

32758

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

EDITED BY THE
REV. MANDELL CREIGHTON, M.A., LL.D.

DIXIE PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

AMERICAN EDITOR, JUSTIN WINSOR, LL.D., Librarian of Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts

VOLUME III.

1888



LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16th STREET

1888

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

	PAGE
— GNEIST ON THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION. By <i>G. W. Prothero</i>	1
THE CLAIM OF THE HOUSE OF ORLEANS TO MILAN. By <i>Miss A. M. F. Robinson (Madame James Darmesteter)</i>	84, 270
BENOÎT DE BOIGNE. By <i>Sidney James Owen</i>	68
THE CAMPAIGN OF SEDAN. By <i>W. O'Connor Morris</i>	209
CHATHAM, FRANCIS, AND JUNIUS. By <i>Leslie Stephen</i>	288
THE PLANTATION OF MUNSTER, 1584-1589. By <i>R. Dunlop</i>	250
THE SUITORS OF THE COUNTY COURT. By <i>F. W. Maitland</i>	417
THE WEST-SAXON CONQUEST OF SURREY. By <i>H. E. Malden</i>	422
HEOTSVITHA OF GANDERSHEIM. By <i>W. H. Hudson</i>	481
THE EARLY LIFE OF THOMAS WOLSEY. By <i>the late T. W. Cameron</i>	458
THE GREAT CONDÉ. By <i>J. Breck Perkins</i>	478
THE SETTLEMENT OF AUSTRALIA. By <i>E. C. K. Gonner</i>	625
THE TOMB OF DANTE. By <i>the Rev. Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford</i>	685
ELIZABETHAN PRESBYTERIANISM. By <i>William A. Shaw</i>	655
THE BATTLE OF NASEBY. By <i>Lieut.-Colonel W. G. Ross, R.E.</i>	669
NOTES AND DOCUMENTS	94, 292, 498, 680
— REVIEWS OF BOOKS	127, 851, 558, 761
— LIST OF HISTORICAL BOOKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED	190, 829, 609, 814
— CONTENTS OF PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS	201, 409, 619, 825
INDEX	888



N^o 12, OCTOBER 1888

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY THE

REV. MANDELL CREIGHTON, M.A. LL.D.

DIXIE PROFESSOR OF ECLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

American Editor, JUSTIN WINSOR, LL.D., Librarian of Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts

CONTENTS

1. <i>Articles</i>	PAGE
THE SETTLEMENT OF AUSTRALIA. <i>By E. C. K. GONNER</i>	625
THE TOMB OF DANTE. <i>By the Rev. PRINCIPAL OF ST. EDMUND HALL, Oxford</i>	635
ELIZABETHAN PRESBYTERIANISM. <i>By WILLIAM A. SHAW</i>	655
THE BATTLE OF NASEBY. <i>By Lieut.-Colonel W. G. ROSS, R.E.</i>	668
2. <i>Notes and Documents</i> —The Parentage of Gundrada, wife of William of Warren : by Edward A. Freeman D.C.L.—Carucage : by Miss Kate Norgate—The Visitation of the Monastery of Thame, 1526 : Edited by the Rev. George G. Perry—Cromwell and the Insurrection of 1655, Part II. : by Reginald F. D. Palgrave, C.B.—Letters of the Rev. William Ayerst, 1706–1721, Part I. : Edited by C. E. Doble	680
3. <i>Reviews of Books</i> — <i>Pulszky</i> , The Theory of Law and Civil Society : by Professor H. Sidgwick, Litt.D.— <i>Strachan-Davidson</i> , Selections from Polybius : by Arthur Tilley— <i>Davis's</i> Edition of Hebrew Deeds of English Jews : Papers read at the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition, 1887 ; <i>Höniger's</i> Edition of Das Judenschreinbuch der Laurenzpfarre zu Köln : by A. Neubauer— <i>Lea</i> : History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages : by Lord Acton— <i>Mailand's</i> Edition of Select Pleas of the Crown, I., 1200–1225 : by J. H. Round— <i>Lumby's</i> Edition of Higden's Polychronicon, IX.— <i>Craig-Brown</i> , History of Selkirkshire : by the Editor— <i>Barbé</i> , The Tragedy of Gowrie House : by the late T. W. Cameron— <i>Plenkens</i> , Er Frederik II's Datter Anna, Dronning af Storbritannien; gaaet over til Katholicismen? by Professor A. W. Ward, Litt.D.— <i>Bright</i> , History of England, IV. : by Lord Acton— <i>Theal</i> , History of the Boers in South Africa : by A. J. McGregor— <i>Thompson</i> , The Owens College, Manchester—Short Notices	761
4. <i>List of Historical Books recently published</i>	814
5. <i>Contents of Periodical Publications</i>	825

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY

LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
AND NEW YORK: 15 EAST 16th STREET

1888

Price Five Shillings]

[All Rights Reserved

Notes and Documents

THE PARENTAGE OF GUNDRADA, WIFE OF WILLIAM OF WARREN.

It is well known that the first wife of William of Warren, first earl of Surrey and founder of Lewes priory, bore the name of Gundrada, and till 1846 she was generally, perhaps universally, believed to have been a daughter of William the Conqueror and his queen Matilda. Since 1846 her birth has been the subject of a good deal of controversy. The question is not a very important one in itself, but it is mixed up with a question of great historical interest and difficulty, namely, what was the ground for the papal prohibition of the marriage of William and Matilda. This last question, I venture to say, has not yet been answered. And a short time back I would not have said at all positively that the question about Gundrada herself had been answered. But a great deal of light has been thrown on the matter since 1846. And very lately indeed a further light has been thrown on it, by which a balance of likelihood which practically amounts to certainty has been left on a side which had even been thought of in 1846.

I examined all that had been said on the matter up to 1869 in the Appendix to the third volume of my History of the Norman Conquest published in that year. That appendix I reprinted with some needful additions in the second edition of that volume published in 1875. I will now first sum up the case as it stood then, and will afterwards go on with some notice of the course taken by the controversy since.

With regard to the marriage of William and Matilda, it is well known that it was forbidden by Pope Leo the Ninth and the council of Rheims in 1049. The words (Labbe, Concilia, vi. 1412) are, *Interdixit et Balduino comiti Flandrensi ne filiam suam Willelmo Normanno nuptui daret, et illi ne eam acciperet*. No reason is given for the order, but it comes among several other decrees dealing with irregular marriages. In 1049 then a marriage between William and Matilda was thought of, but had not yet been celebrated.

Ten years later (see the Life of Lanfranc, p. 289, ed. Giles), Pope Nicolas the Second, in the second Lateran Council in 1059, granted a dispensation confirming a marriage which had been already entered

into between William and Matilda. The date of the marriage therefore comes between 1049 and 1059. Of several dates which have been given or supposed to be given the only possible one is that in the Tours Chronicle, no great authority in itself, namely 1058. This date, as Mr. Stapleton has remarked, falls in singularly with the captivity of Pope Leo at the hands of the Normans of Apulia.

The reason for the prohibition is nowhere directly stated; but it is vaguely referred to by several writers as being, as we should expect, some ground of kindred or affinity. I have, in the Appendix already referred to, collected a good many modern opinions up to 1875; but I may safely say that the descent of William and Matilda from any common forefather had not been clearly made out then, and has not been clearly made out now. The truth is that the subject was one which was not liked in Normandy; the references to it in Norman writers are therefore few and vague, and the chief panegyrist of the Conqueror, William of Poitiers, nowhere hints that any objection was ever made to the marriage. On the other hand, in Flanders the courtship of William and Matilda became the subject of several legends.

These are the main certain facts with regard to the marriage. On the questions with regard to that marriage I do not propose at present to enter further, except so far as they bear on the birth of Gundrada, who used to be accepted as a daughter of William and Matilda. The facts about her, as far as they were known in 1875, were these.

1. On her tombstone at Lewes she was called *stirps ducum*.
2. In an alleged foundation charter of her husband (Monasticon, v. 12), he speaks of Queen Matilda as the mother of his wife, but not of King William as her father. His words are, *pro salute animæ meæ et animæ Gundredæ uxoris meæ et pro anima domini mei Willelmi regis qui me in Anglicam terram adduxit . . . et pro salute dominæ meæ Matildis reginæ matris uxoris meæ, et pro salute domini mei Willelmi regis filii sui*.
3. In a charter of the Conqueror himself to Lewes priory (Monasticon, v. 18), William is said to speak of Gundrada as his daughter (*pro anima Guilielmi de Warrenna et uxoris suæ Gundredæ filie meæ*).
4. In another Lewes document (Monasticon, v. 14), Matilda is called *mater Henrici regis et Gundredæ comitiſsæ*.
5. Gundrada is not mentioned in any list of the children of William and Matilda, nor is she spoken of as the king's daughter, or William of Warren as the king's son-in-law, in any writer of the time. But
6. She is spoken of by Orderic (522 c) as sister of Gerbod the Fleming, who was for a while earl of Chester. *Guillelmus de Guarenna qui Gundredam sororem Gherbodi conjugem habuit*.

It followed from all this that there was no evidence beyond that of the Lewes charters to make Gundrada a daughter either of William or of Matilda. Whatever other evidence there was looked the other way. In the epitaph, the words *stirps ducum* would be an odd way of describing the daughter of a king. The negative evidence, the lack of all reference to Gundrada's royal birth in any contemporary writer, would of course give way to the smallest direct positive evidence, but it would be very strong in the absence of such evidence. And if Orderic was right in calling Gundrada a sister of Gerbod, she could not have been the daughter of both William and Matilda; for Gerbod was assuredly not a son of William.

The first stage of the question then should have been, What was the value of the Lewes documents as evidence? and, What did their evidence prove, if we accepted them as genuine? But in 1875 the genuineness of the documents was generally accepted; only a certain doubt had been thrown on the reading of one of them. But there had been a good deal of controversy as to their meaning.

Now this is one of the cases in which the question of the meaning of a document and the question of its genuineness cannot be separated. An undoubtedly genuine contemporary charter, whose text has not been tampered with, is, for certain classes of facts, facts of genealogy conspicuously among them, the very highest evidence that can be had. But the documents in a cartulary, mere copies of original charters, are of far less authority. As copies, they are liable to mistake, and they may be actual forgeries. The amount of trust which we put in them depends largely on internal evidence. Now among these Lewes documents, the charter of the Conqueror was undoubtedly a real original; only it was alleged that the text had been tampered with. The charter of William of Warren and the others were at best copies, conceivably forgeries, which had to be taken at what they were worth. Speaking generally, they would be enough to prove any alleged fact against which there was no opposing evidence elsewhere; but if they contained statements contrary to well-established evidence elsewhere, we should be inclined to suspect, not the statements resting on such well-ascertained evidence elsewhere, but the genuineness of the documents which contradicted them.

In our present case the charter of the Conqueror, if its text was undoubtedly uncorrupted, was evidence of the very highest kind. And, accepting its text as uncorrupted, the obvious—not perhaps the necessary—inference certainly was that Gundrada was William's own daughter. For, if the text were genuine, he called her *filia mea*. But, in weighing the value of the other Lewes documents, it had to be considered what it was that they stated. From the alleged charter of William of Warren the most obvious inference certainly was that Gundrada was the daughter of Matilda, but not

the daughter of William. The way in which the grantor spoke of the king and queen was a very strange way for any man to speak of his wife's parents. He almost pointedly distinguished Queen Matilda the mother of his wife from King William—not the father of his wife, but the man by whom he himself was brought into England. The third Lewes document, if accepted, proved that Gundrada was Matilda's daughter, but it left the question open as to her father. And, with the strong likelihood which would thus seem to be established, the language of the Conqueror's charter, if accepted as genuine, did not seem necessarily to upset the obvious inferences from the charter of William of Warren. For King William to speak of Gundrada as his daughter did not absolutely prove that she might not have been the daughter of Matilda only. While no man was likely to speak of his wife's parents as William of Warren was made to speak of the king and queen, a man might easily speak of his step-daughter, his daughter for many purposes of law, as *filia mea*.

Now this inference was made the stronger by the fact that the words *filie mee* in the Conqueror's charter were affirmed to be an insertion in a different and a later hand. If this were so, it would of course at once take away any difficulties arising out of the language of that charter. The charter of William of Warren—no one had as yet doubted its genuineness—seemed to imply that Gundrada was the daughter of Matilda but not the daughter of William. The only mention of Gundrada anywhere else, the passage where Orderic spoke of her as the sister of Gerbod, looked the same way. The Lewes charter went far to show that William was not Gundrada's father. Orderic confirmed that showing, and further suggested a father for her. Whoever was the father of Gerbod must be the father of Gundrada. And this seemed further to imply that, before her marriage with William, Matilda had been married to the father of Gerbod and had borne him two children, Gerbod and Gundrada.

I do not know whether anybody had gone through this line of thought before 1846; but that year saw the results of a line of thought which could not have been very different. A paper on the parentage of Gundrada and the marriage of William and Matilda was then published by Mr. Stapleton in the *Archæological Journal*, iii. 1. Mr. Stapleton had studied Norman records as perhaps no other man had; no man better knew all the minute facts about Norman places and persons; but his power of arranging and making use of his facts was by no means equal to his diligence and acuteness in bringing his facts together. He was one of those writers who hopelessly jumble together statement, argument, and conclusion, so that it was not always easy to see what his conclusions were. He never made a clear statement of what he was trying to prove; he would assume the thing to be proved in a casual kind of way while

still in the act of proving it. He seemed never to see the difficulties on the other side, and he seemed to think that anything that he asserted was proved unless it could be directly contradicted. The very title of the paper was strange, puzzling, and misleading. It ran thus:

Observations in disproof of the pretended marriage of William de Warren, earl of Surrey, with a daughter begotten of Matildis, daughter of Baldwin, comte of Flanders, by William the Conqueror, and illustrative of the origin and early history of the family in Normandy.

Now to say nothing of other queernesses, this heading would never have suggested to any one the real object of the paper. A reader altogether ignorant of the matter would certainly have thought that Mr. Stapleton's object was to disprove a 'pretended marriage' of William of Warren; that is, to show that he did not marry somebody, not to prove something about the parentage of a wife whom he did marry. And such a reader would hardly take in that 'Matildis, daughter of Baldwin, comte of Flanders,' was no other than the duchess of the Normans and queen of the English. I really think that the most obvious meaning of Mr. Stapleton's heading would be that somebody had said that William of Warren married a natural daughter of King William, and that Mr. Stapleton wished to prove that he did not marry her.

But Mr. Stapleton's purpose was very different from this. His object was to fix, in his own way of fixing, the parentage of Gundrada, to show that she was not the daughter of King William, to show whose daughter she was, and to fix the circumstances and causes of the papal prohibition of King William's marriage with her mother. It was hard work indeed—I said so in 1869 and in 1875—to disentangle Mr. Stapleton's conclusions from his arguments and his casual assertions. But, as far as I understood him, he seemed to wish to lay down three propositions.

First, Matilda of Flanders, before her marriage with Duke William, was married to Gerbod, advocate of Saint-Bertin, and had by him three children, Gundrada, Gerbod, and a certain Frederic, who appears several times in the second volume of Domesday.

Secondly, the ecclesiastical objection to the marriage of William and Matilda was not owing—at least not wholly owing—to any kindred or affinity between them, but to the fact that Matilda, at the time of William's courtship, had a husband still living.

Thirdly, the delay in the celebration of the marriage was caused by the necessity of obtaining a divorce between Gerbod and Matilda.

It will be at once seen that the second and third of these propositions stand quite apart from the first. For the first Mr. Stapleton had really strong ground to go upon, as long as nobody doubted the alleged charter of William of Warren. The charter gave Gundrada a mother in Queen Matilda; Orderic gave her a

father in the father of Earl Gerbod, that is, as Mr. Stapleton showed, the elder Gerbod the advocate. But the two latter propositions were in no way needed to establish the first, and Mr. Stapleton brought no real proof of them whatever. Considering the marriage of Gerbod and Matilda to be established, the most obvious supposition was that, at the time of Matilda's marriage to William, she was Gerbod's widow.

Mr. Stapleton's doctrine did not long remain unchallenged. In the thirty-second volume of the *Archæologia* (1847), p. 108, appeared an article headed, 'Remarks on Matilda, Queen of William the Conqueror, and her daughter Gundrada.' This was the work of the South-Saxon antiquary Mr. W. H. Blaauw, a writer whose services to English history have never been appreciated as they deserved. He was perhaps bound, as a Sussex man, to say something on behalf of the Lewes tradition; and he defended it in full, making Gundrada the daughter of William as well as of Matilda. Mr. Stapleton had pointed out that in the alleged charter of King William, quoted to show that Gundrada was his daughter, the words *filie mee* were written in a different hand instead of some words which had become illegible. He held that the true reading was *pro anima Guillelmi de Warennæ et uxoris sue Gondrade pro me et heredibus meis*. Mr. Blaauw read it, *pro anima Guillelmi de Warennæ et uxoris sue Gondrade filie mee et heredum suorum*. He brought some strong objections to Mr. Stapleton's reading *pro me et heredibus meis*, and, while admitting that the words *filie mee* were an insertion in a later hand, he maintained that they were inserted simply to preserve the original reading when it had become illegible by the folding of the manuscript. On some points he attacked Mr. Stapleton's theory with much force, showing the utter lack of any direct proof for it, especially for the notion of a divorce, and enlarging on the fact that all the accounts of William's courtship speak of Matilda as a maid, *puella, pucele, demoiselle*. He set aside Orderic's description of Gundrada as Gerbod's sister as one of his occasional mistakes in genealogy. But perhaps the most valuable part of Mr. Blaauw's inquiry lay in this, that he saw that the right place to go to for any further information in the shape of charters was Cluny the mother church of Lewes. The Lewes documents, or copies of them, would naturally be sent thither, and there was distinct evidence that they were. Mr. Blaauw himself mentioned (p. 123; *Monasticon*, v. p. 12) that at one time, in William Rufus' reign, the monks of Lewes had no charter, the document being at Cluny. And Mr. Blaauw further printed one document from Cluny, of which we have heard a good deal since, but the importance of which neither he nor any one else seemed to see at the time. This was no other than a genuine charter older than any strictly Lewes document, namely an original grant of Earl William to Cluny itself before his foundation

of the dependent house at Lewes, with the confirmation of King William. The force of this undoubted and uncorrupted document is distinct. In it neither King William nor William of Warren, though both mention Gundrada, makes the slightest reference to her having any kindred either to the king or to the queen. In her husband's charter she is simply *Gundreda uxor mea*; he and she act *consilio et assensu domini nostri regis Anglorum Guillelmi*; King William acts *rogantibus et obnixè postulantibus Willelmo de Warennâ et uxore ejus Gundreda*. The signatures (other than those of mere witnesses which are put separately) are in this form and order.

'Signum Willelmi regis Anglorum.
Signum M. regine Anglorum.
S. Willelmi comitis filii regis.
Signum Willelmi de Warennâ.
S. Gundrede uxoris W. de Warennâ.'

(The application of the title of 'comes' to William Rufus is of importance, but it does not touch our present question.) That Mr. Blaauw could print all this without seeing how it bore on his argument, and especially on the question about the reading *filie mee*, was certainly very wonderful; but so it is.

Thus in 1847 the documentary evidence stood thus. There was a document, not original but a copy, the alleged charter of Earl William to Lewes, which called Queen Matilda the mother of Gundrada, but did not call King William her father. There was a genuine document, the charter of King William to Lewes, in which the king seemed to call Gundrada his daughter; but the reading was, to say the least, very doubtful. There was an undoubted and uncorrupted document, the charter of Earl William to Cluny, with King William's confirmation, a document in which, if Gundrada had been the king's daughter, it would have been natural to call her so, but in which she was not so called, either by her herself or her husband or her alleged father.

In 1858 appeared Mrs. Green's 'Lives of the Princesses of England,' in which she gave a chapter to Gundrada without accepting her as the Conqueror's daughter. Mrs. Green pointed out the lack of any mention of Gundrada anywhere but at Lewes, save only the passage in Orderic which called her Gerbod's sister. She pointed out that the reading in the Lewes charter of King William was doubtful, and that the charter of William of Warren only went to prove Gundrada to be the daughter of the queen and not of the king. She saw further the force of the use of *ducum*, not *regum*, on Gundrada's tomb. On the whole, she gave a very good summary of the arguments that had been hitherto brought on each side; but she failed, like Mr. Blaauw himself, to see the part in the argument which should have been played by the Cluny document which

had been printed by Mr. Blaauw, and which is actually referred to by herself. Mrs. Green leaned on the whole to the belief that Gundrada was Matilda's daughter, but not William's; but she saw the difficulties involved in that belief.

I next come to myself. And I must here do penance openly before all men, for not having seen, any more than Mr. Blaauw or Mrs. Green, the value of the all-important piece of evidence which Mr. Blaauw had brought to light from Cluny. I went fully into, I believe, every other side of the question in the Appendix to which I have already referred. I there drew out Mr. Stapleton's theory in the form of three propositions, as I have stated it here, and I distinctly said that of those propositions I accepted the first and rejected the second and third. That is to say, I accepted Gundrada as a daughter of Matilda, but not a daughter of William, and also as sister of the younger Gerbod. The inference I drew was that Matilda, at the time of her marriage with Duke William, was the widow of the elder Gerbod. I argued against the other points of Mr. Stapleton's theory, for which I could see no kind of evidence. I went through several opinions as to the cause of the prohibition of the marriage of William and Matilda, and set forth my own belief that it must have been some ground of kindred or affinity, though I held that it had not been clearly shown what that ground of kindred or affinity was. On a very small matter, I pointed out that the Frederic whom Mr. Stapleton made a third child of Gerbod and Matilda was really the brother of William of Warren, not the brother of Gundrada.

My general position was then on the whole very much that of Mrs. Green, though I went much more fully into the arguments than she did. I did not then doubt the authority of any of the Lewes documents. The alleged charter of William of Warren seemed to me to be very strong proof that Gundrada was the queen's daughter but not the king's; no man, I argued, would draw the strange distinction between his wife's mother and her father which William of Warren is there made to draw between the queen and the king. And I argued that the Lewes charter of King William did not go against this. The reading *filie mee* was very doubtful, and, if genuine, it was a way in which a man might very likely speak of his step-daughter. The charter of Earl William to Cluny and its confirmation by King William, by what ill-luck I know not, I wholly passed by.

In that Appendix I argued against Mr. Blaauw on several points. He had spoken slightly of the authority of Orderic on matters of genealogy, and specially of the confusion which he (like many others) made about William's daughters. I answered that the mere omission of Gundrada's name in any of his lists would prove very little against her being William's daughter, but

that a great deal was proved by the fact that, the only time when she was mentioned at all, she was mentioned in a way in which nobody would ever have spoken of a daughter of the king, namely as sister of Gerbod. And I argued also against Mr. Blaauw's strongest point, namely the absence of any evidence (out of Lewes) for Matilda's former marriage, and the fact that Matilda, at the time of her marriage with William, is expressly spoken of as a maid. I pointed out the doubtful and mythical character of some of the stories of William's courtship; but I chiefly relied on two parallel cases in which an earlier marriage which it was inconvenient to dwell on had been hushed up in the like sort. Duke Robert, the Conqueror's father, married Estrith sister of Cnut; no Norman writer mentions the fact. So in the *Encomium Emmae* or *Gesta Cnutonis*, the first marriage of Emma with Æthelred is altogether left out; her children by Æthelred are turned into children of Cnut, and she is daringly called *virgo* at the time of her second marriage. From this I argued that the fact that no one mentioned any marriage of Matilda with Gerbod, and even the fact that she was called a maid at the time of her marriage with William, did not disprove, what I held to be established by other evidence, that Matilda had been married to Gerbod and was by him the mother of Gundrada.

When I look at my own arguments of twenty years back, they seem to me to be—assuming what was then the common ground of all disputants, the authority of the Lewes documents—satisfactory on all points but one. I made, I repeat it, the same strange omission as Mr. Blaauw himself. I did not see the force of the Cluny document printed by Mr. Blaauw. I could hardly have passed it by altogether; there it is in Mr. Blaauw's paper, which I had certainly read. I can only suppose that I looked on Earl William's charter and King William's confirmation as showing that Gundrada was no daughter of William, but as not inconsistent with her being a daughter of Matilda. Still it is strange that I did not bring the document into my argument.

The next person, as far as I know, to bring the matter up again was Sir George Duckett in the 'Sussex Archæological Collections' for 1878, p. 114. His position was the old local one that Gundrada was not only the daughter of Queen Matilda but of King William also. He accepted the Lewes documents as they stand, defending the genuineness of the words *filie mee* in King William's grant. He also gave another quotation which I do not remember to have seen elsewhere.

'In the Ledger Book of Lewes are these words:

Iste (William de Warenne) primo non vocabatur nisi solummodo Willielmus de Warenna, postea vero processu temporis a Willielmo rege et conquestore Anglia, cujus filiam desponsavit, plurime honoratus est.
(Watson's Memoirs, i. 36.)

Sir George Duckett did not tell us the date of the 'Ledger Book,' and the reference to Watson's Memoirs gave me no light. He seemingly saw no difficulty in the way in which William of Warren is made in the charter to speak of the alleged parents of his wife, and he speaks of the phrase *stirps Gundrada ducum* as 'conclusive of her *affinity* to the Conqueror.' By this last phrase I presume that Sir George Duckett meant the opposite to what he said, as it was the *affinity* of Gundrada to the Conqueror, asserted by Mr. Stapleton, against which he was arguing. He then went on to fix the marriage of William and Matilda to 1049, the year of Pope Leo's prohibition. They could not have been married so late as 1053, as otherwise Gundrada could not have been born soon enough. He alluded, but without quoting or giving the reference, to a passage of William of Jumièges (vii. 26) which runs thus :

Willelmus dux a quibusdam religiosis sæpius redarguebatur, eo quod cognatam suam sibi in matrimonio copulasset, missis legatis Romanum papam super hac re consuluit.

William of Jumièges goes on to add that the pope (who is not named) feared a war between Normandy and Flanders if William and Matilda were obliged to part; he therefore absolved them on their founding the two abbeys at Caen. Hence Sir George Duckett inferred that 'it was not till *after the marriage* that the fact of their near relationship was brought to the knowledge of the pope.' He did not explain how this was consistent with the *prohibition* of the marriage by Leo.

Sir George Duckett further told us: 'That William of Normandy was Matilda's first and only husband is plain from the following facts.' The facts were the legend of Brihtric (which I have fully examined in the Appendix to vol. iv.), whom Sir George Duckett made a 'son of Earl Algar,' that is a brother of Eadwine and Morkere. We were referred to 'Thierry's "Conquest of England," i. 428 (Hazlitt),' a reference which I was and am unable to make, and which sounds like a translation. Sir George Duckett then collected the passages in which Matilda is called *puella* and the like, but without noticing the light thrown on them by the application of the same kind of language to the undoubtedly widowed Emma. Lastly, he ruled that, when Orderic speaks of Gundrada as *soror Gerbodi*, he must have meant 'foster sister,' and he added a discourse on fosterage. Gundrada, it seems, was William's daughter, but put to nurse with the wife of the advocate Gerbod. He ended with the conclusion that he had 'thus adduced different unanswerable arguments in favour of the royal parentage of Gundrada.' Of the charter to Cluny printed by Mr. Blaauw he had never a word to say.

I can hardly fancy that this kind of argument was likely to make many converts. But both the doctrine of Mr. Stapleton and

the elder one which had found a defender in Sir George Duckett were presently to be vigorously attacked. This was by Mr. Chester Waters, than whom no man better deserves to be listened to on any point of genealogy, especially of the Norman genealogy of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Mr. Waters wrote two letters in the *Academy* on 28 December 1878 and 24 May 1879, the latter in answer to a letter of mine in February called forth by his former one. Mr. Waters' position was that Gundrada was no daughter either of William or of Matilda, a position which he was the first to assert. He remarked that there was no evidence connecting her with either except the Lewes documents. Of these he accepted the charter of the Conqueror as genuine, holding of course the words *filie mee* to be a spurious insertion. But now came the real turning-point of the controversy. Mr. Waters was the first to put the controversy on its real ground by seeing how very slight was the value of the other Lewes documents, among them of the alleged charter of Earl William. None of those who had said anything before him, neither Mr. Stapleton nor Mr. Blaauw nor myself, seems to have remembered how little a document which is in any case a copy and which may be a forgery proves when there is any evidence the other way. Mr. Waters then went about to prove his position that Gundrada was not the daughter either of William or of Matilda in a way which to me at least was a little startling. He brought no direct evidence, positive or negative, but referred to a letter of Saint Anselm (Lib. iv. ep. 84) to King Henry the First. This contained nothing directly about Gundrada's parentage, but it mentioned a proposed marriage between her son, the younger Earl William of Warren, and a natural daughter of the king. It is plain that, if Gundrada were the daughter either of William or of Matilda, her son and Henry's daughter would be first cousins. Anselm forbade the marriage on the ground of kindred; but he made no mention of this near kindred; he spoke only of one much further off, namely that they were in the fourth *generation* of kindred on one side and in the sixth *generation* on the other. *Cum ipse et filia vestra ex una parte sint cognati in quarta generatione et ex altera in sexta.* Mr. Waters held that this fully proved that Gundrada was not a daughter of either William or Matilda, that is, not a sister or half-sister of Henry the First. He did not say directly how this proved the point; but I understood his argument to be that Anselm would not have forbidden the marriage on the ground of a distant degree of kindred when he could have forbidden it on the ground of a much nearer degree. That is, he would not have used a weaker argument when he might have used a stronger. This is undoubtedly a very strong presumption; but it would hardly upset any good direct evidence. But the main question of all was now started, Are any of the Lewes documents, except the charter of the Conqueror in

its genuine text, to be reckoned as good evidence? Only again there was nothing said about the charter to Cluny.

Mr. Waters went further into the twofold kindred between King Henry's daughter and the son of William of Warren and Gundrada. The kindred in the sixth degree he saw in the descent of the King's daughter from Gunnor the wife of Richard the Fearless and of Earl William from a sister of Gunnor. And he illustrated the meaning of *generatio* by two letters of Ivo bishop of Chartres (45 and 46). The first concerned the marriage of Robert count of Meulan to Isabel of Vermandois (see Orderic, 729 D, and my William Rufus, i. 551), which was allowed by dispensation; the second touched the marriage of Baldwin the Seventh of Flanders, who hardly concerns us on his own account. It seems plain that, by *sexta generatio* and such like phrases, Anselm and Ivo meant strictly the sixth *generation* of pedigree, and not what we should call the sixth *degree* of kindred. Only then how could anybody have married anybody? One does not wonder that King Henry of France sought for a wife in Russia.

But there still was the kindred on the other side—that is, through Gundrada—between Gundrada's son and King Henry's daughter. In Mr. Waters' view Gundrada, sister of the younger Gerbod, was daughter of the elder; but he did not provide her with a mother. He suggested that the advocate Gerbod was in some way descended from the ducal house of Burgundy, which would account for his daughter being called *stirps ducum*. This was avowedly a conjecture, but Mr. Waters brought several incidental points to show its likelihood. He lastly remarked that, as Gundrada's son Reginald took a prominent part in the siege of Rouen in 1090, she may have been nearly as old as her supposed mother Matilda. But, on Mr. Stapleton's theory, she must have been born before 1049, which would make her old enough for the purpose.

The next writer on the subject, as far as I know, was Mr. Martin Rule in his 'Life and Times of Saint Anselm,' published in 1883. He discussed the subject in vol. i. p. 415. I wrote a review of the book in the *Academy*, which led to a published letter or two from the author. Mr. Rule was a controversialist of a singular kind. That he had a good opinion of himself and his work was perhaps no more than is proved when any one of us puts forth any printed writing; only Mr. Rule, like Southey, expressed that good opinion a little more directly than is usual. And Mr. Rule had clearly worked hard in some out-of-the-way sources, though he sometimes strangely missed the most obvious authorities. It was as hard to make out his conclusions as those of Mr. Stapleton: sometimes one had to patch them together out of casual scraps up and down the book. He put forth surmises for which he allowed that he

had no evidence as if they were truths that had never been doubted ; he disputed in a dark and mysterious fashion, sometimes implying that he knew things which he would not tell, sometimes implying that the disputant on the other side was hiding things in the like sort. He was always supposing some deep and hidden purpose in his adversary ; in a passage where I thought that I was speaking as the simplest seeker after truth, he ' noticed my rhetorical devices and passed on.' This was in the book, before I had written my review of him ; for Mr. Rule, I know not why, was very angry with me even then. I think I can live through his anger ; but it is hard to have one's careful statement of a case altogether misrepresented. I had drawn out Mr. Stapleton's three propositions ; I accepted one, but I rejected two, among them the very important one that Matilda had a husband living at the time of her marriage with William. This Mr. Rule called adopting Mr. Stapleton's argument 'with slight but immaterial modifications.' And elsewhere, more hardly still, so much of Mr. Stapleton's view as I did adopt was called 'Mr. Freeman's conjecture.' But I will leave personal matters, and deal as well as I can with Mr. Rule's position in the controversy, so far as I can make it out from his very singular fashion of statement and argument.

Mr. Rule then, as far as I understand him, accepted all the Lewes documents—the Cluny charter again he did not touch—but held that they were to be taken in a mystical sense. Gundrada was not the child, but the godchild, of both William and Matilda. Hence the words *mater* and *filia*. Without any reference to Mr. Waters, Mr. Rule quoted the same letters of Anselm and Ivo which Mr. Waters had already quoted, and dismissed them with the mysterious remark that 'there is little need to consult Yvo of Chartres or the "Acta Conciliorum ;" for the information I need may be obtained from domestic sources.' It was almost more mysterious when Mr. Rule told us :

William the Bastard was in the fifth degree of descent from Duke Rollo, and Matilda was also descended from Duke Rollo through Adela the wife of her great-grandfather Hugh Capet.

By the law under which they lived William and Matilda were *consanguinei*. I have not stated that law, and have no more to say about it.

This was hardly enough to satisfy an eager craving after knowledge. By Adela wife of Hugh Capet might possibly be meant Adela granddaughter of Hugh Capet and mother of Matilda, who was said to have been married or contracted to William's uncle Duke Richard the Third. This was one of the ways in which the kindred or affinity of William and Matilda had been explained, and I examined the subject in my Appendix, p. 657. But this did not trace Matilda's pedigree up to Rolf. And when Mr. Rule was pressed on that head (see *Academy*, 10 March 1883) it appeared that he 'had no

more to say about it.' For all the answer that he gave (*Academy*, 31 March 1883) was this:

Nor will it avail him to ask me for the pedigree of William and Matilda. Mr. Freeman can trace their descent from Duke Rollo without my assistance.

The descent of William the Conqueror from Rolf I could certainly trace without anybody's assistance. As to the descent of Matilda from Rolf I was altogether in the dark—I am altogether in the dark still—and Mr. Rule refused to enlighten me.

Mr. Rule had also a discovery of his own, to show who Gundrada was. In the Bermondsey Annals, under the year 1098, a certain *Ricardus Guet, frater comitissæ Warennæ*, appears as a benefactor of that abbey (see Planché, 'Conqueror and his Companions,' i. 136). This had been taken as giving Gerbod and Matilda yet another son. Mr. Rule made Gundrada the sister of Richard 'Wet or Wette;' but he did not say how this made her *stirps ducum*.

The next year, 1884, Mr. Waters came on the field again. He put forth a little book, dedicated to Bishop Stubbs, headed 'Gundrada de Warrenne' (Exeter, Pollard). In this he went again through his main arguments in the *Academy*, repeating more distinctly his conviction of the spuriousness of the alleged charter of William of Warren and of the inserted words *filie mee* in the genuine charter of King William. He then disposed of Sir George Duckett's notion about *soror* meaning 'foster-sister.' He next came to Mr. Rule, whom he cruelly spoke of as 'the last and worst writer on Gundred's parentage.' He showed that the meaning which Mr. Rule gave to *mater* and *filia* was impossible, and reminded him—Mr. Rule was scrupulous about canon law—that, as a man and his wife could not (for obvious reasons) be godparents to the same child, Gundrada could not be (in this sense) *filia* to William, if Matilda was (in this sense) *mater* to Gundrada. Mr. Waters was no better able than I was to trace the descent of Matilda from Rolf; but he did what I could not have done, he explained the reference to Richard Guet in the Bermondsey Annals. The Countess of Warren there spoken of was not Gundrada, but a second wife of Earl William, a daughter of the house of Goet, lords of Mont Mirail. Mr. Waters lastly expressed his belief that the matter might be fully cleared up from the records of Cluny. He did not seem to have noticed, any more than I had noticed, how much Mr. Blaauw had already unconsciously done towards clearing up the matter from that source.

In 1886 Sir George Duckett came forward again in several shapes, to do, yet more unconsciously than Mr. Blaauw, what Mr. Waters had suggested might be done. He appeared in Sussex, in Yorkshire, and in a privately printed volume. What he said in Yorkshire

I know only from a writing of Mr. Waters ; but from that I presume that it was much the same as he said in Sussex. He there ('Sussex Archæological Collections,' xxxiv. 121) took no notice of either Mr. Rule or Mr. Waters, and he still clave to the belief that Gundrada was the daughter of William and Matilda. But Sir George Duckett did more. He printed again, with no small rejoicing, as altogether a fresh discovery, the charter of Earl William to Cluny with the confirmation of King William, the same which Mr. Blaauw had printed thirty-nine years before. His text was in some things more correct than Mr. Blaauw's ; he printed the original contractions ; he filled up with the name *Scanberga* a blank which Mr. Blaauw seemingly could not read ; he filled up with the word *faciunt* another blank where Mr. Blaauw had guessed *construxerunt*, and he corrected *donavimus* into *donamus*. But in all material points, in everything that proved anything, Sir George Duckett's text was Mr. Blaauw's text over again. Yet its printing was a direct gain ; for somehow or other both Mr. Waters and myself, and I dare say others as well, began, as soon as the charter was printed by Sir George Duckett, to give to it the heed which we had so unluckily failed to give to it when it was printed by Mr. Blaauw. We became more alive to the fact that in this undoubtedly genuine document, the text of which had never been tampered with, neither King William nor Earl William had a word to say about Earl William's wife being King William's daughter, while Gundrada herself signed in a way in which a daughter of King William never could have signed. This was perhaps not exactly the result which Sir George Duckett looked for from his labours, but we could thank him for it all the same.

In the 'Sussex Archæological Collections' Sir George Duckett added a note which was a little mysterious :

Researches in the archives of Cluni have not only resulted in the above deed of gift, but in a yet more important record, the *Inspeximus* and exemplification of Earl Warenne's charter of foundation. This attested and collated copy conclusively ends further controversy as to the words *matris uxoris meæ*. There is no room for further argument on that head.

Surely it was hard to draw this tempting picture of a document which was to prove so much, and not to let us profit by it, even in the shape of a translation or a summary. This is what Sir George Duckett did, as far as the Sussex Archæological Transactions were concerned. He told us about the '*Inspeximus* and exemplification,' but, so far from printing them, he did not distinctly tell us in what direction all further controversy was conclusively ended. We had to infer their contents from Sir George Duckett's abiding belief in Gundrada as the daughter of both king and queen. But the revelation which was deemed too precious for the public eye, or at

least for the South-Saxon eye, was made open to a select few in the shape of a thin privately printed volume: 'Record Evidences among Archives of the Ancient Abbey of Cluni. By Sir G. F. Duckett, Bart. Printed for the author, 1886.' Here we learned all about the '*Inspecimus* and exemplification,' which were printed in full. The copy of the alleged charter with which we had hitherto been dealing was made in 1444; the '*Inspecimus* and exemplification' was a little earlier. It was made in 1417 by Thomas Nelond, prior of Lewes, and it professes to contain copies of the foundation charter of Lewes priory by the first Earl William of Warren, and of the confirmation of it by his son the second earl. This last Sir George Duckett did not print; but he printed part of the other; 'the parts,' he says, 'which appear of most interest.' So far, it was, as Sir George Duckett said, word for word with the later copy with which we had been dealing all along. It therefore contained the passage which spoke of Queen Matilda as the mother of the earl's wife and the passage which did not speak of King William as her father.

We now knew, by Sir George Duckett's help, what the Cluny records really supplied. We now knew what the whole of our documentary evidence was. There was, as we knew or might have known before, a genuine charter of King William which did not call Gundrada his daughter, but which practically implied that she was not his daughter. There was also, what we knew in another shape, a fifteenth century copy of an alleged charter of Earl William which called Queen Matilda the mother of Gundrada, but which did not call King William her father. That is to say, the evidence was much the same as it was after the publication of Mr. Blaauw's paper; only we knew more certainly that there was no undoubted contemporary evidence to make Gundrada the daughter of Matilda. For Sir George Duckett had shown that all the documents which called her so were at best copies made in the fifteenth century.

I suppose that Mr. Waters could hardly have wished for anything more to his purpose than these discoveries—for in a certain sense they really are discoveries—of Sir George Duckett. Yet it turned out that there was at least one man besides Sir George Duckett who thought otherwise. A review of Sir George Duckett's privately printed volume appeared in the *Academy* for August 28 1886, under the signature of 'W. Sykes.' The writer seemed to know nothing of any stage of the controversy earlier than the appearance of Mr. Waters, who was in his eyes the first person who had doubted that Gundrada was the daughter of both the king and the queen. Mr. Waters had 'invented a theory;' but his theory had 'failed to meet with general acceptance, owing to its being in direct contradiction to all ancient documents containing mention of Gundreda's name.' Mr. Waters had suggested that the document

which contained the words *matris uxoris mee* were what Mr. Sykes calls a 'monkish forgery.' This charge, according to Mr. Sykes, was 'disposed of' by Sir George Duckett's discovery of another fifteenth century copy a little older than the fifteenth century copy which was already known. Mr. Sykes also spoke of the 'oldest deed of all—the original grant of Earl William'—that is, his grant to Cluny—without saying a word as to the evidence which it supplied.

In the same year, 1886, Mr. Waters put forth a 'Postscript' to his little book on Gundrada, pointing out the way in which the Cluny documents went to strengthen his view and not that of Sir George Duckett. But Mr. Waters still spoke of Mr. Blaauw's old discovery, the first charter of Earl William with King William's confirmation as 'brought to light'—as in a certain sense it was—by the 'researches' of Sir George Duckett. Still, better late than never, he pointed out, what we ought all to have seen forty years ago, that the Cluny charter was as distinct against Gundrada being William's daughter as any piece of indirect or negative evidence could be. He also pointed out, what also had not before occurred to himself or to anybody else, that the passage in Orderic was not the only place in which Gundrada was spoken of as Gerbod's sister. He quoted another passage from that singular history printed in the 'Liber de Hyda,' many of whose statements it is impossible to believe, but all whose statements are worth examining, as their writer's account seems always independent. At pp. 295, 296, the Hyde writer has a good deal to say about Gerbod and his brother Frederic, and he speaks of Gerbod as a brother of Gundrada. The book was not printed till 1866; so the earlier writers could not make any use of it. I made use of its statements about Gerbod, Frederic, and William of Warren in the narrative in my fourth volume (pp. 470, 585, ed. 2), but I seem not to have noticed them when I wrote the Appendix to the third. Mr. Waters was the first to bring these statements into the present controversy. As for their value, the Hyde writer is yet more likely to make a mistake than Orderic, but he is not likely to have copied from Orderic, and the two were not likely to make the same mistake. And after all the value of the statement that Gerbod and Gundrada were brother and sister was negative. We were not trying to prove that Gundrada was Gerbod's sister, but that she was not King William's daughter, and for that purpose even a mistaken statement of her sisterhood to Gerbod would prove a good deal. If she had been the daughter of the king and queen, it could not have come into any man's head to speak of her as sister of Gerbod; no one would speak in that way of Countess Adela or any other of the king's known daughters. Two independent statements that Gundrada was sister of Gerbod went a long way indeed to show that she was not the daughter of King William.

Mr. Waters went on with some matter about William of Warren's earldom, and about the various spellings of the name, Warren, Warrenne, Warenne, and any other—I have always, writing in English, used the common English form. He lastly summed up the evidence from his own point of view. But he should not have spoken of 'the judicial declaration of Archbishop Anselm that Gundrada was not the king's daughter.' Anselm did not say a word about her being the king's daughter or not. He forbade a marriage between Gundrada's son and King Henry's daughter on grounds which he was not likely to have taken if Henry and Gundrada had been brother and sister. But he made no 'judicial declaration' as to Gundrada's parentage. According to Mr. Waters' case, a 'judicial declaration' that Gundrada was not the king's daughter could not have been needed, because nobody had thought that she was.

Lastly, in this present year 1888 Sir George Duckett has appeared yet again, in the shape of two volumes of 'Cluni Charters and Records.' They are still not for the general public, but only 'for subscribers.' But the adventurous will find them in the Bodleian. I have gone thither to look at them, but I did not find anything on our matters which was not in Sir George Duckett's smaller book. I did however look at some other matters, and I found that Sir George Duckett, as a maker of cribs, runs the most eminent performers in that line very hard. It is a light matter to translate *Dux Normannorum* and other titles of that class by 'Duke of Normandy' and the like; but it would need real genius to outdo the translation of *reges Latini* by 'kings of the Latin Empire.'

And now what is the state of the controversy? Very different certainly from what it was when I discussed the matter in 1869 or even in 1875. The evidence now stands thus.

1. No original writer asserts or implies that Gundrada was the daughter either of King William or of Queen Matilda.

2. Two independent writers call her the sister of Gerbod, which is inconsistent with her being the daughter of King William.

3. Saint Anselm, in forbidding the marriage of Gundrada's son with King Henry's daughter, speaks in a way in which he is most unlikely to have spoken if Henry and Gundrada had been brother and sister.

4. The ages of Gundrada's sons, the younger of whom played a distinguished part in 1090, make it unlikely that she was the daughter of parents who were certainly not married in 1049, and were most likely not married till 1058.

5. The tombstone of Gundrada calls her *stirps ducum*, which is not likely if she had been the daughter of a king.

6. In an undoubted charter of Gundrada's husband, confirmed by King William, she is spoken of simply as the wife of William of

Warren, not as the daughter of King William, and she signs in a way in which a daughter of King William would not have signed.

7. In another undoubted charter of King William, he appears to speak of her as his daughter; but the words which call her so are inserted in a later hand.

8. There are several Lewes documents which directly call Queen Matilda the mother of Gundrada, but which do not call King William her father. But none of these documents are originals; they are all at best copies of the fifteenth century.

Now, in weighing the force of this evidence, we may safely put aside the notion that the words *soror*, *mater*, *filia*, are to be taken in some mystical or metaphorical sense, to express, not natural kindred, but artificial affinity by gossipred or fosterage. We may be sure that *soror* means 'sister,' that *mater* means 'mother,' that *filia* means 'daughter,' in the ordinary and natural meaning of those words. Those words were all likely enough to be used in addressing persons who stood in the relation of gossipred or fosterage; they would not be so used in legal documents or in ordinary narrative. If either William of Warren or the monks of Lewes in his name called Queen Matilda the mother of Gundrada, the meaning intended to be conveyed was that she was her mother. When Orderic and the Hyde writer called Gundrada sister of Gerbod, they meant that she was his sister. Above all, Mr. Waters has unanswerably disposed of Mr. Rule's astonishing notion that Matilda could have been *mater* to Gundrada, and Gundrada at the same time *filia* to William in the sense of spiritual affinity. Such a relation as Mr. Rule implies would make the birth of our English Ætheling Henry many degrees more improper than the birth of his father the Bastard. The only conceivable question is as to the force of *filia*, in case any one still looks on that word as part of King William's charter to Lewes. I still think, as I thought in 1869, that that word alone would not upset Mr. Stapleton's doctrine; it might surely be used of a step-daughter. On the other hand, considering the early ages at which girls were married, I do not see much strength in the argument which I have marked 4. But Mr. Waters' case can do very well without it.

As the evidence now stands, there is really no ground either for the old belief that Gundrada was the daughter of King William and Queen Matilda, or for Mr. Stapleton's doctrine, which I formerly adopted, that she was the daughter of Matilda but not the daughter of William. There is absolutely nothing to make her William's daughter, except the words *filie mee* said to be in King William's charter to Lewes. Those words are not inconsistent with Mr. Stapleton's theory; but then their genuineness is so doubtful, or rather their spuriousness is so clear, that they are of no value to

support any theory. We may say without any kind of doubt that Gundrada was not the daughter of William. She is nowhere called the king's daughter, nor is her husband called his son-in-law, even where it would have been most obvious, as in the Cluny charter, to call them so. In the only two passages of any writers where she is mentioned, she is not called the daughter of William, but the sister of Gerbod. Her tombstone records her descent from dukes, not her birth as the daughter of a king. If she was the king's daughter, no one had the slightest interest in denying the fact; many people had an interest in asserting it. It is wonderful indeed that, if it had been so, the fact should have remained unknown, or at least unrecorded, everywhere beyond the precincts of Lewes priory. And when we get within those precincts, we find nothing but a charter, genuine indeed in the rest of its matter, but whose text has been tampered with on this particular point. After this, with no real evidence on one side, with so much evidence on the other, we may set aside the notion of Gundrada being King William's daughter as so unlikely, so devoid of all proof, that we may fairly call it impossible; and surely it is not that kind of impossible which makes one say *credo quia impossibile*.

We now come to the documents contained in the Lewes cartulary, and above all to the alleged foundation charter of William of Warren, and as to the amount of value to be attached to them. Now, first of all, if these documents be trustworthy, what do they prove? They clearly tell in favour of Mr. Stapleton, not of Mr. Blaauw or of Sir George Duckett. It was the alleged charter of William of Warren which made me formerly accept the theory of Mr. Stapleton. A genuine document which called Matilda the mother of Gundrada, but which did not call William her father, would, when coupled with the description of Gundrada as sister of Gerbod, certainly go a long way towards the belief that Gundrada was the daughter of Matilda and of the father of Gerbod. That is, it would go a long way to prove that Matilda, when she married William, was the widow of the elder Gerbod. It must be distinctly understood, what does not seem always to be understood, that this document can never be quoted to prove that Gundrada was William's daughter: if it is allowed to prove anything, it proves quite the other way. Only can it be allowed to prove anything? That is the point on which the whole question is now brought to turn. The later document from Lewes and the earlier document from Cluny are both confessedly not originals. They may be true copies of originals or they may be forgeries. Now we should naturally assume them to be true copies, if there was no reason to think otherwise. Only is there not reason enough to think otherwise? If Gundrada and Gerbod were the children of Matilda by a former marriage with the elder Gerbod, how is it

that there is no mention anywhere of such marriage or parentage? How is it that Orderic, so fond of genealogy, when speaking of Gerbod and Gundrada as brother and sister, does not speak of both of them as children of Matilda? How is it that every writer who mentions the marriage of William and Matilda speaks of Matilda as a maid at the time? I felt these difficulties in 1869 and in 1875; one of them I did my best—with, I think, a provisional success—to dispose of. But, accepting, as I did, the genuineness of William of Warren's charter, I thought that its direct statement outweighed them all. Since then the further difficulty is added that, when it would have been specially to Anselm's purpose if he could have spoken of Gundrada and Henry the First as sister and brother, he says nothing of any such near kindred, but grounds his prohibition of the marriage of their children on a kindred far more remote. Now that the possibility of forgery in the charter has once been suggested by Mr. Waters, I do not see how its genuineness can be maintained in the teeth of such a mass of difficulties and improbabilities as this.

There is only one difficulty the other way. If Earl William's charter be a forgery, if its intent was, as it doubtless would be, to exalt the dignity of the foundress, why did the forger not distinctly speak of William as the father of Gundrada as well as of Matilda as her mother? Believing, as I did, in the genuineness of the charter, this was the argument which, more than any other, made me accept Mr. Stapleton's theory. Earl William, I argued, would never make this strange distinction between the parents of his wife. And it is undoubtedly strange that the forger should do it. But it is less strange that a forger, seeking variety in the turn of his phrases, should speak of the queen in one way and of the king in another, than that Earl William should do so in a serious document in which he had no object but to state facts. At any rate we cannot allow a singularity of expression of this kind to establish the genuineness of the charter in the teeth of such a mass of evidence the other way.

The conclusion therefore is this. There is nothing to show that Gundrada was the daughter either of King William or of Queen Matilda; there is a great deal to show that she was not. The little that we know of her comes to this, that she was the sister of Gerbod earl of Chester, that is, the daughter of the elder Gerbod the advocate, and that she had a pedigree which in some way entitled her to be called *stirps ducum*. Who her ducal forefathers were we may hope that Mr. Waters will some day find out. In any future edition of the History of the Norman Conquest I shall think it my duty to alter every passage which implies a belief in any part of the theory of Mr. Stapleton. My belief in that theory was a good deal shaken by the arguments of Mr. Waters;

but it is Sir George Duckett whom I have specially to thank for sending me definitely over to Mr. Waters' views. I ought to have seen the force of the charter to Cluny when it was first printed by Mr. Blaauw; as I did not do so, I am thankful to Sir George Duckett for printing it again, and thereby bringing it more strongly home to my mind. I ought perhaps, without Mr. Waters' help, to have thought of the possibility of the documents in the Lewes cartulary being forgeries. But, as I did not do so, while I can thank Mr. Waters for first suggesting the thought, so I can no less thank Sir George Duckett for so opportunely strengthening that thought as he has done by printing the whole story of the *Inspecimus* and exemplification from Cluny. By the joint help of Mr. Waters and Sir George Duckett, a piece of history, perhaps of no great importance in itself, but of some interest, if only on account of the controversy which it has awakened, has been, we cannot exactly say cleared up, but at any rate freed from a long-standing error.

There still remains the question as to the nature of the kindred or affinity between William and Matilda. Mr. Rule, who says that he knows what it was, will not tell me, because he says that I know it already. I do not know it already; but I hope that Mr. Waters may some day find it out; he, I am sure, will tell me when he does.

One word more as to the name Gundrada, Gundred, or whatever we are to call her. I have, from habit, followed the spelling on her tombstone, as the one that I first happened to see. I hope that no one who is, what I am not, particular about spelling will on that account call me 'a pedantic nuisance' or a 'disgrace to literature.' Rather than be called such hard names, I would gladly spell the name in any other way that may be less pedantic and more literary, say *Gundthryth*, which would certainly be the English form, if there were one, or *Guntrut*, which I am sure I have seen somewhere. The name is one of the endless names from the root *gund*, now understood to mean *battle*. Förstemann reckons up about twenty different spellings of it. Einhard spells it as I do as the name of the granddaughter of Charles the Great. For I must still, with Shakespeare and other 'disgraces to literature,' so call the first German emperor, for in history 'Charlemagne' is, as Shakespeare seems to have known, not his name, but the name of his younger brother. One is sorry to give offence, even in these small matters; but we cannot make the facts; we must take them as we find them. It may be more serious if I, or if Mr. Waters, should offend any of those who have hitherto rejoiced in a fancied kingly pedigree on the strength of a real or imagined descent from William of Warren and Gundrada.

EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

Cambridge University Press.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE DIVINA COMEDIA. Including the complete collation throughout the *Inferno* of all the MSS. at Oxford and Cambridge. By the Rev. EDWARD MOORE, D.D., Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, and Barlow Lecturer on Dante in the University of London. [In the press.]

THE HISTORY OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT: being the Syriac Version of the Pseudo-Callisthenes. Edited from Five Manuscripts, with an English Translation and Notes, by ERNEST A. WALLIS BUDGE, M.A., formerly Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Tyrwhitt Scholar, Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum. Demy 8vo. [In the press.]

ELEMENTS OF THE LAW OF TORTS: a Text-Book for Students. By MELVILLE M. BIGLOW, Ph.D. [In the press.]

OCCASIONAL ADDRESSES ON EDUCATIONAL SUBJECTS. By S. S. LAURIE, A.M., LL.D., Professor of the Institutes and History of Education in the University of Edinburgh. Crown 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK, ACCORDING TO THE SEPTUAGINT. Edited by H. B. SWETE, D.D., Honorary Fellow of Gonville and Caius College. Vol. I. GENESIS—IV. KINGS. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

'The edition has been executed in the very best style of Cambridge accuracy, which has no superior anywhere; and this is enough to put it at the head of the list of editions for manual use.'—ACADEMY.

NEW VOLUME OF THE PITT PRESS SERIES.

AN ELEMENTARY COMMERCIAL GEOGRAPHY. A Sketch of the Commodities and the Countries of the World. By Dr. H. R. MILL, F.R.S.E., Lecturer on Commercial Geography in the Heriot Watt College, Edinburgh. [Immediately.]

THE ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE AND OF THE COLLEGES OF CAMBRIDGE AND ETON. By the late ROBERT WILLIS, M.A., F.R.S., Jacksonian Professor in the University of Cambridge. Edited, with large Additions and brought up to the present time, by JOHN WILLIS CLARK, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 4 vols. Super royal 8vo. £5. 6s.

Also a Limited Edition of the same, consisting of 120 Copies only, Large Paper Quarto; the Woodcuts and Steel Engravings mounted on India Paper. Price Twenty-five Guineas net each set.

'The beautiful volumes which lie before us contain the results of the combined labours of the late Professor Willis and of his nephew and literary executor, Mr. John Willis Clark, and give to the world the long-promised and much-desired "Architectural History of the University of Cambridge." . . . Of the beauty of the illustrations so abundantly scattered through the pages of the work, we cannot speak too highly . . . while the unstinting liberality with which these illustrations are given, to elucidate the architectural descriptions and render them generally intelligible, calls for much gratitude from the non-professional reader. . . . We may add that the usefulness of the work as a book of reference is much enhanced by one of the most complete and well-arranged indexes we have ever had occasion to consult.'

QUARTERLY REVIEW, October 1887.

'The whole work has been done in such a thorough and painstaking manner as to render it a most valuable record of the architectural history of Cambridge and a fitting memorial to the peculiar genius of Professor Willis.'

TIMES.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE ROYAL INJUNCTIONS OF 1638. By J. B. MULLINGER, M.A., Lecturer on History and Librarian to St. John's College. Part I. Demy 8vo. (734 pp.), 12s.

Part II. From the Royal Injunctions of 1635 to the Accession of Charles the First. Demy 8vo. 18s.

SCHOLAE ACADEMICAE: some Account of the Studies at the English Universities in the Eighteenth Century. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, M.A., Fellow of Peterhouse. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LIFE AND TIMES OF STEIN, OR GERMAN AND PRUSSIA IN THE NAPOLEONIC AGE. By J. H. SKIRRY, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. With Portraits and Maps. 3 vols. Demy 8vo. 30s.

AN INTRODUCTION TO GREEK EPIGRAPHY. Part I. THE AICHAIC INSCRIPTIONS AND THE GREEK ALPHABET. By E. S. ROBERTS, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Gonville and Caius College. Demy 8vo. with Illustrations, 18s.

THE GROWTH OF ENGLISH INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE. By W. CUNNINGHAM, B.D., late Deputy to the Knightbridge Professor in the University of Cambridge. With Maps and Charts. Crown 8vo. 12s.

FROM SHAKESPEARE TO POPE: an Inquiry into the Causes and Phenomena of the Rise of Classical Poetry in England. By EDMUND GOSSE, M.A., Clark Lecturer in English Literature at Trinity College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 6s.

TRAVELS IN NORTHERN ARABIA, from November 1876 to August 1878, and in the PERSIA in May and June 1875. By CHARLES M. DOUGHTY, M.A. of Gonville and Caius College. With numerous Illustrations and a Map. 3 vols. Demy 8vo. £3. 3s.

'An author who takes Arabia for his field challenges comparison with the greatest modern writers of travel. It is the highest tribute we can pay Mr. Doughty to own that, with the charm of Burckhardt and Burton, Palgrave and Palmer, undiminished upon us, we judge his book to be the most remarkable record of adventure and research which has been published in this generation. He enjoyed opportunities that the experience of no one of his predecessors combined. He describes the life of the nomads with a minuteness and colour that will make his work stand for the Bedouin what Lane's famous description is for the modern Egyptians; while he succeeds in carrying out individual characters from groups and classes in a way that Lane never attempted.'—SPECTATOR.

'The work describes a country and people hitherto absolutely unknown to Europeans. A picture such as has never before been given of Arab life, customs, and manners, and a description of a vast tract of country hitherto untrod by the foot of a European.'—STANDARD.

'Its value as a storehouse of knowledge simply cannot be exaggerated.'—SATURDAY REVIEW.

KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE IN EARLY ARABIA. By W. ROBERTSON SMITH, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of Christ's College and University Librarian. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES OF GREEK HISTORY. Accompanied by a Short Narrative of Events, with references to the Sources of Information and Extracts from the Ancient Authorities, by CARL FETEN. Translated from the German by G. CHAWNER, M.A., Fellow of King's Coll., Cambridge. Demy 4to. 10s.

SOPHOCLES—THE PLAYS AND FRAGMENTS. With Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose. By R. C. JENK, LL.D., LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. Part I. OEDIPUS TYRANNUS. Demy 8vo. New Edition, 12s. 6d. Part II. OEDIPUS COLONEUS. Demy 8vo. 12s. 6d. Part III. THE ANTIGONE. 12s. 6d.

'The whole edition so far exhibits perhaps the most complete and elaborate editorial work which has ever appeared. It seems scarcely possible that anything material to Sophocles can have escaped such diligence as these pages show. . . . This volume is full of enjoyment both for students and simple readers, and we anticipate with confidence the continuation and completion of Professor Jebb's most honourable task.'—SATURDAY REVIEW.

THE DESPATCHES OF EARL GOWER, English Ambassador at the Court of Versailles from June 1790 to August 1792. To which are added the Despatches of Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Munro, and the Diary of Lord Palmerston in France during July and August 1791. Edited by OSCAR BROWNING, M.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Demy 8vo. 15s.

THE HISTORY OF THE LAW OF TITHES IN ENGLAND: being the Yorks Prize Essay of the University of Cambridge for 1887. By WILLIAM EASTBURY, B.A., LL.B., St. John's College and the Middle Temple. 7s. 6d.

COMPLETE CATALOGUES ON APPLICATION.

London: C. J. CLAY & SONS, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane.

EPOCHS OF ANCIENT HISTORY.

Edited by the Rev. Sir G. W. COX, Bart. M.A. and by C. SANKEY, M.A.

Ten Volumes, fcp. 8vo. with numerous Maps, Plans, and Tables, 2s. 6d. each.

- | | |
|---|--|
| The Gracchi, Marius, and Sulla. By A. H. BRESLY. | The Rise of the Macedonian Empire. By ARTHUR M. COUNTIS. |
| The Early Roman Empire. From the Assassination of JULIUS CÆSAR to the Assassination of DOMITIAN. By the Rev. W. WOLFE CAPEL. | Rome to its Capture by the Gauls. By WILHELM IHSE. |
| The Roman Empire of the Second Century, of the Age of the ANTONINES. By the Rev. W. WOLFE CAPEL. | The Roman Triumvirates. By the Very Rev. CHARLES MERIVALE, D.D. |
| The Athenian Empire. From the Flight of XERXES to the Fall of Athens. By the Rev. Sir G. W. COX, Bart. | The Spartan and Theban Supremacies. By CHARLES SANKEY. |
| The Greeks and the Persians. By the Rev. Sir G. W. COX, Bart. | Rome and Carthage, the Punic Wars. By R. BOSWORTH SMITH. |

EPOCHS OF MODERN HISTORY.

Edited by C. COLBECK, M.A.

Nineteen Volumes, fcp. 8vo. with Maps, 2s. 6d. each.

- | | |
|--|--|
| The Beginning of the Middle Ages. By R. W. CHURCH, D.D. | The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution, 1602-1660. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER. |
| The Normans in Europe. By Rev. A. H. JOHNSON. | The English Restoration and Louis XIV. 1648-1678. By OSMUND AJRY. |
| The Crusades. By the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart. | The Fall of the Stuarts; and Western Europe from 1678 to 1697. By the Rev. EDWARD HALE. |
| The Early Plantagenets. By W. STUBBS, D.D. Bishop of Chester. | The Age of Anne. By E. E. MORRIS. |
| Edward the Third. By the Rev. W. WARBURTON. | The Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648. By SAMUEL RAWSON GARDINER. |
| The Houses of Lancaster and York; with the CONQUEST and LOSS of FRANCE. By JAMES GAIDNER. | The Early Hanoverians. By E. E. MORRIS. |
| The Era of the Protestant Revolution. By F. SERRON. | Frederick the Great and the Seven Years' War. By F. W. LONGMAN. |
| The Early Tudors. By the Rev. G. C. MORRILL. | The War of American Independence, 1775-1783. By J. M. LUDLOW. |
| The Age of Elizabeth. By the Rev. M. CREIGHTON. | The French Revolution, 1789-1795. By Mrs. S. B. GARDINER. |
| | The Epoch of Reform, 1830-1850. By JUSTIN MCCARTHY, M.P. |

EPOCHS OF CHURCH HISTORY.

Edited by the Rev. Canon CREIGHTON, M.A.

Fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. each.

- | | |
|--|---|
| The English Church in other Lands. By the Rev. H. W. TUCKER, M.A. | The Church and the Roman Empire. By the Rev. ARTHUR CARR, M.A. |
| The History of the Reformation in England. By the Rev. G. G. FERRY, M.A. | The Church and the Puritans, 1570-1660. By HENRY OFFLEY WAKEMAN, M.A. |
| A History of the University of Oxford. By the Hon. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L. | The Church and the Eastern Empire. By the Rev. H. F. TOZER, M.A. |
| A History of the University of Cambridge. By J. BASS MULLINGS, M.A. | Hildebrand and his Times. By W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A. |
| The Church of the Early Fathers. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D. | The Arian Controversy. By H. M. GWATKIN, M.A. [<i>In the press.</i>] |
| The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century. By the Rev. JOHN HENRY OVERTON, M.A. | The Counter-Reformation. By A. W. WARD. [<i>In the press.</i>] |
| | The English Church in the Middle Ages. By the Rev. W. HUNT. [<i>In the press.</i>] |

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

CLARENDON PRESS NEW AND STANDARD HISTORICAL BOOKS. THE OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

COMPLETION OF THE FIRST VOLUME, A-B.

Vol. I., A-B, royal 4to. half-morocco, 52s. 6d. (may also be had handsomely bound in whole rusia). Part IV., BRA-CASS, 4to. paper covers, 12s. 6d.; or separately, Section I., BRA-Byz, 7s. 6d.; Section II., C-CASS, 5s.

A NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY ON HISTORICAL PRINCIPLES.

Founded mainly on the Materials collected by the Philological Society. Edited by JAMES A. H. MURRAY, B.A. Lond., Hon. M.A. Oxon, LL.D. Edin., D.C.L. Dunelm, &c., sometime President of the Philological Society, with the assistance of many Scholars and Men of Science.

The OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY aims at furnishing an adequate account of the meaning, origin, and history of English words now in general use, or known to have been in use at any time during the past 700 years. It endeavours—

1. To show with regard to each individual word when, how, in what shape, and with what signification it became English; what development of form and meaning it has since received; which of its uses have become obsolete and which survive; what new uses have since arisen, by what processes, and when.
2. To illustrate these facts by a series of quotations ranging from the first-known occurrence of the word to the latest or down to the present day; the word being thus made to exhibit its own history and meaning. And
3. To treat the etymology of each word strictly on the basis of historical fact and in accordance with the methods and results of modern philological science.

NEW WORK BY PROFESSOR EARLE.

Just published, crown 8vo. cloth, 16s.

A HANDBOOK TO THE LAND-CHARTERS AND OTHER SAXONIC DOCUMENTS.

By JOHN EARLE, M.A., formerly Fellow and Tutor of Ortel College, Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford.

It is the aim of this 'Handbook' to facilitate the critical study of the Saxon legal documents, which were collected by Kemble in his 'Codex Diplomaticus,' and which are now being republished by Mr. De Gray Birch in his 'Cartularium Saxonum.' To the student who wishes to understand early English history these documents are indispensable. For they, with the West Saxon Laws, compose the extant body of constitutional evidence prior to Domesday, and these with Domesday constitute one whole and continuous study. . . . The book seeks to fulfil the function of a handbook, both by the typical nature of its arrangement and by its references to all standard works bearing on the subject.

NEW EDITION OF CLARENDON'S HISTORY OF THE REBELLION.

Just published, Six Vols., crown 8vo. cloth, £3. 5s.

CLARENDON'S (EDW., EARL OF) HISTORY OF THE REBELLION AND CIVIL WARS IN ENGLAND.

Re-edited from a fresh Collation of the Original MS. in the Bodleian Library, with Marginal Dates and Occasional Notes. By W. DURR MACRAY, M.A., F.R.S.

COMPLETION OF WHITLEY STOKES' ANGLO-INDIAN CODES.

Just published, 8vo. half-bound. Vol. I., 30s.; Vol. II., 38s.

THE ANGLO-INDIAN CODES.

Edited by WHITLEY STOKES, D.C.L., late Law Member of the Council of the Governor-General of India.

Vol. I.—SUBSTANTIVE LAW. Vol. II.—ADJECTIVE LAW.

This work contains the principle codes of law which have, during the last twenty-six years, been enacted by the Governor-General of India in Council. Each Code is preceded by an Introduction giving a general view of its objects and contents, pointing out its principal divergencies from English law, and making suggestions for its amendment. The foot-notes to the sections embody or refer to the rulings of the Indian High Courts on their wording and the decisions on which many of them are founded. These rulings as well as the amendments of the Codes are brought down to May 1888.

It will be of real service to the law student and the professor wherever the English language is spoken, and should very properly become a part of the course of study in all law schools of any note.—CALCUTTA REVIEW.

The whole work bears the impress of careful study and a masterly grasp of legal principle and historic facts.—AMERICAN LAW REVIEW.

BOSWELL'S LIFE OF SAMUEL JOHNSON,

LL.D., and Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides. Edited, with Notes, &c., by GEO. BIRBECK HILL, D.C.L., Pembroke College, Oxford. 6 vols. medium 8vo. leather back, cloth sides, with Illustrations, £8. 3s.

No pains have been spared to render the Oxford edition of the 'Life' fully worthy in point of accuracy and the judicious selection of illustrative matter of the author and his work.

'The classical edition, the scholar's Boswell!'

PALL MALL GAZETTE.

HISTORIA NUMORUM: a Manual of Greek Numismatics.

By BANCLAY V. HEAD, Assistant-Keeper of the Department of Coins and Medals in the British Museum. Royal 8vo. half-morocco, 42s.

'The most comprehensive work on Numismatics which has appeared since Eckhel's days.'—CLASSICAL REVIEW.

'Marks an epoch in Numismatics.'—ACADEMY.

ROUGH LIST of the MS. MATERIALS

relating to the HISTORY OF OXFORD, contained in the printed Catalogues of the Bodleian and College Libraries, arranged according to subject, with an Index. By F. MADAN, M.A., Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian. 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d.

A HISTORY OF ENGLAND PRINCIPALLY

in the SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. By LEOPOLD VON RANKE. Translated by Resident Members of the University of Oxford, under the superintendence of G. W. KITCHIN, D.D., and C. W. BOASE, M.A. 6 vols. 8vo. cloth, £3. 3s.

PROTESTS of the LORDS,

including those which have been expunged, from 1624 to 1674; with Historical Introductions. Edited by J. E. THOROLD ROGERS, M.A. 3 vols 8vo. cloth, £3. 2s.

HISTORY of AGRICULTURE and PRICES

in ENGLAND, A.D. 1269-1793. By J. E. THOROLD ROGERS, M.A. 8vo. cloth.

Vols. I.-II. (1269-1400), £2. 2s.

Vols. III.-IV. (1401-1682), £2. 10s.

Vols. V.-VI. (1683-1793), £2. 10s. 8vo.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

in its Origin and Development. By WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Lord Bishop of Chester, late Regius Professor of Modern History, Oxford. Library Edition. 3 vols. demy 8vo. cloth, £2. 8s.

'The standard work on the subject of which it treats.'—TIMES.

SEVENTEEN LECTURES on the STUDY

of MEDIEVAL and MODERN HISTORY, and KINDRED SUBJECTS. By WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D. Crown 8vo. Second Edition. 8s. 6d.

The THEORY of the STATE.

By J. K. BLUNTISCHLI, late Professor of Political Science in the University of Heidelberg. Authorized English Translation from the Sixth German Edition. Demy 8vo. half-bound, 12s. 6d.

Full Clarendon Press Catalogues free on application.

London: HENRY FROWDE, Clarendon Press Warehouse, Amen Corner, E.C.



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>