

THE HOUSES OF FITZ-ALAN AND STUART: THEIR ORIGIN  
AND EARLY HISTORY.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. ROBERT WILLIAM EYTON, M.A.

THIS subject is brought forward in the present instance as one well fitted to an occasion when it may reasonably be expected to attract some degree of antiquarian notice. The writer submits a problem rather than a mature theory, anxious that some new lights may be elicited on a question which at present seems to be as full of difficulty as of interest. Thus seeking for assistance, he feels that the surest way to obtain it is to arrange and offer all the evidence which he has himself collected on the subject.

The preliminaries of the proposed investigation are these :—The English Genealogists say, and say truly, that the great house of Fitz Alan is descended from Alan Fitz Flaald. The Scottish historians say that the Royal House of Stuart is descended from Banquo, Thane of Lochaber, the victim of King Macbeth. It is also discovered that the same Royal House is descended from Alan Fitz Flaald.

The further question, and that which, answered affirmatively, will make all these assertions consistent, and establish a great genealogical, or rather historical truth, is this.—Were the Stuarts descended from Banquo through Alan Fitz Flaald? or in other words—Was Alan Fitz Flaald a descendant of Banquo?

Before we enter into particulars we must discharge this subject of certain previous mistakes, which, if allowed to remain, will encumber us with some such chronological difficulties as usually pave the way to wild conjecture and double error.

“In the time of William the Conqueror,” says Dugdale, “Alan, the son of Flathald (or Flaald), obtained by the gift of that king, the Castle of Oswaldster, with the territory adjoining, which belonged to Meredith ap Blethyn, a Britton.”

<sup>1</sup> Communicated to the Historical Section, at the Meeting of the Institute at dinbur gh, July, 1856.

This statement seems to have been originally derived from the "Fitz Warine Chronicle," which (purporting to give an account of William the Conqueror's visit to Wales and disposal of the Marches) says that the king "came to a country joining to the White Laund" (the district about Whittington is meant) "which belonged formerly to a Briton, Meredus son of Beledins; and beside it is a little castle which is called the Tree of Oswald; but now it is called Osewaldestre. The king called a knight Alan Fitz Flaeu, and gave him the little castle with all the honour appertaining to it: and from this Alan came all the great lords of England who have the surname of Fitz Alan. Subsequently this Alan caused the castle to be much enlarged."<sup>2</sup>

John Leland, abridging another version of this same metrical romance, says—"Alane Fleilsone had gyven to hym Oswaldestre."<sup>3</sup>

The particulars thus asserted require some observation. In the first place William the Conqueror's only visit to Wales was in A.D. 1081;—earlier rather than later. Domesday (compiled five years after that date) says not a word about Oswestry, or any place which we can identify with the present town. Neither does it say anything of a castle thereabouts. It gives, however, a full account of all the manors in the district; and a brief comparison with later documents will show that Rainald, Sheriff of Shropshire, was then holding all the lands in that quarter which were subsequently held by Fitz Alan. The Shropshire Domesday moreover, makes no mention of Alan Fitz Flaald, either under that or any similar name. There is, in short, no coeval mention of such a person in Shropshire till the reign of Henry I.

In the next place Meredyth ap Blethyn, whose era one would fix from the above as earlier than the visit of William the Conqueror, was a Prince of North Wales at the very time. The death of his father, Blethyn ap Convyn, was in 1073. Meredyth did not succeed him as king of North Wales, nor as anything more than prince of Powis Land. He died in 1133; and it was Madoc ap Meredyth, his son, who, according to the Welsh Chronicles, first built Oswestry Castle, in 1148.

<sup>2</sup> Fitz Warine Chronicle (Warton Club), pp. 13, 14.

<sup>3</sup> Collectanea. Vol. i., p. 261.

Dugdale further relates how "Alan Fitz Flaald married the daughter and heir of Warine, Sheriff of Shropshire, and had in her right the Barony of the said Warine."

That Alan Fitz Flaald had Warine's barony is true, but it was after the era of Rainald the Sheriff, Warine's successor. Moreover, the documents to which Dugdale refers in proof of the alleged marriage, prove nothing of the kind. I discredit this supposed match altogether; and for three reasons:—1st. Because it is nowhere authentically announced. 2ndly. Because, if it had taken place, there are authentic documents which traverse the very ground in which it would have constituted an important fact, and yet these documents say nothing about it. 3rdly. Because there are good reasons for thinking that Alan Fitz Flaald's only wife was another person than any supposed daughter of Warine, Sheriff of Shropshire.

Another story has yet to be told and contradicted. The Fitz Alans held a considerable fief in Norfolk, the tenure of which was made matter of report by a provincial jury in the year 1275. These jurors said that, "Melam (Mileham) with its appurtenances, was in the hand of William the Bastard at the Conquest, and the said king gave the said manor to a certain knight, who was called Flancus, who came with the said king into England; and afterward the said manor (descended) from heir to heir till (it came) to John Fitz Alan, now (1275) in the king's custody."<sup>4</sup>

There was, therefore, a Norfolk tradition, the counterpart of that current in Shropshire, except that it made Flancus or Flaald the feoffee of the Conqueror, and not his son Alan. We will examine this tradition by the same test as the last. The honour of Mileham with its adjuncts, as subsequently held by Fitz Alan, is readily identified in the Norfolk Domesday. It had belonged to Archbishop Stigand (deprived in 1070), and was then (1085-6) in the king's hand, William Noiers having custody thereof. Neither in Mileham itself, nor in any of its adjuncts, does the name Flancus or aught associable therewith occur. After the completion of Domesday, William the Conqueror passed so little of his remaining life in England, that it would be idle to attribute his alleged feoffment of Flancus to that brief interval.

<sup>4</sup> Rot. Hundred. i. 434. The jurors made a mistake as to the name of the minor then in custody. It was Richard.

Having now got rid of certain traditions about Fla. his son Alan as untrue in each essential particular, we to certain other traditions, which only relate to those per by implication, which are also inaccurate in many po. but which may possibly contain a germ of truth well we searching for,

Shakespeare knew of a legend which made Banquo ancest of the Stuarts. The story in his hands became a matter of world-wide fame. We attend first, therefore, to his, as to the most known version thereof, and we must attend with caution. The fundamental study of the dramatist is the human mind, its motives, its workings, and its passions : his art is to exhibit those principles in appropriate though imaginary action. With the historian it is otherwise. His knowledge should be primarily that of actions themselves ; from these, well and honestly investigated, he will infer or suggest what were the characters and motives of the actors.

When Shakespeare sought in a remote and obscure period of Scottish story the materials of a drama which was to exhibit, in one phase, his consummate knowledge of the human heart, no secondary considerations were suffered to interfere with his engrossing purpose. Among adjuncts altogether subsidiary to the main object, we trace rather the flattery of a courtier than the accuracy of an historian.

Waiting on the smiles of royalty, Shakespeare was by no means careful to memorialize the circumstance that, when Macbeth rebelled against and slew king Duncan, Banquo Thane of Lochaber was of Macbeth's party ; but Shakespeare did not omit another matter of tradition, viz. ; that this same Banquo was progenitor of the Royal House which then occupied the throne of England. The existence of this legend being established, Shakespeare's personal belief therein or particular use thereof, are no longer matters for our consideration. We proceed to present it in its other forms<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> For the best version of this tradition I depend on the following authorities.—Powel's History of Wales (Edition of 1811, page 73) contains an abstract thereof, compiled apparently from Holinshed and from the Scotch historians, Hector Boece and George Buchanan, who both wrote in the first half of the XVIth century.

Robert Wells, alias Stewarde, last

Prior and first Dean of Ely, being a vain man (*homo ventosus*) and proud of his ancestry, compiled in the year 1522 a genealogy of the Stuarts. It is printed by Wharton in the *Anglia Sacra* (vol. i., p. 686). The author, who was really a Stuart, surrendered Ely Priory, Nov. 18, 1539, and being a great promoter of the Dissolution, was appointed dean of the same cathedral by Henry VIII. on Sept.

accompanied by such external tests of date and circumstance as remain for our guidance.

Macbeth reigned in Scotland about seventeen years, viz. ; from 1039-40 to 1056-7. A date varying between the years 1048 and 1053 is assigned for the period when Macbeth, suspecting that certain of his subjects were plotting the restoration of Malcolm Canmore (eldest son of Duncan), endeavoured to fortify his throne by confiscations, imprisonments and executions. Some nobles, more fortunate than the rest, fled the kingdom, and awaited in foreign countries the turn of events. Of those who perished by the axe or the dagger was probably Banquo Thane of Lochaber ; of those who escaped was Fleance, Banquo's son. He sought the protection of the king or prince of North Wales,—Trahern ap Caradoc, says one account ; Gruffyth ap Lewellyn, says another. We must adopt the latter, whose era (1037-1063) is entirely consistent with the facts above stated, whereas Trahern ap Caradoc did not succeed to the throne of North Wales till 1073, *i.e.* seventeen years after Malcolm Canmore had been restored to that of Scotland.

As the guest then of Gruffyth ap Lewellyn, Fleance secretly became either the husband or the paramour of his protector's daughter, a deception or a crime for which he atoned with his life. The issue of this alliance, doubly ill-fated if, as it is said, the Welsh princess died in prison. was a son whom I find called Walter in both versions of this tradition, but whom I shall here call only Son of Fleance.

It does not appear where the Son of Fleance was brought up : it was "in the country" says one authority, by which, I presume, is meant, not in the Welsh Court. He was, says the same authority, in his eighteenth year, when some Welshman having insulted him with the supposed illegitimacy of his birth, he slew the over-curious genealogist, and was obliged to fly the country. Naturally enough he returned to Scotland, where Malcolm Canmore was at length reigning. The period of his return can be ascertained by a circumstance given. It was, says the legend, at the time when "Queen Margaret, sister of Edgar Atheling, sought refuge there with many English." Though Margaret's royalty is here somewhat anticipated, the event alluded to and its date are

10, 1541. He died Dec. 23, 1557. Among the armorial insignia attached to this

genealogy is the ancient Stuart coat—Arg. a fesse cheque, az. and arg.

obvious enough. It was in the summer of 1067 that Edgar Atheling, his mother and two sisters, with many Saxons left England to the triumphant Norman and placed themselves under the protection of Malcolm, who soon afterwards married Margaret, the elder of the said sisters.

The Son of Fleance then, born about 1050, and returning to Scotland in 1067, is said to have soon distinguished himself in the service of Malcolm, who knighted him, gave him lands, and made him seneschal or steward of Scotland.

"Of the which office," says one authority,<sup>6</sup> "he and his posteritie retained that surname of Steward ever after, from whom descended the most noble kings of Scotland of the family of Stewards, besides many other Dukes, Marquesses, Earls, and Barons, of great fame and renowne."

My second authority, after a similar flourish, ends his account of the Son of Fleance, whom he calls Walter throughout, by saying that he died about the forty-second year of his age (constructively then about 1091), and left a son Alan.<sup>7</sup>

"Alan Seneschal or Stuart," continues this writer, "was also a famous knight. He performed great things in the Holy Land under the standard of Godfrey of Bouillon" (the crusade of 1096-1099 must be here intended). "He demeaned himself bravely against Stephen King of England at Abarton." (The Battle of Alverton, otherwise called the Battle of the Standard, must be the event alluded to. It was fought on August 22nd, 1138. No Alan of this family can have been present thereat.) The same writer proceeds to give Alan a son, Alexander, whom he makes to have been founder of Paisley; but we happen to know that Paisley was founded in or about 1163, by Walter Fitz Alan, Steward of Scotland, whom this author altogether excludes from his proper place in the genealogy. In fact, the known descent of the earlier Stuarts is quite irreconcilable with this part of the account which I quote, and which we may here dismiss, having better authorities to depend upon than those which at the best were merely legendary.

Before however we can compare the Scottish legends with the English accounts of the origin of the Stuarts, the latter must be collected and arranged, for at present they

<sup>6</sup> Powel, *ut supra*.

<sup>7</sup> Robert Stewarde, *ut supra*.



exist in only a fragmentary form. To this business I now address myself.—

It is well known how Henry I. endeavoured to strengthen his hold on the English sceptre, to which his title was doubtful. His uniform policy was to create a new aristocracy, unconnected with that older one with which Domesday acquaints us.

This policy had a double result. It secured to himself and his daughter after him, the steadfast loyalty of a small but able band of chieftains, but it alienated the affections of the nobility created by his father, which underrated the new favourites, and in the sequel adhered generally to the usurper Stephen.

Further, it is not probable, nay in some instances we know the contrary, that Henry selected his favourites from among the Normans. Foreigners, or men whose origin was unknown or problematical, were preferred. Such, in Shropshire, were Warin de Metz, a Lorrainer, the three Peverels, and, greatest of all, Alan, son of Flaald.

King Henry had occupied the throne of England about three months, when (on November 11, 1100), Matilda, daughter of that Malcolm and Margaret, of whom we have spoken, became his queen.

The first mention which I can find of Alan Fitz Flaald belongs to the year following. On Sept. 3, 1101, the king was holding a great court at Windsor. A charter, which he granted to Herbert, Bishop of Norwich, is attested by Alan Fitz Flaald, (whose name however is printed as Alan Fitz Harald). The charter designates the witnesses as the "illustrious of England, ecclesiastical and secular," and the list (headed by Queen Matilda) warrants the description. Alan Fitz Harald's name occupies no mean position thereon. It stands before those of Gilbert and Roger Fitz Richard, of Robert Malet, and of Herbert, the king's chamberlain.<sup>8</sup>

The charter by which Herbert, Bishop of Norwich, founded the cathedral priory of his see, passed on this same occasion. It is attested by the king and queen, and by a set of witnesses who nearly all appear in the king's charter. Among the rest, Alan Fitz Flaald is a subscriber. But this charter contains something still more to our purpose. It

<sup>8</sup> Monasticon, iv. 17, v.

confirms the "Church of Langham, which had been Alan's, and his (Alan's) tithes."<sup>9</sup> Now Longham was afterwards a recognised member of Fitz-Alan's Honour of Mileham, from which it was not far distant. Summarily, then, we conclude that Alan Fitz Flaald had acquired a part of his Norfolk fief before September 1101, and had already granted a church and tithes therein towards the endowment of Norwich Priory.

Continuing to investigate Alan Fitz Flaald's connexion with Norfolk, I should point out that Henry I. seems to have been seized in demesne of the Manor of Eaton. Eaton was near Norwich, and so not a member of Mileham. This manor the king gave to Alan Fitz Flaald, and Alan transferred it to Norwich priory, apparently before November 1109; for that I take to be the date of a charter, whereby Henry I. gives to the said priory "his (the king's) Manor of Eaton, which Alan Fitz Flaald had before given thereto; and this with soc and sac and other customs, as the manor was when in the king's demesne." "And hereof," says the king, "I will confirm unto them (the monks) a charter, when Alan shall come to my court."<sup>1</sup> I suppose the king was waiting for some fuller information as to the grant before he gave it a more formal sanction.

Alan Fitz Flaald's interest in Norfolk is further illustrated by his grants to the priory of Castle Acre, a Cluniac house, whose site and precinct formed the western boundary of his honour of Mileham. His charter, already printed,<sup>2</sup> I will not here recite, but only remark that Adelina, his wife, is a party thereto; that he gives land at Kameston, (Kempston), and "apud Sparlacum" (at Sporle), also three soldates of rent out of his mill of Newton, with other things; and that three of the witnesses to this deed, viz., Ruald le Strange, Gorhannus, and Henry de Pagrave, were probably ancestors of John le Strange, Herbert Fitz Gurant, and William de Pagrave, who held three of the five knights' fees, which, in 1165, constituted the Norfolk fief of Fitz-Alan.<sup>3</sup>

A confirmation of King Henry I.'s to Castle-Acre, which seems to have passed in 1109, does not include Alan Fitz Flaald's donations,<sup>4</sup> which I therefore take to have been later. He seems to have otherwise benefited this house,

<sup>9</sup> Monasticon, iv. 17, Num. iii.

<sup>1</sup> Monasticon, iv. 17, Num. vi.

<sup>2</sup> Monasticon, v. 51, ix. Kempston, Sporle, Great and Little Palgrave, Mile-

ham and Castle Acre, all lie within a circle of less than eight miles in diameter.

<sup>3</sup> Hearne's Liber Niger, i. 142.

<sup>4</sup> Harl. MS. 2110, fo. 112.



and a different confirmation of Henry I., which I have no means of dating, alludes to his further grants.<sup>5</sup>

A grant by William de Boscville to the same priory conveys the church of Newton, and is tested by Alan Fitz Flaald. This grant I believe to have been earlier than 1109.<sup>6</sup>

I should now notice that the foreign Abbey of St. Florant, near Saumur, on the Loire, (diocese of Angers, province of Anjou) had several very ancient cells in England. I here instance Andover (Hampshire), Sele (Sussex), and Sporle (Norfolk), because I can show a connexion between Alan Fitz Flaald or his descendants and each of these cells.

Sporle to wit, was near to, if not a member of the honour of Mileham : and its endowments lay chiefly in Alan Fitz Flaald's Norfolk fief, viz., in Great and Little Palgrave, in Dunham Magna, Mileham, Hunstanton, and Holme.<sup>7</sup>

Early in the reign of Henry I., the privileges of their church or cell of Andover being in question, the monks of St. Florant defended the same. An inspeximus of the record, which details the consequent proceedings, calls the said record, by great error, a charter of king William I. Whatever of royal charter is involved in the narrative is by Henry I., and must have passed between 1103—1107, probably in the former year. The royal memorial favours the immunities of the monks of St. Florant. It passed at Storunell, in the New Forest, where the king was probably hunting, and is attested amongst others by Alan Fitz Flaald.<sup>8</sup>

As regards the cell of St. Peter's at Sele, both Alan Fitz Flaald's son and grandson, were benefactors thereto, as the charter testifies ; wherein the latter, called Jordan, son of Jordan, son of Alan Fitz Flaald, is said to have confirmed the mill of Burton to the Abbey of St. Florant, as his father had previously given it.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Harl. MS. 2110. fo. 112—Alan Fitz Flaald's interest in some of the places wherein he granted to Castle Acre, was not the sole interest. His grants, too, were afterwards confirmed and augmented by persons whom I cannot make out to have been descended from Alan. One of these, Simon de Norfolk, mentions his "ancestors from the time of Alan Fitz Flaald," speaks of his (Simon's) mother, Avelina, and of the day when he (Simon) acquired (conquisivit) the Honour of Mileham.

<sup>6</sup> Ibidem, fo. 23, b.

<sup>7</sup> The foundation of Sporle has been attributed to Henry II., probably because he was an Anjovin. I should suppose it to have been earlier than his day, but little is known about it.

<sup>8</sup> Monasticon, vii. 992, i. Another attestation of Alan Fitz Flaald's to a charter of Henry I., was at York (Monasticon, vi. 683, Num. v). I can only guess its date as circa 1109.

<sup>9</sup> Dallaway's Sussex, vol. ii., pt. ii., p.

I now pass to a much more important and more difficult subject, the connexion of Alan Fitz Flaald with Shropshire. We have seen that he must have been enfeoffed in Norfolk before the period of that great Shropshire catastrophe, the forfeiture and exile of Earl Robert de Belesme. The latter event occurred in the autumn of 1102, and a month or two later there is good reason for thinking that Rainald the Domesday sheriff of this county was still unaffected in credit or estate by the fall of his suzerain.<sup>1</sup>

The great ascendancy of Richard de Behneis, who now became King Henry's viceroy in the west, makes it very difficult to mark at this period the succession of those who may be called sheriffs-in-fee of Shropshire.

Warin, the first sheriff of Shropshire, was dead at the time of Domesday, 1085-6. He had probably held both office and estate in consequence of his marriage with Ameria, a niece of Earl Roger de Montgomery. Warin left a son, Hugh, an infant at his decease. Ameria remarried to Rainald,<sup>2</sup> and so, at the date of Domesday, Rainald had both the shrievalty and lands of Warin, not I think as guardian of Warin's heir, but in right of Ameria. There is good reason for thinking that Hugh, the son of Warin and Ameria, and step-son of Rainald, entered on his inheritance after the cession of the latter.<sup>3</sup> His line however must have soon expired with his life; and failing all other descendants of Ameria, the shrievalty and its attached barony will have reverted to the crown.

Then came the event thus described in the only, but very authoritative document, which touches the question.—

225, No. x. The grandson's grant seems to have been in the way of restitution, and to have been made "during the sickness whereof he died, and in the presence of the Archbishop." The original deed with other Sele charters is, I presume, in possession of the President and Fellows of St. M. Magdalene Coll., Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> Antiquities of Shropshire. Vol. ii. 193, 194.

<sup>2</sup> This fact has been doubted, in consequence of Rainald being called in one instance, Brother of Warin. We must there interpret the word "brother" as brother-in-law, for it is certain that Rainald (whose name by the way was De Ballol) married Ameria. His Norman

fief of Ballol (Ballolium) was in the Oximin, and was held under Earl Roger.

<sup>3</sup> I use the word "cession" advisedly, for it is clear to me that Rainald neither lost his shrievalty by forfeiture nor by death. He was in fact living in France as late as 1118. The death of Ameria, at whatever period (if without issue by Rainald), would, according to the well-known custom of England, have terminated all his pretensions in her right. Nevertheless, he might have been continued in office either by the Norman earl or the king, for a period and during pleasure, if Hugh son of Warin had been still in minority at his mother's death.

"Alanus filius Fladaldi honorem Vicecomitis Warini post filium ejus suscepit."<sup>4</sup>

From these words has arisen the unwarranted statement that Alan Fitz Flaald acquired his Shropshire fief by marrying a supposed daughter and eventual heir of Warin.

Had it been so, I think the precise and nearly coeval document which I have quoted, would have stated the fact.

My conviction is that Alan Fitz Flaald received by a new investiture, and by grant of Henry I., the whole honour of the sheriff of Shropshire, whether we call it the honour of Warin, of Rainald, or of Hugh; that he so received it during the first ten years of Henry's reign, but under no claim whatever of hereditary right or succession.

This "Honour of the Sheriff" lay chiefly in Shropshire, but it involved lands in Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and Sussex.<sup>5</sup> In three out of these four counties I have now to speak of Alan Fitz Flaald's further concern.

In the autumn of 1109, Henry I. paid a visit to Shropshire. It was during that visit I suppose that the king, Richard (de Belmeis) Bishop of London, Alan Fitz Flaald, Hamo Peverel, Roger and Robert Corbet, and Herbert Fitz Helgot, attested a judicial decision of the bishop, which regarded some right of Shrewsbury Abbey.<sup>6</sup>

To the same abbey and probably at the same period "Alan Fitz Fladald, with ready devotion, conceded all things which had been bestowed by his predecessors<sup>7</sup> or by his barons, whether in his time or previously." Of this were witnesses Richard Bishop of London, Hamo Peverel, Roger Fitz Corbet, and nearly the whole county.<sup>8</sup>

We learn this from a recitatory charter of King Henry I., which passed in 1121. The statement is repeated in Stephen's confirmation (above noticed), with the additional clause about Alan Fitz Flaald having *received* the honour of Warin.

Confirmations of Henry II. and Henry III. mention

<sup>4</sup> Monasticon, iii., 519, Col. a.—This document is a narrative of their endowments, drawn up by the monks of Shrewsbury, and confirmed by King Stephen soon after his accession.

<sup>5</sup> Viz., all which Rainaldus, Rainaldus Vicecomes, or Rainaldus Bailiote had held in those counties under King or Earl at Domesday.

<sup>6</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 1.

<sup>7</sup> "Antecessoribus" is the word used, which, if translated "Ancestors" might lead to error. The latter implies hereditary precedence, a meaning which the usage of the time did not attach to the word "antecessores."

<sup>8</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 35.

and ratify a grant of tithes in Opton (Upton Magna) to Salop Abbey, by Alan Vicecomes. This was doubtless Alan Fitz Flaald, but I know of no other instance of his being described by a title, which probably indicated rather his right as of fee, than any active discharge of the office of sheriff. In fact, we know that during the whole of Alan's life the official deputy of Belmeis in Shropshire was Fulcuius.

Dugdale estimated the period of Alan Fitz Flaald's tenure of Wolston, Warwickshire (it was part of the fief of Rainald under Earl Roger at Domesday), to have been as early as the time of the said earl or one of his sons, that is as early as the year 1102.<sup>9</sup> In this antiquity of dates, Dugdale was mistaken. Dugdale constructively intimates that Dame Adeliza, who granted in Wolston to Burton Abbey, before the year 1114, was Alan Fitz Flaald's widow, and the mother of that Sibil who, with her husband Roger de Freville, confirmed Dame Adeliza's grant in the year 1132.—

Here, I doubt not, that Dugdale was right; but it does not at first appear how Dame Adeliza, as a widow, could grant definitely in her husband's fief. That difficulty is solved by a further piece of evidence in the Burton register, viz., that the monks of Burton "redeemed the grant by a payment of six merks to Roger de Freville and Sibil his wife in 1132."<sup>1</sup>

I shall say nothing more as to Alan Fitz Flaald's Warwickshire fief, than that it involved the manor of Stretton super Dunesmore; that that manor had constituted part of Rainald's Domesday fief, and that there Alan Fitz Flaald himself sometime made a specific grant to Burton Abbey.

As succeeding to the shrievalty and estates of Rainald, Alan Fitz Flaald will have been a tenant in the honour of Arundel. I have, however, no notice of his personal concern in Sussex. A feodary of the honour of Arundel, which

<sup>9</sup> Dugdale's Warwickshire (Thomas's Edition), vol. i., p. 33.

<sup>1</sup> Dugdale's MSS. in Bibl. Ashmol., 13 G. i., fo. 529. The same Roger de Freville and Sibil, his wife, also made a grant in Wolston to Kenilworth Priory. Dugdale has given us, under Wolston, a tabular statement of their succession, as

suggested, not asserted by him. It may help to clear a difficult question if I add that, in 1165, Engelram de Wlfricheston and Hamo filius Rdaulfi, held jointly a knight's fee under Fitz Alan, and that that fee was undoubtedly Wolston. Dugdale's Genealogy takes no notice of these two persons.

I have elsewhere ascribed to the year 1135,<sup>2</sup> enters this tenure as "Stokes II. milites," without giving the name of the then tenant.<sup>3</sup>

The widow however of Alan Fitz Flaald, called in this instance *Avelina*, seems to have had part of her dower in these Sussex estates; for William Fitz Alan, her eldest son, granting, between the years 1155 and 1158, the land of "Piperinges" to Haughmond Abbey, added to his grant such rights of common pasture in the neighbouring vill of Stokes as had been previously enjoyed by "his mother Avelina."<sup>4</sup>

On the whole, therefore, we conclude that Alan Fitz Flaald was enfeoffed by Henry I. in Norfolk in 1100 or 1101, in Shropshire &c., after 1102 and before 1109; that he was living in the latter year, but dead in 1114.

His wife and widow, variously called Adelina, Adeliza, or Avelina, perhaps survived him many years.<sup>5</sup> Their marriage must have taken place, as we shall presently see, between 1100 and 1105. Who she was shall now be our inquiry, and I think that that point can be settled without doubt. The various fees in Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, and elsewhere, which formed the Domesday barony of Ernulf de Hesding, are found in 1165 to be divided among coparceners. A third of this fief, or thereabouts, was then vested in the representatives of Alan Fitz Flaald.

Now, that Ernulf de Hesding, who for his brave defence of Shrewsbury in 1138 was so mercilessly put to death by Stephen, was, as Ordericus informs us, maternal uncle (avunculus) of William Fitz Alan. Therefore William Fitz Alan's mother and Alan Fitz Flaald's wife was Avelina de Hesding, and she was in her issue a co-heiress.<sup>6</sup> These are the undoubted conclusions to be adopted from a mass of difficulties which beset the succession of the Domesday Ernulf de Hesding. With the residue of those difficulties we have nothing here to do. We are content to have demolished the old error, which made the wife of Alan Fitz Flaald a daughter of Warin, sheriff of Shropshire. I proceed now to

<sup>2</sup> Antiquities of Shropshire. Vol. ii., p. 202, note.

<sup>3</sup> Liber Niger, i., 65.

<sup>4</sup> Haughmond Chartulary, fo. 166.

<sup>5</sup> I also think that she re-married, but my evidence on the point is too much a matter of detail to bring forward.

<sup>6</sup> In 1165, that part of the Barony of

William Fitz Alan (then a minor) which lay in Wiltshire is expressly said to have previously belonged to "Ernulf de Hesdinges" (Liber Niger, i. 145). My idea is, that this Ernulf, being son of him who was hanged by Stephen, had died without issue, so that his estate devolved on his collateral heirs.

name the children of Alan Fitz Flaald and his wife Avelina de Hesding. These were William, the heir of both, Walter, Jordan, Sibil, and possibly some others.<sup>7</sup> Of William Fitz Alan, as he was called, I have said most of what need be said in my notice of Haughmond Abbey.<sup>8</sup> I here add, or rather deduce, that he must have been born about 1105; not much later, as his younger brother was of age in 1129; not much earlier, otherwise Ordericus could hardly have called him *a youth* in 1138.<sup>9</sup>

Of Jordan Fitz Alan I have spoken briefly above. It remains to say of him that in the year 1129 and 1130 he seems to have been farming for King Henry I. some royal manor (probably Clipston) in Nottinghamshire or Derbyshire; also in 1130 he was excused his quota of the Dane-geld, then assessed on those counties and on Lincolnshire. In Lincolnshire too the sheriff is allowed to deduct 4*l.* 16*s.* from his yearly ferm in respect of "land of Jordan Fitz Alan;" that is, I presume, land then first granted by the king to the said Jordan.<sup>1</sup>

Of Sibil, married to Roger de Freville, in or before 1132, I have before spoken.

It remains then to treat of Walter Fitz Alan, the undoubted ancestor of the Royal House of Stewart, and therefore the person around whose name our previous arguments and our future conclusions must be assembled as their centre. I have in my notice of Haughmond Abbey shown how Walter Fitz Alan attested the earliest grant which his brother William is known to have made to the canons of that house. I have also exhibited Walter Fitz Alan in the court of the empress at Oxford in the summer of 1141, where also was David king of Scots and William Fitz Alan.

Another charter of the empress made perhaps later to Haughmond, has also the attestation of Walter Fitz Alan.

<sup>7</sup> Simon, a brother of Walter Fitz Alan, attests a charter of the latter about 1163. I know nothing further of him with any certainty. He is the reputed ancestor of Boyd, earl of Errol.

<sup>8</sup> Archaeological Journal, vol. xiii. p. 145.

<sup>9</sup> He would then be thirty-three, according to my estimate, and I believe it was the custom of that age to use the term "*Juvenis*" much later than is consistent with our ideas. A singular instance of

this occurs with regard to the second William Fitz Alan, son of the person here spoken of. He came of age in 1175; and in 1188 (when he was thirty-four years of age) Giraldus, his guest, calls him "*a noble and liberal young man.*"

<sup>1</sup> Rot. Pip. 31 Hen. I. pp. 7, 11, 12, 121, &c. One entry seems to place Jordan Fitz-Alan's Lincolnshire estate in "*Louendene Wapentac.*"



So also has a grant of William Fitz Alan to Shrewsbury Abbey, which I cannot date with any certainty, but think it must have passed between 1155 and 1160.<sup>2</sup> Within the same limits of time William Fitz Alan "invested" his brother Walter in his Sussex manor of Stoke,<sup>3</sup> and this feoffment must have been over and above those two knights' fees of new feoffment, which in 1165 Walter Fitz Alan is said to have held in the barony of his nephew.<sup>4</sup> The locality of the latter I cannot determine, except by stating that the Knights Templars held in 1185 a virgate of land in Coneton, which they had originally by gift of Walter Fitz Alan.<sup>5</sup> The place alluded to was undoubtedly in Shropshire, and was perhaps Cound.

This is all that I can say of Walter Fitz Alan, as connected with England. Notwithstanding his reappearance in this country on his elder brother's restoration (1155), it is quite clear that during the reverses which began to attend the cause of the empress in 1141, Walter Fitz Alan had taken refuge in the court of her uncle,—David king of Scots. He attested a grant of that monarch to Melrose Abbey, which seems to have passed in June, 1142, at Ercheldon<sup>6</sup>. He also attests King David's charter to May Priory, which is dated at Kyngor, and must have passed between August, 1147, and May, 1153.<sup>7</sup> Also he attested a charter of Prince Henry of Scotland to Holm Cultram,<sup>8</sup> which must have passed after the foundation of that house in January, 1150, and before the death of the prince in May or June, 1152. Malcolm IV. ascended the throne of Scotland on May 24, 1153. On June 24, 1157, being at Roxburgh, he expedited a charter to Walter Fitz Alan, his seneschal (Dapifero). It confirms to the said Walter and his heirs the donation which King David the grantor's grandfather gave him, viz., Renfrew and Passeleth. It also gives to him and his heirs the Royal Seneschalcy, as King David gave the same.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Salop Chartulary, No. 84.

<sup>3</sup> Harl. MS. 2188, fo. 123.

<sup>4</sup> Liber Niger, i. 144. The Sussex fees of Fitz Alan are not entered in the Liber Niger, that is, not under Fitz Alan's barony. They were no part of Fitz Alan's tenure in capite, being held of the Earl of Arundel.

<sup>5</sup> MS. account of the Templars, quoted Monasticon, vii. 821, xxiv., as in custody of the King's Remembrancer.

<sup>6</sup> Liber Sanctæ Mariæ de Melros (Bannatyne Club, p. 4).

<sup>7</sup> Monasticon, iv. 62, i. Ernald, abbot of Kelso (the first witness), did not become so till after August, 1147, and King David died May 24, 1153.

<sup>8</sup> Monasticon, v. 594, iii. A search among Scottish chartularies would, I doubt not, greatly strengthen this evidence.

<sup>9</sup> Douglas's Peerage of Scotland (Wood's edition, 1813), p. 45.

The Scottish Abbey of Paisley, near Renfrew, is said to have been founded in 1163. Its founder was Walter Fitz Alan, and it was colonized with monks from the great Cluniac house of Wenlock, in Shropshire. The latter event is placed by the Melrose Chronicle in 1169, when it says that "Hunbaudus Prior de Weneloc adduxit conventum apud Passelet qui est juxta Renfrieu." A charter of the founder is mentioned by a great Shropshire antiquary as containing names of several witnesses, which associated their bearers with that county. He instances Robert de Mundegumbi, Robert and Geoffrey de Costentin, Richard Wall and Roger de Nesse.<sup>1</sup>

Walter Fitz Alan, Seneschal of the king of Scotland, was also a benefactor to Melrose Abbey. He granted to that house the lands of Machline in Kyle, about the year 1170, says my authority. His charter seems to be yet in existence. Its seal presents on one side the figure of an "armed Knight on horseback; at full speed; a lance, with pennon, couched in his right hand and a shield on his left arm." The legend is, *Sigillum Walteri filii Alani Dapiferi Reg.* The counter-seal presents "a Warrior with a spear in his right hand, leaning against a pillar, and with his left hand holding a horse."<sup>2</sup>

Here then we have another authentic notice of Walter Fitz Alan as steward or seneschal of the king of Scots.

At his death, in 1177, the Melrose Chronicle accords him the same title, as well as commemorates the ties which had bound him to that house.—"Obiit Walterus filius Alani, dapifer Regis Scotiæ, familiaris noster, cujus beata anima vivat in gloria."

<sup>1</sup> Blakeway's MSS. Parochial History, vol. iii., Tit. Wenlock.—A better transcript of this charter is I find in the Paisley Register (Maitland Club, 1832, p. 5). It gives Alan the grantor's son, Walter and Nigel de Costentin, and Alexander de Hasting (Hesding) in addition as witnesses.—

I had not seen the Paisley Register when I wrote the above. It strengthens many points of my statement, and, as far as I am aware, controverts none. Its amplitude of evidences forbids more than this general reference to a work of great interest, and most consummate editorial skill. The same may be said of the Liber

Sanctæ Mariæ de Melros. When will our English chartularies (many of them essential to a complete history of the kingdom) be treated with similar deference?

<sup>2</sup> Laing's Scottish Seals, p. 126, Nos. 769, 770, quoting Melros Charters. See also plate iii., fig. 1. These seals, says Mr. Laing, afford a presumption that as yet the family used no coat armour.

P.S.—This charter is, I find, printed in the Liber de Melros (Bannatyne Club, 1837, p. 55). Its witnesses are Alan the grantor's son, Robert de Costetin, Robert de Montegumeri, Walter Costentin, Richard Wallensis, Adam de Neuton.

Walter Fitz Alan was succeeded by his son Alan, called Alan Fitz Walter. He died in 1204.

He also granted Machline in Kyle to Melrose Abbey, and apparently early in his life. The seal of his charter has the figure of an "armed knight on horseback, with a sword in his right hand and a shield on his left arm. The legend is as follows ;—S' Alain L. Fi Watir L. Fi. Al. Senescall. Re. Sco.—which I suppose in full is, *Sigillum Alain le Fitz Watir le Fitz Alain Senescalli Regis Scotiæ*."<sup>3</sup>

This same Alan, renouncing at a later period his claim to certain lands in Blenselei, in favour of Melrose Abbey, sealed his charter with a seal which indicates some progress in art as well as fashion. On the knight's shield the remains of a fesse chequé are quite apparent, "and this," says Mr. Laing, "is perhaps the earliest instance of this well-known bearing of the Stuarts." The legend is :—*Sigill. Alani filii Walteri*.<sup>4</sup> At his death, in 1204, this Alan was succeeded by his son Walter, called Walter Fitz Alan.

A confirmation by this Walter to Melrose Abbey assures certain land at Edmunstune, as granted by Walter Fitz Alan his grandfather. The shield on his seal is charged with a fesse chequé. The legend is *Sigill' Walteri filii Alani*.<sup>5</sup>

This is the same Walter Fitz Alan who, as seneschal, attests the deed whereby Alexander II. of Scotland fixed the dower of the English Princess Johanna. The charter passed at York on 18 June, 1221.<sup>6</sup>

He also in September 1237 was one of the commissioners named by the same king to swear to the peace then agreed upon with Henry III.<sup>7</sup>

He died in 1241, says the Melrose Chronicle, calling him "Walterus filius Alani Junioris," which shows that the Scotch annalists recognised an earlier Alan in this descent than the father of Walter Fitz Alan (II).

<sup>3</sup> Laing's Seals, p. 127, No. 771, and plate iii., fig. 3. Mr. Laing estimates the date of this Charter as about 1170 ; perhaps on better grounds than would induce me to place it after 1177. The mixture of Norman-French and Latin in the legend is singular.

P.S.—The witnesses to this deed are Reginald de Asting, William de Lindesei, Walter de Constantin, Adam de Neuetun.

<sup>4</sup> Laing's Seals, p. 127, No. 772, and plate iii., fig. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Laing's Seals, p. 127, No. 773, and

plate iii., fig. 4. The date assigned by Mr. Laing for this deed (*circa* 1170) is probably a typographical error. Another deed of the same person is dated by Mr. Laing, *circa* 1200. Mr. Laing also quotes a deed of Alexander Stuart, son of this Walter, which he dates *circa* 1226, and deeds of James Stuart, son of Alexander, which he dates *circa* 1270 and 1296. Some of these dates must surely be very wide of the mark.

<sup>6</sup> Rymer's *Fœdera*, vol. i., p. 165.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 234.

Alexander Stuart, son of the latter, occurs in various deeds and diplomatic matters of king Alexander III., and under dates of 1252, 1255, 1258, 1260, 1262, and July, 1281.<sup>8</sup>

Soon after the last date he will have died. He left two sons, James and John, the former of whom occurs as seneschal of Scotland on February 5, 1283, and throughout the reign of Edward I. of England, to whom he did formal homage as seneschal of Scotland, on October 23, 1306.

But I am not intending to enter upon the various political changes of that period. I have descended thus far in my account of the Stuarts for a specific purpose. It is to say, that at one period in the reign of Edward I., Richard Fitz Alan (then Earl of Arundel in England), was declared hereditary steward of Scotland.<sup>9</sup>

I cannot verify this statement by reference to the particular document from which it was doubtless derived, and therefore I will not use it further than as a token that one fact was well understood in that day, viz., that the English Fitz Alans and the Stuarts of Scotland were descended from a common ancestor, viz., from Alan Fitz Flaald, and that the Fitz Alans were the elder representatives of the line. In short, the great-grandfather of James Stuart, and the great-grandfather of Richard Fitz Alan had been first cousins, and each of them grandsons of Alan Fitz Flaald. I now leave this matter to the more intelligible form of a tabular pedigree, and proceed to state my own belief as to that part of it which, at present, has not been fortified by proof, but which may now, it is hoped, attract the attention of others, and so meet with further comment, either illustrative or corrective, as the event may prove.

My belief, then, is that the son of Fleance was named Alan, not Walter, and that he whom the English called Alan Fitz Flaald was the person in question.<sup>1</sup> The change from Fleanchus to Flaaldus is not very great, when we compare it

<sup>8</sup> *Fœdera passim*, and *Fragmenta Scoto-Monastica*, p. xlii.

<sup>9</sup> Blakeway's MSS. *Parochial History*, vol. iii., Tit. Wenlock.

<sup>1</sup> The alternative is, that there was a Walter, son of Fleance, and father of Alan Fitz-Flaald. That supposition is not inconsistent with chronological possibility, and it has the support of the Scot-

tish legends. But it makes Alan Fitz Flaald to be in reality Alan Fitz Walter. However, these patronymic surnames were sometimes perpetuated to a second generation; to which it may be again replied, that when so perpetuated, they were usually carried on to the third and fourth generations.

with other instances where a foreign name had to be accommodated to the English ear.

We must remember, too, how a Norfolk jury, wishing evidently to designate the father of Alan Fitz Flaald, called him Flancus, though this probable approach to etymological correctness was adulterated with a great historical inaccuracy.

As to the Prior of Ely's genealogy of the Stuarts, so fully quoted above, I can take it for nothing more than a conjectural embodiment of certain traditions preserved in the family. Possibly, what he says of each of the four Stuarts whom he puts after Fleance, may have been true of some Stuart; but he gives names, whose order of succession is known, in a wrong order, and connects persons and events in a way which chronology shows to have been impossible. Between Fleance and Alexander he inserts four generations, the number of the subjoined pedigree; but his four successive names are Walter, Alan, Alexander, and Walter, whereas I have given them as Alan, Walter, Alan and Walter. About the second and third he is demonstrably wrong, probably, therefore, about the first and more remote.

But to continue.—The equivocal circumstances which seem to have attended the birth and education of the son of Fleance may well have affected him and his immediate successors in such a way as that they were disinclined to make any parade of their origin, even if they did not studiously conceal it. Alan Fitz Flaald's supposed changes of country, from Wales to Scotland and from Scotland to England, gave unusual facilities for such concealment.

I take it to have been Henry I.'s marriage with a Scottish princess which first brought Alan Fitz Flaald to the English court. He came, I should suppose, in the suit of queen Matilda, and if he had been formerly distinguished as a servant of king Malcolm, and more recently as a crusader, nothing is more probable than that he was retained by Henry I. on account of capabilities which, at that period of his reign, were greatly needed by the king. The enormous fief with which the king so promptly advanced a stranger, does not help us to determine who that stranger was; for, as I have explained, no specific claim to the shrievalty of Shropshire, could have accrued to Alan Fitz Flaald, either by inheritance or by marriage. I say *no specific claim to the shrievalty*, because I am not sure that Alan Fitz Flaald had not a large

claim on the king's consideration, and one of an hereditary nature too, though not amounting to a legal right, nor to any claim on the particular lands which he obtained. And here I introduce one hypothesis more, which possibly may be relevant to the whole subject. Algar, Earl of Mercia, who died in 1059, left two sons, the earls Morcar and Edwin. They both suffered forfeiture after the Conquest: both, perhaps, died by violent deaths, nor is either of them said to have left any surviving issue. But earl Algar is said also to have left two daughters. About one of these alleged daughters, Lucia, there is much mystery, but the same legends which name her relationship to earl Algar, make her also to have been ancestress of the Anglo-Norman earls of Chester and of Lincoln. The other daughter of earl Algar is called Alditha, and said to have been wife, first of Griffyth ap Lewellyn, prince of North Wales, and secondly of Harold, son of earl Godwin. With this supposed remarriage to Harold I have nothing here to do, but if Alditha was a daughter of earl Algar, and the wife of Griffyth, she may also have been mother of Griffyth's only recorded daughter,—of that Guenta I mean whom legends would teach us to have been the wife of Fleance, or at least mother by Fleance of Alan Fitz Flaald. Again, if Alan Fitz Flaald was the legitimate son of Fleance and Guenta, and if the other circumstances alleged above be true or probable, it is also true or probable that Alan Fitz Flaald was the great grandson of earl Algar, and (setting aside attainders) one of the legitimate representatives of the Saxon earls of Mercia. Then, again, if Henry I. were prevented by law, custom, Norman prejudices, or Norman interests, from recognising in Alan Fitz Flaald an hereditary right to particular estates already in the hands of others, it is still possible that the husband of a Scoto-Saxon princess may have seen something of justice in placing a descendant of earl Algar in a prominent position, especially when this supposed scion of an ill-fated house was a Scot, able and brave, a courtier likely to return a voluntary favour with gratitude, not a demandant likely to treat involuntary gifts as concessions.

Then, too, we may suppose a policy in the king's measure.—

By giving to Alan Fitz Flaald the specific fief of the sheriff of Shropshire, he encouraged no notion of hereditary right, such as might have led to further and extravagant



expectations, but he placed in the very van of border warfare a chieftain, who, if our assumptions are correct, could trace his descent from the native princes of North Wales.

We certainly conclude, then, that the personal favour and peculiar policy of Henry I. were two causes of Alan Fitz Flaald's advancement. We suggest that a compassion for misfortune and a sense of justice may have had their influence on the king's conduct.

Whatever the motives and whatever the facts, they are worth the fullest investigation, for they concern the foundation of a most illustrious house, a house which still numbers among its representatives the Queen of England and the highest of her subjects,<sup>2</sup> while there is hardly an ancient and noble family, whether in England or Scotland, but can name among its ancestors a Stuart or a Fitz Alan.

<sup>2</sup> The Queen represents one branch of the Stuarts. The Duke of Norfolk, the premier peer (after princes of the blood royal) represents Fitz Alan.

# GENEALOGY OF FITZ ALAN AND STUART.

