family noticed seems to be an “Alan de Lascel” (Reg. of St. Andrew’s, p. 182); and not one of all the descendants or collaterals of Alan, as it is curious to remark, takes the Christian name of Robert, which could not well have been if they were of the same family as this Roberto de Sigillo.

In England, it seems, the name Lascelles, &c., of the twelfth century still maintains in some families nearly the same form now. Its origin, as it is contended, is La-scelles—the French of De Sigillo; and if this be a correct etymology, it becomes a subject for inquiry vastly curious: how in Scotland, the like name, from being differently syllabled and accented—Lasceles—should have taken the form latterly of Lesly. After all, Mr. Lower’s belief, as stated in his Pat. Brit. (voce “Lascelles”), may be the better founded of any yet mooted, who informs us that Lassels probably was the more general orthography, and that La Lacelc (observe the duplication of the in considering any interpretation of the meaning of the term) is a place in the arrondissement of Alençon, in Normandy; from which, as he would guess, this name may territorially have had its origin, like many other names of the Norman immigrants (vide “N. & Q.” 4th S. v. 314, 374). But this view is most materially strengthened by the established fact of the name Lascelles occurring in the roll of Battle Abbey, on the Dives Column, and by a Lascelles being found, in the third year of the reign of the Conqueror, associated with Clifford, the governor, in resisting a certain siege (4th S. v. 314). In fact, as it would appear, the family carried the name which it bore in Normandy along with it coming here in or after 1066; and regarding the legend applicable to the seal, alleged to have been given by Rufus on the occasion of his murder to Sir Humph de Lascelles, who has been reckoned one of that king’s bodyguard, there can barely be a doubt of its apocryphal nature, as well as of the name originating that legend at some comparatively late period, when its true etymology and import have become unknown, and the euphony of it was, as it would seem, alone regarded in its interpretation—Lascelles, “the seals.”

There is no doubt the gloss of the editor of the register, of Hun. de Richmond, referred to in “N. & Q.” 4th S. v. 313, bearing upon the name “Baldrico de Sygillo”; but it is given as a mere “forte” or guess. And the statement that immediately follows, regarding the deed of award of date 1200 (ibid.), that the names of W. de Lascelles, Roberto de Sigillo, and Ada de Sigillo, all occur in that same award, proves to our mind that the name Lascelles, and De Sigillo were not then considered the same, or these parties respectively the same family. The De Sigillos of England as well as those of Scotland were, as we believe, ecclesiastics, and those of that class whose duty was—and it was an important one—to see to the due execution of deeds.

The arms of the English Lascelles seem to have been, Arg. three chaplets in chief, gules; those of the Norman Laceles, a single crescent; and those of the Scottish families, on a bend three buckles. May there not have been a confounding of the chaplets and buckles? The seal of a Scotchman, a “Radulf de Lascelles,” A.D. 1292, is blazoned as ermine three garbs; the shield is suspended by the guise, and on the dexter thereof a mullet of six points between two roundles; and on the sinister, a crescent between as many of the same (Laing’s Cat., p. 85). No fewer than five De Lasceles of Scotland made submission to Edward I. in 1292-6, three being of the county of Fife, and two of Edinburgh; while two Le Seelers (Sealeers) do the like, one of Peebles and the other of Roxburgh. The distinction in the use of De, and Le of the Norman-French is to be marked: the one seemingly denoting a name derived from a place or possession, the other from an office or calling.

ESTFEDARE.

SHELLEY’S “DÆMON OF THE WORLD.”

(4th S. v. 534.)

I had hoped to see a reply to the query put by your correspondent C. D. L. from some much abler pen than mine, and I conceived that Mr. Rossetti would be able to show how the apparent forgetfulness of Shelley was to be accounted for.

I have before me a copy of the original scarce edition of Queen Mab described by C. D. L. It has been corrected in MS., the corrections extending through the first twenty-one pages.

The corrections of the first stanza bring the text exactly to that of the Daemon of the World as cited by C. D. L. Not having a copy of the Daemon of the World, I cannot say whether the corrections which follow would alter the whole of the text in the same fashion; but I subjoin a copy of the next stanza, first as it occurs in the text, and next as it stands when corrected or amended.

Queen Mab.

“Hath then the gloomy power,
Whose reign is in the tainted sepulchres,
Seized on her sinless soul?
Must then that peerless form,
Whose love and admiration cannot view
As breathing marble, perish?
Which steal like streams along a field of snow,
Leave nothing of this heavenly sight
But loathsome and ruin?
Must putrefaction’s breath
Without a beating heart, those azure veins
Whose reign is in the tainted sepulchres,
Which love and admiration cannot view
As breathing marble, perish?
Which steal like streams along a field of snow,
Leave nothing of this heavenly sight
But loathsome and ruin?
Must then that peerless form,
Whose love and admiration cannot view
As breathing marble, perish?
Which steal like streams along a field of snow,
Leave nothing of this heavenly sight
But loathsome and ruin?”
Queen Mab corrected.

"Hath then the iron-receiv'd skeleton,
Whose reign is in the tainted sepulchres,
To the hell-dogs that crouch beneath his throne,
Cost that fair prey? must that divinest form,
Which love and admiration cannot view
Without a beating heart, whose azure veins
Steel like dark streams along a field of snow,
Whose outline is as fair as marble cloathed
In light of some sublimest mind, decay
Nor leave aught of this pure spectacle
But loathsomeness and ruin?
Spare aught but a dark theme
On which the lightest heart might moralize?"

I am not able, in consequence of the absence from home of the friend who lent me the volume, to state the name of the gentleman who bequeathed it to him. I only know that it had been for very many years in his library, and that it was believed that the corrections were in the hand of Shelley himself. I confess that, when, some months ago, I compared the handwriting of these corrections with a fac-simile of Shelley's ordinary handwriting, I found that the alterations which would hardly be expected to be introduced into the Christian church, which is the gift of Baptism.

The Arabian province alluded to by Ulpian was that conquered from the Nabathanean Arabs, part of which became afterwards known as the Third Palestine. As it lay to the east and south of Judaea, its usages may be aptly cited in illustration of those of the neighbouring province. The inimical placing of the minatory cairns in Arabia could only have had one signification. "If you cultivate this land, your tomb is prepared for you, and is ready on the spot; you may regard your assassination as a settled affair."

The words in italics, in the preceding passage from Ulpian, appear to convey the exact significance of the Hebrew מִזְיֵמ. A tziyun was merely "a heap of stones, piled up as a mark or indication." The idea of any "inscription" in such a case is ridiculous; the meaning of the tziyun was, in most cases, sufficiently explained by the local situation and the usages of the country. If there had been any inscription over the sepulchre of the man of God in 2 Kings xxiii. 17, we may presume that Josiah could have read it quite as easily as any of the standers-by. It would have been superfluous for the good king to have inquired מִזְיֵמ מ? if the tziyun before him could have told its own story.

HENRY CROSSLEY.

BAPTISM AND CHRISTENING (4th S. vi. 111.)—

The supposed difference here noticed between "christening" and "baptizing" is a bit of slip-slop, and of a very aggravated kind. The words are obviously synonymous, as Bar-Point says they are considered in America, according to any rational construction.

To "christen" means to make a Christian, or introduce into the Christian church, which is the gift of Baptism.

The popular phraseology will be understood by reading the office for Private Baptism in the English Prayer-book.