The Genealogist.

THE RIDDELLS OF THAT ILK, AND THE RIDELS OF BLAYE, CRANSTON-RIDEL, AND WITERING, DISTINCT FAMILIES.

By JOSEPH BAIN, F.S.A., Scot.

In the current volume of the *Archæologia Æliana* (xii, p. 192), there is a very interesting notice of the three Papal bulls, by which Adrian IV confirmed a family arrangement by the head of the Roxburghshire de Rydales, soon after the middle of the 12th century, which the author (Mr. Bates) truly says is probably a unique instance in Scotch conveyancing. And one is glad to hear that, though dissevered from the domain to which they relate, these documents are in the hands of the learned representative of the family. But the author of the paper goes into the question of the origin of the Roxburgh Riddells, and in his remarks, shews that he has either not availed himself of, or disregards certain sources of information, part of which has been in print for nearly ten years[1], which would have prevented his falling into the belief that the "Ridels" and "de Rydales," who appear almost simultaneously in Scotland, were the same family. The evidence of the surname alone goes for the other way. I may refer to a paper which appeared in *Notes and Queries* on 9th August, 1879[2], where all the information I then had was set down, to shew the separate origin of these two old families—that the Ridels came from Gascony, or the south-west quarter of France; the de Rydales from Yorkshire. I have nowhere seen any answer to the statements in that paper, which indeed being taken from original records, are unanswerable. And they are confirmed in every point by what I have since seen in the public records. The Ridels of Cranston-Ridel in Lothian, and Wytering in Northampton, and the de Rydales of Lillesclive in Roxburgh, were undoubtedly distinct *aborigines*. The former family *never* prefixed "de" to their surname, which was a personal one; the latter invariably did so because they came from a place so called. The first Ridel of Cranston was probably Gervasius Ridel, who appears in the *Inquisicio* of Earl David in A.D. 1116, and it remained with his successors till the reign of Edward III, with more or less interruption during the wars of independence. As the family, on account of their Northampton estate, mostly sided with England, they finally lost Cranston, and retired to Northamptonshire, ending in female succession in the reign of Edward IV.[3] The first of the Riddells of that Ilk, was Walter *de* Ridale (not "Walter Ridel" as Mr. Bates calls him) who received Lillesclive, &c., from David I. (1123-1153). The arms of these two

[1] And some, as the close of this paper shows, for nearly a century!

[2] 5 s. vol. xii, p. 102.

[3] Chalmer's *Caledonia*, *Chartulary of Kelso*, and Bridge's *Northamptonshire* and Public Records.

families were essentially different. On the seal of Sir Hugh Ridel (of Cranston) appended to his homage to Edward I. in 1296, which is in the Public Record Office, the charges are a plain chief, and a pile (?) in base, although it is somewhat damaged, and besides is on rather a small scale. The arms of the Riddells of Riddell, a chevron between three ears of rye, evidently refer to the old form of their surname, "Rydale," and may thus be called *arma cantantia*. Some variations of them will be found in Mr. Stodart's *Scottish Arms*, where, however, the earliest occurrence of the arms is not (I think) given. But if Mr. Bates will look at the 2nd and 3rd volumes of the *Calendar of Documents relative to Godland* (1272-1357) he will see reason to modify his views as to the identity of the Ridels and de Ridales. What I have ventured to say in the Preface to vol. ii, p. lxii, is confirmed by any documents that I have since seen in the public records.

After consulting these records, it will not "be safe to assume" that Walter de Ridale (not Ridel) and Gervasius Ridel were brothers, or that Geoffry Ridel, the Archdeacon of Canterbury (C. 1164) was "connected with the lords of Lillesclive." Though Mr. Bates notices Thomas de Ridell, a Berwick burgess, whose will appears in the Durham Record in January, 1358-59,[1] he does not mention Philip de Ridale, an earlier Berwick burgess—Mayor of Berwick in fact—who appears on the *Ragman Roll* in 1291, and must have been a man of wealth. Sir William Rydel (or Ridel) appears in Northumberland from 1301 to 1330, evidently a distinguished person. His seal is given in vol. iii of the Sc. Calendar, as a lion rampant within an engrailed bordure—thus different from the arms of the other families.[2]

It is curious that unless "John of Lillesclive" was a Riddel, of Roxburghshire, no one of that family appears on the *Ragman Roll*, not indeed during the Wars of Succession—with a trifling exception, a Michael Ridel a juror on a Roxburgh inquisition. The Ridels of Cranston-Ridel alone appear during that period. This is rather remarkable considering the position of the Riddells of that Ilk on the most debateable part of the Eastern marches, which was the subject of contention between the countries long after Scotland recovered its independence. I notice that the account of the Riddells of that Ilk in Burke perpetuates the fallacy that Gervase Ridel and Walter de Ridale were closely related. The greatest genealogist of his day—John Riddell—a cadet of that Ilk—know quite well that the stocks were different, or, as he styled it, "double," though he did not emphasize the fact so clearly as he would have done in the case of another family.

Mr. Bates concludes his paper by referring to what he calls the "monstrous fabrication" of the genealogy of the Riddells of Ardnamurchan.[3] Though this work was published in 1794, I had never consulted it, or seen the pedigree in question. But I have now done so, and on a fair consideration of its details, he must allow me

[1] Surtees Society Wills, vol. i, p. 28. Thomas Riddel probably his son appears also in the records. (*Col. of Doctor Scotland*, vol. iv).

[2] The lineage of this Knight is given in Hutchinson's *Durham*, vol. iii., in the Ardnamurchan pedigree to be afterwards noticed, and is supported by the records. Hugh Ridel was his executor according to the same authority, corroborated by vol. iii of the *Cal. of Scots Documents*.

[3] In Hutchinson's *Durham*, vol. iii. *Addenda*.

to say that his unqualified condemnation of it, is not borne out by such parts of it as I have been able to test by reference to authorities. It deals with thirty generations, beginning with the Counts of Angoulême and Perigord, and ending with Sir James Riddell of Ardnamurchan and Sunart, Baronet, in 1794. I will not undertake to say anything as to the truth or falsity of the first seven generations, but beginning with the 8th of the lineage, Galfredus Ridel of Blaye, said to be the first who used that surname in A.D. 1048, down to the 22nd Henry Ridel of Witering, who died in 1471, and was the last of the principal Northampton Ridels, the accounts given in this pedigree are in a great measure substantially borne out by the Scotch and English historical records. Whoever drew up the pedigree for Sir James Riddell had evidently consulted original authorities, and these fifteen generations unquestionably deal with real persons, and contain a solid basis of fact. There are, of course, errors in dates and minor points, but the writer was one evidently well versed in the connections of the Ridels, Rydels, or Rudels, of Blaye, in Guienne, the chief continental seat of the family, as also with their English and Scotch possessions. He also draws attention to what he calls "the singular error made by some Scotch 'Genealogist,' in confusing the two families of Ridel and de Rydale, and points out the fact of the latter having come from Yorkshire. This independent testimony, hitherto quite unknown to me, is confirmed in all substantial points by my own researches on Scotch historical questions in the English records, not at all with particular reference to this family. Whether the Ardnamurchan descent from a younger branch of the Ridels of Witering is correct or not, I have no means of ascertaining, but seeing that the earlier part of their lineage is so correctly given, there is no antecedent reason why the latter part may not be correct also, if the authorities for it are sound.

However this may be, it does not affect the proposition which I venture to maintain, that the "Ridels" and the "de Ridales" were originally distinct families—the former from the south-west of France, the latter from Rydale in Yorkshire.

The question being of some interest as touching Scottish records, and having been raised in a publication of standing such as the *Archæologia Æliana*, anyone who has some acquaintance with the above records is at liberty to state the case, as it is made out from these, and traverse the conclusions of the learned Newcastle antiquary.

Mr. Bates raises another question of some interest. The third of the Papal bulls names a place called "Brahebi" as held by Walter de Ridale and his ancestors under Hexham Abbey. He says there is no such place now known by that name in Roxburgh—but assuming it to be in Scotland, "it is the sole trace of that Church having owned estates on the north side of the Tweed." But I would ask what authority is there for this conjecture? There is not a single place in Scotland named among the possessions of Hexham, confirmed to the Abbey by Edward I in 1305, by a charter printed in *Dugdale*. It is not conceivable that, if they had held any lands in Scotland, they would have been left out of that charter. It is therefore more likely to be some place on the English side of the March that has changed its name.