ADELIZA "THE VISCOUNTESS."

As it is obviously undesirable that a new and gross genealogical blunder should be embalmed in the pages of this Magazine for the bewilderment of future students, I propose to correct it at once, before it obtains currency.

On p. 86, *ante*, Mr. Kirk writes:—

"It had also been announced beforehand by the late Editor, that I should throw some light on the parentage of the Countess Rohese. . . . At length we are in a position to settle the question. . . . She was . . . daughter of Richard Fitz-Gilbert de Clare and of Adeliza, or Alice, 'the Viscountess' his wife, who was the daughter of Ranulf Meschin, Earl of Chester, and of Countess Lucy."[1]

Of Adeliza "the Viscountess," he observes:—

"This title is given her in the history and cartulary of Gloucester Abbey, edited by the late Mr. W. H. Hart; but whence did she derive it? Could she have adopted it as a surname in memory of her grandfather, Thorold Vicecomes? In the same volumes she is described as sister of Ranulph Gernons, Earl of Chester, widow of Richard Fitz-Gilbert, and mother of Walter (the Constable), of Gloucester. These descriptions finally settle," etc., etc.

Such are Mr. Kirk's assertions—confident, of course, as usual. And now let us see who "the Viscountess" really was. There is no plainer bit of genealogy in the whole Norman period. "Adeliza *Vicecomitissa* mater Walteri de Gloucestria,"[2] was the widow of "Rogerius *vicecomes* pater Walterii," who is referred to in Domesday book.[3] The relationship of the three is transparently clear from the Gloucester Cartulary and Domesday Book, as was shown by Mr. A. S. Ellis as far back as 1880.[4] Consequently the "Vicecomitissa" is so styled as the widow of a "Vicecomes"; and she had no more to do with the Earl of Chester, with Lucy, or with Thorold, than she has with Mr. Kirk himself!

But how did Mr. Kirk produce this wild blunder? He confused Adeliza, the Sheriff's widow, with an *entirely different* Adeliza, who lived at a later time, and is *carefully distinguished* from her in the index to Mr. Hart's volumes. Here are the two pedigrees:—

Rogerius=ADELIZA
"Vicecomes" dead before 1086 | "Vicecomitissa" (A)
Walterius filius Rogerii Domesday tenant 1086.

Ranulf Meschin=Lucy.
Earl of Chester. "ob. 1129"[5] | "ob. 1141"?[5]
Richard=ADELIZA
Fitz Gilbert | (B)
Roger, Earl of Hertford ob. 1173.

Now, as Walter, Mr. Ellis points out, "was of age in 1086," his mother, Adeliza (A), was married *at latest* in 1064: but Adeliza (B),

[1] She is also "Adeliza the Viscountess," in Mr. Kirk's chart pedigree (p. 90).
[2] *Gloucester Cartulary*, I, 81. The name also occurs as "Athelayz," "Adelysa," "Adeliz," and "Adelice," in the cartulary.
[3] Hoc manerium dedit W. comes Rogerio Vicecomiti patri Walterii (I. 169).
[4] *Bristol and Glouc. Arch. Trans. IV*, 77. The use of *Vicecomitissa* in this sense is not without parallel.
[5] These are Mr. Kirk's dates, (p. 87).

on Mr. Kirk's hypothesis was born *at earliest* in 1101, for he dares not assign her parents marriage to an earlier date than 1100, therefore, Mr. Kirk's Adeliza was *married* at least five-and-thirty years before she was even *born*! Comment is superfluous.

Now, observe that this blunder is Mr. Kirk's very own: as he would himself say, he is "the first to suggest" it. No one else—least of all Mr. Hart—had confused the two women. Moreover, it was by an exactly similar blunder, that Mr. Kirk, as I said (p. 3), "positively assumed" throughout his first paper, that an Alfred de Lincoln, "living in 1130" (and in 1135-8), was identical with an Alfred de Lincoln "living in 1086," who was father, he held, of "Thorold the Sheriff" —who had died even before 1086. He subsequently retracted this absurdity and admitted that the two Alfreds were distinct—and, having done so, has now the audacity to charge me with adopting, "without acknowledgment," his correction of this alleged identity, as if I had ever accepted his original transparent blunder!

But what is the inference to be drawn from the case of "Adeliza the Viscountess?" Simply this—Mr. Kirk, it is essential to remember, has *not* "produced fresh and authentic evidence, chiefly from manuscript sources" (p. 81) on the difficult "Lucy" problem; he has simply advanced an hypothesis, which remains one more hypothesis and nothing more.

His correctness is therefore a matter, not of *fact*, but of *opinion*, and that opinion must depend on our estimate of Mr. Kirk's genealogical skill. If he asserts, as we have seen he does, that "Adeliza the Viscountess" was a daughter of Lucy, and granddaughter of Thorold the Sheriff, we know what value to attach to his assertion as to Lucy herself. The opinion of a writer who can so blunder, is simply and absolutely worthless.

Have we then attained no definite result from this prolonged controversy? Yes, we have at length obtained a scrap of "fresh and authentic evidence" in the charter contributed by Mr. H. J. Ellis, of the British Museum (*ante* p. 86). Here we leave the regions of conjecture for the welcome ground of evidence and fact; yet even the evidence of this charter that the mysterious Countess Rohese (of Lincoln) was really Rohese de Clare, is not (as Mr. Kirk imagines) new. There lies before me a work published nine years ago, in which she is rightly described as "Rohese de Clare, who was the niece of the Earls of Chester and Lincoln."

One point it may be well to clear up; the well-known passage in John of Hetham runs thus:—

> Gilbertum de Gant tunc adolescentulum, captum cum rege, compulit idem comes ducere neptem suam uxorem.

The Earl in question was Randulf of Chester—"Gernons" as Mr. Kirk names that unfortunate noble, writing:—

> "If it was permissible to suppose that Gernons gave 'his share of the Earldom' to his niece, it must be equally allowable to conjecture that he transferred the whole of it to his half-brother" (p. 87).

The former expression is found in Courthope, who in turn derived it from Mr. J. G. Nichols, where we read:

"Earl Randulf procured his share of the Earldom to be transferred to Gilbert de Gant, his prisoner at the battle of Lincoln, whom he at the same time compelled to marry his niece." [1]

It will have been seen above that John of Hexham says nothing about the earldom, the reference to which was interpolated by Mr. Nichols himself, its form being suggested by his fantastic notion that Earl Randulf and William de Roumare held the Earldom of Lincoln, at the time, in coparcenery. The fact is that Earl Randulf could neither grant to his niece a "share of the Earldom" of Lincoln, nor to his half-brother "the whole of it," for the excellent reason (among others) that it was not his to give. In spite of the network of speculation that has been spun around this earldom, we have no ground in the contemporary evidence of chronicles or records for asserting that Randulf, or his father before him, held or even professed to hold, the Earldom of Lincoln.

J. H. ROUND.

EXTRACTS FROM A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY NOTE-BOOK.

(*Continued from p.* 104.)

The Maunor of Denton Court was anciently holden of the honour of Mainemott by Knight service till K. Johns reigne when the said Mainemott revolted to the French, whereupon it was then confiscated to the King. The King granted the honour to William de Say, & then the honour was called the honour of Say. About the time of Edward the third the said honour came to the Crowne by Escheate, and King Henry the 6th released all castle ward, & all services saving 4d. per annum. This Mr. Tho. Denne the Counsellar informed mee Anno Dni 1637.

James Master Sonne of Richard Master of Langden Esq. was bapt. Oct. 11, 1627.

Maximillian sonne of William Dallison Esq. bapt. Dec. 15, 1633.

March 1, 1665, Ms. Mary Master married to Mr. Escut Archdeacon of Exeter.

Sir Basil Dixwell his second sonne . . . . born at Broome upon St. Valentines day Feb. 14, 1666 betweene 11 & 12 of ye clock.

His eldest sonne Basil was born Dec. 11, 1665 about 5 in the morn.

Saturday March 2, 1666. Sir Tho. Peyton was married to the Lady Thorne Hill (*sic*).

Fryday May 1, 1666 my brother Loue dyed.

William Oxinden the eldest twinne & sonne of Ed: married Dorothy Grove daughter of...Grove an Atturny at Canterbury, by whom he had no issue.

Henry his brother the second twinne married Jane (*sic.*)...Ap. 27, 1620, by whom he had issue Henry & William.

William dyed unmarried [&c. See pedigree p. 39].

1649, Denton streete was paved from my Red house to the Church style at the cost of mee Henry Oxinden, excepting forty shillings which Phineas Andrew Esq. & forty shillings which Mr. Clement Barling, Rector then of Denton, allowed towards the charge of it.

1639 I layd the 4 grave stones in Denton Chancel upon my Ancestors &c: & sate up the Armes in the windores.

The yew tree before the great parlour windore at Maydeken I planted Anno Dni 1637.

The eldest of them about the round house 1640.

Ap. 1635 Sir Basil Dixwell layd the foundation of the house at Broome, it was up by the middle of No: following ... it was Sept. following 1637 before the joiners had made any great progress in wainscotting the rooms, & it was St. Mich. 1638 before they & the painters had finished their work, and made the house ready fo

[1] *Topographer and Genealogist* I., 17 and 301.