847:46–48).


39 The register which holds these coats of arms was started in 1592 and was completed around 1603 (Innes of Learney 1946:406–409).


44 I owe this reference to Dr. Stephen Harrison, the University of Glasgow. The anonymous external reader of this paper informed me of the recent excavation of an 18 metre, English, oak-built vessel dating to the early 17th century off the coast of Rutland Island, west Donegal (Kelleher 2017). The vessel, and how it came to rest there remain unknown, but it was armed and carried a cargo which included red bricks, barrels, olives and what were thought to be Spanish reals.

45 Glasgow University Library, Special Collections, MS Euing, 19 (30).

46 Letter, Sir Arthur Chichester, Ulster, to the Scottish Privy Council, April 1608, talking about a forthcoming action to be taken by English forces of 400 men against the Scottish Islanders, who were, “for the most part as false and treacheraeous as the barbarous Irish ...” (The National Archives, Kew [TNA], SP 63/223, fol. 154. See also Canny 2001:23, 47–53, 132–137, 191, 204–205; Horning 2013:52–60, Palmer 2001:75; Stroh 2016:38).

47 Kin relations form another point of contrast between
England and (Lowland) Scotland in their encounters with the respective Gaelic societies of Ireland and Scotland (MacCoinnich, 2015a:3–11).


Deposition of island chiefs: Macdonald of Clanranald, Macdonald of Sleat, MacLeod of Dunvegan, Maclean of Duart, Maclean of Lochbuie, and MacNeil of Barra at Edinburgh, 1634 (NRS, GD 150/3035).

NRS, GD 150/3035. This document of 1634 echoes a complaint made by the burgh of Crail in 1586 (Marwick 1866:213).


According to Poul Holm long-established and, pre-sumably, well-organised Danish and Norwegian fisheries were rendered ineffective at this time by a much more commercially sophisticated Dutch herring fleet (Holm 1996:188–189).

(Rorke 2001:207, Rorke 2005:149–165, NRS, E 75/7.) A number of references from the years 1580 and 1588 show Dundee fishermen active in Hebridean and North Minch waters (Miliar 1898:197–199, 218–223). A more recent study of Crail burgh court books dating to the second half of the sixteenth century, demonstrated the central importance of fishing—in large part in the north Isles (the northern Hebrides) as well as Orkney and Shetland to the south and east of Scotland (Riis 2016).

For a contrary interpretation of Stiol Torcaill’s activities, see Murdoch (2010:135–136).

The reference to his death is in the indictment against Niall MacLeod of Lewis on trial at Edinburgh in 1613. The testament, made and given up by Elspeth Taquhair, Robert’s daughter, 12 January 1602, makes no mention of the manner or circumstances of her father’s death or even the date of his decease other than the year, 1601, focusing on questions related to goods and monies that needed resolving (NRS, JC 2/5, fol. 81v. NRS, CC 8/8/36/245. Pitcairn 1833 vol 3:245).

NRS, JC 26/3.

NRS, CC 8/8/45/217. See also, MacCoinnich (2015a:143).


Inveraray Castle Archive: Bundle 1117, Argyll Transcripts, ix, 137.


NRS, RD I/445, fol. 71.

“... for ye shall never have undertakeris till first they know q[hua]r to fish ... tyme is precious ...” Seafirth, in London, 19 June 1631, to Secretary of State, John Coke (TNA, SP 16/194, fol. 34).

For more detail on this, see MacCoinnich (2015a:chapters 4–6).

74 MacCoinnich 2015a:chapter 6 and appendices F2–F7.

For a study of the slightly later 18th-century coal and salt works in Fife see Martin (1999:42–65). Thanks to Dr. Simon Taylor for this reference. For salt see also Riis (2016:6–8)
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(MacCoinnich 2015a:273–274.) Later MacKenzie plans (1762) to develop their fishery were also impeded by the imposition of a tax on salt (TNA, MPD, 1/53. TNA, T1/416/18). Something which was prohibitively expensive is still said in Lewis Gaelic to be—“cho daor ris an tisalainn Spáinneach” (as expensive as Spanish salt). For the labour intensive nature of peat in salt production see also, Oram (2012:231).
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Kintyre. They were set in lease by the Marquis of Lorne to Alexander Osborne of Ramwulling (Ireland), 1637. These were still being worked in 1669 when a tack of St. Ninian’s Lands were set to Archibald (Gilleasbaig) Macdonald of Sanda with the rights to the coal and salt works being reserved to Argyll (Inveraray Castle Archive, AT xi, 787. AT xiv, 639). Attempts were also made by Macdonald of Sleat (Isle of Skye) and Campbell of Calder (Isle of Islay) to build salt pans at the very end of the 17th century (Shaw 1980:160–161).

79 Eric Cantona, “When the seagulls follow the trawler, it is because they think sardines will be thrown in the sea”, quoted from The Independent, 31 March 1995.

80 Bishop Mark of Sodor (1276–1303) referred to fishing tithes in Man (then part of Scotland) and the Isles in his Episcopal constitutions of 1292. The Scottish Bishop, Bernard of Sodor (ca. 1330–1348), is also said to have introduced an ecclesiastical taxation on fisheries in Man and the Isles (Bray 2005:30–51 and 39, Broderick 2004:fol. 51v, Watt and Murray 2003:261–262).
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88 “Coppie of suspension from the king anent the fisch-ing” dated, Hampton Court, 6 November 1635 (NRS, GD 188/31/bundle 12).