

The Ancestry of Henry Adams

of Braintree, New England.
By Rev. Hiram Francis Fairbanks

Henry Adams, of whose ancestry we are about to write came from Devonshire, England, in the year 1632, and settled at Mt. Wollaston, in the town of Braintree, not far from the present city of Boston. He died in 1646.

He was the ancestor of John Adams, a signer of the Declaration of American Independence, a member of the first Continental Congress, and the second President of the United States; consequently he was the ancestor of John Quincy Adams, sixth President of the United States. He was likewise the ancestor of Samuel Adams, another signer of the Declaration of Independence, and member of the first Continental Congress, and who became the second Governor of Massachusetts in the new commonwealth.

Henry Adams brought with him to the shores of this Western World his wife, eight sons and one daughter. One of these sons remained with him in Braintree, four removed to Medfield, two to Chelmsford, all in the present State of Massachusetts. As to the final place of residence of one son and daughter there remains considerable uncertainty.

The author of these pages was descended from Henry Adams through his fourth son, Jonathan Adams, for three generations in the male line and after that in the female line.

The object of this pamphlet is to formulate and enforce certain facts brought out by previous investigators which prove that Henry Adams was a descendant of Lord ap Adam and his wife Elizabeth de Gournai, who lived in the latter part of the Thirteenth and early part of the Fourteenth Century; and that through Elizabeth de Gournai he was descended from Matilda and William the Conqueror, and through Matilda from the Counts of Flanders, on the one side being derived from the Capetian Kings of France, and on the other from Charlemagne, the great Emperor of the West.

Without much doubt many of the descendants of Henry Adams do not care to leave the shores of New England in search of a more remote antiquity in the history of the family line. To begin with him, the first of the family on American soil, is enough for them; for they are fully satisfied with the history of the family on this side of the ocean. I have to acknowledge that it is certainly a great honor and one which I thoroughly appreciate, to belong to a family which, if not the most distinguished as many claim, is at least one of the most distinguished families that America has ever produced. To repeat: Two of the descendants of Henry Adams signed the Declaration of American Independence and were members of the first Continental Congress. No other family has furnished a father and a son to the office of President of the Republic, to say nothing of the other eminent men who with honor to the nation have occupied its high stations.

The descendants of Henry Adams were among the chief founders of this mighty Republic of the Western Hemisphere, a nation which to-day counts a population of nearly 80,000,000. And since their time men of his lineage by hundreds have occupied positions of honor, trust, and patriotism in the annals of their country. It is probable that more descendants of this man have been graduates of Harvard and Yale and other colleges than of any other man who ever settled in America. It is no wonder then that many of his name or blood are well satisfied to rest on their laurels on this side of the Atlantic.

But there are many other members of the family—and I am one of them—who believe that we have the right not alone to our place among the great historic families of this country, but that we have an equal right to our genealogical heritage on the other side of the ocean, to our noble and distinguished lineage in the British Isles and Europe back to Lord ap Adam and his still more noble wife, Elizabeth de Gournai, and through her and a long line of her ancestors to

Charlemagne. We believe that the blood of Charlemagne flows through our veins, and that we have a full right to claim it, and that our claims are just and valid.

In the year 1851 William Downing Bruce, Esq., F. S. A., member of the Middle Temple, London, and corresponding member of the N. E. H. G. Society, wrote that he had discovered among the papers of Hon. Edward Hamlin Adams of Middleton Hall, Member of Parliament for Carmarthen, Wales, an ancient manuscript which he copied. He furnished a copy of it to be sent to New England with this explanation: "It is copied from an ancient parchment roll, with arms, of the time of Charles L, which I discovered among the papers of the late Edward Hamlin Adams, Esq., of Middleton Hall, M. P., from the county of Carmarthen, and is now in the possession of his son, Edward Adams, Esq., of Middleton Hall in said county. Mr. Adams is a gentleman of great wealth and consequence in this county, and takes great interest in genealogy." The pedigree is as follows:

"Sir John ap Adam came out of the Marches of Wales, married Elizabeth." She was the daughter of John de Gournai, Lord of Beverston. Their children were: "Sir Thos. Ap Adam, m., had issue; (2) Sir John ap Adam—Wm. ap Adam; in. had issue—Roger of Lancashire. Sir John ap Adam had a son, (3) William ap Adam, who had a son (4) Sir John ap Adam, who was the father of (5) Thos. ap Adam; m. Jane, daughter and heiress of Sir John Inge; (6) Sir John ap Adam, Kt, m. Millicent, daughter of Sir Matthew Bessylls; (7) Sir John ap Adam, alias Adams, m. Clara, daughter and co-heiress of Mr. Roger Powell; (8) Roger Adams m. Jane, daughter of Ellyott; (9) Thos. Adams m. Marie, daughter of Mr. Upton; (10) John Adams m. Jane, daughter of Mr. Rennelegh; (11) John Adams m. Catherine, daughter and heiress of Mr. Stebbing." Children of preceding: "Nicholas M. and had issue; (12) John m. Margerye, daughter and heiress of Mr. Squier—George m. and had issue." Child of John: "(13) Eichard m. Margaret, daughter of Mr. rmager (Sic. Cop.)." Children of Richard were: Robert m. Elizabeth Sharlaw; (14) William m. daughter of Boringoton.-' Children of William were: "George—Henry, died in Braintree, New England, 1646—Ambrose—John."

We may add that George Adams was the ancestor of Mr. Bruce. He was a lieutenant in the service of Charles I., and died in Barbados in 1647.

The question which we now intend to consider is whether this manuscript is in reality the ancient document which it is claimed to be. If it is an ancient and original document, found in the possession of an Adams family of high character and respectability, and as it coincides with the report of the Heralds' Visitation of Devonshire in 1564 so far as their record extends, then we have every reason to believe that it is a genuine and trustworthy pedigree of the family whose lineage it traces. As it is chiefly a question of competent witnesses for or against it, we shall group our witnesses who directly or indirectly testify in its favor. And to make our argument doubly sure we shall insist on the fact that the burden of proof under the circumstances rests on the negative. We shall after that present any unfavorable opinions expressed against it, and answer the objections which have been made.

The first witness in its favor is Mr. William Downing Bruce, Esq., member of the Middle Temple, London, and Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. So strong is the testimony of Mr. Bruce in its favor that it seems to be admitted by all parties that if his statements are truthful the document is without much doubt correct. Mr. Bruce was a gentleman of learning and respectability. His intelligence and knowledge of the subject were such that his one critic has not attempted to prove that he was deceived. For the culture and respectability required to become a member of the Middle Temple, London, I refer the reader to the article on "The Inns of Court" in the American Encyclopedia. Mr. Bruce had also made a special study of genealogy and antiquaries. It was for this reason that he had been made a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. His knowledge of this subject had enabled him to take a broad view of genealogy, and to know where to expect to find original and valuable documents, and to judge of their genuineness when found. His whole training and culture fitted him to investigate on broader lines and on a higher plane of criticism than could his critic, a retired Pennsylvania merchant, who having chosen London for his

residence became a professional genealogist. Mr. Bruce, belonging to the Adams family, took more interest in his subject than would an outsider, and time and money would be expended more freely and persistently by him than by others who had not the same strong motive.

Another witness, although indirect, but none the less important, was Edward Adams, Esq., J. P., of Middleton Hall, Carmarthen, Wales. In fact the high standing of this family, both father and son, gives great weight to any document found in their possession and which without doubt they believed to be genuine. Hon. Edward Hamlin Adams was a member of the British Parliament, and belonged to one of the old and aristocratic families of Wales. His son, Edward Adams, was a magistrate, and was the owner of valuable estates received from his father. He v/as living during the whole time of the discussion and by his part in the affair practically upheld Mr. Bruce. The landed gentry of Great Britain are not usually so anxious to claim family kinship to Americans as to take the part he did unless well convinced of its truthful character. He died in 1875 without male issue. His heir was his eldest daughter, Miss Lucy Caroline Adams, who became the wife of Mr. Lawrence, Vicar of Tong, a minister of the established church. In "Walford's Country Gentry" she was described as "Lady of the Manors of Gwynionydd Ucherdin, Gwynionydd Iscerdin, and Caerwedros, County Cardigan, residence Middleton Hall, Llanartheney, near Carmarthen." Her heir was her sister, Miss Adah Constance Adams, who had married John Williams Hughes, Captain of the Scots Guards. In Walford we also find that one branch of the ancient family of Lord ap Adam had settled in Charlton, County Somerset, and afterwards removed to Fenne in the County of Devonshire, and another branch had settled in Brompton, in the County Kent. In their coat-of-arms the Devonshire family had quartered the coat-of-arms of the Gnrnav or de Gournai family. To show how old families sometimes disappear from the scene in less than fifty years, not one of these families is found in Burke's "Country Gentry" in the edition of 1897.

Another witness in favor of the genuineness of this ancient parchment roll was Mr. Somerby, an excellent authority and the author of "Pedigrees." Although under the influence of Mr. Chester he changed his mind with reference to the brief note after the name of Henry, the document was so clearly and evidently correct that all the arguments of Mr. Chester could not change his opinion of the rest, and inasmuch as for a long time he upheld the genuineness of the entire manuscript he was in reality a strong witness in its favor. The more so is this the case because the arguments of Mr. Chester, being founded on false suppositious, utterly fall to the ground. The editor of the Genealogical Register quotes Mr. Somerby as saying that he thought "the parchment roll had been drawn up or additions made to it years before Mr. Bruce copied it." Mr. Somerby states that he had seen the original parchment roll, had examined it, and for some time he had considered it evidently correct; but afterwards the "researches made by Mr. Chester had convinced him" that the record after the name of Henry, "died in Braintree in New England, 1616," was an addition made by somebody. But Mr. Bruce says the same thing, although he holds to the genuineness of the entire document. He says that the words above quoted "were in a later hand, say 1680." Mr. Bruce's knowledge as an antiquarian without doubt helped him to arrive at this conclusion. Nothing could be more reasonable than that on the receipt of definite and authentic news of Henry Adams' death it should have been recorded on the parchment roll that contained his name. In the very nature of things in those early times it might have been many years after his death before such notification, accompanied by satisfactory proofs, would have been received from a far distant country in the American wilderness.

Mr. Chester is the only person who has pretended to any knowledge of the matter who attempted to criticize the authority of the document. Mr. Chester was, I am inclined to think, an estimable gentleman, who set too high a value on his own opinions. He was a retired American merchant who went to London and in time was employed by certain Americans to make search for their English pedigree. He was probably a good collector of facts and figures where no great talent for original research was required. But his early training and habits had not prepared him for such work as the aforementioned gentlemen were more capable of performing.

His two chief arguments against the document appear to be these: He had never seen the document although he had several times asked to see it; and he found no records to confirm the

last portion of it in the "Wills and Administrations" of the various Adams families of the kingdom. Why he had never seen it is partly evident from the fact that there seems to have been "no love lost" between Mr. Bruce and himself. He himself indicates this when he asserts his "inability to accept the word of Mr. _____ unless verified by other evidence." We see that his reason here given against the existence of an original parchment roll falls to the ground in the face of the very ample evidence of the other witnesses who from actual examination verified the statement of Mr. Bruce. He applies his other argument, the absence of "Wills and Administrations," back to the time of Nicholas, and thus brings himself in opposition to the unanimous conclusions of all the other witnesses. Let us consider this argument of the absence of other documents. It is a very narrow one.

There are hundreds of thousands of manuscripts of all kinds pertaining to arms, pedigrees, lands, administrations, visitations, births, marriages, and deaths in the public and private libraries of Great Britain. Take one example. There are 40,500 manuscripts, independent of charters and rolls, in the British Museum alone, many of them of the aforesaid character. Thousands are also contained in private libraries, many of them practically inaccessible to the public. Thousands of others during the course of centuries have been lost or destroyed. An investigator might employ a score of genealogists for years and spend a hundred thousand dollars in his search, and yet pass over important documents which he seeks, to say nothing of those no longer in existence. It must also be remembered that the time of which we write was in the neighborhood of 300 years ago. The absence of corroborative documents under the circumstances is a very poor proof against a known positive document, it would require positive contradictory documents of greater authority to disprove it. To understand better the great extent to which an investigation might be made and still be unsatisfactory it would be well to consult a book in my possession indicating some of the sources of such investigation. It is written by Richard Sims, Esq., of the British Museum, entitled "A Manual for the Genealogist." For any man after a few hours or even days of investigation to decide with such high-handed presumption on the genuineness and authority of a document which he had never seen is scarcely less than the reduction to an absurdity. It is the old example of bad logic in an exaggerated form. Four men swear that they saw the man do the act. One man swears that he did not see him do it. What kind of an "intelligent" jury would it be that would still remain undecided? I have found in all my investigation that every one who holds an adverse opinion to our proposition refers back to Mr. Chester, who is their judge, witness and jury about a matter of which they themselves know nothing.

Let us now consider the addition to the name of Henry Adams in this ancient record; "died in Braintree in New England, 1646." An addition or even explanatory note in a document may be as correct and trustworthy as the rest of the record, and may have all the authority of the document itself of which it is a part. It would be an extremely dangerous proceeding to reject any part of a document unless reasons could be given for so doing which are altogether convincing. Most of the important annals of history are those that have been continued either at different times in his life by the same author, or else by different authors in successive generations. This fact has in no way weakened their authority; and in many cases the fact that the names of the writers are utterly unknown to us has hardly lessened their weight among scholars. It often happens that the note or explanation is clearer, more satisfactory, and of greater weight than the document itself without it. In this particular case there is not a particle of evidence to show that the brief completion of the record at a not far distant later date was not made by the same author and authority that had recorded the earlier part of it, or else by some one equally trustworthy in all particulars. There is every reason to believe that this addition was made by an authority who had a full knowledge of the facts recorded, and wished to complete the record in his time. I have been very much surprised at the weak reasoning, defective logic, and vague and untenable positions of all those who have attempted to weaken the authority of this ancient parchment roll.

We must take into consideration the respectable condition of life of all those who had anything to do with this document, as well as the honorable character and antiquity of the family in whose possession it was found. All these facts go to show not alone the correctness of the pedigree as

recorded, but equally the genuineness of the record that "Henry Adams died in Braintree in New England, 1646.

Weak, superficial criticism is one of the easiest things on earth to make, and it is the delight of certain men of limited knowledge and learning to pose before the world as critics. All the affirmative witnesses for our document, and they include all who ever saw and examined it, agree that the addition to the name of Henry Adams was made at a time long before Mr. Bruce ever saw it. They all believed that it had been made in the neighborhood of one hundred and seventy years before that time, which was 1851. For a long time Mr. Somerby agreed with the others until he was imposed on by the claims of Mr. Chester; and even after that he continued to believe, so far as we are able to determine, that it had been added "years before Mr. Bruce saw it."

The force of our argument, however, does not depend on this. For if we show that Mr. Chester did not succeed in proving his objections, as we have shown, and will show, then his entire argument fails, and any opinions of others accepted on his invalid conclusions also fail with it. It must also be borne in mind that the probability or certainty required to prove a genealogical pedigree in remote past centuries is not the same that is required to prove our heirship to a property or estate. If it was, there would be but few genealogical trees left standing; for only a limited number of historic families could thus prove by legal proofs their earlier and remote lineage. Richard Sims, Esq., of the British Museum, in his valuable "Manual" already mentioned, says: "Although many of the public libraries of this country contain undoubted national records, charters, and registers, even the Magna Charta itself, they are not allowed as evidence in our courts of justice; having been separated from their proper custody, they are rejected and disowned, however valuable." The value of the ancient parchment roll, of which we write, as a proof of pedigree, may be inferred from his words following the above quotation on the same page: "However valuable, then, and however genuine a document may be, it will not be received as evidence" (he means legal evidence in courts of justice) "unless it be in the possession of some person connected with the estate or property to which it refers, or who can satisfactorily account for its possession." If this rule of evidence holds good in legal matters pertaining to estates, by inference it also holds good in genealogical matters pertaining to pedigrees. The Adams record was in the possession of an Adams family of high character to whom it referred, and we have to conclude that the entire document, including the record of the death of Henry Adams, is what it claims to be.

Mr. Browning has therefore very properly, in his "Americans of Royal Descent," placed Henry Adams and those descended from him among the descendants of Charlemagne. In fact if Mr. Browning had rejected the pedigrees of all those whose claims do not rest on as well established a basis as those of Henry Adams his book would have shrunk into much more insignificant proportions.

Another weak objection urged against our position and practically contained in one of the objections of Mr. Chester is that Henry Adams of Braintree was a man in somewhat humble circumstances in life, boasting neither wealth nor titles. It is not 300 years since Henry Adams came to these American shores and his descendant's to-day number several thousand.

It was another three hundred years from the time of Lord ap Adam to Henry Adams. How many sons of younger sons had multiplied; how many branches of the family had come into existence. Barber in his "British Family Names" says: "In the majority of cases the later descendants of illustrious families have sunk into poverty and obscurity unconscious of their origin, and this was more likely to be the case with younger branches." It is doubtful if one name in six of those who are recorded in Domesday Book is to-day found among those who own land in England, and the names of five out of six of the landholders of our day are not recorded there.

Many branches of the Adams family had undoubtedly for some time or for several generations been in reduced circumstances before the time when Henry Adams with his large family immigrated to America. Some of the older branches of the family had retained a portion of their property, but even they had become much reduced from the position which the family held in

earlier times. By consulting "Burke's Extinct Peerage" and other similar works we shall find the following facts: "Sir Thomas ap Adam was living in 1330, having then alienated the greater part of the estates he had received from the Gurnays, and sold the Castle and Manor of Beverstone to Thomas de Berkley." Thomas here spoken of was the eldest son and heir of Lord ap Adam, while John from whom Henry Adams was descended was his second son. "The last fragment of the once great estates of Baron ap Adam was sold in 1580 by Dr. Symings of London to Wm. Lewis, Esq." But for a long time before this no part of the estate was owned by any one bearing the name of ap Adam or Adams.

If such a change had taken place in the fortunes of the oldest branch of the family what could we expect to have become the condition of those branches of the family which in numerous generations had descended from younger sons who in turn were also the descendants of younger sons? Yet this explains the exact facts which would decide the condition in life of Henry Adams at the time he immigrated to America. Some branches of the family through marriage or favorable condition of their property had recovered a portion of their earlier prosperity and something of their former position, while the larger number, oftentimes with a numerous offspring, had gradually been reduced to a condition of comparative poverty and obscurity. Therefore we find these brothers in about the exact condition in which we might expect to find them. The oldest brother gets a commission as a lieutenant in Foreign Service, and the others are left to shift for themselves. Henry Adams with his wife and nine children has enough to take him to the New World and start him well in life in his new home. Yet he was a man of intelligence and ability, having a fair education, and when he died he divided among his sons a library, something very rare in this new land two hundred and fifty years ago.

We have here considered only the results which are ordinarily produced under that natural law of change mentioned by Mr. Barber in times which are under normal conditions. But for a whole century before the emigration of Henry Adams from England such normal conditions had not existed. And during those times of civil and religious revolutions and persecutions, the civil and religious principles which men held directed against them powerful influences and forces that changed entirely financial and social conditions in a few generations of family history. Large numbers of Catholics and Dissenters were helped along their way more quickly to "poverty and obscurity" by laws and oppressive measures enacted against them; so that the words are exactly true which John Adams, second President of the United States, had placed on the monument of his ancestor: "In memory of Henry Adams, who took his flight from the Dragon of Persecution in Devonshire, England, and alighted with eight sons near Mt. Wollaston."

Therefore the second argument of Mr. Chester and his copyists is shown to be worthless, and falls to the ground with the other. For at least three generations there were probably no "wills and administrations" in this branch of the Adams family for the very good reason that they were not needed.

The final question which remains to be considered has already been introduced by the inscription just quoted on the monument of Henry Adams. This question is not, however, essential to our main proposition. It is incidental to it, but has at least some bearing on the force of our argument. Those who have tried to weaken the authority of Mr. Bruce's parchment roll have made intellectual attempts to show that President John Adams was mistaken and that his ancestor did not come from Devonshire. The fact that this ancient parchment roll had not been discovered in the time of John Adams serves all the more to confirm his statement. I have read everything I could find on the other side of the question, and I find nothing against it but the most unfounded surmises. Some have started out with the supposition that he did not come from Devonshire, but from somewhere else in England, and finding no proof for their theory have naturally come to the conclusion that the original home of the family could not be located. Such seems to have been the opinion arrived at by one distinguished member of the family for some time resident in England. Others have suggested that he came from Braintree in Essex, although they have been unable to obtain a particle of proof for their assertion. One author goes so far as to state that Savage in his Genealogical Dictionary of New England concurs in this opinion. I happen to own a

set of this valuable work and can certify that he does nothing of the kind. He gives both opinions equally as traditions. I think much of the trouble has arisen from two sources; one that "the wish is father to the thought," and the other a confusion coming from the name. They have thus falsely concluded that he was associated with the Hooker colony, the chief part of which came from Essex and settled in Braintree, but by order of the court removed to Newtown. Why did not Henry Adams or any of his sons go with them? For the plain reason that he had no connection with them. This is the clearer from the fact that four of his sons afterwards removed to Medfield and all but one to other parts of the country, but not one of them ever associate himself with the Hooker colonists.

An equally plausible opinion might be formed from another name in favor of my proposition. Henry Adams settled in that part of Braintree called Mt. Wollaston. The only Woolaston in England is near Tidenham, in Gloucestershire, in the immediate neighborhood of the estates of Lord ap Adam, probably on the estates which he once owned. It might naturally be supposed that Henry Adams was attracted to Mt. Wollaston because it was a reminder to him in a strange land of the home of his ancestors. The supposition would appear even more plausible if the origin of the name had been lost sight of, as it might have been if it had not been recorded that the height was named after Capt. Wollaston, who landed there in 1625. But neither supposition should have any weight, for in such matters we are often easily deceived by a coincidence which if not accidental has no relation to the subject. Another statement which I have read is equally at variance with the facts. It is that John Adams had supposed that his ancestor had "formed part of the company of Winthrop, most of whom came from Devonshire," and in this way he was misled.

The truth is quite the contrary. All the prominent men who came with Winthrop, as I find on examination, came from other parts of England, and not one from Devonshire; and the very name of Boston would have suggested to John Adams Lincolnshire instead of Devonshire. John Adams with his acute intellect made no mistake. He was nearer than any of the other authorities to the original source of information, and all of his family line had remained in Braintree, receiving in this way the unbroken traditions of the family more correctly than it was possible for those who had dispersed to receive them. To understand how close was his connection with undoubted family tradition it will be enough to remind the reader that Edward Adams was the youngest son of Henry Adams and came from England with his father. When he died the father of President John Adams was twenty-four or twenty five years of age. It is believed that President Adams was confirmed in the truth of the family tradition by investigations made during his residence in England.

The inscription carved by his order in imperishable stone to remain for all time, and the ancient parchment roll handed down in one of the most noble and ancient families of Wales, had no connection in time or place, but they perfectly unite together to prove a genuine and unbroken link which cannot be forced from the chain to which it belongs of unbroken lineage for twelve hundred years.

We shall now summarize a few important parts of our argument. An ancient parchment roll exists which has every proof of being genuine and trustworthy. All the witnesses who have ever examined it bear a substantially unanimous testimony in its favor, and the number of these witnesses is ample. Their intelligence was such and their study and investigations in that particular line had been so exact that they possessed the skill of experts united with the education and breadth of men in the learned professions in a country where the words "learned professions" mean something. This ancient parchment roll was found in a family of high character and standing, in a family to whom the pedigree referred, and in whose possession it had been without doubt for more than two centuries. This parchment roll agrees with every other similar document known to exist so far as it relates to the same subject, and there is no other of any kind so far as is known or even claimed to exist that in any particular militates against it. The various criticisms and objections which have been urged against it we believe we have completely answered in the preceding pages.

The conclusion necessarily follows, that in so far as a moral certainty can exist in the vast majority of well-authenticated pedigrees the lineage of Henry Adams of Braintree and his descendants is fully proved to be an unbroken one back to Charlemagne.

We shall here insert the Adams pedigree chiefly as it is given on pages 66-68, in the attractive volume of Mr. Browning, entitled "Americans of Royal Descent." To this we have added other interesting facts obtained by our own investigation.

PEDIGREE.

1. Pepin of Landen, born before the year 600.
2. Grimoald.
3. Pepin of Heristal.
4. Charles Martel, King of France.
5. Pepin the Short.
6. CHARLEMAGNE, Emperor of the West.
7. Louis the Pious.
8. Charles II. (the Bald).
9. Judith, married Count Baldwin (of the Iron Ann).
10. Baldwin II., Count of Flanders.
11. Arnolph the Great, Count of Flanders.
12. Baldwin III., Count of Flanders.
13. Arnolph II., Fifth Count of Flanders.
14. Baldwin IV., Sixth Count of Flanders.
15. Baldwin V., Seventh Count of Flanders, married Princess Adela, daughter of Robert the Pious, son of Hugh Capet, King of France.
16. Matilda, married William the Conqueror, King of England. Queen Matilda was also descended from Alfred the Great, and the father of William was first cousin of St Edward the Confessor.
17. Princess Gundred, daughter of the preceding, married William de Warren, who was created Earl of Surrey.
18. Edith de Warren, married Gerard, Baron de Gournai. He was the son of Hugh de Gournai and Basilia, daughter of Gerard Flaital, and sister of William, bishop of Evreux. He with his father fought in the battles of Mortemer and Hastings. His father became a monk in the Benedictine Abbey of Bee. Gerard de Gournai died in Palestine in 1096.
19. Hugh de Gournai, married Millicent de Maria, daughter of Thomas, Lord of Coucy.
20. Hugh de Gournai, married Lady Julia Dampmartin, sister of Reginald, Count de Boulogne. He lost Ms Norman estates through political troubles and took refuge in England. He was buried in Langley Abbey, Norfolk. Hugh de Gournai, Lord of Beverston ; died without male issue.
21. Anselm de Gournai, Lord of Beverston; succeeded his brother.
22. Robert de Gournai, Lord of Beverston; was a younger brother.
23. Anselm de Gournai. Lord of Beverston.
24. John de Gournai, Lord of Beverston; married Lady Oliva, daughter of Henry Lovel, Baron of Castle Cary.
25. Elizabeth de Gournai^ married Sir John ap Adam of Beverston and Tideuham, Lord ap Adam by writ, 1296-1307. His estates were large not only in his own right but he received valuable estates from his wife. Their names are found in most works on extinct peerages. He was engaged in the Scottish wars. There remains to this day a beautiful stained glass window in his memory in the church in Tidenham, with his name, coat-of-arms, and the date 1310 in the upper part. His coat of arms is given as "argent, a cross gules, 5 mullets or, crest; that of a ducal coronet, a demi-lion." This means that on a silver ground was a red cross which extended from the top to the bottom and to each side, and on this cross were five golden stars. The crest as given in Fairbairn's Crests was the head and principal part of the body of a lion, rampant gardant; that is erect and the right paw raised.
26. Sir John ap Adam, Kt., second son. He was brother of Sir Thomas ap Adam, heir to his father, but who was never summoned to Parliament.
27. William ap Adam, married and had issue.
28. Sir John ap Adam, Kt., married and had issue.
29. Thomas ap Adam, married Lady Jane, daughter of Sir John Inge.
30. Sir John ap Adam, Kt., married Millicent, daughter of Sir Matthew Bessylls.
31. Sir John ap Adam, alias Adams, married Clara, daughter of Mr. Roger Powell.
32. Roger Adams, married Jane, daughter of Mr. Ellyott.
33. Thomas Adams, married Marie, daughter of Mr. Upton.
34. John Adams^ married Jane, daughter of Mr. Rennelegh.
35. John Adams, married Catherine, daughter of Mr. Stebbing.

36. John Adams, married Margerye, daughter of Mr. Squier.
37. Richard Adams, married Margaret, daughter of Mr. Armager.
38. William Adams, married daughter of Mr. Boringoton.
39. Henry Adams, of Braintree, married and had eight sons and one daughter.