



THE
RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW,

AND

Historical and Antiquarian
MAGAZINE.

EDITED BY

HENRY SOUTHERN, ESQ. M.A.

OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

AND

NICHOLAS HARRIS NICOLAS, ESQ.

OF THE INNER TEMPLE, BARRISTER AT LAW.

SECOND SERIES.

VOL. II.

LONDON: BALDWIN AND CRADOCK.

SOLD BY W. F. WAKEMAN, DUBLIN; JOHN THOMPSON, EDINBURGH; AND
CAREY AND LEA, PHILADELPHIA.

1828.

In one of the most valuable, but least known, Collections in the Museum are about ten thousand charters, which were indexed by Ayscough. Why is not that Index printed?

THE WARRENS OF POYNTON.—The principal object of “The History of the House of Warren,” a work in which it is manifest that great attention was given to the subject by its learned author, was to prove that a race of gentry of the name of Warren, who had resided, from the reign of Edward III., at Poynton, near Stockport, in Cheshire, were in legitimate descent from the ancient Earls of Warren; and that, being so descended, the head of that family had a right to the earldom of Warren.

The second position was a palpable non sequitur. For if it could have been proved, to the satisfaction of a Lords’ Committee, that Sir George Warren did descend in the line contended for by Mr. Watson, it would by no means have followed that he was entitled to the rank and privileges of Earl of Warren, which had once passed to the issue of a female heiress; and, on the same principle, would have gone, on the death of John, the last Earl of Warren, if any where, to the issue of his sister, the Countess of Arundel.

In his first position he appears to be equally in error. He has shown, indeed, that Vincent¹ and Dugdale² are both wrong when they deduce the Warrens of Poynton from John de Warren, an illegitimate son of the last Earl. He has also produced very probable reasons why the Warrens of Poynton did not descend, as others have conjectured, from a John de Warren, said to be son of John, the seventh Earl, who died in 1304, by a second wife, a daughter of Mowbray. But it does not follow that, having cleared away these two hypotheses, the third which he adopts becomes established as indisputably true. We are persuaded, indeed, that that hypothesis is equally without the support of evidence, and in opposition to very pertinent probabilities with the two which Mr. Watson has ably disposed of.

It is admitted that the Poynton family descend from a Sir Edward Warren, who was living in the reign of Edward III. This is a point about which there is no dispute. The question is, how Sir Edward was connected with the Earls? Mr. Watson deduces his descent from Reginald, a second son of William, the second Earl (and consequently grandson to Gundred, the daughter of the Conqueror), who is said to have had, by Adeliza, a daughter of Roger de Mowbray, William, his only son and heir; who, by Isabel, a daughter of Sir William de Haydon, had Sir John Warren; who, by Alice, daughter of Roger de Townsend, had another Sir John, father to Sir Edward, by Joan, daughter of Sir Hugh Port.

Now, we have no attempt to *prove* the existence of the two Sir Johns: no inquiries (for the latter of these, at least, must have lived within the period through which we are so rich in that species of evidence): no reference to any thing which has the semblance of authority for the marriage with Townsend and Port. The whole is

¹ “Discovery,” p. 525.

² “Baronage,” I. 82.

taken from an unsupported pedigree, which purports to have been prepared by Flower and Glover, but which would seem to betray some inferior hand, when it gravely states that Hugh Capet was the son of Osmund de Comitibus Villâ, by Warina, sister to Herfastus, did we not know that the truly respectable name of Glover is subscribed to other northern pedigrees in which there are errors as palpable. We think, therefore, that till there is something to prove the existence at least of these two Sir Johns and their wives, it were too much to call upon his majesty to allow a dignity to their supposed personal representative, which would have had the effect of placing him above all the earls of the realm. We think, moreover, that the true descent of Sir Edward Warren, and consequently the relation in which the Warrens of Poynton stand to the Earls of Warren, is shown in a very satisfactory manner in a volume relating to the topography of the south part of Yorkshire, which has been lately published. It was known to Dugdale that the last Earl of Warren, who died in 1347, left a will which was entered in the register of Zouch, Archbishop of York. Mr. Watson, when he was preparing his History of the House of Warren, inquired for this will; but, to his great mortification, found that Zouch's register, which contained it, was lost. He was therefore compelled to take his knowledge of it from the few notices of its contents to be found in Dugdale's Baronage. In the course of the researches made for the topographical work just referred to, the author discovered, not indeed the original register, but a very valuable abstract of it made by Dugdale's great friend and coadjutor, Dodsworth¹; and in that abstract a much more ample notice of the contents of the earl's will than is to be found in the Baronage. He mentions in it several children, males and females, all of whom must have been illegitimate; and amongst them occurs the name of *Edward de Warren*, to whom he leaves 20*l.*

It is then for the first time shown, that the last Earl of Warren had a son who bore the name of Edward; and as the house of Poynton is known to descend from an Edward de Warren, who must have been contemporary with that Edward; as there was a strong current of tradition that it did descend from an illegitimate son of the last Earl of Warren; as the distinction in the arms of the Warrens of Poynton was a lion rampant ermine, which was the coat of Nereford, and the earl is well known to have had a mistress of the name of Maud de Nereford; as there is also an absence of all evidence for any other descent of Sir Edward Warren, the undoubted ancestor,—we confess we see not how the conclusion can be evaded that he is the Edward de Warren named in the will, a son, but not legitimate, of the eighth and last Earl.

The name of Warren was allowed to all the male issue of the Earl. This appears to have been on the same principle that the Cornwalls, Barons of Burford, and the Somersets, now Dukes of Beaufort, had their surnames. The one descended from an Earl of *Cornwall*, the other from an Earl of *Somerset*. So the Earl of Warren gave the

¹ Dodsworth's MSS. at the Bodleian, vol. xxviii. f. 134.

name of his earldom to his illegitimate sons. Another illegitimate son of the Earl of Warren not noticed by Watson, named Ravelyn, is mentioned in the Rolls of Parliament, 9 Edward III. ¹

¹ Vol. ii. p. 88.

VOL. II.—PART III.

M M

This is one of the documents John Gough Nichols uses in his critical account of the Rev. John Watson's book *Memoirs of the Ancient Earls of Warren and Surrey*. It was written by Mr. Joseph Hunter and was included in his *History of South Yorkshire* and presented for print in this 1828 volume of *Retrospective Review*.