

The American Genealogist.
Vol. 9 p 93

Call number (973 B2ag)
Genealogical Society Library
Salt Lake City, Utah

ROYAL ANCESTRY

A Note by the Editor-in-Chief

Many Americans find it amusing to trace a line of ancestry abroad, working it back through county families into the knighthood, the peerage and the mediæval royal houses. The difficulties in the way of working out such a line and of proving it by valid evidence are tremendous.

In view of the appalling number of ancestors we all possess when we go back thirty generations or a thousand years, it seems not unlikely that most persons of European descent have one or more lines of descent from early sovereign houses; but for every line of this sort, they must possess thousands of lines from the freemen and serfs who were contemporary with Charlemagne. This is as true of living members of royal families as it is of commoners. For strains of plebeian blood have worked their way into ruling houses about as rapidly as strains of royal blood have worked their way into plebeian families. It does not seem to be generally known that one-half the blood of the children of the present King of Italy is that of Montenegrin commoners; that one grandmother of the ex-Queen of Spain was a German commoner; or that one grandmother of the present Queen of England was likewise a German commoner.

It is of course impossible to trace an ancestral line for a thousand years unless we do connect with royalty or the baronage, because in the earlier centuries no genealogical records were kept of the common people. And it may have a certain cultural value to link ourselves with outstanding characters of history, and to feel that we are "the heirs of all the ages."

Unfortunately, as soon as most Americans delve into books that deal with the English gentry and peerage, their critical faculties seem to desert them entirely. Mr. G. Andrews Moriarty, in an article in *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register* a few years ago,* estimated that not one in twenty royal lines claimed by Americans has been proved by satisfactory evidence, and the present writer heartily concurs with this estimate.

It does not seem to be realized that lines of ancestry in England, like those in this country, can only be proved adequately by reference to contemporary documentary sources, or to the published works of those who have made the requisite study of such original sources. The earlier peerage books, such as those of Collins, Burke, and Playfair, are not safe to follow for mediæval pedigrees. Many families recently raised to the peerage did not wish to be thought *parvenus*, and sometimes furnished the peerage writers with early ancestral lines that had little or no basis in fact. While the editors of Burke's *Peerage* make corrections from time to time as errors are demonstrated, much of the erroneous matter incorporated in the book by earlier editors has been carried annually from edition to edition.

The general reference works which are usually to be relied on are *The Complete Peerage*, by G. E. Cockayne; the new *Complete Peerage* begun under the editorship of Gibbs and not yet completed; articles in *The Genealogist*, an English periodical; the books of J. Horace Round, a noted mediævalist; *The Dictionary of National Biography*; and Farrer's *Honors and Knights' Fees*. These are all modern compilations based on considerable research in original sources.† In addition, many record sources are available in print. It need scarcely be added, that a large amount of experience and special knowledge is essential before any genealogist can become really proficient in handling these English sources.

American sources for royal ancestry are very nearly worthless, or have been so up to the moment of writing.‡ The most elaborate work of a general nature is *Your Family Tree*, by David Starr Jordan, Ph.D., LL.D., and Sarah Louise Kimball (D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1929), which, while professing to be "a glance at scientific aspects of genealogy," illustrates how far a man of eminence in one branch of knowledge may

* Vol. 79, p. 258.

† Dugdale's *Baronage* and *Monasticon* remain important reference works, although published about 250 years ago; and Sir William Dugdale, their author, deserves a tribute for possessing the critical point of view and employing the research methods of modern scholars. His *Baronage of England*, published in 1675, is the best work of its kind published before the new *Complete Peerage*, the most recent work in this field, and is particularly useful because of the inclusion of younger children and of the early baronies by tenure.

‡ We have not seen the latest edition of Browning's *Americans of Royal Descent*, which we understand has been published under new editorship, but our observation applies to the earlier editions.

stray from scientific methods when he attempts work in another branch for which study and training have not prepared him.

We should hesitate to speak in such uncompromising terms of a recent publication were it not for the fact that already it has become the "royal ancestry bible" of hundreds of people, as witness frequent references to it in the genealogical columns of the *Boston Evening Transcript*, and the reprinting of pedigrees contained in it in later books.* Among the authorities listed at the end of *Your Family Tree* are the *Abridged Compendium of American Genealogy*; *Burke's Commoners, Peerage, and Royal Families*; *Genealogical and Family History of New Hampshire*; *O'Hart's Irish Pedigrees*; *Browning's Magna Charta Barons*; *Anderson's Royal Genealogies*; and *Visitation pedigrees* (not described more specifically).

The sources which should have been used in work of this type apparently were unknown to the compilers, since they failed to utilize them. It is unnecessary to comment on the sources actually used, except to say that some of them are satisfactory to use for clues, provided that the information found in them be verified later from primary record sources or more generally reliable compilations. The *Visitation pedigrees* mentioned are presumably those published by the *Harleian Society*, and these are extremely useful for clues. However, a word of caution will not be amiss.

Not only are the *Harleian pedigrees* based on the rough notes of the *Heralds* making the *Visitation*, but even the finished products in the *College*, are unreliable. The *Elizabethan heralds* not infrequently forged pedigrees for *Tudor upstarts*, and when honest had little critical faculty and, if they found a lot of charters in a man's muniment chest, they strung them together hit or miss into a pedigree. Hence, the *Visitation pedigrees* often omit or interpolate generations. Generally speaking, a *Visitation pedigree* may be accepted as far as the great-grandfather of the man who entered it. Beyond that, these pedigrees are useful, but as guides only, for further research in original sources.

The only source used for the earlier generations of the royal houses appears to have been *Anderson's Royal Genealogies*, published two hundred years ago, before scarcely any critical research had been made in contemporary source material for the true history of the early periods. On page 23, for example, we find a pedigree of kings of *Seythia* and *Ireland*, beginning with *Baoth* who received *Seythia* as his lot upon the division by *Japhet*, son of *Noah*. Is it really necessary to point out that there is no documentation whatever for these legendary or fic-

* As for example in *Some Descendants of Stephen Lincoln*, printed for William Emsign Lincoln, New York, 1830, p. 316.

tional kings "beginning with *Baoth*" and for many centuries thereafter?

On page 43 the kings of *Scotland* are traced back to an alleged monarch who reigned in *Ireland* in the fourth century B. C. On page 53 the *Anglo-Saxon* rulers are traced back to *Noe* [*Noah*] through *Woden* [*Saxon* equivalent of the *Norse* god, *Odin*]. The curious juxtaposition of a *Bible* character with a *Saxon* god should have indicated the fabricated nature of this pedigree; the line is certain back to *Egbert*, who was believed to be a descendant of *Cerdic*, but his exact line of descent from *Cerdic* is not certain. From *Cerdic* back to the god *Woden*, the line may be viewed as partly traditional and partly mythological; back of *Woden*, it is fictitious.

On page 61 appears the most curious pedigree of all. In it *Charlemagne* is traced through *St. Arnolph*, his undoubted ancestor, to *Pharamond*, who was an actual early ruler of the *Franks* but not a proved ancestor of *St. Arnolph*; and the wife of *Pharamond* is then described as a granddaughter of *Coilus* ["*Old King Cole*"] of *Britain*, alleged to have died 170 A. D., who is described as grandson of *Arviragus* by his wife *Genissa*, daughter of the *Roman Emperor Claudius*, whose descent is asserted through *Mark Antony* and the *Julian gens* from old *Aeneas* himself, a supposed contemporary of the *Trojan* war.

Credulity could go no further; yet this same pedigree, in abbreviated form, was actually accepted and printed in the *Abridged Compendium of American Genealogy*, volume 2, page 370. *Dr. Arthur L. Keith*, reviewing the first three volumes of the *Abridged Compendium* in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (vol. 16, pp. 399-402), refers to the inclusion of this pedigree in the following terms: "This is mythology, not genealogy If it is seriously meant, it condemns the work as a piece of colossal ignorance and audacity."

For the statement that *Arviragus* of *Britain* married a daughter of the *Emperor Claudius*, *Your Family Tree* specifically refers to *Anderson's Royal Genealogies*, tables 120, 121, and 122. These tables are concerned with the families of *Julius Caesar* and *Mark Antony*, but *Claudius* is there credited with no such daughter. These particular tables are based on the *Roman historians*, who are the proper sources for the genealogy of the early emperors. However, in table 478 are found the early legendary kings of *Britain*. In the pedigree itself *Anderson* fails to mention any wife for *Arviragus*; but above the pedigree he states that *Arviragus* was "affirm'd by *Humphrey Lhuyd* to have oppos'd the *Emperor Claudius* until a Marriage was concluded between him and *Genissa* Daughter of *Claudius*; but *Sueton* in his *Life of Caligula* mentions no such Daughter, and *Juvenal* evinces that *Arviragus* liv'd in the Days of *Domitian*, the 7th in Succession from *Claudius*."

In other words, Anderson showed his scholarship by quoting the Roman writers, and his good judgment by omitting this apocryphal daughter of Claudius from the pedigrees; but it was his method to show that he had not overlooked anything in print, hence his mention of the daughter of Claudius on the weak authority of Humphrey Lhuyd. In his introductory passages preceding many of the fabulous pedigrees, Anderson frequently stated plainly his own opinion that they were fabulous. Apparently the authors of *Your Family Tree* either did not take the trouble to read these passages, or else cynically disregarded them and quoted Anderson as authority for pedigrees which he himself, though printing them, had repudiated.

In criticizing a single book when there are others equally deserving of unfavorable comment, we have chosen it as the outstanding and most frequently quoted book of its type. For the benefit of those whose historical reading is insufficient to enable them to dismiss fabulous pedigrees at a glance, we will say that no documents have come down to us from the period of English history preceding the Saxon monarchies. What little knowledge we have of early tribal chiefs of the Britons comes to us from casual mention by Roman writers, by Gildas and Bede, and in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. The picture we get from these sources is clouded and lacking in those details that are essential to a connected genealogy. We get no connected history or genealogy of the early rulers of Britain until many centuries after that epoch, and all historians are agreed that Geoffrey of Monmouth's account, while he may have made use of legendary material, is mainly romance and not history.

Families of English descent cannot be traced back of Domesday book (1086) except the royal lines and a few of the more prominent Norman families. Two families, the Ardens of Warwickshire, and the Berkeleys, have *proved* descents from Saxons living at the time of the Conquest. Practically all European royal lines break off between 600 and 800 A. D., and the further back we go, the more shadowy is the evidence for the line claimed. Back of 600, it is useless to attempt to go, because no documentary evidence sufficient to establish a pedigree has reached us from the darkest period of the "Dark Ages." The earliest generations of the royal houses, as found in many printed sources, are usually derived from chroniclers who wrote centuries later, and these early generations may be characterized as uncertain, traditional, or fictitious, as the case may be.

Most of us would feel some incredulity if told that a four-legged chicken was hatched in the yard next door to us; but it becomes quite credible when we read that it saw the light in a remote village of Spain. Similarly, if a man claims to be our first or second cousin, we want full particulars of the relationship; but many people seem willing to accept, without the

slightest evidence, any claim of relationship provided only that it is a few centuries old. But in truth, the same standards of evidence hold good for each generation of a pedigree, whether in 1800, in 1600, or in 1000 A. D.

KINGS OF IRELAND

A Note by the Editor-in-Chief

Many Americans who pursue that delectable pastime of working out a Royal Ancestry, have entered the kings of Ireland on their charts. The line is usually derived through the wife of King Henry I of England, back through the Kings of Scots, to their royal ancestry in Ireland. Sometimes, however, the line is worked out through one of the Norman chieftains who participated in the conquest of Ireland and married the daughter of an Irish chieftain.

For the Irish line, dependence is usually placed on Anderson's *Royal Genealogies* or some similar work. It is strange that those who so freely copy Anderson's long pedigrees of Irish monarchs never trouble to read his critical comments (on page 775 of his monumental work which was published in 1732) regarding the historicity of these alleged kings. Anderson himself points out some of the contradictions and anachronisms in these pedigrees; quotes Sir James Ware, a gentleman of learning in Ireland, to the effect that "the ancient Histories of Ireland before King Leogaire are fabulous, or strangely mixed with fabulous Narrations"; and concludes that "there is no Vestige of Learning or Letters among the Irish before King Leogaire and his Contemporary St. Patrick." Then he adds: "But seeing They have generally so great an Esteem of their ancient Kings, and give out They can prove 'em by proper Vouchers in due time, I think it my Duty to exhibit them in my Genealogical Disposition, as I have already the *uncertain** Kings of other Nations." The Irish pedigrees then follow, based on the so-called Irish historians.

From this it will be seen that Anderson, although he included the early Irish pedigrees in his work, did not hold them in very high regard. It is quite unfair, therefore, to quote these pedigrees and give Anderson as the authority, without expressly quoting his own opinion of their authenticity.

The chief purpose of this note is to call attention to a recent book, *Tara, a Pagan Sanctuary of Ancient Ireland*, by R. A. S. MacAlister, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., published in 1931 by Charles Scribner's Sons. Dr. MacAlister is Professor of Celtic Archaeology, University College, Dublin; President of the Royal Irish

* The word "uncertain" is italicized by Anderson.

Academy and of the Royal Society of Antiquities of Ireland; and author of *The Archaeology of Ireland*.

It can hardly be imagined that a scholar with such a background would be personally prejudiced against the claims made by the older Irish historians. We invite special attention to page 96 and Chapter III. The "official history" of Ireland, Dr. MacAlister finds to be "a medley of fragmentary traditions, genealogies, and what not, artificially strung together"; "manipulated folklore rather than history." He further states that it is impossible to accept such a list of kings, in the form in which it is presented to us, as a statement of actual history.

The book is intensely interesting to anyone who is interested in antiquities and folk-lore. The reason for our note is to show that the most recent Irish authority is in substantial agreement with Anderson's opinion, and expresses himself even more unequivocally with regard to the historical veracity of the Irish king list. The present book gives us more than mere opinion, for examples are cited of duplications and of "manipulation" of material by the older historians.

It would of course be improper to say of the genealogies that they were forged. The Irish race is peculiarly proud and sensitive. In a day when other nations were making claim to great antiquity, the Irish would not be outdone. The criteria of history were not so exact in those days, and the Irish "historians" had plenty of material in the way of myth and folk-lore on which to draw, not to mention the imagination with which their race has always been gifted. It was not considered improper to piece together this legendary material into a connected "history" and to assign dates. Needless to say, there exists no documentary evidence whatever. While there is some basis of fact behind the "official history," genealogy is too exact a science to warrant the acceptance of pedigrees strung together out of myth, legend and imagination.

DESCENTS FROM THE CID

The Genealogists' Magazine, the official organ of the Society of Genealogists in England, contains a brief article by C. F. H. Evans in the September 1931 issue,* based on a recent book, *La España del Cid*, by R. Menéndez Pidal, 2 vols. (1929). The researches of Pidal, with references to authorities, disprove many statements made in Turton's *Plantagenet Ancestry* (1928) and other compilations.

From this article we quote the following passages, which will be of interest to all who can trace a descent from Eleanor of Castile, wife of Edward I, King of England.

* Vol. 5, p. 361.

"Rodrigo Diaz, el Cid, señor de Valencia, born about 1043, died 1099 married 1074 Jimena Diaz, died about 1115, daughter of Diego, Conde de Oviedo (of uncertain parentage) by Cristina, daughter of Fernando Gundemariz and Jimena de León. . . . The latter was the daughter, possibly illegitimate, of Alfonso V, King Emperor of Leon, born 994, died 1028."

The surviving children of the Cid were two daughters, of whom the younger, Maria Rodriguez (c. 1080-1105), married about 1098, as his first wife, Ramón Berenguer III, Conde de Barcelona, born 1082, died 1131. From their daughter Jimena, the counts of Foix are descended. The statement in George's Genealogical Tables, 5th ed. (1916), table 37, that Berenguela of Barcelona, wife of Alfonso VII of Castile and Leon, was a daughter of Maria Rodriguez, is incorrect. Apparently Berenguela's mother was Ramón Berenguer's third wife, Dulce of Provence.

The elder daughter of the Cid, Cristina Rodriguez (c. 1077-1116), married about 1098, Ramiro, señor de Monzón. Their son Garcia VII (d. 1150), King of Navarre, was father of Blanca (d. 1156), who married 1151 Sancho III (c. 1134-1158), King of Castile. Their son, Alfonso VIII (1155-1214), King of Castile, was father of Berenguela (1171-1244), who married 1197 Alfonso IX (1171-1230), King of Leon. Their son, Fernando III (1199-1252), King of Castile and Leon, was father of Eleanor, wife of King Edward I of England.

Genealogists everywhere should be grateful to Mr. Evans for calling attention to this interesting pedigree from the Spanish hero, and to the recent Spanish publication which corrects previously accepted errors.

Catherine M. Wurts, *Wurts Family to the Somerset Co. Va. Families*

Vol. 19
 Call number (973 B2 a9)
 Genealogical Society Library
 Salt Lake City, Utah

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by GILBERT H. DOANE, B.A., of Madison, Wis.

NOTE: Book reviews will be discontinued in the coming volume for the duration of the war, Mr. Doane remaining on the staff as a Contributing Editor. The reasons for this decision are stated herein under the heading, "Queries and Answers."

Magna Carta, by John S. Wurts, Brookfield Pub. Co., New York City.

This appears to be the latest publication of a series commenced more than fifty years ago by the late Charles Henry Browning giving the pedigrees of "Americans of Royal Descent," in which the tycoons at the turn of the century were wont to have recorded their alleged descents from the mediæval royalty and baronage. Mr. Browning's mantle has, apparently, fallen upon the shoulders of Mr. Wurts. When one considers the utter lack of accuracy, scholarship and knowledge evinced by the late Mr. Browning in his various publications, it was to be hoped that Mr. Wurts would change all this, but apparently such hopes are doomed to disappointment.

The book is divided into four sections, the first being some general statements regarding the Great Charter under the heading "The Romance of the Great Charter"—matter which is well known to any well informed schoolboy. The second part consists

of biographies of the twenty-five surety barons, together with their pedigrees and a list of present day persons who, according to Mr. Wurts, are descended from them. The third part is a medley of descents from Queen Boadicea, St. Helena, the Emperor Constantine, Irish and Frankish Kings, mediæval kings, and the like. There is also a long dissertation upon the Druids. This third part need not detain us beyond remarking that these descents are the purest moonshine, consisting of totally unreliable Keltic pedigrees and the wild romancings of Renaissance genealogists. The fourth part consists of a list of the original Knights of the Garter, with a brief account of each. There is a formidable bibliography, from which, however, one misses such indispensable books as Dr. Round's "Feudal England," "Peerage and Pedigree," "Peerage and Family History," and "Family Origins," and Dr. Farrer's "Honors and Knights Fees" and "Yorkshire Charters," as well as many other authoritative works.

As the principal part of the book is the second division, containing the biographies and ancestry of the surety barons and their descendants, it is proposed to confine the present review to this section. With respect to the long lists of present-day persons, who are said to descend from the various barons, it may be remarked that no pedigrees are given or proof of these descents offered. All that we have is Mr. Wurts' say-so to bridge a gap of some seven hundred years. Such assertions, until details and evidences are forthcoming, have no probative value and cannot be considered seriously by scholarly genealogists.

We now turn to the ancestries of the surety barons, as set forth under each, and quickly discover numerous errors. It is proposed to take several of the pedigrees and analyze them.

The first pedigree given (p. 39) is that of William d'Aubigny of Belvoir, whom Mr. Wurts still calls "Albini" in the barbarous half-Latin, half-English, jargon of the seventeenth century antiquaries, which has been discarded by scholars of to-day. The pedigree commences with Robert de Todenei, who is described as the standard bearer of the Conqueror. This is of course an error, as the standard bearer was his kinsman Ralf de Toëni or de Conches, the head of the great house of Malahuc (Dugdale's *Baronage* I, 469). His son, we are told, was William d'Albini Brito, who died about 1155, having married Maud, daughter of Simon de St. Liz. It is quite evident that Mr. Wurts has not studied the elaborate and fully documented note upon this family in Dr. Farrer's "Early Yorkshire Charters" (Vol. I, p. 461, cf. also Vol. II, p. 433) or the article in the *New Complete Peerage* (Vol. IX, pp. 577-78 and note c). Had he done so, he would have learned that Robert de Todenei had five children, viz.: 1. Berenger, the Domesday tenant of North Dalton, who

Vol 19 - 973 B2 a9

died *s. p.* before 1116; 2. William, the lord of Belvoir, who died *s. p.*; 3. Geoffrey, who died *s. p.*; 4. Agnes, who married Hubert de Ryes; and 5. Adeliz, the second wife of Roger Bigod (d. 1107). Roger and Adeliz had Hugh (d. shortly before 9 March 1176/7), who became Earl of Norfolk in 1141, succeeding his elder, presumably his half, brother, William in 1119. They had also a daughter Cecily, called "de Belvoir," who inherited her mother's fee. She married William d'Aubigny Brito, who occurs 1124-29 and in the Pipe Roll of 31 Henry I; he was a Justice Itinerant. William and Cecily were the parents of William d'Aubigny II of Belvoir, who occurs in the great return of 12 Henry II and who died in 1167. He married Maud de "St. Liz," daughter of Robert Fitz Richard, of the Fitz Walter branch of the de Clares, who took the name of St. Liz from her mother's family, her mother having been Maud, daughter of Simon, Earl of Huntingdon. William and Cecily had also Robert, styled "de Toteneia," Roger, Eudes, and Ralf d'Aubigny, who died at the siege of Acre in 1191, leaving three daughters (*cf.* also Hist. Manuscripts Comm., Duke of Rutland's MSS., IV, 106).

We next consider Mr. Wurts's account of Roger le Bigod, Earl of Norfolk, and his ancestors (p. 43). Mr. Wurts tells us that the wife of the first Roger of Domesday was a daughter of the famous Hugh de Grantmesnil, but by reference to the account of the Earldom of Norfolk in the *N. C. P.* (Vol. IX, p. 577) we learn that his first wife was "Adelidis, whose parentage is unknown." His second wife, as stated above, was "Adelicia, sister and co-heiress of William de Tosney, Lord of Belvoir and daughter of Robert de Tosney, Lord of Belvoir." We are also told that this Roger founded the "Abbey of Whetford" in Norfolk in 1103, but as no such abbey exists this undoubtedly refers to Roger's foundation of the Priory of Thetford in that year. (*ib.*; *cf.* Dugdale's *Baronage*, I, 132). On page 44 we are told that Roger, Earl of Norfolk, the Surety, married as his first wife Isabel, daughter of Hameline Plantagenet (the bastard of Count Geoffrey of Anjou) but reference to the *New Complete Peerage* (Vol. cit., p. 589) shows that he had but one wife, "Ida, whose parentage is unknown." On page 47 we learn that Hugh Bigod, the Chief Justiciar, brother of Roger and son of Hugh, another of the Sureties, married first Joan, daughter of Robert Burnet and had Roger and John. Again referring to the *New Complete Peerage* (Vol. cit., p. 593), we find that the wife of the Justiciar was Joan, widow of Hugh Wake (d. 1241) and daughter and heiress of Nicholas de Stuteville.

Turning now to the family of Robert de Vere (p. 127 *et seq.*) we find that the de Veres were "the noblest family in England—and indeed in all Europe" and "that they derive their title from a time when the Nevilles and Percys enjoyed only a local celeb-

ity." Now the greatness of the de Veres will not be denied by any student of English history, but it should be noted that the founder of the family in England, the first Aubrey, while an important tenant *in capite* in Domesday, did not rank among the foremost magnates such as William Fitz Osborn, Richard de Bienfaite, Hugh Lupus and Roger de Montgomery. Their importance commenced with Aubrey II (killed in 1141), the Great Chamberlain and favorite of Henry I, whose son Aubrey III was created Earl of Oxford in 1147. The latter greatly increased his importance through his connection with and adherence to the redoubtable Geoffrey de Mandeville. Contemporary with this Aubrey was Jocelyn de Louvain, half-brother of Queen Adeliza, who was the ancestor of the Percys. He was a very important magnate and, as son of Duke Godfrey of Lower Lorraine and Count of Louvain, although probably born on the left side of the blanket, he descended in the male line from the great race of the Regniers (founders of the House of Brabant), and in the female line from Charles, Duke of Lorraine, the last of the French Karolings; consequently, his family ranked among the most illustrious of Europe at this period. So the Percys were, at this period, far more important than the de Veres. On page 128 it appears that the earliest named ancestor of the de Veres was "Alfonso, Count of Ghesnes, who was the father of Alberic de Vere, Count Aubrey 'Sanglier,' married before 1139 Beatrix de Ghent daughter of Henry and his wife Sibylla," and they had, according to Mr. Wurts, a son Alberic de Vere, who died in 1088. "He, being in high favor with King Henry I, was constituted great high chamberlain of the Kingdom in 1133, to hold the same in fee to himself and his heirs. In 5 Stephen, 1140, while a joint sheriff of several counties, with Richard Basset, Justiciary of England, he was slain in a popular tumult at London." Comment upon this is needless, how could a man who died in 1088 be Great Chamberlain in 1133 and be slain again in 1140! Further, any one who is familiar with the pedigree of the Counts of Guisnes will know the impossibility of this descent.

The true facts of the early pedigree of the great house of de Vere are as follows: Aubrey, who is said to have been the son of another of the same name (*cf.* Crispin's *Falaise Roll*, p. 117), came from Ver, in the canton of Gavray, arrond. of Coutances (Dupont, "Recherches" &c., Vol. I, p. 102). He was an important tenant *in capite* in East Anglia at Domesday, the *caput* of his barony being Headingham in Essex. He occurs in the Abingdon Chartulary about 1105 as a benefactor of that Abbey. His wife was named Beatrice. Their son, Aubrey II, was a favorite of Henry I, who made him Great Chamberlain. He was slain on 9 May 1141 in a popular tumult, which occurred during

the anarchy, which prevailed during the civil war between Stephen and the Empress (*cf.* Round's "Geoffrey de Mandeville," p. 81). He married Adeliza, daughter of Gilbert de Tonbridge (de Clare), the head of the great house of de Clare (Round's "Feudal England," p. 575). Their daughter, Rohese, married first Geoffrey de Mandeville, the great earl of Essex, and her brother, Aubrey III, profited greatly from this connection. Aubrey III was Justiciar of England and in 1147 was created Earl of Oxford, and he inherited from his father the office of Great Chamberlain. Aubrey III married as his first wife Beatrice, daughter of Henry, Castellan of Bourbourg, who was the heiress of her maternal grandfather, Manasser, Count of Guisnes, from whom he was divorced in 1144. The ancestry of Beatrice is given in Round's "Geoffrey de Mandeville" (p. 397). Aubrey, for a short time, held the title of Count of Guisnes *jure uxoris* (*ib.*, pp. 188-89; *cf.* also p. 392).

On page 71 we have an account of John Fitz Robert of Warkworth and of his ancestry. This John was the ancestor of the Claverings. His ancestry offers one of the most confused and difficult problems of twelfth century genealogy, and it has been considered by three of our greatest mediævalists, Dr. Round, Dr. Farrer and Geoffrey White, the latter now one of the collaborators of the *New Complete Peerage*. There is no difficulty with his father Robert Fitz Roger or his grandfather, Roger Fitz Richard of Warkworth. The difficulty is with the parentage of the latter. Roger Fitz Richard was a minor baron of Henry II, who enfeoffed him with Warkworth shortly after the defeat of the royal army by the Welsh at Coleshill in 1157, for his brave conduct on that occasion. Mr. Wurts, following Dugdale, makes him the son of Richard Fitz Eustace, but this is just where the difficulty lies. Round, Farrer and Geoffrey White have all pointed out that this is extremely unlikely if not impossible. In order to grasp the difficulty it is necessary to consider the family of Eustace Fitz John, the great Northern baron of the time of Henry I and Henry II. This Eustace fell, when an elderly man, in the defeat at Coleshill in 1157, a defeat largely brought about by the cowardice of the royal standard bearer, Henry de Essex. Eustace was the son of John Fitz Richard styled "Monoculus" or "the one eyed" (Dugdale's *Baronage*, I, 90) of Saxlingham, whose brother Serlo de Burgh or de Pembroke was lord of Knaresborough. (It may here be observed that the ancestry given by Mr. Wurts to Serlo and John has no basis in fact.) Eustace had two wives. His first wife was Beatrice, daughter and eventual heiress of Ives de Vesci, the lord of Alnwick in Northumberland, by whom he had a son, William de Vesci, Lord of Alnwick (d. 1184), the ancestor of the later Vescis, who became extinct at the beginning of the fourteenth century. His

second wife was Agnes, daughter and heiress of William Fitz Neel of Halton, Constable of Chester, a Domesday tenant, under Hugh Lupus. By Agnes, Eustace was the father of Richard Fitz Eustace (d. —1163), who married (as her first husband) Aubrey de Lisours, daughter and heiress of Robert de Lisours by Aubrey, daughter of Robert de Lacy and heiress of her nephew Robert de Lacy, who died *s.p.* in 1193. (Farrer's "Early Yorkshire Charters," Vol. III, p. 199; *New Complete Peerage*, Vol. VII, p. 677.) It should here be noted that in the chart given in the *New Complete Peerage* he is called Robert Fitz Eustace instead of Richard Fitz Eustace. However, a charter whereby "Agnes, daughter of William Constable of Chester," who describes herself as the wife (widow) of Eustace, gave the monks of Watton the entire vill there for the souls of "my son Richard and of Geoffrey" etc. (*Mon. Ang.*, old ed., Vol. II, p. 799), would seem to indicate that his name was Richard, as it is usually given, and not Robert. Richard and Aubrey were the parents of John the Constable of Chester, whose son Roger, also Constable, assumed the name of de Lacy, when he became the heir of his grandmother, Aubrey de Lisours, who had inherited the Lacy fees from her mother. Roger was the ancestor of the Pontefract Lacys, Constables of Chester and Earls of Lincoln. John the Constable, son of Richard Fitz Eustace and Aubrey de Lisours, married Alice "de Vere," whose mother, called Alice de Essex, was the daughter of Aubrey de Vere II, the first Great Chamberlain. Alice de Essex is the subject of a special monograph by Dr. Round (*Essex Arch. Soc. Trans.*, n.s., Vol. III, p. 242). She had several husbands; the first was William de Sackville, the second Robert de Essex, and the third our Roger Fitz Richard of Warkworth, the grandfather of John Fitz Robert, the Surety. There is some disagreement as to which of the husbands of Alice de Essex was the father of Alice de Vere, the wife of John the Constable. Dr. Farrer believed that she was the daughter of Robert de Essex, but Dr. Round and Mr. White have adduced very weighty reasons for considering her the daughter of Roger Fitz Richard. (*Essex Arch. Soc. Trans.*, *op. cit.*; "Vere, Sackville and Lacy," by Geoffrey White in *The Genealogists' Magazine*, Vol. VII, pp. 469-73; *cf.* also *Early Yorkshire Charters*, Vol. III, p. 199). If, as seems most likely, she was the daughter of Roger Fitz Richard, then obviously the latter cannot have been the son of Richard Fitz Eustace, for in that case we should have John the Constable marrying his own niece, and in any event chronological considerations make it very unlikely that John the Constable and Roger Fitz Richard were brothers. The male line, then, of the Surety Baron, John Fitz Robert, cannot be carried beyond his grandfather Roger Fitz Richard.

In the story of the Great Charter the most important figure is that of Robert Fitz Walter, "the Marshal of the Army of God," who was the leader of the combination which extorted it from John. Robert was the head of a cadet branch of the de Clares, whose grandfather Robert Fitz Richard was a younger son of Richard Fitz Gilbert, the head of the house of Clare. On page 76 Mr. Wurts tells us that this Robert Richard married Maud, "Lady of Bradham." This statement, derived from the Dunmow Chronicle, is quite correct, but he should have added that she was the daughter of Simon de St. Liz, Earl of Huntingdon, by Maud, daughter of the Countess Judith (*N. C. P.*, Vol. V, p. 472 n). Earl Simon gave his daughter Daventry as a *maritagium*, and it descended to her son Walter Fitz Robert and from him to Robert Fitz Walter, the Surety (Farrer's *Honors and Knights Fees*, Vol. II, p. 395 *et seq.*). The second wife of Walter Fitz Robert (father of the Surety) was the widow of Henry d'Oilli and the daughter of Humphrey de Bohun (Round in *Essex Arch. Soc. Trans.*, n.s., Vol. VII, pp. 329-30; *Essex Fines*, pp. 474-75, 575).

The above are examples of the errors and omissions to be found scattered through the pedigrees of the Surety Barons. This does not mean that much of the genealogy is not correct, but it serves to show that each of the pedigrees should not be accepted as correct until it has been carefully checked.

The book is illustrated by several photographs and woodcuts. The best of these are the photographs of the Great Charter, Mr. Browning and Mr. Wurts. Among the numerous woodcuts are Queen Boadicea exhorting the Britons to fall upon the legions, King Alfred minding the Cakes, and totally imaginary portraits of Pepin le Bref, Charlemagne and Hildegarde, Hugh Capet, the Conqueror, and so on. To judge from the past, the book will doubtless find a ready sale among the uninformed public, panting for baronial and royal ancestry.

—G. Andrews Moriarty, A.M., LL.B., F.S.A.

31. (a) ROYAL LINES. No descent from Bela III has been found for Eleanor of Castile, first wife of King Edward I. She was dau. of Fernando III by his second wife, Joan de Dammartin, dau. of Simon de Dammartin, Count d'Aumale, by Marie, Countess of Ponthieu, dau. of Guillaume III, Count of Ponthieu, by Alix of France, dau. of King Louis VII by Constance of Castile. Margaret of France, second wife of King Edward I. was dau. of King Philippe III by Marie of Brabant, dau. of

Henry III, Duke of Brabant, son of Duke Henry II by Maria of Suabia, dau. of the Emperor Philipp by Irene Angela. She was dau. of Isaac II, Emperor of the East, but Turton's *Plantagenet Ancestry*, page 43, fails to specify the name of Irene's mother, from which fact we may deduce that the name of her mother is not known, or that it is in dispute. Turton bases his charts of the Emperors of the East on Lohmeier's *Der Europäischen Kayser und Königlichen Häuser*, and as that work was published in 1730, there are quite likely more modern studies of the Angelus and Comnenus families available. Anderson's *Royal Genealogies*, also an old work, states that the first wife of Isaac II, the mother of Irene, is unknown, and that the second wife was Mary of Pannonia. The querist enclosed a chart which gives the mother of Irene as Margaret, dau. of Bela III of Hungary; this may be correct, but we do not know the authority on which the statement is based.

(b) Gunhild, dau. of Canute, m. the Emperor Heinrich III in 1036 and d. in 1038, leaving an only child, Beatrix, who became an abbess. There are no known descents from Canute.—
D. L. J.