REMARKS ON MR. PYM YEATMAN'S NOTICE OF THE BARONY OF ROGER ARUNDEL IN HIS "HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF ARUNDEL."

The first part of Mr. Pym Yeatman's 'History of the House of Arundel' has already been reviewed in the pages of the GENEALOGIST, and a fourth Part, which has now been published, completes the volume. A considerable portion of this Number is devoted to the Barony of Roger Arundel of Domesday, and to this section of the work I shall confine myself in the following remarks.

The author says (p. 302):—

"Mr. Thomas Bond has taken great pains to clear up this pedigree in his edition of Hutchin's 'History of Dorset,' a work which he has greatly enriched by much genealogical lore, a copy of which is here given; but in this research he cannot be congratulated upon having achieved success. To the writer, indeed, he appears to have added to the confusion by suggesting unquestionably erroneous conclusions."

Thus, adopting as his text the pedigree he alludes to, which he reproduces *in extenso*, but without noticing the qualification there expressed, that it was offered as in some respects conjectural, Mr. Yeatman proceeds to tear it in pieces, disputing the identity of nearly every name and the accuracy of every link which it contains. These are grave allegations on his part, and it therefore becomes necessary to examine the grounds upon which the author has arrived at his conclusions, and to consider how far he can be trusted as an accurate and faithful critic.

It is unfortunate that he only occasionally cites direct authorities for his opinions, and his conclusions are generally based on what he considers probabilities. In order to prove his case he suggests that almost every individual in the pedigree in the 'History of Dorset' was in reality quite a different person and bearing a name quite different from the one by which he is mentioned in the contemporary or other authorities from which the pedigree was compiled.

Thus he supposes that—

Roger Arundel of Domesday was identical with Roger de Montgomery, Earl of Arundel and Shrewsbury, or if not so, there appears no reason to doubt that he was Roger Pictavensis, Montgomery's younger son.

(p. 305) Roger de Arundel was, in all probability, Roger de Novoburgo.

(p. 213) Roger Arundel of Domesday is called Ralf Arundel.

Robert Arundel, who has generally been believed, and with very good reason, to be the son and heir of Roger Arundel of Domesday, was probably the notorious Robert de Belesme, or else (p. 304) he was Robert de Novoburgo.

(p. 262) Gervase is Gouvis.

(p. 301) Roger de Poles was another Roger Arundel or he was Roger Powes or Powis.

(p. 306) Robert de Poles may be Roger de Poles.

The Poles and Fitzpains were the same family.

Robert Fitzpain was clearly Robert de Poles.

(p. 319) William de Glastonia was father of Robert de Pole.

"Decidedly the Peverels and Poles were identical."

(p. 304) Azilia de Glastonia was Cecily Fitz Walter.

Fitz Walter was Arundel.

(p. 308) Walchelin le Wereer was Walchelin Brewer or Walchelin Maminot. (p. 318.)
(pp. 304-307) William and Robert de Glastonia were William and Robert Malet.
Robert de Glastonia was Robert de Lincoln.
(p. 350) Ralph Arundel of 14 Stephen was identical with Rualoc son of Roger de Albini "or it is possible he is identical with another Ralph Albini lord of Petherton." (p. 213.)
(p. 216) Roger Treloy is probably Roger Arundel.

This is certainly a novel method of constructing a pedigree, which nothing but the most indisputable evidence could justify. Numberless difficulties are suggested where none really exist, and possibilities and probabilities unaccompanied by proofs are offered for their solution.

But in the present instance destruction is more conspicuous than construction, for, having knocked in pieces the Arundel pedigree, he does not show us how he would reconstruct it. He gives us in its place a singular jumble of Earls of Arundel and Warwick, Countess of Salisbury, Percy of the North, Princes of Powis, Peverels and Pomeroys, Malets and Fitz-Walters, none of whom, as I contend, had anything to do with the Arundel barony.

After reading the list of "aliases" above mentioned, the reader will be in some measure prepared for the many startling theories which he will meet with in this book.

The narrative is so diluted and so confused that it is difficult to follow it shortly and comprehensively. I can, therefore, only select some of the most remarkable errors and notice them *seriatim*, quoting the author's own words in order to avoid the risk of unintentional misrepresentation.

In the first place, no direct evidence is adduced to prove that Roger Arundel was identical with Roger de Montgomery, but certain reasons are given for assuming the identity as probable, and then it is treated as if it was an established fact. The reasons certainly do not, to my mind, bear out the conclusion in the slightest degree.

As regards mere probability, I can hardly think anything more improbable than that a person of such wealth and distinction as Roger de Montgomery, holding the rank of Earl in Sussex and Shropshire, of which latter county he owned nearly the whole as chief lord, and being in the Domesday of both these two counties always called "Rogerius Comes," should be described as simply "Rogerius Arundel" in Dorset and Somerset. But it was not only in the counties in which he held official rank that he is described as an Earl, for he is still "Rogerius Comes" in the Domesday of Kent, Hants, Wilts, Middlesex, Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and Cambridgeshire.

It cannot be argued that the Domesday Commissioners who made up the returns for Dorset and Somerset, described the Earl of Arundel and Shrewsbury by the simple name of "Rogerius Arundel" because he held no official rank in those counties, for Hugh Earl of Chester in the Dorset Domesday is called "Hugo Comes," and Alan Earl of Brittany is "Comes Alanus."

In Domesday Book the lands of the chief tenants are set forth in the order which accords with the rank of the owners. Thus, the king's lands are first surveyed, then those of the bishops, next the abbots and other ecclesiastics. Then come the barons and knights, and lastly the "servientes regis." "Rogerius Comes," in all the instances above alluded to, takes precedence as an earl, whereas Rogerius Arundel stands nineteenth

amongst the barons of Dorset. Is it probable—nay, it may be asked is it possible—that so distinguished a person as the Earl of Arundel and Shrewsbury, who has been described as "without doubt, the greatest of all Norman chiefs next to the Conqueror himself," could be placed thus low and shorn of all dignity, in a list where precedence according to rank has in all other cases been strictly observed in arranging the names?

That Roger Pictavensis was identical with Roger Arundel of Domesday rests on no better grounds; but as Mr. Yeatman himself seems, as hereafter mentioned, to have ultimately discarded that idea, it need not be further mentioned here.

The circumstance on which Mr. Yeatman chiefly relies for support of his theory of probability that Roger Arundel was Roger de Montgomery, is the identity of the names of a few of the under-tenants of both these lords. He considers (p. 300) that as the names of the tenants of Roger Arundel of Domesday Book concur with those of Roger de Montgomery, it affords strong presumptive evidence that Roger Arundel is identical with Roger Montgomery, Earl of Arundel and Shrewsbury. This imaginary identity is frequently urged. But the fact is, it is only in a very few instances amongst the numerous tenantry of the Earl of Arundel that these names "concur," and they are of the commonest description, viz., Roger, Robert, William, Richard, and Hugh; the same names being met with in Domesday as sub-tenants of many other lords. This kind of evidence, therefore, might be equally applicable to prove the identity of Roger Arundel with other over-lords called by names different from his own. But Robert, Roger, and Hugh, says Mr. Yeatman, are names of three of the sons of Roger de Montgomery, and Roger Arundel had tenants of these names. And so, it may be replied, had many other Domesday tenants.

Mr. Yeatman says, Hugh was one of the chief tenants of the Earl of Arundel, and we find a Hugh was sub-tenant of Stock Gaylard, Dorset. Mr. Yeatman (p. 138) seems to have supposed the two Hughs were identical, for he says :—

"Stock House ..... is a place of especial interest in this work, since it was probably the residence which was held by Roger Arundel at the time of Domesday; it afterwards devolved upon de Novoburgo, and it was taken from him by King John, who could not brook the retention in the hands of a subject of so important a hunting forest as that of the Vale of Blackmoor ..... old walls, in some places two yards thick, remain an imperishable monument of the grandeur of the ancient family of Arundel."

In point of fact we must look elsewhere and not at Stock Gaylard for monuments of the grandeur of this family, for they never did—nor did the Novoburgos ever—possess this place. It was held in Domesday by William de Ow, whose under-tenant was Hugh Matravers (see proof of this in Hutchins). Mr. Yeatman has mistaken Stock Gaylard and the forest of Blackmoor for Poorstock (the "caput" of the Arundel barony) and its adjoining forest, which are in quite a different part of the county. Under this mistaken impression too, he considers that an effigy of a cross-legged knight in Stock Gaylard church represents Roger de Pole, who never had any connexion with the place and died in the crusades.

Amongst the tenants thus supposed to be holding under the Earl of Arundel by the name of Rogerius Arundel, Mr. Yeatman mentions as the most remarkable Roger de Busli who, he says, held Bingham in Dorsetshire. But there is no place in that county so named, nor is any such

found in the Dorset Domesday. A Roger de Buissel held Sutton, co. Somerset, of Roger Arundel, but Roger de Busli also held half a carucate of land in Leicestershire of Earl Hugh, and this fact, even supposing that Buissel was Busli, can give rise to no suspicion that Earl Hugh and Earl Roger were the same under different names.

"Nor is this the only fact of importance," adds Mr. Yeatman, "to be derived from Domesday...As a further proof that Roger de Arundel, his [Roger Busli's] Lord, was the Earl of Arundel, it may be noticed that Blandford—one of the manors—was held of the Barony of Lancaster—Roger de Pictavensis' Barony—another fact of even greater significance."

Now, even if we admit that Buissel was Busli, it is not easy to see how the premises warrant the conclusion. There is nothing in Domesday to justify the assertion that Blandford was held of the Barony of Lancaster. Roger Arundel held it of the king *in capite* and Robert held it of him.

(p. 350) "Roger de Busli held little Cheseltown under the wife of Hugh Fitz Grip. Her name has not transpired. She was therefore probably connected with Roger de Busli's wife, the Queen's daughter."

The wife of Hugh Fitz Grip held Ceosolburn (Cheselborn not Cheseltown) and Roger held it of her, but there is not the faintest ground for supposing that this Roger was Roger de Buissel or Roger de Busli. But even if it had been so, it is not easy to see why the wife of Hugh was "therefore" probably connected with Roger de Busli's wife.

Mr. Yeatman says :—

"If Roger Arundel of Domesday was not identical with Roger de Montgomery there appears no reason to doubt that he was Roger Pictavensis."

And at page 55 he says :—

"It is probable that under the name of Roger Arundel, Earl Roger Pictavensis held at Domesday a number of manors in Dorset and Somerset."

And yet by the time he has reached page 211 of his book he has altered his mind, for he says disapprovingly—

"It has been reserved for Count Ogilvy to identify Roger Arundel of Domesday with Roger Pictavensis."

Now, if Roger Arundel of Domesday had been identical with either Roger de Montgomery or Roger Pictavensis, it is pretty certain that we should have found the property held by him in some way mixed up with that of the latter or their descendants, or at least the transfers on death or other occasions would have been synchronous, but this is not the case. The barony of Roger Arundel stands alone as a distinct and separate property. On the whole, therefore, I consider there is not the slightest shadow of evidence in favour of Mr. Yeatman's theory. It is proverbially difficult to prove a negative, but "probabilities" may be so strong as to amount to demonstration, and such it appears to me is the case in the present instances.

Mr. Yeatman says :—

"Roger de Novoburgo, Earl of Warwick, held Roger Arundel's estates and died in 1153."

But that cannot be true, for the estate was still held by Roger Arundel the second of that name in 1162, when he accounted for them in Dorset

and Somerset.[1] Mr. Yeatman adds that the Earl of Warwick was founder of Bindon Abbey and married Grundred, sister of William Earl of Surrey. In point of fact Roger Earl of Warwick died in 1153, 18 Steph.,[2] and Roger de Novoburgo who, with Matilda his wife, refounded Bindon in 1172[3] must, therefore, have been quite a different person.

Mr. Yeatman says, elsewhere, that William de Novoburgo, Earl of Warwick, refounded Bindon, but there is no authentic trace whatever of such a refoundation. The evidence is positive and indisputable that the wife of Roger de Novoburgo, the refounder of Bindon, was Matilda de Glastonia. They had no known son named William.

Writing about Robert Arundel who, there can be little doubt, was son of Roger of Domesday, Mr. Yeatman says (p. 302):—

"He [Mr. Thomas Bond] appears to have overlooked a very simple rule in genealogical research by assuming that, because the estate is found to be held in the reign of Stephen and of Henry I. by a person of the same name as the Domesday holder, that such person must necessarily be a descendant of the first; but, as it is perfectly obvious, the last holder may or may not be alien in blood, and he may have only adopted the name on account of the territory; and if we find the subsequent holders of the estates possessing another name which was their family name long previously, the strong probability is that he has done so."

Again (p. 209):—

"The Pipe Rolls do not identify the holding of Robert Arundel . . . but it is a fact that Roger Arundel of the Pipe Roll of 7 Hen. II. held the very manors in Somerset and Dorset held by Roger Arundel of Domesday, from which a natural inference would be that he was descended from him. This, no doubt, induced antiquarians so learned as Mr. Thomas Bond and others to accept this theory, but the fact that the estates did not remain in the family but went to others who could show no right of blood (apparently) should cause us to hesitate before accepting it. It is manifestly a mere guess without a shadow of proof to support it."

So far from its being a mere guess, Mr. Yeatman himself in the paragraph last quoted admits it to be a "natural inference." Indeed, it will be generally allowed that according to "a very simple rule of genealogical research" the probability in this case is very strong indeed, and no more than this has been claimed. No necessity has been asserted, for the pedigree is avowedly conjectural, but when an estate which is described in Domesday is found in the reign of Stephen or Hen. I. in possession of a person of the same name as that of the lord who held it in Domesday, it would require very unequivocal evidence to show that the two were strangers in blood and that the former was not a descendant of the latter. So far from the estates not remaining in the family but going to others who could show "no right of blood," there is the strongest circumstantial evidence to show that one moiety of the barony descended hereditarily to the Neuburghs, and there is nothing to show that the Poles did not obtain the other moiety by descent. It is obvious that the fact of subsequent holders of the property possessing another name, which was their family name long previously, is no evidence against acquisition by descent through a female.

Mr. Yeatman says (p. 301):—

7 Hen. II., Roger Arundel accounted for £40 for his knights' fees. . . . "Possibly, however, this Roger was of a different family, only called De Arundel on account of this barony." "It is possible that Roger Arundel of 7 Henry II., if there was such a person, was his [Robert de Belesme's] son." "Is it possible that the entries of 7 and 8 Hen. II., relate merely to the barony and not to the baron.". . .

[1] Pipe Roll. [2] Dugd. Bar. [3] Dugd. Mon.

It may be asked where is the difficulty which requires these strange far-fetched "probabilities" for their solution? There is no obscurity about this Roger Arundel, who certainly held the barony which had belonged in Domesday to one of the same name. What better evidence could be found that there "really was such a person" as Roger Arundel living in 7 Hen. II. than that of the contemporary Pipe Roll, which tells us that in this year he paid £40 for his knights' fees? and what possible grounds can there be for assuming him to be identical with a son of Robert de Belesme which last named person Dugdale tells us had only one son and his name was William.

In 8 Hen. II. Roger Arundel was in possession of this barony, a date which makes it clear that he must have been Roger de Novoburgo.

I am unable to perceive any grounds whatever for this conclusion.

(To be continued.)

REMARKS ON MR. PYM YEATMAN'S NOTICE OF THE BARONY OF ROGER ARUNDEL IN HIS "HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF ARUNDEL."

(Concluded from Vol. L., *New Series, p.* 102.*)*

Mr. Yeatman says (p. 301):—

"Mr. Thomas Bond, of Tyneham, and most of those who have written upon this pedigree, assume that Roger de Arundel died about this time" [*i.e.* soon after 8 Hen. II.], "but there is not a shadow of evidence to prove it, nor, except this Roll, is there any evidence to prove his existence. And the proof that there was a Roger de Arundel, son of a Robert, who held Halse about this period, may possibly apply to the Lord of Sandford, whose estates joined Halse, if they did not not comprise it. It may perhaps relate to quite another person."

There is a very strong shadow of evidence, for, having been mentioned in several previous Rolls, his name is no longer found in subsequent ones after this date, but soon afterwards, viz., in 11 Hen. II., the whole barony of Roger Arundel is found in possession of Gerbert de Percy. There is not the slightest ground for believing that the notice in the Pipe Roll relates to any "other person" than the very Roger Arundel whose barony so soon afterwards passed to Gerbert de Percy. There is no evidence that Sandford was at this time possessed by another Roger Arundel, though it may have been. If so, however, he was a different person from the Roger who held the barony, because Sandford passed to other Arundels, whilst the estates of Roger, the last baron, went to Percy.

(p. 301) "In 7 Hen. II. the barony was in the hands of Gerbert de Percy."

This is wrong, for it has just been shown that in this year Roger

Arundel paid for his knights' fees—in fact for the barony. Gerbert de Percy does not come in view till 11 Hen. II.

"There is evidence, too, of a Matilde Arundel who held a portion of the Poorstock Barony, who married firstly Roger de Novoburgo, and who by Coker and some others is stated to have been a daughter of Robert de Arundel, but there is no statement that she was connected with Roger, and—seeing that she only held a portion and not the whole of the inheritance for her life—it seems more probable that she was a widow of a former holder."

Mr. Yeatman is here, as elsewhere, evidently confusing Matilda Arundel with Matilda de Glastonia who was Roger de Novoburgo's wife. There is no reason whatever to suppose that Matilda de Arundel ever had a husband named Novoburgo. Coker's statement that she was daughter of Robert Arundel is quite consistent with all that is known about her. Her husband, Gerbert de Percy, certainly held the whole of the barony.[1] There is no warrant whatever for stating that she only held the barony for her life, for she alienated a portion of the estates, which she could not have done if she held only a life interest. Her husband De Percy held the "barony of Roger Arundel," which he is shown, by her alienation of part of it in mortmain, to have got from his wife. This leaves no doubt of her connexion with Roger.

The payments in the sheriff's accounts for the lands of Matilda de Arundel in Lulworth—

"May have been an old payment never satisfied, or it may have been a portion of the inheritance of Robert or Roger de Arundel, not given to the heir."

Lulworth, which Mr. Yeatman curiously confuses with Worth Matravers in the Isle of Purbeck, never belonged to a male Arundel. It was Glastonia's property as will be hereafter shown.

"Gerbert de Percy married a widow, Matilde, who, holding dower in Roger Arundel's barony, may have taken his name."

If this was so it would be a solitary instance in the history of feuds of a widow taking her name not from her father or husband but from the former owner of *land* which she held in dower! It is needless to argue this point.

(p. 302) "Maud de Arundel gave the Manor of Bexington, one of the Manors of the Poorstock Barony, to Bindon; but the grant was made with the express consent of King Henry, and this would rather indicate that the lady was not the true heir, and only acted under the direction of the King: certainly the other portion of the property did not descend to her heirs."

(p. 305) ". . . who was that Matilde de Arundel who, with the leave of the King, gave Bexington—the Arundel Manor—to Bindon? This lady was surely the widow of William de Novoburgo, Earl of Warwick, and that Countess called of Sarum—because simply she resided there, as is well known was the fact—whom Coker calls the chief founder, he styles her Maud Arundel, wife of William de Novoburgh, Countess of Sarum. . . . This lady, as the Earl's widow, would be entitled only to this estate in dower, and hence, to enable her to dispose of it so as to bind her nephew, the true heir, she was compelled to obtain the King's license."

(p. 305) "This lady was the daughter and coheiress of William de Percy, the proud Baron of the north, whose sister married Jocelain, of Louvain, ... and just as that lady compelled her husband to adopt the name of Percy, the Countess of Warwick seems to have imposed it upon her last husband Gerbert."

All this is fanciful, and mere imagination. Mr. Yeatman should have told us how the Earl of Warwick got possession (as he supposes) of the barony of Roger Arundel; on what evidence he makes Matilda Countess

[1] *Pipe Roll* and *Liber Niger*.

of Warwick to be identical with Matilda Countess of Salisbury? and what was Gerbert de Percy's family name? According to Mr. Yeatman, this lady, twice a Countess, dropped the rank and became simply Matilda Arundel, because she held part of the Arundel barony in dower. The fact is, Matilda Arundel was not a Percy, except by marriage. She was neither Countess of Warwick nor Countess of Salisbury. She was simply Matilda Arundel, retaining her maiden name after marriage, as was often the case with territorial heiresses of that early period. Gerbert de Percy was simply Gerbert de Percy, a member of a family which became settled in Dorsetshire.

Coker does not make the above statement as from his own knowledge, or even as believing it to be true. He simply says he has seen it in an old MS.; and unless we could ascertain by whom the MS. was written, and on what grounds the writer had formed his opinion, we can attribute no weight to his statement. Perhaps his authority might have been one of Mr. Yeatman's class of antiquaries, who makes A mean B; but this is barely possible.

Matilda, wife of William, Earl of Warwick, was daughter and coheir of William, Lord Perci;[1] and the paternal name of Maud, wife of Patric, Earl of Salisbury, is unknown. There are no grounds whatever for supposing that the two were identical, or that either of them had any connection with the Arundels or their barony.

To suppose that Matilda Arundel was widow of the Earl of Warwick merely because she had the King's licence to alienate a portion of the Arundel estates (for Mr. Yeatman's argument seems to amount to this), and that, for the same reason, it was not her own freehold, is certainly a bold supposition. The fact is, that—being possessed of the land *sui juris* (for if she had not been so she could not have alienated at all beyond a life interest), and holding it *in capite* (for Roger Arundel had done so)—it was necessary to obtain a royal licence; and such a licence would be the more necessary, as the alienation was in mortmain. If she then had a husband, this would be an additional reason, because the King would look upon such husband as his actual tenant. A widow could not alienate dower property in mortmain, or indeed, at all, beyond her life interest. Gerbert de Perci held the whole barony,[2] and there can be scarcely a doubt that one moiety of it at least descended to the heirs of Matilda.

Mr. Yeatman says (p. 303):—

"Mr. Bond assumes that Matilde, the wife of Gerbert de Percy, was also the wife of William de Glastonia because he finds (apparently) proof that the wife of each was a benefactor of Bindon. This is no doubt true, but it may have arisen from the circumstance that they were successively interested in the soil. It does not necessarily follow that they were identical, and very possibly there was more than one Matilde de Arundel."

I have not "assumed" it as an incontrovertible fact, but I have suggested it as in the highest degree probable, though not for the reasons supposed by Mr. Yeatman; but, amongst other reasons, upon the following grounds. Besides the Arundel estates, Matilda Arundel had a life interest in the manor of West Lulworth, Dorset, which was Glastonia's property, and never belonged to a male Arundel. It is difficult to

[1] Dugdale. [2] *Liber Niger* and *Pipe Roll.*

account for the possession of it by her, except by supposing she got it in dower from a former husband. Now we find that William de Glastonia, who had previously been lord of this manor, had a wife called Matilda, who joined him in the first foundation of Bindon Abbey. This abbey was afterwards refounded by Roger de Novoburgo and Matilda de Glastonia, his wife; the latter being, there is every reason to believe, granddaughter of William the first founder. Great territorial heiresses in those days commonly retained their maiden names after marriage; the inference, therefore, seems irresistible, that Matilda, wife of Gerbert de Perci, was identical with Matilda, wife of William de Glastonia. Moreover, the Newburghs, who were unquestionably heirs of the Glastonias, and inherited their property at Lulworth and elsewhere, also became possessed of a moiety of the Arundel barony. These facts render it in the highest degree probable, if not absolutely certain, that they obtained the Arundel property by descent from Matilda Arundel by a marriage with William de Glastonia.

(p. 305) "Mr. Bond has assumed, that M, the wife of Wm. de Glastonbury, was Matilde de Arundel, the wife of Gerbert de Percy, but the letter M, which is repeated three distinct times" [in the inspeximus charter of Bindon Abbey],[1] "may mean nothing more than that the name of the wife was unknown."

This passage is another instance which shows how necessary it is to receive Mr. Yeatman's positive assertions with caution. I carefully examined the charter, and the name is not written simply "M," but very distinctly "Matild'."

(pp. 302-3) "Roger de Novoburgo, in the reign of King Richard I. or previously, recovered half the Arundel Barony by lawful title in the King's Court. Of course, therefore, he or his ancestors had previously enjoyed it. The inference is, that Roger Arundel of 8 Henry II., who then possessed the property, was the ancestor of this same Roger de Novoburgo, as well, possibly, as of Roger de Poles, and that he was not, in fact, an Arundel by blood."

There is nothing to show that Roger de Novoburgo did not claim *jure uxoris*; and to suppose that Roger Arundel of 8 Hen. II. was not an Arundel by blood is certainly a very strong supposition!

(p. 303) "It is quite possible that Robert de Arundel, the Justiciary of the first Great Roll of the Pipe, was no other than the son of Roger de Novoburgo."

And on p. 304, Mr. Yeatman suggests other reasons for identifying Robert de Arundel with Robert de Novoburgo, but they are not very intelligible. "According to a very simple rule of genealogical research," Robert de Arundel must be assumed to be Robert de Arundel until he is absolutely proved to be some one else; and not a shadow of such proof has been adduced.

(p. 304) "It seems certain that William and Robert Malet here mentioned were the two knights whom the outside world knew by the name of Glastonia."

(pp. 192-194) "In some manner, which is yet a mystery, the Malets obtained half the inheritance of the estates of Roger Arundel, and transmitted them to the Novoburgos."

Which Mr. Yeatman considers of great interest and importance. It certainly would be so if it were true, but Mr. Yeatman unfortunately does not tell us very distinctly upon what evidence he makes these positive assertions respecting the identity of the Malets and Glastonias. Robert

[1] Charter Roll, 9 Edw. I., No. 91.

Malet, as is well known, was Lord Great Chamberlain, and Mr. Yeatman supposes (p. 307) that Robert Malet, who, he asserts, was husband of Azilia de Glastonia, was Robert de Glastonia and was so called after the forfeiture in 1002 (*sic*) of all his (Robert Malet's) estates, and his office of Great Chamberlain, when he assumed the name of Glastonia. Now, because Walcheline le Werreer had a grant from King Henry I. of the manor of Winfrith, to be held by the service of being the King's Chamberlain, and transmitted it to his representatives the Glastonias, who held it by the same peculiar tenure, Mr Yeatman seems to suppose, if I rightly understand him, that the two chamberlainships were the same, and, therefore, the chamberlains themselves were identical. Nothing can be more baseless than such reasoning. The early Norman kings had many Chamberlains; eight are mentioned in Domesday; and Herbertus the "Camerarius" of King Hen. I., is a well-known personage. The office of Great Chamberlain, which was forfeited by Robert Malet, was granted by King Hen. I. to Alberic de Vere. There can be no sort of reason, therefore, for assuming that the Malets and Glastonias were identical, and it is quite certain the Malets never obtained any part of the estate of Roger Arundel and transmitted it to the Novoburgos.

(p. 308) "No doubt he [Wacheline de Werrer] held part of this inheritance on the forfeiture of the Malets. There was a Wacheline de Werrer, a Domesday tenant of Roger de Arundel, Earl of Arundel, in Shropshire, holding Grinstead and Faintree of him."

"The fact that about the same time a Wacheline de Werrer held part of the Dorset Barony of Roger Arundel, is another proof of his identity with the Earl. Now the name of Werrer seems to be a corruption of Bretwerrer, Britwere, or Brewer. It is possible, therefore, that Alice Brewer had other claims to this estate besides those in dower."

Walcheline le Werreer never had any portion of the fee of Roger Arundel of Domesday, or of Robert Malet. The Wacheline alluded to as holding Gerenstead and Faintree ["Grivelesul and Faventrei"] of Roger Earl of Shrewsbury is simply called "Walchelinus" in Domesday. The addition of "Werrer" is Mr. Yeatman's own. Walchelinus is by no means an uncommon name. It occurs several times in Domesday. There are not the slightest grounds therefore for identifying the Shropshire tenant with the uncle of William de Glastonia, and I don't think the reader will be disposed to admit Mr. Yeatman's etymology as in the least degree probable.

(p. 308) "William de Glastonia, who appears in the first Great Roll of the Pipe to have paid 300 marks for his uncle Wachel's lands in England, and to have been discharged from further payment for his Norman possessions." . . . . "William de Glastonia was no other than the son of Robert Malet." . . . . "William de Glastonia and Matilde, his wife, confirm the gift of Wacheline to Glastonbury of the same church of Winfrith.

"From this it would seem that Wacheline was permitted to enjoy part of the forfeited estates of Robert Malet, his brother-in-law, and in consideration of a great fine William Malet was allowed to succeed him."

Robert de Glastonia was certainly not son of Robert Malet, there is not the slightest ground for such an assertion, neither did Winfrith, for which, with other lands, the 300 marks were paid, ever belong to a Malet. Mr. Yeatman's notice from the Great Roll is inaccurate. It states that William de Glastonia accounted for a debt of 308 marks and two pence for part of the land and office (the office of chamberlain) of Walchel'

his uncle, of which sum he paid 20 marks into the Exchequer in England, and acquitted himself of 20 marks more to the King in Normandy, leaving 268 marks and one penny still due. William de Glastonia and Matilda his wife did not confirm the gift of Walcheline to Glastonbury of the church of Winfrith. The confirmation was by the husband alone. If his wife had joined him it would have been significant, as it might have afforded something like evidence that she had some hereditary interest in the property of Winfrith, which she had not.

The payment of 308 marks and two pence was evidently for a relief or primer seizin—or as we should now call it, succession duty—and not an amercement. If it had been the latter it would have been so stated on the roll. But, even if all Mr. Yeatman's premises had been correct, it is difficult to see how he arrives at his conclusions.

(p. 318) "This father of Wachelinus [Maminot] was in all probability that Wachelinus de Werra or Britowerra, who Henry I. appointed one of his Chamberlains, and who granted Winfrith to the Abbey of Glastonbury, and whose nephew took the name of Glastonia."

Thus, Wacheline le Werreer having been Wacheline Brewer, now becomes Wacheline Maminot ! !

(p. 306) "Mr. Bond would indentify this Robert fitz Pain with the Sheriff of Dorset and Somerset of 31 to 35 Henry II., who was clearly the Robert de Poles, the father whose fine was partly paid in 1 John."

It is perfectly clear he was quite a different person for he succeeded Robert de Pole in the inheritance.

(p. 261) "Sir Robert Fitzpain was heir (nepos), that is, either nephew or grandson of Roger de Poles, who about 22 Hen. II., obtained seizin of half Roger Arundel's inheritance."

It is much to be wished that Mr. Yeatman had told us what authority calls him *nepos*, as, if he is correct, it would clear up one of the chief difficulties in the pedigree; for in the Pipe Roll 10 Rich. I., Robert de Pole is called brother of Robert Fitzpain, and in that of 1 John he is called his father.

(p. 267) "Aubrey, daughter and co-heir of Walter Waleran, married first, Sir John de Ingham, who died 6 John; secondly, William Boteril; and, thirdly, Robert Fitzpain, Lord of Marshwood."

In point of fact Aubrey's first husband was Robert de Pole, her second was John de Ingham, and her third was William Boterel. There is no probability of her ever having married a Robert Fitzpain. The first Fitzpain who owned Marshwood, Dorset, was Robert, great-grandson of the Robert who succeeded to a share of the Arundel barony.

Writing of Azilia, wife of Robert de Glastonia, Mr. Yeatman says :—

(p. 304) "Possibly she was mother of Matilde de Arundel, who married Robert de Novoburgo's father as well as Gerbert de Percy. Possibly she was identical with Cecelia fitz Walter to be mentioned presently; possibly he was Walter de Arundel, also to be mentioned. And this Walter was the link by which the Novoburgo's were connected with the family of Arundel. Now as we shall see presently Cicelia fitz Walter was the mother or stepmother of Robert fitz Pain, for he was bound to warrant her estate (in dower). If, therefore, Cicelia and Azilia are identical, she must, after the death of Robert Glastonia, have married a De Powes or De Poles. If Azilia was the Arundel heiress, it is possible that her daughters were Matilde and Cicelia, and one married Poles and the other Novoburgo, and this seems the most probable solution."

In reply to all these supposed "possibilities" let us turn to certainties. The wife of Robert de Novoburgo's father was not Matilda Arundel but Matilda de Glastonia, quite a different person from Matilda Arundel wife of Gerbert de Percy. Azilia could not have been identical with Cecelia fitz Walter, not only because Azilia and Cecelia are quite different names, but also because Cecelia claimed dower in Plymtree, Devon, which was Pole property and never belonged to the Glastonias or Arundels; and for the same reason it could not have belonged to Walter Arundel, who, therefore, could not have been a Fitzwalter. It is evident that Cecelia must have been widow of a Pole, from whom she obtained this estate in dower, but there is no reason whatever to suppose that she must necessarily have been mother or stepmother of Robert fitz Pain merely because he was bound to warrant the property. He may have been more distantly related, although the heir, and even if he was heir *jure uxoris*, the warrantee would not, I apprehend, be on that account deprived of the benefit of the warranty.

(p. 305) "We have the clearest proof, from the chartulary of Shaston, Harl. MS. 61, f. 28, that a Maude de Arundel was the daughter of Robert de Glastonia, his wife, by Azilia, his wife. This lady, Mr. Bond supposes, was her daughter, and the same chartulary proves that her husband was that Roger de Novoburgo, whom Mr. Bond makes the husband of her granddaughter; in fact Mr. Bond would make the mother and daughter of Azilia to be the same person."

Mr. Bond has said nothing of the kind, but quite the reverse. He has shown distinctly that the two Matildas were different persons, and "we have the clearest proof from the chartulary" that Matilda, wife of Roger de Novoburgo, was Matilda de Glastonia. She is not there called Matilda de Arundel.

(p. 306) "By what right did Robert de Poles obtain it," [*i.e.*, half the Barony of Roger Arundel] "and who was he? . . . The immediate suggestion which arises on this fact is that Roger de Poles must have been the son of a sister, or of the daughter of Azilia, wife of Robert de Glastonia."

(p. 308) "If not identical, Azilia was either the sister or the mother of Cecilia, who was the mother of Robert fitz Pain."

There are not the slightest grounds for these suggestions, and I have found no reason to suppose that Azilia was in any way concerned in the Arundel barony unless through her husband Robert de Glastonia.

Mr. Yeatman continues—

"Mr. Bond's account of this transaction is singularly complex and erroneous, he adds to the confusion of making Azilia the daughter of Matilde de Glastonia, by giving her without any proof of any kind a sister Sibil, whom he makes the wife successively of Pagan fitz John and of Maurice de Pola, or of Nicholas de Pola, of Wilts."

On the contrary, I have distinctly shown that Azilia was not the daughter but the mother of Matilda de Glastonia. With regard to Sybil it would have simplified the matter if Mr. Yeatman had informed his readers that, before he published the above paragraph, he had been informed by me in some correspondence which had passed between us, that I admitted I had been misled by Dugdale in making Robert fitz Pain to be a son of Pain fitz John; that I had been led to doubt the accuracy of that illustrious antiquary on that point since the 'History of Dorset' was published, and that, therefore, the conjectures (not positive statements as Mr. Yeatman interprets them) respecting the alliances

depending on that supposed paternity, of course, fell to the ground. Mr. Yeatman was also fully aware, from the same correspondence, that I had admitted myself to have been misled as regards the maternity of Azilia de Glastonia, by finding her in possession of Almer, which I at first supposed was Arundel property, and if it had been so it would have afforded strong evidence that she was heir or coheir of the Arundels; but further investigation had led me to discover that Almer was Glastonia property and only held by Azilia in dower. It would have been better if Mr. Yeatman, while severely criticising my suggestion (it was only the suggestion of a possibility), had told his readers that I had changed my views on that point, and why.

As regards Robert Fitz Pain I have been unable to discover, with anything like certainty, how he was connected with the Poles, but I am unable to accept Mr. Yeatman's views on the subject. I cannot help suspecting, however (and Mr. Yeatman will be justified in considering it "a mere guess"), that he may have been brother-in-law, that is to say, husband of a sister of Robert de Pole, and that he obtained the property *jure uxoris*. In the Pipe Roll of 10 Ric. I., he is called his *brother*, but in 1 John he is described as his father. The sheriff, evidently, did not know, nor was it necessary for him to enquire, which description was correct; I cannot agree with Mr Yeatman in thinking the entries relate to two different persons. True, the wife of Robert Fitz Pain is nowhere mentioned, but this does not affect my theory. In the case of Gerbert de Perci, it is only by collateral evidence that we find he obtained the barony *jure uxoris*. Another case occurs in Dorsetshire, where I think it likely the relationship was similar. In the Close Roll of Henry III.,[1] we find the King granted to William de Whitwell the land of Wynterburn, which Roger de Milers, *his brother*, had from the King. Of course it is possible that Whitwell and Milers may have been half-brothers. The late Mr. Eyton told me he had met with a case in Shropshire, where "brother" evidently was used for brother-in-law, but I have no note of it.

In the Pomeroy pedigree, Rohesia de la Pomerai, mentioned hereafter, is described in most instances as *mother* of Henry de la Pomerai, but in one instance she is called his *noverca*, which in fact she was. The cases are somewhat analagous.

(p. 307) "Cecilia fitz Walter . . . . was probably a coheiress of Matilde de Glastonia, another daughter of Azilia, and hence it was that the widow of Roger de Poles interfered in the estate of Robert de Glastonia."

It will be remembered that Mr. Yeatman thought Cecilia and Azilia were identical. Nothing can be more clearly proved by documentary evidence than that Matilda de Glastonia, daughter of Azilia, had by Roger de Novoburgo, her husband, a son and heir Robert de Novoburgo, ancestor of the Neuburgh family. It is not possible, therefore, that Cecilia fitz Walter could have been a coheir of Matilda de Glastonia.

(p. 307) "Robert de Glastonia and William fitz Walter both married sisters of Sanson de Lincoln."

In the absence of all evidence I am unable to accept the statement that Robert de Glastonia's wife was a De Lincoln. It is highly improbable.

[1] Rotuli Lit. Claus. Vol I., p. 477.

(p. 308) "As Gerbert de Percy evidently survived his wife and did not enjoy her estate, it is evidence that if she was the heiress, she died without issue unless, indeed, as it is very possible, Robert de Novoburgo was her son. Possibly on the death of her husband, De Novoburgo, she married Gerbert de Percy."

There is no evidence to show either that Gerbert de Percy survived his wife, or that he then lost the inheritance. It is clearly proved that Robert de Novoburgo was son of Roger de Novoburgo by Matilda de Glastonia. There is nothing, therefore, here to show that Matilda was not an heiress.

(p. 307) "It would seem that on the death of Matilde de Arundel, her husband, Gerbert de Percy, who for a very short time had enjoyed this inheritance, was put aside, and the king for a time seemed to have kept it himself, and then for some reason to have granted it to Alured de Lincoln, probably because of the ancient claim of his family through the Malets and others. The date of his investiture would seem to be about 29 Henry II, for the Pipe Rolls of that year show that he was then charged in the sum of £200 19s. 9d. Robert fitz Pain married his daughter, and possibly he then endeavoured to pass the inheritance to him, and we find, as before stated, that he paid £100 in 26 Henry II. as his relief for holding half the barony."

There is no evidence that Gerbert de Percy was put aside by the king, or that the latter "kept it himself for a time." The last we hear of Gerbert de Percy as connected with the barony is in 14 Hen. II., but the silence of the Roll, as regards his connection with the barony, from 14 Hen. II., when he certainly had the whole of it, for he paid scutage for the whole, does not prove that he was no longer in possession of it. It is obvious that, unless he owed money on account of it, it would not be noticed. I can find no reason for supposing that the king granted the barony to Alured de Lincoln, or, indeed, that Alured de Lincoln ever had anything to do with it, although Mr. Yeatman builds a good deal on the assumption that he had. I examined the Pipe Rolls of Dorset and Somerset of 26 and 29 Hen. II., as well as that of 16 Hen. II., in which latter year, also, Mr. Yeatman says (p. 308), the Arundel barony was in De Lincoln's possession; but neither of them has any such entry. On the contrary, in 26 and 29 Hen. II., the moiety of the barony, which afterwards belonged to the Fitzpains, belonged to Roger de Poles.[1] If Mr. Yeatman has met with any evidence which has escaped my researches, showing that Alured de Lincoln ever held any portion of the barony, it must have been the portion of the Neuburghs and must have been held only temporarily, as it afterwards was by Robert Belet, before it was restored to Robert de Neuburgh, during whose minority (apparently) it was disposed of by the king. This, however, would afford no evidence of relationship. There is no evidence, that I am aware of, that Robert Fitzpain married a daughter of Alured de Lincoln; but Roger Fitzpain, his son, married Margery, sister and co-heir of the last Alured de Lincoln; and hence probably the confusion in Mr. Yeatman's mind.

(p. 350) "He [Alured de Lincoln] held in the time of the Confessor the Manors of Lulworth, which at Domesday was partly held by Roger Montgomery and partly by Ailfus, the Chamberlain, probably his son. . . . . Ailfus the Chamberlain was probably ancestor of Wacheline le Werrer and the De Glastonias, who brought this Manor to the Novoburgos."

Neither of the four Lulworths in Domesday ever belonged to Roger de Montgomery or Roger Arundel. There cannot be the least doubt

[1] Pipe Rolls of Devon.

that the Lulworth, which afterwards came to the Glastonias and through them to the Neuburghs, was the same which, together with Winfrith, was held by the king in demesne, for it was parcel of the manor of Winfrith, and both Winfrith and *that* Lulworth afterwards belonged to the Glastonias, having been granted to their ancestor by King Hen. I.[2] East Lulworth was held at the Domesday survey by the Earl of Mortain and was first acquired by the Neuburghs, by purchase from the De Lulworths, in the time of Edw. I. I suppose Mr. Yeatman's reason for identifying the Lulworth of Aiulfus with that which afterwards belonged to the Glastonias was because he finds Ajulfus described as chamberlain. But that could not have been the chamberlainship of the Glastonias, because we clearly identify their manor as being in the king's hands in the time Domesday, and their office of chamberlain is shewn, by the *Testa de Nevill*, to have been created in the time of Hen. I.

(p. 307) "The widow of Roger de Novoburgo appears to have married William, the son of Robert Belet, and there is a fine of 9 Henry III., between herself, Robert de Novoburgo, her son Robert fitz Pain, and Alice Brewer, which probably settled all questions of dower then in agitation."

There is no mention in the Fine[3] of any widow of Roger de Novoburgo. A Margery Belet was a party to it, but there is nothing to show who she was, or in what way, if any, she was connected with either of the other parties. There is no evidence whatever that she was widow of Roger de Novoburgo.

(p. 311) "The de Poles were simply the de Powis family.....descended from Pagan Peverel."

(p. 306) "[In] the Pipe Rolls for 26 Henry II, where Roger de Powes paid £100 to have a moiety of the Honour of Poorstock."

(p. 319) "If we assume that William de Glastonia, the nephew of Wacheline, was the first husband of Matilde de Arundel, and the father of Roger de Poles, the inference is very strong that he was a Prince of Powis also, and that his uncle Wacheline was a member of the Peverel family, who did not take their absurd surname."

The supposition that William de Glastonia was father of Robert de Pole is certainly not a little strange, for, independently of the difference of names, the Poles never seem to have got any of the Glastonia estates. But, having satisfied himself from the evidence of the Pipe Roll that the De Poles were no other than Powis's, Princes in Wales, Mr. Yeatman enters into a long account of the Powis and Peverel families. Unfortunately, however, for his theory, the Pipe Roll which he cites affords no warrant for this strange theory. Mr. Yeatman has misread the record. The name on the Roll is never written Powes or Powis at all. It is invariably and clearly Poles and Pole. The entry in 26 Hen II., alluded to by Mr. Yeatman, says :—"Rogerus de *Poles* redd. comp. de c.*l.* pro habenda medietate de honore de Poorstoke." He paid £8 of the debt, and continued, *by the same name*, to pay off the residue by annual instalments till 1 Ric. I., when he had his *quietus*. Even if the name had been written Powes in the Roll of 26 Hen. II., the fact that in all the entries in subsequent years relating to the same debt it is invariably

[2] Testa de Nevill.

[3] Divers Counties (Dorset and Somerset), 9 Hen. III, No. 37.

written Poles, would have proved that the first-named entry was a clerical error. But it is not only in relation to this debt that we meet with the name in these Rolls. It is mentioned in several successive years under the following form:—"Homines Rogeri de Poles de Suanewiz deb. dim. *m.* q[a] injuste saisiver' se de crasso pisce;" which latter words Mr. Yeatman (p. 308) reads "crassas piscus"! Although the latter entries are found in the Pipe Roll of Dorset, whilst the former are in that of Devon, in which latter county the Poles resided, there can be no doubt that both relate to the same persons; for part of Suanewiz (Swanage) in Dorset was parcel of the Arundel barony.

There is, therefore, really not the slightest ground for supposing the Poles to be Powis's or Peverels, and, even if the "Poles" of the Pipe Roll were really Powes's, it would be a slender foundation on which to build so stately a superstructure.

But it is almost more remarkable that Mr. Yeatman makes the Pomeroys the same family as the De Poles, and, therefore, Princes of Powis. He says (p. 63)—

"Joscelyn Pomeroy was probably a Prince of Powis."

And (p. 319).—

"Which name [Pomeroy] appears to be identical with that of Peverell, through why is not so clear as it is certainly identical with that of Powis."

It may well be asked "why?", for in point of fact the Pomeroys were never either Poles or Powis's. There is scarcely a baronial family in England whose early pedigree has been so clearly and satisfactorily worked out step by step as that of the Pomeroys of Berry Pomeroy in Devonshire.

That there was some very early connection between the Poles and Pomeroys is probable; but the only evidence of it is that King Hen. II. confirmed to the Canons of Plympton "Cadewurdam quam Rogerus de Pola et Pomerius frater ejus dedit."[1] Now the Poles were Poles, at least from the time of William Rufus, in whose reign the Abbot of Gloucester gave Plymtree, Devon, to Nicholas de Pola in exchange for Edmundeston in Warwickshire;[2] and the Pomeroys were Pomeroys from the time of Domesday.

Mr. Yeatman adds (p. 311)—

"Goszilinus Pomeria, who attested Henry I's. Charter, married the daughter of Reginald, Earl of Cornwall (King Henry's son)."

And (p. 247) he says:—

"Sybil Corbet had . . . . by the King, Rohesia who married Johel Pomeroy."

There was no such person as Johel Pomeroy. The facts are these. Rohesia de la Pomerai was sister of Reginald, Earl of Cornwall, as is proved by a transcript of an original charter printed in the third edition of Hutchins's History of Dorset (I. 629). Her son Joscelin de la Pomerai by Henry de la Pomerai, her first husband, is called nephew both of the Earl of Cornwall and of Herbert Fitz Herbert, son of Herbert the Chamberlain[3] by Sibilla Corbet, mother of Earl Reginald. Rohesia must, therefore, have been daughter of Sibilla Corbet. She could not have been the king's daughter, because in the Dorsetshire Pipe Rolls

[1] Oliver's *Mon. Exon.* [2] Dugdale's *Monasticon.* [3] Hoveden.

of King John, she is called sister of Doun Bardolf, being then wife of John Russel, her second husband. In p. 319, Mr. Yeatman gives her the name of Gundred.

(p. 310) "Matilda de Pomeria, was probably Matilde de Peverel, sister and heiress of William Peverell of Essex."

This is another of Mr. Yeatman's unfortunate "guesses," for Henry de la Pomerai, son of that Matilda, is described in a charter as "filius Matilde de Vitrei." Rohesia is called his "noverca."

(p. 310) "Idem Robert querit vsus Alice Brewere (in the other Roll she was called Moun) medietate ville de worth. . . . It is clear from this Roll that Robert, as coheir, was seeking half his inheritance. This Worth was possibly Lolworth, or perhaps the Deepworth of the Pipe Rolls and Rotuli Curiæ Regis before set out."

Worth was Worth Matravers in Purbeck, which was part of the Arundel barony; but never, as Mr. Yeatman elsewhere conjectures, its "caput." It is not correct that in the other Roll Alice Brewere was called Alice Moun in relation to the suit. Two suits were carried on concurrently, one relating to Worth the other to Surrenton in Somerset, but in the former (which is distinguishable from the other in which Alice Moun was defendant), the defendant is never called anything but Alice Brewer, and she is so called in a Fine of Worth, after Alice Moun had married William Paynel. There is reason, therefore, to question whether the two ladies were identical.

Not the least remarkable, as it appears to me, of Mr. Yeatman's flights of imagination, is the pedigree which he "propounds" of the Arundels of Cornwall and Wardour, who have usually, and with the greatest probability, amounting as some have thought to certainty, been supposed to spring from a son of Roger Arundel of Domesday. Mr. Yeatman supposes them to be a totally different family, viz., a branch of the Albinis Earls of Arundel, and quite unconnected with the baronial Arundels. His reasoning is rather complex, but if I rightly understand it, he shows, from an Inspeximus charter, that a William de Harundel granted lands in Treloy in Cornwall to Reinfrid de Harundel, and from the Close Roll of 17 John it appears that William de Arundel, uncle ("avunculus") of Unfredus de Arundel, was at that time in rebellion against the king, in consequence of which his land was seized. William de Albini Earl of Arundel was at the same time in rebellion against King John.

In Michaelmas Term, 3 Hen. III., William de Arundel was defendant in a law suit relating to Treloy, and as he did not put in an appearance (a very common occurrence), the cause was adjourned till Hilary Term following, that is to say, from September to January.

"Looking," says Mr. Yeatman (p. 216), "at the date and at the long period of delay given to William Harundel, it seems obvious that he was absent at the Crusades, a fact which is important in establishing his identity with the Earl of Arundel, who was at the Crusades at this very period."

About this time there were three successive generations named William Arundel, and contemporaneously, there were three successive William de Arundels of Cornwall. From these coincidences, Mr. Yeatman seems to

consider there is—

"No doubt whatever that William de Harundel, the grantor of Renfred de Arundel, was the Earl himself."

Now, the adjournment of suits was the commonest occurrence, and they often lingered on for years. The adjournment from Michaelmas to Hilary was the shortest that could be made, for it was only till the next Term. There was, indeed, no long period of delay, and there can be no reason, therefore, from this circumstance to assume that the defendant was in the crusades.

William de Arundel, father of William, is called uncle of Unfred; but "uncle," says Mr. Yeatman, may be used to designate nephew or grandson, a son or a cousin german, or in fact almost any one near of kin. Therefore, Unfred or Reinfrid de Arundel was *brother* of William de Albini, the third earl of that name, and son of William the second earl.

"The words of the deed" of William de Harundel, says Mr. Yeatman, "imply that he claimed to be an Earl," but I fail to perceive in them any such implication.

I have thus laid before the reader some of the numerous inaccuracies into which the author of this work has fallen, and have stated some of the singular theories he has advanced. Whether his method of constructing a pedigree is "in accordance with the very simple rule of genealogical research," and whether he has not—to use his own words—"added to the confusion by suggesting unquestionably erroneous conclusions," I leave the reader to decide. The effect of his criticism on my own mind has been to confirm the views I previously entertained.

It only remains to be noticed that although Mr. Yeatman avers that in quoting authorities he has "given the exact words and even the mistakes of the original," my own reading of some of those which he has given *in extenso*, the originals of which I have examined, is very different from his. I have found them to be in the common forms in which similar documents are worded, and they are perfectly good sense. So much cannot be said of Mr. Yeatman's transcripts, as the practised reader will readily admit. The misreadings are numerous and very remarkable.

T. Bond.