

The Lineage of Lichfield

BY JAMES BRANCH CABELL.

Manuel¹ the Redeemer, Count of Poictesme, b. 1213, d. 1239, by his alliance, in Sept. 1238, with Alianora of Provence, b. circa 1220, d. 24 June 1291, then the wife of King Henry the Third of England, supplied an heir for England, in the person of: Edward² Longshanks. Compare *Les Gestes de Manuel*, in the thirty-fourth chapter: the authorities for all this portion of the pedigree, however, have been enumerated by Verville in both editions of his *Notice sur la vie de Nicolas de Caen*, in the sixth chapter, and need not here be cited.

Edward² Longshanks, b. 16 June 1239, King of England after 1272, d. 7 July 1307, had by Hawise Bulmer, b. 1242, d. 28 Oct. 1270, a natural son, Roger³ Bulmer, first Earl of Pevensey, b. July 1263, d. circa 1320, who left issue, and descendants as aforetime recorded. Edward² Longshanks m. (1), in Aug. 1254, Ellinor of Castile, b. 1244, d. 29 Nov. 1290 (dau. of that St. Ferdinand, King of Castile and Léon, whom Dom Manuel¹ converted from wickedness), and had, with other issue: *Edward³ of Caernarvon*. Edward² Longshanks m. (2), 8 Sept. 1297, Meregrett of France, b. 1281, d. 14 Feb. 1317, and had, with other issue: Edmund³, Earl of Kent, b. 1302, who in turn had issue: Joan⁴ of Kent, m. (1) Sir Thomas Holland, and (2), as hereinafter, Edward⁵ the Black Prince.

Edward³ of Caernarvon, b. 25 Apr. 1284, King of England after 1307, murdered by his wife's orders 22 Sept. 1327, m., 23 Jan. 1308, Ysabeau of France, b. 1295, d. 22 Aug. 1358, and had:

Edward⁴ of Windsor, b. 13 Nov. 1312, King of England after 1327, d. 21 June 1377, m., 24 Jan. 1328, Philippa of Hainault, b. 1312, d. 14 Aug. 1369, and had, with other issue: *Edward⁵ the Black Prince*; Lionel⁵ of Clarence, b. 29 Nov. 1338; *John⁵ of Gaunt*; Edmund⁵ of York, b. 1344; and Thomas⁵ of Gloucester, b. 1354.

Edward⁵ the Black Prince, b. 15 June 1330, d. 8 June 1376, m. (1), in Sept. 1360, Alixe Riczi (dau. of Gilbert, Vicomte de Montbrison), b. 1342, d. Aug. 1361, and had issue: Edward⁶ Plantagenet, known as Edward Maudelain, b. Aug. 1361, d.

unm. Feb. 1400. Edward⁵ the Black Prince m. (2), 10 Oct. 1361, his cousin, Joan⁴ of Kent, as above, and by her had issue:

Richard⁶ of Bordeaux, b. 13 Apr. 1366, d. 26 Feb. 1441, King of England after 1377, who, following his dethronement in 1400, took the name of Richard Holland. He m. (1), 14 Jan. 1382, Anne of Bohemia, b. 1367, d. 7 June 1394, by whom he had no issue; m. (2), 1 Nov. 1395, Isabel of Valois, b. 9 Nov. 1387, d. 13 Sept. 1410, by whom he had no issue; m. (3) 30 June 1403, Branwen of Wales, b. 1385, d. Jan. 1423, by whom he had four children. Compare, for the descendants of his second son, "The Hollands of Lichfield," in *Lichfield Hist. Mag.*, Vols. III, IV.

John⁵ of Gaunt, as above, b. 24 June 1340, d. 3 Feb. 1399, m. (1) Blanche of Lancaster, by whom he had issue:

Henry⁶ of Derby, known also as Bolingbroke, and after 1400 as King Henry the Fourth of England, b. 1366, d. 20 March 1413, m. (1), in 1381, Mary Bohun, and (2), by procuration 3 Apr. 1402, in person 7 Feb. 1403, Jehane of Navarre, b. 1372, d. 9 July 1437, then the widow of Duke Jehan of Brittany. Queen Jehane subsequently m., as her third husband, Antoine Riczi, Vicomte de Montbrison. By his second marriage Henry⁶ of Derby had no children; by his first marriage he had issue:

Henry⁷ of Monmouth, b. 19 Aug. 1387, King of England after 1413, d. 31 Aug. 1422, m., 3 June 1420, Katharine of Valois, b. 27 Oct. 1401, d. 3 Jan. 1437. After his death she m. (2) Owain Tudor. Henry⁷ of Monmouth had issue only:

Henry⁸ of Windsor, b. 6 Dec. 1421, King of England after 1422, dethroned in 1465, d. 21 May 1471. His downfall, through his wife's relations with the Duke of Suffolk, and the extinction of this line of Manuel's descendants, are narrated in *Le Cocu Rouge*, that very curious romance erroneously, I think, ascribed by Hinsauf to Nicolas de Caen, and never as yet, I believe, put into English.

[COMPILER'S NOTE—In view of Mr. Redman's article entitled *Bülg the Forgotten*, as published in the November issue of THE REVIEWER, it has appeared advisable to discontinue these genealogical papers. The reader will readily comprehend that, were

there nothing else, the unique policy pursued by the editors of *THE REVIEWER*, of using one portion of the magazine to disparage the contents of the remainder, creates an impossible situation.

Nor do I think that Mr. Redman's article requires in the main any serious "reply", the necessary space for which has been offered me in these pages. I would, however, point out that with Bülg's morality I have no concern: the worth of an author, once he is dead, is not nicely to be estimated by the latest scale of ethics, in any civilization wherein the most pious are apt particularly to affect the "literary remains" of an adulterer or a debauchee, as preserved for us in the Book of Psalms and the Proverbs of Solomon. For the rest, the misdoings of Gottfried Johannes Bülg were, at least, as well known to me as to Mr. Redman,—who indeed does not allude to the Scholk-Ernsten affair at all,—but I did not consider that a formal cataloguing of these peccancies was requisite every time I referred to the man's writings, any more than do I believe that every quotation from Shakespeare should of necessity be prefaced with an account of the scandalous concomitants of that poet's marriage.

Also, Mr. Redman's paper is so worded as to obscure the one really important point. Nobody denies Bülg made a number of changes and interpolations in the manuscripts of René Vincennes: that seems, on Mr. Redman's own contention, to be a fairly old story. But—without actually saying so,—Mr. Redman conveys to the casual reader the impression that in preparing the English version of the Jurgén epos these alterations were retained by me. That such is not the case may readily be seen by comparing my rendering with the text now generally received as authentic: though I do not deny that in sundry places Bülg seemed to me so much to have bettered the old *Histoire*, from every literary standpoint, that I viewed the forged additions wistfully. And not I alone. No less profound and conscientious a scholar than Dr. S. L. M. Barlow, indeed, then urged me at least to retain the remarkable chapter wherein Basiliske the Quondam administers to Jurgén the enchanted pill, and to include, if only in a footnote, the equally spurious but edifying episode of "How St. Jurgén committed barratry with the young man who sniffed",—upon the ground that these impostures, ethics apart,

were simply too excellent to be omitted. Yet it seemed better, all in all, to cling to the now "standard" text with that fidelity which I in the ultimate displayed; and for which Mr. Redman—I do not assert, of set purpose; I merely say, as his article was published—has failed to give me the least credit.

To one staggering affirmation made by Mr. Redman, however, the meekest must take exception: it is that "even the name" of Jurgen was "a fanciful invention" of Bülg's. Now to the mind of an unbiassed person, I submit, the shortening of the hero's name from Iurgenius to Jurgen appears a change too slight and obvious to merit being called "an invention", far less a particularly fanciful invention: and here again Mr. Redman's paper is—again I do not say, of set purpose,—so worded as to be to the average reader directly misleading.

But for the while, be it repeated, I prefer to make no extended comment upon this paper, nor upon the causes leading to its insertion—reinforced by Miss Newman's acrimony—cheek by jowl with the second instalment of my *Lineage of Lichfield*. These obviously are matters to be taken up anywhere rather than here. And meanwhile also, this combination of occurrences has naturally rendered impossible a continuance of these genealogical papers in the pages of *THE REVIEWER*.]

At the Year's End

BY FRANCIS LEE DAINGERFIELD.

The Spring of Youth
Goes quickly flashing past,
In golden rain.
The dull hot days
Of Summer's Middle-age
Mellow too fast
Into the Autumn sunset.
And Winter's night is long,
When we are old.