

12 50

Amesbury

D. Murray
sent to me by
of Amesbury

RALEGHANA.

BY

T. N. BRUSHFIELD, M.D.

(Read at Ashburton, July, 1896.)

[Reprinted from the Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature, and Art. 1896.—xxviii. pp. 272-312.]



-RALEGH-

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
NORTH CAROLINA

D107

RALEGHANA.

BY

T. N. BRUSHFIELD, M.D.

(Read at Ashburton, July, 1896.)

[*Reprinted from the Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature, and Art.* 1896.—xxviii. pp. 272-312.]

RALEGHANA.¹

BY T. N. BRUSHFIELD, M.D.

(Read at Ashburton, July, 1896.)

IN his first lecture on *Heroes and Hero-worship*, T. Carlyle remarked, "Universal History, the history of what man has accomplished in the world, is at bottom the History of the Great Men who have worked here." This he condensed into the axiom, "The History of the World . . . was the Biography of Great Men."

To descend from the general to the special, we find the following passage in the "Address to the Reader," in E. Cleaveland's well-known work: "The History of the Family of Courtenay may in effect be said to be an History of the County of Devon."²

Coming more immediately to the subject-matter of this paper, it may be affirmed that the history of England of the Elizabethan period is, to a considerable extent, represented by the life of Sir Walter Raleigh, more especially from the time of his first appearance at Court until the death of Elizabeth, in 1603. It is less a biography than a chapter—and a very important one—in our history. With the advent of James I., his more active physical energies and political life may be said to have terminated. How extensive an area his actions covered, and how greatly they influenced the history of his period, is thus related by one of his eminent literary contemporaries (also a Devonian), Dr. Nathanael Carpenter, in his *Geographie*, published in the first year of Charles I.

¹ The title *Reliquiæ Raleghanae* would have been a more appropriate one, but it had been already used to designate a work published in 1679, consisting of discourses and sermons by Dr. Walter Raleigh, Dean of Wells.

² *Hist. of the Courtenay Family* (1735), vij.

“Who hath known or read of that prodigie of wit and fortune? Sr *Walter Rawleigh*, a man vnfortunate in nothing els but the greatnes of his wit and advancement? whose eminent worth was such, both in *Domestick Policie, Forreigne Expeditions, and Discoveries, Arts and Literature*, both *Practick and Contemplatiue*, which might seeme at once to conquire both Example and Imitation.”³

Very few Englishmen have had their biographies so frequently written, or their actions commented upon, as Raleigh, and yet there are wide gaps in his public career to be filled up; and of the details of his private life we know but little. No one will gainsay the importance of taking advantage of all fresh sources of knowledge, to supply many of the missing links of information, that may serve to throw light upon the guiding motives of many of his deeds, and give a clearer insight into his general character, and which at the present day is certainly misunderstood. Another desirable point is the investigation of many statements respecting him, which, though generally accepted as facts, are apt either to be exaggerated, or to be altogether erroneous. Moreover, our knowledge of his family is of a very meagre description.

The object of the writer of the present paper is to gather into it many fragments relating to Sir Walter Raleigh, and to the members of his family, some of which are now brought under notice for the first time; bearing in mind the following authoritative opinion of a leading modern historian:

“Everything that in the remotest way bears upon the history or institution that he [the historian] is describing, has its special value.”⁴

1. WALTER RALEGH AND HAYES BARTON.

The birthplace of Sir W. Raleigh, Hayes Barton, as it has been termed of late years, though formerly known simply as Hayes (and so designated by his biographer, J. Shirley, in 1677), has already been fully described.⁵ Of the history of his father, Walter Raleigh, we possess but few fragments. Assuming that he ceased to be a ward in 1518,⁶ the only incidents of his life that have as yet been found recorded consist of the following: The carved bench-ends in East Budleigh Church, displaying his coat of arms, and dated 1537,

³ Ed. of 1625, bk. 2, p. 261.

⁴ *Lectures on Mediæval History*, by [Bp.] W. STUBBS, D.D., lect. 5, p. 97.

⁵ *Dev. Assoc.* xxi. 312-320. ⁶ *Ibid.* xv. 165.

must have been done under his auspices. Hoker records that he nearly lost his life during the rebellion of 1549.⁷ In 1553-4, he assisted Sir P. Carew to escape in a bark belonging to him,⁸ and on September 14 of the same year, "Walter Rayleigh, Esq., and Katherine, his wife," are mentioned in a Latin deed of that date relating to land in the parish of Mewy [Meavy].⁹ The tithes of fish, etc., of Sidmouth were leased by him and his two sons in 1560, and disposed of by them in 1578.¹ He was churchwarden of East Budleigh, in 1561; and in a list of debts due to the estate of an Exeter merchant named Lante, at the time of his death, in 1569, is this entry:

"It. Mr water Rawley v^s ix^d."²

He had married and buried two wives, and in 1548, or following year, had taken his third wife.

At what time he entered upon his occupancy of Hayes, is entirely unknown; but, according to Wood,³ he "had a remnant of a lease of 80 years in it." Probably it took place within a short period of his marriage with Joan Drake, some time between 1518 and 1525. Although conjectural, we may, if Wood's statement be correct, assume that this remnant would be about 25 years. It must, however, have terminated about 1550 or 1551, as we know by a document that has recently been discovered.

Preserved among the large mass of papers and documents that came into the possession of the Rolle family in 1785, at the time of the purchase of the estates belonging to the Dukes, there was found a copy of a lease dated 1551, relating to Hayes, and, from the light it throws upon the Raleigh family, it is now, through the kind permission of the Hon. Mark Rolle, printed *in extenso*.

"**Th**is Indenture the sixt day of October in the fite yere of the reigne of our Sovereigne Lord Edwarde the Sixt by the Grace of God Kyng of Englande, Ffraunce and Irelande defendo^r of the faith and in earth of the Churche of Englande and also of Irelande the supreme hedd BETWEEN RICHARD DUKE Esquire of th' one pht and WALTER RALEGH Esquire and JOHN RALEGH Gentleman some of the same Walter of th' other pht WITNESSETH that the said Richard hath dymysed graunted and to farme letten and by these presents dymysseth graunteth and to farme lett etc (?) to the said Walter and John his capital messuage of his Barton of Powreshayes and all his houses buyldyns landes medowes and pastures to the

⁷ *Descrip. of Exeter* (1765), 41, 2.

⁸ *S. P. Dom.* Mary, iii.

⁹ *Inf. of the late Mr. R. Dymond.*

¹ *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 172-5.

² *Notes and Gleanings*, i. 138.

³ *Ath. Ox.* ii., ed. Bliss, II. 235.

same Barton belonging and appteynyng tother with the comēn of pasture from the premysses unto the Townes of Woodbury and Lympton and wth the pasture of the Wood called Haywoode kepynge preserving and fensyng well and sufficiintlie the same Woode and the Spryng thereof from tyme to tyme from distrucon and bityng of beaste after the fellyng of eny woode there by the said Richarde Duke his heires or assignes all which premysses the said Walter now holdes in farme EXCEPT and ALWEY RESERVED to the said Richarde Duke his heires and assignes the meadows called Haymede otherwise called Clape mede and Lytell mede AND ALSO except and alwey reserved to the said Richarde Duke his heires and assignes free libertie power and authoritie from tyme to tyme to do and take their pleasure to hawke hunte fishe and fowle in and upon all the premysses conveyd reserved to the said Walter Ralegh and John Ralegh TO HAVE and TO HOLD all and singular the premysses wth th' apptence (except before excepted) to the said Walter Ralegh and John Ralegh from the feast of Saynt Mychaell th' Archangell last past before the date hereof unto thence and terme of Fourescore yeares then next folowyng fully to be complete and ended if the said Walter Ralegh and John Ralegh or either of them so long do lyve YELDING therefor yerely to the said Richarde Duke his heires and assignes Twelve pounds of lawfull money of Englande at the Feaste of the Birth of o^r Lorde God the annuncyaion [*sic*] of o^r Ladye the Virgyne the natyvyte of Saynt John Baptiste and Saynt Michael th' Archangell by even portions to be paid during the said terme AND the said Walter and John to paye or cause to be paid yerely for and in the name and behalf of the said Richarde his heirs and assignes for respyte of sute of Court to the ffee of the Barony of Okhampton Fiftene pence yerely And to the heires of the Lorde . . . [?] sometyme Lorde of the Mano^r of Woodbury for rent of pcell of the said comēn of pasture Foure pence or a pounce of . . . [?] yerely And also to do the office of the [Tyt] hyngman of the Tythyng of Powes hayes and sute to the Court of the Hundred of Est Bud[leig]h And also to repair susteyne and mayneteyne well and sufficiintlie the said Capitall mesuage and all . . . premysses so well . . . and dyches as often as nede shall require during the said terme at the coste and charge of the said Walter and John and shall leve the same sufficiintlie repaired at the end of the said terme AND IT IS AGREED between the said pties that the said Walter Ralegh and John Ralegh shall once yerely competent and sufficient hedgbote firebote and ploughbote in and upon the lands of the said Barton as of the underwoods in the said Woode called Haywood and to be spent and be occupied in and upon the premysses during the said terme wthout delyverye and that the said Walter and John shall have sufficient housbote to be taken as well upon the landes of the said Barton as in the said woode for the necessary repacons of the same as often as nede shall require duryng the said terme And if it

happen the said yerely rent of Twelve pounds to be behynde or unpaid in pte or in the hole by the space of Syxe wekes after any of the said Feasts at which it ought to be paide, if in the mene-tyme it be demanded and no sufficient distresse may be founde upon the premysses or if the said Walter Ralegh and John Ralegh do dye wthin the said terme that then it shalbe lawfull to the said Richarde Duke his heires and assignes in to all and singuler the premisses to reenter and the same to repossede and have ageyne as in their first estate This Indenture or eny thyng herein conteyned to the contrary not wth standyng PROVIDED ALWEY and it is agreed betwene the said pties that it shalbe lawfull to the said Richard Duke his heires and assignes from tyme to tyme to take fell and carry away or cause to be taken felled and caried away at their will and pleasure the Trees and Woode in the said Woode called Haywoode wthout let or interrupcon of the said Walter and John or of any other psonie or psones by their means assent or procurement this Indenture or any thyng therin conteyned to the contrary notwithstanding.

" IN WITNESS whereof the said pties to these present Indentures interchaungeably have putte their seales the day and yere first above wrytten.

" Duke

"



"

There are a few points in this document worthy of notice. It was drawn up in the year 1551, when, probably, Carew Ralegh was a year old, and the future Sir Walter had not been born. John was the second son by the first marriage, and while both he and his father are mentioned several times in it, the name is invariably "Ralegh." Although it had been some time in the hands of the Duke family, and was subsequently known as Dukeshayes, at the date of the deed it was termed "Powreshayes." The holding must have been very extensive with respect to the common land, which is noted to extend to "the Townes of Woodbury and Lympton." "Haywood," the one facing the present farmhouse to the south, had probably been a wood for centuries previously. The "Spryng" was the young underwood, and the term is still employed in the North and in East Anglia, but it is absent from West-country glossaries. The field-names of "Haymede," or "Clape mede," and "Lytell mede," are unable to be identified. The "Clape mede" was, perhaps, one of the enclosures intersected by a brook not far from the house, and united by a clapper bridge—a plank thrown across.

The various allowances formed very important items in the economy of the farm and buildings; "hedgbote," thorns and frith for the repair of hedges; "firebote," firing for the tenant; "ploughbote," wood for repairs of ploughs, carts, and agricultural implements generally;⁴ and "housbote," timber for repairs of tenement. All materials yielded by the estate.

The lease was held on the two lives of the father and son, no provision being made, such as was customary at a later period, for a third life to be entered, to replace one of the others who had died. It was for eighty years, and hence would have expired in 1631; but probably it was surrendered soon after the death of Walter Raleigh, in 1581.

Several reasons have already been given why Walter moved from Fardel to Hayes in his early life—retrenchment, interest in shipping matters, and the vicinity of his first wife's residence.⁵ But the fact of his family possessing the manors of Withycombe Raleigh, on the S.W., and Colaton Raleigh, on the N.E. of Hayes, the latter being situated about midway between them, may have acted as another powerful cause.

Before quitting the subject of Hayes, advantage may be taken to draw attention to two passages in the original letter of Sir Walter Raleigh, first printed in its entirety in *Dev. Assoc.* xxi. 319, and there shown in italics, which serve to point out the portions omitted from all the copies previously printed. Remarkably enough, these omissions contain the only allusions to the assistance rendered by "Mr Sprinte," in the attempt made by Sir Walter to purchase the property. Who that gentleman was, enquiries at the time the paper was written (1889) failed to discover; since then, through the kind aid of the Rev. R. E. H. Duke, vicar of Monk Fryston, Lumby, Yorkshire, he has been identified, and much light has been thrown on the subject-matter of Sir Walter's letter.

Richard Duke, the possessor, *inter alia*, of the Otterton estate and of Poerhayes, died in 1572, leaving a daughter, Christiana, who had married, as her first husband, George Brooke, second son of Lord Cobham; and in the Register of Baptisms of Otterton he is thus noticed:

"1565. 20 Octob. Petrus fil. Georgii Cobham aſs Brooke armig."

⁴ G. PULMAN, in the glossary to his *Rustic Sketches* (1871), 126, has the following note: "Plough. In addition to the well-known agricultural implement, the farm waggon and horses are often included under the general term of *plough*. 'Farmer Smith got a cappical plough'—meaning that his waggons and teams are excellent."

⁵ *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 165, 6.

Her second husband was George Sprent, or Sprint, and according to Hutchins,⁶ the manor of Stalbridge, "late parcel of Sherborne abbey," was in 15 Eliz. (=1572, 3), held by "George Sprent, in right of his wife Christian, daughter and heir of Richard Duke."

He is again recorded in the proceedings of the Court of Chancery⁷ in 1572, the plaintiff being "Gilbert Drake gent," and the defendants "Gregory Sprinte and Christiana his wife and Rich. Duke." The premisses were "Lease granted (by Margery Trowe late Prioress and the convent of the dissolved Monastery of Polslove) of the Rectory of Budleigh and Millacombe [Withycombe] Raleigh and the messauges advousons and churches." "George" and "Gregory" Sprinte were evidently the same person.⁸

These particulars point out the relationship of G. Sprinte to the Duke family, and it was most probably owing to his marriage that he became possessed of the moiety of Otterton. Particulars of his property at "Colliton"—presumably Colaton Raleigh—are unknown. In his letter, Sir Walter shows that if he failed to purchase the Hayes property direct from Mr. Duke, he made the alternative proposition, that Mr. Sprinte (with whom he had previous dealings) was willing to exchange his moiety of Otterton with Mr. Duke for Hayes, in which case it is assumed he would sell the latter to Sir Walter. The Rev. R. E. H. Duke is of opinion that R. Duke could not part with Hayes, having entailed it and the Otterton property on his nephew.

It only remains to record that Sir Walter's letter has found a fitting resting-place in the Albert Memorial Museum, to which it was generously presented by its possessor, Mr. W. F. Glubb, of Great Torrington.

2. WALTER RALEGH'S THREE WIVES.

I. *Joan Drake*.—The year in which Walter Raleigh married his first wife, Joan Drake, is unknown. No facts in her history have descended to us; and, although her tomb is yet preserved in its original site, in the centre of the nave of the Church of East Budleigh, the date of her death is no longer decipherable on it. There are, however, two points relating to her which deserve present mention.

⁶ *Dorset* (1868), iii. 675.

⁷ *S.P.*, *Chancery Proceedings*, Series ii, bundle 55, No. 22.

⁸ In *VIVIAN'S Visitations*, George Brooke is noted as the second husband of Christian Duke, instead of the first.

1. In the Raleigh pedigree, in Vivian's *Visitations of Devon*, her name is entered as "Alice," and in a footnote, "The Harl. MS. has Joane, which is an error" (639). In the Drake pedigree, it also appears as "Alice" (293). Nevertheless, the evidence of her name being Joan is too strong to be overturned; it is so given in the Visitation of 1564,⁹ and also in the *Records of the College of Arms*, by George Harrison, Windsor Herald.¹ Colonel Vivian appears to have been misled by the name "Alice," in the Drake pedigree, being signed by a member of the family,² and this he accepted as testifying to its correctness; but both relatives and heralds sometimes made terrible mistakes in genealogies. We have, however, positive testimony in the inscription on her tomb, recording her name as "Johanne Raleyh." He commits another mistake by terming her the second wife of Walter Raleigh; corrected in a later page (293, 639).

2. Attention has already been directed to the inscription on the edge of her tombstone being reversed, and having to be read from right to left³—a peculiarity of which no other example has yet been noted.

Reasons have been already adduced for believing that she died about, or probably prior to, the period of the Reformation;⁴ and that the inscription on her memorial stone, commencing, "Orate pro anima," was designedly reversed, to serve some special object, although we may perhaps be unable to solve the actual reason. It is certain that Raleigh had become an early follower of the Reformed doctrine—how early, we know not, but most probably some time before his wife's death, as otherwise he would scarcely have authorized the reversal of the inscription to be made.⁵ As she evidently died in the Roman Catholic communion, he, while desirous of paying every respect to her memory, whether by or without her expressed wish, probably directed the evidence of her faith to be incised on her tomb, but in reversed characters, so that at the period when altered forms of worship were being rapidly made, the inscription would be less obtrusive by the greater difficulty experienced in reading it. Whether this

⁹ Ed. Colby, 180, from *Harl. MS.* 1,080

¹ Printed in HOWARD'S *Misc. Gen. et Her.* ii. 155.

² *Vis. of Devon*, 1620, Harl. Soc. 94.

³ *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 170, and accompanying illustration.

⁴ *Ibid.* xv. 171.

⁵ Assuming that she died about 1534, the entire absence on the carved bench-ends in East Budleigh Church, dated three years later (1537), of any mark or symbol of a religious character, serves to indicate that he had ceased to be of his wife's faith, as he must have had much to do with the designs they bear.

surmise be correct or not, it is certain that its peculiarity has assisted in preventing its subsequent mutilation.

II. — *Darrell*.—Walter Raleigh's second wife is thus noted by Westcote: "Secondly he married a daughter of Darrell of London" (536). This is confirmed by the *Visitation* of 1564, where, however, the name appears as "Dorrell."⁶ She is, however, not mentioned by Pole, nor in the Holland and Harrison pedigrees.

Edwards (i. facing 8) gives a *fac-simile* of a Raleigh pedigree, made by H. St. George, Richmond Herald,⁷ where her name is entered as "Darrell."⁸ Notwithstanding this, Edwards was of opinion that Walter Raleigh's second wife was a daughter of Jamekyn de Pant, a merchant of Genoa; but this was an error, and how it originated has already been pointed out.⁹

III. *Katherine Champernown*.—The third wife of Walter Raleigh was Katherine Champernown, to whom the only reference under the present heading is, from a religious point of view, of some importance. In his Memoir of "Raleigh," Mr. Edm. Gosse affirms that "his mother seems to have remained a Catholic" (2), and bases it upon the following statement, contained in the *Acts and Monuments* of John Fox,¹ under the heading, "The trouble and martyrdom of a godly poore woman which suffered at Exeter," with a woodcut of "the patient martyrdom of a poore woman at Exeter, being one Prest's wife."

1557. "There resorted to her a certaine worthy Gentlewoman, the wife of one Walter Rauley, a woman of noble wit, and of a good and godly opinion: who comming to the person, and talking with her, she said her Creed to the Gentlewoman, and when she came to the article, *He ascended*, there she staid, and bade the Gentlewoman to seeke his blessed body in heaven, not in earth and told her plainly that God dwelleth not in temples made with hands, and that sacrament to be nothing else but in remembrance of his blessed passion, and yet (said she) as they now use it, it is but an Idoll, and far wide from any remembrance of Christ's body; which, said she, will not long continue, and so take it good Mistresse. So that as soon as she came home to her husband, she

⁶ Ed. Colby, 180.

⁷ From *Harl. MS.* 1,080, ff. 3,606, 361. H. St. George was Richmond Herald in 1615.

⁸ The name is Darrell in the MS., but in the *fac-simile*, in Edwards' work, it looks like "Parrett," or "Parrell," owing to the figure 2 being in close contact with the initial letter.

⁹ *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 172.

¹ Ed. of 1641, iii. 588 *et seq.*

declared to him, that in her life she had never heard a woman (of such simplicity to see to) talke so godly, so perfectly, so sincerely, and so earnestly; insomuch, that if God were not with her, she could not speak such things, to the which I am not able to answer her, said she, who can reade, and she cannot."

Mr. Gosse adds, "This anecdote would not have been preserved if the incident had not heralded the final secession of Raleigh's parents from the creed of Philip II." (3.) This took place in 1557, but according to Mr. Gosse's own statement, Walter Raleigh "was a Protestant when young Walter was born," in 1552 (2), and in fact must have been one some years before, as has already been pointed out.

That Katherine Raleigh was a Catholic can scarcely be deduced from the dialogue quoted from Fox's work, and which appears to have been of the same character that would probably take place at the present day, between a moderate churchwoman and one holding advanced evangelical opinions. We can readily believe that her "hatred of bigotry and of the Spaniard" equalled that of her second husband, and that she was a staunch Protestant before she married him. Not only were her own children, by both marriages, of the same persuasion, but there are indications that her own family, the Champernowns, had been followers of the Reformed faith for some years; *e.g.* an endeavour had been made by Bishop Gardiner, in 1546, to prosecute Queen Catherine Parr and some of the ladies of her Court, of whom Katherine Raleigh's sister, Lady Denny, was one, for sympathizing with, and rendering assistance to, Anne Askew, then under trial for heresy, and who was subsequently burnt on July 16 of the same year. She is reported to have been examined concerning them before she was racked, and in her reply to the question, whether there were not "divers Ladies that had sent" her money, she answered, "That there was a man in a blew coat which delivered me ten shillings, and said that my Lady of Hertford sent it me; and another in a violet coat gave me eight shillings, and said my Lady Denny sent it me, whether it were true or no I cannot tell. For I am not sure who sent it me, but as the maid did say."² The attempt to implicate Lady Denny failed, and was not renewed, probably owing to the death of the King soon afterwards (on January 28th, 1547).

There are some side issues connected with the foregoing remarks relating to Katherine Raleigh, which must not be

² Fox, Ed. of 1641, iii. 578; cf. STRYPE, *Ecc. Mem.* i. (1816) 620.

omitted, especially as they relate to Devonshire occurrences. They refer, in a great measure, to Agnes Prest, over whose persecution and martyrdom Dr. Oliver throws a halo of doubt. "The bishop's register," he notes, "is perfectly silent on the lamentable persecution of Agnes Prest for religious opinions. If she suffered death for them in August, 1558—another account says 15th November, 1557—it must have been when Bishop Turberville was absent. 'Indeed,' says Fuller, 'her death was procured more by the violence of Blaxton, the chancellor, than by any persecution of the bishop.'"³ Hoker, the City of Exeter Chamberlain, was between 31 and 32 years of age at the time Agnes Prest was burnt, and is not likely to have invented a statement as to this occurrence. He specially mentions that "for Religion and Heresy," she "was burned in Southinghay for the same." He further quotes the commencement of the Indictment (in Latin), taken at Launceston "before William Stanford, then Justice of the Assize."⁴ This is corroborated by the historians of Launceston and Dunheved, R. and O. Peters (1885), in the following quotation from their work :

"In the 4th week of Lent 2 & 3 Philip and Mary, 1555, Agnes Prest, of Northcott Hamlet, Boyton, was indicted at Launceston for denying the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar, and for saying that no Christian doth eat the Body of Christ carnally but spiritually. A true bill was found against her, and the petty jury also found her guilty. She was then sent to the Bishop of Exeter for further examination. She persisted in her former opinion, and was condemned as a heretic. Finally she was delivered to the Sheriff of Devonshire, and was executed at Southernhay, outside the walls of Exeter, in November, 1558. During her long imprisonment all attempts to induce her to recant must have failed. She is supposed to have been the only martyr for the Protestant religion, in the diocese of Exeter, during Mary's reign."⁵

In our local history, the subject is of some importance. Dr. Oliver alleges "that but one person in this extensive diocese, Agnes Prest, is even alleged to have been the victim

³ *Bps. of Exeter*, 136, 7. Dr. Oliver's quotation is not altogether accurate. In his account of Agnes Prest, Fuller remarks, "She was presented to James Troublefield, Bishop of Exeter, and by him condemned for denying the Sacrament of the Altar. . . . She was the onely person in whose persecution Bishop Troublefield did appear; and it is justly conceived that Black-stone, his Chancellour, was more active than the Bishop in procuring her death." (*Worthies of England* (1662), pt. i. 250.)

⁴ *Bps. of Exeter* (1765), 142.

⁵ 200. Cf. *IZACKE'S Memorials* (1677), 128; and *PENALUNA'S Hist. Survey of Cornwall* (1838), i. 77.

of this barbarous law.”⁶ He had, however, overlooked another example, that of Thomas Bennet, who was “condemned of Heresy,” and burnt at Livery Dole, Heavitree, in January, 1531, as recorded by Hoker, and cited by the Doctor.⁷ It is true, he doubts the occurrence—his words are, “We have suspicion of the fact”—partly because he hesitates to accept the testimony of Hoker, and partly for the reason that it is not alluded to in the Bishop’s Act Book. The fact of Thomas Benet having been burnt at Livery Dole on January 10, 1531, is recorded in a *Psalterium vetus cum Kalendario*, a MS. of the thirteenth century, preserved in the Chapter Library, Exeter (No. 3508 in the Catalogue), in a marginal note made in the sixteenth century; but whatever else may have been the cause of the omission, it was not customary for the Bishops to record executions for heresy, after the subjects had been delivered over to the secular power.⁸ Hoker’s authority is, however, not so easily got rid of. “Hoker at the time must have been but an infant,” states the Doctor, but as he was born in 1526, he was seven years old, and such a scene would make a powerful and lasting impression on himself, his relatives, and friends; its very object being to strike terror, “by which,” wrote Queen Mary, in a letter to her Council, shortly after her marriage with Philip II., “they shall both understand the truth, and beware not to do the like.”⁹

3. WALTER RALEGH’S CHILDREN.

Walter Raleigh had issue by each of his three wives; but in the *Visitation* of 1564 (ed. Colby, 180), all the children are erroneously assigned to the second and third wives. Of these, two were by the first wife, one by the second, and three by the third. It is believed that all six were born at Hayes; but there is no evidence of this or of their respective

⁶ *Hist. of Exeter* (1861), 104.

⁷ *Bps. of Exeter*, 122.

⁸ In the case of Agnes Prest, the Doctor remarks “I look in vain for any mention of such an occurrence in the Register of Bishop Turbeville, or the Act Books of our Common Council.” (*Hist. Exeter*, 104.) The present Town Clerk of Exeter, G. R. Shorto, Esq., informs the writer that the Chamber Act Books contain matters confined strictly to the Corporation itself, and do not record executions, with which the Corporation had nothing to do.

⁹ LINGARD’S *Hist. of England*, v. (1823), 82. This letter is believed to have been written prior to the arrival of Cardinal Pole in England on November 21, 1554; and forms a striking contrast to the statements made by Dr. F. G. Lee, in his *Life of Pole* (1888), 189–90, e.g.: “She [Mary] entirely disclaimed every degree of force and violence against those who had been seduced into heresy and schism” (190).

ages in the East Budleigh Registers, which do not commence until the year 1555. (Where the second wife is omitted from the pedigree—as in the Holland one—the name of her child does not appear.)

I. *Children by Joan Raleigh* (first wife).—1. *George*. We know little of his personal history. Pole affirms “he dwelled at Furdell (322), and he retained that estate until the time of his death, when it passed to his brother John. Full possession he would probably obtain when his father died in 1580-1. Prior to the latter event, he had evidently left there to reside either in Littleham or in Withycombe Raleigh. His name is thus recorded in the list of the churchwardens of the former place :

“George Raleigh es. }
John Periman } 1580.”

That, like his father, he had some direct interest in shipping matters, the two following examples will prove.

a. “George Rawleyghe gent.” appears in a list headed “the names of Sea Captaynes the vth of Januarie 1585 [6]”; remarkable for including all four of Walter Raleigh’s sons.¹

b. Letter from “Sir F. Walsyngham to the Mayor and Aldermen [of Exeter] From the Court at Somerset House, 26 Nov. 1588 :

‘I am given to understand that at suche tyme as ther was given ‘this last sommer for the settinge forthe of certain shippes out of ‘your Citie yet apperethe that emongst others you tooke a man of ‘warre, beinge a shippe appertayning unto Mr. George Rawley, ‘makinge agreement wth him for the furnishing and setting of her ‘fourthe for her Ma^{ties} service, but now you refuse to make him ‘satisfaction for the same.’ Prays them to pay him without more delay. ‘I have saved him from acquaynting their Lordships wth ‘your slackness herein upon the perswasion I have that this my ‘own letter shall sufficientlye prevaile wth you.’”²

He probably lived in Withycombe Raleigh (the estate belonged to his step-brother, Sir Carew Raleigh) during the last years of his life, commencing some time before the transaction related in the following paragraph, and which, there can be little doubt, refers to him :

“1591. Nov. 18. Decree in Chancery in favour of William Vynton against George Rawley, for a lease of two mills, proved to be put in writing contrary to the will of the testator [*Docquet*].”³

¹ *S. P. Dom.*, Elizabeth, vol. clxxxvi. In the Calendar, the family of Drake is alone mentioned.

² “Exeter City Muniments,” in *Notes and Gleanings*, ii. 106.

³ *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, Elizabeth, cexl. 66.

(Several members of the Vynton family are recorded in the Registers of Withycombe of that period).

He died there in 1597, the following being a transcript of the entry in the Burial Register :

1597. "George Rauligh Esquier dyed the xxijth of februarye but was buried the xijth of Marche 1596." [o.s.]

He was interred in the parish church (St. John's in the Wilderness), as thus recorded by Dean Milles:⁴

"At the North east corner of y^e North isle on a flat stone is this inscription to George, the eldest son of Walter Raleigh, and eldest Brother, by a first wife, to y^e famous S^r Walter :

'Here lyeth the body of George Raleigh of Fardhill Esquier 'who departed this life the xvjth day of Februarie, and in the yere 'of oure Lorde One thousand, five Hundred ninety and seven.'"⁵

It is singular that the interment did not take place until nearly three weeks after death. The site of the grave is easily identified, but no tombstone remains, having most probably been removed when the church was dismantled many years ago. At that time the north aisle was shortened to its present dimensions, and George Raleigh's grave, formerly within, became, by this alteration, outside the church building.

Much uncertainty exists as to whether he married, and if so, the name of his wife; or whether he did not marry, and had illegitimate issue. Some authors, like Oldys, do not refer to the matter at all. According to Westcote (536, 566) he married—first, "Katharine, daughter of *Thomas Gilbert*, of Compton, esq.," and "Isabel, daughter and heir of *John Reynward* of Cornwall"; and second, "Dorothy, daughter of *Sneddal*, of Exeter, esq."

Now the *Visitation of Devon* of 1564 asserts George Raleigh's wife to have been Katharine, daughter of *Otho Gilbert*, and Katherine Champernown, who became subsequently the third wife of Walter Raleigh.⁶ If this were correct, George married his step-sister—an improbability.

Westcote is the only author who affirms he was twice

⁴ Dean Milles formed a large collection of MSS. relating to Devonshire, now preserved in the Bodleian Library. The quotation is from MS. *Top. of Devon*, c. 12. He was precentor of Exeter Cathedral in 1747, and Dean in 1762, to the time of his death in 1784, and it was within these dates that he made his collections.

⁵ It is noteworthy that, according to this transcription, George Raleigh died on Feb. 16, whereas in the Burial Register the assigned date is Feb. 22.

⁶ Ed. Colby, 112, 180; not in the Raleigh pedigree, but in that of the Gilbert family.

married; but the name of the second wife alone appears in the Holland pedigree:

“Georgius Ralegh primo genitus = filia Joh̄is Snedall.”⁷

Pole, on the contrary, affirms he “died without lawful issue,” and this seems to be corroborated by the circumstance of his brother John being successor to the Fardel estate (322). In the Gilbert pedigree, Vivian, in his *Visitations*, affirms he married Katherine Gilbert, but subsequently, in his table of the Raleigh family, he corrected this, and against his name simply added, “died, leaving illegitimate issue” (406, 639).

1a. His son *George* (No. 2) is thus entered in the Register of “Christenings,” Withycombe Raleigh:

“1567. George Rauleigh the xxith daye of December.”

His University career is thus noted in Boase's *Reg. Coll. Exon. Ox.*,⁸ “George Raleigh or Rawlye, pleb. of Exmouth, M[atriculated] 14 Oct, 1586, age 18, B.A. 9 July 1590, at Inner Temple, 1595.” He married in 1597, as shown by an entry in the Act Book of Bishop Babington, recording, on April 15th of that year, a licence of marriage being granted between “Georgio Rawley ats Blake de Withiecombe Rawley gen^o et Mar^{te} Drake de ead.”

(Is not this an evidence of his illegitimacy? Blake being probably his mother's name. How else could he assume it?) Westcote affirms she was the “daughter of Thomas Drake, of Harpford” (536). The ceremony took place in the month after his father's funeral. His children are thus recorded in the baptismal (“Christenings”) register of Withycombe Raleigh:

1600. “George the sonne of m^r George Rauleigh the xith daye of December 1600.”

1602. “Marye the daughter of m^r Gorge Raleghe the xiiij of februarye 1602.”

1604. “John Raleghe the sonne of m^r George Raleghe was the vjth daye of Maye 1604.”

1605. “Margeret Ralegh the daughter of m^r George Raleghe the xijth daye of Septemb. 1605.”

1606. “Jane Ralegh the daughter of m^r George Ralegh the xxvjth daye of October 1606.”

1608. “Drake Ralegh the sone of m^r George Raleghe the vth of maye 1608.”⁹

⁷ It is curious that Mary, Walter's daughter by his second wife, is reported to have married Hugh Snedall, of Exeter. And William Sanderson, who wrote a *History of Queen Mary and King James*, containing calumnious statements about Sir Walter Raleigh, answered, it is said, by his son Carew, “was husband to Ralegh's niece, Margaret Snedall.” (STEBBING, 242, 3.)

⁸ Commoners, 1894, 266.

⁹ The Registers had evidently been examined by Westcote and by Dean Milles, each recording the six names.

Of these children, the Registers yield us the following information :

Mary married John Werman, January 16th, 1626-7, and had issue.

Margaret married Thomas Whitborn gen.,¹ October 7th, 1628, and had issue.

Jane married Henry Collin, January 3rd, 1632-3.

Drake died January 20th, 1640-1.

(The surname acted as the first name of a local family: "Rauleigh Toller" is recorded several times in the Registers between 1582 and the close of the century.)

His death is thus entered in the Burial Register of the same parish :

"m^r George Raleghe the xxij day of October 1616"

Pole states that the Withycombe Raleigh property was, "by S^r Carew Ralegh, sold unto George Ralegh, base sonne unto George, elder brother unto S^r Carew, whose sonne doth now enjoy it" (155).

1b. *George* (No. 3). the son alluded to in the extract from Pole's work just quoted, married the "second daughter to Gideon Haydon of Cadhay in Ottery St. Mary, esq."²

His earlier history is thus given in Boase's *Reg. Coll. Exon. Ox.*³: "George Raleigh or Rawleigh, 1 s. George, Esq., of Withecombe Raleigh, near Exmouth, M[atriculated] 17 Dec. 1619 age 19, adm. to Bodleian 30 Aug. 1625, at Inner Temple 1623."

The Withycombe Raleigh Registers are signed at the bottom of the page of 1640-1 by

"Georgio Ralegh }
William Peeke } Guardians 1641."

2. *John*. The earliest notice of him we possess has been already recorded in the account of Hayes, of which he was, with his father, the co-lessee, in 1551. He married "Anna daughter of Bartholomew Fortescue of Filley in com. Devon, Esq."⁴ Sir W. R. Drake has, in error, stated she was the wife of *George* Raleigh,⁵ and the relict of Gaverick of Ford.⁶

¹ Probably a near relation of Captain Richard Whitbourne, of Exmouth, author of *A Discourse, &c., of New-found-land*, 1620, *vide Dev. Assoc.* xxv. 90 ; xxvii. 340 *et seq.*

² WESTCOTE, 536.

³ Commoners, 1894, 266.

⁴ Harrison pedigree ; cf. Holland pedigree and VIVIAN'S *Visitations* (639).

⁵ *Devonshire Notes*, 244.

⁶ WESTCOTE, 536, and OLDYS, i. 10 ; the latter records the name as "Gaicrick."

With his brother George, his name appears in the list of sea-captains on January 6th, 1585-6. We next hear of him in the following entry, transcribed from the Churchwardens' Accounts of Woodbury:

"1587-8. Rec^d of John Rawleigh for the litell Alle howsse iij^s."

Part of the common rented by him was in Woodbury parish.

On the death of his brother George, in 1596-7, he succeeded to the Fardel estate, which he subsequently sold to his step-brother, Sir Carew Raleigh.⁷ Although Oldys states that he had issue, both Pole and Westcote affirm the contrary. No entry referring to him, or to them, can be found in the Registers of Withycombe Raleigh; but in the account of the Church of that place, in the MS. of Dean Milles, the place of his interment and his epitaph are thus recorded:

"In the middle of y^e Alley of y^e North Isle on a flat grave-stone, on which is carved a cross, is y^e following inscription:—

"Of your cheryte pray for y^e soll of Johan Ralyghe (Pater-noster and Ave) who departed y^e 15th daye of December mvcxxix.'" ⁸

It is open to doubt whether this memorial refers to the same John Raleigh of whom we have been writing, and this is caused solely by the assigned date upon it being 1629. If Walter's son John was 21 years old when he became co-lessee of Hayes, in 1551, he would be aged about 99 at the time of his recorded death, in 1629. It is, however, possible that he was considerably under age at that time, and we possess a good precedent for this in the lease of the tithes of fish, &c., of Sidmouth, granted in 1560 to "Walter Raley thelder esquir and Carowe Raley and Walter Raley the younger sonnes of the same Walter,"⁹ when young Walter was only eight years of age, and his brother Carew not more than two years his senior. That he was George's brother is indicated by the circumstance that he continued to his life's end in the same faith as his mother.

No incised gravestone is at present discoverable in "y^e Alley of y^e North Isle" of the church, but there is an oblong flat stone, apparently of Purbeck marble, answering to the position described by Dean Milles; but whatever inscription

⁷ POLE, 322.

⁸ "1529" is crossed through here, and these letters inserted.

⁹ *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 173.

it may have borne originally has long since been worn away. (The under surface is rough.)¹

II. *Child by* — *Ralegh* (second wife).—According to the *Visitation of Devon* of 1564,² there was no issue (“s.p.”) by the second marriage; but Westcote (536) affirms that there was; and Oldys³ states that it was “a daughter named Mary, who was married to Hugh Snedale, of Hilling in Cornwall, esq.,” and Oldys adds, “and had issue.” An enlargement and slight modification of this is given in Vivian’s work:—

“Mary, only da. mar. 13 Oct. 1563, at St Mary Arches to Hugh Snedall of Exeter”⁴

III. *Children by Katherine Ralegh* (third wife).—1. *Carew*. The third son of Walter Ralegh and the eldest child by his third wife; born *circ.* 1550. In the Harrison pedigree he is named “Cary,” and in that of St. George as “Charles or Carew.”

The earliest mention we find of him is in the Sidmouth lease of the tithes of fish, &c., in 1560, and again in 1578;⁵ next among those who adventured with Sir H. Gilbert, “in monny or comodities,” on December 12, 1582,⁶ where his name appears as “M^r Carrowe rawley esq.” On July 31, 1584, a Commission by the Lord High Admiral was issued “to Sir Francis Drake and Carew Rawley, Esquire, for the apprehension of pirates, &c.”⁷ His name is included in the list of “Sea Captayns,” in January, 1585–6, when there was an alarm of invasion.⁸ He is mentioned in a letter of Sir Gilbert and John Cary, dated July 27, 1588, as desiring to have some pieces of ordnance for Portland Castle.⁹ A “certificate by Caru Rawligh of the tinner,” relative to their exception from contribution, is dated September 30 of the same year.¹ He is alluded to in a document of February 18,

¹ The writer begs to acknowledge the attention and courtesy of the Vicar, the Rev. G. P. de Putron, in affording him every assistance in the examination of the sites of the graves of George and John Ralegh, as mentioned by Dean Milles; and also for facilitating his investigation of the parochial records, for references to members of the Ralegh family.

² Ed. Colby, 180.

³ i. 10, quoting from the *Visitation*, also of 1564, from a MS. in the Heralds’ Office, by William Hervy, Esq., Clarencieux—this one is not mentioned in Colby’s list, at p. 4 of his work.

⁴ 639. Stated to be taken from the Parish Register of St. Mary Arches, Exeter; but the Rector informs the writer that no marriages are recorded in the Register of that year.

⁵ *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 173, 4.

⁶ *S.P. Dom.*, Eliz., vol. clvi. 13.

⁷ *Ibid.* clxxii. 38.

⁸ *Ibid.* clxxxvi. 8.

⁹ *Ibid.* cexiii. 43. Letter printed at length in *Notes and Gleanings*, i. 83.

¹ *Ibid.* ccxvi. 48.

1589. On March (1?), 1591, his name appears with that of Sir Walter, relative to four ships,² and on 26th of the following October respecting the sale of a quantity of dried fish taken in a prize.³ He is alluded to in a letter written in 1594, relating to victuals to be provided at Weymouth for the Brest expedition.⁴

In 1601, just before the departure of Queen Elizabeth from Basing House, where she had been entertained by the Marquess of Winchester, she "made eleven knights, one being M^r Carew Rawleigh."⁵ He married "Dorothie da: of S^r W^m Wroughton K^t the relict of Jo: Thynne of Longleate K^t." (St. George pedigree.) To the latter he had been "gentleman of the horse."⁶

The Fardel property, which came into his possession at the death of his step-brother John, "hee sold unto Walter Hele of Cornwood"; and that in Withycombe Raleigh he "sold unto George Raleigh [No. 2], base sonne unto George, elder brother unto S^r Carew." (Pole, 155, 322.) He probably parted with his Devonshire property on the occasion of, and prior to, his retirement into Wiltshire, where he subsequently married, his residence being Downton House, a few miles from Salisbury. He was living in 1623, but the date of his death is unknown.

Of him Aubrey remarked, "I have heard my grandfather say that S^r Carew had a delicate cleare voice, and played singularly well on the olpharion (w^{ch} was the instrument in fashion, in those dayes), to which he did sing." He describes the instrument to be "as big as a lute, but flat-bellied, with wire strings."⁷

According to the Harrison pedigree he had three sons, Gilbert, Walter, and George; all born in Wiltshire. The second one was the ill-fated Dean Raleigh, the author of *Reliquiæ Raleghanæ* (a collection of thirteen Sermons and Discourses printed in 1679), who was killed by a soldier, *circ.* 1645.

2. *Walter Raleigh*, afterwards Sir Walter Raleigh.

3. *Margaret*. Whether she was born before or after Sir Walter is unknown; is not mentioned by Pole, or in the Harrison pedigree. She appears in the Holland pedigree as "Margareta" and "Margery." According to Westcote she

² *S. P. Dom.*, Eliz., cccxxxviii. 63.

³ *Ibid.* cxlii. 44, 98.

⁴ *Hist. MSS. Com.*, Hatfield MS., pt. iv. 563.

⁵ BAIGENT and MILLARD's *Hist. of Basingstoke*, 416.

⁶ AUBREY, *Letters*, &c., ii. 510.

⁷ *Ibid.* *Letters*, &c., ii. 510.

was "married, first to [Lawrence] Radford of Mount-Radford, esq., clerk of the peace; secondly to [George] Hull, of Larkbear near Exeter, esq." (536.) Her marriage to "Lawrence Radford" is noted in the *Visitation* of 1564,⁸ but as he did not die until 1590, the second husband is not alluded to. The name appears as "*John* Radford" in Edwards' work; certainly an error.⁹

4. DEATH AND INTERMENT OF WALTER RALEGH AND HIS WIFE.

Hitherto nothing has been known of the deaths of Walter Raleigh and his third wife, and little but surmise as to the place of their interment. Recent researches have, however, thrown light upon both.

The well-known letter, written by Sir Walter to his wife, in December, 1603, when under sentence of death at Winchester, contains this paragraph:

"Begg my dead body, which living was denyed you; and either lay itt att Sherborne if the land continue, or in Exeter church, by my father and mother."¹

This has generally been supposed to be intended for Exeter Cathedral: an opinion entertained by Wood,² and thus emphasized by Edwards.³ "Sir Walter's father and his mother are buried in Exeter Cathedral."⁴ According to the Rev. Chancellor Harington, the monument usually assigned to them was "erected to the memory of 'Sir John Gilbert and Lady.'⁵

The late Mr. Robert Dymond, during his examination of the Registers of St. Mary Major, Exeter, drew the attention of the writer to the following entries amongst the burials:

1580-1. "M^r Walter Rawlye gentelman was buriede the xxiiijth of februarye."

1583, May 13. "Joane Courtney, serv^t to M^r Rawley."

⁸ Ed. Colby, 180.

⁹ Cf. VIVIAN, 637, 639.

¹ EDWARDS, ii. 207.

² ii. 243.

³ i. 15.

⁴ Aubrey dissented from this. Cf. *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 175.

⁵ *N. and Q.* 5th S. viii. 515. The only tomb to a member of this family recorded in the *Monumentarium* of the Cathedral, by the Rev. J. W. Hewett, is that of Richard Gilbert, D.D., who died in 1524 (*E.D.A.S.* iii. 110). There is, in the south choir aisle of the Cathedral, an "effigy of a knight in armour, cross-legged, said to commemorate one of the Chichester family" (*Ibid.* 108; cf. *History of the Chichester Family*, 17), and attributed to the 14th century. Mr. W. Cotton has shown that it may, with greater probability, be assigned to Sir Henry de Raleigh, who died *circa* 1301. (*Gleanings from Cath., &c., Records*, 1877, 5-10.)

No record of the interment of Katherine Raleigh could be found.

In the course of last year (1895), a copy of her will was discovered in the Probate Registry Office, in Exeter,⁶ and a transcript is now given *in extenso*, for which the writer is indebted to the late Mr. Winslow Jones.

“PROBATE REGISTRY AT EXETER.

“Consistory Court of the Bishop of Exeter, Book 4, fol. 430*b*

“Exceter Testm Katherina Rawley gen

Deare sonnes by my Last Will and Testament I most earnestlie entreate you that after my death you will see such debts to be satisfied as shalbe demaunded after my departure and that you will see my servants satisfied and to have there due in such thinges as I have bestowed vpon them to the vttermost farthinge to the end I may ende my dayes towards god wth a pure harte and fayth full concience and so I bidd you all farewell The xvijth day of Aprill 1594.

“Imprimis due to John Vnckle a Butcher viij^{li}. Itm due to Henrie Ellett the Apothicarie ij^{li} xv^s Itm due to M^r Bodley the Marchante xvij^s vj^d Itm due to M^r Christofer Spicer to the brode gate for liveries iij^{li} vj^s vj^d Itm due to Marie Weare xx^s Itm due to Emline Baker the greate salte in parte of payment for xl^s Itm I giue to M^{rs} Katherine Hooker the bedd wherein I lie performed my saddle and saddle Clothe pfourmed the little salte and two spones one payer of hollande sheets the little borde wth the greene Carpett Itm I give to Marie Weare all the apparell that I weare besides a writinge that she hathe to showe Itm to Joane Jellicott I give xx^s Itm I give to Johane Wise x^s Itm I give to Jacés Waye xx^s Itm I give to mother Cosens x^s Arthure Gilbert Nicholas Bolte and Richard Jarman Wittnisses

“Administratio bonorum suprascripte Katherina Rawley generose

“Commissa fuit per magistrum doctorem Sutcliffe xj^o maii 1594

“Domino Johanni Gilberte militi eius filio

“Exhibitum est	}	lxij ^{li} xiijs iijj ^d ”
Inventorium ad		

⁷“Civitas Exon. Administratio bonorum Katherine Rawleighe xj^o Maii Anno Domini 1594. Venerabilis vir M^r Doctor Sutcliffe commisit administrationem bonorum Katherine Rawleighe generose nuper parochie sancte Marie maioris Civitas Exonie filio suo Domino Johanni Gilberte militi. Et habet ad exhibendum Inventorium citra festum sancti Johannis Baptiste proximum.”

⁶ Book 4, fol. 430*b*–446*b*. It is unnoticed in C. Worthy’s recently published work on *Devonshire Wills*.

⁷ fol. 446*b*.

This will—apart from the interesting particulars as to the gifts recorded in it—is of great importance to us, in showing that Katherine Raleigh was resident in the parish of St. Mary Major, and that Walter Raleigh, who was interred in the church belonging to it, we have no reason to doubt, must have been her husband. Her widowhood of thirteen years is quite sufficient to explain the absence of her name from the Burial Register, inasmuch as she died in 1594, and the Register, from 1591, is wanting for many consecutive years. Their residence in this parish is corroborated by Izacke. In his *Memorials of Exeter* (1681) he relates, under the year 1618, an account of the trial and death of Sir W. Raleigh, and concludes his notice thus :

“Some say that he was born at *Budley* in *Devon*, others, that he was a Native hereof, and born in the house adjoining to the Palace-gate, on either account as our Countrey-man, I held it unfit to pass him by altogether in silence” (147).

The comment of Oldys upon this statement of Izacke, that it “has no authority, and perhaps had not so much as rumour to countenance it,”⁸ is correct enough with respect to its not having been the place where Sir Walter was born, and to this alone. Izacke’s testimony of the Raleighs having resided in a house “adjoining to the Palace-gate,” is confirmed by the passage in the will, recording that Katherine Raleigh was “nuper parochie sancte Marie maioris,” the street known as Palace-gate separating that parish from the precincts of the Cathedral. We must bear in mind that Richard Izacke (1624–1698) was born within six years of Sir Walter’s execution, and within living memory of those who could testify to the Exeter residence of the Raleigh family.

In what year Walter Raleigh and his wife left Hayes, for Exeter, we are unaware; but, in all probability, several had elapsed prior to his death, in 1581, when, according to the data already given,⁹ he must have been about 85 years old; and, as his widow survived him for 13 years, she was probably much younger than he was at the time of their marriage.

The selection of a residence in the parish of St. Mary Major may have been influenced by the number of Katherine Raleigh’s kinspeople—the Gilberts—dwelling there, judging from the number of that family recorded in the Registers.

Doubtless some memorial in stone, to the memory of Sir Walter’s parents, was erected in the old Parish Church, but all traces thereof have vanished.

⁸ i. 12.

⁹ *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 165.

At the time of his father's death, in 1581, Sir Walter was serving in Ireland. He was living at Sherborne in 1594, when his mother died.

5. BIRTH-YEAR OF SIR W. RALEGH.

In what year was Sir Walter Raleigh born? is a question that has not been answered by his biographers as satisfactorily as could be wished. The earliest memoirs of him, by Winstanley and Shirley, as well as one of the latest and most important—that by E. Edwards—make no allusion as to the date of his birth, nor to his age at death. Although Oldys does not record Sir Walter's age at the time of his beheading, he gives two widely different authorities for recording the year when he was born. Here is the first:

“I find the computation has been made, from Camden's account of his age at his death, that he was born in the year 1552.”¹

This is evidently based on a statement in Camden's *Annals of King James I.*,² that Raleigh “was beheaded in the 66th year of his age”; and as this took place in 1618, it points to 1552 as that of his birth.

The second is thus recorded by Oldys:

“Herewith corresponds an observation I have found in an astrological author, who, fixing his birth in the sixth year of King Edward VI. . . . calls it ‘a year remarkable in our chronicles; first, for that strange shoal of the largest sea-fishes, which, quitting their native waters for fresh and untasted streams, wandered up the Thames so high, till the river no longer retained any brackishness; and secondly, for that it is thought to have been somewhat stained in our annals with the blood of the noble Seymour, duke of Somerset: events (says he) surprisingly analogous both to the life of this adventurous voyager, sir Walter Raleigh, whose delight was in the hazardous discovery of unfrequented coasts, and also to his unfortunate death.’”³

As, however, portents, omens, and coincidences are not at the present day accepted as facts, we may dismiss from further notice any consideration of Oldys' second reference.

Another age is thus noted by W. Stebbing, Raleigh's latest biographer:

“If the inscription on the National Portrait Gallery picture,

¹ Life of Sir W. R., in *Works* (1829), i. 12.

² *Vide* KENNETT'S *Hist. of England*, ii. (1706) 650.

³ Quoted by Oldys (12-13) from “Supplement to G. Le Neve's *Collection of Nativities*, MS. *penes me*, fol. 9.” This is not mentioned in the Bibliographical Notes appended to the *Memoir of W. Oldys*, by W. Thoms (1862); nor has the MS. been traced to any library, public or private.

1588, 'aetatis suae 34,' and that on Zucchero's in the Dublin Gallery, 'aet. 44, 1598,' be correct, his birth must have been, not in 1552, but about 1554."⁴

The same author describes a contemporary miniature, preserved at Belvoir Castle, as "of especial interest, on account of the age inscribed, sixty-five, and the year, 1618, which imply a belief that he was born later than 1552" (29).

Two remarkable epigrams on Raleigh are contained in vol. 103 of *State Papers, Domestic*, of James I. *sub.* Oct. 31, 1618, one of which assigns to him a much older age.

"An Epigram of Sr Walter Rawley beheaded at 74 years of his age.

Who best did calculate the life of man
Found threscore and ten years made up his span
If more then to suruiue be, to be dead
Life lost not Raweley when he lost his head."

The second, although not relevant to the present subject, may, owing to its being comparatively unknown, find a place here.

"Another.

Hope flattered thee though lawes did life convince
Yet thou might'st dy in fauour of thy prince
His mercy and thy liberty at last
did sealle beleife, and make opinion fast
In truth, when time had puld thee out of Gayle
And newe hopes, had sette againe newe saille
As many of this world as held free will
Thought thou wert safe and had'st escapt thy ill
But nowe wee see, that thou wert bay'ld by fate
To liue or dy, as thou couldst serue our state
And then wert lost, when it was vnderstood
Thou might'st doe harme, but could'st not doe more good."

Attention was first called by Mr. A. C. Ewald to these pieces, in *Gent's Mag.* for 1883 (cclv. 45), and subsequently in *Studies Re-studied* (1885), 203, 4. The foregoing have been transcribed from the original MS. Mr. Ewald affirms that, "shortly before his execution Raleigh drew up [these] two epigrams"; but they contain inherent evidence of having been written by some friend, and certainly not by Raleigh himself. He never spelt his name "Rawely," or "Raweley," and could not have asserted he was seventy-four years of age, as that would have placed the year of his birth in 1535, many years prior to the marriage of his mother with Walter Raleigh.⁵ We may therefore conclude he could not have

⁴ *Memoir* (1891), 6.

⁵ The paper on which the epigrams are written bears no watermark, and the handwriting, in the opinion of Miss Toulmin Smith, is "not later than the middle of the 17th century."

been seventy-four years of age in 1618. That he was born in 1554 is much more probable. The Baptismal Register of East Budleigh, the parish in which he was born, renders us no assistance, as the earliest entry is dated 1556.

The first husband of Katherine Champernown, the mother of Sir Walter, was Otho Gilbert, of Compton, who died on Feb. 18, 1547. Allowing at least a year for her widowhood, we may fairly infer that she married her second husband, Walter Raleigh, some time in 1548. Three children were the issue of this union; Carew, the eldest, Walter, and a daughter. Whether the latter was the second or third child is unknown; but assuming that Walter was the youngest, it is not improbable that he was born in 1552. If Wood be correct, that in 1568, or thereabouts, he became a commoner of Oriel College, Oxford,⁶ he (Raleigh) would in that year be sixteen years old; and many of his contemporaries went to the University about the same age.⁷ This has been generally accepted by biographers as correct. If born in 1554, he might, in 1568, have been considered too young to be sent to College, as he certainly was for foreign military service, which, according to Camden, he entered upon in the year following (1569), as recorded in his *Annales* (1635), 117:

“The Queene . . . permitted Henry Champernoun . . . to leade into France a Troupe of a hundred voluntary Gentlemen on horse-backe . . . Amongst these . . . were . . . Francis Barkley, and Walter Raleigh a very young man, who now began first to be of any eminent note.”

There is some confusion in the statements made about Raleigh's movements at the University. Wood affirms that “C. Champernowne, his kinsman, studied there at the same time,” and that “after he had spent about three years” there, “he left the University without a degree” (ii. 235). Foster, in his *Alumni Oxon.*, accepts 1568 as the date of Raleigh's entrance; at the same time it appears that his name is entered in the College Books as “W. Rawley,” in 1572, in the same year as C. Champernowne.⁸ At first sight this is irreconcilable with his journey into France in 1569, where he is recorded to have remained three years. (Edwards states six, i. 21.) Stebbing suggests that his name may have been retained in the Oriel list until 1572 (9), and this

⁶ *Ath. Ox.*, ed. Bliss, ii. 235.

⁷ Camden (1551-1623) went to Oxford in 1566; Hakluyt (1553-1616) in 1570; Sir P. Sidney (1554-1586) in 1569.

⁸ *Reg. Univ. Ox.*, A. CLARK, ii. pt. 2, 40.

appears to be corroborated by the fact that the list in which Raleigh's name appears is headed "Lists of Members on the College Books (1563-1583)."⁹

A due consideration of all these circumstances leads to the belief that Camden's statement, from which we infer Raleigh's birth-year to have been 1552, to be correct.

6. BOYHOOD OF SIR W. RALEGH.

Of the manner in which he passed his boyhood, or how he was educated, we do not possess any direct evidence; and a similar statement may be made of many of those prominent individuals who lived during the Elizabethan period. Only one fact connected with the period of his youth is known, viz., that in 1560, when he was eight years of age, and the year prior to his father's election as churchwarden, his signature is appended to a deed below that of his father and brother,¹ and the writing is remarkably good. A man with the large amount of brain power he possessed, with so many faculties highly developed, must have had these gradually and well trained in his early youth, and we can have little doubt that much of his intellectual vigour was derived from his mother; partly from heredity, and partly from her tuition. She must have possessed great mental endowments and physical energy; "an especially grand woman indeed," exclaimed Kingsley, "for few can boast of having borne to two different husbands such sons as she bore."²

The vicar of the parish may have assisted him in his early studies, and if he went to school at all, it would probably be to the one at Ottery St. Mary, instituted in 1545. Kingsley pictures him as "a daring boy, fishing in the grey trout-brooks, or going up with his father to the Dartmoor hills to hunt the deer with hound and horn," &c. (87.) It is, however,

⁹ *Reg. Univ. Ox.*, ii. pt. 2, 9. Another explanation is possible. May not Raleigh have entered the University in 1572, and not at the earlier date? Two circumstances are in favour of it. 1. His kinsman, C. Champernowne, is on the College list of the same year, and he took his B.A. degree in 1576. 2. Raleigh's movements between 1572 and 1576 are unknown. Although some authors affirm that he was in Paris during the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, Aug. 24, 1572, Stebbing declares "there is no foundation for the story." (11.)

¹ *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 172-4.

² *Works*, xvi. (1880) 87. Buckle, the historian, remarked, "I shall hereafter, from a vast collection of evidence, prove that the popular opinion is correct, that able men have able mothers." (*Life*, by A. H. HUTH, i. 253.) It is noteworthy that neither Raleigh nor Buckle are included in *Mothers of Great Men and Women*, by J. A. HOLLOWAY. (New York, 1884.)

somewhat strange, that although he was no doubt accustomed to manly sports, he does not allude to them in his works. Naunton's remark of him that he was "an indefatigable reader,"³ was probably equally as true in his boyhood as it was in his manhood. We can feel certain that he exhibited an early predilection for the sea, although, as Gosse states, "it is tantalising that we have not the slenderest evidence of the mode in which this particular schooling was obtained." (6.) Still, though direct knowledge is wanting, we have to bear in mind the surroundings of his early years, which serve to indicate how, during that period, he became acquainted with, and his taste was fostered for, naval pursuits. We know that his father was interested in shipping matters.⁴ During his visits to Exmouth, Dartmouth, and Plymouth, the youth could not fail to hear recounted the wondrous adventures of Drake, Hawkins, and his kinsmen, the Gilberts. Probably he accompanied one of the latter—Sir Humphrey—on some of his voyages. (Gosse, 7.) Then, again, the sea-coast bounded his own parish to the south in the bay of Budleigh Salterton—then Salterton or Salterne—two miles only from his residence, and visible from the ridge immediately in front of the latter. All these circumstances could not fail to tincture the mind, and to influence the pursuits of his future life. This form of naval education (if such it can be termed) has been embodied in a painting by the late Sir J. Millais, entitled "The Boyhood of Raleigh," suggested (as he informed the writer) by a passage in Froude's *England's Forgotten Worthies*,⁵ a picture less familiar to the public than the majority of his works, owing to the fact that it has never been engraved. It was exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1870, and is of especial local interest owing to the subject being a purely Devonshire one, and for having been painted at Budleigh Salterton. A sunburnt sailor, seated, is relating his history to two boys, his right arm extended towards the south, "for there lies the Spanish main, the scene of all his troubles and adventures." Young Walter "sits up on the pavement, and, with his hands locked about his raised knees, and with dreaming eyes, seems to see El Dorado," &c.; the other boy, "whose intelligence is not of the vision-seeing sort . . . lies almost at length on the ground, leaning his chin within both his hands."⁶ The sailor was, at the time the picture was being painted, a resident of Budleigh Salterton.

³ *Fragmenta Regalia* (1641), 31.

⁴ *Dev. Assoc.* xv. 165, 6.

⁵ *Short Studies*, iv. (1868), 294-333.

⁶ *Descriptive Catalogue of the Grosvenor Gallery* (1886), 57.

(Miss Gibbons informs the writer that he was a swarthy-visaged man, named Vincent, a native of Jersey, and well-known for being the ferryman across the river Otter at its mouth.) In the *Art Annual* for 1885 (6), there is the *fac-simile* of a sketch of the sailor, differing somewhat from that in the finished picture. The latter "has a pathetic interest of its own in the fact that the two boys in it, the dark one and the fair, are portraits of the painter's two sons; for the fair boy died before he grew into a man, and his death has been the grief of his father's life."⁷

One interesting circumstance, that seems to indicate his prolonged home residence during his early years, is thus related by Aubrey :

"Old Sr Thomas Malett, one of the Justices of the King's Bench, tempore Car. I. et II., knew Sr W. and I have heard him say, that notwithstanding his so great mastership in style, and his conversation with the learnedest and politest persons, yet he spake broad Devonshire to his dying day."⁸

History repeats itself; while Raleigh is affirmed to have spoken "with that strong Devonshire accent which was never displeasing to the ears of Elizabeth" (Gosse, 21), the late Earl of Iddesleigh, when Sir Stafford Northcote, is said to have amused our present Queen with Devon stories in their proper dialect.

7. LADY RALEGH.

That Elizabeth, one of the Queen's maids of honour, and the daughter of Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, "an able statesman and ambassador," was the lawful wife of Sir Walter Raleigh, has never been questioned by any writer; but where and when the marriage ceremony took place is unknown, and has been assigned to various periods, ranging from the latter part of 1591 to the corresponding one of 1592. A grave charge has, however, been made against him, that it was preceded by intrigue, "the worst action in his whole life," as it was termed by Prince. This assertion, first made by Camden, and by him alone, of all the writers of his period, has been accepted as true by the majority of Raleigh's biographers, down to a recent period.⁹ Some modern writers

⁷ *Ibid.* This picture formed the subject of a poem in *The Grey Friar*, ii. (1892) 98; and of comment in *The English School of Painting*, by M. ERNEST CHESNEAU, quoted in RUSKIN'S *Notes* of the works of Sir J. Millais (1886), 31.

⁸ *Letters*, &c., ii. 519.

⁹ Some authors have gone a stage further, illustrations of which will be found in LUCY AIKIN'S *Court*, &c., of *Queen Elizabeth* (published by Ward, Lock & Co., n.d., 423); and in a *Memoir of Sir W. Raleigh*, by S. G. DRAKE (1862), 23.

believe this to be corroborated by the contents of a letter, to which attention was first directed by J. P. Collier, in 1851. Each of these demands a separate examination.

The work of W. Camden, well known under the short title of *Annales*, published 1615–27, contains this passage, remarkable for being recorded under the year 1595, immediately prior to Raleigh's voyage to Guiana, instead of under 1592:

“Ac maiora contra Hispanos quidam Angli priuate & Regina publice aggressi sunt: Walterius enim Raleighus Regii Satellitii Præfectus, honoraria Reginæ virgine vitata (quam postea in vxorem duxit) de gratia deiectus & per plures menses custodia detentus, nunc liber factus est sed ab aula relegatus genio suo obsequutus est.” (Pt. ii. 93, 4.)

The impression left on the mind of Raleigh's latest biographer, after a careful consideration of the foregoing quotation, he thus records:

“The sole independent testimony [of the intrigue] is the single sentence of Camden's. . . . If Camden had not spoken, and if Raleigh and she had not stood mute, it would have been easy to believe that the imagined liaison was simply a secret marriage resented as such by the Queen. . . . Had contradiction been possible, Camden would have been contradicted in 1615 by Raleigh and his wife.”¹

At first sight, this appears to be almost unanswerable, but much of the effect disappears with the knowledge that, whereas the first part of Camden's work was issued in 1615, and terminated with 1588—the year of the Armada, the second part, containing the Raleigh episode, was not published until 1627—nine years after Sir Walter's death!

There is some uncertainty as to the date when a knowledge of the occurrence, whether of intrigue or marriage, first reached the ears of the Queen. On March 10, 1592, Raleigh wrote a remarkable letter to Sir R. Cecil, in which he alludes to the “malicious report” of his asserted marriage.² He started upon a naval expedition on May 6, and was almost immediately summoned back again, but for what reason has never been satisfactorily explained. The intrigue or marriage could not have been known to the Queen for some time after, as on June 8 he addressed a letter to Lord Howard of Effingham, “from Durham

¹ W. STEBBING, *Life of Raleigh* (1891), 89, 90.

² EDWARDS, ii. 46. Tytler, in his *Life of Raleigh* (1833, 129), believes it to have been written “after the private marriage had taken place.”

House.”³ But in the following month, July, three letters of his to Sir R. Cecil were written from the Tower,⁴ to which place he had been sent by the Queen.

That “Mrs. Throgmorton” was imprisoned at the same time, we learn from a letter of Sir E. Stafford to Anthony Bacon, dated July 30, 1592, containing the following passage :

“Yff you have anye thinge to doe with Sr Walter Rawley or anye loue to make to M^{rs} Throgmorton att the Tower to morowe you maye speake with them yff the countermande come nott to-night.”⁵

The Tower imprisonment must not be accepted as proof of the offence said to have been committed by Raleigh. Elizabeth was accustomed to punish her favourites, who married without her consent, by consigning them to a prison, and banishing their wives from Court; Leicester, Earl of Southampton, Essex, Sir T. Perrott, were notable examples.⁶

According to Mrs. A. T. Thomson, “there were other and deeper sources of offence,” that led to Raleigh’s imprisonment; and from the tenor of a letter written by Cecil “there is considerable reason to conclude that the Queen’s displeasure had some reference to Raleigh’s appropriation of certain prizes, which Cecil, with other commissioners, was appointed to superintend.”⁷ That lady has, however, misconstrued the facts of the case. Cecil’s letter of September 21 shows that Raleigh had been sent, although still a prisoner (“y^e Queen of England’s poore captive”), to Dartmouth, to assist in partitioning and preventing embezzlement of the spoil forming the cargo of the great carrack, the *Madre di Dios*, which had been captured during Raleigh’s imprisonment, and by his ships. Based upon a letter, dated September 23, sent by “a correspondent about the Court of the name of Colman,” Collier was of opinion that Raleigh ceased to be a prisoner on proceeding to Dartmouth;⁸ but Cecil’s testimony shows this to be incorrect. His release took place, most probably, in December of the same year. Another

³ EDWARDS, ii. 46-8. In the *Cal. S. P.* it is stated to be addressed “to Lord [Burghley].”

⁴ EDWARDS, ii. 48-52. None of the three records the actual day.

⁵ Transcript kindly supplied by Mr. Kershaw, the librarian of Lambeth Palace, from *Lambeth MSS.* 648, No. 123. It contains verbal differences from the version printed by J. P. Collier, in *Archæologia*, xxxiv. 160. Stebbing affirms the date, July 30, to be “impossible.”

⁶ EDWARDS, i. 50-1, 135, 252; *Lives of the Earls of Essex*, i. 160, 211; OLDYS, i. 180.

⁷ *Life of Raleigh* (1830), 92, 482-3.

⁸ *Archæologia*, xxxiv. 162.

author affirms that Raleigh's imprisonment was partly on account of a clandestine attachment, etc.; and partly on account of a tract which he had published, entitled *The School for Atheists*,⁹ a work unknown to bibliographers.

Let us now turn our attention to a letter contained in a paper by J. P. Collier, entitled "Continuation of New Materials for a Life of Sir Walter Raleigh," printed in *Archæologia*, xxxiv. 160-170, a transcript of which is now given at length:

"S. W. R., as it seemeth, hath beene too inward with one of her Maties maides; I feare to say who, but if you should guesse at E. T. you may not be farre wrong. The matter hath only now been apparent to all eies, and the lady hath been sent away, but nobody believes it can end there. S. W. R. hath escaped from London for a tyme; he will be speedily sent for, and brought back, where what awaiteth him nobody knoweth, save by conjecture. All think the Tower will be his dwelling, like hermit poore in pensive place, where he may spend his endlesse daies of doubt. It is affirmed that they are marryed; but the Queen is most fiercely incensed, and, as the bruit goes, threateneth the most bitter punishment to both the offenders. S. W. R. will lose, it is thought, all his places and preferments at court, with the Queen's favour; such will be the end of his speedy rising, and now he must fall as low as he was high, at the which manie will rejoice. I can write no more at this time, and do not care to send this, only you will hear it from others. All is alarm and confusion at this discovery of the discoverer, and not indeed of a new continent, but of a new incontinent" (161).

If this letter were genuine, it would be sufficient to justify Camden's assertion, but there are several circumstances incident to it of an adverse character.

In some prefatory remarks upon it, Collier alludes to it as "a Letter which bears only the date of 1592, without the month or day, in my possession," and "must have been anterior to" the imprisonment. He then adds, "It does not appear to whom . . . [it] was addressed, nor by whom it was written, the concealment having probably been designed, in consequence of the peril to which it might then have exposed the parties" (160-1).

All this is rendered the more unsatisfactory by the knowledge that it has never been recorded by any other author. Mr. Collier does not inform us from whence he obtained it, and we are unaware whether it was ever seen by anyone, excepting himself. Moreover, since his death, all traces of it have disappeared.

⁹ *Dict. of Gen. Biog.*, by W. L. R. CATES (1881), 1087.

as it seems
Sir W. R. hath
of the L. Maider, I fear
guess at E. J. you will
matter hath only now
and the lady is sent away
will end there. Sir W. R.
for a time: but he will be
back, where what awaits
conjecture: all suppose
long place like hermit
where he may spend his
is most highly incensed,
most bitter punishment
is expected to lose not only
his places & preferments
more now, but when I
know. All is confusion
not of a new continent,

1592

can too inward with one
to say which but if you
or be your wrong - The
is apparent to all eyes
, but nobody believes it
ath escaped from London
speedily sent for & brought
to him I know not but by
the Tower will be his Disch-
re in your me please oblige
days of doubt. The 2
nd They build, threatens the
with the offenders. In W.
ly all his favours but all
Court. I can write no
re anything I will let you
D Desmay at the discovery
out of a new invention.

A great portion of Collier's MS. collections, in his own handwriting, and on which he founded his papers on the "Life of Sir W. Raleigh," that appeared in the *Archæologia*, xxxiv.—xxxv., are in the possession of the writer, and amongst them is a sheet, containing, what appears to be a draft copy of this very letter, in Collier's writing; and, as the matter is one of great literary importance, a *fac-simile* of it is now given, so that it may be the more readily compared with the printed version.

That wide differences exist between them is at once apparent. In the following comparison of their respective contents, the first word or phrase is taken from the *fac-simile*; the second, from the printed version—I. Verbal, *e.g.* "Q" for "Majesty"; "suppose" for "think." II. Grammatical, *e.g.* "if you guess at E. T. you will not be farre wrong" for "if you should guesse at E. T. you may not be farre wrong"; "I feare to say which" for "I feare to say who"; "bruit" is a verb in one, a substantive in the other. III. Sentences reconstructed; *e.g.* "what awaiteth him I know not but by conjecture" for "what awaiteth him nobody knoweth save by conjecture." IV. The printed version contains several important additions, especially in the latter portion. V. Of the four alterations in the first (two interpolations and two erasures), only one—an interpolation—is found in the second. True it is they are of that character not unlikely to occur in any ordinary draft copy. It is, however, noteworthy that of 55 letters, &c., transcribed from State Papers, and other sources, by Collier, for his Raleigh articles; also of a similar collection, more than three inches thick, formed by him towards a "Life of the Earl of Essex" (unpublished), all in his own handwriting, on letter-paper, and extending in some instances to four pages—all of which are in the writer's possession—no one sheet contains so many alterations as are shown in the *fac-simile*.

VI. The *fac-simile* contains this couplet:

" Like hermit poore in pensive place obscure
Where he may spend his endless days of doubt "

In the printed copy the word "obscure" is omitted, and the metrical character of the lines is thereby changed. Collier makes some comment upon the poem (of which the above quotation forms the opening couplet), and of its publication the year after the date of the letter in the *Phoenix Nest*, and that owing to its appearance in the former, "it ought hereafter to be added to the productions of Raleigh's

muse." It had, however, been already assigned to Sir Walter so far back as the year 1644, in a small 4to of eight leaves, entitled *To-day a man, To-morrow none*.¹ It is very remarkable that, in his *Bibliographical Catalogue*, published in 1865 (fourteen years after he had read his paper before the Society of Antiquaries, containing the letter quoted), and including an extended account of this poem, there should be no reference to this letter of 1592 for containing the earliest notice of it.

It is always distressing to call in question the good faith of any author; but after a due consideration of the foregoing statements, it is simply impossible to receive the letter cited by Collier as evidence in the matter *sub judice*, until its genuine character is either proved, or further light is able to be thrown upon it. It has had a variable effect on the various biographies of Raleigh that have been issued since 1851. Edwards (1868), although quoting from Collier's article in the *Archæologia*, makes no allusion to this letter. Gosse remarks, "there is a lacuna in the evidence as to what actually happened early in 1592; the late Mr. J. P. Collier filled up this gap with a convenient [*sic*] letter, which has found its way into the histories of Raleigh, but the original of which has never been seen by other eyes than the transcriber's" (56). St. John (1869) relies upon its accuracy; as does also Stebbing (1891), who quotes the sentence, "it is affirmed that they are married," which is absent from the fac-simile (90).

Dismissing Collier's letter, we have to depend solely on the assertion of Camden as to Raleigh's intrigue, and, in doing so, must not overlook the fact that the second part of his work (published in 1627) recording it was, to use Camden's words, submitted to James I. for "his Majesty's judicious censure—whether it please him they shall be suppressed or published, for I am indifferent. If published, whether not in his name, as dictated to me from his Majesty."²

He probably heard some of the petty gossip of Elizabeth's Court, and more than twenty years afterwards published what he had heard, as facts. The intrigue of 1592 was apparently unknown until the publication of Camden's work. Men attending the same Court, contemporaries of Raleigh, such as Sir R. Naunton and Sir R. Winwood, who knew much more of the inner life of the Court than Camden did, make

¹ It is included in the list of Raleigh's writings by the Rev. J. HANNAH in his *Courtly Poets* (1870), 12, 13.

² *Camden Epistolæ*, Ed. Tho. Smith (1691), letter 287.

no allusion to it; nor is it mentioned in any lampoon or ballad. A clandestine marriage was quite sufficient for Elizabeth to order both offenders to be imprisoned; had it taken place subsequent to this imprisonment, it would have been more easily traced. Stebbing records that "so careful were they to avoid publicity that Lady Raleigh's brother, Arthur Throckmorton, for some time questioned the fact, though his suspicions were dissipated, and he became an attached friend of the husband's" (91); which he would hardly have done had Raleigh acted dishonourably to his sister.

The most reasonable, and certainly the most charitable conclusion, is that arrived at by two modern authors. A. C. Ewald remarked, "he [Raleigh] proposed and was accepted, and the lovers were secretly united; indeed, so secretly that, according to some, intrigue had preceded marriage."³ And the present Bishop of Peterborough (Dr. Creighton) has thus given his opinion: "Elizabeth disgraced her favourite for having dared to marry secretly one of her maids of honour, Elizabeth Throgmorton."⁴

Of the marriage, he it said that, to his life's end, Raleigh had the greatest affection for his wife "Bess." Oldys⁵ affirms "they lived together ever after in the most exemplary degree of conjugal harmony"; and in his letter to her of December, 1603, when in daily expectation of being executed, he spoke of himself as having "comforted you and loved you in his happiest tymes."⁶ There is good evidence that she treasured up his memory throughout her long widowhood of twenty-nine years.⁷

Two authors were under the impression that Sir Walter had been married twice. Thus Aubrey, writing about 1680, stated, "He had 2 wives; his first was . . . Throckmorton; 2^d . . . mother of Carew Raleigh, 2^d son."⁸ And Sir R. Schomburgk, in the introduction to Raleigh's *Discoverie of Gviana*,⁹ remarked, "we recollect having seen it stated somewhere, that doubts were expressed of Elizabeth Throgmorton's having been his first wife." There is no evidence of, or reason to believe, the correctness of either of these statements.

³ *Studies Re-studied* (1885), 170.

⁴ *Age of Elizabeth* (1888), 185.

⁵ I. 180, i.

⁶ EDWARDS, ii. 286.

⁷ Separate miniatures of Sir Walter and his son are preserved at Belvoir Castle, together with an enclosing case embellished with a "heart and other emblematic ornaments" and the intertwined initials W.E.R. (Walter and Elizabeth Raleigh); no doubt worn by Lady Raleigh "in memory of her son and husband." Wood-cut illustrations and description are given in the *Art Journal* for April, 1896, 103.

⁸ *Letters, &c.*, ii. 510.

⁹ Hakl. Soc., 1848, xliii.

8. THE CHILDREN OF SIR W. RALEGH.

The issue of his marriage with Elizabeth Throgmorton was two sons: (1) Walter; and (2) Carew.

I. *Walter*.—In the pedigree of the Raleigh family by Geo. Harrison, Windsor Herald,¹ is the following entry:

“Walter Raleigh Capt. 1 November, 1593, at Lillington. Killed in America. s.p. aged 23.”²

This points out the probability that he was born at Sherborne, at which place his parents were residing about that period.³

A full-length portrait of him, with that of his father, is in the possession of Sir J. F. Lennard, Bart., by whom it was lent to the Tudor Exhibition of 1890, and is thus described in the Catalogue: “Near him [Sir W. R.] stands his son in blue doublet, trunks and hose laced with silver, buff shoes, falling white band, sword-belt white and gold embroidered; in right hand, glove; left on his hip, holding black hat” (109). On the picture, dated 1602, is the inscription—“Æ. SVE 8.”⁴ He was sent to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where he matriculated on October 30th, 1607, aged 14, and became B.A. June 21, 1610.⁵ He was a pupil of Dr. Daniel Fairclough—now better known by the name Featley, subsequently assumed by him—and there is preserved a letter of his in reply to one he had received from Sir Walter Raleigh, respecting his son, and remarkable for its allusion to two phases in young Walter’s character, that had been pointed out to him by his father:

“I shall haue more leisure to ouersee his carriage and instruct him in learning, in both which you required my care, and gaue me

¹ In the College of Arms, and printed in HOWARD’S *Misc. Geneal. et Heraldica*, ii. 155-7.

² The Registers of Lillington, Dorset, “had several of the Kelways, Coles, and Walter, a son of Sir Walter Raleigh, but only the modern books now remain” (HUTCHINS’ *Dorset*, 1870, iv. 199). The Rector informs the writer that the earliest register preserved commences in the year 1712.

³ Letters from Sir Walter Raleigh to Sir Rob. Cecil, written in 1593, are preserved in the Hatfield Collection, and are thus dated: “From Sherborn Castle,” August 15th; “From Gillingham Forest,” August 27th; “From Weymouth,” October 8th; “From Sherburne Castell,” February 25th, 1593-4 (EDWARDS, ii. 83-7).

⁴ “This picture,” according to Oldys (i. 353), “of Sir Walter and his son did belong to the Carews of Beddington, whence, by marriage with a daughter of the late sir Stephen Leonard, baronet, it was removed to West Wickham in Kent; near which place, at a gentleman’s seat, where there is a copy that was taken from it, I lately saw it.”

⁵ FOSTER’S *Alum. Oxon.* Although entered as 14 years old, he must have been within a day or two of 15.

very good directions in your letter, discovering vnto me two of the most dangerous euills, one vnto his mind, the other vnto his body, vnto which he is subject—straunge company and violent exercises.”⁶

His character, in many respects, resembled that of his father; he was brave, daring, and full of impetuous energy; but whether his mental capabilities would have developed like those of the former, we know not. Nearly all the particulars of his known history are recorded by Edwards (I. 622–6). The day he was killed in Guiana is uncertain; but it must have taken place on or before January 8th, 1618, as on that day, Captain Keymis wrote to his father to announce it.

II. *Carew* was born in the Tower of London, and baptized on February 15th, 1605, at St. Peter ad Vincula, in the Tower (Harrison pedigree), but authors (*e.g.* Stebbing) assign his birth to the latter end of the year previous.⁷ There is reason to believe that his godfather was Richard Carew, of Antonie, the author of the *Survey of Cornwall*.⁸

He entered Wadham College, Oxford, in 1619, matriculated on March 23rd, 1620–1, and retained his name in the College books till 1623.⁹ A remarkable anecdote incident to his admission is thus related by T. G. Jackson :

“In the Statutes [of the College] . . . James had altered the qualification, ‘in Anglia natus,’ into ‘in Britannia natus,’ and he now writes, on Oct. 30, 1618, to desire the College to admit to the next vacant Fellowship, William Durbame, M.A. of St. Andrew’s ‘*notwithstanding anie thing in your Statutes to the contrarie!*’ The College turned for help to the Chancellor, Lord Pembroke, pointing out that Durham was ineligible, and though we do not know the whole history of the dispute, in the event the College was successful. James’s letter is dated the day after Sir Walter Raleigh’s head fell on the scaffold, and it was, perhaps, not only sympathy with the King’s victim, but indignation at the attempted intrusion of the Scotch M.A., that provoked the College to add to the usual dry record of admission of a Fellow-Commoner,

⁶ Printed at length in Wood’s *Ath. Ox.* iii. 169.

⁷ None of the works on the Tower of London contain, any account of births that took place within its precincts, especially of children of notable personages. D. C. Bell records all who were buried in the Chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula, in a work published in 1877, and states that “the entries of christenings commence in 1587” (42).

⁸ His *Life*, written by his kinsman, Hugh Carew, prefixed to the *Survey* (1769, xxj.), states “Sir Walter Raleigh had a Son, whose Christen-name was Carew; and probably our Author was his Godfather.”

⁹ Information courteously supplied by the College authorities. Sir Walter and his sons went to different Colleges: Sir Walter to Oriel, Walter to Corpus Christi, and Carew to Wadham.

Carew Raleigh, in 1619, 'fortissimi doctissimique equitis Gualteri Raleigh filius.'"¹

In general character he appears to have been more like his mother. Wood remarked, he "proved quite different in spirit from his father . . . far, God wot, was he from his father's parts, either as to the sword or pen"; also that he had written several poetical pieces (ii. 244, 5). He made very strenuous efforts to regain possession of the Sherborne estates, and presented a petition to the House of Commons on the subject.²

He was M.P. for Haslemere in 1649-53, and for Guildford in 1659. Whether he also represented Callington, in Cornwall, has formed the subject of several articles in *Notes and Queries*,³ but remains undecided. He was appointed Governor of Jersey in 1659, through the influence of General Monk. At the Restoration he declined knighthood from Charles II., who, however, conferred that honour upon his son Walter.

In 1629, the manor of East Horsley, Surrey, was, by the Earl of Southampton, conveyed to Carew Raleigh, from whom it was subsequently purchased by the "eldest surviving son and heir of Sir Christopher Hildyard, of Winested, in the County of York."⁴

On the death of his uncle, Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, in 1643, "either by gift or devise, the estate of West Horsley passed to his nephew, Carew Raleigh."⁵ According to the Harrison pedigree, he "settled the West Horsley estates on his two sons, Walter and Philip, and their heirs male, by deeds dated 26 and 27 December, 1656."⁶ On the death of Walter, on June 15, 1660, the estate reverted to his father,

¹ *Hist. of Wadham College* (1893, iii).

² This was printed in 1669 with the title of *A brief Relation of Sir Walter's Troubles*, &c. ; also in the *Harleian Miscellany*, *Somers Tracts*, &c. &c. To him has been attributed a reply to a work containing some calumnious statements against his father, written by William Sanderson ; the rejoinder being headed, *Observations upon some particular Persons and Passages in a Book lately made public*, &c., and was issued in 1658. Stebbing, however, shows good reason for believing he was not the author (243). In HALKETT and LAING'S *Dictionary*, it is assigned to Carew Raleigh on the authority of Wood, but this is scarcely correct ; all that Wood records is to mention Carew as the author, "as 'twas generally reported" (ii. 244).

³ 6th S. xii. 448-457 ; 7th S. i. 57-8, 116, 176.

⁴ MANNING and BRAY'S *History of Surrey* (1814), iii. 31.

⁵ BRAYLEY and BRITTON'S *Surrey*, ii. 76. On the death of his uncle, Sir Francis Carew, Sir N. Throgmorton, brother to Lady Raleigh, took the name of Carew on succeeding to the estates in 1607. In the same work (iv. 55), the date is altered to 1611.

⁶ This is accompanied by a *fac-simile* of his signature appended to the deed of Dec. 27, 1656, settling the lands upon Walter.

who sold it to Sir Edward Nicholas, as thus recorded by the latter in a private memorandum book :

“On the second of March, 1665, I paid Mr. Carew Raleigh the sum of 9,750*l.*, being the full purchase money for the manor, lands, &c., of West Horsley, in the county of Surrey.”⁷

He lived in St. Martin’s Lane, London, “on the west side, from 1636 to 1638, and again in 1664,”⁸ where, at the close of 1666, he probably died, and was buried in his father’s grave in St. Margaret’s Church, Westminster—thus entered in the Burial Register:

“1666 [7] Jan. 1 Carew Rawleigh, Esq., kild. m. chancel.”⁹

The only explanation of this entry that has yet been made is that Carew Raleigh was killed, and that his body was interred in the m[iddle] of the chancel—a position which answers to the site of his father’s grave. Of the actual circumstances attending his death we know nothing.

An abstract of his nuncupative will has been printed “from memory.”¹ The following transcript is from the original document preserved in the Probate Office at Somerset House :

“Test. Carew Raleigh Jany 10th 1666 juxta

Memorand. that Carew Raleigh Esq. of the parish of St^t Martin in the Fields in the County of Middlesex did several times whilst he lived but more especially on or about the 28th day of December A. D. 1666 with an intent and purpose to make and declare his last will and Testament nuncupative utter and speak these words following or the like in effect viz: I do make my wife my sole Executrix and I give unto her all my estate whatsoever which words or the like in effect he uttered and declared with intent and purpose that the same should stand for and be his last will nuncupative in the presence of Sir Peter Tyrrell Baronet and Frances Cox and of Dame Philipp Ashley alias Raleigh the said Mr. Raleigh’s then wife and executrix and that he was at the premises in his perfect memory and understanding.

Pet. Tyrrell
Frances Cox (Signed)

10 Jany 1666

(Sworn and proved the same day 10th Jany 1666 at Exeter House)”

⁷ *Gent’s Mag.*, 1790, i. 419.

⁸ *Haunted London*, by W. THORNBURY (1865), 256.

⁹ So recorded in *Gent’s Mag.* for October, 1850, 368, and since verified by Mr. Ellison, the Parish Clerk. It is remarkable that the latter portion of the entry is omitted in the quotation from the Register in WALCOTT’S *Memorials of Westminster*. In VIVIAN’S *Visitations of Devon*, the year 1667–8 is given in error. The date is assigned to 1680, in MANNING and BRAY’S *Surrey*, and that the interment took place in West Horsley Church ; errors repeated in *Alumni Oxon.*, and in other works.

¹ *Ibid.* 368–9.

No portrait of him is known.

His son Philip survived him, and was reported to be living in 1692.²

III. Had Sir Walter Raleigh a daughter? is a question which was never raised by his early biographers, although answered affirmatively by his later ones, and on testimony of the most slender kind.

The earliest, as well as the only information we possess, was first made public by the Rev. J. S. Brewer, in his edition of Bishop Goodman's *Court of King James*, published in 1839. To this the editor contributed a letter, from a "contemporary copy, transcribed from Serg. Yelverton's collection in All Souls [Oxford], marked MS. 16, 18, fol. 100 b."³

Raleigh was arrested and sent to the Tower on July 17, 1603, and this letter is supposed to have been written a few days later—in Gosse's opinion, on the 21st.⁴ The following extract from it contains all that is pertinent to the present enquiry, and is the only occasion when a daughter is mentioned, or even referred to :

"That thou didst also love me living, witness it to others; to my poor daughter, to whom I have given nothing; for his sake, who will be cruel to himself to preserve thee. Be charitable to her, and teach thy son to love her for his father's sake. . . . The Lord for ever keep thee and them."⁵

This, and the portion that precedes it, shows that the suggestion of Gosse (55), "that it was the birth of this child [daughter] which brought down the vengeance of Queen Elizabeth" upon the parents, is untenable. Upon this information alone, authors have affirmed that Raleigh had a daughter, and that she was illegitimate. "Who is the daughter mentioned in this letter?" asks the historian Gardiner.⁶ "Does anybody know what became of her?" is a question that appeared in *Notes and Queries* (vi. S. x. 46),

² *Harrison* pedigree.

³ Reprinted, with several errors, by Edwards, ii. 383-7. It is to be regretted that although he visited All Souls Library, he was "accidentally deprived of the opportunity of collating this letter with the MS."

⁴ Brewer heads it "Sir Walter Rawleigh to his wife, after he had hurt himself in the Tower," and adds, in a foot-note, "This letter at once determines the much-vexed question, whether or not Sir Walter did attempt to stab himself in the Tower." The writer has no intention of discussing, on the present occasion, this alleged attempt of Raleigh to commit suicide, but the letter under notice must have been penned before he made any such attempt.

⁵ BREWER, ii. 94, 97.

⁶ *Hist. of England* (1883), i. 122.

and neither enquiry has yet elicited a reply. The statement in the letter recording her existence is uncorroborated in print or MS., as far as is yet known. She is like a shadow, forced upon our attention, and departs as one, leaving "not a wrack behind." ("The extraordinary apparition of an otherwise invisible daughter.")⁷ In it there are nine references to his "child," and two to his "son"; but the context shows them to relate to his son Walter—Carew had not then been born. It contains no special feature indicating that Sir Walter was the author; or, if genuine, that the portions quoted were not interpolations. It is a copy, undated, unsigned, unaddressed, and found entered in a commonplace book belonging to the Yelverton family, in the hand of a copyist "of ordinary seventeenth century character."⁸

Let it be contrasted with another letter of Raleigh's, the authenticity of which no one has ever cast doubt upon; one written to his wife in December, 1603, "in the most solemn moment of his whole life," and in daily expectation of death. One of the most beautiful and touching of its kind that was ever penned by man; the difference in tone and character will be at once manifest.⁹ In this there is no allusion to a daughter. In the earlier one, supposed to have been written while Raleigh was in a state of despair, he in a most business-like way makes out a catalogue of his debts. The work of Stebbing must be referred to (as it is the only one wherein the subject is adequately examined) for a critical comparison of these two letters; where the conclusion arrived at is that "the obstacles to the acceptance of this composition as authentic are almost insuperable" (197). It is very singular that Edwards makes no comment whatever respecting this "apocryphal daughter," as Stebbing terms her.¹

"Sir Walter Raleigh," wrote Froude, "is commonly represented by historians as rather defective, if he was remarkable at all, on the moral side of his character."² Such represen-

⁷ STEBBING, 198.

⁸ STEBBING, 195.

⁹ The original has not been preserved, but there are three contemporaneous transcripts from which Edwards collated the one printed in his work (ii. 284-7). It has always been remarkably popular since its first publication in 1644, under the title of *To-day a man, To-morrow none*; next in 1648, in *The Arraignment of S. W. Rawleigh*, "Coppied by Sir Tho: Overbvry"; and in each edition of the *Remains*, commencing in 1651, &c. &c.

¹ There is a ballad in the Roxburgh Collection, entitled "Sir Walter Raleigh Sailing in the Low-Lands" (reprinted by the Ballad Society in Roxburgh Volumes, vi. 418-421), in which Sir Walter is made to say to the boy who is the hero of the ballad: "My eldest daughter thy wife shall be." On this the editor remarks, "He [Sir Walter] certainly had a daughter." But according to this ballad he must have had three!

² *Short Studies*, i. 315.

tations have been based upon his supposed prenuptial intrigue, and upon an alleged illegitimate daughter. It is but simple justice to his memory that the data upon which such charges have been made should be rigorously investigated. How far either of these assertions can be depended upon for accuracy or the reverse, has been the object of the writer to indicate.



