

2003

10/6

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

Alhauer

BELSIDE ROAD,
EDLYWOOD,
SHEFFIELD.

MARY DAVIES MANOR

1871-1872

1871



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

LEWIS ROAD,
FALMOUTH,
SHEFFIELD.

MARY DAVIES AND
THE MANOR OF EBURY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE SPIRIT OF THE HOLY COURT

A selection of fine passages from Sir Thomas Hawkins's translation (1634 Edition) of "The Holy Court," by Nicolas Caussin, S.J.

THE MYSTERY DRAMA OF PARSIFAL

This contains the story of Wagner's great drama, a verbatim translation of the libretto, the principal themes in musical notation, and an explanation of the mystery.

ARUNDEL HYMNS

Edited jointly with Henry, Duke of Norfolk.



5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

The Grosvenor Family

- 1. Lord Robert Grosvenor
(*see Lord Enry*) d. 1893
- 2. Countess Grosvenor
d. 1891
- 3. Lady Elizabeth Grosvenor
(*see Wentworth*) d. 1899
- 4. Lady Caroline Grosvenor
(*see Light*) d. 1906
- 5. Lady Evelyn Grosvenor
d. 1899
- 6. Lord Belperave
(*see Duke of Westminster*) d. 1899
- 7. Marquess of Westminster
d. 1885
- 8. Earl Grosvenor
d. 1879
- 9. Lady Mary Grosvenor
Countess of Massfield d. 1922
- 10. Lady Enry
d. 1891
- 11. Marchioness of Westminster
d. 1846
- 12. Lady Mary Egerton
d. young
- 13. Lord Thomas Grosvenor
(*see Earl of Wilton*) d. 1892
- 14. Lady Eleanor Grosvenor
(*see Duchess of Northumberland*) d. 1911
- 15. Countess of Wilton
d. 1868

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Photo. by Mrs. 1893

Mary Davies and the Manor of Ebury ❁ ❁

By Charles T. ^{indal}Gatty, F.S.A.

Author of "Recognita, George Wyndham"

"I believe that if the history of any one family in upper or middle life could be faithfully written, it might be as generally interesting, and as permanently useful, as that of any nation, however great and renowned."

—LOCKHART'S "LIFE OF SIR WALTER SCOTT."

"To keep the past alive for us is the pious function of the historian. Our curiosity is endless, his the task of gratifying it. We want to know what happened long ago."

—AUGUSTINE BIRRELL.

*With Eight Photogravure Plates
and Thirty-one other Illustrations*

VOLUME ONE

London :
The Waverley Book Company, Ltd.
96 Farringdon Street, E.C.

DA 4 37

G 76 G 38

V. 1

*The Owner of these Insuing Archives
and*

The Writer of this Book

*Dedicate the Work to those through
whose help it has been completed*

To Miss Ethel Stokes

*To the Officers of the British Museum, the
Record Office, the Society of Antiquaries, the
London Library, the Ecclesiastical Commission, the
County Councils of London and Middlesex, the
Municipalities of London, Westminster and Chester*

To Sir George Sitwell Baronet

To Dr. Bridge and Mr. Denis Hyde of Chester

To Mr. G. F. Hatfield of London

and

To Mr. E. K. Willett of Eaton

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PRELIMINARIES	I
THE MANOR OF EIA	14
THE BAILIWICK OF ST. JAMES	24
THE MANOR OF HYDE	33
THE MANOR OF NEYTE	35
THE MANOR OF EBURY	41
THE VILLAGE OF EIA	50
THE WASTE OF THE MANOR OF EBURY	51
THE HUNDRED OF OSSULSTON	54
RETROSPECT	61
HUGH AWDELEY	76
THE COURT OF WARDS AND LIVERIES	81
MORRIS <i>alias</i> POYNTZ	89
AWDELEY LORD OF THE MANOR	97
GORING HOUSE	99
PIMLICO	110
THE REA FAMILY	112
DOCTOR DUKESON	119
THE PASSING OF HUGH AWDELEY	124
ASPECTS OF HUGH AWDELEY	135
THE DAVIES FAMILY	156
ALEXANDER DAVIES, LORD OF THE MANOR	159

	PAGE
JOHN TREGONWELL	170
THE ESTATE OF ALEXANDER DAVIES	174
PETERBOROUGH HOUSE	182
THE EARL OF PETERBOROUGH	188
THE INFANT MARY	192
LORD BERKELEY OF STRATTON	200
THE BRIDEGROOM	203
FROM THE THAMES TO THE DEE	223
THE OLD STOCK	227
THE FIRST TWO GROSVENOR BARONETS	232
THE FLEET PRISON	244
SCROPE <i>versus</i> GROSVENOR	248
THE KING'S PARDON.	256
THE PEDIGREE	260
RACING RHYMES	270
HOME LIFE AT EATON	276
THE DINNER PARTY	290

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PLATE	FACING PAGE
1. THE GROSVENOR FAMILY. BY C. R. LESLIE, R.A. <i>(Photogravure) Frontispiece</i>	
2. VISCOUNT BELGRAVE, BY T. GAINSBOROUGH, R.A.	10
	<i>(Photogravure)</i>
3. PLAN OF THE MANOR OF EIA	15
4. THE WESTBOURNE FLOWING SOUTH THROUGH WHAT IS NOW ALBERT GATE	20
5. PLAN OF THE CONDUIT FROM PADDINGTON (1632)	34
6. SAIGHTON GRANGE	38
7. THE SITE OF OSSULSTON	56
8. THE FUNERAL OF ABBOT ISLIP IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY	72
9. SKETCH OF GORING HOUSE	108
10. PORTION OF THE ROLL OF HUGH AWDELEY'S DEBTORS .	140
11. PEDIGREE OF THE DAVIES FAMILY	156
12. MILLBANK FRONTAGE TO THE THAMES	182
13. GROSVENOR HOUSE ON MILLBANK	184
14. ANDERSTON MANOR	196
15. SIR THOMAS GROSVENOR, BARONET. BY SIR PETER LELY	224
	<i>(Photogravure)</i>
16. EATON HALL IN THE 17TH CENTURY	226
17. EATON BOAT	228
18. SIR RICHARD GROSVENOR, BARONET. FROM A WINDOW AT FARNDON	238
19. GROSVENOR RACING STABLES AT WALLASEY	270

MARY DAVIES AND THE MANOR OF EBURY

PRELIMINARIES

AMONG the many recipes suggested by philosophers for the attainment of intellectual happiness, I know none so sure as the quickening of the past. To re-create the past gives confidence in the present and courage for the future. Only in what has been, do we find our real selves, for the present is always a becoming, and the future is not. It is the past which assures us that this planet is not only the tomb but also the womb of life, and sharpens in us the expectation of immortality, making us dread obliteration of the bygone time quite as strongly as annihilation in the future. And this is why such quickening has been the occupation of the greatest and most mature intellects. Homer, Shakespeare, and Sir Walter Scott gave vitality and immortality to the dead from sheer love of life. They took the imperishable gold of past ages and minted it to the currency of their day. John Ruskin used to say that there was very little of the Resurrection in Shakespeare, but for me he is the poet of eternal life. His work is in itself a resurrection, starting among themes bounded by the will of man, moving amidst material

2 *Mary Davies and the Manor of Ebury*

things, but gradually rising to supreme tragedies, controlled by supernatural influences, and by the sceptre of divine justice. On the title-page of his works might be placed the words of Prospero,

“Graves at my command
Have wak'd their sleepers, op'd, and let 'em forth
By my so potent Art.”

And what such great minds loved all men desire according to their capacity. We look at the monuments, the muniments and the miniatures of our ancestors, who once occupied the very houses we live in, walked in the same gardens, studied in the same schools, worshipped at the same shrines, fought on the same battle-fields, drank of the same vineyards, and we love to give life, if we cannot give immortality, to those who have gone before us.

* * *

It is true that talented writers have warned us against an excessive contemplation of the past. Marryat says we are apt to become crystallized, like Lot's wife, by a persistent looking backward. Samuel Butler went so far as to suggest “A Society for the suppression of Erudite Research and the Decent Burial of the Past,” but I do not think we need take him too seriously when we remember the amount of time and labour he spent, not alone in the discovery of “The onlie begetter of these insuing sonnets,” and the authoress of the *Odyssey*, but also in identifying each one of us with every ancestor that we have had, up to that remote speck of protoplasm from which we are all supposed to have started.

Besides which it is salutary to look back, and far,

so that we keep a sense of proportion as to the importance of what happens now. All the past that we can imagine, from palæolithic man down to the last born infant is but a span long, and "all that now tread the globe are but a handful of the tribes that slumber in its bosom." The contemplation of such infinities keeps us in right relation to all around us, whilst the greatest literature inspired by God and man sets before our minds histories of life and character that animate and influence our conduct.

This being so, with what reverence should we unroll any fragment of the long record. What special responsibility falls upon the historian or biographer. The dramatist and novelist may let fancy play around their characters, but whoever sets out to quicken the real men and women of the 17th century must be vigilantly truthful. "To the living," wrote Voltaire, "we owe some consideration; to the dead we owe only the truth." Sir Walter Scott could do what he liked with his blustering bravo, Captain Colepepper, in *The Fortunes of Nigel*, but my swashbuckler of the same name was a real live man, of a good family, about whom I must invent nothing. And yet I think my genuine Colepepper is quite as astonishing as his fictitious one.

If a family chronicle be compiled with care, it should be read with sympathy. Considering the tears and tremors expended over the fortunes of imaginary characters in English fiction, surely a true record of the joys and sorrows of real men and women who lived and moved and had their being in homes and on lands we know well, should awaken an equally genuine and

4 *Mary Davies and the Manor of Ebury*

serviceable fellow-feeling. Indeed family histories and biographies are very valuable, for a nation is composed of individuals as a loaf is made of grains of flour. I wrote recently to a student at one of England's greatest public schools, and sent him the names of a dozen important family histories, and asked him how many of these were in his school library. He found one only; there should be more.

All the characters in this book once lived and walked the earth, and by their thoughts and actions influenced the lives and fortunes of many in our own generation; and every fragment of past life, be it concerned with only one family, and a narrow tract of property, has in it the promise of the present and the future.

“ There is a Historie in all men's Lives,
Figuring the nature of the Times deceas'd :
The which observ'd, a man may prophetic
With a neere ayme, of the maine chance of things,
As yet not come to Life, which in their Seedes
And weake beginnings lye entreasured :
Such things become the Hatch and Brood of Time.”

Hen. IV, Part II, 3, 1, 80.

* * *

To put this gospel of retrospection into practice, my recipe is as follows. To one comfortably furnished bedroom, in a well organized English country house, add a well-piled log fire, in front of which should be drawn an easy chair, flanked by a low table on the right, provided with pens, ink, and paper. And, at a convenient distance, at least three old iron boxes from the muniment room, containing letters, wills, marriage-

settlements, pocket-books, and accounts, telling one of the loves, hopes, intrigues, strifes and sorrows of the men and women in backs, breasts, ruffs, wigs, and brocaded skirts, who gaze upon us from the canvases of the period.

The thing then becomes a chase; you find the scent, and off you go. It finally settles down into a jig-saw puzzle; not the ordinary jig-saw, where all the pieces are, or should be, in a single box, but one in which the fragments are scattered about in letters, leases, wills, law-suits, Acts of Parliament, books, registers and newspapers. Some pieces cannot be found, and others will not fit, so that the result may be incomplete, and perhaps irregular in shape, but great care must be taken that it be nowhere spoiled by surmises and guesses, so often made, and so frequently wrong, because nothing in life is so likely to have happened as the unexpected.

Now it did so happen a few years ago that I chanced to find an unsorted series of papers, throwing light upon the social history of a family, and the topographical history of London in the 17th century. I was at Eaton Hall near Chester, and found a model muniment room, stocked with enamelled boxes charged with small mediæval deeds, dating from the reign of Stephen, all carefully catalogued by a patient antiquary, and containing the usual information that Robert de Eaton holdeth in feodo from John de Brochall, etc. I confess I was not seeking anything of this kind, it savoured too strongly of Dryasdust for my palate; but stowed away in unsorted boxes I found a quantity of later matter, dealing with the 17th and 18th centuries,

6 *Mary Davies and the Manor of Ebury*

which soon began to fit in with the pictures at Eaton, and throw a flood of light on the family history. I shut myself into my bedroom and wrestled with huge parchments, and heaps of letters. I prowled round corridors and penetrated into back bedrooms hunting for bygone baronets and their wives. I came on to mysterious allusions in letters of 1703 and 1704 to conspiracies and law-suits, the names of the villains in the piece being purposely abbreviated. And then, gradually, fragments from various quarters began to come in, and I was able to piece together a long but interesting story, lacking symmetry, but possessing many of the ingredients of a real romance, the chief figure being a woman named Mary Davies, for whom we can claim no extraordinary gifts of ability, beauty, or noble birth, but around whom were gathered a group of strange people and events, and through whom were transmitted a few fields of pasture, now part of London, which contained, even in the 17th century, "the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice."

I will tell the tale as simply as I can, and puzzle the reader as little as possible with carucates, wapentakes, or witenagemots, or any of the indigestible pabulum with which Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries feed their flocks. I have invented nothing in this history. It has been my great good fortune to light accidentally on a collection of documents about a well-known family and property, and I have tried to let these papers tell the story, without hindrance. "The art of writing is the art of interesting," and who could fail to be interested in such a record? For every quotation, giving the words

of the characters, there is contemporary manuscript authority in depositions, spoken evidence, letters, or deeds preserved in some private or public collection. In most cases extracts are given with modern spelling and punctuation, and dates in the new style only.

* * *

It is interesting to get even a slight sketch of part of the history of a family that has endured since Norman times in the same county, and since the 15th century on the same spot, owning and cultivating land, bearing arms in battle, begetting children, building houses, and serving the state as Members of Parliament, Mayors, and Magistrates. These families have so to speak grown up with England, helped to evolve her history, and frame her fateful decisions. Some were Catholic, others Protestant; some Liberal, others Tory; some wore helmets, others periwigs and beaver hats, according to the accidents of the ages; but beneath such signs and tokens these gentle folk, in the main, have evolved qualities suitable for their function.

Possibly the reader may think that in these pages I give a medley of miscellaneous information rather than a consecutive compact biography; but after all, what we are trying to get at is what actually happened. Some who have looked over the manuscript of these volumes tell me they are crowded with side-tracks, that the by-ways are broader than the highways, and that the whole lacks form and proportion; but if each critic were to erase from the map the path for which he had no use, what route would remain? I have not written the book for readers whose patience and enlightenment can only drag

them through a newspaper paragraph. It has been presumed from start to finish that the families written about in this book, and the property with which they were concerned, shall have the historical setting revealed by their records and possessions. Fiction, and artificial biography may make symmetrical patterns, but truth is stranger than either. The most surprising gossip about the most astonishing people, is never so amazing as what they really do. Let the reader then be patient if this story seem discursive, for such is life; nor let him grudge the writer a few reflections arising out of comparisons between the 17th and 20th centuries, for this helps to bring the old people to life again, and makes them one with ourselves. The world is not only wonderful because it has changed so much, but also because it has altered so little. From the era of the Roman Emperor Constantius, who died "in the imperial palace" at York, A.D. 306, to that of George II, who died A.D. 1760, there were but a few hours difference between the time it took to get a letter from Rome to England, the Emperor probably having the advantage. At Monte Cassino years ago I was told by a student of Byzantine Codices, that the sign-manual of the Emperor was sometimes an ink impression of the cuticle of the palm of his thumb, the latest method of personal identification used at Scotland Yard to-day!

*

*

*

With regard to the period we are about to contemplate, naturally the clever people have no trouble; they have read Pepys, Evelyn, Halifax and the like, and know where they are, but for a great many the past is

a sort of nebulous maze out of which the stars shine, but the spectators are without any gauge to test their distance or movement. Sesostris, Cæsar and Charlemagne glisten in the empyrean of past ages, but only those who have a chart can mark the time of their rising and setting. Lord Beaconsfield is said to have remarked with regard to his wife, "She was a bright creature! She had no knowledge of the past, nor fears as to the future. She often used to ask me if the Romans or the Greeks came first." Now this very common obstacle to the appreciation of dates may be got over in this story if the reader will look at Leslie's picture of the Grosvenor family (Plate 1), painted in 1833. If the present Duke of Westminster stood before it, he could say, "The small boy in the tunic was my grandfather, and the old man holding his hand was his grandfather, and the grandfather of the elderly gentleman was Mary Davies's youngest son." This is something of a gauge as to time.

As to environment I have done what I can to place the characters in their actual surroundings, and here and there have ventured to try and extend the scenery beyond their 17th century home-life into the England and Europe of that day. It is curious how much the illusion of costume seems to cut us off from our ancestors, whereas their letters and their wills seem to bring them into our midst. Old costumes are properly called fancy dress. They put the wearers on to an imaginary plane. Children and stage-managers play on this make-believe effect, but what we want to do in telling this story is to strip off these elaborate wigs and embroidered coats, and

find beneath them the contriving minds and loving hearts of the old folk. And as the elderly gentleman in Leslie's picture has helped us over the stile of time, we will use him once again to assist us over that of dress. He actually came through from the period of powdered wig and satin coat, and the reader may trace the effect of the transition by seeing him, as a youth, from a portrait by Gainsborough (Plate 2), in what we may call fancy dress, and finding him again on Leslie's canvas (Plate 1), at the age of 66, looking for all the world like a benevolent Chairman of the London and North Western Railway Company.

* * *

It were well if wigs and waistcoats were the only screens that conceal our ancestors, but we are foiled also by inflated epitaphs, buttoned-up biographies, burnt records, prejudiced histories, and ignorant historians. Therefore, before we begin the true history of Mary Davies, it is necessary to sweep away a few of the many fictions that have grown up around the story of her life. Twenty years ago the world believed, and her descendants believed, that she lived at Bourdon House, in Davies Street, Berkeley Square; that she was the daughter of a London Alderman, who kept cows and sold milk; that Bourdon House was the ancient Manor-house of the Manor of Ebury; that young Sir Thomas Grosvenor fell in love with the beautiful milkmaid, and that her provident father, knowing the racing tendencies of the Grosvenors, created a trust in the reign of Charles II, which survives to this day. Bits of this legend appear in the pages of various writers on London,



J. Gainsborough, pinx.

Emery Waverth sc.

*Viscount Belgrave
afterwards, Robert, 1st. Marquess of Westminster*

and are not worth quotation or reference, for they are all untrue. She never lived at Bourdon House, nor did her father, who was not an Alderman, nor was she a milk-maid, nor was Bourdon House the Manor-house of Ebury Manor, nor did her father keep a dairy or create a trust. So when Colonel W. F. Prideaux wrote to *Notes and Queries* in 1894, from Jaipur, Rajputana, and expanded about "Bourdon Farm at Pimlico with its magnificent dairies," I do not wonder that Mr. Philip Norman wrote in a subsequent issue asking where he could learn more about these Bourdon dairies, adding the significant fact that "Burdon" Street first appears in the parish rate-book in 1739, that is 74 years after the death of Mary Davies's father!

Not that the "milk-maid" legend is a novelty. In 1785 some one published *The Heraldry of Nature*, for the Peers of England, "blazoned from the authority of truth, and characteristically descriptive of the several qualities that distinguish their possessors." The Grosvenor arms are given, "Quarterly, argent, two black nags combatant," etc.; and "Supporters. The dexter, a jockey; the sinister, a milk-maid, both proper."

Another example of the fictions published about the Davies family may be found in *The Great Governing Families of England*, where the authors, writing of Mary's father, say:—

"The story is, that during the general panic and social disorganization consequent on the Great Plague of London, a large amount of valuable property, money, and title-deeds was left by neighbouring families in Mr. Davies's charge, most of which the owners never lived or returned to reclaim. Alexander Davies made such excellent use of the capital thus

placed at his disposal—there is no imputation against his honesty—that he was enabled to bring together, by fresh purchases, the large landed property in the metropolis with which his daughter eventually enriched the Grosvenors.”

Could a greater collection of rubbish be concentrated in one paragraph? The only connection between Alexander Davies and the Great Plague is that it killed him! As for “fresh purchases,” the property his daughter succeeded to was given to him complete, and larger than it ever was afterwards, three years before the Plague. When he died, during the first months of the Plague, he was so deeply in debt, that an Act of Parliament was passed to secure his creditors.

Another writer who dealt at some length with the story of Mary Davies, was the late Rev. W. J. Loftie. In his *History of London* and in *Merry England*, for September, 1883, he gave a few accurate and many inaccurate statements about the Davies family and the Manor of Ebury, which I have neither patience, time, nor space to correct.

The real story is quite different from this, therefore it is well to rid our minds of all bogus scenery, and be prepared to accept an entirely different setting for the piece.

* * *

A last word before the curtain rises. It is possible the reader may expect that any record drawn from an exciting epoch of English history would be peopled with illustrious characters, such as come to life among the magic pages of Macaulay. But here are no kings or their counsellors, no political gamblers playing with

loaded dice for huge stakes of life or fortune; no thrones, no scaffolds, but only a group of ordinary English folk, landowners, professional men and traders, evolving a strange story, without concerted plan or blatant advertisement, for "True merit, like a river, the deeper it is the less noise it makes." So, while Savile, Lord Halifax, was constructing political apothegms, Shaftesbury concocting political intrigues, and Dryden composing political satires, the Grosvenors, not illustrious in council, court, or camp, formed part of that great body of decent country folk, who passed sufficient of their lives far enough from London among natural and simple surroundings, to acquire a sane judgment about their duty towards their neighbour, which is the fibre and the fabric of England's common weal.

THE MANOR OF EIA

BY all the rules of polite society, the story of the lady should come before the history of her land, but in this instance the property takes precedence. Not only was it there before she arrived, but when she came it dominated her destiny. She might almost have said *l'état c'est moi*, for her whole life turned upon her estate, and in the end the estate helped to turn her head. On account of those few fields she was hidden in France, lest she should be stolen; for them she was bought and sold; for them she suffered villainous ill treatment, and endured years of unmerited litigation in almost every court of law under the English crown. We begin then with the estate.

* * *

The property inherited by Mary Davies formed part of an enclosure, called in Domesday the Manor of Eia, which, from the Conquest till Henry VIII, belonged to the Abbey of Westminster. This area has been identified and described by Mr. Saunders and Mr. Rutton in Volumes 26 and 62 of *Archæologia*, and I shall not repeat their labours; indeed my story does not begin until the Manor was in process of dissolution. There is a small plan of this area on Plate 3, and a large one on Plate 31. The small plan is divided into sections marked A, B, C, and D, representing nominal manors or bailiwicks carved out of the whole at various

times, for various reasons, indicated in the first of these volumes. This part of the book is topographical




PLATE 3.—PLAN OF THE MANOR OF EIA.

and historical, the rest deals with the story of Mary Davies, and of the family into which she married.

The Manor of Eia was bounded on the north by the Roman road from Bath to London, now the Bayswater Road and Oxford Street; on the south by the

Thames; on the west by the Westbourne, and on the east by the Tybourne. The road and river have not changed, but the streams have altered their aspect, and here and there their route, whilst most of their contents have been tapped by the great drainage schemes of modern London. Like the generations who played by these brooks when they babbled through green fields, they are gone underground. When we do not see them we forget that these ancient watercourses of the Hampstead and Highgate hills have to get down to the river somehow. Their chief obstacle is the underground railway, over which they are carried in pipes. The conduit can be seen suspended, between roof and rails in the Sloane Square station, which conveys the Westbourne, or Serpentine, to the Thames. The Tybourne crosses the railway in Victoria Street.

I have traced the courses of these streams with some particularity, but they have been liable to modifications, and are given approximately. Windings are apt to be straightened, and levels altered, when open brooks are converted into culverted sewers. With regard to the Tybourne, I have been chiefly guided by an elaborate *Plan of the King's Scholars Pond Sewer*, made in 1807, for the Westminster Commission of Sewers, by W. Tredgold, a fine piece of work, kindly shown me by Mr. Braines, the enlightened Librarian of the London County Council.

* * *

The best way to get an idea of the boundaries of the Manor is to follow them afoot. Say we start off at Marlborough Gate, to traverse the northern boundary.

At this Gate the Westbourne flows south under the road, emerging through visible pointed arches into a plateau of ornamental stone work, and passes thence into the Serpentine. We leave this and go east along the Bayswater Road, passing the site of Tyburn gallows at the point where the Edgware Road joins the Bayswater Road. About 700 yards east of Tyburn, we reach Davies Street on our right, having traversed the entire northern boundary of the Manor.

At this point the Tybourne flows under Oxford Street, from the west side of Stratford Place, into Davies Street, down South Molton Lane, across Brook Street, down Avery Row, across Grosvenor Street, and passing under numbers 81 and 82 goes into and across Bloomfield Place, and under the premises of Messrs. Savory and Moore, into Bruton Place. Here the stream was heard distinctly years ago, through a hole in the cellar floor, flowing, and seemingly falling. Here also a tradition survives that Queen Anne came up the stream in her barge. It is possible, for in Brook Mews, below Claridge's Hotel, during building excavations, a pier wall was laid bare with iron rings for mooring boats, probably at the top of a small creek.

When a London stream has been enclosed in an arched culvert, and the sides have risen with the ascending city, and become overlaid with buildings, it needs an effort of the imagination to picture it once more winding between banks and braes, fringed with rushes, and redolent with wild mint. Yet such was the Tybourne down in the valley below the west side of Bond Street; and to-day, when one looks down Lanca-

shire Court or Bloomfield Place, one almost expects to find it there still, with washerwomen, ducks, and dabbling children.

From Bruton Place the stream goes straight along what was Little Bruton Street, across Bruton Street, and round the back of South Bruton Mews, to the bottom of Hay Hill. Thence it takes a westerly turn, under the garden of Lansdowne House, across Little Clarges Street and Curzon Street, and for a short distance along Half Moon Street. Then, across White Horse Street, after which it turns south, emerging into Piccadilly below White Horse Street, as far down as Brick Street. Colonel Sir Robert Edis, architect of the Junior Constitutional Club, saw the culvert encased in concrete through which the stream passes under the building. In old days it crossed Piccadilly under a substantial stone bridge, and passing through fields, now the Green Park, flowed across the site of Buckingham Palace, and then divided, one channel going to Westminster to drive a mill. The main stream crosses the Buckingham Palace Road, then goes under Palace Street, along the south side of St. Peter's Chapel, past the back of St. George's Workhouse, along the west side of the Stag Brewery, across Brewer Street and Victoria Street, to the block of buildings on the left side of the Vauxhall Bridge Road. Here it flows due south for about 220 yards midway between the buildings that face Carlisle Place and the Vauxhall Bridge Road, after which it crosses that road and turns south-west down Tachbrook Street, and through what is now the London County Council Drainage Station into the river.

With regard to the Stag Brewery it is an interesting fact, that although this great group of buildings has been set out with minute particularity on ordnance maps, and is provided with parochial boundary stones, yet, up to a time within living memory, to comply with an obligation expressed in the lease, it has been customary for two or three boys, generally from a Charity School, to be taken to the parish boundary within the brewery, at a point where a hole had to be made every time in a brick wall, and have whipped into them by a birch rod, such a keen remembrance of the actual spot, that their testimony would be available as evidence in years to come. No doubt it was hoped that the recollection of this perfunctory punishment, coupled with a suitable remuneration, would rise up in the persons of these boys, from their bounds to their brains, there to be stored for ready reference should disputes arise.

We have now completed the eastern boundary of the Manor, and walking west along the river bank we follow the southern boundary which ends a short distance beyond the eastern limit of the grounds of Chelsea Hospital. Here the Westbourne joins the river, and can be plainly seen from the Chelsea Suspension Bridge at low tide. This is the western boundary of the Manor, which we left flowing towards the Serpentine at Marlborough Gate. To pursue it back to that point, we trace it up across the Chelsea Bridge Road, under the barracks, across the Pimlico Road, up what is now Holbein Place, through Sloane Square Station, past the back of the Court Theatre, across Cliveden Place, up the east side of Little Cadogan Place, across Pont

Street and Lowndes Street, along the east side of Lowndes Square, under what was called the Knights Bridge, through Albert Gate, and under the Row, after which it is the Serpentine.

I think that the corner of the Chelsea Hospital grounds divided from the rest by the Westbourne, was once a portion of the Manor of Ebury. There is among the Grosvenor archives a receipt for £200. "On account for lands lately mine taken in for their Majesties use into St. James's Park, and other lands lately mine taken in for the use of the Royal Hospital at Chelsea."

* * *

Such were approximately the boundaries of this Manor, which contained about 1,090 acres, 482 north of Piccadilly, and 608 south. All this the Crown took from the Abbey, and gradually exchanged, granted, leased or sold, as it seemed best to the godly wisdom of the monarch of the day. There are three maps of this area among the Grosvenor archives, dated 1614, 1675, and 1723. Respecting the 1614 map (Plate 31), I note here, as a tribute of respect to the surveyor who then made it for Lynde and Doubleday, that when his map was superimposed by Mr. Staton, Mr. Emery Walker's partner, upon the modern ordnance, the two surveys were reconciled without any sort of adjustment. Sometime between April, 1663, and July, 1665, a copy of the 1614 map was made for, or possibly by, Alexander Davies, owner of part of the land, who wrote many notes and queries upon it. Thanks to Mr. G. J. Turner this copy was acquired by the British Museum (Ad. MS.

Plate IV



Drawn from Fisher's & Co. by O. F. Fisher

Copyright 1880 by O. F. Fisher

THE WESTBOURNE FLOWING SOUTH THROUGH WHAT IS NOW
ALBERT GATE

38104), and thanks to the London Topographical Society was reproduced in facsimile.

With regard to parochial boundaries these varied from time to time as new parishes were formed out of the 13th century parish of St. Margaret's, Westminster, which included all this Manor.

* * *

As to the character of the land, the 1614 map, reproduced on a reduced scale on Plate 31, shows an agricultural area, divided into fields of pasture and arable, with few buildings, and I imagine it experienced little change, save for enclosures, between 1300 and 1700. The southern portion lay at a low level along the banks of a tidal river, subject at intervals to exceptional flood. On the 1614 map (Plate 31) the fields on the river bank, and for some distance inland, are separated by double lines, indicating ditches, while the pastures bordering Piccadilly, and beyond, are divided by single lines. All the low lying land on both sides of the river was swamp and sometimes lagoon. "This great marsh," writes Besant, "covered all the land known later as St. James's Park, Tothill Fields, the Five Fields, Victoria, Earls Court, and part of Chelsea: on the other bank the marsh extended from Rotherhithe over Bermondsey, Southwark, Lambeth, Vauxhall, and part of Battersea. The places which here and there rose above the reach of the flood were called islands: Bermond's-*ea*—the Isle of Bermond; Chels-*ea*—the Isle of Shingle (Chesil); Thorn-*ea*—the Isle of Bramble; Batters-*ea*—the Isle of Peter." (*Westminster*, p. 7.)¹ The Abbot of West-

¹ I doubt the "Peter." The early form of Battersea from a charter dated 693 is *Batriches Eye*. (See Vol. x., *Surrey Arch. Soc. Trans.*)

minster's Grange, in Pimlico, stood on such an eminence, and was called "Eye or the Island" as well as "la Neyte." Probably the Ebury Farm did the same, but here we cannot restore the ancient levels which were obliterated after 1826, when an Act was secured to drain and raise these low lands. According to Dr. Wheatley, "The earth excavated at St. Katherine's when the docks were formed, was carried by water to Millbank, and employed to fill up the cuts or reservoirs of the Chelsea Waterworks Company, under the superintendence of the builder Thomas Cubitt, who took the lease of the ground, on which he and others erected Eccleston Square and much of the south side of Pimlico." (Wheatley and Cunningham, *London Past and Present*, 2, p. 322.)

There are constant allusions to these ditches in the early records at the Abbey. In 1303 we get "Scouring 88 perches of the ditch between the Island and the Marsh," and in the bailiff's accounts between 1331 and 1333 we find "men hired to scour the ditch from Abbottes brigge as far as the moor, and from the moor to the garden of Henry de Grondesburgh, with the help of the servants of the manor, and the aid of the tenants of Eye to do their part." Disputes as to whose duty it was to scour the ditches went on freely as far down as the 17th century.

The 1614 map (Plate 31) gives one interesting example of the name and boundary of a field becoming the route of a street. Look at the "Shoulder of Mutton field," as it was called, the late Sir Richard Sutton's property, at the corner of Park Lane and Piccadilly,

marked "St. James" on the map. Note the direction of its northern boundary line; also, that immediately over it is "Brick Hill Close." Well, that northern boundary is there to-day, the street following the identical route of the hedge, and it is called Brick Street. In his *Ghosts of Piccadilly* Mr. Street writes, "Engine Street, now stupidly called Brick Street." He should have consulted the ghosts of the 17th century.

Sir Laurence Gomme, in *The Geographical Journal* for May and June, 1908, called attention to the survivals of ancient topography on London maps, and gave as an example the "various acre strips" on the north side of Piccadilly between Park Lane and the stone bridge over the Tybourne. If we had a map before the 16th century enclosures, no doubt we should get many more such strips, illustrating old communal holdings.

Another interesting point indicated by the 1614 map are the four small enclosures marked "Poules," showing some of the lands, said by Sir Laurence Gomme to have belonged to St. Paul's Cathedral and to have stretched "all round the city."

Of course this much may be said of any great and ancient city, that strait are the gates and narrow the ways which preserve the history thereof, whilst most of the broad ways denote its destruction.

THE BAILIWICK OF SAINT JAMES

WE pass from the contour and character of the Manor to its dissolution, which began when this venerable area came up against the disintegrating bulk of Henry VIII. This merry monarch commenced his reign in the Palace of Westminster, which stood on the site of our Houses of Parliament, and had been a royal residence since the time of Edward the Confessor. In 1512 Westminster Palace was damaged by fire, and Wolsey being subsequently damaged by downfall, the king moved into the Cardinal Archbishop of York's house at Whitehall, the present Treasury standing on the site of Wolsey's great hall.¹

“Sir,
You must no more call it Yorke-place, that's past?
For since the Cardinall fell, that Titles lost,
'Tis now the Kings, and call'd White-Hall.”

Hen. VIII, 4, 1, 95.

It proved a luckless residence for the Stuart dynasty.

“It seems the favourite palace of the Stuarts: James and Charles I both plan sumptuous palaces on its site. Then one bitter January day Charles walks out of one of the windows of the Banqueting House to meet his doom. Cromwell reigns and dies there. The place one would think would be too full of horror and tragedy for Charles II to live there, but there he spends his careless hours, unequally divided between political craft and reckless voluptuousness,

¹ See Mr. C. L. Kingsford's most interesting account of this mansion in the *London Topographical Society's Records*, Vol. xii., p. 62.

on the site where his father was beheaded. There he too dies, and Vanity Fair is scattered. Three years later a boat puts out from the Terrace and takes away the last Stuart king. The dynasty floats away in that wherry into space. Then there arrives a Dutch prince with an asthma which forbids him to live so near the river, the palace is deserted, and soon afterwards burned down by another native of Holland, a laundress drying linen in her room. A casual ailment disestablishes the ancient palace. And so the glory passes from Whitehall, and it dwindles into a realm of red tape." (Lord Rosebery, *London Topographical Society's Records*, vol. 6.)

From the windows of Wolsey's Whitehall palace, Henry VIII looked west across a rural landscape, and one can imagine him riding over this land, or scrutinising maps and plans, scheming the enclosure of happy hunting grounds within easy reach of his new residence. "Ye have hearde before," wrote Hall in 1532, "how the kyng had purchased the Bysshope of Yorkes place, whiche was a fayre Bysshops house, but not meete for a kyng : wherefore the Kyng purchased all the medowes about saynct James, and all the whole house of S James, and ther made a fayre mansion, and a parke, and buylded many costlye and commodious houses for great pleasure." The house, now the Palace of St. James, was a hospital, said to have been dedicated by citizens of London from time immemorial to the care of leprous women. Some bandits rob the rich but protect the poor and aid the sick, but Henry fleeced anybody and everybody. He broke up institutions sanctified by centuries of devotion to the relief of suffering, and clipped every groat the poor man possessed by debasing the coinage. He cast out the leprous patients, and turned their home

into a hunting box. The truth is, this benevolent institution suffered more than once from royal patronage. In October, 1449, Henry VI, of pious memory, granted "to our well-beloved in Christ ye Provost and Kings College of ye Blessed Mary of Eton, the Hospital of Saint James, and the custody thereof . . . for the increase of the livelihood of ye said Provost and College." In September, 1531, Henry VIII, of unregenerate memory, laid hands on the Hospital, and the lands with which pious benefactors had endowed it. Eton got distant slices in exchange, and the king got what the charter calls

"the scite, circuit, precinct and ambite of the Hospital, and certaine lands and meadowe grounds belonginge to the said house of St James, amountinge in acres to the number of one hundred fowerscore and ffive and a half, whereof there lyeth between Chareinge Crosse and Ayehill, upon the south side of the King's highway leading from the said Chareinge Crosse to Ayehill, in arable ground, meadows and pasture, three score and fower acres; and allsoe in the Northfield, upon the north side of the highway leadinge from the said Chareinge Crosse to the said Ayehill, in arable ground meadow and pasture, fourscore and sixteene acres."

Now this Hospital property was the first portion which Henry VIII broke away from the ancient Manor of Eia. It did not come to Mary Davies, but it did help to determine the peculiar shape of her inheritance. It is what we now call Berkeley Square and Mayfair, and marked A on Plate 3. Some was waste, taken by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, some is marked "St. James" on the 1614 map, but I believe that most of it was Hospital property.

The Eton charter says the Hospital held 96 acres

north "of the King's highway leadinge from the said Chareinge Crosse to the said Ayehill." It has been held that this Ayehill was the Hay Hill of to-day. This surely is wrong. The 16th century Ayehill or Hay Hills, was the ridge of land along the east side of Park Lane, called on the 1614 map (Plate 31) "Mr Greenes and Mr Colbanks Hay Hills." Confirmation comes from a Commonwealth "discoverer," Captain Hemsdell, who, searching for tenements held by Charles Stuart, comes on to "3 small cottages . . . with the voyd parcell of ground commonly called Hayhill, situate near Hyde Park, abutting on the common highway there leading towards St James's Park east, and on another part of the said highway leading towards the town of Knightsbridge N. and W., and upon 2 closes of pasture now or late in the tenure of Edward Coalbancks." It is quite likely that this was the dangerous route alluded to among the King's Bench Ancient Indictments (File 260, m. 15), in the reign of Henry VI, where "Felons from the sanctuary at Westminster have lain in wait to dispoil and kill the King's subjects on the King's highway at Ey Hylle." I venture to think that if Dr. Wheatley and Mr. Dasent had seen our 1614 map, they would have agreed that the Hay Hill where Wyatt and "his infatuated followers were repulsed by the Queen's troops," and his headless body was afterwards gibbeted, was along Park Lane, and not on the modern Hay Hill. The highway from Ayehill to Charing Cross went down Park Lane, across Piccadilly to Constitution Hill, straight through the middle of what is now the Green Park, and direct along

Cleveland Row and Pall Mall to Charing Cross. Several 17th century maps, such as Faithorne's, show this road, and I hope some champion of highways will reveal who blocked this ancient public way at Constitution Hill and Cleveland Row.

North of this road the Hospital owned 96 acres, and at least 50 or 60 of these must have been north of Piccadilly. The principal owners hereabouts until recently have been the Earl of Berkeley, Earl Howe, and the greatly lamented Sir Richard Sutton, Bart. Their ancestors all came into possession during the reigns of Charles II or James II, and all three estates, I believe, formed part of the Bailiwick of St. James. This Bailiwick was given by Charles I, in 1628 (Aug. Office. Grants No. 144) as part of the dowry of Queen Henrietta Maria.

With regard to the Howe and Sutton properties, the passage from the Crown to these families is made clear by the archives they have placed at my disposal, but Lord Berkeley was unable to help me as he would have wished. No doubt the site of Berkeley House, now that of Devonshire House, came through Lord Clarendon, but was all the rest of the Berkeley property thereabouts in that grant? There is a grant to Berkeley of Stratton among the Egerton MSS. (6695, 1-15) of the forfeited manors of Cromwell and other "malignants," unfortunately giving no localities, and it is possible that when these malignants were in power provision was made for them from the Queen's dowry, and that after the Restoration these lands were granted to loyalist friends and adherents.

The last Lord Berkeley of Stratton died without issue in 1773, and left his property to his distant relative the Earl of Berkeley. On the 1614 map (Plate 31) Berkeley Fields bear Sir Henry Maynard's name, who, as Secretary to Lord Burleigh, was probably granted a Crown lease, though I have not found it.

The Mayfair property of Earl Howe, in a Patent issued to Sir John Coell 17 July, 1688, is stated to be "in trust for Henry Lord Dover," and to include, "two closes of lands called Brookefield, parcel of the Manor of St. James . . . on the north side of the Highway from Piccadilly to Knightsbridge, containing 14½ acres." A month later, Dover and Coell assigned to Millett, and four months later Millett, Dover and others sold to Richard Kent. Eleven years after Kent "released all his right of redemption" to Sir Nathaniel Curzon, from whose issue came Earl Howe. We seem to arrive at the derivation of "Mayfair," from a grant made by James II of a permit to hold a fair on May 1, in Brookfield. (*Journal of the House of Commons*, 26 Jan., 28 Feb., 1699-1700.)

One difficulty connected with the compilation of this book has been to refrain from following the many inviting side tracks suggested by the introduction of such names as Henry Jermyn, Lord Dover, and Sir John Coell, which arouse associations with Jermyn and Dover Streets, with Dover's uncle, Henry Jermyn, Lord St. Albans, lover, chief retainer, and probably second husband of Queen Henrietta Maria. These administrators of the Queen's affairs saw possibilities of a profitable building speculation on her dowry lands. St. Albans

acquired what is now St. James's Square, and built for himself the first house. Those interested in this will find sound information in Mr. Arthur Dasent's *The History of St. James's Square*, and in a delightful volume entitled, *Rushbrook Parish Registers, 1567 to 1850*.

* * *

The property in this Bailiwick of St. James inherited by the Sutton family came from the Pulteney family, and formed part of the dowry of Queen Henrietta Maria. William Pulteney held leases of a considerable portion of land hereabouts, as well as other freehold property acquired from the Earl of Clarendon. Queen Henrietta surrendered this dowry to Charles II, 25 June, 1668, and the king, two months later (Patent Roll 20 Charles II, Pt. 3, No. 8), granted a lease to Pulteney "in consideration of the surrender by Pulteney of an estate which he had for about 24 years to come in certain closes called Highfield or Sandpitt Field, and the 6 acre close . . . containing in all about 26 acres, for the enlargement of the Park of St. James." Charles II evidently wanted to turn the farm land in what is now the Green Park into part of St. James's Park, and gave Pulteney a 999 years' lease, at a rent of £12 a year, of land north of Piccadilly, in exchange for an unexpired lease of land on the south. In the reign of King George I an Act of Parliament was passed enabling His Majesty to grant the freeholds of the estates held by Pulteney on full consideration being paid for the same, and this purchase was duly carried into effect.

What Pulteney had come eventually to Sir William

SIR WM. PULTENEY =

William =
Pulteneys

John =
Pulteneys

William Pulteneys,
Earl of Bath
ob. s.p.
1764

Daniel Pulteneys
of Harefield.

Benjamin =
Titchborne

Margaret
Titchborne

Chas. Earl of
Sunderland

= Sir Robert
Sutton
ob. 1746

= Judith
Titchborne
md. 1724
ob. 1749

Frances Pulteneys,
4th dau., but
eventually heiress

= Wm. Johnstone,
who took name
of Pulteneys.

= Sir Richard Sutton
ob. 1802

= Henrietta Laura,
Countess of Bath,
1803, ob. s.p. 1808

= Sir James
Murray, took
name of Poultney

32 *Mary Davies and the Manor of Ebury*

Pulteney created Earl of Bath, then to his brother General Sir Harry Pulteney, then to Daniel Pulteney, and from him to Frances Pulteney, by whom it was devised, after the death of her daughter Henrietta Laura, Countess of Bath, and failure of her issue, to her first cousin Sir Richard Sutton, the first Baronet. The pedigree on page 31 shows the line of descent.

THE MANOR OF HYDE

AFTER Henry VIII had established himself at Whitehall, and equipped St. James's House as a hunting box, he enclosed in 1540 what is now Hyde Park, stocked it with deer, and enlarged the north-east corner, by thrusting eastward the Roman Road, the direct continuation of the Edgware Road, or Watling Street, to the present line of Park Lane. This area is marked B on Plate 3 (p. 15).

Though Hyde was called a manor in the 16th century, we have no evidence that it was ever more so than in name; yet it had a separate jurisdiction from Neyte and Ebury for a long time. The Commonwealth sold it in lots, and Sir Anthony Deane, a friend of Pepys, and fellow-prisoner with him in the Tower in 1679,¹ according to Mr. Rutton in the *Home Counties Magazine*, Vol. 6, p. 148, bought three divisions of the park in 1652, The Banqueting House Division, The Old Lodge Division and The Middle Division. He gave £9,020 8s. 2d., which included £2,410 9s. 6d. for the timber and underwood, and £300 for the deer. At the Restoration the investment suffered depreciation. Deane died in the Charterhouse in 1721,² at the age of 98, and several years afterwards a descendant of his named Percy tried to make out that some of the Grosvenor property was part of Deane's purchase, but failed.

Though the Manor of Hyde formed no part of the

¹ *Journal of the House of Commons*, 22 May, 1679.


² *Mawson's Obits*, p. 142.

inheritance of Mary Davies, it is possible the archives of her estate may throw light on the course of the Roman Road through Hyde Park before it was diverted to Park Lane. To push this highway east, Henry VIII took from the Manor of Ebury 55 acres. These are specified in Wevant's lease (see page 42), 15 acres called "Tiborne close," and 40 acres lying upon Stonehill. The question now arises whether a knowledge of the amount of land displaced by the diversion will help to determine the route of the Roman Road before the change was made.

* * *

On Plate 5 is reproduced a plan from an original among the Grosvenor archives, which tells its own story, and forms an interesting illustration of the information given by Mr. A. Morley Davies about London's First Conduit System, in Vol. 2, New Series of the *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archæological Society*, p. 9. The conduit is clearly traced from Tybourne Field to the Receipt opposite the Lord Mayor's Banqueting House, situated on the west side of what is now Stratford Place, and just beyond the small bridge under which the Tybourne is shown crossing Oxford Street. On the shaded triangle at the entrance to Marylebone Lane, the Marylebone Town Hall stood for many years, till a new building was recently erected in the Marylebone Road. On the lintel over a doorway in the old building is inscribed, "St. Marylebone Watch House. Rebuilt A.D. MDCCCIV." The gallows are placed at the entrance to the Edgware Road.

Plate V



PLAN OF THE CONDUIT FROM PADDINGTON, MADE IN 1632

THE MANOR OF NEYTE

WE have now dealt with sections A and B on Plate 3, and come to the plot marked C. Here was the seat of government for the whole Manor of Eia, for here stood the ancient castellated and moated Manor House, habitually used as the country grange of the Abbot of Westminster, and occasionally as that of the King. This parcel, at the Reformation, was reserved for some time by the Crown, and lent as a residence to Court favourites. In early days it was called "Eye or the Island," and here the Abbot's steward held the Manor Courts. "Of actual court rolls," Miss Stokes tells me, and she has searched the records at the Abbey, "very few remain, and the courts would appear from the rolls of accounts to have been held irregularly, but they certainly were held up to the end of the 14th century, and the customary tenants performed the usual boon works. In 1347 a woman has to answer for marrying without the lord's licence. In 1392 certain men are presented for being residents, but not sworn of the frank-pledge." No courts are known to have been held after the Manor passed to the Crown.

In the reign of Edward III the Manor House was called "la Neyte." It was one mile only from the Abbey, and as the domain extended to the Thames, the Abbot and his visitors could come and go by road or river. In this rest and guest house, during cosmopolitan

days, there were doubtless gatherings of ecclesiastics and laymen from all parts. Roll No. 4,875 at the Abbey gives us a grant of lands by Abbot Walter, 24 June, 1285, and among the witnesses is the Bishop of Verdun, and perchance the Abbot and Bishop, in that moated grange, discussed civil and ecclesiastical affairs pregnant with problems of importance to the future of England and Europe, just as, more than 600 years later, literally only a few yards away, in Eccleston Square, Viscount Grey of Fallodon probably discussed with eminent statesmen, the immortal defence of Verdun, and its importance to the future history of the human race. There is something sumptuous about the names of some of the Bishop's fellow-witnesses, such as Sir Otto de Grandison, Sir Roger Lestrangle, Sir Roger de Northwode, Sir John de Cobeham, Sir Richard de Bosco, and Sir Gilbert de Briddashale.

The Manor House was not a remote retreat in which to idle away time, it was a scene of constant activity. Manorial Courts had to be attended; tenants to be kept up to their duties, and assisted in their disputes and difficulties; trespassers on fishing rights to be prosecuted; gardens to be planted and weeded; alleys to be turfed; willows, hemp, and flax to be grown and garnered; fish to be caught; ditches to be scoured, and their banks and walls kept up; windmills to be canvassed, set going, and mended; walls to be thatched and plastered; highways and bridges to be repaired, and the criminals who infested them to be caught and indicted. Such, for example, as Thomas Parker of Westminster, a "soudiour," who, with John Lokwode, yeoman

of Kyngeston on Thames, was presented on September 12, 1460, "for killing John Lambard at Neyte," "attacking him with a bore spere" and a "gleve."

In 1331-2 we have record of repairs to the Abbot's chamber, against his coming after All Saints. The year after, glass windows are put into the lord's chamber, and later on repairs are effected in the chapel, pantry, butlery and kitchen. In 1295-6, the drawbridge is repaired. In an account of Roger Seman, serjeant of la Neyte, 3 February, 1327, we get a peep into the Abbot's garden, for which seeds are bought, "letuse," "saverye," "borage," "chirsill" and "violet." In 1345-6 "turves" are bought for the "alleyes," and 6d. is given to the King's gardener from "le Paleys," who came to cut small willow twigs to tie up the vines at the palace, so that he should not do any damage. During the residence of Edward II at "la Neyte," 12 men were "hired for 2 days to weed the garden." Other entries refer to the planting of willows, flax, hemp and peas. In 1304-5 we get "Cutting stubble for covering the walls at the island." Walls in Berkshire are still thatched.

In 1327 Edward III gave up "the manor of Eybury which his father had held," and an inventory was made of the late king's goods, including 60 cows, 500 sheep, and a pigeon house. Mr. Rutton finds the probable origin of the name "la Neyte," in the use of the place as a cattle depot. There are rude sketches of the grange on the 1614 and 1675 Grosvenor maps, which were reproduced by Mr. Rutton in *Archæologia*, but I have thought it more helpful to give here a drawing of

another Benedictine Abbot's Manor House, probably very similar to la Neyte, and far more intelligible. Plate 6 reproduces a drawing from Ormerod's *Cheshire*, of Saughton Grange, near Eaton Hall, where the Countess Grosvenor now resides. This was one of the country houses of the Abbot of St. Werburgh's in Chester. The drawing was made before the house was modernised.

La Neyte was retained by Henry VIII, and Sir Anthony Browne made bailiff. In October, 1537, Ralf Sadler thanks the King on behalf of Thomas Cromwell, Lord of the Privy Seal, "for the commodity he has lent him in his houses of the Nete and St. James." In 1539, "My Lord Privy Seal stood with my Lord of Oxford at the back gate of the park, which opens towards the Nete, watching the city musters march by, after being reviewed by the King." (*Letters and Papers Henry VIII.*)

The Abbot's grange is gone, and the site occupied by an unlovely layer of brick and stucco messuages. For a while it was a tea-garden called "the Neat Houses." On 1 August, 1667, Pepys records, "After the play we went into the House, and spoke with Knipp [an actress], who went abroad with us by coach to the Neat Houses, in the way to Chelsea; and there in a box in a tree, we sat and sang, and talked and eat; my wife out of humour, as she always is, when this woman is by." Nell Gwyn's mother kept a house of refreshment here, and on 29 July, 1679, was unfortunately "drowned in her own fish-pond." A contemporary account says that her demise was as much due to brandy as to water.

Plate VI



SAIGHTON GRANGE

With the expansion of London every vestige of this venerable homestead disappeared. The site was so far forgotten that the late W. J. Loftie wandered as far as Kensington to find it. In his *History of London* (1883), he writes, "We are driven therefore to believe that the manor house of Neyte, where the great Abbot Littlington and the still better known Abbot Islip died, was situated not very far from the site of Kensington Palace, if not actually upon it." It was a mistake for Mr. Loftie to be driven to Kensington; he should have taken a hansom to the British Museum, and looked at sheet xi. Nos. 1 and 2 of the large ordnance, issued 29 June, 1872, eleven years before his *History*, on which he would have found the Abbot's grange, correctly located in Pimlico.

One cannot help regretting the loss of this historic house, just as we lament the loss of the *Golden Hind*, in which Drake circumnavigated the globe, which vessel, by Queen Elizabeth's order, lay in the dock at Deptford as a memorial of that great achievement, becoming the goal of the sightseer, and the mine of the souvenir hunter, until it disappeared, through depredation and decay. Just as we also regret the loss of a house at Stratford-on-Avon, bought by Shakespeare out of his professional earnings, under the roof of which he gave up his soul to God, which residence, according to one account, was ultimately purchased by a clergyman, possessed by such an irresistible antipathy to local assessment, that sooner than pay rates on Shakespeare's home, he pulled it down! According to another account Shakespeare's actual residence was demolished by Sir Hugh Clopton in 1720, and the clergyman removed its

successor. The parson and the squire must toss up for the honour of the outrage.

The Manor of Neyte was ultimately divided into two portions. One, including the Grange, the meadow north of it, and a long strip running south to the river is said to be Mr. Stanley's on Mackay's 1723 map. The other, a triangular meadow, adjoining Neyte on the east, containing 14a. 1r. 37p. (*see* Plate 3), is called "Mr. Wise's Estate." The first of these Neyte properties belongs to Mr. Cyril Sloane Stanley, who has very kindly tried, but without success, to unearth for me the passage from the Crown to his family. All I have ascertained is that it was granted by the Crown to Sir Anthony Browne, and that Browne's son, Viscount Montague, sold it to Sir Arthur Darcy. On the Grosvenor 1675 map, the Neat Lands have written on them "Edward Peck Esqre, proprietor."

The second portion of the Manor is in part the property of Sir Watham Waller, Bart., who inherits it, through marriage, from the family of Wise, to whom it was conveyed by Pendock Price in 1713. The Price family were in possession in 1650. In 1616 William Mann purchased it from William Whitmore and James Verdon, to whom it was granted by James I (Pat. Roll 10 Jas. I, pt. 6, No. 12).

Several interesting particulars about the Manor of Eye and the Abbot's grange will be found in *Walter De Wenlok, Abbot of Westminster*, by Dr. E. H. Pearce, the present Bishop of Worcester.

THE MANOR OF EBURY

THIS, the largest and most important section of the Manor of Eia, marked D on Plate 3, became the inheritance of Mary Davies. As early as the reign of Edward I, Ebury was a grange or farm, and the residence of a bailiff. The site is marked on the 1614 map, Plate 31, and is now occupied by St. Philip's Church, Buckingham Palace Road.

The Abbey accounts, 1315-17, record "wages of a carpenter repairing the sollar over the gate at Eyebery," and, "a lock for the inner gate"; also, "repairs to the sheds, bakehouse, etc., next the Bailiff's Chamber." In 1319-21, "the courtyard at Eyebery is sown with beans." In the London Topographical Society's Records, Vol. XI, p. 85, Mr. C. L. Kingsford published an interesting letter from the Abbot "To John Noreys ffermour of Eybury," dated 25 March, 1467, charging him "to delyuer to oure welbeloued Thomas Wilkyns the Oke growyng next the style vppon the right honde as we goo to the Neyte ward from Westmynster."

I give here a list of the holders of this Manor from 1518 to 1626. It is only a list of names and dates, but it is short, and followed by a few notes on the tenants themselves.

1518. *Michaelmas*. Abbot Islip grants lease of Manor of Eybury to Richard Whasshe, for 32 years, at annual rent of £21.

42 *Mary Davies and the Manor of Ebury*

1544. *Sept.* 1. Henry VIII grants from Michaelmas 1543, to John Wevant and Isabel his wife, for 41 years, a lease of "all the site of the Manor of Eyburye . . . before that demised to one Richard Whashe : except and always reserved to the said late king Henry, . . . all that close of land called the Twenty acres lying over against the Manor of Neyte on the south part, and all that close called Abbots Mead, and one pasture called the Calfhawe, lying on the east part of the said Manor of Neite : . . . except also and always reserved out of the said demise, all that close of land and meadow called Tiborne close containing by estimation fifteen acres, and all those forty acres of pasture lying upon Stonehill, parcel of the said farm, which then were enclosed within Hyde Park." Annual rent, £21 5 8.
1567. *Oct.* 28. Queen Elizabeth grants, from Michaelmas 1584, for 31 years, to William Gibbes Esq., one of her Gentlemen Pensioners, in consideration of his "good, true, and faithful service," a lease of the site of Eybury Manor, as it was enjoyed by John Wevant and Richard Whasshe, and subject to the same rent. "And he shall find bed & board for the Queen's steward & surveyor and their servants coming to the said manor to hold courts there yearly, & from time to time, at his own expense." [Pat. Roll. 1033, 9 Eliz.] This grant Gibbes promptly sold in a week to William Whasshe for £450.
1585. *April* 2. Queen Elizabeth, by letters patent, grants to Sir Thomas Knevett, one of the Grooms of Her Majestys Privy Chamber, from Michaelmas 1615, when Gibbess lease expired, a lease of the site of Eybury Manor for 60 years, annual rent as before.
1591. *Aug.* 18. Knevett assigns the lease of one half of the Manor to Cuthbert Lynde, and the other half to Edmond Dowbleday.
1614. *June* 7. Sir Humfry Lynde, of Clapham, son and executor of Cuthbert Lynde, and Edmond Dowbleday of Westminster, make a partition of the property, and

the deed setting forth the particulars was illustrated by a map given on Plate 31.

1614. *Nov.* 28. Sir Humfry Lynde assigns his moitie of the Manor to William Hay of London.
1618. Hay having died, and his will being proved 20 Feb., 1618, his wife marries Sir Symon Clarke.
1618. *Nov.* 26. Sir Symon Clarke, Bart., of Newbold Hall, Co. Warwick, and Dorothy his wife, sell to John Mayle and Richard Croshaw, Hay's moitie of the lease of Eybury for £4,760, "for the use of Sir Lionel Cranfield."
1620. *Jan.* 12. Mayle and Croshaw convey the lease to Sir Lionel Cranfield.
1623. *May* 13. James I sells freehold of the site of the Manor of Eybury, by letters patent, under the great seal of England, to John Traylman and Thomas Pearson, for £1,151 15 0, subject to a rent of £38 7 10, which charge the Grosvenor estate pays to-day to the Earl of Sandwich, whose ancestor acquired it as a fee-farm rent from Charles II. With the site of the Manor of Eybury were also included certain parcels of land in the neighbourhood, acquired by sundry Crown purchases, some of which had been leased to Cuthbert Lynde and Robert Turner by Queen Elizabeth, 27 Feb., 1596.
1623. *May* 14. Traylman and Pearson sell the Manor to Nicholas Herman and Thomas Catchmay, servants of, and trustees for, Sir Lionel Cranfield, for £1,501 15 0.
1626. *March* 1. Cranfield, now Earl of Middlesex, Herman and Catchmay, sell the freehold of the Manor to Hugh Awdeley for £9,400. On the same day they assign to Awdeley, Lyndes moitie of the crown lease for 60 years. They except also out of the property what the Davies map¹ calls the "Saw-pit acre," on the east side of the Green Park, part of the site of Barkshire House, which Herman and Catchmay had leased to Thomas Viscount Andover, afterwards Earl of Barkshire, for 3,000 years, at a rent of 2s. 8d.; on 1 August, 1623.

¹ See page 20.

The foregoing catalogue starts with a real farmer under Abbot Islip, who was liable to certain obligations : "Eighteen cartloads of good hay were to be cut and carried into the Manor of Neyte for the Abbot's use, part at the tenant's expense, part at a fixed price. At Christmas a boar worth ten shillings was to be provided. All fuel required for the Abbot's use was to be got and carried from the Thames bank to the Manor of Neyte at one penny per cartload. . . . The tenant to have wood from the Manor of Eybury required as heybote, ploughbote, cartebote and fyerbote, but all loppings of trees growing on the reserved land and in the Manor of Neyte are excepted for the Abbot's use."

From this honest cultivator we pass to a string of Court menials, who got the lease, not to raise food, but money; for these Crown Lands were "the great resource for gratifying favourites and rewarding services." To indicate the sort of people these flunkeys were, we find Wevant, Yeoman to Henry VIII, who got 4s., in 1544, for "riding to St. James and Enfyld, to see things ready for the Queen" (Catherine Parr). Gibbes was a "Gentleman Pensioner" under Elizabeth. Thomas Knyvet was all sorts of things, "Groom of her Majesty's Privy Chamber," superintendent of the "wild beasts and fowl in St. James Park and Garden"; also "Warden of the Mint." In 1611 a Warrant was issued "to Thomas Lord Knyvet and Edmond Doubleday to pay to the said Lord Knyvet or his heirs £2,000 as the King's gift, from the profits of the Mint." A month later these two men, as Wardens of the Mint, are paid

£ 120 “ for providing gold for coining angels used in curing the King’s evil.”

Knyvet assigned his lease of Ebury Manor 24 years before it was due to him, to Cuthbert Lynde and Edmond Doubleday. Lynde was a grocer of London, and Doubleday a vintner of Westminster. In 1604 a grant was made “ to Andrew Bright and Edm. Doubleday of the offices of distilling herbs and sweet waters at the palace of Whitehall, and of keeping the library there.” Knyvet and Doubleday seem to have run on one leash. In 1609, a grant was made “ to Tho. Lord Knyvet and Edm. Doubleday, of the office of keeping the plate and money in the Tower, and the coinage of money there and elsewhere, for life.” Cuthbert Lynde died in 1608, before his lease began, but it passed to his son Humphry, and to him and Doubleday we are indebted for the map on Plate 31.

Perhaps the most striking achievement recorded of Thomas Knyvet and Edmond Doubleday, is that they had the proud distinction of arresting Guy Fawkes. It seems that the King sent Knyvet, “ a gentleman of his Majesty’s privy-chamber, and justice of the peace in Westminster, and one, of whose ancient fidelity both the late queen, and our now sovereign have had large proof; who . . . went, about midnight, to the Parliament-House, accompanied with such a small number as was fit for that errand.” Mr. Doubleday’s fitness is attested by the writer of the *Anglorum Speculum* who calls him “ a Man of great Stature, Valour, Gravity, and Activity.” The following account is regarded by Dr. Gardiner as the testimony of Knyvet and Doubleday :

“Upon the hearing of some noise Sir T. Knyvet required Master Edmond Doubleday, Esq. to go up into the chamber to understand the cause thereof, the which he did, and had there some speech of Fawkes, being therewithal very desirous to search and see what books or instruments Fawkes had about him; but Fawkes being wondrous unwilling to be searched, very violently griped Master Doubleday by his fingers of the left hand, through pain thereof Master Doubleday offered to draw his dagger to have stabbed Fawkes, but suddenly better bethought himself and did not; yet in that heat he struck up the traitor’s heels and therewithal fell upon him and searched him, and in his pocket found his garters, wherewith Master Doubleday and others that assisted they bound him. There was also found in his pocket a piece of touchwood, and a tinder box to light the touchwood and a watch which Percy and Fawkes had bought the day before, to try conclusions for the long or short burning of the touchwood, which he had prepared to give fire to the train of powder.”

Doubleday seems to have had a physical aptitude for this kind of work, as may be judged from *The Arraignment of John Selman*, London, 1612 (British Museum Catalogue, 27, k.2).

“On Wednesday the 25 of December last past, being Christmas day, one John Selman did presume to come into the Chappell at White Hall, with intent . . . to cut a purse, or picke a pocket: and hovering long about one Leonard Barry, was espied and noted by one Mr. Dubble-day, who . . . did not cease with his eye to follow him, . . . for John Selman, after long hawking, and following of the foresaide Leonard Barry, . . . after he had (as it seemed) purchased his prise, tooke his way forth of the Chappell, which M. Dubble-day perceiving, he came directly to . . . Leonard Barry, and did aske him whether he wanted any thing out of his pockets or no: to which he answered, no surely sir I thinke I doe not. But M. Dubble-day wild him to be sure, and thereupon Leonard Barry putting his hand into his

pocket mist his purse, and said to M. Dubbleday, Sir, I have lost my purse. Then said M. Dubbleday, goe with me and follow that man, for surely he hath it . . . and thereupon M. Dubbleday and Leonard Barry followed John Selman forth of the Chappel, and having overtaken him, M. Dubbleday stept before Selman, and caught him fast by both the wrists, willing Leonard Barry to search his pockets, for there quoth M. Dubbleday shall you find your purse."

And so it was, and the matter "came to his Majesties eare, who being then in his royall person, accompanied with our gracious Queene, the thrice noble Prince, the Duke of Yorke, and the Lady Elizabeth, with divers of the Nobility, his sacred Majesty being ready to receive the Sacrament, was somewhat disturbed with the report hereof."

Eventually, Selman confessed and was hanged, and Sir Francis Bacon, who passed sentence upon him, remarked that "The first and greatest sinne that ever was committed was done in Heaven. The second was done in Paradise, being heaven upon earth, and truly I cannot chuse but place this in the third ranke, in regard it was done in the house of God," etc.

* * *

Passing from these Court flunkeys to Cranfield we get into a different atmosphere. We are used nowadays to see business men in high offices of State, but in old days this was rare. Cranfield was an early and undesirable example. He rose rapidly through rare capacity, and fell even more suddenly through rash capacity. He was created Baron Cranfield in July, 1622, Earl of Middlesex in September of the same year, and Lord Treasurer during the same month. In 1624 he was impeached for corruption, sentenced to lose all his offices, fined £50,000, and imprisoned for a fortnight in the Tower. James I went to the House

of Lords during Cranfield's trial, and gave particulars of his knowledge of the man :

"The first acquaintance that I had with him was by the Lord of Northampton (who is with God), who often brought him unto me a private man, before he was so much my servant. He then made so many projects for my profit, that Buckingham fell in liking with him, . . . and brought him to my service. . . . He found this man so studious for my profit, that he backed him against great personages and mean, without sparing of any man . . . I was deceived if he were not a good officer. He was an instrument under Buckingham for reformation of the Household, the Navy, and the Exchequer : Buckingham setting him on, and taking upon himself the envy of all the officers. . . . If he hath helped himself with the King's loss . . . I speak not for him. . . . I love my servants (God is my witness), but it is only for virtue's sake; and he is an unhappy master that doth not love a faithful servant; but, if there appear in any of them falsehood or treachery, and deceit under trust, my love is gone."

Now among all the various charges brought against Cranfield, by that astute lawyer Sir Edward Coke, and others, I find none respecting the corrupt sale of Crown Lands. His peculations were from the royal Wardrobe, the Customs, the Ordnance, and the Court of Wards; but had his transactions as to the Manor of Ebury been known, no further witness would have been needed. These proceedings were buried under bribes. Cranfield must himself have cleared at least double the price he got for the King.

We regard with peculiar aversion dishonest officials such as Cranfield and Bacon, who took or gave bribes, but educated "persons of quality" in the 17th century were not so strict. The case of *Pell v. Bagg*, for official

bribery, tried in the Star Chamber (*see* Rushworth's *Hist. Colls.*, Vol. 2, p. 240), is worth reading. The Lord Chief Justice fined Bagg £5,000, sent him to the Tower, and made him repay £2,000 to the plaintiff, and £1,500 damages. Archbishop Laud agreed, but Lord Cottington and the Earl of Dorset said Bagg ought to be acquitted; the Earl declared "he thought it no crime for a Courtier, that lives at great expence in his attendance, to receive a Reward to get a business done by a great Man in power."

As far as Awdeley was concerned the Manor had a clean title and was honestly paid for. And certainly a legitimate investment based upon national expansion, is superior to illegitimate issue enriched by royal revenue, or Church lands bought cheap, or huge fortunes defalcated from the country's exchequer.

THE VILLAGE OF EIA

WITHIN the Manor of Eia, though the site is not yet determined, a village community arose. In 1205 there is a record of "messuages in Eya." In 1234 "Henry de Belegrave and Robert de Boulogne and Ascelina his wife," deal with $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres in Eya. It is curious to see the name Belegrave associated with this district hundreds of years before it was subsequently imported from Cheshire. There was also a site of importance called Eye Cross, probably at or near the village. Mr. Larwood, in his *History of the London Parks* (2, 66, Note) writes:—"By the side of the Eya stream, and on the western outskirts of the leper-house meadow, there stood in 1531 a stone cross called Eye Cross. It is not impossible that this was the same stone cross near which in ancient times the Anglo-Norman kings held their Placita, or public courts and assemblies, a remnant of the French *jours de Mai*. These courts in ancient records are often said to have been held 'apud stone cross in County Middlesex.' See, for instance, 22 Edward I *Placita quo warranto*, and many others. Eye Cross is also mentioned as a land-mark in the charter of feoffment from Abbot Islip to Henry VIII, by which the lands forming St. James's Park were surrendered, 23 Hen. VIII, C. 21, *Stat. of the Realm*, 388-9."

THE WASTE OF THE MANOR OF EBURY

IT is not uncommon to find on an English estate a squatter, who has built a small tenement on waste land, or by the side of a wide road, or on a bit of open common, and acquired legal title by years of undisputed possession. In some cases the Lord of the Manor may have wished to turn the intruder out, but is confronted by the difficulty that his own right to the waste is not specified in his title deeds. This may not be a matter of much consequence about a strip of waste in Cumberland or Carmarthen, but a fringe by the wayside in the Manor of Ebury is of more importance than a principality in Utopia; such a fringe, for example, as now extends from St. George's Hospital to Wilton Place, which is held by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, as successors in title to the Dean and Chapter of Westminster. Surely here we have waste, that was once part of the side of a very wide road on which squatters established themselves in days when nobody dreamed of present values. To what manor did this waste belong? Clearly to the Manor of Ebury. This frontage is a fringe of Ebury Manor, and that manor is the Grosvenor property, and begins at the back of the fringe and runs to the river. As to the right of the Grosvenors to the waste of Ebury Manor, this is clearly proved by the Letters Patent of

James I, by which the Manor passed to Traylman and Pearson. The exact words are: "Ac omnia et singula domus edificia structuras horrea stabula columbarias hortos pomaria gardinia terras prata pascuas pasturas communas terras dominicales *vasta* jampna bruerias moras mariscos aquas piscarias piscaciones proficua commoditates advantagia . . . quecunque dictis Scitui et terris dominicalibus manerii predicti ullo modo spectancia et pertinencia." The right of the Grosvenors to the waste of Ebury Manor was tested in the dispute about Goring House, and was admitted by the Attorney-General, who acted as adjudicator.

In 1682 Sir Thomas Grosvenor petitioned Charles II with regard to some land about to be enclosed in St. James's Park, which, he said, were "Wast grounds," "parcell of the Wasts belonging to the said Scite and Manner of Ebury," and asked for "Satisfaction for the Same," which he failed to get. What we have is the opinion of the King's law officers on Sir Thomas's claim. They do not report any examination of their own into the merits of the case; what they say is: "Wee have considered of the said Petn and doe humbly Informe your Maty That We have on your Matys behalfe agreed with Sr Wm Poulteney, and others claiming under him for the said houses and Waste, and that the said Sr Wm Poulteney is to be ingaged in the sum of £600 to indemnifi your Maty against all Clayments whatsoever for 3 yeares time, And further Wee have consulted the said Sr Wm Poulteney on the said Petn who Informeth Us, that the houses and Wast menconed in the said Petn have time out of mind belonged to the Deane and

Chapter of Westminster, and were never accounted any part of Ebury Farme. . . .”

But it may be said that the Dean and Chapter of Westminster were granted the Manors of Knightsbridge and Westbourne Green in 1542, by Henry VIII, and that these enclosures may have boiled over from the west side of the Westbourne to which they belong, and bubbled up towards Hyde Park Corner, and even into St. James's Park, and along Park Lane. For example, take the site of Dorchester House in Park Lane, sold by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster to the Holford family, about 1851. The Act authorizing the sale states that the Dean and Chapter “are seised” of the Manors of Knightsbridge and Westbourne Green. But the site of Dorchester House marches on the north side with the Manor of Ebury, and is a very long way from the Manor of Knightsbridge. The Dean and Chapter have had some distinguished antiquaries among them during recent years, and a great classification of their archives, so let us hope that the titles to these lands will be thoroughly elucidated and established, for the sake of London's topographical history, especially as the owners are amply protected by law from any risk of restitution.

It is important to remember in this connexion that from 1626 till 1662, the Manor of Ebury was held by one man, who owned property in many parts of England, and much more land than he could possibly identify and control. I shall tell later on the story of a surprising imposition that was practised on him in connexion with the site of Buckingham Palace, and the waste of the Manor of Ebury.

THE HUNDRED OF OSSULSTON

IN days gone by it was the custom to write and speak of London as in the County of Middlesex and the Hundred of Ossulston. A note on "The Hundreds of Middlesex" in *The London and Middlesex Notebook* for July, 1892, says that Ossulston "is the largest and most important one, inasmuch as it includes London itself. Southward its boundary-line is the Thames, which separates it from Surrey; eastward, the river Lea; and on its north-east part an irregular line, partly consisting of the county boundary between Middlesex and Hertfordshire, and partly the parish boundaries of Hornsey and Stoke Newington, both of which are within the Hundred. On the north-west the boundary-line is the river Brent, as far as Ealing, separating it from Gore and Elthorne Hundreds, thence the boundary runs southward from the Brent to the Thames, forming the dividing-line not only of the Hundreds of Ossulston and Elthorne, but also of the parishes of Hanwell and Ealing."

Mr. Edward Jenks, in his excellent *Outline of English Local Government* (1913), says that "London is locally situated in the Hundred which took its name from (or gave its name to) the forgotten site of Ossulston." It seems strange that a spot of such importance should have left so little trace of its whereabouts. Various writers have stated that Ossulston was situated

where the Marble Arch now stands. "Ossulvestane Hundred took its name from Oswulf's stone, a Roman boundary mark, which stood where Watling and Tamesis Streets cross (Edgware Road and Oxford Street). This ancient stone is shown on Rocques' map as the 'place where soldiers were shot,' but it disappeared when the Marble Arch was removed to its present site. . . . It is possible that Hyde Park orators occupy to-day almost the same spot as was used in past ages for the assembly of the Hundred." (*Antiquities of Middlesex*; Montague Sharpe; pp. 60 and 133.) I can find no authority for this identification beyond the statement of Mr. W. H. Black in the *London and Middlesex Archæological Society's Records*, IV, p. 62. There is no reference to Ossulston on Rocques' map. In the deed to which our 1614 map is attached, Park Lane is called "the Way from Osolstone towards Tiburne," which is distinctly against Tyburn and Ossulston occupying the same site.

The most important contribution towards the identification of the site of Ossulston was made by Mr. G. J. Turner, who saw the name on the map of Ebury Manor referred to on page 20, and afterwards told the Society of Antiquaries that on a spot by the side of Park Lane he had found the word Osolston. I fear those present were not unanimous in their assent to his having discovered the forgotten site, but from the researches made for me by Miss Stokes, I am convinced Mr. Turner was right.

The map on which Mr. Turner found this name is an imperfect copy of Plate 31 in this volume, and leaves

out an enclosure marked across the corner of the meadow immediately over the word Osolston, in which enclosure is an oval ring. This corner now covers most of Nos. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and a portion of 12 South Street, part of South Street itself, and Park Street, and the garden of Aldford House.

The name is spelled in various ways in the old documents—Osolstone, Oseleston, Oswaldston, Othelston, Hoselveston, and Uselston. Before I contribute the discoveries Miss Stokes has made to this interesting subject, I want, for the sake of the general reader, to steal from Mr. Jenks a few sentences about the Hundred itself.

“The Hundred, or Wapentake, has to-day only an antiquarian interest. It is impossible to trace with certainty the origin either of the institution or of the areas which now bear its name. The extent and numbers of the Hundreds appear to be quite arbitrary. The county of Leicester has but six Hundreds; the county of Sussex (less than twice its size) has sixty-four. The small county of Oxford has exactly the same number as the far larger western Shropshire. Devon has thirty-three Hundreds; the adjoining county of Somerset (far smaller) has forty-three. The Hundred comes first into authentic history as a *police district*, whose inhabitants were made liable for the discovery of the perpetrators of theft and other crimes committed within their district. The most important session of the Hundred Court, that of the Sheriff, who held his ‘Tourn’ for the purpose of seeing that the police machinery was in full working order, has, after long decay, now been expressly abolished by statute.”

* * *

The evidences I now give respecting the Park Lane site come from two sources—the records at Westminster Abbey, and the Ancient Indictments of the King’s Bench

in the Record Office. In both of these there are continuous references to Ossulston from the 13th century, and what we want to know is whether both sources refer to the same place, and if this is the spot marked Ossulston on the 1614 map.



PLATE 7—THE SITE OF OSSULSTON

The Abbey records refer to Ossulston first as a field, pasture or arable; later as a farm of twenty-nine acres. They locate it in the Manor of Eia. In the 1296 accounts of John Cherchwyne, reeve of Eye, his returns for Ossulston are mingled with those of Tyburn. In the account of Robert ate Oke, Sergeant at Eyebury, 1342-43, we get, "Expenses of the Sergeant and other honest men and neighbours for one day at Bedepunt proving a stray cow, 15d.; and of the same people afterwards on the same business at the tourn of the sheriff of Middlesex at Oselston, 12d."¹

¹ Westminster Abbey Records, 26897.

Among the King's Bench Indictments we get a return under the Hundred of Osselston in 1398-99 :

"The jury present that there is a public path leading from Stowelmulle to Oselston, which has existed from time immemorial, and ought of right to be, beyond (extra) which path ran a small watercourse, and a wooden bridge used to lie over the said water, by which path and over which bridge foot passengers have been accustomed to go from the vill of Edelmeton to the vill of Westminster, and divers other vills in the county of Middlesex; but on Monday after All Saints 22 Ric. II, the Prioress of Clerkenwell raised a . . . (illegible, ? mound) in the middle of the watercourse, blocked up the path, and removed the bridge, to the very great nuisance of the whole county of Middlesex." ¹

Again, in the time of Richard II, a Presentment is headed "Hundred of Othelston in the liberty of Westminster," referring to "a highway called le Sugge, extending from the chapel of Tybourne to the Mewes." ²

Another Presentment reads :

"John Clerk of Westminster and his fellow jurors, present that from time immemorial there has been, and ought of right to be a public footway called Shereway in Iseldon [Islington] for the King's lieges going from and returning to Iseldon to [and from] a place called Osilston in the town [villa] of Westminster, to hold any county [court] for the county of Middlesex at Osilston aforesaid, for the suing or defending of their suits and complaints, etc., in that court; one Robert Rosemonde of London, notarie, on the Monday after St. Peter ad Vincula, 10 Hen. V (1422), obstructed the said path with logs of timber and other impediments." ³

And yet another Presentment in 1484-85 reads :

"The jury present there is a ditch lying in a lane called

¹ King's Bench File 177. M. 31.

² *Ibid.*, 181. M. 21.

³ *Ibid.*, 218. M. 10, of 2nd numbers.

Westmynster lane, leading between Tyburn and 'lez Osilston Pyttes' in co. Middlesex, containing 10 perches in length, which is noisome and defective for want of cleaning out and scouring, which ditch the Abbot of Westminster ought by right to repair and clean out, by reason of his holding lying on the east side of the said lane; and the ditch is so dangerous that no one can cross, ride or carry goods there, without serious risk to body and goods, to the nuisance of the whole neighbourhood." ¹

Until some other Ossulston turns up in Westminster I think we may believe that Mr. Turner has found the "forgotten site," and that the researches of Miss Stokes have confirmed the discovery. May we not also infer that the selection of Tyburn as the site of the gallows arises naturally from its being the nearest cross roads to the Sheriff's Court? So here, on this unexpected spot, we are carried back, as Mr. Jenks says, to the days before King Alfred, and to the dim beginnings of our history.

* * *

In 1680 an Ossulston jury became involved in that inflammable political question, the religion of the Duke of York, brother and heir presumptive to Charles II. The Duke became a Catholic, upon which the House of Commons passed a Bill excluding him from the succession. The House of Lords threw the Bill out, so we get the panic of the Popish Plot inflaming the Commons to keep James off the throne, and the peers of the kingdom bent on keeping up the Stuart succession. On 21 June, 1680, "the Grand Jury that served for the Hundred of *Oswaldston*," Charles Umfrevill Esq. being

¹ King's Bench File 367. M. 34.

foreman, found that the constables attending were "defective in not presenting the Papists, as they ought"; and thereupon ordered them "to make fuller Presentments" on 26 June, "On which Day the Jury met for that Purpose: When several Peers of this Realm, and other Persons of Honour and Quality, brought them a Bill against *James Duke of York*, for not coming to Church." On 22 December, 1680, it was reported to the House of Commons that in Trinity Term some of the Oswaldston jury having gone to the King's Bench to present a petition, Chief Justice Scroggs and other judges had discharged the jury "in a very unusual manner." The House forthwith "*Resolved*, That it is the Opinion of this Committee, That the Discharging the Grand Jury of the Hundred of Ossulston in the County of Middlesex, by the Court of King's Bench, in *Trinity* Term last, before the last Day of the Term, and before they had finished their Presentments, was illegal, arbitrary, and an high Misdemeanour."

RETROSPECT

I THINK it was Harriet Martineau who wished that the prevailing wind in Egypt would reverse its direction for a few centuries, and uncover the treasures upon which it has piled the sands of the Sahara. It would be interesting also to wipe away all buildings on the Manor of Eia, and saunter about Fursey Close, the Neather Fields, and Hay Hills, and to stroll down the sloping meadows towards Berkeley House, which stood where Devonshire House now stands, and meet Lady Berkeley consulting Mr. John Evelyn, who writes :

12 May, 1684. " I went to advise and give directions about the building two streets in Berkeley Gardens, reserving the house and as much of the garden as the breadth of the house. In the meantime, I could not but deplore that sweet place (by far the most noble gardens, courts, and accomodations, stately porticos, etc., anywhere about the town) should be so much straitened and turned into tenements. But that magnificent pile and gardens contiguous to it, built by the late Lord Chancellor Clarendon, being all demolished, was some excuse for my Lady Berkeley's resolution of letting out her ground also for so excessive a price as was offered, advancing near £1,000 per annum in mere ground rents : to such a mad intemperance was the age come of building about a city, by far too disproportionate already to the nation."

*

*

*

Or, accompany Mr. Evelyn ten years before, when (21 September, 1674) he " went to see the great loss that Lord Arlington had sustained by fire at Goring House,

this night consumed to the ground, with exceeding loss of hangings, plate, rare pictures, and cabinets; hardly anything was saved of the best and most princely furniture that any subject had in England. My lord and lady were both absent at the Bath."

* * *

Or, earlier still, to walk with Evelyn after he had dined with Lord Southampton in Bloomsbury, 9 February, 1665, into St. James's Park, and see the zoological specimens on view :

"A milk-white raven; a stork, which was a rarity at this season, seeing he was loose, and could fly loftily; two Balerian cranes, one of which having had one of his legs broken and cut off above the knee, had a wooden or boxen leg and thigh, with a joint so accurately made that the creature could walk and use it as well as if it had been natural; it was made by a soldier. The park was at this time stored with numerous flocks of several sorts of ordinary and extraordinary wild fowl, breeding about the Decoy, which for being near so great a city, and among such a concourse of soldiers and people, is a singular and diverting thing."

And possibly, about this time, catch sight of Mr. Pepys, waiting upon Charles II as his Majesty exercises his dogs and feeds the ducklings in the Decoy.

* * *

Or, perchance, to meet the vendors of early vegetables from the Neat-Houses, calling through the city such lines as we get in the Roxburghe Ballads :

"Here's cucumbers spinage and frinch beans
Come buy my nice sallery
Here's parsnips and fine leeks
Come buy my potatoes ho !

Come buy my plumbs and fine ripe plumbs
A groat a pound ripe filberts ho !
Here's corn-poppies and mulberries
Goose berries and currants also
Fine nectarines peaches and apricots
New rice twopence a pound
Let none despise the merry merry cries
Of Famous London Town."

Richard Bradley, in 1706, writing about the early forcing of vegetables, says :

"The first which are Kitchen Gardens and exceed all the other gardens in Europe for wholesome Produce and variety of Herbs are those at the Neat-Houses near Tuttle fields, Westminster, which abound in Salads, early Cucumbers, Colliflowers, Melons, Winter Asparagus, and almost every Herb fitting the Table."

* * *

Or to pass along by Hyde Park Corner during the Civil War, and come on to the citizens of Westminster complying with the order of the Lords and Commons, 15 October, 1642, " that Houses for Court of Guard, and Posts, Bars, and Chains, be forthwith erected and set up, in such places and by-lanes of the Parish of St. Margaret's Westminster, St. Martin's in the Fields, . . . the charge thereof to be borne by the inhabitants." Thus are they described in *Hudibras* :

" From ladies down to oyster wenches,
Labour'd like pioneers in trenches,
Fell to their pickaxes and tools,
And helped the men to dig like moles."

There is an engraving " shewing the Forts erected by Order of the Parliament in 1643," but as it also gives

“the Desolation by the Fire in 1666,” it can hardly be called contemporary evidence. According to this there was, in and adjoining Ebury Manor, a large fort with four bulwarks at Hyde Park Corner, a small bulwark in Mount Street, and two small bulwarks in or near the line of Grosvenor Place.

* * *

Or to have walked over the stone bridge that spanned the Tybourne in Piccadilly in 1598, and helped to arrest John Frauncis, who assaulted Samuel Morris on this spot, “and robbed him of a graye horse worth 40s., 800 eggs worth 40s., 3 dead mallardes worth 3s., a dead teal worth 6d., 7 dead larkes worth 7d., 2 dead hennes worth 3s., a black woollen-cloth cloak worth 9s., and 22 pence in numbered money”; for which defalcations Frauncis was convicted, and hanged.¹

* * *

Or earlier still in 1592, to have witnessed the riot, caused by the parishioners of St. Margaret's and St. Martin's, who claimed that Ebury Farm, the Neat, St. James's Farm, etc., had, according to ancient custom, been laid open for their benefit, from Lammas Day (1 August), till Plough Monday, the first Monday in January after Epiphany. The Elizabethan sub-tenants had enclosed their fields with fences and gates, and deprived the parishioners of immemorial rights. These disputes about enclosures went on all over Europe, and formed one of the great political problems of that period. In Mr. John McMaster's interesting *Short History of St. Martin-in-the-Fields*, there is a chapter on “Our

¹ Middlesex County Records.

Commons," dealing with these very farms, and giving extracts from the Vestry Minutes in the 16th century. Mr. McMaster says that "down to the time of Henry VIII, St. Martin's had over 500 acres of common land."

"And where there were hedges and ditches and ponds of water
Now we have nothing but bricks and mortar."

The parishioners appealed to Lord Burleigh, High Steward of Westminster, who ordered an enquiry; but before that was attended to, on Lammas Day, 1592, a body of complainants arrived "with Pickaxes and such like Instruments, pulled down the Fences, and brake the Gates," on which the tenants made "grievous complaint" to Lord Burleigh.

Peter Dod, citizen and grocer of London, who was on the spot, "attending upon certain of the City's Works, touching conveying of Water from thence to London," saw the people with pickaxes and shovels breaking the fences, and said, "Why do ye this?" They replied, "It is Lammas-tide; and we throw it down for Common. And if we take here any Cattle of any other Men's than theirs of the Parishes of St. Martin's or St. Margaret's, after this day, we will carry them to the Pound." "I never saw the like of this," said Dod. "If you may do this by Authority it is well, otherwise it is not well." It was answered, "We have here the Bailiff of Westminster, and the Officers of St. Martin's; and we have our Authority from the Queen's Majesty and the Council, granted by King Henry, confirmed by Her Majesty, etc."

The next day about 60 parishioners arrived, and went north of Piccadilly to "lay all common." They brought Mr. Cole, High Constable of Westminster, who "led them the way from Field to Field, with a written Roll in his hand." The farmers petitioned the Lord High Treasurer, saying "they had enjoyed these closes time out of mind," and suggesting it might stand with his Honour's good liking to commit the riot to the Star Chamber. The parishioners, however, stuck to their plea. They said that Ebury Farm was leased to one Whashe, who let it to divers persons who enclosed it "for their private commodity, and had made Pastures of Arable Land; thereby not only annoying Her Majesty in her walks and Passages, but to the Hindrance of her Game, and great injury to the Common, etc." Then came St. James's Farm, held by Pulteney, who "now threateneth Death to any that shall presume to open the same; altho' it pleaseth Her Majesty to grant the same to him none otherwise than they have been granted before, that is Lammas-ground." Then "108 acres, or thereabout of Neat . . . which hath been always Common at Lammas until within these 19 years." "And of these Enclosures, it may please your good Lordship (the plea proceeded), to be informed, that at her Majesty's last being at St. James's, she greatly misliked, and said she had for them but 8d. an Acre, and that the Inhabitants abused her greatly therein; whereupon she commanded some of the Tenants to be by the Lord Chamberlain committed to the Marshalsea; which was done: And yet, notwithstanding, they have proceeded to a farther Enclosure."

Seymour says that these passages "are taken out of the Original Paper belonging to the beforesaid Lord Treasurer Burleigh." What happened then we do not know, but we do know that enclosures ultimately prevailed.

Similar disturbances took place on the east side of London, at an earlier date. In Hall's Chronicle, 1513-14, we get:—

"Before this tyme the townes about London as Islyngton, Hoxston, Shordysh and other, had so enclosed the comon feldes with hedges and diches, that nother the young men of the citie myght shote, nor the auncient persons might walke for their pleasur in the feldes, except either the bowes and arrowes were broken or taken away, or the honest and substancial persons arrested or indited saieng that no Londoner shuld go out of the citie out in the hygh wayes. Thys sayeng sore greved the Londoners, and sodainly this yere a great nomber of the citie assembled them selves in a morninge, and a turnor in a fooles coote came cryenge through the cytye, shovels and spades, and so manye people folowed that it was wonder, and within a short space all the hedges about the townes were cast doune, and the diches filled, and every thyng made plain the workemen were so diligent. The Kinge's counsayll hearyng of this assembly came to the Gray Friars, and sent for the Mayre and the counsail of the cytye to knowe the cause, whiche declared to them the noysance done to the Citezens, and their commodities and liberties taken from them though they would not yet the commonaltie and younge persones, whyche were dampneyed by the noisance would pluck up and remedy the same. And when the kinges counsayll had harde the aunswer, they dissimuled that matter, and commaunded the Mayer to se that no other thyng were attempted, and to call home the citizens, which when they had done their enterprice, came home before the kynges counsayll and the Mayre departed without any harme more doing, and so after the feldes were never hedged."

*

*

*

Or to peep through the fence round Hyde Park in February, 1578, and see John Duke Casimir, at the invitation of Queen Elizabeth, divert himself, when "he killed a barren doe with his pece . . . from amongst 300 other deere."

*

*

*

Or to stroll along Willow Walk (now Warwick Street) from Neate Houses towards Tothill Fields, in 1571, and join the crowd, estimated at 4,000 persons, who came to see the opening ceremony of a trial by battle between the champion of the Plaintiff Lowe, and the champion of the Defendant Paramour, to decide a dispute about property. It seems difficult to believe it, but ordeal by battle, in civil and criminal suits, survived as the law of England till early in the 19th century, when it was abolished by statute. In 1818, "Richard Thornton was tried at Warwick for the murder of Mary Ashford," and acquitted. "The girl's brother, William Ashford . . . brought an appeal of murder in the King's Bench to which the defendant Thornton appeared, and throwing down his glove on the floor of the Court, declared he was not guilty of the murder, and would defend the same by his body." Lord Ellenborough and the rest of the judges "ordered a battle to be fought, according to the antient rules, in the presence of the judges of the King's Bench." Before the battle Ashford cried craven, so judgment was given in favour of Thornton. In the 1571 case of *Lowe v. Paramour*, somewhere in the neighbourhood of what is now Vincent Square, "a list was made in an even and level piece of ground, set out square sixty feet," and a seat for the

judges of the Bench was made without the lists, and covered with the furniture of the same Bench in Westminster Hall, and a bar made there for the serjeants at law. "And about the tenth hour of the same day three Justices of the Bench . . . repaired to the place in their robes of scarlet, with the appurtenances and coifs also." Then came the champion of the demandants, "apparelled in red sandals, over armour of leather, bare-legged from the knee downward, and bare-headed, and bare arms to the elbow, being brought in by the hand of a knight, namely Sir Jerome Bowes, who carried a red baston of an ell long tipped with horn, and a yeoman carrying a target made of double leather." After this came the other champion, and both of them "came before the Justices with three solemn congies." This imposing ceremony was gone through to complete certain legal technicalities and fix the place and date of the fight. In the end the Queen forbad the battle and compelled the litigants to come to terms. For this interesting scene I am indebted to Mr. Inderwick's excellent volume *The King's Peace*. See also Rushworth's *Historical Collections*, Vol. 2, p. 93.

* * *

Or to look across Oxford Street, from the entrance to Davies Street, on 15 September, 1562, towards the Lord Mayor's Banqueting House, a solitary structure in a rural meadow, standing about where is now Stratford Place, and see the preparations for the annual inspection of the conduits that brought water to the City. On this occasion, according to Strype:—

“The Lord Mayor, aldermen, and many worshipful persons, rode to the conduit-heads to see them according to the old custom : then they went and hunted a hare before dinner and killed her ; and thence went to dinner at the Banqueting House, entertained by their chamberlain. After dinner they went to hunt the fox. There was a great cry for a mile, and at length the hounds killed him at the end of St. Giles, with great hollowing and blowing of horns at his death : and thence the Lord Mayor, with all his company, rode through London to his place in Lombard Street.”

* * *

Or perchance to stand in the Upper Field, and look across towards Tyburn gallows, 4 May, 1535, and see Prior Haughton and his fellow monks from the Charterhouse bravely suffer for their faith. Or in 1681 witness the martyrdom of Archbishop Plunkett.

“ Ah ! What a warning for a thoughtless man,
 Could field or grove, could any spot of earth,
 Show to his eye an image of the pangs
 Which it hath witnessed ; render back an echo
 Of the sad steps by which it hath been trod ! ”

WORDSWORTH'S *Excursion*.

* * *

Or to stand by the Abbot's Bridge over the Tybourne, about where Warwick and Tachbrook Streets now intersect, on Thursday, the 16th of May, 1532, soon after 3 in the afternoon, and see the funeral cortège of John Islip, the last Catholic Abbot of Westminster, pass on its way from Neyte Manor House along Willow Walk (now Warwick Street) to the Abbey. The procession reached the best part of a mile, “ from Neyte untill Touttell Streete.” There are two records of the ceremony, one at the Abbey, the

other at the College of Arms, and both are published in the *Vetusta Monumenta*. From these we learn that the Abbot died at Neyte on Sunday, the 12th, at about 4 or 5 in the afternoon, after which "his Corps was chestid and cered, and so remayned in a large parlour in the seid place which was hangid with blacke clothe garnyshed with Scocheons of his Armes and the Monasterye, the Corps covered with a riche pawlle of clothe of golde of tysewe, and burnynge day and night 4 greate tapers, with masses daylie, and every nyght wache untill thurseday, the 16me daye, about 2 of the clocke, at what tyme com all the fathers of the howsse with the monks, and the Abbot of Burye in pontificalibus did say such ceremyns as to the same appertenethe the space of a howre. Then abowte 3 of the clocke the corps was conveid unto Westminster Monasterye." The procession was led by John Gardyner and William Alove, who carried black staffs, "to avoid such people as wolde not be orderid and to make rome." Then follow ecclesiastical and civil mourners, heralds, who got £5 and their "clokes" for their services, and "afore the Corps 24 pore men in Gownes and hodes in one range, beringe 24 torches," as Sir Thomas Malory wrote of the funeral of Queen Guinevere, "and so, with an hundred torches ever burning about the corps." After the coffin, and alone, came Lord WyndSOR, the chief mourner. The body was borne by six of the Abbot's yeomen in black coats, another six "going by to help them as they had need." At the entrance of the monastery the Abbot of Bury received the corpse, and proceeded into the choir, where it was "sett undre

a goodlye Hersse with manye lights and majesty and Vallounce, set with pencells," etc. Plate 8 is a beautiful drawing of this scene preserved at the Abbey, reproduced here by permission of the Society of Antiquaries.


After the Dirge had been solemnly sung, the mourners "departed unto a place over the Chappell of the defuncte where was prepared for them spyced breade, suckett marmylate, spyced plate and dyverse sourts of Wynes plentie." On the next day at 8 a.m. was "songe solemplye" the Mass of Our Lady, and after it the Mass of the Trinity, and finally the "Masse of Requiem, songe by the Abbot of Bury."

(See *Vetusta Monumenta*, Vol. 4, Dugdale, 1, 278, and Add. MS. in British Museum 5829, fo. 61.)

* * *

Or possibly, at an earlier epoch, to meet the gay and gallant company, bedashed with mosses and flowers, and thus described by Sir Thomas Malory:—

"So it befell in the month of May, Queen Guinever called unto her knights of the Table Round; and she gave them warning that early upon the morrow she would ride on Maying into woods and fields beside Westminster. And I warn you that there be none of you but that he be well horsed, and that ye all be clothed in green, either in silk outhur in cloth; and I shall bring with me ten ladies, and every knight shall have a lady behind him, and every knight shall have a squire and two yeoman; and I will that ye all be well horsed. So they made them ready in the freshest manner. And these were the names of the knights: Sir Kay de Seneschal, Sir Agravaire, Sir Brandiles, Sir Sagramore le Desirous, Sir Dodinas le Savage, Sir Ozanna le Cure Hardy, Sir Ladinus of the Forest Savage, Sir Persant of Inde, Sir Ironside, that was called the Knight of the Red Launds, and Sir Pelleas, the lover; and these ten knights



THE FUNERAL OF ABBOT ISLIP IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY
(From an Old Drawing)

made them ready in the freshest manner to ride with the queen. And so upon the morn they took their horses with the queen, and rode on Maying in woods and meadows as it pleased them, in great joy and delights." (Book xix, cap. 1.)

* * *

And away among these early days we can imagine ourselves with Saxon ancestors attending the hundred-mote at Ossulston, presided over by the sheriff, the freeholders acting with him as judges. A sacred spot, a cradle of our Common Law, and Local Government. Mr. Inderwick thought it probable these courts were held in the open air, and quotes from the laws of Edward the Confessor an illustration of their procedure: "It is there said that when the President of the Court arrived at the appointed place, all the suitors and others, gathering to the accustomed spot, dismounted from their horses and received him under their spears. And then he, raising his own spear in the midst, touched theirs, and was thus confirmed in his post."

* * *

Or, perchance, to sit by this time-honoured trysting-place on a summer evening, and hear the heavy tread of marching men, and see the last remnants of the Roman legions bend their steps down Watling Street toward the ford and ferry at Westminster, and so to Dover, the contents of the smallest outlying arteries rushing back to protect the great Imperial heart.

Or far away and long ago to imagine these ancient tracks during vast epochs of unrecorded time, when trade routes were established, and men and commodities went to and fro. My friend Captain Roger Pocock sees in his mind's eye the Salt Trail stretching from Droit-

wich to Dover, along a track that became a pavé in Roman times, with trains of ponies bearing skin bags of salt. On its way south he sees the Salt Trail joined by the Gold Trail, coming from Dolgelly. And further on where Watling Street reached Tyburn Tree, he sees the Bronze Trail come in from Cornwall. Thence south along the dry ridge parallel to Park Lane, and through the marshy ground to Westminster, over the river and along the Old Kent Road.

It may be there is a reminiscence of this old track in an early document in the British Museum (*Harl. MS.* 2115, fo. 53), which says: "First beginning at the Rake called Chester Rake . . . and so following nigh Hull Ash toward Pykton Dale unto Salterway, which is the Kings highway near Chester for our Lord the King to lead his host in the time of war, unto Shotwyk ford, and so following over Salterway unto Saffe diche, and so unto the town of Newton."

Much remains to be discovered about the trade routes of prehistoric days. "How few," wrote Sir Arthur Evans in the *Times* for February 10, 1919, "realise that, a century and a half before the Roman Conquest, the early Belgic invaders had not only brought Britain within the range of classical influences, but had actually introduced a graduated coinage derived from that of Philip of Macedon. . . . I do not expect that many of those acquainted with Shakespeare's Cymbeline, realise that such a prince actually existed in Ancient Britain under not very different conditions of palace life and foreign relations, still less that he and his colleagues, in the British predecessors of Col-

chester, St. Albans, and other towns, were striking coins with finely executed Græco Roman types and Latin inscriptions."

* * *

Or once again to try and imagine this area "in the dark backward and abysm of time," before England was an island, when "the Atlantic broke against a shore lying far to the west of the British Isles," and "the Irish Sea, the English Channel, and the German Ocean," were "wide valley plains, watered by many noble rivers. The Rhine, with its tributaries the Elbe and the Thames, swept in wide meanders to the north till it opened into the sea not far south of the Faroe Isles; and the Seine, gathering the waters of the south of England and north of France into its flow, continued its course through the fertile plains of the English Channel till it entered the Atlantic a hundred miles west of the farthest point of Brittany or Cornwall." (Sollas, *Ancient Hunters*.)


HUGH AWDELEY

BY this time the reader is probably thinking, What a tedious tale is here! Through how many more centuries shall I have to wander up and down the forgotten sites of Ebury Manor looking for Mary Davies? Well, the most direct approach to the heroine of our romance lies through the history of Hugh Awdeley, now owner of Ebury Manor, and the human conduit through whom it passed into the Davies family.

Hugh was the second son of John Awdeley, mercer, of the parish of "St. Michael's, Huggan Lane, near Woodstreete," and "of Sutton in the county of Kent," who married Margaret, daughter of John Hare, a wealthy mercer of Cheapside.

He was baptized in 1577, went to the Bar, being admitted to the Inner Temple 1604, and called 1611. The Temple Register describes him, "Hugh Audley, London, second son of John Audley of Sutton, Kent. B. 1611. Registrar of the Court of Wards and Liveries. Died 1662, 'infinitely rich.'"

Hugh's elder brother, Thomas, took out a grant of arms from William Camden, 7 October, 1608, which unfortunately is not accompanied by any pedigree. All Camden says is :—



“To all and Singular as well Nobles and Gentlemen as others unto whome these presents shall come William Camden Esq: als Clarenceux Principall King of Armes of ye South East and west parts of this Realme of England from ye River of Trent Southwards Sendeth Greeting Whereas Anciently from ye beginning valliant and vurtieous acts of worthy persons have been Comended to ye world with sundry monuments and remembrances of their good deserts amongst ye which ye Cheifest and most usuall have bin ye bearing of signes and tokens in sheilds Called Armes wch are evident demonstrations of Prowes & vallor diversly distributed according to ye quality

and deserts of ye Persons wch order as it was most prudently devised in the begining to Stir and kindle the hearts of men to ye imitation of vertue and nobleness even so hath ye same been and yett yt is Continually observed to ye end yt such as have done Commendable service to theire Prince or Country either in war or peace may both receive due honour in theire lives and also derive yt same successively to theire Posterity for ever in wch respect whereas *Thomas Audly* of London son and heir of John Audly of Sutton in ye County of Kent Gentelman & Maudlin his wife daughter of John Hare of London Esquier hath requested me to make search how and in what manner he may beare his Armes without prejudice to any other Gentelman of Coate Armer I considering his just and resonable request wth ye antiquity of his name have made search accordingly and doe find that he may lawfully beare in a sheild *Or a Fess Cottised between three Conyes Sable Mantled Sable Doubled Argent* as more plainly appeareth depicted in the Margent and for his Crest

on a Torse of his colours a Martlett Or beaked winged and tuffed Sable ye wch Armes and Crest wth every percell thereof I the afforesaid Clarenceux do Ratifie and confirme to the same *Thomas Audly* his breatheren and their Isseu to beare use and shew wth their due differences According to ye Law of Armes. In wittness whereof I the aforsaid Clarenceulx King of Armes have signed these presents with my hand and sett there unto the seale of my office. Given at London ye 7t day of October in the yeare of our Lord God 1608 and in ye sixth yeare of ye raigne of our Sovereigne Lord King James William Camden Clarenceulx King of Armes."

John Awdeley died in 1579, and Seymour says left considerable property, real and personal. As neither of his sons left issue, it is necessary to say something about his three daughters, Alice, Sarah, and Elizabeth, to whose descendants Hugh Awdeley's fortune came. Alice married Sebastian Bonfoy, Huguenot by extraction, feather-dresser by occupation, who lived in "the precinct called the Black Friars, near Ludgate." Sarah married Robert Harvey, grocer and citizen of London. Elizabeth married Stephen Pecoock, and their daughter Mary married John Davies, draper and merchant adventurer of London, the grandfather of Mary Davies. The families of Bonfoy, Harvey and Davies were therefore next of kin to Hugh Awdeley, and all entered their pedigrees in the College of Arms, and all took good care to show their connexion with this "infinitely rich" relation.

A gossiping sketch of Hugh Awdeley, called *The Way to be Rich*, tells us he was admitted clerk in September, 1597, to an anonymous employer, and that it was the example of his uncle, one Williams, that

inured him to "closeness and parsimony." Also, that "his host in Fetter Lane, a very rich and thriving old man, admitted him to so much familiarity with him, and put so much trust in him, that he committed to him his accounts, and allowed him his diet, . . . and made him one of his executors when he died."

We know for certain that part of his youth was spent in the service of his mother's brother, John Hare, Prothonotary in the Court of Wards and Liveries, in whose office he got insight into the work of that institution. John Hare died in 1613, and said in his will, "And to my nephew H. Audley and my honest Clerke Richard Chamberlayne whom I have chosen and trusted as they know to performe certain matters agreed betweene us, and to each £20, and do pray them that they will be faithfully ayding to my sonne Nicholas for the due ordering and executing of matters in the office. And I do chardge my said son to be ruled therin by them for they are honest and of good experience. . . . And so I do leave this wretched wicked worlde whereof I was weary longe synce, and do rest in assured hope of a joyfull resurrection. . . . Written with myne owne hand and with joye of heart."

In 1604 Hugh Awdeley and Richard Chamberlayne got nominations for clerkships in the Court of Wards, to which they were appointed in 1619. *The Way to be Rich* says Awdeley paid £3,000 for the post, and it may be true. I imagine that during most of this period of his life he lived in the Temple. There is an entry in the *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* 10, p. 30, stating that:—

“On the 6th of July, 1636, Thomas Gardiner, Recorder to the King, issued a certificate to the effect that Finch and Jeffrey Evans, now in gaol, with Edward Riley and Henry Woodward, who are not yet taken, upon Ascension Day last, between twelve and one in the day time, raised a ladder against the study window of Hugh Awdeley, three stories high, in the Inner Temple, no person being therein. Evans entered at the window, and delivered to Finch upon the ladder, out at the window, £200 and upwards, which money Finch delivered to Riley and Woodward in the Temple church, and they escaped therewith. Then, Finch returning up the ladder to Evans, they were both apprehended in the manner, and about £550 found about them, which they had taken out of Mr. Awdeley’s study. They were both convicted, but upon a legal doubt conceived by the Court, judgment has not yet been given. Evans is a plasterer’s son, who used to work with his father about the Temple, and plotted the mischief, Finch being very young and a stranger.”

In 1638, November 4, the Benchers of the Inner Temple ordered: “That Richard Chamberlayne and Hugh Audley, chief clerks of the Court of Wards and Liveries . . . shall take their places and sit at the upper end of the ancient bar table, above the rest of the utter barristers.” The “Utter Barristers,” says John Chamberlayne, “are such as from their Learning and Standing are called by the Benchers to plead and argue in the Society doubtful Cases and Questions, which are called *Moots* . . . and whilst they argue the said Cases, they sit *uttermost*, on the Forms of the Benchers, which they call the Bar. . . . All the rest are accounted *Inner-Barristers*, who, for want of Learning, or Time, are not to argue in these *Moots*.”

THE COURT OF WARDS AND LIVERIES

AS Hugh Awdeley spent many years in the service of this Court, and as his connexion with it was closely allied with his purchase of Ebury Manor, the reader may care to spend a few minutes in learning the function of this institution. To understand the position of this Court when Awdeley entered it, one has to appreciate that all organic growths, physical and political, suffer change, and that each development leaves behind it parts that were functional in their day, but in the lapse of time have outgrown their utility, like the Marble Arch, which having failed to give satisfaction for access or egress, has now become a meaningless obstruction in a crowded thoroughfare. The Court of Wards was a feudal institution, and the feudal system had its use in its day. Macaulay says it was originally created for national defence,

“but in the course of ages whatever was useful in the institution had disappeared, and nothing was left but ceremonies and grievances. A landed proprietor who held an estate under the Crown by Knight service—and it was thus that most of the soil of England was held—had to pay a large fine on coming to his property. He could not alienate one acre without a licence. When he died, if his domains descended to an infant, the sovereign was guardian, and was not only entitled to great part of the rents during the minority, but could require the ward, under heavy penalties, to marry a person of suitable rank. The chief bait which attracted a

needy sycophant to the court, was the hope of obtaining, as the reward of servility and flattery, a royal letter to an heiress."

If there was no heir the lands reverted to the over-lord, and there were forfeitures for breaches of fealty, and fines for failure of service. These feudal fines and forfeitures which had been cruelly and corruptly extracted under Henry VII, were by a statute of Henry VIII, handed over to a Court of Wards, created for the purpose of controlling the wards, as well as their Liveries or deliveries from wardship. The Court perished with the monarchy in 1646, for "the insect had outlived its usefulness," but its downfall was welcomed by every landed proprietor in England. It was situated, says Inderwick, "in Old Palace Yard, between the back of Westminster Hall, and the ancient building known as Edward the Confessor's Hall." Here Awdeley worked as clerk from 1619 till 1643, and again from 1644 onwards, as keeper of the records.

It is easy to believe that an official of this Court, with first rate abilities and long practice, might have opened to him endless avenues of information enabling him to advance ready money on real estate to needy clients. No doubt there was also considerable jobbery. A letter at Hatfield to Sir Robert Cecil, from one Bellott, dated 13 December, 1593, holds out most appetizing wardship prospects in Cheshire, and ends: "I wrote heretofore for a stay of the son and heir of Mr. Calvelly, the which I hope you will not omit. And if you might also procure a stay of Sir William Burton's, Mr. Wilbram's, Mr. Edgerton's of Ridley, and Mr. Gravernor's

of Eton, it were not amiss, for that if any of them should fall, the worst would be better than £1,000. I note them the rather for that their children be but young and some of them sickly. There is one John ap Edward of Wrexham in the Co. of Denbigh, yeoman, sick, and not like to recover. I wish the w (wardship) of his son to one of your grooms of the stable." (Historical Manuscripts Commission.)

Now it so happened that in the very year Awdeley became clerk in this Court, the Mastership thereof was conferred upon Sir Lionel Cranfield, so that the orbits of these constellations coincided at the time when the Lord Treasurer was commencing his tortuous deal with regard to Ebury Manor.

* * *

When Awdeley was made clerk in this Court, an agitation against its proceedings had already started. In 1614, Mr. Hitchcocke said in the House of Commons that he had "known *the* Clerk of the Wards sit there in a rug gown; now Twenty Clerks; and where Clerks increase, the Grievance of the Subject groweth." What Mr. Hitchcocke would have remarked if he had wandered round Whitehall three centuries later, lies beyond the range of human speculation.

Between 1620 and 1630 Parliament desired reform and asked the King to treat, and on 16 February, 1640, a Committee was chosen to consider of this Court, and its "Irregular Proceedings." Then came the Civil War, which rent the national soul and the imperial Government in twain, from top to bottom, separating those who clung to "authority and antiquity" under

the royal banner, from such as supported "liberty and progress" under the ægis of Parliament. It was a difficult time for Awdeley, whose sympathies were wholly Royalist. He held office under the Crown, and behold the Crown marched off to Oxford, set up a new Court of Wards, a new Master, and a new seal. This seal was brought to London in 1646, and on July 11 was "by a Smith broken in pieces at the Bar of the Lords House, all the Commons present." (Rushworth's *Hist. Colls.*, Vol. 6, p. 16.) Meanwhile, the Parliament at Westminster began to sound the old officials of the revenue-bearing departments as to their political leanings. On December 23, 1642, a batch of Government servants were ordered to attend the House next day, and among them was Awdeley. The Speaker told them "That the House had been informed of their good intentions, and inclinations to peace," and suggested they should advance £20,000 to the Parliament, but they all with one consent began to make excuse.

In June, 1643, the House appointed a Committee with Sir Harry Vane as chairman, "To consider of some Course for staying the Revenue of the Court of Wards; and for diverting it from going to Oxon; and converting it to be employed to the Use of the Commonwealth." When this Committee reported in December, the House resolved, "That the Office of the Clerkship of the Court of Wards be forthwith sequestered from Richard Chamberleyne and Hugh Audeley."

This was all very well, but a permanent Government official, with a thorough knowledge of his job, familiarity with its legal technicalities, and the threads of 24 years'

experience in his head, may be easy enough to discharge, but exceedingly difficult to replace. A State department which earns revenue, like a well stocked stream or cover, has its watchful poachers, who, by long practice in the arts of procrastination, evasion and collusion, require the experienced official to baffle their ingenuity. This clerkship was not an ordinary job, like cataloguing cargoes for Customs, or collecting the Hearth Tax; it involved a thorough knowledge of the law, and the intricate artifices of clients and lawyers to evade it.

Besides this, Awdeley had money, and Parliament wanted cash, for war is costly, even with one's own countrymen. So Parliament adopted a sort of opportunist policy with Awdeley, alternately cajoling and bullying, as occasion required. One thing they did not want, and that was to lose sight of him. They did not like the idea of his escaping to Oxford to assist the King. All these points having been considered, the House of Commons, within 12 months of his dismissal, "Resolved, that the sequestration of his estate shall be totally taken off, and he restored to his place in the Court of Wards." He was a great artist; he waited till they were hard up, and then bribed them, taking good security for the investment. A week after his reinstatement the *Journal of the House of Commons* records:—

"Whereas Hugh Awdeley Esq. at the request of this House hath undertaken to furnish the sum of one thousand Pounds for the present supply of the garrison of Aylesbury to enable to march to His Excellency the Earl of Essex; It is therefore this day ordered, That the said sum of £1,000 shall be repaid unto the said Hugh Awdeley, or his assigns out of the first monies that shall come in of £3,000 formerly

assigned to the said garrison out of the revenue of the Court of Wards and Liveries: and the Committee for the Revenue is required to take care for the repayment of the same accordingly, with interest."

His opinions, however, were so well known that when he was assessed, and his nephew Robert Harvey refused to pay, and used "contemptuous speeches to the Committee's Officers," Mr. Harvey was put into Peter House, wherever that was, until he discharged the obligation.

Later on, in 1649, the Attorney-General Prideaux opened a direct attack upon Awdeley and others, before the Lord Chief Baron. Prideaux pleaded that the officials of the Court of Wards were sworn to faithful service:—

"Yet now so it is, may it please your Honours . . . James Tooke, Charles Maynard, Richard Chamberlayne and Hugh Awdeley, having . . . gotten into their hands . . . leases, bonds, and other securities, for rents, fines and wardships . . . and contriving among themselves how to suppress conceal and detain . . . the same, thereby to make some unjust benefit unto themselves . . . therefore these officials should be called upon to disclose on oath all they have in their hands."

To this bill Awdeley and Co. duly responded, and the Attorney-General raised exceptions to their replies, without being able, as far as I can trace, to prove any dereliction of duty.

After this Awdeley was harried because he did not want to serve as Sheriff in Norfolk, where he had property. In 1649 the House of Commons threatened to fine him £ 1,000 if he did not accept his Commission.

The two entries relating to this matter stand in the *Journal of the House of Commons*:—

February 16, 1649. "Ordered, That *Hugh Audley* Esquire be, and is hereby enjoined to come in, and accept of his Commission, and take the Oath, to serve as High Sheriff of the County of *Norfolk*, according to Law, on *Monday* next; by Four a Clock in the Afternoon, upon pain of One thousand Pounds: And that the Fixing of this Order on the Door of his Chamber, or Place of his last Abode, shall be a sufficient Notice to him in this Behalf."

February 26, 1649. "The Question being propounded, That *Hugh Audley* Esquire, High Sheriff of the County of *Norfolk*, be dispensed with for his residence in the County, during the Time of his Sherifffalty. It passed with the Negative."

So he had to go.

In March, 1651, the Committee for the advance of money tried another tack. Information was given that *Awdeley* had corresponded with the late king at Oxford, and handed to him bonds to the value of £10,000, belonging to the Court of Wards, beside lending his Majesty large sums. To this *Awdeley* replied that the charge was so vague he was unable to make any defence, and on 14 January, 1652, "the case was dismissed, *nem. con.*, the prosecutor not having ascertained or proved the charge."

In 1653-4 the authorities made further attempts to extract trust money of the Wards, which they said he was concealing, but all to no purpose, so they left him in peace. When the Restoration came the House of Commons dealt with the question of recompense to the Officers of the Court of Wards. On 10 April, 1662, it was reported that *Hugh Awdeley* was "very old," so

he got nothing, but a Mr. Fane, who "produced his Grant of the Two Clerks Places of this Court, in Reversion, after Audley and Chamberlaine," got £10,000!

There were two formal abolitions of the Court of Wards and Liveries. The first took place November 27, 1656, when the Lord Protector sent Serjeant Dendy, with a mace in his hand, to the House of Commons, to tell the Speaker "that his Highness is in the Painted Chamber, and desires to speak with this honourable House." Whereupon Mr. Speaker, "attended with the whole House, the Clerk with the Bills in his Hand, and the Serjeant with his Mace . . . went up to the Painted Chamber: Where his Highness, attended with the Lord President and the rest of the Council, etc. . . . Then the Clerk read the Bills or their titles, and his Highness said, 'We do consent,' and amongst them was An Act for taking away the Court of Wards and Liveries." After the restoration, Charles II repeated the process, and on December 24, 1660, royal assent was given to an Act abolishing the Court, "and for settling a Revenue upon His Majesty in Lieu thereof."

MORRIS ALIAS POYNTZ

NO one who knew him has cast any reflection on the honesty of Hugh Awdeley. He is described as capable, careful, and even covetous, but not corrupt. Once, however, it must be admitted, his official probity, as custodian of the records of the Court of Wards, fell under suspicion, but clearly he was the victim of fraud. I give the story from the *Journal of the House of Lords*.

Once upon a time there lived at Stoke Milburge, Co. Salop, a Baronet named Sir Adam Littleton, who married Awdrey, daughter and heiress of Gabriel Poyntz, of North Ockendon in Essex, and through her acquired considerable property, there, and in Bevis Marks in London. Some time between 1640 and 1650, one John Morris, adopting for the occasion the surname of Poyntz, advanced a claim to the ownership of Lady Littleton's property, valued at £2,000 a year, and on the strength of certain documents, gathered round him a group of conspirators and subscribers, to support it. He also claimed to have had considerable success at law, and to have obtained verdicts from juries in Essex and London. Anyway, the thing became serious, for he granted leases to tenants in Essex and London, and nobody quite knew what to do.

In May, 1647, Mr. John Browne, Clerk of the Parliaments, announced in the House of Lords that at the last assizes at Chelmsford, there was produced a

copy of an Act of Parliament, which he alleged was false and counterfeit, "because there had never been such an Act." The House naturally thought this very important, both for the Commonwealth and the Clerk, and appointed a Committee of examination. John Morris, Mary his wife; Thomas Smith, and Isabel his wife, and the rest were ordered to be attached and examined, and the Committee was given right of search. The story came to Mr. Browne through Sir Adam Littleton, who thus described the gang: "Morris, Smith and Darby are wire-drawers, and Harris a cooper, all men of low and desperate condition; who have gotten up great sums of money on pretence of this title, and are followed by a rabble of others in a like condition." Mr. Browne searched the records from the 35th year of Elizabeth, and found no Act to correspond with the forgery. What the conspirators did, was to get Mr. Browne to certify a copy of a genuine Act, and counterfeit his signature on a false Act.

On the evening of the day Mr. Browne told the story to the House, the Deputy to the Gentleman Usher of the Peers, accompanied by constables, went to Morris's house in Bevis Marks, and demanded admission in the King's name. This being refused, they forced open the door, showed their warrant, and searched the premises. Some of the conspirators escaped through the back way. In an upstairs room a man was found hidden in a bed, and between the bed and the mattress was a black box containing papers, "thought to be very important for the discovery of the matter"; these were sealed up, and "delivered to the Clerk of the Parlia-

ments then present." On September 21, after full hearing of counsel on both sides, the Lords gave judgment, and decreed that John Morris and the rest be fined £2,000; that they pay Mr. Browne £500, and be bound in good behaviour hereafter. Their Act was decreed to be "damned," and "cancelled," "as being forged, counterfeit and fraudulent." They were also to be imprisoned at the House's pleasure.

It seems, however, that it was one thing to get Isabel Smith into gaol, but quite another thing to keep her there. She was a woman of considerable resource, and very soon after she got into Newgate she contrived to get out, and, as luck would have it, turned up at the Court of Wards. Technically speaking the Court was abolished, but its records were stored at Westminster, in the guardianship of Hugh Awdeley, and available for search. So down went Isabel, stuffed with forged documents, in preparation for a fresh campaign at the Essex Assizes.

In October, 1647, Lady Littleton, now widow of Sir Adam, petitioned the Peers saying that Isabel Smith had managed "to go at large," to the Court of Wards, and, under pretence of searching for documents, had contrived to insert fresh forgeries, and got Hugh Awdeley to certify copies of them. "And so," she says, "forasmuch as the said Mr. Awdeley (contrary to the trust reposed in him) hath admitted Isabel Smith (a notorious delinquent, and at that time committed to Newgate for forgery), to come amongst the evidences and records . . . and hath since given out copies under his own hand . . . therefore, your Petitioners most

humbly pray your Lordships . . . that the said Mr. Awdeley's unjustifiable carriage in the business may be examined . . . and that the said forged writings may be brought into this House; and . . . Isabel Smith may be kept close prisoner to prevent her like wicked practices in some other place."

To this Awdeley replied :—

"As Clerk of the late Court of Wards, petitioner has custody of the records . . . which are kept in a room called the Treasury at Westminster. About six weeks since, when he was out of town, the Clerk who usually waits in the office, told him that a woman wanted copies of some parchments, which the book-bearer had brought to the office; and when the petitioner came to town, seeing that the records were but copies of originals, and knowing nothing of the proceedings before Parliament, he ordered copies to be made, and signed them as usual. About ten days later, some other persons came to the office, and took exception against petitioner for giving the copies in question, and asked him to enquire how the parchments were found; when it appeared that Mrs. Smith had desired to search in the Treasury for some records, and that William Berringer the Book-bearer, and John Beseley, an ancient Clerk, had gone in, and she with them, . . . Beseley first searched in the lower part of the press . . . but not finding what Mrs. Smith wanted, he told the book-bearer to get the short ladder and . . . look in the upper part of the press, which he did, but refused to meddle with the writings; upon which Mrs. Smith stepped up the ladder, and threw down some loose writings . . . the book-bearer and Beseley both observing what she did, and Beseley then finding the bundle of parchment writings, wished her to forbear throwing any more down; but how long this bundle of parchments had been there, or how they came there, petitioner cannot say."

It then became Isabel's turn to petition their Lord-

ships. She describes herself as an "innocent sufferer," who heard there were some documents affecting Morris's claim in this Court and got the clerk to search till he said "he was weary; then she entreated him to go on . . . till he sat down and bade her search . . . he also told the book-bearer to get a ladder . . . on which she prayed him to go up; but he, being unwieldy and fat, bade her go up, which she did, and with both hands plucked many parchments out of the press, and threw them down upon the ground; and one of the last . . . was the bundle of writings which concerned Morris, which the clerk perceiving by something written on the back, willed her to come down. The clerk, the book-bearer, and the other client were standing close by the whole time . . . she denies the charge of forgery."

The Lords made short work of Isabel's apologia. They heard counsel on both sides and then "Ordered, adjudged, and declared, that all the parchments found in the Court of Wards, are hereby damned and vacated, as being forged and counterfeit, there being no records in the proper Courts to warrant any such; and that they shall never be admitted to be pleaded, or given in evidence . . . and that the copies under Mr. Awdeleys hand given out by him, be brought into this House, by Isabel Smith . . . that so they may be vacated."

It might be thought that Isabel's warfare was now accomplished, even if her iniquity was unpardoned, but once again, in 1648, she made another desperate attempt to get official recognition of her forgeries. On May 10 Lady Littleton again petitioned the Lords, saying that

Isabel Smith, "a most restless and wicked spirit,"¹ together with her keeper at Newgate, one Andrew Booth, had got out and gone to the Tower. Booth, "after much ill language," had struck Lady Littleton's son. Moreover, Isabel is still deceiving people with her bogus documents, and going to law. Upon this the House sent for Mr. Ryley, Record Keeper in the Tower, who explained that Mrs. Smith came oftentimes bringing a writing pretended to be copied in the Tower, of the reign of Elizabeth, and asking to see the original, to which Mr. Ryley replied that there were no records there of so late a date. But afterward, one Jennings, a writer in the office, discovered a parchment roll, on a little cupboard or press in the outer room, and Ryley believed one of the conspirators put it there, and declared the whole thing a forgery. On this it was ordered that Isabel Smith, now a prisoner in Newgate, shall be removed to the prison of the Gatehouse at Westminster, there to remain a close prisoner.

One interesting phase of this story remains to be told, as illustrating the way political feeling was then thrust into social life. Morris and Co. were a gang of rogues, detected and condemned, but at that time a great change had come over England. "In the summer of 1647," says Macaulay, "about twelve months after the last fortress of the Cavaliers had submitted to the Parliament, the Parliament was compelled to submit to its own

¹ An excellent 17th century description of a formidable female, though the first prize must be awarded to Mr. Pepys, who wrote of his housekeeper, "she hath a height of spirit, captiousness and noise of tongue, that of all woman kind I have hitherto had to do withal, do render her conversation and comportment as a servant most insupportable."

soldiers. Thirteen years followed, during which England was, under various names and forms, really governed by the sword. Never before that time, or since that time, was the civil power in our own country subject to military dictation."

Now these rogues understood this right well, and what they did was to send a petition in October, 1647, direct to Sir Thomas Fairfax, Lord General of the Forces, saying that the Clerk of the Parliaments had conspired with Sir Adam Littleton to deprive Morris of his inheritance, to seize his papers, and fine and imprison himself and his associates, "by which they will be utterly ruined, unless His Excellency, touched with compassion, will request Parliament by letter, to leave them and their adversaries to a free trial at law."

The scheme was to prejudice Parliament in the estimation of the army, by distributing this petition among the regiments. Fairfax received a letter purporting to come from the officers of Colonel Whaley's regiment, and other regiments, saying they are deeply oppressed in their spirits wherever they come, by the complaints of the poor against the inroads made on their common rights, and are especially affected by the case of John Morris, etc. Fairfax seems to have acted promptly, and received an explanation from Colonel Whaley within a few days. The Colonel wrote: "I have been with my regiment and read them a copy of the letter pretended to be sent from them and four other regiments this day sen- night to your Excellency. They had not heard of it before and disown it. Our enemies are trying to make us odious to the kingdom by underhand means. My

regiment requests to be publicly vindicated. I questioned the private agitators of my regiment about it; they ingenuously told me they had not acquainted the regiment with it, but it being brought to them by a friend, who desired them to subscribe it, they set their hands to it."

(See *Journal of the House of Lords*, vols. ix and x.)

AWDELEY LORD OF THE MANOR

HUGH AWDELEY held the Manor of Ebury from 1626 till 1662, and during those years he sold a few small parcels. One was bought by the Earl of Arundel, and adjoined his residence called Tart Hall, which faced east at the north end and west side of what is now Buckingham Gate. This Thomas Earl of Arundel was the only son of Philip, Earl of Arundel, who was attainted, and died a prisoner in the Tower, 19 October, 1595. An indenture dated 12 December, 1633, records that Thomas, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, and Lady Alatheia his wife, having a joint interest in one little parcel of pasture now converted into an orchard, containing 3 roods, and 30 perches, in the parish of St. Margaret's, Westminster, "having the way leading from Westminster on the east, and Stonebridge on the west part, through which a common sewer passeth, with the appurtenances thereof for the residue of a term of years yet in being, by force and colour of a grant from the late Queen Elizabeth," by Letters Patent dated 22 April, 27 Eliz., made to Knivett, "the reversion in fee simple of and in which said parcel of land is lawfully come and derived unto" Hugh Awdeley, by Letters Patent of King James. Now Hugh Awdeley "in consideration of the sum of £20," sells this parcel to the Earl and Countess of Arundel. The reader can find information

about Tart Hall in Walpole's *Anecdotes, Archæologia*, Vol. 49, Wheatley and Cunningham's *London Past and Present*, and in *Harleian MS.* No. 6272, which gives a schedule of its contents.

* * *

Another plot was sold to Sir Henry Vane the elder, Controller of his Majesty's Household. On 10 March, 1638, Vane paid Awdeley £ 30 for an acre late in tenure of Valentine Keeling, Sir Jeremy Turner, Knight, and Robert Baker, "in or near a place called the Gravell Pitts at the Cawsey way head there, leading to the Windmill, within the parish of St. Martin in the fields . . . and adjoining to certen ponds in the said Gravell Pitts, on the East part to certeyne lands of Michael Poultney in the occupacon of one—Phillips, and at the South end upon the high way there." (Grosvenor London Documents, 49.) I cannot satisfy myself about this site. On the deed Awdeley calls it "One acre parcell of ye Neate Lands," and on another deed it is called "Parcell of Ebury," and yet Alexander Davies in a marginal note seems to think it was possibly "neare Pickadilly Hall."

Other plots were sold to Sir Robert Pye, Auditor of the Exchequer to Charles I. Pye paid £ 540 for 5½ acres in "Little Doggs meadow," and a parcel of 4 acres in Longmore.

GORING HOUSE

BUCKINGHAM PALACE has become such an important piece of national property, that no apology is needed for bringing together any facts that throw light upon the history of its site and surroundings. It is interesting, for example, to know that part of the site of the Palace and nearly all its grounds were the property of Mary Davies. Our earliest plan of the site is the 1614 map, Plate 31. This gives us the 4-acre walled-in Mulberry Garden of James I, in a large field west of St. James's Park, and below it is a half-acre close marked "Poules." A man called Sir William Blake Kt., "inclosed and built upon this half acre," "a faire house," in 1623. This house was the great grandparent of Buckingham Palace, and, like other ancestors, caused considerable trouble. If the half-acre on which it was built had been Blake's own property, all would have been well, but as the land belonged to somebody else, a terrible tangle ensued.

I can find very little about Sir William Blake, and what there is on record is not attractive. He and his son William were made members of the Inner Temple in 1623. In 1626, Sir William Blake and William Rolfe were made trustees for Awdeley when he bought Ebury Manor, and in the same year both Blakes were appointed to the office of "Cheirographer of the

Common Pleas." In 1627 Blake was knighted, and died in 1630. His widow renounced the administration of his goods, but his son took the grant. Sir William was described as of Hale House in the parish of Kensington. Young Blake married Anne Hawker of Heytesbury, Co. Wilts, who in January, 1642, petitioned the House of Lords, saying that Sir William Blake and one William Rolfe, "being much indebted," had inveigled her into a fraudulent marriage contract; and if the story she told was true she was disgracefully swindled. Rolfe, she said, "has lain long in prison for debt." Three years later Anne Blake and Rolfe requested their petitions might be dismissed, as they were agreed. Rolfe was made member of the Inner Temple in 1616. He is described as of the Inner Temple, and of Enford, Co. Wilts. He was M.P. for Heytesbury 1628-40. He died 1646, and his principal creditor administered his will.

After Sir William Blake died in 1630, his son William conveyed the half-acre and house, through others, to George Lord Goring in 1633, "whoe upon part of the said half acre built a faire house and other convenient buildings and out houses, and upon other part of it made the ffountayne garden, a Tarris walke, a Court Yard, and a lawndry Yard," and "inclosed all this with brick wall." What Goring did with Blake's house, according to Alexander Davies, was to extend it, "by addition of another pile of building joining south to Sir William Blake's."¹

Meanwhile, Goring himself was negotiating with

¹ Notes on Plan of Ebury Manor, British Museum. Add. MS. 38104.

Awdeley for more land hereabouts, and, in 1630, Awdeley "did enter into communication with George Lord Goring touching his purchasing . . . pastures and grounds, parcell of the Manor of Ebury . . . and upon £520 paid towards the purchase Awdeley permitted him to have possession of part of the said grounds, by virtue whereof Lord Goring did erect all the out houses, and made the ffountayne garden," etc., "upon parcell of the waste of the said Manor of Ebury, antiently called the pitts alias the Gravell Pitts."

* * *

We now have Goring in a house built on somebody else's land, for which young Blake has taken the money, with gardens beyond bought direct by Goring from Awdeley, and £520 instalment paid. At this point, and in the year 1636, Goring borrowed £2,450 from his relative John Denny, and gave as security Goring House, the half-acre, and more besides. In 1637 Denny died, and as Goring paid neither interest nor principal his debt to the Denny family rolled up till he owed them £5,000. Meanwhile Awdeley was beginning to get restive about his purchase money, for Goring had agreed to buy £7,000 worth of Ebury Manor, and only £520 had come in, so he insisted on an agreement to this effect; that his Lordship should pay £2,600 in 1641, £2,320 in 1642, and £2,160 in 1643, with a covenant that in default of payment of any of these sums, Awdeley should retain the £520, and have the lands again. When 1641 came and Goring failed to pay, Awdeley began to lease the land to others, "and thereupon several treaties were had" . . . "and

at last it was agreed" that Awdeley should make a lease of the great garden to Mr. French, who had planted it. Then came a fresh dispute, and before the same was settled, "his Lordship went away," but before his going it was agreed that Awdeley should lease the lands not inclosed within the walls to John Davies, and the lease was sealed, and Awdeley received the rent, "until the tenant was disturbed by the forts and the turfing of the ground."

When Goring went off to fight he left matters in considerable confusion. Not only had he bought land from Blake which did not belong to Blake, but he had mortgaged it to Denny; besides which he had set up "a correspondence and intimate acquaintance with" Sir John Jacob, Kt., of Stratford-le-bowe, and Mr. Isaac Jones of Covent Garden. (If camouflage was intended, this nomenclature might have been improved.) One of these gentlemen represented to the Court of Exchequer later on, that Goring, "having several occasions for great sums of money," drew upon their loving-kindness, on security of profits arising from royal offices, by November, 1632, up to the amount of £15,000. But as this was considered "but a casual and contingent security," it was agreed that his Lordship should "enter into a Recognizance in the nature of a Statute Staple," with a penalty of £20,000, as a "collatterall security." On the strength of this Isaac piled up the debt, and Jacob, having squared up with Isaac, prudently stepped out. Goring went to fight and was banished, after which came a lull, when Isaac Jones sought the bosom of Abraham, and was succeeded by his son, Sir Samuel

Jones, Kt., of Courtenhall, Northants. Then came the Restoration, when Charles II turned up, and Lord Goring, and Sir Samuel Jones and his little account, which, by October, 1662, had reached the healthy total of £25,000. Within a few months, however, Lord Goring, or as he now was, the Earl of Norwich, was called to face another account. "In his passage by land from Hampton Court to London," he died at Brentford, aged about 80. His son Charles refused to pay anything, so Jones and Jacob came and told their tale of woe to the various Barons in the Court of Exchequer, and put in a claim for Goring House. What happened to them at the hands of the Barons we cannot find in the Record Office, but we know from other sources they did not get Goring House.

* * *

Meanwhile the Committees of the Commonwealth which dealt with sequestrations and assessments of property came on to cases of disputed title, and Goring House was one of them. There was a supposition that it was Lord Goring's, but Mr. French was paying his rent to Awdeley for the great garden, and Awdeley now claimed to own the walled-in plot as well. On this in comes Mistress Anne Denny, one of the children of John Denny, claiming that when Goring discovered his debt to their family was more than the property was worth, he gave up all right and title in this land and house, to her brother Edward Denny. The Committee for Sequestrations was so impressed by her claim that it paid her the rent. Awdeley then began to see there was something seriously wrong with the whole matter,

and twice in the King's Bench he tested the Denny title, and won on each occasion. Then Edward Denny, John's son, lost his temper, and on New Year's Day, 1651, lost his head and broke into the fountain garden, trod down and consumed grass to the value of 40s.; and in 1652 did break and spoil a door worth 40s., and a lock worth 10s.; and did deface, break down, and take away one fountain of lead and stone valued at £100. The four younger children of John Denny petitioned, saying that the rent of Goring House "is all the present maintenance they have to keep them from perishing, and should the same be detained from them, they are liable to suffer much extremity. Your petitioners humble suite is, That this honble Committee would be pleased to take the distressed Condition of Orphants into consideration," etc. It was a sad case, but it must be remembered that some of these afflicted "orphants" were old enough to earn a living. In 1653, Mr. Newdigate, counsel for Edward Denny, stated his claim in the Court of Chancery. He admitted he had difficulty in proving legal title for want of evidences, which, owing to Lord Goring's delinquency, could not be found. It was ultimately agreed by both sides, and ordered by the Court, that all these differences "be referred to the hearing, final ending and determination of Edmond Prideaux, Esq., Attorney-General for the Commonwealth of England."

* * *

On March 3, 1653, Prideaux made his award, and before disclosing its contents I would like to state fully the problem he had to solve, from the deeds before me.

Blake did unquestionably buy on July 28, 1623, "4 acres of Arrable land in Ebury Feild" and "half an acre of pasture lying in a feild near the West gate of St. James Parke on the Northside of the ffootway leading from London towards Chelsey," but, in the deed which conveyed the property to him *Northside* is erased, and *Southside* is substituted; hence the trouble. In Awdeley's "Breviat of the whole proceeding of ye whole matter," the case is thus stated:—

"In the deed of purchase dated 28 Julii 1623 (by wch Mr. Blake purchased) . . . it was (in all probability) first menconed to be a halfe acre of ground more or lesse lying in a feild nere unto the West Gate of St. James Parke on the north side of the footway there leading from London to Chelsey, as the former conveyances were. But because that abuttall would not serve for the halfe acre of ground whereupon Mr. Blake had now begun to build a faire house, Therefore North in that deed is raised out and South putt in, and soe is London rased out and Charing Crosse written upon it as appeares playnly by that deed now in the hands of the defendt (Awdeley) of wch rasures noe memorandum is made upon the backe of the deed wch makes it more suspicious and probable to be done after the sealinge and delivery of the said deed to fitt it unto that halfe acre where his house is built, wch lyes indeed on the south side of the footway leadinge from London towards Chelsey and not on the north side thereof as all the antient deeds doe abutt their half acre. And there was at that time more color to doe this because Sir William Blake the purchaser was then in possession of this halfe acre on the south side of the said footway as a Trustee for the defendt Mr. Awdeley."

Though Awdeley does not express it, he implies that Blake was responsible for the rasures, and exposes the motive.

At the time Prideaux arbitrated, Blake had been dead 20 years, Goring banished 5 years, and the only parties left were the defrauded offspring of John Denny, and Awdeley the real owner of the soil. The Denny claim to the half-acre was not good, but Goring had mortgaged the house to them, and Parliament, through the Council of State on July 2, 1652, ordered Mr. Frost "to pay £25 to Anne Dennie out of the exigent money for quartering soldiers in Goring House for three months before the allowance was made to her by Council for quartering soldiers there." (*Calendar of State Papers Domestic.*)

On March 3, 1653, Prideaux gave his award, but neither stated nor solved any questions of law or equity; all he did was to define the property concerned, and say that Denny "shall procure the soldiers now quartered in the said house and buildings, and all other persons to be removed thence, and give peaceable possession to Mr. Awdeley, who shall pay Edward Denny in or at the Inner Temple Hall, London, the full and just sum of £1,100." Twelve years later Edward Denny of Howe, Norfolk, petitioned Lord Arlington for "benevolence":—"Was formerly owner of Goring House, his lordship's habitation, but suffered during the troubles and was obliged to sell it to Sir John Lenthall; is in the King's Bench for debt, and though ashamed to beg, is compelled to use Belisarius' complaint 'Da obolum.'" I cannot imagine why he told Lord Arlington he had sold Goring House to Speaker Lenthall's son, Sir John Lenthall.

We have not a complete record of what happened

at Goring House between the time Lord Goring left it, and Lord Arlington came into residence. What we know is that in 1646, when Monsieur Bellieure the French Ambassador visited England, Parliament furnished Goring House for his accommodation, and on July 1 a company was sent on the king's barges, to "repair unto Gravesend, there to give the French Ambassador his first reception." The Ambassador's steward "that is sent hither to provide for him, doth dislike Goring House." The Lords suggested Hatton House; the Commons stuck to Goring House. When Bellieure went to Oxford to see the King, the Commons suggested that the Speaker should have the use of Goring House until his return, but the Lords sent word that "no Person shall be admitted to lodge in the French Ambassador's House, to the Interruption or Disturbance of his Servants, or Disposure of his Goods left there or using or taking away any of the King's Stuff within the said House until the said Ambassador's Return."

On Jan. 9, 1647, the House of Commons "Ordered, etc., That the Petition of Hugh Awdley and Robert Harvy be referred to the Consideration of the Committee of the Revenue, to give the Petitioners Satisfaction for Goring House, during that Time which the French Ambassador enjoyed it."

We also know that Goring House was used as Commonwealth barracks in 1653, from Prideaux's award that Denny should "procure the soldiers now quartered in the said house and buildings and all other persons to be removed thence." According to the

Catalogue of Westminster Records, page 58, the Churchwardens of St. Margaret's had to supply, "by command," coals, faggots and candles "to a regiment of souldiers at Goringe House."

We know too that during the Commonwealth certain discoverers went to and fro, identifying lands and buildings that had been property of "Charles Stuart, late King of England." These discoveries went to a Surveyor General, were enrolled as Parliamentary Surveys for the various counties, and are in the Record Office. Three refer to this property, one made in 9 July, 1651, and two others 23 June, 1652. From these, and from maps, and the sketch of Goring House in the British Museum reproduced on Plate 9, we can frame some idea of how the place looked in the 17th century. Goring House, that is Blake's house enlarged, faced south on ground now occupied by the southern wing of Buckingham Palace. In front of Goring House, according to the discoverers, was a "Court Yard," "with a faire paire of gates and a paved walke up to the said house bounded with the said laundry yard on the East, the fountaine garden on the West." These official surveys give careful descriptions and measurements of the buildings and domain, and tell us that "parte thereof" is used "for a Bowling alley and parte thereof is Meanelye planted with severall sortes of fruite Trees and the other parte thereof planted with white thorne in the manner of a wilderness or Maze walkes."

I must acknowledge that I cannot reconcile Faithorne's map of this plot, dated 1658, with the



SKETCH OF GORING HOUSE

documents before me. Faithorne gives a small gabled house facing south into the Buckingham Palace Road, and north of it a long, large, flat-roofed mansion, apparently facing east, with square-walled garden at back; and above this a smaller house, also with walled garden. My only consolation is that other students of London topography, with far greater experience, have had difficulties with Faithorne.

PIMLICO

AS so large a portion of Ebury Manor is called Pimlico, it would be interesting to know whence this name was derived and imported. Pimlico, like Piccadilly, has had abundance of attention from anti-quaries, but the problem remains unsolved. It has been suggested it was derived from an actor and inn-keeper at Hoxton, from a seaport in North Carolina named after an extinct race of Indians, from a tropical bird, from an island in the West Indies, from a textile material, from a hamlet in Oxfordshire, etc. (See *Notes and Queries*, 21 November, 1908; Wheatley and Cunningham's *London Past and Present*, Vol. 3, p. 96; *Antient Drolleries*, Oxford University Press, 1891; *Pimlyco, or, Runne Red Cap*, 1609.) The earliest record I know connecting it with the west end of London is an entry in the Overseers' Accounts for the parish of St. Martin's in the Fields for 1630, in which 5s. is "paid for the hire of a horse and sledd, and a labouring man to make a grave, and to cover it at Hide pke corner, for Thomas Wood, who hanged himself at Pimplico." This word Pimplico appears again on a copy of Plate 31 made about 1664, by Alexander Davies (*see* page 20). It is there written on a small plot of ground on the south side of the Buckingham Palace Road, between the back of Tart Hall and More's

Gardens. The same plot is shown on our 1614 map (Plate 31), and bears there only the name of Sir Henry Maynard. We do not know if the district between Westminster and Chelsea now called Pimlico took its name from the Buckingham Palace Road site, but it seems probable. In the *Catalogue of Westminster Records*, p. 192, are given three entries from Vestry Minutes, referring to "the turning of the King's Highway at Pimlico," in 1681-2. The editor seems to assume that the Pimlico of 1681 was the Pimlico of 1900. I am not sure that it was. The highway referred to in these minutes is clearly stated to be "at the West end of St. James's Park leading from the Towne of Knightsbridge to this parish" (St. Margaret's). In the index to the volumes of *Penny Merriments* in the Pepys Library, at Magdalene College, Cambridge, is a chap book called *Peter Pimlico and Peggy* . . . but unfortunately it is missing from the volume.

THE REA FAMILY

LONDON is not only a city, but a continent, divided into territories occupied by tribes or trades. The Jews here, the journalists there. It was always thus, and in the 17th century, Fleet Street was what would be called in Teheran, "the street of the scriveners," professional draftsmen of legal documents originally, no doubt, but defined by Dryden, as those whose business it is to place money at interest. The scriveners lay entrenched near those legal citadels, the Inns of Court, and among them was an expert named John Rea, who fell in with Awdeley when the old man was about 77.

There is little on record about the Rea family, except a brief pedigree in Peter Le Neve's *Catologue of Knights*. The Reas were connected with the Le Neves, but Peter does not glory in the alliance, and what he says about them denotes neither distinction nor success. One died in the Charterhouse, another was "one of the band of Pentioners," a third "dyed very poor, and was parish Clerk of St. Peters le Poor." One married "Jo Slyford, citizen and basket-maker of London. No Gent. I assure the reader." Such were Le Neve's comments on his Rea connexions.

What happened between Awdeley and the Reas is revealed in a petition, addressed by the old man to

the Lord Chancellor in 1661, of which there are two rough drafts. I have pruned constant repetitions of legal jargon, but enough is given of the actual text to tell the tale as Awdeley told it. He says,

that being acquainted with one John Rea, a scrivener, who knew he possessed a very plentiful estate in land and monies, this Rea, about 1654, became importunate for the Petitioner to sojourn with him at his dwelling near Temple Bar, which invitation was many times reiterated with great profession of respect and tenderness, to him and his aged condition. To this proposition Awdeley with some reluctancy condescended, and agreed with Rea for lodging, diet, etc., as also the use of certain rooms, closets, and cupboards, and went thither himself, and brought with him bonds, mortgages, and considerable sums of ready money.

And Rea was ever soliciting that Awdeley should give him some countenance, by employing him in his affairs, for that if he would but trust him, it might be a means to very much advance him in the world, he being at that time of low and mean condition. Awdeley thereupon condescended to his request, and delivered into his hands divers jewels, plate, pearls and other moveables, also mortgages, bonds, and securities. And Rea promised that every 6 months he would deliver to Awdeley a true account of all the transactions he undertook for him. Nevertheless, Awdeley was very cautious how he did interest John Rea (being always very fearful of him), yet Rea did so thrust and insinuate himself into his affairs, that at length (though with much reluctancy) he was constrained, lying at Rea's house, and there having his diet, to permit him to receive divers sums of money for which securities had been taken.

And your Orator further sheweth, continues Awdeley, that he growing very aged, and indisposed to agitate business himself, was constrained to rely much upon Rea, who did for divers years manage your Orator's business, and received your Orator's rents and monies, and put the same at interest, and did always once in six months render an account of his

doings and dealings, until about the Feast of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary, 1661, now last past.

And your Orator sheweth that in further flux of time, the said Rea grew to that confidence as to take upon him, without your Orator's privity, not only to call in great sums of money due, which otherwise your Orator had suffered to have still continued, but also to receive all monies as grew due, sometimes acquainting your Orator therewith, and sometimes concealing the same.

And after your Orator had sojourned in the house of John Rea about the space of seven years, and Rea had gotten full knowledge of his affairs, and knew where he used to keep his bonds, he, contriving to make himself master of your Orator's estate, did, about the month of June, 1661, earnestly importune your Orator to go unto the country, to take the air, at a house which Rea had taken at Hammersmith, and there to sojourn with Rea and his family during the summer season, and to return back at Michaelmas to Fleet Street, pretending that such retirement at that time of the year would be very advantageous to your Orator in his health. And your Orator sheweth that upon such importunity, he was persuaded, not at all mistrusting the mischief which was intended him, and did thereupon go, and left locked up in Fleet Street, bonds and other things of great value, at least £2,000 in gold, and one string of pearl which cost your Orator at least £500 in ready money. And John Rea having urgent occasion for money to buy the lease of his dwelling house, importuned your Orator to lend him the sum of £400, which your Orator did, upon the bond of him, and one Roger Rea his brother, to be paid at a certain day, now long since past, with interest after the rate of 6 per cent. per annum. And the said John Rea, having further occasions for money, towards payment of his debts, intreated your Orator to lend him £500 more, which your Orator did, and for security thereof, to be paid at a certain day, now long past, with interest at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum, John Rea gave your Orator his own bond, and made him an assignment of the lease of his house, and a bill of sale for the goods of his house, which though of far less value than the said £500, yet your Orator, for the

accommodation of the said John Rea in his necessitous condition, and thinking thereby the more to engage him to faithfulness in your Orator's business, was contented to accept.

And about the month of December, 1656, the said John Rea, having for your Orator's use, received of one Thomas Pride and Valentine Wanton, the sum of £2,000 of your Orator's monies, which your Orator ordered Rea to dispose of at interest upon good security, in the next half-year's account, the said John Rea set down the £2,000 to be lent to himself, albeit your Orator had given no direction or consent; so that he converted the said monies to his own use. And when your Orator pressed for repayment, or good security, he offered your Orator a mortgage of certain lands which he said belonged to his wife, but upon search of the title your Orator found the same very defective and doubtful. Whereupon the said John, labouring earnestly with your Orator to continue the said £2,000 in his hands, affirming that otherwise he should be utterly undone, your Orator, in further compassion, did consent thereunto, and thereupon, as well for security of the £2,000, as also for the more sure payment of the said £400 and £500 which your Orator had lent him before, which were all to be repaid with interest at a day now long since past, he, together with his brother Roger, became bound by a Recognisance, in the nature of a Statute Staple, bearing date about the 26th day of April, 1657, of the penal sum of £3,000, defeasanced for the repayment, with interest for the same after the rate of 6 per cent. per annum, at a day now also long since past.

And your Orator further sheweth, that about the month of September, 1661, your Orator, being returned from Hammersmith, to the house in Fleet Street, shortly after making search for his bonds, and other things, in the cupboards wherein he had left them locked up, found, to his great amazement, that during his absence the locks of the said cupboards had been opened, and the securities, together with both gold and silver, jewels, and other things of great value, including all your Orator's account books, embezzled, and the locks of the cupboards shut, and locked again. And your Orator being much troubled, and acquainting the said

John Rea with what had happened, and questioning him concerning the same, desiring him to help your Orator to his things so taken, he, the said John Rea, replied very slightly, that he knew not how, or by whom, it was done, though in a very short time after your Orator came to understand that John Rea was the thief, if not the only actor therein, your Orator accidentally seeing a great part of his bonds in John Rea's hands, which he, after he was so discovered, did offer to deliver to your Orator, with divers other of the things taken if your Orator would have condescended to his most unconscionable and unreasonable demands.

What these demands were Awdeley does not state, but he accuses Rea of conspiring with his debtors, altering the names of the parties in the bonds, compounding with the persons who stand bound in them, and receiving gratuities.

He continues—

And although your Orator hath at sundry times in all friendly manner requested Rea to render an account of all monies and things committed to his care, since the Feast of the Annunciation, 1661, and to pay such monies as he had received, and such bonds as he had taken in your Orator's name, also to deliver the aforesaid £2,000 in gold, the gold chain, string of pearls, jewels, ready money, and all securities, yet he, the said John Rea, minding utterly to defraud your Orator, doth refuse so to do, or give any account or satisfaction therein. And although your Orator hath requested Walter Rea to render an account of money received for your Orator, yet he, combining with his father, doth altogether refuse so to do, but intendeth to keep the same, or to share the same with his father. In tender consideration whereof, and as, by reason of the great confidence your Orator had reposed in John Rea, these affairs were secretly transacted, your Orator hath no witnesses to prove the same, or if there be any he cannot produce them, they being unknown to your Orator, or dead, or in remote places, so that by the

Common Law of the kingdom your Orator is utterly destitute of relief; and to the end that John Rea and his confederates may discover all such matters as do belong to your Orator, and may bring into this Honourable Court all deeds, accounts and writings which are in their hands; and lastly, that Rea and his confederates may answer all and singular the premises, and that your Orator may be relieved herein by the justice and equity of this Honourable Court; May it therefore please your Lordship to grant unto your Orator, his Majesty's gracious Writ of sub poena against John Rea, Roger Rea, and Walter Rea, and other confederates, commanding them, at a certain day, and under a certain pain, to appear in this Honourable Court, then and there to answer the premises, and to abide such order as to your Lordship's grave wisdom, and this Honourable Court, shall seem agreeable to equity and good conscience. And your Orator shall ever pray, etc.

The awkward part about the old man losing his bonds and books was, that his accounts were long and his memory getting short, and if he wanted to foreclose a mortgage or recover interest, how could it be done? Moreover he was in great fear that the Reas would treat with his clients, and mitigate their indebtedness in their own interest, so he put into the petition the names of over a hundred debtors, and begged the Lord Chancellor that these be compelled to come into Court and state on oath their exact position with him.

Moreover, it came to his memory that he had made a settlement of his Middlesex lands on John and Walter Rea, and now he wants the deeds back,

“a certain deed of settlement by your Orator formerly made of a certain farm called Ebury Farm and Goring House, and all other his lands and hereditaments in the county of Middlesex, of a very considerable yearly value, whereby your Orator

had settled the same upon the said John Rea and his heirs . . . and divers other things of great concernment, which your Orator cannot particularly mention."

I do not know how far this petition represented what really happened. A Chancery Decree, 28 April, 1662, says:—

"The defendant John Rea having appeared and put in an answer and demurrer . . . foreasmuch as the plaintiff is advised not to proceed upon the bill, It is ordered that the same be dismissed out of this Court with 20s. costs to be paid by the plaintiff to defendant John Rea in respect thereof."

If the Reas had really taken the old man's bonds, jewels and cash, I think the loss would have been recorded by Awdeley's executors. Possibly the Reas had a rehearsal, and found there was too much life and fight in the old dog.

Smyth's *Obituary*, 7 February, 1671, says, "Sir John Ray Kt late of Richmond, once a Scrivener in Fleet St, buried this day."

Pepys in his diary, 23 February, 1662, noting Awdeley's death, says that the old man did "forgive one man £60,000 which he had wronged him of, but names not his name; but it is well known to be the scrivener in Fleet Street, at whose house he lodged."

DOCTOR DUKESON

THE Rea family having quitted the stage, we are left with the pathetic figure of "ould Awdeley," smarting under the annoyance of imposition—for as Savile, Lord Halifax says, "Many men swallow the being cheated, but no man could ever endure to chew it"—homeless, and childless, looking about for some domestic refuge for himself, and his faithful servant Mary Lockwood. When the curtain rises again the pair are safely ensconced in what is generally called the "bosom" of a clergyman's family, more than adequately equipped in this instance, by 12 daughters and 3 sons. Along which path Awdeley came there is not known, but more than one were open to him. The clergyman was Rector of St. Clement Danes; therefore a near neighbour for years, and a staunch Royalist. Then, again, one of the Rector's daughters, named Mary, had been married two years before to Alexander Davies, a young scrivener of 24, grandson of Awdeley's sister Elizabeth. This scrivener Awdeley had taken, as confidential clerk, after his quarrel with the Reas, to assist Nicholas Bonfoy in the management of his affairs, so the clerk may have advised the Rector to offer shelter to the dilapidated Dives. Another Miss Dukeson, Rebekah, had married William Docwra, an ingenious busy man of affairs, intimately associated with the Grosvenor family for

many years, and best known to fame as an original projector, if not inventor, of a "Penny Post for the conveyance of letters and small parcels about London." Such were the surroundings of Hugh Awdeley during the last year of his life, illustrating the truth of the saying that nothing is so likely to happen as the unexpected. Through the greedy folly of the Reas the old man called in Davies, Davies was linked up with Dukeson, and Dukeson with Docwra.

* * *

Everyone knows the two churches that stand out in the middle of the Strand, between Charing Cross and the Law Courts, the first dedicated to St. Mary, and the second to St. Clement, and called St. Clement Danes. In 1634 the Rev. Richard Dukeson was made Rector of St. Clement's, and ministered in an earlier church, the present building not being completed till 1682. The old rectory stood on the right side going down Milford Lane, a narrow thoroughfare that runs towards the Thames, just opposite to the church. The house survived, it is believed, till 1851, when Infant Schools were erected on the site, which were replaced by stables for the horses of W. H. Smith and Sons. The Hearth Tax returns for 1674 show Milford Lane to have been a fashionable residential quarter, containing over 100 families, with such names as Throgmorton, Welde, Lord Henry Howard, the Countess of Arundell, etc.; and no doubt these Catholics congregated here to be near Arundel House. If there has been no change in the width of the lane itself, which measures at the entrance barely 8 feet from pavement to pavement, there has

been considerable alteration in its use. It resounds to-day with the whir and hum of printing machines, and is apt to be inconveniently blocked by even a single lorry bearing rolls of printing paper.

After eight years' enjoyment of this benefice, the troubles of the Civil War fell heavily on Dr. Dukeson. The House of Commons, on July 4, 1642, "Resolved, That Dr. Duckson of St. Clement's, and Mr. Smith his Curate . . . shall be sent for as Delinquents." On July 13, "Dr. Duckson was several times called in; and, being demanded several Questions concerning commanding the Publishing of his Majesty's last Declaration, which reflects with much Scandal upon the Parliament, did most insolently prevaricate with the House; and gave nothing but shuffling Answers to the Demands and Questions propounded unto him by Mr. Speaker, by the Command of the House. Resolved, That Dr. Dukeson shall be forthwith committed a Prisoner to the Gatehouse; there to remain during the Pleasure of the House, for his shuffling and shifting Answers to the House, and laying an Aspersion upon a Member of this House." Eight days later the Doctor petitioned the House, and he, and his curate Mr. Smith, "are forthwith released from any further restraint."

This was only the beginning of his troubles. *The Perfect Diurnal* of 5 January, 1643, says: "Sir Edward Wardner, Doctor Castle of Westminster, Doctor Fuller of the Savoy, Mr. Dinkson of Saint Clement's, and some others, this day set forward towards Oxford with a Petition to His Majesty for an accommodation (as is

pretended): and being examined upon the way by the Courts of Guard at Hide Park, they produced a Warrant from the Lords in Parliament for the free Passage with their Petition to His Majesty without interception. Whereupon the Captaine of the Guard told them that though he was commanded by their Warrant to give them free Passage with their Petition, yet he would search them, that they should carry nothing else to His Majesty, which he did accordingly, and found divers Letters about them especially Doctor Dinkson." These papers were handed to the Commons, who found them "of a very high and dangerous consequence." The party, stripped of all papers except their Petition, had been allowed to proceed to Oxford, but a troop of "Dragonners" was sent to bring them back to Parliament, so back they came. They were put in custody of the Serjeant at Arms, from which doubtless they were soon released, and the next thing I find recorded of Dr. Dukeson is, that he ultimately found his way to Oxford, and "exercised his function" there. At the Restoration, after 17 years' sequestration, the Doctor returned to St. Clement's, and remained there till he died in 1678.

What a strange medley of sympathy and surmise must have alternately possessed the souls of the Dukeson household, during the time of Awdeley's visitation! Comparatively speaking he was a millionaire, and a millionaire on his last legs, stuffed with cash, jewels, lands and mortgages. Only a saint could have remained wholly indifferent as to his final intentions about that vast property, and if his caretakers were not saints, they

were honest sympathetic friends, and he was far too penetrating not to recognize their integrity. Did he lie awake at night in Milford Lane, and listen to the watchman call the passing time, and the murmur of conversation from the parlour below, where his reverend host, with his sons-in-law, discussed the preparations their lodger was making for the disposition of his treasure?

THE PASSING OF HUGH AWDELEY

“**O**ULD AWDELEY” lived so long that he became historical in his lifetime. Successive relays of expectant relatives came and went, whilst he clung to life and treasure. Oh, how this unreasonably deferred ever-green expectation hung just beyond the grasp of each rising generation! The great-grandchildren of his sisters were old enough to be taken for inspection to the rectory of St. Clement’s, but if they returned home filled with anticipations of an early succession, surely a sad look must have come over the countenances of parent and grandparent, as each recalled how they too went on a similar errand, in days gone by, and yet nothing happened, or seemed likely to happen to this hardy perennial, who had lived through 26 years of Elizabeth, 23 of James I, 24 of Charles I, 11 of the Commonwealth, was still going strong at the Restoration of Charles II, and might outlive the lot.

Still, there is an end to everything, and Awdeley knew this perfectly well, and began in good time to apportion out the treasure he had collected. I cannot say that the Grosvenor archives reveal all that could be known about what he had. He probably gave away properties by deeds of gift, which repose in enamelled boxes I have never seen. I have no record, for instance, of Goodmanchester or Cressing Temple, though the

Harveys were at the one, and the family of Sir Thomas Davies at the other. What we do know is that he changed his mind, and that as he got old and feeble, his resolutions drifted to and fro. This happened after he fell in with the Reas, but he soon fell out with them, and returned in the end to his first intention, which was to make provision for the issue of his sisters. To get a picture of how many risks the Ebury property ran of going to other families, I must relate what happened.

If all that "scite, soil, circuit, and precinct" of the Manor of Ebury had been endowed with an intelligent soul, it would surely have been astonished at the number of times Awdeley gave it away and took it away. It might have felt too, after a tranquil lordship of over 500 years under the Abbot of Westminster, that it was somewhat undignified to be leased, re-leased, settled and revoked, with the changing humour of an eccentric elderly gentleman. The first note I have of his dispositions is in 1647, when he was about 70, and I suppose thought it time to settle what was to become of all the lands he held in his grip, when he could no longer hold his breath. So, in June of that year, he drew up deeds settling the Manor of Ebury, and other properties, on trustees, for the benefit of Robert Harvey of Goodmanchester, Co. Hunts, son of his late sister Sarah, "for the consideration of the actual love and affection which he did bear unto him." It was a natural and proper disposition, and it stood firm for several years, but, as luck would have it, Awdeley did not do the same.

In September, 1656, he revoked the settlement of June, 1647, and re-settled Ebury Manor on trustees, "to the use and behoof of Nicholas Bonfoy, son of Samuel Bonfoy, Gent., deceased, son of Alice Clarke, widow, deceased, sister of Hugh Awdeley," for his life; and then to Hugh, his eldest son. In the Visitation of 1663, Nicholas Bonfoy describes himself as living at Hese in Middlesex, and says that his boy Hugh was then 11, so the lad was about 5 when Awdeley settled Ebury upon him. At the same time he settled lands in the counties of York, Lincoln, Notts, Warwick, Wilts and Northants, on trustees, to the use and behoof of Robert Harvey, from whom he took away Ebury.

In March, 1657, came a great change. Ebury Manor was settled on John Taylor, Roger Rea and Thomas Meade, to hold it in trust for John Rea, and Ann his wife, who are to have it after Awdeley's death. Then came a lull until October, 1660, when the settlement of March, 1657, was revoked, but the one that took its place only extended the number of life beneficiaries, and did not change the ultimate destination, which was still John Rea.

After a lapse of twelve months, and the old man's quarrel with the Reas, came the final cataclysm. The Manor of Ebury, secured to John Rea by the settlements of 1657 and 1660, is snatched away by a deed of revocation dated 10 October, 1661, and in the same month is leased to Nicholas and Thomas Bonfoy, and Alexander Davies. This led to the final arrangement on 1 November, 1662, when he settled all his Middlesex

property on Thomas and Alexander Davies. The land is given in trust to Charles Wheeler of Fulham and John Marsh of Covent Garden, "To the use and behoof of Hugh Awdeley during the term of his natural life," and after his death the ground called Market Meadows, "to the use and behoofe of Thomas Davies." And for the lands in tenure of Thomas Grinter, to the use and behoofe of Robert Shirley of Bromeley, Co. Essex, Gent., and Hanna his wife, for the term of their lives, as long as they do not plow up the ground without leave of Alexander Davies, the next heir. And Alexander is to have all the rest of his Middlesex property, and out of it Awdeley's half-brother William Harvie for his life yearly £66 13 4, to be paid "at the four most usual feasts," "in the common Tellinge House of the Old Exchange, in Cornhill." And Mary Lockwood, Awdeley's servant, is to have £30 a year for life out of the same. In several elaborate sentences he reserves power to alter or revoke this deed, and this power is guarded with as many precautions as if he were just turned thirty.

It must have got rather exciting towards the end, for those who were interested, and only knew in part what was going on. I expect the old man enjoyed drawing up these legal effusions crammed with the usual "wherewithal and what-with-standing." He was a legal artist by profession and practice, and obviously loved his job. The many changes he made were due to circumstances we do not know, probably connected with the acquisition of fresh properties. In the main he intended to benefit his family, and the only obstacle

was the Rea family, who feigned a benevolence that took pity on his feeble condition, and everything else they could lay hands on. He took Ebury Manor from both Harveys and Bonfoys, but gave them what were better things in those days, for Belgravia and Pimlico were swampy meads, and Grosvenor Square was not laid out till 1723.

* * *

After the deed of gift on November 1, comes his will, dated 4 November, 1662. Among the Delegates' Probate archives are some rough notes for a will dated 3 October, 1661, in which he desires "To be laid at the feet of the great Divine," "To be buried in the daytime," "To be carried to my Chamber," and something unintelligible about "rosemary." I suppose he wished his body to be laid in his rooms in the Temple, where he had lived and worked so many years, on its way from St. Clement's Rectory to the Temple Church. It looks as if his memory gave way at the end. Among the Delegate papers is the following formal memorandum: "23 Aug., 1662. In remembrance of the great favors which I have received of my very loving friend and kinsman, Samuel Price of London, grocer, for his true performance of many great businesses, which I have imployed him about, and in Especiall one at Worcester House and another at the Parliament, which business has bin of a very great advantage to me as in relation to the benefit of my estate; I doe therefore faithfully promise to leave him at my decease, over and besides what I have, and do Intend to leave unto my very loving cousin his wife, she being one of

my heirs at law, and her child, if it please God that she be safely delivered, and which I hartely desire that she may, £6,000 in money, and likewise out of what moneys and of whom he shall receive it, as likewise a share to himselfe of some part of my estate in Land, which is as yet unsettled, either in a perticuler writing by it selfe, or by my last will and testament. In witness whereof, I have hereunto sett my hand Hugh Awdeley." After all this it is rather astonishing to find the only mention of any Price in his will is the following: "To my cozen Price £100 and to her husband £10 for a ring." Of course, he may have given them property between the 23rd of August, and his death.

Hugh Awdeley's will is given, almost in full, by Mr. Carthew, and I adopt his text. It begins:

"In the name of God, Amen. The fowreth day of November, anno Domini 1662, I, Hugh Awdeley, of the Inner Temple, London, Esq., being though sicke and weake in body yet of perfect memorie, praised be God therefore, doe make this my last will and testament, in manner following. First and principally I commend my soule into the hands of Almighty God the Father Sonne and Holy Ghost my Maker and Redeemer, believinge by the precious death and bloodshedinge of my Redeemer Jesus Christ, and by the mercy of God to have pardon and forgiveness of all my sinnes and to bee saved; my body I (committ) unto the earth, to bee buried in decent manner with as much privacy as may bee, and without any blackes or mourning weeds to bee used at the interring thereof, only rings of a reasonable value to be given to such as shall accompany my corps at the interring thereof in remembrance of their departed friend. And as for those worldly goods wherewith God hath blessed mee, I doe dispose, give, and bequeath the same as followeth.

Item, I give and bequeath unto and for the use of the poore harboured and kept in the three noted hospitalls in or neare London, commonly called and knowne by the name of Christ's hospitall, St. Bartholomew's hospitall, and Saint Thomas' hospitall in Southwarke, to each of them one hundred pounds, . . . Item, I give, and bequeath, and appoint fower hundred pounds to bee given and distributed at the discretion of my executors unto fortie maiden servants such as are knowne to bee Protestants, and to live under the Episcopall government, and not reputed to bee of the Presbyterian religion, Quakers, or any other of the new upstart religions, by tenn pounds a peece, who have served one master or one mistresse by the space of three years next before my death, not being apprentices, or of their kindred, but serveing for wages only."

Later on he says :

" Item, I give unto Marie Lockwood, in reward and recompence and towards a satisfaction of her broaken sleepe and pains taken with mee in my sicknesse, three hundred thirtie-three pounds six shillings and eightpence in money, and all my household goods, apparell, linnen, beds, and bedding. Item, I give unto Mr. Law the minister tenne pounds, and unto Edward Dodson, who was my brother's late servant, tenne pounds; and I also give and appoint one hundred pounds of my estate to bee given and distributed by my executors unto and amongst poore householders whose charge is greater than their meanes and endeavours can support."

The Benchers of the Inner Temple got £100 " towards the repairing of their church." He left " Mr. Fifeild Butler of the Inner Temple, and the Clarke of the Church there, fortie shillings a peece, and to the steward and the rest of the butlers of the said Inner Temple twentie shillings a peece." Beside these there are many legacies of money and plate, mostly to

relatives. "It will be observed," says Mr. Carthew, "that the testator speaks of no real property, except what he held as mortgagee, although he was the possessor of several considerable estates in different counties. . . . The fact is, he had in his lifetime made settlements of all his landed property upon his relations, subject to his own life-interest." He appointed as executors his "loveing freind and kinsmen Mr. Thomas Bonfoy and my two godsonns Mr. Robert Harvey and Mr. Thomas Davies." These proved the will 24 November, 1662. (Prerogative Court of Canterbury. Wills at Somerset House. 134 Laud.)

When Awdeley disposed of his personal property by will, he was so concerned to secure agreement among the beneficiaries, that he overlooked taking a legal precaution, the absence of which caused the very litigation he strived to obviate. He knew that when the carcass became available the eagles would dispute the division, so on the same day he made his will he gathered the birds of prey together, and told them his intentions, to prevent any subsequent misunderstanding. My authority for what happened is a Bill of Complaint in Chancery in 1663 by Nicholas Bonfoy and Alexander Davies, in which it is distinctly stated that before his death Awdeley gave directions for certain articles of agreement to be executed by his three executors, Thomas Bonfoy, Robert Harvey, and Thomas Davies, unto Nicholas Bonfoy and Alexander Davies. By these articles, dated 4 November, 1662, it was agreed that though Awdeley had not made N. Bonfoy and A.

Davies executors with the other three, yet he intended them to share his personalty equally with his executors, so that each of his five nephews should receive an equal part. The reason he gave for not making Nicholas and Alexander executors was, that he thought they would not be so properly serviceable in that capacity for the getting in of his estate. And it was thereby further declared, to prevent any misunderstanding, that it was the true intent and meaning of the said articles of agreement, and of the said parties thereunto, as of the said Hugh Awdeley that all the personal estate should be equally shared between your Orators and the executors, to every one an equal fifth part. All this was very well, but what Awdeley forgot was to appoint any residuary legatee, and, as Mr. Carthew writes, "Awdeley probably intended to have made the executors of his will his residuary legatees for their own benefit, but there were other relations standing in the same degree of affinity and they disputed the will on various grounds. Suits were instituted both at law and in equity which were not altogether terminated forty years after the death of the testator, when all the parties originally interested had left this world and its goods behind. A striking exemplification of the saying of the Psalmist, 'He heapeth up riches and cannot tell who shall gather them.'"

* * *

On November 15, 1662, he passed away in the old rectory down Milford Lane. His body lies in the Temple Church. The entry in the Temple register reads, "Hugh Awdley of the Inner Temple Esq. was buried at uper end of the South isle where the Vestry

now standeth the one and twentieth day of November 1662." This is curious, as it seems to have been made some time after the event. There is, I regret to say, no trace left of the exact spot where the bones of Hugh Awdeley rest under the vestry in the Temple Church. During the restorations of 80 years ago the old vestry was replaced, and all the old gravestones from the floor of the church were pulled up. Many were broken, a few were put into the Triforium, and the rest used to pave the courtyards. Of those put outside all but a very few have had their inscriptions entirely obliterated.

Among the Grosvenor archives is the bill for the funeral expenses: "For the Buriall of the worshppll Hugh Audley Esqe, one of the Masters of the Bench of the Honble Societie of the Inner Templi, in the south Isle of the high Chancell of the Temple Church, upon Fryday night, November 21th 1662." Nothing was charged for the ground or rites, but the minister got 10s., the clerk 5s., the Knells 6s. 8d., and the grave-maker 6s. 8d., and six bearers £1. The grave-maker's petition for further consideration is pinned to the bill: "To the Worshppll gentlemen, Executors of my ancient Master Hugh Audley Esqe. It is humbly prayed by Samuell Hall the Sexton and Grave-maker of the Temple Church, that in regard of his paines and extrordinary care in the making of that grave, your worshpps will be pleased extend your faviour to him as may stand with your good pleasure. And as bound he shall ever pray etc. Samuell Hall." The torches and tapers cost £1 18 0. Four "Lynin Towells to lett down the body into ye grave" cost 12s. The wine "for the bearers

when they fetcht the body from Dr. Dukson's house" cost 2s. Six shillings was paid the bearers for "bringing the corpes from Dr. Duckson's house to the parliament chamber adjoining to the Temple Hall." The total cost was £6 19 10, for which sum a receipt was given to Alexander Davies by John Playford, I suppose "the musical publisher who kept a shop in the Inner Temple, near the church door." (*Dictionary of National Biography*.) It seems that from very early days ceremonies accompanying the burial of the dead have been associated with the refreshment of the living, and so we are not surprised to find among the Awdeley estate accounts bills for entertainment at the Horne Tavern, the Castle Tavern in Paternoster Row, the Ship Tavern "for the Dinner at proving the Will," and for further nourishment at the Griffin Tavern.

* * *

"Where be his Quiddits now? his Quillets? his Cases? his Tenures, and his Tricks? why doe's he suffer this rude knave now to knocke him about the Sconce¹ with a dirty Shovell, and will not tell him of his Action of Battery? hum. This fellow might be in's time a great buyer of Land, with his Statutes, his Recognizances, his Fines, his double Vouchers, his Recoveries: Is this the fine of his Fines, and the recovery of his Recoveries, to have his fine Pate full of fine Dirt? will his Vouchers vouch him no more of his purchases, and double ones too, then the length and breadth of a paire of Indentures? the very Conveyances of his Lands will hardly lye in this Boxe; and must the Inheritor himselfe have no more? ha?"

Hamlet, 5, 1, 107.

¹ Head.

ASPECTS OF HUGH AWDELEY

THE memory of Hugh Awdeley has suffered, like many another, from biographers. Shortly after his death there appeared a small quarto entitled:

THE / Way to be Rich, / According to the
Practice / OF THE / GREAT AUDLEY, /
Who begun with *two hundred* Pound, /
in the Year 1605, and dyed worth *four /
hundred thousand* Pound this instant /
November, 1662. /

Rem, quocunque modo, Rem /

PSAL. 49, 13. /

Yet their Posterity approve their sayings. /

LONDON /

Printed for E. Davis, 1662. /

(British Museum 113 l. 49, and 1029 c.1.) Isaac Disraeli made this tract the text of an article on the methods of 17th century usurers, and described Awdeley as the cony-catcher in the warren, where the half-ruined prodigals were fleeced by the money-lender. He writes of him as "this genius of 30 per cent. . . . this puritan among his money bags," and winds up with an allusion to a "stranger who grasped the million he had raked together and owed him no gratitude at his death." Who this stranger was I cannot imagine, for all Awdeley had was divided before

or after his death among his relatives, some of whose descendants are to this day exceedingly grateful to him. "The legal interest," wrote Disraeli, "was then 'ten in the hundred'; but the thirty, the fifty, and the hundred for the hundred, the gripe of Usury, and the shameless contrivances of the money-traders, these he would attribute to the follies of others, or to his own genius." It is easy to say Awdeley would have said this, but did he? Of course, it is only natural that anyone combining the names of Isaac and Israel should pour invective on an Anglo-Saxon rival in this particular art, but is it just?

Then comes Mr. F. S. Merryweather, in *Lives and Anecdotes of Misers*, who devotes a chapter to the misdeeds of Awdeley. "His whole life," says this writer, "was one of trickery and disreputable craft. His schemes of villainy were so intricate, and his deceptions so subtle, that few could discover their purpose, or tread the labyrinth of his plot . . . of all the lawyers who disgraced their profession, there was never one so disreputable as Audley; there was never usurer so usurious, never a creditor so unrelenting; and there never was one whose craft wrought the ruin of so many unfortunate, but honest men."

In 1871 Mr. G. A. Carthew published in the 6th vol. of *The Herald and Genealogist* the only efficient attempt yet made at an account of Awdeley. Fourteen years later the *Dictionary of National Biography*, without referring to Mr. Carthew's article, repeated Disraeli's estimate, and went one better, saying "He was always willing to advance money to improvident young gallants; he was indeed a most heartless blood-sucker."

This article was contributed by the late Mr. A. H. Bullen, who wrote to me in 1917, "I fear that I had no special information when I wrote that notice of him in *D.N.B.*, and I am sorry I wronged his memory." So is everybody, for the sake of the *Dictionary*, as well as for Awdeley's memory.

Following the *Dictionary* came Mr. Inderwick, generally very careful, who refers to Disraeli, and the *Dictionary*, and brands Awdeley as "a notorious usurer"; adding the surprising information, that Mr. Davies, the book-seller, whom Awdeley appointed one of his heirs and executors, published his life, "a somewhat ungrateful return for an unexpected legacy." But why identify E. Davis, for whom the tract was issued, with Sir Thomas Davies, truly a book-seller, and great-nephew of Awdeley's, to whom the old man gave before his death 18 acres of land in Westminster, and consulted him about the provisions of his will?

Considering the number of people that subsist on over-draft, the almost universal unpopularity of the money-lender is very astonishing. Whether it arises mostly from the borrower's apprehension of the lender's refusal, or the lender's apprehension about the borrower's repayment, is not yet determined. Charles Lamb touched this human foible with exquisite humour.

"The human species, according to the best theory I can form of it, is composed of two distinct races, *the men who borrow, and the men who lend*. To these two original diversities may be reduced all those impertinent classifications of Gothic and Celtic tribes, white men, black men, and red men. All the dwellers upon earth, 'Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites,' flock hither and do naturally fall in with one

or other of these primary distinctions. The infinite superiority of the former, which I choose to designate as the *great race*, is discernible in their figure, port, and a certain sovereignty. The latter are born degraded. 'He shall serve his bretheren.' There is something in the air of one of this cast, lean and suspicious; contrasting with the open, trusting, generous manners of the other."

I write with deference, but I believe Awdeley's biographers are wrong. They produce no evidence but *The Way to be Rich*, and I consider they distort the main drift of that pamphlet. It is not a condemnation, but a tract in praise of thrift, with Awdeley as the example. Pepys bought the book in 1663, and calls it "a serious pamphlett, and some good things worth my minding." The writer evidently knew little of Awdeley, and starts him in life with £200, though his father was a wealthy mercer, with a house in the country, and died, according to Seymour, leaving "Manors, lands and tenements among his children," very shortly after Hugh Awdeley's birth. His mother also came from a rich city family. Mr. Carthew describes *The Way to be Rich* as "an unauthenticated and catch-penny book," and I agree with him, though it is full of gossip, and all really old gossip is interesting. The only paragraph which condemns his methods I give as it stands, but not because I believe it to be true:—

"By his Scrivener's means he grew acquainted with most of these young gallants, nor were the youngsters so needy, as the other was ready to feed them with money, sometimes with a courteous violence, forcing upon them more than they desired, provided the security were good, or the advantage great: sometimes he would adventure to trust, if his estate in hope were over measure, though he himself were under

age; he adviseth them to be good husbands, and sell first the stragling part of their Estates, perswading them that they should not be sensible of such Sales, which would make their means more entire, as counting the gathering of such sattering rents, rather burdensom than profitable: this he would have at half the value, so that the feathers would buy the goose, and the wood pay for the ground: and when the poor Gentleman had with his money stopped one gap by prodigality, he would open another: O how the Principal, the Use, the Use upon Use swell the debt to an incredible summe, until half the Estate was sold, and then the old man knew, that when half the Estate was gone, the Gentleman would live as if he enjoyed the whole; and though he abated in Possessions, he abated not in Expences: how cunningly would he put his decaying Gentleman upon such projects as in hope of recovery would revive them, or it may be, which is worst, he would engage two decaying Gentlemen together, until they both miscarried: how subtilly would he let his debts grow on until they became to a considerable summe: Gentlemen could not be more careless to pay than he was willing to continue the debt, knowing his Bonds, like Infants, battle best with sleeping."

It is not a pleasant portrait, but was it drawn from life or hearsay? Oddly enough, in another passage, the writer indulges in a diatribe against usury, but does not mention Awdeley. Thrifty old men get a generous helping of petty detraction, and I am sure old Awdeley would have smiled at *The Way to be Rich*, for, on the whole, the book is complimentary. Possibly, he might think it rather mean of writers 250 years after his death using this chap-book as a true bill, not in a Dictionary of National inventions or epitaphs, but of serious biography, where one expects to find authentic information from contemporary historical records.

The evidences about Awdeley to which I have had

access, give other aspects of the man. One of the most important is a parchment roll of his estate at the time of his death. It measures nearly seven inches wide and is five yards long, and gives the names of his debtors by bond and mortgage, and the rate of interest charged. From this one knows the class of people he dealt with, and the pressure he put upon them for repayment. He worked hard to command wealth, not an uncommon ambition. He was exceedingly thrifty, surely no sin in the 17th century. He was a well-trained lawyer, and verily there are too few of these at any time. In 1621 he had to get a pardon from the Crown for an offence against the usury laws, but every English banker of to-day would have had to do the same if he lent money on security and took interest. Dr. Cunningham, in his *Growth of English Industry*, says that "Deposit banking was usurious, according to all the old definitions of that offence. . . . The statute of 1552 prohibits interest as well as usury." The fact is Awdeley lived in an age of transition with respect to loans and interest. The old usury laws leaned back upon the Book of Deuteronomy: "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury: Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury." Those to whom this edict was addressed have never failed the stranger in this matter.

The Catholic Church prohibited usury, and Hergenröther says it was "made a subject of reproach to the Popes . . . that by the prohibition of the receipt of interest on the loan of money real usury was increased,

Thomas Widdowes and Robert Manton. Mareschalles of London 159. by bond dated
 the 20th of May 1658 bound to pay 5 £ 00 s 00 d to pay 5 £ 00 s 00 d to the use of
 of the said 1659

The same Robert Manton Mareschalles of London 160. by bond dated
 and the same 25th of June 1658 bound to pay 5 £ 00 s 00 d to the use of

Charles Widdowes bound to pay 5 £ 00 s 00 d to the use of the said 25th of June 1658

The same Robert Manton and Thomas Widdowes bound to pay 5 £ 00 s 00 d to the use of the said 25th of June 1658
 bound to pay 5 £ 00 s 00 d to the use of the said 25th of June 1658

The same Robert Manton and Robert Manton Mareschalles of London 161. by bond dated
 the 20th of May 1658 bound to pay 5 £ 00 s 00 d to the use of the said 20th of May 1658

and the welfare of whole countries, as well as the growth of commerce, was injured." But, he goes on, "the present economical condition of society, in which money is become a productive commodity, and in which consequently the loan of money is differently regarded, has only come about gradually." Awdeley stood on the threshold of "the present economical condition of society." And who now, save by slavery, could build ships, excavate tubes, and irrigate deserts without capital, which in turn can only be attracted by the hope of interest? And who in Awdeley's days could have sustained the staple source of England's wealth, the produce of her fields and flocks, save by a like process? The Civil War, the bad harvests which accompanied it, and the vindictive compositions, confiscations and imprisonments imposed on landlords, brought widespread ruin. The *Journal of the House of Lords* for 3 June, 1646, gives particulars of the sufferings of Cheshire. It is a pitiful picture, showing how in 1643 the King came to Chester, and plundered a great part of the district, and was followed by Lord Capell, who "in like manner spoiled and robbed the country" several times. Then came an army out of Ireland under Lord Byron, which besieged Nantwich and "spoiled the country." After which came Prince Rupert's army "when he did go to Yorke," and another army led by Colonel Goreing, "both which Armies plundered the Country both of Goods and Cattle, and did what Spoil possible, to the Impoverishing of the same, and utter Undoing of many Families." "After the Battle at Yorke, the Prince with his scattered Forces came back through the County, and

in like Manner spoiled the Remainder of the Country." And on and on goes this miserable catalogue of devastation and ruin, leaving one amazed that any of the land-owning classes survived. When the actual fighting ceased there began an elaborate system for collecting revenue. "Royalists of property," says Mr. Gairdner, "were dealt with in a drastic fashion," so small wonder if they had recourse to the money-lender. Indeed, Sir Ralph Verney wrote, "There is scarcely an honest man that is not in a borrowing condition." (1650-60.)

The first thing that occurs to one on looking at the list of Awdeley's debtors, is their variety and substance. The nobility, gentry, professions and trades are all freely represented. No doubt he was well known to many families, from negotiating them through the Court of Wards, and if he had been the blood-sucking ruffian depicted by Disraeli, how came such men as the Earl of Winchilsea and Sir Philip Musgrave among his debtors? These were not young spendthrifts or gambling ne'er-do-wells, but men of responsible standing and distinction. Among the traders we get merchants, haberdashers, vintners, wax-chandlers, merchant-tailors, pewterers, grocers, and the like, many of them citizens of London.

Among the sufferers from the Civil War we find such names as Thomas Bennett, of Babraham, Co. Camb., who borrowed £515 in 1647, and £824 at a later date, neither of which obligations were discharged in 1662. Then comes Sir John Wake, Bart., who raised a troop of horse for the King, and mortgaged his estate to serve the royal cause. He borrowed £206 13 4 in 1638, still

owing in 1662. Sir John Cotton, Bart., of Lanewade, Co. Camb., was sheriff of the county, and proclaimed Lord Essex a traitor in every market town. He fought for the King, and "carried to him at Oxford the plate sent by the University of Cambridge." Another case is that of Sir Thomas Gardiner, Recorder of London, an old and trusted friend of Awdeley. In 1643 he joined the King at Oxford, and was nominated his Solicitor-General. In 1644 he was prisoner in the hands of the Parliament. In 1647 he paid a fine of £942, and his delinquency was pardoned. In August, 1648, it was resolved in the Commons that Sir Thomas Gardiner have "liberty to go to the King, to attend him during the time of the Treaty." Two of his sons were slain in the Civil War, within a few weeks of each other, and were buried in Christ Church Cathedral, amid "universal sorrow and affection." The eldest was knighted by Charles, as he sat at dinner, on reporting Prince Rupert's success at Newark. Sir Thomas Gardiner had a property at Cuddesdon, which he mortgaged to Awdeley in 1649 for £6,933 6 8; and although Gardiner died first, nothing was done with the property till Awdeley's death, when it was sold, in accordance with a provision in his will.

Among his aristocratic debtors was the Duke of Ormonde. The Duchess, it seems, was in London in 1659, and borrowed for her husband's "occasions" £1,000, John Rea acting as scrivener for Awdeley. Rea continued to collect the interest till Awdeley's death, when his executors got wind of the transaction, as also did Nicholas Bonfoy, but since all of them by October, 1663, were at sixes and sevens, the settlement was

referred to Chancery,¹ the Duke himself being ready to refund, "having sent for the money out of Ireland." Then again there was the Savage family, John, Lord Savage of Rock Savage, Thomas Savage of Beeston, and Edward Savage of Hammersmith, Papists and delinquents, who managed among them to borrow over £1,000 between 1636 and 1639, all unpaid when Awdeley died.

The Hare family, Lord Coleraine and Sir Ralph Hare, had close on £12,000 on mortgage, none of it discharged in 1662. It may be said that these were relatives; quite true, but if he was a heartless villain, surely his relations would be the last to put themselves at his mercy. His brother Thomas made him his residuary legatee, and writes of him as "my right-well-beloved brother Hugh Awdeley . . . whom I make my executor in respect of that confident trust which I have ever found and do repose in him."

The Earl of Antrim borrowed £516 13 4 in 1638, unpaid in 1662. In 1639 a Mr. William Courteen, of Fenchurch Street, borrowed £1,040; his sureties were John, Earl of Bridgewater, and Courteen's son-in-law, Sir Edward Littleton. Sir Edward was a zealous Royalist, and had to pay £1,347 composition for his estate. This was still owing in 1662.

The majority of his aristocratic debtors were Cavaliers, but he also lent a few sums to well-known Roundheads. There was Sir Francis Russell, of Chippenham, Cambs. (a personal friend of the Pro-

¹ Bills and Answers before 1714. Bridges $\frac{64}{71}$.

tor), who borrowed £2,781 in 1659, still owing at Awdeley's death. Sir Francis's son, John Russell, married Frances, Oliver Cromwell's fourth daughter, and widow of the Hon. Robert Rich. Sir Francis Russell's daughter Elizabeth married Henry Cromwell, the Protector's fourth son.

Robert, Lord Rich in 1656-7 borrowed over £700 from Awdeley. His father, Admiral the Earl of Warwick, "who carried Oliver's sword of State at the proclamation of his Protectorate," had petitioned Parliament in 1647 on behalf of his son, regretting his "departure into the King's quarters, but since his return, some years since, he has obeyed all their commands." In 1656 Lord Rich petitioned the Protector: "Is very unhappy to find himself ranked as a delinquent after so many years' peaceable deportment. Had he any real estate in his power, he would gladly contribute to the public charge, but he has none, nor any personal estate, except his clothes, etc." It was this man's son Robert who married Cromwell's fourth daughter in 1657. He died two months after the wedding. His grandfather, Lord Warwick, survived him only two months, and during the following year his father died.

Another group, closely connected with Cromwell, appears among these debtors. Robert Wanton, or Walton, Merchant Tailor of London, Valentine Wanton, of Stoughton Magna, Co. Hunts, and Sir Thomas Pride, had between them (1656 and 1659) as much as £2,000. Some of these transactions are shown in facsimile from Awdeley's roll, on Plate 10. Pride, the abettor of Pride's Purge, and one of the regicides,

was knighted by Cromwell. His daughter married Robert Wanton, who was "ruined by a contract to supply nearly £7,000 worth of cloth at Oliver's funeral." I am indebted to Mr. Waylen's *House of Cromwell* for these particulars. "On the return of royalism, Colonel Wanton, as having been one of the most impetuous of the late King's judges, could of course expect no mercy, and he accordingly retired to some spot in the Low Countries, where he died in the following year."

* * *

There is in the British Museum (c. 18, e. 1, 57) a printed sheet, dated 1661, setting forth "The Oppressions and Wrongs to the value of above ten thousand pounds done by Hugh Audley to Sir Philip Knivett, Baronet, deceased; Occasioned by his selling of his lands in Norfolk, called Buckenham and Tibbenham in 1648 and 1649 to the said Hugh Audley for £18,508 10 0, whereof the said Hugh Audley was to keepe in his hands £6,935 13 4, and to allow interest for it, and to pay the rest to the creditors of Sir Philip Knivett," etc. This statement of grievances and claims made by the creditors of Sir Philip is a long complicated story, giving only one side of the case. It was probably published because the creditors had no case in law, for in 1652 Awdeley himself begged that the matter might be left to the judgment of the Court. It is plain from the Calendar of the Committee for the Advance of Money, that Awdeley was examined by the Committee in the presence of Knivett; and Miss Stokes, who has gone through the record, can find no evidence of any concealment or fraud. It is quite possible that

Awdeley was helping to protect the interests of Knivett's children against grasping creditors.

* * *

Very instructive is an account of Awdeley's personal estate made up to 2 July, 1684, from which I gather, as to the afore-mentioned debtors, that Thomas Bennett at that date had paid £869, and still owed £824. Sir John Wake still owed £206 13 4. Sir John Cotton borrowed £398 10 0 in 1657, and had repaid £520 before 1684. The Duke of Ormonde borrowed £1,000 in 1659, and had repaid £1,395 by 1684. The Savage family, which borrowed £1,360 in 1636-8, had repaid £250 in 1684. The Hare family by 1684 had paid all their debt and discharged their mortgage. Lord Antrim, who borrowed £516 13 4 in 1638, had managed by 1684 to reduce his liability by £300. William Courteen, who borrowed £1,040 in 1639, was still owing the same sum in 1684. Sir Francis Russell by 1684 had paid his debt. Robert, Lord Rich, who borrowed £717 in 1656, had repaid £885 by 1684. Thomas Pride and Valentine and Robert Wanton had not managed to contribute anything towards the discharge of their debt by 1684. After reading these figures I think my readers may spare themselves any tears and lamentations with regard to the victims of the *Dictionary of National Biography's* "heartless blood-sucker."

* * *

As to the rate of interest charged by Awdeley, we have his own testimony with regard to the shaky securities offered him by the Reas, in each case 6 per cent. per annum. In addition to this we have a record in

Alexander Davies's accounts to the executors of several cases of various kinds, every one of which is set down at 6 per cent. There is no sign of any interest over 6 per cent. anywhere in the accounts. We may not know all, but what we do know is neither gossip nor surmise. It may be said, how could so large a fortune accrue from such a rate of interest? But we must remember that in *The Way to be Rich* indication is given that Awdeley speculated in shipping and merchandize, and that our evidence is limited to money advanced on real estate. Perhaps there was another ledger of an earlier date which we have never seen.

The passage from *The Way to be Rich* reads thus :—

“Section 3. How he ventured with a Merchant.

Having furnished himself with a considerable summe of money, he resolved to venture £200 in four Ships, £50 in each; One whereof failed, the other three returned happily with his thrice fifty pounds, made thrice two hundred; and really there is not a nobler way of disposing money either for honour or advantage than in the publick way of Trade and commerce, where with a little observation a man may make such advantage of the contingency in several Nations as may quickly raise a man to an estate, which he may live on handsomely and comfortably, and at death bequeath honourably; what advantages this Gentleman (by the Bie out of his profession) made of the Wares (wars) with *Spain* and *Holland* in reference to the commodities that have relation to those Countries, was only known to himselfe, he being very reserved in that which he gained out of the reach of his profession, only this is well known that Ship of Currance (currants) arriving a little before Christmas, wherein he had a share; upon a sudden Embarge was raised by him and some Partners to an incredible summe of *money* by intelligence held with some Factors they had abroad.”

*

*

*

As to his will, its provisions are not miserly, nor are the gifts mean. John Davies owed him money for twenty years, and died without repayment, but this does not hinder Awdeley from leaving his widow £1,000, and making both her sons rich men. He forgives other poor debtors their obligations, and leaves them legacies. Of Robert Harvey he says, "And I doe alsoe hereby remise, release and quit claime unto my said nephew Robert, all such debts, duties, and demands whatsoever in anywise due unto mee upon his former accompts, which I accompt to bee very great, and hee would never perfect them; and now my intent and meaning is, hee shall never bee questioned for them." Later on in the will, apparently to make Robert Harvey present his account, for the convenience of his executors, Awdeley leaves his children £5,500, "but with this condition, that whereas their father hath accompts dependeing with mee for two yeares past, if hee shall not within the space of one month next after my decease perfect those accompts, and cleare with my executors the foote of the same, that then soe much as my executors shall discover to bee due upon the said accompts, and shall rest as a certaine sum at the foote thereof to be paid, shall be deducted out of the said severall legacies." He left to his "honourable friend and kinsman Hugh Lord Colraine and Sr Ralph Hare, Baronett, to each of them soe many peices of plate as shall cost five hundred pounds."

*

*

*

Considering the number of gentry that sought the assistance of Hugh Awdeley, one cannot help thinking that much correspondence of his must repose among the

archives of English country houses. The Grosvenor records retain a few tattered relics of letters that passed between him and his fellow-clerk, Thomas Fabian, in August, 1650. At this time Awdeley was acting as High Sheriff for Norfolk, Parliament having threatened in 1649 to fine him £1,000 if he would not serve. So up he went, and Fabian watched over his affairs in London, reported progress, and retailed news. On the back of Fabian's letters Awdeley sometimes copied his reply. Fabian addresses his letters, "To the Worshipfull and my much honoured Master, Hughe Awdeley Esqre, highe Shereife of Norfolk at Olde Bucknam. These presents." He generally begins "Worthy Sir," or "Worthy Master." One commences, "Most courteous Master." The letters all refer to the protection of his pocket from the demands of the Commonwealth officials, who were trying to seize his London lands as Crown property, and levy military obligations upon him. "Pray make known," he wrote to Fabian, "that I am charged here (in Norfolk) for all my Estate both real and personal, and that in such a proportion, as never was any man before." Fabian writes to console him:—

WORTHY SIR,

My humble services remembered, I have received your letter of the last of August, and sorry that you stand still so highly charged in the Militia. Mr. Webb did complain to Mr. Heveningham that you were hardly used, and Mr. Davy did second him, and withal desired Mr. Heveningham to write on your behalf, who promised to write, and came afterwards to their house, and related that he had writ on your behalf. I was this morning with Mr. Sewell, and with one of Mr. Poulteney's tenants, they do not as yet hear of any

proceedings in the new Militia with them, and they do confess Brookefield may be yours in reversion, but the residue not yours but other men's. Mr. Poultney hath bought as much in houses and land as must cost him 2,000 and odd pounds. I was most part of yesterday in the new Treasury and with the officer. The stairs are making, and the plasterers make an end this day. The smith was setting upon irons in the windows. Casements, glass and a lock are preparing. I desired to be acquainted with the joiner that I might confer with him about the presses. The carpenter told me that Mr. Carter the Surveyor General had not left any order for presses, and told me that if presses be to be made, as in the former, they will not be made in four months and some money paid them; and further said that it was moved and promised in my presence, and other gentlemen with me, that the presses over the Parliament House should be removed to this place, but we have not any order for it, neither will Mr. Carter be in town until after Michaelmas. I conceive that those evidences and records that lie next the walls, are in greater danger and in worse condition than those in the middle of the room. And if those were removed and laid in the middle of the new Treasury, then all would be in a hopeful way of safety, which I leave to your consideration and direction. The officers confess to be sensible and affected in the condition of the case, but they cannot act without direction, neither will they act without money. The Serjeant at Arms hath promised that when the Surveyor cometh back all matters shall be prepared and fitted. Mr. Wilson did send for me this day was seven-night to his lodgings. I went that way home and several times since, and to-morrow between eight and nine he will attend for me; it is to deliver me Mr. Stirropp's answer or certificate touching the bonds. We hear that Serjeant Boulstredd and Serjeant Greene are rumoured to be made Barons. Sir John Gell has to come to trial to-morrow. Mr. Sewell did desire his service to be remembered, and your health and happiness is desired and prayed for by

Your obliged servant,

THOMAS FABIAN.

The new Treasury, of course, was where Awdeley sat and guarded the archives of the Court of Wards. Awdeley is pleased at the prospect of better accommodation, and replies, "That there is hope we shall shortly have the new Treasury I am very glad, wishing the records were already placed in the same." Later on Fabian indicates the difficulties of getting the work finished: "I have this day as formerly spoken to the Serjeant at Arms and the Surveyor and chief carpenter for hastening the Treasury. They say the workmen shall not depart until the work be done, and in truth the workmen are there, and lock themselves in and sometime play at 9 pins, and work slowly or little." Awdeley's brief notes are entirely business, but Fabian gets in a bit of gossip. "Sir Paul Pindar," he writes, "is dead, and to be buried on Tuesday next. Baron Gates was brought out of the country and buried in the Temple Church on Saturday." On 22 August, 1650, Fabian writes: "Baron Rigby and his Marshall died Sunday night, Baron Yates on Monday night. Mr. Woodward, Sheriff of Surrey, on Tuesday. Mr. Andrews, of Lincoln's Inn, beheaded on the Tower Hill at 3 o'clock this Thursday. The Lord Almighty preserve and defend you from the arrows of this life, and patience in all your sufferings, is the daily prayer of your obliged servant." Awdeley concludes his letters generally with an unusual idiom: "And now," he writes, "thanking for all your care, my love and best wishes to you and all yours remembered dearest."

*

*

*

The truth will out "even in an affidavit," as Mr.

Justice Mathew said. Here, in this gossiping pamphlet, used by Awdeley's biographers to blacken his character, we get a picture of something to be respected. Section 5 of *The Way to be Rich* treats of "How he managed his calling at the Counter when he was his own man."

"When he set up for himselfe, the repute of his care, industry, and ability, drew him a world of Customers, his advice was so ready for their money, and his purse for their Estates, that there was none whose occasions were great, or case perplexed, but they repaired to Awdeley; his advises were brief and weighty, his management of affaires was subtle and close, his own behaviour retyred and reserved, his privadoes and companions were rich, prudent, and industrious, his correspondence was general and usefull, there being very few within his acquaintance but such as were subservient to his thriving way, his vigilance was observable, his condescention to the meanest was obliging, his garbe was grave and decent, his expences improved and usefull," etc.

Section 10 deals with "What a landlord he was." He would say that "a man had best let his Land on a reasonable rate, so that the tenant by employing his stock, and using his industry, may make an honest livelihood, thereby to maintain himself and his children." Do those who blame Awdeley for lending money on land to needy ne'er-do-wells, really believe that tenants thrive better under spendthrifts than under thrifty landlords?

His official conduct is described as beneficent. "In the Court of Wards he gained money by doing good office, viz. in hindering some great persons to make a prey of young Heires, for some fees allowed him by the Heire's relations; and therefore he was the father of the fatherless."

His general maxims about thrift are quite good :—
 “ They cannot thrive that are not punctual.” “ They cannot thrive who have not an exact Account of their Expences and Incoms.” “ They cannot thrive who are of too light, voluble and wandering minds.”

* * *

I cannot find any portrait of Hugh Awdeley, and one wonders what he looked like. Acute, surely, but probably kindly, for I do not find anything despicable about him, and he certainly had a sense of humour.

“ There was an Heir belonged to the Court of Wards, about whose Lands this was a controversie, where his Lands lay : saith Audley, if you cannot find his Lands in the Country, how can we find them here ? ”

Another anecdote from *The Way to be Rich* says,

“ His friends were few, but choice : his Great friends used to wait upon him in great state to gain credit and repute : one among the rest came always attended with a large retinue, who it seems were onely hired for the time, and so dismissed when the complement was over ; this was observed by the old man, and one time the Grandee taking his leave of him with extraordinary Complements, spare your Complement, said he, for I believe I shall shortly see you again, but let me, I pray you, salute your servants, whom I shall never see again.”

Although *The Way to be Rich* says nothing about his countenance, there are a few words concerning his clothing :—

“ Besides his thrift in Dyet, he was very close in Apparel ; for as the fashion of those times went, he wore a Trunk Hose with Drawyers upon all occasions, with a leather Doublet, and plate Buttons ; and his special care was to buy

good Cloth, Linnen and Woolen, the best being best cheap, and to keep them neat and clean, for he observed that dust and dirt did cloaths more harm than wearing; and since when his cloaths were misplaced, he would say to his servants, I weare cloaths enough, you need not weare them too."


* * *

Considering the number of villainies Awdeley's biographers have led us to expect and failed to find, I think it is surprising how many of these we can prove to have been practised on him. Thieves broke into his Temple chambers twice, and stole over £700. Blake built a house on his property on the strength of a forged document. Goring took his land and only paid for a fraction of it, and then borrowed money on it from Denny. Denny took Awdeley into Court, and Awdeley had to pay him £1,100, to buy back some of his own freehold. The Commonwealth turned him out of a highly lucrative Government billet, for which he is said to have given £3,000, and gave him no compensation. Charles II gave to somebody else £5,000 compensation due to him. Isabel Smith stuffed forged documents in among those he had charge of. The Reas tried to make away with his goods and papers. His executors quarrelled over his will, though they had sworn to agree, and now his biographers vilify his memory; so one cannot help being glad that he had a sense of humour!

THE DAVIES FAMILY

AS the fortunes of Alexander Davies and his offspring form the chief interest of this story, I give a short account of the Davies family, but can find no record of their kindred anterior to that on their pedigree in the 1664 Visitation of London, reproduced on Plate 11 by permission of the College of Arms. There is no trace of any grant of these Davies arms, which were concocted from Welsh originals, and allowed at the Visitation. The shield shows the arms of Davies quartering Pecock and Awdeley.

Alexander's father, John Davies, who married Awdeley's niece, Mary Pecock, left a bundle of 33 documents, mostly bonds for money owed him between 1619 and 1645. Smyth's *Obituary*, 24 December, 1652, enters "John Daves, Old Jury, Broaker, a prisoner in Ludgate, buried in St. Olave's Old Jury; his son Tho. Daves, a bookseller, was afterwards an Alderman and Lord Mayor of London, enriched by the legacy of Hugh Audley." What financial difficulties got John Davies into prison we know not, but considering the insanitary condition of those places it is not surprising he died there. Thomas Awdeley, Hugh's elder brother, had a good opinion of the man, and says in his will (2 April, 1641), "I desire my cousin John Davys citizen and draper of London, whom I persuade myself will be



Robert Davie of Wykeham
in Great Lane Street
Essex

John Davie of Wykeham
Baronet in Great
Lane Street
Essex

Stephen Davie of
London

Elizabeth da
John Davie of
Essex
after Charles High
Kilby of Essex
Essex

John Davie
Essex

John Davie of London
Proprietor and Merchant
of Barbadoes

Mary Davie
of London

Married

St. Thomas Davie Knight
and Alderman of London
died 1632

Elizabeth da
William Davie
of London

Alexander Davie
of London married
Mary da High
Kilby of Essex
Essex

Thomas Davie
Essex

Mary Davie
Essex

Married

Thomas Davie

John Davie of
London

John Davie
Essex

Married

both willing, trusty and faithful, to be aiding and assisting to my . . . executor in . . . helping him to provide things necessary for my funeral, and in consideration of his travell and pains to be taken therein I give him £ 10." John Davies's widow lived till 1665, apparently in good circumstances. She left the lease of her house in Old Jewry to a daughter, £ 100 to each of her children, £ 50 to her grand-daughter Mary Davies, and her "Diaper lynnens," "best greene carpet," and "Turkey worke chaires" to her son Thomas. She left the poor prisoners in "the two Counters and Ludgate" 40s. each prison.

Her eldest son went to St. Paul's School, and appears thus in the Register: "Thomas Davies, son of John Davies, of London, draper; free of the draper's Co.; an eminent bookseller; served as Sheriff in 1667; Knighted Oct. 23; Lord Mayor 1677 when the Monument was erected to commemorate the Great Fire. Died in 1679 aged 48, buried in St. Sepulchres Church." Pepys, 23 November, 1662, writes: "I hear to-day how old rich Audley is lately dead, and left a very great estate, and made a great many poor familys rich, not all to one. Among others, one Davis, my old school-fellow at Paul's, and since a bookseller in Paul's Church Yard." In 1667 Pepys went to see Charles II lay the first stone of the first pillar of the Exchange, and noted that one of the sheriffs "is Davis, the little fellow, my school-fellow, the bookseller, who was one of Audley's Executors, and now become Sheriffe; which is a strange turn methinks." Although these 17th century worthies were often generous to one another in pompous Latin inscriptions on

marble monuments, they could be fairly acid on occasion. A contemporary account of the City aldermen for 1672 says of Sir Thomas Davies, "hee knows as well how to keep as Audley knew how to get and keepe . . . a meane spirited person . . . one that will venture as little as may be, either for the safety of the King, or service of the state."

The next son, Alexander, became a scrivener. His admission to Merchant Taylors School is thus recorded: "Davies Alexander second son of John draper, b in Olaves Jewry 17 Apl. 1636."

ALEXANDER DAVIES, LORD OF THE MANOR

THE death of Hugh Awdeley put Alexander Davies into a new position in life. Hitherto he had worked for wages, but now he was a landed proprietor, with an estate in the neighbourhood of London, and believed himself entitled to a large slice of Awdeley's personalty. The income of the Ebury property when he got it was about £1,300 a year, a startling contrast to his previous salary. He was young and ambitious, and soon turned his mind to the development of his property. Ebury Manor was a long way from London, and there was strong opposition to the development of the capital at the expense of the country. Note the following from Rushworth's *Historical Collections*, Vol. 2, p. 232:—

“Ann. 1635. About the beginning of this Year an Information was exhibited in the Star Chamber by Sir *John Banks* the King's Attorney General against 7 Lords, about 60 Baronets and Knights, and 100 Esquires, who had Offices and Places in several Counties, and divers Ladies of Quality; reciting, That *Q. Elizabeth* and *K. James* had by several Proclamations commanded Persons of Livelihood and Means to reside in their Countries, and not in or about London; and his present Majesty . . . hath observ'd a greater number of the Nobility, Gentry, . . . to resort of late to *London, Westminster*, . . . and to reside there . . . contrary to the antient usage of the *English Nation*; . . . and by their Residence in *London*, etc., they are become unserviceable, and

draw their Mony from the Country, and spend it in the City in excessive Apparel, provided from foreign Parts, to the enriching of other Nations; and consuming the Treasure of this in vain Delights and Expences, to the wasting of their Estates, and the Poor not reliev'd or set on work."

We find the same feeling in Cobbett, two centuries later, who called London the Great Wen. Indeed it has been maintained that in old days the families living near the capital suffered extinction much more rapidly than those who resided at a distance.

What Alexander wanted was a marketable building site. What he did was to offer £2,000 for 18 acres on Millbank, close to the City of Westminster, which Awdeley had given to Thomas Davies when he gave Ebury to Alexander, and having secured the land he plunged into a building speculation. What he ultimately got from Awdeley's personal estate was so much less than he expected that he had to borrow money and entangle his real property.

He had hoped and believed that as Awdeley had gathered his executors and secretaries together, and made them covenant to share and share alike, he would have capital enough to develop his Millbank property, but he soon found he was mistaken. On 14 April, 1663, the three executors, Major Thomas Bonfoy, Robert Harvey, and Thomas Davies, with Awdeley's two clerks, Nicholas Bonfoy, brother of Major Thomas, and Alexander Davies, brother of Thomas Davies, met at the Mermaid "by Grayes Inn," to compose a certain difference which had arisen since the death of Awdeley, touching their respective shares. "Now, therefore, for

a final end and determination of the said difference, and for a right understanding," they proceeded to agree to certain rules and regulations; to an inventory of debtors and creditors; to the payment of legacies and funeral expenses, and to the equal division amongst the whole five persons of the remainder of the estate. They agreed that a "trunck, or chest, or place" be selected, in which all documents be placed, and none of them detain deeds in their own custody. The evidences were to be scheduled, and locked in a trunk, for which there were to be three keys, two for the three executors, and one for Alexander Davies and Nicholas Bonfoy. Before the meeting ended Alexander put in his account, with an affidavit to which he was prepared to be sworn, "but the executors replied that there might be some things forgotten by him, which they might think of. . . . Therefore, after they had perused it, one of them would go along with him at any time, and see him sworn. Yet it may be they might not put him to his oath at last. Upon this Alexander Davies addressed himself to Mr. Brownell their attorney and said, 'Ay, but Mr. Brownell, I am obliged by the Articles to deliver up my account upon oath, therefore, if I am not now sworn I shall break the Articles'; he answered, 'No, no; there is no need of it presently, any other time would serve as well.' Alexander replied, 'I must not trust to that.' The executors with one consent answered, 'If they could they would not offer to take any advantage against him for that, they desired only to look over the account first, and then any other time should serve as well.'"

The schedule of debtors put in by Alexander has

been referred to on p. 140, and after it came a short list of such things as: "Item, in a box, 16 Roman heads mounted in gould, 12 gould rings, . . . a small necklace of pearl with seven small dyamonds, one necklace of large pearl contayning 44 pearles." "Item, one silver and guilt pott, with a gould chaine, and a hatt band with studds." "Item, 30 pieces of gould 34^s, twelve crusadors of Portuge £3 6 8 in gould, six meddalls about £4 value; forty two peeces of ould gould; one hundred Angells in gould; forty eleaven shilling peeces of gould; fourtene peeces of Barbary gould about 18^s; three pounds fifteene shillings in tenne odd peeces of gould."

Before the year was out Nicholas Bonfoy and Alexander Davies commenced proceedings in the Court of Chancery against the three Executors, and on that gloomy threshold I propose to leave them.

As there has been some speculation with regard to Alexander's residence, I note here that in a document dated 8 October, 1662, his "dwelling house" is given as in "Southampton Buildings near Gray's Inn." Smyth says he died "at Westminster," so likely enough he moyed there to superintend his building scheme. In the Churchwardens' Accounts of St. Margaret's, a Mr. Davies is rated in Bell Alley, out of King Street, Westminster, in 1663 and 1664, which rating in 1665 is charged to "Widow Davies," and that would fit the case.

The legend that he was an alderman and a dairymen, and lived at Bourdon House in Davies Street, Berkeley Square, alluded to in the Preliminaries, has no founda-

tion in fact. Bourdon House was built, almost surely, between 1721 and 1723. Mr. Norman thought that Burdon Street first appeared in the rate books in 1739, but the courteous guardians of those records have shown it to me in the year 1726. In 1725 it seems to have been called Grosvenors Passage, and in that year a Captain John Burden has a tenement rated at £60, which I think must be Bourdon House. In 1726 William Burden is rated for the same sum in Davies Street. This was a very high rating compared with all the houses around. It fits in with a printed list of ground rents for sale, late the estate of Richard Barlow deceased, which is at Eaton. The properties were leases granted 15 July, 1721, for sixty years from Sir Richard Grosvenor to Thomas Barlow, "which said premises are situate and being on the south side of Grosvenor St., the East side of Davies St., and in Grosvenor Meuse." William Burden Esq. has a lease from 1723 at a ground rent of £18, "two houses and a stable yard, at an improved rent of £150." The style of decoration confirms the above date. Mr. Oliver Brackett, of the Victoria and Albert Museum, attributes the pitch-pine panels and their carving to 1720-40.

On 4 August, 1663, Alexander settled the Manor of Ebury upon Luke Killingworth, and Edward Green, in trust for himself and his heirs; and failing heirs, he assigned £50 a year to his mother for 12 years, and if she survived that time, £100 a year for life. To Sarah Gournall, his sister, an annuity of £40 for 12 years, and if she survived that date, £100 a year. To Dorothy Small, his sister, £30 for 12 years, and after that £100. To William Docwra, his brother-in-law, £100

for 12 years, and after that £ 200. To Mary Davies, his wife, £ 100 a year for life, "As a token of his respect to his said wife, beyond her dower or right of Dower in the premises, or any other her customary or other share or proportion of in or to the estate real or personal of the said Alexander." To his brother Thomas and his heirs a full third part of the Manor for ever, and two full third parts of the same to his brother William.

* * *

During the brief time Alexander owned Ebury Manor two attempts were made to snatch it, or a bit of it, from his hands. In 1663 a Bill was presented before the Lord High Treasurer by Sir Geoffrey Palmer, Attorney-General, inspired by an error so ludicrous, one can hardly believe it really happened. The Attorney pleaded that the late Sir Allen Apsley, Lieutenant of the Tower, and Victualler of the Fleet, "pretended" that Charles I owed him £ 42,276, for supplying expeditions "beyond the seas," whereas Sir Allen was indebted to his Majesty "in a far greater sum . . . to this day unsatisfied." To get £ 20,000 out of Charles, secured by landed estate, Apsley got the King to issue Letters Patent (17 September, 1628) to Apsley's "menial servant" Stephen Alcock, granting lands, including "Highbury ffarme alias Newington Barrow." When Apsley died, Alcock, to whom Apsley assigned the royal grant, seized the property, and the Attorney-General, confusing Eybury with Highbury, in accordance with the Cockney custom, sued the executors of Awdeley, and Alexander Davies, together with Alcock, for a conspiracy to defraud the Crown. Alexander's reply is on the Bill :

“My estate is and was never otherwise . . . called Ebury farm . . . and besides, King Charles was never seized of my estate, for it was purchased of King James . . . therefore the estate called . . . Highbury or Hilbery farm, is not my estate, but some estate else.”

* * *

The second attempt was made by Jones and Jacob, the two tribesmen who, it will be remembered, were seeking to recover £25,000 from Lord Goring's estate, and hoped to lay hands on Goring House, but failed.

* * *

The interest attaching to the site of Goring House, now Buckingham Palace, has caused me to give here a few interesting notes, gathered from Alexander's papers. In his reply to the claim entered by Jones and Jacob, Alexander says he was informed that Edward Denny acknowledged to Awdeley, when Awdeley bought the house, that it was “in soe greate decay that” £1,500 would not “put itt in repayre.” He hath heard also and doth believe that it was “so meanelly and improvidently Built, and was runn into soe great decayes and ruines that to susteyne the same from fallinge,” Hugh Awdeley and his tenants laid out great sums of money. He believes also that he can prove that Awdeley “repayred the said house severall tymes, and that when the same was repayred soldiers have been putt into the same whoe have made such wast and spoyle therein, that before he could let the same to any Tenant hee hath beene forced to repayre the same agayne, and that besides what hee payd the said Edward Denny hee was out of purse about the said howse Three Thousand

pounds att the Least besides his Travell and Attendance.”

We learn also that among the tenants of Goring House during Alexander's lifetime was Daniel O'Neill, of the family of Tyrone, and, according to Lord Clarendon, nephew of the celebrated Irish confederate, General Owen Roe O'Neill. Alexander let the premises to him 30 May, 1663. O'Neill fought with Prince Rupert, and had been Groom of the Bed-Chamber to Charles I. In October, 1641, he was committed to the Gate House at Westminster, and in December accused of High Treason. In 1642 he petitioned for his health's sake to be bailed, or, "to go abroad with his Keeper to take the air." The Lords removed him to the Tower, telling the Lieutenant to let him have "fitting Liberty." This he took for himself, and on 6 May, 1642, Sir Harry Vane told the House of Commons that O'Neill was escaped. The ports were stopped, and the Lords told the Lord High Admiral to search for him, and described him as "being of a sanguine Complexion, of a middle Stature, having light brown Hair, about the Age of Thirty Years, little or no Beard, and of late hath been sick." O'Neill got to the Continent and became Groom of the Bed-Chamber to Charles II during exile. This office he continued to hold after the Restoration, as well as that of Postmaster-General of the three kingdoms, Master of the Powder, and the command of the King's Horse Guards. He died at Belsize House, Hampstead, 24 October, 1664, aged 60.

Out of this tenancy arose some dispute, for in the

Alexander Davies, Lord of the Manor 167

Journal of the House of Commons, 14 May, 1663, it was "Ordered, That Alexander Davies, William Dockwra, John Warner, and Francis Gregg, be sent for in the Custody of the Serjeant at Arms . . . for their Breach of Privilege, in causing Actions of Ejectment to be brought, and Declaration to be delivered, to Mr. Oneale, a Member of this House, and his Tenant, to try the Title of certain Messuages and Lands in the Possession of the said Mr. Oneale, and his Tenants." On 17 June following, Davies and Gregg were "discharged of their Commitment, paying their fees." On 2 April, 1664, the *Journal of the House of Commons* reports that "A Petition of Alexander Davyes Gentleman, was read. Ordered, That this Petition be referred to the same Committee to which the Bill concerning the Water brought from Hide Park to the City of Westminster, and Parts adjacent was committed; to take the Petition into Consideration, and examine; and report the Matter to the House." I hope someone will have better fortune than I have had in finding out what this petition was about. The index to the *Journals* says it was "laid aside"!

On 10 May, 1665, an indenture was drawn up between Alexander and Lord Arlington, which states that Lord Arlington "hath propounded" to give him £3,500 for Goring House and gardens, then in his lordship's tenure. No doubt Lord Arlington purchased O'Neill's unexpired lease.

* * *

Among the Grosvenor archives is a copy of a warrant signed T. Southampton, to Sir Robert Long,

Auditor of his Majesty's Exchequer, to pay Mr. Anthony Cogan "the rent of the great garden and of the Mulberry garden feild." What Cogan did was to take two leases from Hugh Awdeley for nine and fifteen years, of the Mulberry Garden Field and the great garden, involving a total payment of a little over £1,000 by annual instalments. He then sold these leases to Charles II for '£2,500 in cash,'¹ subject to the annual rents of "fourscore pounds per annum and one hundred of apples or tenne shillings in money in lieu thereof for the said great garden. And the yearly rent of 20 and one pounds for the said Mulberry Garden Feild." (Grosvenor London Documents. No. 85.) On 22 March, 1663, Alexander Davies gave a receipt to Cogan for this rent, for the great garden, and the Mulberry Garden Field, both in occupation of the King.

* * *

In Dorothy Osborne's first letter to Sir William Temple (1652) she says: "I will give you an account of Myself, and begin my story, as you did yours, from our parting at Goring House." The modern editor of her letters unfortunately did not inquire where this mansion was, and says: "Its grounds stood much in the position of the present Arlington Street"! He also says that in 1665, Goring House was the town house "of Mr. Secretary Bennet, afterwards Lord Arlington"; though Bennet was created Lord Arlington in 1664, and for some years before that was Sir Henry Bennet.

* * *

¹ Calendar of Treasury Books. Appx. 1. Crown Lease Book, p. 1542. Stowe MS. 498, pp. 43-6.

After these few details about Alexander's estate, gathered from his papers, I will now resume the main thread of our story, and come, after what I fear the reader will consider a long and circuitous route, to the birthday of the heroine of this drama.

On 17 January, 1665, Mrs. Alexander Davies gave birth to a daughter, whose baptism is thus recorded in the registers of St. Giles in the Fields: "3 Feb. 1664-5, Mary, dau. of Alexander Davies Esqr and Mary his wife borne the 17 day of January last and baptized this third day of February."

* * *

In the midst of domestic happiness, and adventurous building speculation at Millbank, Alexander was stricken by the Plague. Smyth's *Obituaries*, 3 July, 1665, says: "Alexander Davis, scrivener, died at Westminster, suspected (not returned) of the plague; his mother Mis Davis in Old Jury, died there." A petition to the Lord Chancellor from Cooke, etc., 10 May, 1694, states that Alexander "died of the plague." He was buried in the churchyard of St. Margaret's, and a tombstone, the only one I have noticed still remaining, and possibly left there at the wish of the first Duke of Westminster, records: "Here lyeth interred the Body of Alexander Davis of Ebury in the County of Middlesex Esquire who dyed July 2nd Anno Domini 1665, aetatis suae 30." In Walcott's *Memorials of Westminster* (p. 163), he is called "Alexander Ebury" after the Caledonian manner.

JOHN TREGONWELL

ON the death of Alexander Davies, in July, 1665, his widow found herself at the age of 21, in what is called an eligible position. Alexander died intestate, and his fortune was by law divided between his daughter and widow, the child inheriting two-thirds, and the mother one-third for life. Besides this Alexander had settled £100 a year upon his wife, so, as she said, she "was look't upon to bee in great plenty." But her husband had speculated heavily in buildings on Millbank that were not finished, and when he died his affairs were much involved. Nevertheless the prospects were good, the heiress was barely a year old, some of the property was very saleable, and it only wanted a capable head to organize matters for the benefit of the child and herself. To this end her friends suggested she should make a second marriage with Mr. John Tregonwell, of Anderstone Manor, whom she described as "a gentleman of an ancient good familie, of a competent estate in Dorsetshire, known to bee a man of honour and good understanding, and a Member of Parliament." And so, among the Vicar General's marriage allegations we find 15 February, 1666, "John Tregonwell, of Anderson, Co. Dorset, Esq. widower, about 35, and Mrs. Mary Davies, of St. Clement Danes, widow about 22." The wedding took place at Chelsea a week later.

The whole affair seems rather sudden, but the circumstances were urgent. The lady felt that the responsibility was more than she could cope with, and she was probably right. So the "faire Mansion house" by the river bank, which Alexander built for himself, but did not live to roof in, and on which Dr. Dukeson spent £200 to keep the weather out, became the London home of Mr. and Mrs. Tregonwell, the infant Mary Davies, and Tregonwell's son John by a previous marriage.

The Tregonwell pedigree needs rectification. Hutchins's *Dorset* (Ed. 1861, p. 161) credits this John Tregonwell with three wives, (1) "Lewes, dau. of Lady Beauchamp. (2) . . . dau. of Sir George Fane. (3) Mary, dau. of Dr. Dickenson, rector of St. Clement's; afterwards relict of Alexander Davis." The only issue of these alliances given by Hutchins is through Lewes Beauchamp, namely, "Dorothy, married Thomas Warr of Swill Court, Somerset; d. 1736. Jane, married Dan. Waterland, D.D. 1761. Elizabeth, married Edward Seymour: and John Tregonwell, born 1701; died 1760."

Several of these statements are demonstrably false. First, the third wife's name was Dukeson, not Dickenson. Second, she was relict of Alexander Davies before she married Tregonwell, not after. Third, we have among the Grosvenor archives the marriage settlement of Elizabeth Seymour, which proves conclusively, by stating it explicitly, that John Tregonwell and his wife Mary had four daughters. This document recites the marriage settlement of their parents, John Tregonwell

and Mrs. Mary Davies, which makes provision for possible issue, and the Seymour settlement states distinctly, "John Tregonwell, about February, 1681, died, and left four daughters by the said Mary, viz. Elizabeth, Dorothy, Jane and Mary." Hutchins's pedigree is wrong as to the daughters, and, as to the son John, one is left in bewilderment, for Hutchins says he was born in 1701, that is when the mother assigned to him by Hutchins had been dead certainly forty years, and the father had been buried about twenty! Some Dorset antiquary should set to work on this pedigree. The only interest I have in it concerns the daughter Dorothy, who married Thomas Warre of Swell (not Swill!) Court, for her daughter Jane married Sir Robert Grosvenor, and from them came the present Grosvenor family.

It is, however, of some general interest to note here that the eldest girl Elizabeth married first Henry (not Edward) Seymour, and afterwards Dr. James Welwood, a well-known historical writer. He was educated at Glasgow, became M.D. of Leyden, and came to England with William III. He wrote, at the request of Queen Mary, an account of the Stuart dynasty in England. William III found the memoir in the queen's cabinet after her death, and handed it to the Earl of Portland to return it to Welwood, who published it.

Dr. Welwood was not always fortunate with regard to his writings. On 9 November, 1691, a complaint was made in the House of Commons of a pamphlet called *Mercurius Reformatus, or, The New Observer*, "reflecting on the Proceedings of the House." The printer and author were ordered to be sent for, "in

custody of the Serjeant at Arms." The printer was Richard Baldwyn, the author Dr. Welwood. On 21 November Baldwyn was brought to the Bar, and on his knees gave Dr. Welwood's name as the author, begged pardon, was reprimanded and discharged, paying his fees. On 27 November Welwood acknowledged his offence and humbly prayed to be "discharged of his Imprisonment," and on the 30th he was brought to the Bar, where "upon his Knees, he received a Reprimand from Mr. Speaker," and was "discharged out of Custody" paying his fees.

In later years Welwood wrote to his mother-in-law, Mrs. Tregonwell, after his marriage :

"Madam, Your Daughter haveing done me the honour to marry me, I hope you are too good to envy me the happiness. I was affraid to ask your Consent before-hand least you should have refused it me : ffor as I know none that deserve her, so I have not the Vanity to think I doe. Its trew She might have bestowed herselfe much better, if the goods of fortune could have tempted her, But She could never have given herselfe to any one that puts a higher value upon the Gift than myselfe, which I shall evidence to her by all the services of my lyfe, and by the purest and most perfect affection and Esteem. Let me therefore Madam humbly implore your pardon both for her and me, and assure you that there is nothing in my power I will not doe to gaine your favour and friendship Being firmly resolv'd to court all opportunity of showing myselfe what I really am, ever to you in particular, and to all yours, Madam, A most humble and a most faithfull servant, James Welwood. No^r 24, 1703."

THE ESTATE OF ALEXANDER DAVIES

WHEN we look at Alexander's estate to-day it is hard to realize the crippled condition in which he left it. Yet there it was, entangled and compromised by a load of liabilities. He bought the land on Millbank from his brother Thomas, but he never paid him for it. He borrowed money right and left, from friends and relations. His mother lent him £400. Awdeley's servant, Mary Lockwood, then Mrs. Crosse, lent him £600. The houses he began to erect were left unfinished, and the builders and bricklayers were left unpaid. The whole amount owing, according to the official estimate, reached "severall Thousand of Pounds." Alexander was suddenly carried off by the Plague in his 30th year, and, according to the word of his widow, he made no will; at any rate no one came forward to proclaim the making or attestation of such a document. And so, on 6 July, 1665, in the Peculiar Court of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster, a commission was issued to "Mary Davies, relict of Alexander Davies, late of the parish of St. Margaret Westminster, deceased, intestate, to administer the goods, etc., of the deceased."

We know from the lady herself that it was the entangled condition of Alexander's estate that led his widow to seek a second husband, and when she and Mr. Tregonwell set out to square up Alexander's affairs,

they soon discovered that in spite of heavy commitments and complications, the estate was a sound and an improving proposition. They discovered, for example, that when Alexander died, half the Ebury property yielded no income, being subject to a lease that was due to expire in ten years' time. They also realized that the heiress herself was a fairly good negotiable asset. There was, too, a margin to be earned from her upkeep during infancy, a bride-price to be got from a prospective husband, with pickings to boot, and a favourable remuneration for the general administration of the estate. The great thing was to get time, to postpone settlement, and see that the heiress was not stolen. Forty years later Francis Cholmondeley described Mr. Tregonwell as an extravagant man who had diminished his estate; but if Mr. Tregonwell stood on the prow, Mrs. Tregonwell sat at the helm, and her masterly mind is apparent through all these negotiations.

Scarcely, however, had the ship set sail when a tempest arose. The creditors it seems were opposed to a policy of procrastination. On 14 November, 1666, Thomas Davies filed a Bill of complaint in Chancery against Mr. and Mrs. Tregonwell, and William Docwra, begging for a writ of subpœna, to make them produce evidences respecting the estate of Alexander Davies, who died owing the plaintiff £4,000. I regret to say Thomas Davies accused the defendants of fraud. He boldly states that Alexander's "relict," Mrs. Tregonwell, "pretending that he died intestate, procured letters of administration of all his goods and

credits, and together with one William Docwra (who then lived in the house with her, and had married her sister), possessed themselves of all the said goods, and of several deeds of mortgage, bonds, bills, etc., including the last will and testament of the said Alexander Davies, whereby he devised considerable legacies to the Plaintiff, and provided for the payment of his debts. And she, the said Mary, the relict, having about April last intermarried with John Tregonwell, he has possessed himself of the goods not disposed of by Mary, the relict . . . and though the Plaintiff hath often in a friendly manner requested John Tregonwell and his wife to pay him the said £2,000 (with £180 for interest), and have requested them, and William Docwra, to discover and produce the said will and settlement, yet they, in confederation refuse to do so."

No decree or order in respect of this Bill has been found, but, during the same month, a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons, "to enable a Sale of Goring House." It was read a second time, 10 November, 1666, and a Committee appointed "to inform themselves of the Debts and Value of the Estate; and to summon and hear all Parties concerned; and to send for Persons, Papers, and Records." Mr. Pepys was on the Committee, but I can find no trace of the contents of the Bill, nor the names of its promoters, nor yet on whose behalf it proposed that Goring House should be sold. A month later, 12 December, 1666, William and Thomas Davies petitioned the House, I suppose to claim the property as part of Alexander's estate, but I do not know. The House of

Commons referred the petition to the same Committee as dealt with the sale of Goring House, and requested the Committee to report on the petition, but I can find no report anywhere. It is possible that this 1666 Bill to "Enable a Sale of Goring House," may have been set on foot by Thomas Davies, who wanted to recover the value of the Millbank land.

* * *

In the year following another, and probably a friendly suit, was instituted against the Tregonwells by their brother-in-law, William Docwra. Alexander Davies had lent Docwra £1,600, for Docwra's "better advancement from shop-keeping to a more credible (*sic*) employment in the Custom House in London." For security, Docwra entered into a recognizance of £3,000, and by an indenture dated 19 February, 1663, Alexander agreed that if the £1,600 was repaid, then the recognizance should be void; but if Alexander died first, before the £1,600 was repaid, the whole debt should be cancelled. When Alexander died Docwra had only repaid £4 3 4, and now he wanted the indenture, and called upon the defendants to produce it. Their view was that they could not part with the deed without an order from the Court. This order was made, and the plaintiff was "acquitted and discharged of the said £1,600, and every part and parcel thereof." (*Chancery Decrees and Orders*, 1666, A. vol. 227 fo. 605.)

* * *

We know very little about the Tregonwells between 1667 and 1675. No doubt during those eight years

their creditors tried all they knew to get paid, while the Tregonwells manœuvred all they could to postpone a settlement. After all, their fruit was ripening, whilst that of the creditors was rotting. They had a lease of half the property falling in, the issue of a law suit about Hugh Awdeley's personalty still pending, as well as an heiress cooking on the stove and nearly ready for eating. And so, at their own good time, on 28 April, 1675, a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons "for vesting Lands of Alexander Davies Gentleman deceased in Trustees for payment of his Debts." On 4 May the Bill was referred to a Committee on which Mr. Tregonwell served, and it received Royal Assent 22 November, 1675. It opens thus:—

"Whereas Alexander Davies late of Westminster Gentleman deceased haveing a great Estate in Lands and Houses in and neare Westminster did in his life tyme begin and had farre proceeded in building a faire Mansion house now or late in the Occupation of the right Honble Henry Earle of Peterborough neare the Horse Ferry of Westminster where the said Alexander Davies and his Tennants had erected a faire Streete towards the Thames side And for carrying on his designes and undertakeings in building upon the premisses did borrow and become indebted severall Thousands of Pounds and before the finishing of the said Mansion House and other Buildings the said Alexander Davies in the tyme of the late great Sicknesse departed this life Intestate greatly indebted leaving Mary Davies his only Daughter and heire an Infant not above Seaven Moneths old and without makeing any Settlement or provision for Satisfaction of his Creditors and before hee had payd any part of the purchase money for the Ground whereon the said Buildings were begun and the other Grounds thereunto adjoining Bee it therefore Enacted," etc.

The Bill then proceeds to deal with portions of the Manor of Ebury, which are to be "vested settled and established unto and upon" Sir Thomas Davies, William Davies, Dr. Dukeson, John Tregonwell and William Docwra, "upon TRUST and Confidence nevertheless and to the intent that all and every the premises so vested and settled shall as soone as conveniently may bee sold," to satisfy Alexander's creditors.

The Act defines the portions of the property which were to be sold, and amongst them was Goring House with the garden "Haveing therein a Tarras Walke and Mounts sett with Trees . . . now or late in the Tenure of Henry Earle of Arlington." Besides which there was a kitchen garden lying beside the highway to Chelsea, a little messuage with a great yard and pond enclosed with a brick wall. Also, one other great garden, containing 20 acres enclosed with a brick wall, and other small plots both south and north of Piccadilly.

From this Act it is clear that most of the premises round Buckingham Palace formed part of the inheritance of Mary Davies, excepting the four acre Mulberry Garden of James I, which was granted to Lord Arlington 28 September, 1672. (Patent Roll 24, C. 2, Part 10, No. 21.) From Wheatley and Cunningham I gather that at Lord Arlington's death the house came to his daughter, the Duchess of Grafton, who sold it to the Duke of Buckingham, who rebuilt it in 1703. In 1761 it was bought from Buckingham's natural son for £21,000, as a residence for George III and Queen Charlotte, and transformed into a hideous palace by George IV, receiving another ugly addition in 1847.

As space does not permit this volume to contain all the original documents connected with these premises, it would be a useful contribution to London topography that someone should publish them. Several Grosvenor documents, for example, refer to sales of land, parts of Mulberry Garden Field, and Crowe Field (*see* Plate 31), by the trustees appointed to administer the estate of Alexander Davies, or by Sir Thomas Grosvenor, and these parcels now form part of Buckingham Palace garden, or the Green Park, or are a portion of the open space at Hyde Park Corner. I have not charged these pages with such details, thinking that the general reader will be satisfied to know that Mary Davies owned most of the land thereabouts, except the Mulberry Garden itself.

* * *

While concerned with the history of Buckingham Palace, I want to correct a statement made by the Duchess of Cleveland in *The Battle Abbey Roll*, which may run on through generations of patch-work books on London, if it is not checked. She wrote:—

“Soon after George Third’s marriage, the ground on which Grosvenor Place now stands, with the adjacent estate, then the property of the Duke of Atholl, was offered for sale for £20,000: and as it adjoined the grounds of Buckingham House, the King wished that it should be bought by the Crown. But Mr. Grenville, who was then Minister, refused to sanction the expenditure. It was finally sold by auction, and Lord Grosvenor became the purchaser, paying for it a price considered rather above its value.”

The Duke of Atholl has no knowledge of his

ancestors having owned any property hereabouts. In 1770, Mr. George Steuart of Berners Street planned and built a house for the third Duke, on the site now occupied by 5, Grosvenor Place. The land was held on lease from the Grosvenor estate, and the transaction recorded in the estate office. The Grosvenors had no need to purchase the property; it was part of the Manor of Ebury.

With regard to Grosvenor Place I think it is certain that this road, or a route very near to it, appears as a path through fields, on Morgan's 1675 map, and is clearly laid out on a plan attached to a counterpart conveyance of 35 acres from Sir Thomas Grosvenor to Lord Arlington, dated 22 October, 1681, on which document it is marked "The intended way from Hide Parke to Westminster," and is shown on the west side of "Goring Great Garden." A copy of this plan is in the Crace Collection, Port. 10, No. 30, and someone wrote on it: "Anno 1681. About this time the new Road from Knightsbridge to Westminster was opened and the old Road from Hyde Park Corner and Tyburn Lane to Westminster was shut up." This plan is still attached to the counterpart among the Grosvenor archives.


* * *

It is with much pleasure that I record here, on the authority of His Majesty's gardener, that on the south side of the Buckingham Palace garden there is a very old mulberry tree, which is in good condition and bears well every year, and carries with it the tradition that it belonged to the Mulberry Garden of James I.

PETERBOROUGH HOUSE

IF one walks direct from the House of Lords to the Tate Gallery along the river bank, we soon come to the Horseferry Road on our right; and thence onwards till we reach the offices of Messrs. Mowlem, is the frontage of what used to be called Millbank, and is now part of Grosvenor Road. This was "the faire Streete towards the Thames side" built by Alexander Davies, and what it looked like may be judged from Plate 12, which reproduces an early 18th century drawing among the Grosvenor archives. I am indebted to Mr. George Codd, a surveyor on the Grosvenor estate, who has kindly compared the present frontage with that on Plate 12. Starting from the right end, at the corner of Horseferry Road, the first three houses, says Mr. Codd, "have been much altered." The next four "are just as in the view, even to the steps and railings to the front doors." The large gateway of the next house is still there, also "the hood over the door-way" of the house beyond. This hood is well known, and considered to be one of the finest in existence. Two or more houses "appear to have been pulled down to form Page Street." The "faire Mansion house" occupied by the Tregonwells was on the extreme left, behind the trees. A direct view of this house on Plate 13 is taken from William Mackay's 1723 map of the Grosvenor estate. The site

Plate XII



MILLBANK FRONTAGE TO THE THAMES

of the house is now occupied by the offices of Messrs. Mowlem.

It is a curious thing that some London historians will insist that this house was built by Lord Peterborough. I say curious, because its origin, and his Lordship's connexion with it, are not family secrets, but set forth in the 1675 Act of Parliament. Yet Wilkinson denies that Davies built it, Walcott goes one better, and boldly says Lord Peterborough erected it "in the reign of Charles I," and Besant (1911) says it "was built by the first Earl of Peterborough, and retained his name until 1735, when it passed to Alexander Davies." By that date Alexander had been buried 70 years! Such is history, but I must be careful, lest I take a similar fall! From the rate book for 1673 it appears that Lord Peterborough was rated for a house on Millbank at £10, and this surely was Peterborough House. At that date Mr. Tregonwell was rated at £6, for a house in the same row. In 1680 his Lordship took a lease for "all that messuage lately built by Alexr Davies Esq." This house appears more than once in our story. It was the London home of the Grosvenors throughout the 18th century, from which they did not move till they migrated to Grosvenor House in Upper Grosvenor Street in 1806. In 1731 Sir Richard Grosvenor completely reconstructed the Millbank house, as may be seen in Wilkinson's *Londina Illustrata*, at a cost of £2,000.

That the Tregonwells began by living there, is proved by a law suit with their next-door neighbour,

Erasmus Jackson, who set up a distillery of "strong waters, which is a very great annoyance to . . . John Tregonwell, and Mary his wife, and Mary Davies." Mrs. Tregonwell calls it the "very fair house" that her husband Davies began to build, "which hath cost above £5,000, as she believeth." I do not know what happened about the strong waters, but Alexander died in 1665, owing Erasmus £300 for bricklaying, which account was not settled till 1695, after strenuous litigation on the part of his widow! In 1683-4, the rate books give us Lord Peterborough in the big house, Sir Thomas Grosvenor nine houses away to the right, and Mrs. Tregonwell next door but two to Sir Thomas.

* * *

There is a pleasing reminiscence, worthy of remembrance, associated with Peterborough House, after it became the Grosvenor residence, recorded in the Introduction to a translation of Juvenal, seldom read. In 1786 the house was occupied by Richard, first Earl Grosvenor, who had an only son, Robert, Viscount Belgrave, whose portrait, painted by Gainsborough in 1787, is reproduced on Plate 2. At this time there came on a visit to Lord Grosvenor a friend, a man of kindly disposition, whose name is unknown, who had taken a protective interest in a poor Oxford student, named William Gifford. Gifford was a boy of gentle extraction, who had struggled up the first rungs of the ladder of life with a will, capacity, and endurance rarely equalled. His drunken father died early, leaving the little lad and a baby brother in charge of a loving and hard-working mother, whose journeymen



GROSVENOR HOUSE ON MILLBANK

“wasted her property and embezzled her money.” Soon after this she herself passed away, leaving William aged 13, and his brother aged 2. “We had not,” wrote Gifford, “a relation nor a friend in the world. Everything that was left, was seized by a person of the name of Carlile, for money advanced to my mother.” Carlile put Gifford to school, and the infant into an almshouse. He soon tired of the burden, however, and put William on to a coaster at Brixham. “I was not only ‘a shipboy on the high and giddy mast,’ but also in the cabin, where every menial office fell to my lot.” After a year of this, Carlile, stung by the reproaches of the local fishwomen at the boy’s distressful state, apprenticed him to a shoemaker. During this time Gifford furtively read every book he could lay his hands on, and mastered elementary mathematics. In his 20th year he was discovered by a local surgeon named Cookesley, who appreciated his talent, and with the help of friends sent him to Exeter College, Oxford. In 1781, however, Cookesley died, but his place was taken by other friends, and amongst them the anonymous patron who visited Lord Grosvenor at Millbank in 1786. To this patron Gifford wrote, addressing the letter to the house, but forgetting to put the patron’s name. Lord Grosvenor opened the letter, heard the story, and asked to see the youth. The rest shall be told in Gifford’s own words :—

“On my first visit, he asked me what friends I had, and what were my prospects in life; and I told him that I had no friends, and no prospects of any kind. He said no more; but when I called to take leave . . . he informed me that he

charged himself with my present support, and future establishment; and that till this last could be effected to my wish, I should come and reside with him . . . I did go and reside with him; and I experienced a warm and cordial reception, a kind and affectionate esteem, that has known neither diminution nor interruption, from that hour to this, a period of twenty years! . . . I was called upon to accompany his son (one of the most amiable and accomplished young noblemen that this country, fertile in such characters, could ever boast) to the continent."

And this was William Gifford, first editor of the *Quarterly Review*, by the choice of Sir Walter Scott and others. To his judgment Byron submitted his poetry. He was a bitter critic and made many enemies, but one of his greatest friends was Hoppner, through whom, probably, Lord Grosvenor acquired the "Blue Boy" by Gainsborough for £100! Gifford died worth £25,000, and was buried in Westminster Abbey, so a great deal came of a letter imperfectly addressed to Peterborough House!

Here is another letter, addressed to the same Lord Grosvenor, which reveals his kindness to men of genius:—

MONTPELLIER, December 27, 1763.

My Lord,

I have this moment received your obliging letter, and would not let the post return without acknowledging it, and of saying, in a few words (for I know you would not like many upon the occasion), that I shall never forget your Lordship's great genteelness to me, as long as I remember anything in this world:—"poor Sterne! what with sickness and bad management, has run aground in the furthest part of France—and wants to borrow fifty pounds. I'll lend him a hundred"—Nobody but Lord Grosvenor would have thought of such a thing.

I would not wish to have a better text than this for a sermon upon public spirit.—How should a man, my Lord, have that in the *gross*, which he has not in the *detail*? or, pretend to be a friend to all mankind, who has not a soul to do a kindness to any one man?—You may take my word, my Lord, that a man must have a *good* heart before he can have a *generous* one—and that to have a generous one, a man must live so as to *afford* to consider the public more than himself—and till this reformation in our luxury is brought about, there will always be a scarcity of what you justly say is now so much wanted.

In the meantime you must be content to bear the mortification of fresh discoveries every day, of men acting, my Lord, upon views diametrically opposite to yours, in which your only comfort will be, that at least you set a good example, and can say to yourself: “*Liberavi animam meam,*” in case the world *will* go to the Devil. I long greatly to chat over these things in Grosvenor Square—till then, Palmer and I, shall continue to talk of you, and drink to your health and happiness, as we have done all the winter tête-à-tête.

I am, My Lord,

Ever your faithful and obliged Servant,

L. STERNE.

THE EARL OF PETERBOROUGH

LORD PETERBOROUGH'S long connexion with the house on Millbank, his acquaintance with the Grosvenors, his change of religion, and his eccentric adventures, are my excuses for devoting a few paragraphs to his history. The *Dictionary of National Biography* says he deserted from the Parliamentary Army and became a Cavalier, was defeated and wounded, and escaped to Antwerp. The best account of him was written by himself, under the pseudonym of Robert Halstead, in a rare fine folio called *Succinct Genealogies* (British Museum, 138, i. 2), published in London in 1685. The early pages are as dull as other people's genealogical records usually are, but when we get to his own story the narrative becomes quite lively.

After various vicissitudes during the Civil War and Commonwealth he came, after the Restoration, into the service of the Duke of York, afterwards James II. He also came, about that time, into the Catholic Church. Some of his contemporaries do not give flattering accounts of his religious sincerity. Lord Ailesbury says in his *Memoirs* that when the churchwardens of St. Margaret's, Westminster, asked Lord Peterborough if they might dispose of his pew in the church, he having become a Catholic, he replied, "No, no; one doth not know what may happen."

While serving the Duke of York he was dispatched on a very exceptional voyage of discovery, to find a suitable second wife for his royal master among the Courts of Europe. So much difficulty has been experienced by men in finding congenial brides for themselves, that the task of discovering an appropriate alliance for somebody else, and he the heir presumptive to the throne, was no light responsibility. Before starting on this voyage he had interviews with Charles II and his Lord Treasurer, whom he described as "dry," "stiff," and "scarce." After various delays he started, "having in his custody Jewels of his Royal Highness's particular Cabinet, to the value of Twenty Thousand Pound, intended for a present to the young Archduchess of Inspruk." This match fell through at once, and Peterborough settled in Paris to await orders. Whilst there he had advice from his master, "That there had been proposed to him Four Wives; with whom, since it was impossible for him to be acquainted, he did command his Lordship to endeavor by all the diligence he could use, to get sight and knowledge of them, or at least, their Pictures, with the most impartial relations of their Manners and Dispositions." The four ladies in question were the Duchess of Guise; the Princess of Modena, Mary of Esté; Mademoiselle de Rais; and Mary Ann Princess of Wirtemberg.

Peterborough gave a detailed and amusing account of his experiences. As we all know Mary of Modena was throughout the first favourite and the eventual winner. He wrote that she "appear'd to be at this time about Fourteen Years of Age, she was tall, and admirably shaped, her Complexion was of the last fairness,

her Hair black as Jet, so were her Eye-brows, and her Eyes, but the latter so full of light and sweetness, as they did dazzle and charm too. There seem'd given unto them, from Nature, Sovereign Power; power to kill and power to save; and in the whole turn of her Face, which was of the most graceful oval that could be fram'd, there was all the Features, all the Beauty, and all that could be great and charming in any humane Creature." Before she left Italy she went through the marriage ceremony, Peterborough acting as proxy for the Duke of York.

At the downfall of James II things began to go wrong with Peterborough. Misson says, "The Chappels of the Country-Houses of Earl of Peterborough and my Lord Dover, pillag'd and demolish'd by the Mob, 21 Decemb. 1688." On 24 January, 1689, Peterborough petitioned the House of Lords from the Tower, where he was a prisoner, pleading that he had been

" a domestic servant to the King very nearly thirty years . . . but finding sensible decay of health, was advised to travel. In order thereunto . . . he did (as advised) obtain His Majesty's general pardon, under the great Seal, of all treasons, offences, and misdemeanours . . . and for his more safe passage, did likewise obtain his Royal licence, to go with his servants . . . to any place as he should think most convenient . . . upon Tuesday the 11th day of December last, was forcibly by the rude multitude stopped and made a prisoner at Ramsgate (and robbed and plundered of all his necessaries) and afterwards at Canterbury. . . . In this extraordinary juncture of affairs, all judges have refused to act . . . by which means Petitioner, very much to the prejudice of his health, has continued a close prisoner in the Tower.

Prays for his discharge, with restitution of his goods, etc.”
“ Read this day, and ordered that the Earl have leave to be at liberty at his own house at Millbank, upon bail, of other and in the value of £1,000 to the Marquis of Halifax, as Speaker of the House.”¹

I do not know that he got into any further trouble, nor can one suppose that Manuscript No. 3408, among the Sloane MS. in the British Museum, which gives “ An account of what appeared on ye dissection of ye body of ye late Earl of Peterbrough,” would add much to our knowledge of the man. Besides which, it is time we went back to Millbank and the infant Mary.

¹ Historical Manuscripts Commission 12th Report. House of Lords, vol. 6. 1689.

THE INFANT MARY

IT is important the reader should realize that Mary Davies was tended by her aunt, Mrs. Mason, her mother's sister, who had constant charge of her from her cradle till her marriage. When she was little more than a year old her mother became preoccupied with a new husband and family, a great house in Westminster, and a country home in Dorsetshire. This helps to explain why mother and daughter were never sympathetic. The mother had every reason to see that Mary was well cared for, and no doubt she was, for the guardianship of an heiress from infancy to marriage was a domestic asset, and Mrs. Tregonwell was a business woman.

There are a few accounts of money laid out on Mary's upkeep. One is headed "An account of moneys laid out upon . . . my young Mrs., Mrs. Mary Davies, since ye 17 of Janry thence 1665, to ye 17 of Janry thence next following." The total for the year is £254 0 9. Of this £11 goes to "Doctor, Apothecary and Chirurgion." "Silke for a Coat and makeing" comes to £2 5 0. "A flowrd tabby coate and makeing" costs £3. Eighteen shillings and sixpence is invested in "Comb, gloves, stockings and shooes." Aunt Mason gets £27 "for her paines and care of her." Her nurse's wages are £19. The servant who makes out the account enters £14 as "my owne wages and ye maide's." For "her own diet, her Aunt's, her nurse's,

and her two servant's, with washing and other conveniences for them," there is allowed £150. In 1667 £176 was paid for "Tammy for 2 Coates, and making." "Rubarb and plaster" come to 10s. "Three frocks and a maske" 10s. In 1668 5s. 6d. was paid for "a lutestring hood and scarfe."

Decked in such apparel she drives out from the "faire Mansion" on Millbank, in a coach drawn by six horses. "All things," wrote her mother, "were carried on with the air of greatness answerable to the fortune she was supposed to have." This coach and six corresponds to the carriage and pair of the 19th century and the six-cylinder car of to-day.

I suppose they drove up through Whitehall and on into Hyde Park. In those times fashionable young ladies showed themselves in the Ring, and were seen of few, but nowadays a wider field of advertisement is sought in the pages of society pictorials, by the possessors of good looks, the performers of good works, and the purveyors of big fortunes. The child was unconscious of anything singular, but for Mrs. Tregonwell, who remembered Southampton Buildings, the outlook must have been exhilarating.

Life in London, especially for children, has always been stimulating, exhibiting a continuous pageant of people and things. In front of Mary's home on Millbank ran the Thames, alive with traffic passing up and down, whilst a constant stream crossed to and from Lambeth by the Horse Ferry a few yards down the street, for the river in old days was the main thoroughfare of London.

Surely too the little girl would have been taken to the City on Monday 30 October, 1676, to see the instalment of her uncle, Sir Thomas Davies, as Lord Mayor, "when sundry Representations, Pageants and Shows" were performed, devised and composed by Thomas Jordan. Mr. Kettle, Librarian of the Guildhall Library, has kindly conducted me to a small quarto entitled *London's Triumphs*, which gives in prose and verse a full description of this particular day's entertainment. It recites how

" Selected Citizens i' th' Morning all
At Sev'n a Clock, do meet at Drapers-Hall,"

and accompanied by Masters, Wardens, etc., to the sound of drums and trumpets march

" To my Lord's House, where th' Aldermen and He
Take Horse, and rank according to Degree."

Then to the Guildhall, and thence "through King-street down to Three-Crane-Wharf," where the Lord Mayor and Aldermen "take Barge," and haste to Westminster, saluted by two broadsides from guns aboard a "Pleasure Boat." They land at the New Palace Stairs, and march to Westminster Hall,

" Where having took an Oath that He will be
Loyal and faithful to His Majesty,
His Government, His Crown and Dignity,
With other Ceremonials said and done,
In Order to his Confirmation;
Sealing of Writs in Courts, and such-like things,
As shew his power abstracted from the King's,
He takes his leave o' th' Lords and Barons, then
With his Retinue he re-treats again

To th' Water-side and (having given at large
To th' Poor of Westminster) doth Re-imbarge,
And scud along the River 'till he comes
To *Black-Fryers* Stairs, where Guns and thundring Drums
Proclaim his Landing; when he's set ashore,
He is saluted by three Vollies more."

His Lordship and company thence proceeded to Cheapside, where began a series of four Pageants, or Masks, set on architectural stages, beautified with gilding and painting, erected so as to intercept the progress of the procession, and demand a hearing for suitable poetical speeches. The first Pageant represented Minerva, and the Arts, Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, etc. The second disclosed the Chariot of Triumph, in which sat Tamburlain, with silver vest, "cloth of gold Tunick down to the ground," etc., attended by Discipline, Conduct, Courage, and Victory. Tamburlain rose and addressed a pompous metrical oration to his Lordship, after which the procession passed on to a third Pageant, Fortune's Bower, "an elegant beautiful Square Edifice erected in the Center of a *Spring Garden*." Here was the Goddess Bona Fortuna, and about her sit her "Triumphant Favourites," Prosperity, Peace, Plenty, etc. The goddess rises and speaks :

" My Name's Bona Fortuna : It is I
That wait on every good Society,
And am the Genius of this Company,
The Ancient Famous Drapers, Men of Treasure,
That are beatified with Peace and Pleasure ;
Who Govern by Right Rule, and Live by Measure ;
That temperately Trade upon the Growth
Of their own Nation, hating Pride and Sloth,
Cutting their Coat according to their Cloth.

Their Manufacture doth in England grow :
 And in the Winter, when Boreas doth blow,
 And all the City wears a Veil of Snow,
 For Cloth and Books Men will have more to do
 In Paul's Church-Yard than Pater-Noster-Row :
 Fortune has said it, and it shall be so."

This alludes to Sir Thomas Davies being a bookseller and free of the Stationers Company, and only temporarily a Draper.

The fourth Pageant was a rout or mad frolic by a troop of shepherds, piping, dancing, tumbling, "which the worse it is done the better it pleases." "This droll being past," the Lord Mayor and Company went to the Guildhall to dine, "where, to make the Feast more famous, his Lordship is illustrate with the splendor and presence of Their most Excellent Majesties, The Duke of York, Prince Rupert, the Duke of Monmouth, and the Archbishop of Canterbury." "His Lordship and the Guests being all seated, the Musick of the City are in readiness to express their skill, and finger their Violins and Lutes with good skill and excellent humour, and after a new Lesson or two being playd, a Person of a good Fancy with a Musical mouth, begins a new Song in Commendation of the Founders of New Bethlehem" (Bedlam).

"This is a Structure fair,
 Royally raised;
 The pious Founders are
 Much to be praised,
 That in such times of need
 When Madness doth exceed,
 To build this House of Bread,
 Noble *New Bedlam*."

Plate XIV



ANDERSTON MANOR

(By courtesy of "Country Life.")

Verse 3

“ Methinks the Lawyers may
Consult together,
And contribute, for they
Send most Men thither;
They put 'em to much pain,
With Words that cramp the Brain,
Till Bedlam's fill'd with Plain—
—tiff and Defendant.”

*

*

*

When Parliament was not sitting no doubt the family migrated to Anderstone Manor, which lies about seven miles south-west of Blandford, Co. Dorset. *Country Life* (3 April, 1915) gave some excellent views of Anderson, or Anderstone as it is spelt in the 17th century, one of which is reproduced, through the kindness of Mr. Hudson, on Plate 14. “The founder of the Tregonwell family fortunes in Dorset,” wrote *Country Life*, “was Sir John, a Cornishman who trimmed his course successfully during that period of quick change between the divorce of Henry VIII and the reign of Elizabeth.” His great grandson, John, bought Anderstone Manor and built the present house in 1622. Sir Frederick Treves calls it “a remarkably fine and stately building. It is of faded red brick faced with stone, has high gables and towering chimneys, handsome stone-mullioned windows, and a general bearing of great dignity and charm.” In this delightful country home, in the heart of a lovely county, Mary Davies spent some of her childhood.

Such were her surroundings, and they were enviable. She had an aunt for a governess, three servants to wait on her, a “coach and six” to “take the air” in, and a

half brother and sisters to play with. The Millbank mansion was large, and the beautiful home at Anderston was set in a lovely county and a genial climate. Nevertheless she had riches thrust upon her, and was an heiress, which in those days meant an investment, something guardians sold for a price, and parents purchased for a son. So the free gaiety of her childhood had this dark shadow thrown across it. Every precaution had to be taken lest she should be stolen, indeed her stepfather took her and her aunt and settled them for a while in France.

The early evidence about child marriages is almost incredible, and, oddly enough, among the chief sources are the Diocesan Court records at Chester. These have been published by Mr. Furnivall, and are amazing; he gives cases of children in arms being plighted. Almost contemporary with Mary Davies was Lady Elizabeth Percy, daughter of Joceline, 11th Earl of Northumberland. Under a clause in her father's will she was taken at six years of age from her mother, who made a second marriage, and put in charge of her father's mother, the Dowager Countess of Northumberland, who treated her as a negotiable security. In vain did Charles II write to arrange a marriage with this heiress of the Percy property and "my son George," one of his many irregular offspring. Her grandmother got a better price from Lord Ogle, of whom Lady Sunderland wrote to Sydney in 1679, "My Lord Ogle does prove the saddest creature of all kinds that could have been found fit to be named for my Lady Percy; as ugly as anything young could be." At the age of 12 Lady Elizabeth became

Lady Ogle, and because of her tender age it was arranged the couple should not meet for two years. Within six months Ogle was dead, and the grandmother in search of a fresh customer, whom she found in Thomas Thynne of Longleat, called "Tom of Ten Thousand," a rich, profligate, handsome man, a little over 30 years of age. Once more the bride and bridegroom separated after the marriage ceremony, and never met again. Thynne was assassinated in 1682 whilst driving down Pall Mall, and the scene of his murder is sculptured on his monument in Westminster Abbey. Again the grandmother started off in quest of a third husband for this twice told widow of 15, who was forthwith married to the Duke of Somerset in 1682.

LORD BERKELEY OF STRATTON

OF course, you cannot parade a little girl up and down in a coach and six without people asking who she is and what she has. Now, there was in town at this time the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord Berkeley of Stratton, son of Sir Maurice Berkeley of Bruton, in Somerset. He fought for Charles I, was knighted by the King at Berwick in 1638, won a battle at Stratton, in Cornwall, and was created a peer by Charles II at Brussels, 1658. Pepys calls him "the most hot, fiery man in discourse, without any cause, that ever I saw," and Lord Clarendon gives an unpleasing account of him. (British Museum. Add. MS. 36270. ff. 104-114.)

He lived in a great house, called Berkeley House, on the site of what is now Devonshire House, but a far finer building, burnt out in 1733. On 25 September, 1672, Evelyn "dined at Lord John Berkeley's newly arrived out of Ireland, where he had been Deputy; it was in his new house, or rather palace; for I am assured it stood him in near £30,000. It is very well built, and has many noble rooms. . . . The staircase is of cedar, the furniture is princely." Three months after Evelyn dined with him, his Lordship opened negotiations for a marriage between Mary Davies and his son Charles, then about 10 years of age. It is to be regretted that we have no record of the diplomacy employed on either side to effectuate the bargain ultimately agreed upon.

All we know is that the price was fixed at £5,000, for which sum the following was Mr. Tregonwell's receipt :

"December the Twelfth Anno Dni 1672. Then Received of the right honble John Lord Berkeley the sume of five thousand pounds of lawfull money of England, being the consideracon money menconed and expressed in certaine Articles of Agreement bearing date with these presents, and made betweene the said Lord Berkeley by the name of the right honble John Lord Berkeley of Stratton and one of his Maties most honble Privy Councill, and the honble Charles Berkeley Sonne and heire Apparent of the said John Lord Berkeley of the first part, mee John Tregonwell by the name of John Tregonwell of Anderston in the County of Dorsett Esqre, and Mary Tregonwell my wife, formerly the wife of Alexander Davies Esqre deceased, I the said John and Mary my wife or one of us being Guardian or Guardians of Mary Davies, being one of the parties hereafter named to these presents of the second part, And Richard Dukeson Rector of St Clements Danes in the County of Middx Doctor of Divinity and grandfather of the said Mary Davies, and the said Mary Davies daughter and heire of the said Alexander Davies and Mary his wife of the third part, I say recd by me J. Tregonwell. Sealed and delivered in the presence of us H. Aldrich. James P. Marten."

When we contemplate this primitive purchase we are reminded of Mr. Jenks's priceless little volume, *A History of Politics*, in which he writes :—

"The ancient forms of marriage, viz., marriage by capture and marriage by purchase, point irresistibly to the conclusion that the woman had little or no voice in the matter. In the case of marriage by capture, the husband carried off his wife by force from a neighbouring tribe; and, long after the reality of this practice has disappeared, it survives, as is well known, in a fictitious form all over the world. It is considered barely decent for the girl to come to the marriage without a show of force. Even in polite modern society the 'best man' is said to be a survival of the friends who went with

the bridegroom in ancient days to help him to carry off his bride, while the bridesmaids are the lady's companions, who attempted to defend her from the audacious robber, and the wedding tour is a survival of the flight from the angry relatives of the bride. In the more peaceful form of marriage by purchase, the lady has become an article of marketable value, whose price is paid, usually in cattle or sheep, to her relatives or owners. It is a refinement of modern days that the 'bride-price' should be settled on the lady herself, or contributed, in the form of marriage gifts, to stock the future home. In ancient times it was paid, if not in hard cash, at any rate in solid cattle, to the damsel's relatives, who, by the marriage, lost the value of her services."

In the Catholic marriage ceremony the bridegroom still places a coin in the hand of the bride, saying, "With this ring I thee wed: this gold and silver I give thee: and with all my worldly goods I thee endow." Is it possible that the ring is a survival from some form of annular coinage?

Before she was eight Mary Davies was sold for £5,000, as prospective wife of the Hon. Charles Berkeley, then between 10 and 11 years old. The match never came off, as Lord Berkeley proved unable to settle £3,000 in land, which was part of the contract. Charles Berkeley went into the Navy, became captain of the *Tiger*, man-of-war, and died of small-pox at sea, "in the streights," March, 1682. His father died in 1678. His will, dated 21 January, 1672, is given in Howard's *Miscellanea Genealogica*, Vol. 5, 2nd Series, p. 156, and in this he refers to the contract, dated 12 December, 1671, between himself and his son Charles, and John and Mary Tregonwell, Dr. Dukeson and Mary Davies.

THE BRIDEGROOM

THE Berkeley match falling through, and the Tregonwells having spent on themselves and the property the money advanced by Lord Berkeley, it became necessary to find another suitor, to refund his Lordship's capital, with interest. Mrs. Tregonwell tells us there was no difficulty about this, it was a question of deciding "among the many offers that were made." In the end, she says, the choice fell upon Sir Thomas Grosvenor, whose "circumstances, familie, and character, appear'd to bee most suitable, and accordingly a treaty was enter'd into, and he and his friends had the whole matter laid before them, and 6 weeks given them to consider of it."

The selection was a happy one. Sir Thomas was a well-bred, well-educated and well-endowed youth, and for the bride the alliance was a rise in social standing. As to fortune, so much stress has been laid upon the endowment of Mary Davies, I may as well note here that the bridègroom was by far the richer of the two, both in real and personal property. It is all very well to look at Ebury Manor to-day, but at the time she enjoyed it, her income was less than half that of her husband.

Thomas Grosvenor "was borne the 20 day of november being wensday att 12 acloke att night 1655,"

according to his mother's entry in her household recipe book. His father was Roger Grosvenor, eldest son of Sir Richard, the second baronet. His mother was Christian, daughter of Sir Thomas Myddelton, of Chirk Castle. In 1661 his father was killed in a quarrel about a foot race by his cousin Hugh Roberts, of Hafod-y-bwch, Co. Denbigh.

In *The Cavalier's Note-Book* Blundell records :—

“My good friend, Mr. Da. Sa. (whom I call son) told me this following story, this present May 12, 1688. Mr. Grosvenor, son of Sir Richard Grosvenor, who was killed some time since, said to Mrs. Houghton . . . that day before he was killed, that if any man was to ride near his footman (who, I think, was to run a race that day), he would kill him, or be killed by him. But the conclusion was this. Mr. Grosvenor that day switched Mr. Roberts, and drew upon him; but Mr. Roberts killed him with his sword, and before he died, he said it was his own fault.”

The following is a copy of the pardon granted to Roberts by the Crown :—

“Whereas at the coroner's court in Chester 23 September 13 Charles 2, (1661), it was found by the oath of honest and lawful men that on 21 August preceding, between 4 and 5 p.m., on the highway at Claverton, co. Chester, Roger Grosvenor of Eaton, Esq., and Hugh Roberts the younger of Havod y bwil, co Denbigh gent, met, and the said Roger Grosvenor attacked the said Hugh Roberts with his sword, and Roberts gave way and drew back as far as he was able, Grosvenor following him and striking him with his said sword, as though he would kill him. Roberts, seeing he was in peril of his life, unless he defended himself, gave the said Grosvenor a mortal wound with his rapier in the lower part of his stomach, of which wound he died in Chester on the following day; and whereas it has been certi-

fied by the Mayor of Chester into the King's Exchequer that Roberts killed Grosvenor purely in self defence, the King pardons Roberts, who is to come up for trial if anyone challenge him respecting the said death. Dated at Chester 7 October 13 Charles 2." (1661.)¹

As Sir Thomas lost his father before he was six, one can imagine that his grandfather, Sir Richard, who survived till he was between eight and nine, would take opportunity to inspire the intelligent lad with the social, religious and political traditions of the family. This man had suffered under family and national disasters, and endured sequestration, imprisonment, and banishment from Eaton for nearly eighteen years. In January, 1664, he died, and one of the keenest impressions of Thomas Grosvenor's youth must have been the histrionic funeral at Eccleston, when he was proclaimed baronet. It is described in the Harleian MSS., No. 2129. The procession was led by "a trumpiter sounding dolefully," followed by gentlemen and servants, one carrying "a penon of armes." Mr. John Wynne bore "the standard," and after "the horse in black," a lance was "trailed" by Mr. Eyton. Then came another "trumpiter sounding dolefully," followed by Sir William Stanley, bearing the "Square baner of Honor, Roger Mostyn the Helmet and Crest, and Thomas Cholmondeley the Coate of Armes." The "corpes" was supported by "2 foote boys on either side beare headed." I suppose "the chiefe mourner" was Sir Thomas himself. The description continues:—

¹ See Dr. Bridge's *Kenrick Edisbury, Chester Archaeological Society's Journal*, Vol. 22.

"This was p'claimed under his standard, after the Achem'ts (hatchments) were offred up: Our most gracious Sov'aigne Lorde Kinge James by his letters patents dated 23 feb: in the 14th yeare of his Reigne Created S'r Rich: Grosvenor of Eaton with the title of Bar'tt, to him and his heires males for evr, by virtue of w'ch graunt it came to his sone and here S'r Ric: Grosvenor now deceased, and is to descend to his grandchild Thomas the sone and heire of Roger, who is fro' hence forth to have the place and tittle of Bar'tt, according to his ancest'rs graunt, By the nam of Sr: Tho: Grosvenor Bartt: whom God graunt longe to florish. God save the Kinge."

Soon after the death of his father Roger Grosvenor, his mother made a second alliance with her father's steward, John Edisbury, and I imagine much of his childhood was spent near Chirk. His mother ran an account with her brother Richard, a merchant in London, in which we get such items as "a laced hat" and "a white hat" for "little Sir Thomas," in 1665, costing 30s. and 10s. In 1669 come "two fine Beavers for Sir Thomas and Esquire Edisbury, £ 3 4 0." In the same year his little sister Sidney has "a rich Genoa velvet sky-coloured side-saddle, with two pommels, silk reins, and tassels, covered with leather, and lined with baize, with all other furniture, and a whip and box." Besides these things there was a large silver salver, weighing 51 ounces, 16 drams, "att ffive shillinges eight pence per oz.," which came to £ 14 13s. 3d.; and a "silver salt," which cost £ 9 5s. od.

There is in the British Museum (Sloane MS. 2266) a small manuscript volume of domestic recipes which belonged to his mother. This homely and delightful book deals with "Conserves," "Cookerie," "Waters," "Per-

fumes" and "Medicinals," but in it she also entered the hour, day and year of her children's births. The "Receipts" start off with such items as "To make a past of pipins or Apreycookes"; "To make Quidiniacke of Quinces"; "To preserve yong Hartichoakes"; "To preserve Malacatoones"; "To preserve Eringo Roots"; "To make Manus Christi"; "To boyle Good-gions or Flounders"; "To make Panchakes that shall bee so crisp that you may reare them on end"; "To make Blamanger." Curiously enough the sweet confections are shaped in "alabaster moulds."

Here are full directions:—

"To Sowse a pigg. Take a faire large pigg being scalded, and cut of his head, then sticke him through the midst, and take out his bones, then lay him in warme water one night, then coller it up like brawne, then boil it tender in faire water, and when hee is tender, throw him into an erthen pan, into water and salt, for it will make him white, and season the flesh, you must put to noe salt in the boyling for that will make him blacke, then take a quarte of the same broth, and a quarte of white wine, and boyle them together, to make sowce-drinke and it will continue a quarter of a yeare, the pig being unclothed, and put in the drinke being cold, you must boyle also in the sowce-drinke 2 or 3 bay leaves, it is a necessary dish in any gentelman's house, you must serve it with ffennell, as you doe sturgion, and viniger in sawcers."

The "Medicinals" include cures for swellings, sores, burns, coughs, pimples, carbuncles, etc., mostly after the manner of old herbals. The cure for Dropsy commences, "Take an ould redd cock that is runn to death"! We are also offered "A receipt to make a fatt man leane," and a cure "for one that is burst, ether

man, or woman or child." Among the "Medicinals" is "A heavenly water which hath many virtues: Take Cloves, nutmeg, ginger, Ledoary, long peper, the seeds of Juniper, Orange, the flowers of sage, basil, Rosemary, Sweet Marjerome, round mints, bay berries, pennie riall, gention, Calaminte, elder flowers, white and red roses, Spicknard, lignum, aloes, wild Crabbs, Cardimonium, Cinamon, Calamus aromaticus, stecudos," etc., etc. These are to be blended into an infusion to remove pimples, heal wounds, cure carbuncles, St. Anthony's fire, "or other pestilent sicknesses."

Nourished on Quidiniackes and Sowsed Pig, and protected from malefic microbes by his mother's mediæval medicinals, Sir Thomas grew up to be an intelligent and ambitious young man. In his pocket-book for 1675 several pages are devoted to "A list of the books which I bought." These number about 344, of which 130 are continental. The Atlas of de la Haye, bought at Geneva in 1671, when he was 16, cost him £6. Beaumont and Fletcher's Plays, £2 12 0, *A Morning Exercise against Popery*, 12s. Woolridge's *Art of Gardening*, 3s. 6d. *Hudibras*, 8s. Bacon's *Essays*, 3s. Raleigh's *History of the World*, £1. Milton's *Paradise Lost*, 3s. 6d. *Coach and Sedan*, an amusing dialogue published in 1636, giving arguments for and against coaches. *Free Trade. Or, the Meanes to make Trade Florish*. London. 1622. A translation of de Comines, 1674, *The Refined Courtier*, 1679, and *Marco Polo*, in black letter, 1579, are not priced. What he liked were military and mathematical works, travel and history. He paid £15 for 36 volumes, "all ould,"

“with a globe.” These included works on surveying, navigation, astronomy and dialling. He took lessons in mathematics, and enters in 1675, “Nicholas Mercator . . . begun with me the 15th of Febru. att £1 10 0 for the mounth.” This no doubt was the Mercator who gave lessons to the Earl of Northumberland at Petworth. Aubrey wrote of him: “He is of little stature, perfect; black haire, of a delicate moyst curle; dark eie, but of great vivacity of spirit . . . he made and presented to King Charles the 2 a clock (twas of a foote diameter) which shewed the inequality of the sunns motion from the apparent motion, which the king did understand by his informations, and did commend it, but he never had a penny of him for it. Well! This curious clock was neglected, and somebody of the court happened to become master of it, who understood it not; he sold it to Mr. Knib, a watch-maker, who sold it to Mr. Fromantle (that made it) for £5 who asks now (1683) for it £200.” Evelyn, 28 August, 1666, “To the Royal Society, where one Mercator, an excellent mathematician, produced his rare clock and new motion to perform the equations.”

The first important project to which Sir Thomas turned his mind was the building of a new home for his family on the rising ground behind the old manor house on the left bank of the Dee, where his family had resided since the early part of the 15th century. He was barely 20 when he began, so I presume he had to come to some arrangement with his trustees. The mansion he built stood about the centre of the present Eaton Hall, and its sturdy substructure stands there

still. Mr. Hughes of Chester wrote to *Notes and Queries* in 1856: "The Vanbrugh family remained connected with Chester until the end of the last century. Sir John himself was architect of the old Eaton Hall." It is impossible, however, that Sir John Vanbrugh had anything to do with this building. Sir John's father, Giles, went to Chester from London about 1667. He was a sugar-baker, and lived in Weaver Street, Chester. There are one or two entries about him in Sir Thomas Grosvenor's accounts:—"Received on the demesne account the sum of twenty pound July the 24th 1678, which money came from Mr. Vanbrought of lead money" Sir Thomas evidently selling him lead from his Welsh mines. Sir John was born in London in 1664, and was only eleven years old when Sir Thomas Grosvenor began to build Eaton Hall, added to which, the first architectural work Vanbrugh is known to have done, began in 1702. Moreover, we have direct contemporary evidence that the architect was Mr. William Samuel, or Samwell, cousin of James Harrington, author of *Oceana*. Aubrey says he was "an excellent architect, that has built severall delicate howses (Sir Robert Henley's, Sir Thomas Grosvenor's in Cheshire)." He supervised the building of the royal residence at Newmarket, and in 1669 disputes arose with the bricklayer Edward Roman, which were referred by the King to Christopher Wren. Roman was afterwards employed at Eaton by Sir Thomas, who also had a row with him, and retained Jeffreys to prosecute him.

Evelyn, who went through Newmarket in July, 1670, writes: "alighted to see his Majesty's house

there, now new-building; the arches of the cellars beneath are well turned by Mr. Samuel, the architect, the rest mean enough, and hardly fit for a hunting-house . . . this house is placed in a dirty street, . . . whereas it might, and ought to have been built at either end of the town, upon the very carpet where the sports are celebrated." It is interesting that Evelyn notes Samuel's cellar arches, because these are the only features of his work now visible at Eaton, and must be strong to hold up the masses of masonry piled on top of them.

In the year Sir Thomas began to build, he enters: "pd Mr. Samuel for his journey from London downe and up £15 0 0, the 13 July 1675." I think the plans were probably settled in London, because on 14 January, 1676, is an entry: "Pd Mr. John Taler that he layd out for ye modall that came from London £6 10 3," and Samuel James had 6s. 6d. for carrying the model in his cart from Chester. There is an account book at Eaton labelled, "Tho: Burton's disbursmts Being the Account Book ffor ye new Building ffrom ye 15 June 1675." To project such a building at the age of 19 shows imagination and enterprise, and a mind enlarged by travel. The secluded old homestead by the silent highway, with its small rooms and narrow windows, was not enough for a youth who had trod the marble stairways and saloons of Italian palaces. His circumstances justified his ambition. He had plenty of good timber, clay, and stone on his estate. He had capital saved during his minority, and an income more than sufficient for necessities.

The style of architecture chosen was that in fashion at the time, such as had been used for three great palaces recently erected along the north side of Piccadilly, Burlington House, Clarendon House, and Berkeley House. The ground-plan of these shows a central block, square or oblong, with wings projecting at right angles from each end of the front, generally used for kitchens and stables. The accounts of the building operations were kept by Burton, and checked by Sir Thomas. The timber was cut at the start, so that it should be seasoned when wanted. The stone came from Eccleston, Llanseelen, Udketton, and Iron Bridge quarries, and much from the ruined Holt Castle, on the Denbighshire bank of the Dee, just above Farn-don, about 4 miles by river from Eaton. Adding what the Civil War demolished at Holt, to what Sir Thomas floated away, and the neighbours carted away, we are left to-day with the shrivelled balance of a once formidable fortress, that guarded the ford at Farn-don against Welsh excursionists. Captain Gartside, according to *Archæologia*, Vol. 20, partially cleared the well at Holt, and recovered some coins and armour.

Sir Thomas took active interest in all the details of the building. His advisers wrote their instructions in his pocket-book, where we get: "22 February, 1675. You are to bargin with your lead Marchants to bring your blockes of Marble from Genoa, every blocke is to bee 8 foote long att least 2 foote beded and 18 Inches high att least; one blocke white and all ye rest of severall colors, take care that ye blockes be sound

stones, without bents or cracks. 5 blockes : 3 shillings a foote to bee deliverd soled and asuer." Again : " 2 millions of bricke ye mould to bee 10 inches 5 and 3 : octr next digg your earth up and soe till ye middle of 9ber and noe longer. 300 of timber; and to bee fallen as soone as may bee; ye trees for boerds are to bee 2 foote square at least and buknotted then quarterd; and afterwards sawed into each quarter and ½ ye best, and other into Inch and quarter. 3 : 600 : quar of great blocke stone 560 quine stone skabled 20 Inch long; 13 Inch bedd and 13 Inches high ye are not to take non under this dementions; but noe matter how much bigger; be shuer to secuer all such alltho 10 foote longe." There are two or three pages of instructions concerning some 300 trees, required for flooring boards, scaffolding poles, and the like. The boatmen at Farndon had a busy time bringing the stone by river to the ferry at Eaton Boat. On 10 June, 1676, Robert Harvey makes his mark for having received " then and att several other times the sum of £ 22 10s. for the geetinge of stones att The Hoult Castill att the ratte of sixpence per tun. I say recd the sayd sum in full of all demandes by me." In October, 1677, Robert Jenteth, a Chester merchant, gets £ 15 15s. " for forty five thousand of duble slates att seven shillings per thousand." In 1685 Mr. Morris has £ 20, " for carveing worke at Eaton."

The old hall was looked upon as a remarkable building in those days. The Rev. Rowland Davies, in April, 1690, rode with the Earl of Orrery from London to Chester, and records :—

"We passed by Beeston Castle, about one mile from us on the left hand. It seems by its situation impregnable, being seated on a very high inaccessible rock, and yet we were assured that there is good water in it. . . . Four miles beyond this we passed through a little town called Tarpорley, where my brother and the Earl shot twelve goslings, which occasioned our riding through the town without stopping. . . . We came to Chester about five o'clock . . . 25th. I went not abroad until it was almost noon, and having paid two or three visits, returned to dinner, at the expense of two shillings; after which I went to prayers at the cathedral, and thence with Jack Travers and Charles Whillington I took an elegant walk by the river's side towards Eaton Hall, belonging to Sir Thomas Grosvenor, near which stands a pretty church called Eccleston . . . 26th. I carried my brother to see Eaton Hall, which is a very noble house, square and very regular, with many fine walks and trees planted around it, but all new work."

*

*

*

I do not think that Macaulay, in his famous chapter on the state of England in 1685, has done justice to the country gentry of that time. His estimate is based more on plays and light literature than on family records. The squire's lack of travel, his miserable education, his provincial accent, his coarse language, the deformity of his dwelling, his heavy drinking, are all enlarged upon in well-turned phrases; but the whole picture, as far as the Grosvenor of that day is concerned, is a caricature, and I suspect it is little better with regard to other families in the county of Chester. In the first place most of them had a University education, as is proved by the register of Brazenose, Oxford, in which we get abundance of Cheshire names from 1510 onwards. There they all are, Cholmondeley,

Legh, Massey, Egerton, Grosvenor, Eaton, Dutton, Brooke, Leeche, Barnston, Brereton, Mainwaring and Middleton. There are plenty of Lancashire boys too, and doubtless many were friends and relatives, and travelled to and fro together in days when the journey was none too safe.

Sir Thomas did not go to the University, but made the continental tour. His passport from Charles II is still at Eaton, dated from "Our Court at Whitehall 7th day of April 1670, for Sir Thomas Grosvenor of Eaton Boat, Baronet, to travel beyond the seas for his education and experience . . . taking also in his company John Edesbury and Gaillard Gent." Sir Thomas was then 14, Mr. Edisbury was his step-father, and Mr. Gaillard a tutor. Sir Thomas wrote to his step-father in 1673 from Lyons :—

"Upon my arrival here I would not let such an occasion pass without acquainting you with it, and how by the Grace of God shall be at Paris in 9 or 10 days, where, if you have anything to acquaint me with, I shall be there ready to receive it. This is all at present, only, the Duchess of York is expected here every day, and is defrayed all through France by the French king. . . . Our journey is now almost at an end, for if it please God, I hope to be at Paris within the month, and there stay all this winter, where I do intend to write to my grandmother for to have an allowance settled upon me, till I come to age, for if she be so backward now, what will she be when I am in England? As for my trunk that you have received from Leghorn, there is nothing forbidden in it, the books much less than anything else. There is nothing against the Church of England, or against the King, only they are in Italian; and as for the little box which cannot be opened, there is nothing in it but stones of Florence, the like of which they see without. For

the books, I pray Sir, take as much care as possible, for they are for to inform me of the Roman history, and many maps of Rome, the great long book full of pictures."

All available evidence proves Sir Thomas to have been a hard-working, affectionate, and highly sensitive man. There never has been in England any great difference of opinion as to the characteristics of a well-bred gentleman. He brings credentials apart from the ludicrous legal definition of "a person who has no occupation," or the false heraldic as "one entitled to bear coat armour." Steele put it admirably, "The Appellation of Gentleman is never to be affixed to a Man's Circumstances, but to his Behaviour in them." When the knights in *Pericles* are being marshalled to their places, and the Prince would have them better bestowed, the First Knight answers:—

"Contend not, Sir; for we are Gentlemen,
That neither in our hearts, nor outward eyes,
Envie the great, nor shall the low despise."

Pericles 2, 3, 25.

This confident courtesy that neither seeks to climb nor fears to fall, reappears in Addison, who says of Sir Roger de Coverley, "He called the servants by their names, and talked all the way upstairs when on a visit." Sir Walter Scott couples "philanthropy" with good breeding, saying that both "depend upon the regard paid by each individual to the interest as well as the feelings of others." Cardinal Newman follows in the same strain: "It is almost a definition of a gentleman to say that he is one who never inflicts pain. . . . He is mainly occupied in merely removing the

obstacles which hinder the free and unembarrassed action of those about him. . . . He has his eyes on all his company; he is tender towards the bashful, gentle towards the distant, and merciful towards the absurd." All which lies below the surface of the definition of a gentleman attributed to Mr. George Bernard Shaw as "one who puts in more than he takes out."

If we blend these features we come upon a countenance and a character beloved all the world over, because it is true to itself and others, and considerate to all. Being true to itself it has ease with dignity, being true to others it gives and gains confidence, being considerate, which is being compassionate, it moves the world. For the highest attribute of man is compassion, and the most perfect example, Christ upon the cross. The Centurion who saw this, and heard Him cry, "Eloi! Eloi! lama sabachani?" said "Truly this man was the Son of God." Any other explanation of complete compassion left derelict in death, was impossible to his gentle heart. Such a tragedy demanded a supernatural solution.

Moreover there seems to have always been in England a traditional machinery for turning out this product. In the republics of school, college, regiment, vessel and workshop, an equation is evolved out of the infinite friction of give and take, establishing a freemasonry that comes to life among the glaciers of antarctic shores, in the forests of Canada, and along the trenches in Flanders. Games and sports have had much to do with it. The soul of every sane boy, between 10 and 18, is absorbed in "The Rules of the

Game," the effort to get, namely, at something that is fair all round. Mr. Austin Harrison puts it thus: "If there is one thing that an Englishman learns at school it is to 'play the game.' . . . We play the game then (shall I say it?) like gentlemen. When we leave school we have this fine sense as the supreme law of our being; it is our real education." When Roger Grosvenor thought his opponent was not playing fair he drew upon him. When English games migrate to other lands, English rules follow them. There are authors, on both sides of the Atlantic, whose writings command respect on either shore, and William James is one of them. In *The Gospel of Relaxation* James says, and with deliberation:—

"The strength of the British Empire lies in the strength of character of the individual Englishman, taken all alone by himself. And that strength, I am persuaded, is perennially nourished and kept up by nothing so much as by the national worship, in which all classes meet, of athletic outdoor life and sport."

* * *

The Grosvenors of the 17th century belonged to the type of country gentry described by Sir George Sitwell in *Letters of the Sitwells and Sacheverells*:—

"In the national scheme of existence the country squire of the 17th century had his proper place. He represented in his own district the authority of government and the majesty of the law; he took his share of responsibility for the security and the finance of his county; he rode at the head of his tenants to record his vote (and their's too) for the political party he favoured, or to fight for the Protestant cause and a free Parliament." . . . "Among his poorer neighbours he acted the part of a little providence, arbitrat-

ing upon their disputes so as to save them the expense of law, advising and helping them in their difficulties, arranging for the education or apprenticeship of their children, and often, at their request, taking charge of their title deeds or making investment of their little savings. He played his part in the making of England, and whatever his limitation may have been, he certainly was not quite so black as Macaulay has painted him."

An American writer has said that we English people travel in 1st, 2nd and 3rd class compartments. The English have travelled longer with compartments than the Americans have without them, and it is always possible for a spectator to fix his gaze on the divisions, and ignore the corridors that connect them. Indeed, as Professor Pollard points out, there is not any impassable barrier between class and class in England:—

"Here there is not, and never has been, a nobility of blood, whatever that particularly idiotic phrase may mean. The younger son of a peer is a commoner, though his blood is just as noble as that of his noble brother; the grandsons of peers often take their place in the upper middle classes; and thousands of members of the middle class in England number peers among their ancestors. The middle class is always being recruited from the nobility, just as the nobility is always being recruited from the middle class."

This bond of sympathy and mutual respect, writes Sir George Sitwell,

"between the nobility and gentry on one hand and the poor freeholder on the other, founded, as Bishop Stubbs suggests, upon the possession of the parliamentary franchise, seems to me the most remarkable fact in English history, the national characteristic which differentiates political and social development in England from that which obtained in France or Germany, Italy or Spain. (*Ancestor*, Vol. I.)

While Sir Thomas was occupied with the building of Eaton Hall, his attention was diverted by the proposal of a marriage with Mary Davies. As this was the only heiress Mrs. Tregonwell had for sale, it became a matter of common prudence for her to make hay while the sun shone. The first thing she had to face was an account of the orphan's property, the profits of her lands for eleven years, since the death of her father in 1665. The child was supposed to be under the protection of the authority guarding orphans in the City of London, and Mrs. Tregonwell tells us that these City Guardians did not dissent from or obstruct her plans. From what I read of these City Guardians in the *Journal of the House of Commons*, I imagine their administration was not ideal. In July, 1689, the artizans employed in rebuilding St. Paul's petition that £23,000 is due to them, and that part of the revenue earmarked to pay their wages is "propounded to be deducted for payment of the orphans of the City of London, no part of whose debt have the petitioners contracted." They pray the House to "compassionate the wives and children of poor artizans," whose families would be ruined if their claim was not paid. In February, 1698, the City orphans themselves petition the House, saying they have for "many years laboured under the greatest calamities; their fortunes being swallowed up, under colour of protection and guardianship." How Mrs. Tregonwell squared these guardians she does not tell us, but we get some idea of her capacities from the dealings she had with Sir Thomas. Some ten days before his marriage she got him to sign

a Release, whereby the profits of Little Mary's estate, during infancy, "were discharged unaccounted for." Next, as the child was only 12 when she married, there was to be an interval of two years, before she made a home of her own, during which time Mrs. Tregonwell demanded an allowance of £500 per annum. Then came £5,000 to repay Lord Berkeley, with £1,500 interest, and beyond this an annuity of £50 a year for Mrs. Mason, who had been with the infant since her cradle days. God helps those who help themselves, but God help anyone who lights on so helpful a mother-in-law. One other small detail had to be arranged. Sir Thomas had to refund Lord Berkeley the price he had given for the infant Mary, but he got back from his lordship a document dealing with the property the heiress was to bring into the possible marriage settlement, for which he gave the following receipt:—

"I Sr Thomas Grosvenor of Eaton in the County of Chester Baronet do acknowledge that I have had and received from the Right Honble John Ld Berkeley a certain Deed bearing date the twelfth day of December 1672 whereby William Thomas gent with the consent of John Tregonwell Esq assigned a certain term of one hundred years of and in the Reversion or Remainder one one third part of certain lands tenemts and hereditamts late of Alexander Davies Esqre deceased unto the said Ld Berkeley. Witness my hand the 31th day of Octr 1677. T. Grosvenor."

Mr. Thomas was evidently the solicitor.

All things being duly arranged, the lawyers drew up the settlements, and a licence was obtained from the Bishop of London, 8 October, 1677, for "Sir Thomas Grosvenor Bart. of Eaton, Co. Chester,

Bachelor 21, and Mary Davies, of St. Margaret's Westminster, Spinster, about 13 [*really*, 12 years and eight months]; at St. Clement Danes or elsewhere in diocese." They were married at St. Clement's in the Strand, I presume by the bride's grandfather, Dr. Dukeson, on 10 October, 1677. Oranges and lemons, sang the bells of Saint Clement's, but I cannot help thinking that some less innocent refreshments must have been served out to the clerk or cleric who entered the ceremony in the parish register thus: "Sr George Grosvenowre of Eaton in the County Palatine of Chester Barronett and Mrs. Mary Dayis of St. Margarets Westminster."

FROM THE THAMES TO THE DEE

WE have no record of the day Mary left her mother to go to Eaton with her husband, but it was probably during the year 1680, after she reached her 15th birthday. It was a tender age to face the responsibilities of married life and domestic control. If she began the honeymoon by driving from London to Chester up the Holyhead Road, the journey would last at least six days, and if she went from Anderstone Manor, through Bath, Gloucester, Shrewsbury and Wrexham, not less than eight. One can imagine her excitement and sense of importance at the novel experience, the interest created by the young couple on the journey, and the curiosity among the neighbours in Cheshire after they arrived. Perhaps Sir Thomas carried in the coach his pocket road-book, still at Eaton, with leather flap cover and brass clasps, dated 1643, calling itself "*A Directory for the English Traveler By which he shall be inabled to coast about all England and Wales*"; of which work there is an earlier edition in the British Museum (291.a.46), "Sold by Mathew Simons at the golden Lion in Ducke laine, A 1635. Jacob van Langeren sculp."

And then the arrival at the little old Manor House of Eaton Boat, on the left bank of the Dee, with barn, stables, and manorial dove-cot grouped round the

homestead; and the warm Cheshire welcome from the family retainers, who come round to greet this slip of a girl as "the Master's Lady." Looking north up the sloping land she could see the walls and scaffolding of her new home, as large and distinguished as a great London house, and below the garden the river, a small stream compared with the Thames at Millbank, still, fresh and pure from the Welsh hills, though probably narrower than now, for the land is better drained, but rising and falling with the tide, and bearing many a fine salmon to its shallow waters beyond Llangollen. And by the Eaton Boat ferry, with pole on either bank, and chain suspended, lie boats filled with stones from the walls of Holt Castle.

From the upper windows she could see across the Cheshire vale, that splendid sandstone escarpment crowned with the overthrown ruins of the mighty fortress of Beeston, as we see them to-day. In her time no interpretation had been given of the contours of hills and valleys, nor could she have guessed what Sir Boyd Dawkins now tells me, that Beeston Hill, the Broxton Hills, Alderley Edge, Bowden, and the other sandstone ranges that dominate the Cheshire Plain, are the higher portions of hills and valleys, cut by the streams of the Tertiary period before the glacial age, the plain itself being formed of glacial sands, clays and gravels, that have filled it to the present level. The concealed portion consists of lower ranges of hills, valleys and ravines, which are now buried in some cases more than 100 feet. If the glacial covering were removed the sea would find its way east as far as Northwich, if not

Plate XV



Sir Peter Leys pinxit

Granger del. 1710. p. 12

Sir Thomas Grosvenor, Baronet


farther. The land then stood higher above the sea, and Ireland and Britain formed part of the continent. Wild extinct beasts, such as the mammoth, lived in Cheshire, and have left their bones and teeth in the peat bogs buried below the glacial deposits. If she knew nothing of this she could see for herself that she had come into what her contemporary Richard Blome called "a county of a fat, fruitful, and rich soil, both for tillage and pasturage . . . plentifully provided with fowl both tame and wild . . . and every where replenished with the habitations of gentry." She could see the Cheshire fields glittering with golden buttercups, and the hedges laden with snow-white hawthorn. She saw the autumn frosts tint the oak leaves in the Eaton paddocks, and the sun set in glory behind Moel Famma. She heard the water-hen call from the reeds by the river side, and saw the wild duck rise from marsh and mere.

And if girls were subject to fits of philosophy, she might have wondered at the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, that had made her, the only child of an intestate scrivener, through little choice of her own, mistress of Eaton Boat, and given her a loving husband, pleasant neighbours, a coach and horses, a garden set with lilacs, lavender, rosemary, and abundance of fruit trees. She never displayed any enthusiasm about her mother, being always with her aunt, so I imagine this home-coming to Eaton Boat was a joyful episode.

Between the day on which she was married and the day she came to Eaton, Sir Thomas had his portrait painted by Lely, very likely as a present for her. We

cannot judge of it as a likeness, but it is an excellent Lely, signed and dated 1678. One cannot help regretting that a good-looking youth of 23 should be so overlaid with wig, but otherwise it is admirable, and well reproduced on Plate 15.

Knyff and Kip's engraving of Eaton Hall, as completed by Sir Thomas, is reproduced on Plate 16. Whether the surroundings were as elaborately finished as is represented, may be open to question. In the top left-hand corner of this we fortunately get a detailed drawing of the old Manor House of Eaton Boat, with its manorial dove-cot, and farm buildings, enlarged on Plate 17. This was demolished in the 18th century.



Eaton Hall on the River Dee near the City of Chester in Cheshire - the Seat of the Town of St James' Green near Baring.

EATON HALL IN THE 17TH CENTURY

THE OLD STOCK

“And you good Yeomen,
Whose Lymys were made in England; shew us here
The mettell of your Pasture : let us sweare,
That you are worth your breeding : which I doubt not :
For there is none of you so meane and base,
That hath not Noble luster in your eyes.”

Henry V, 3, 1, 25.

FROM the peaceful old manor house by the river bank, in due season, the bride and bridegroom migrated to their new mansion on the rising ground a few hundred yards north of Eaton Boat, and we have Francis Cholmondeley's testimony that “in the building and furnishing of this house, the Lady had the satisfaction of her own fancy and contrivance.” Whether the chairs and bedsteads at Eaton Boat suited her taste is not on record, but if she had seen in her own house on Millbank, let to Lord Peterborough, elegant furniture in the French and Italian fashions, perchance the homely Cheshire forms and settles might seem yeoman's gear. Her husband had also travelled, and seen sumptuous Italian palaces, but for him, after all, Eaton Boat was a shrine, that had been cherished by his ancestors, and possibly while the lady's fancy was bent on upholstery, his was turned to family history, marking milestones on the Grosvenor Road.


If I seem to suspend the continuity of my story

during this section, it is to get an extra full-length picture of the Grosvenors, drawn somewhat from the mould in which they had been cast, for this, after all, is part of the inward and spiritual interest of the tale. When the Davies girl married the Grosvenor boy, she espoused a stock steeped for 500 years in family tradition. She herself brought the potentiality of future wealth, but no insignia of past achievement. Such a distinction between man and wife might lie dormant for long enough till some trifling circumstance exposed the contrast. Interesting ancestors are all very well, but not if they involve ugly furniture. I do not say these ancient Grosvenors actually bored her, though other people's progenitors weary everyone that is not a genealogist, but I suspect she had little appetite for their rusty armour, their swords and pikes, their bows and arrows, their musty muniments, and dusty books, especially when she saw them littered over the floors of her beautiful new home.

Imagination raises up before me the young couple, seated in the great hall of the new house, watching Thomas Burton, the house-steward, with his men, unload the wagons of household gear from Eaton Boat, all of it looking diminutive and dowdy in such splendid surroundings. For what expansion of breath and vision must have been experienced to go from the low small chambers and limited illumination of the old manor house, into the lofty hall and wide-windowed dining-room and drawing-room of the new home.

For their preservation it was a good thing to get this wonderful collection of over 600 early documents

Plate XVII



EATON BOAT
(Enlarged from Plate XVI)

out of the cramped and probably damp accommodation of the river home, and posterity owes a debt of gratitude to Sir Thomas. For, in spite of their Latin text, and numberless abbreviations, these parchment charters are very human things, more so, I think, than the alabaster effigies of their owners which beautify our "choirs and places where they sing." These documents say something at any rate, tell somebody what to do, or to possess. Occasionally they rise to a joke, and I hope Sir Thomas drew his lady's attention to the seal of John de Goldburn of Hargrave, on a grant dated 1322, showing a monkey riding full gallop on a hare, and blowing a long trumpet, possibly a pun on the place name, a grave thing for the hare! Another seal of John de Flory, dated 1300, shows a hare mounted on a dog, and blowing a horn, and over it, "Ride alonge."

And now, making every allowance for the possible effect of these heirlooms upon the London heiress, we must not overlook their appeal to the heart of her husband. No man of gentle breeding can see the home of his fathers dismantled and abandoned without emotion. For Sir Thomas the old house was haunted by ancestral shades who had clung through ages of strenuous life to land and home, that he might reap the reward, and raise a new generation to perpetuate their memory. The chairs might be hard, and the tables heavy, but there his grandfather sat and ate his dinner, and poured into the open eyes and ears of his grandson visions of battles and bombardments, the siege and surrender of surrounding castles, Holt, Hawarden, Flint and Mostyn, and echoes of the titanic explosions

that flung great masses of mediæval masonry down Beeston rock. Within this venerable domicile by the Dee-side lay layers of antique documents recording the obligations, disputes and settlements of 500 years, like the stratified flooring of some ancient river cave, that enshrines the history of unrecorded ages.

Only those who have unpacked an old home realize the surprising collection of goods and chattels that come to light in the process. The misfortune is we have no schedule of the contents of Eaton Boat. One would like to know, for instance, if the manuscript *Piers Plowman*, now at Eaton, has been in the family since it was written in the 14th century, and if any suit of armour there was worn at the battle of Shrewsbury. Old family documents tell us of past possessions, but where are they now? Where are the "tables and forms in the hall and parlour at Eaton," mentioned in Richard Grosvenor's will in 1617? Where too is the seal used on Richard Grosvenor's will in 1523, showing a stag in full career, and over it "GROS . . . VENOR," possibly the signet of his ancestor Thomas, who espoused the cause of Richard II, and the badge of the White Hart, or a symbol of the Master of the Game? Where also are "my chain of gold, and my signet of gold, and my velvet cap set with agglettes of gold," which Sir Thomas Gravenor left to his son in 1549? In 1576 Anthonie Gravenor left to his nephew Thomas, of Eaton, "my best Signett of gold, one standinge cuppe Duple gilte engraven, with the Cover for the same, having in the toppe of the cover A and G, . . . and to my cosen Richard his sonne and heyre I give one Bruche of

gold enameled upon my Taffata hatt." Four years later, Richard Gravenor of Dodleston left to Richard Gravenor of Eaton, "one silver bowle parcel gylte havinge in it engraven this worde Aprill, and one other bowle over gylte to drynke wyne in, having in it lyke seales and punches, together with my best fether bedd, my best bolster and pyllowe." Pieces of this plate may turn up in any collector's cabinet if they have escaped the crucible and the Mint. What exist at Eaton to-day from the old house are books, deeds, silver, and probably armour.

THE FIRST TWO GROSVENOR BARONETS

AMONG the many papers brought up from the old house were several which help us to understand the religious and political opinions inherited by Sir Thomas. This is important. The first three Grosvenor baronets, Sir Richard the first, Sir Richard the second, and Sir Thomas, reigned, or tried to reign, at Eaton during about 69 years of the 85 years the Stuarts reigned, or tried to reign, over England. What we want to get at is the attitude of the Grosvenor family towards this royal dynasty. Sir Thomas knew his grandfather, Sir Richard the second, and I wish we knew all that the old gentleman told to his little grandson. The old man must have been singularly attractive in his young days. There is a letter at Eaton from his grandmother "Marye Cholmeley," christened by James I, "the bold lady of Cheshire," written to his father, and dated from Holford, January 1, 1623, which ends with this postscript:—

"Sir, I pray you give leave to my Sonne (grandson) Dick Grosvenor to come to me tomorrow and to be with me the rest of this tyme of Christmas, and to make merry with his Uncles and friends that are now with me. I pray you send him to me for I look for him and am not well without him. And if you had not been nearer a kyn to him than I, you should not have had him all this while."

The only document the grandfather left is docketed, "Case of Sir Richard Grosvenor about the year 1650. His prosecution or rather persecution respecting his composition during the Civil War and Interregnum." This tells us he

"Made his composition for his delinquency att Gouldsmiths' Hall in December 1646, and paid the summe of £2,550 being the whole fine wch was imposed on him for his delinquency and hath his full discharge thereupon. He did likewise in November 1648 compound att Haberdashers' Hall for the twentyeth pte of his estate and paid the fine there imposed on him and hath a full discharge for the same.

Hee beinge an inhabitant in North Wales before and sience these late troubles did again compound with the Courtes appointed by an Act of Parliament: dat: 10th August 1649 for the admittinge of the six Countyes of North Wales unto a generall composition and paid the full sume by them imposed on him as by the said Courtes Certificates doeth appeare.

That the said Sir Richard did faithfully adhere unto this present Government sience the Reducement of Chester wch was in the yeare 1645 and ever sience did ayde and assiste the pliament wth men and money, especially in this last sumers expeditien for there he sent out 2 horses and 13 foote soulders wch he did furnish wth armes and maynetayne wth pay for one month.

That (notwithstandinge) the said Sir Richard is most unjustly psecuted upon a Review by ane Thomas Mercer wch was his tennant who merely out of spleene and malice hath informed the Courtes for compoundinge &c: that the said Sir Richard hath compounded at an Under Vallue for his Estate.

That the said Sir Richard lived in the County of flynt in North Wales before and sience these late warres until he came to London to make his composicion wch was in the yeare 1646 att wch tyme he was arrested and kept prisoner in the fleet untill Michaelmas terme 1649 wch was after the

Act for the generall composition wth North Wales passed, the benefitt of wch Act and of the articles of Anglesey the sd Sir Richard ought to have and thereby be freed from any review or further trouble att all."

During his imprisonment in the Fleet Sir Richard seems to have made friends with a distinguished literary fellow-prisoner, the well-known James Howell. Howell was committed in 1643, and not released till 1651. His best work, the *Epistolæ Ho-elianæ*, a collection of Familiar Letters, appeared while he was a prisoner, and in Book II is the following letter believed to have been addressed to Sir Richard:—

"To Sir R. Gr. Knight & Bar.

Noble Sir, I had yours upon *Maunday Thursday*, late; and the reason that I suspended my Answer till now, was, that the Season engaged me to sequester my thoughts from my wonted Negotiations, to contemplate the great Work of Man's Redemption, so great, that were it cast in counterballance with his Creation, it would out-poyze it far . . . Let this serve for part of my Apology. The day following, my Saviour being in the Grave, I had no list to look much abroad, but continued my retiredness; there was another reason also why, because I intended to take the Holy Sacrament the *Sunday* ensuing: Which is an Act of the greatest consolation and consequence that possibly a Christian can be capable of . . . Therefore it behoves a Man to prepare and recollect himself; to winnow his thoughts from the chaff and tares of the World beforehand: This then took us a good part of that day to provide myself a Wedding-Garment, that I might be a fit Guest at so precious a Banquet, so precious, that Manna and Angels Food, are but coarse Viands in comparison of it.

I hope that this excuse will be of such validity, that it may procure my Pardon for not corresponding with you this last Week. I am now as freely, as formerly,

Your most ready and humble

Servitor, J. H.

Fleet, 30 April, 1647."

If only we could cross-examine the old man on this Case, how interesting it would be. I am sure his little grandson asked him a thousand questions about these things. Why, for example, did the family fight for the monarchy until the reduction of Chester, and then send men to assist the Parliament? Was there a point beyond which the Grosvenors refused to go in defiance of the general will? The old man could explain all this. He certainly paid heavy tribute, and was spared nothing. Children have such a keen sense of taking sides, the lad must have wondered that his maternal grandfather, Sir Thomas Middleton, was a Parliamentary General, and that his father should have married his mother in the very year of the King's execution.

It is very difficult to follow the track of a particular family living in perilous days 250 years ago. It was not a time to record daily experiences, fears, judgments, and hopes, even for the sake of posterity. I have often wished that some sympathetic historian would picture for us such a county as Cheshire during the Stuart dynasty, and give some idea from family archives of the social embarrassments which must have occurred. Every now and again one comes on to records of attempts at friendly amenities amid political antagonism and bloody warfare. For example in 1643, the year after the battle of Edgehill, and the same year as the battle of Newbury and the siege of Gloucester, the King being at Oxford, and the Parliament at Westminster, the House of Lords issued these orders: "That Jemmy Jacke shall have a pass, quietly to go to Oxford, with

a Birding-piece and a case of pistols, for the use of the Prince." "That a pass shall be granted, to permit three boys to carry to Oxford some Beagles, for the Prince his Highness." "That Hugh Rosse shall have a pass to go to Oxford . . . with Boots, Shoes, Stockings, Hats, and other necessaries, for His Majesty's use, and the Prince, and the Duke of Yorke, provided the things be searched before they go."

In 1684, during the scare created by the Rye-House Plot to assassinate Charles II, orders were issued by the Government for the search and removal of all weapons in the houses of suspected Whigs. Among the Cheshire suspects was Sir John Crewe of Utkinton, and the duty of searching his house was given to his cousin, Sir John Arderne. When Arderne arrived at Utkinton Hall, he found Crewe from home, and having done his duty, went himself, and sent Crewe a letter from which I give a few sentences:—

"13 Aug. 1684. Sir, I hope you'l pardon the abrupt leave from Utkinton. . . . I long to see you, and wishe wee could meet some where before you returne. . . . I have a minde to saye somewt to you and probably a horseswapp in at all, but whether wee meet or not, or whether wee (in these sickly times) ever see one another againe; let mee gaine an assurance that none is more desirous to be upon kind good termes with you than my selfe. . . . Maye wee returne to ye old habitt of friendship. May our different sentiments of publikque affaires never swell to ye heate of an argumt : and soe burst into a passion : wch alwayes leaves us worse than it found us : but I have noe roome for more prayers : or addition : save ye tender of humble, hearty, and due service to my honord good Aunt whom I'le serve while I live : my service to your virtuous Lady : and good mother Rowe

when you visite or see them, and am assuredly Honord Cosin
Yours to love and serve you wtsoever you thinke of J.
Arderne.”

Three years later, 24 Jan. 1687, Bishop Cartwright records dining with Sir John Crewe at Utkinton, and meeting there Sir John Arderne, so we may hope that all went well.

The Stuarts certainly did contrive to set every section of society by the ears, and when Sir Thomas Grosyënor came to overhaul the papers left by his grandfather and great grandfather at Eaton Boat, he could see for himself the difficulties his family had faced, and the policy pursued. It began with the great grandfather, Sir Richard, the first baronet, a tough worthy, who loved his kin, but loathed the Pope, the poacher, and the publican. We get a very imperfect impression of his appearance, as the only known portrait is on contemporary stained glass in Farndon Church, reproduced from Ormerod on Plate 18, but we have a fairly good notion of the man, for he was educated, articulate, and positive, and left some of his ideas in writing. He married three wives, sat in three Parliaments, and occasionally held forth in that assembly on such subjects as “the many undue Fees encroached by the Officers in the County Palatyne of Chester,” or against “the importation of Irish cattle, a great Robbing of our Coin, and spoileth all the near adjacent Counties to them. That 5 or 6,000 Cattle imported in the Port of Chester last Year. These carry over nothing but ready Money. The Irish undersell us much. Land by this Means fall 20 in the 100.” He also sat pretty

regularly on Committees about "The Preservation and increase of salmon, Welsh Butter," and the like. As these Committees often sat in the Court of Wards, he probably rubbed shoulders with Hugh Awdeley, and little could they have imagined that Sir Richard's great grandson would marry Awdeley's great niece, and with her acquire the Manor of Ebury.

Sir Richard was educated at Queen's College, Oxford, and brought away from the university a constant practice of Latin quotation, that must have bewildered the Cheshire audiences. His speech, as sheriff, in 1623, "at the Election of Knights of the Parliament," in Chester, is at Eaton in manuscript. The candidates were William Booth, and William Brereton of Ashley. He begins:—

"I shall desire you would give me leave in a word or two to deliver mine advice, wherein I will deal plainly and freely as best becometh a free spirit, without fear of any, without assertion to any. . . . And first I would wish you to take into your consideration the weight of the business which must be laid upon the shoulders, and performed by the abilities, of these your Knights, and when you thoroughly understand that, you will with greater care and conscience, with more judgment and less partiality seek forth for this service . . . gentlemen every way apted and fitted thereto; such as are quick of capacity, nimble of apprehension, ripe in judgment, sound and untainted in their religion, faithful and trusty . . . and who thoroughly understand the nature of this County Palatine; and such whose courage (upon all occasions) dare command their tongues without fear to utter their country's just complaints and grievances. The weight of this employment is understood by taking a view of the nature of Parliament.

A Parliament is the most honourable and highest Court

Plate XVIII



SIR RICHARD GROSVENOR, BARONET

From a Window at Farndon

(This reproduction is the same size as the original.)

of the kingdom, having an absolute jurisdiction and an unlimited power to dispose of the lives, limbs, states, goods, honours and liberties of the subjects, yea, and of their religion too, so far forth as concerneth the free public and outward profession thereof. And therefore it behoveth us to be very wary whom we elect.

Marvel not . . . though I compare this employment to an arbitrament, for I think there seldom hath been or ever will be any Parliament but there have been or will be some busy-headed working politicians, attending opportunities; and wicked projectors, watching advantages to bring in bondage both Church and Commonwealth. But you will demand of me what needeth all this; what new fears arise that we should now be more cautelous and curious than heretofore? I answer: It hath been the happiness of ourselves and our predecessors to have been for many years past witnesses of those golden and halcyon days which they and we have enjoyed under the happy governments of that blessed saint of famous memory, Queen Elizabeth, and His Majesty (James the 1st), wherein every man sat in peace under his own vine and followed his employment in safety, and enjoyed the fruits of his labours, without once paying tribute (as I may say), forth of his sweat, in blood-sucking projectors. . . . When at the last convention of Parliament I had the honour and trust to be your servant, there I observed the many grievances complained of, under which the Commonwealth groaned and laboured, and from which that worthy House sought to free it. The multitude of the Patents of Monopolies of all sorts, adjudged by that House as grievances . . . the many and shrill outcries against corruption in the Courts of Justice, and emptying of suitors' purses by extorting undue fees there: the decay of trade and consumption of coin, to the impoverishing of the whole kingdom.

These and such like (as they were fit subjects for a Parliament to treat of), so did that House take indefatigable pains in finding out the causes of those growing evils, and expounding the remedies. But, alas, those great pains and care yielded not so plentiful an harvest as expected, though

they were not altogether fruitless. Without that exemplary punishment inflicted upon a Prime Officer¹ of this kingdom for corruption, to the terror of others. Besides His Majesty taking notice from the Parliament of the damage sustained by many of his Grants (which otherwise had still been kept from his knowledge), was pleased by his proclamation to decry many of them, and showed himself (like a true father of his country) as willing to call them in as we were to complain of them.

And here give me leave to do His Majesty right who hath suffered much in the misinformed opinions of his subjects, conceiving that His Majesty had been knowing and willing enough that these caterpillers, these Projectors, should have fed and preyed upon his people, whereas the truth is, though we found many of the streams issuing from the fountain itself to be pure, clear, and uncontaminate, it appeared to us, that when any petitioned to His Majesty for a grant of this kind (though the projectors aimed only at their own gain, not caring what hurt redounded to the Commonwealth), yet they apparelled their petitions in honourable habits . . . ever pretending . . . profit to the Commonwealth, and honour to the King. Yet, His Majesty, unwilling that his people should take any prejudice by his grants, took this course to give himself satisfaction (for this is one of the miseries of princes, they must see and hear by other men's eyes and ears), he made choice of some men, learned in the laws, to whom he referred the consideration of the petition, and who were commanded to report to him whether such a grant were not against the laws of the kingdom. And when these had delivered their judgments, that by law he might grant it, yet would not His Majesty be therewith satisfied, well knowing that many things which are lawfull are not expedient, but may be prejudicial to the Commonwealth : and therefore he used also to make a second reference to some persons eminent in the state to examine the convenience or inconveniency of the Grant. And hinc lacrimæ, hence came all the wrong, for those referees many times proved to be

¹ Francis Bacon?

persons interested in those Grants (for that was the policy of the Projectors), and these referees by their partial reports deceived His Majesty, and prejudiced the land. I could recite unto you the many worthy Bills of the last Parliament, some whereof passed both Houses, some the lower House, others in good forwardness to pass, which, had they received life by the royal assent, I dare say this land would have been (through the blessing of God), as happy and flourishing as ever. But, alas, we all know they wanted true essence, suddenly vanishing. But my hopes are that this Parliament will not suffer all that care and pains to be fruitless, but endeavour by all means to give life and form to their predecessors' conceptions."

I have given rather long extracts from this election address, because this book is about a family which took part in public affairs during a long epoch of the Stuart dynasty, and Richard Grosvenor, created baronet by James I in 1621, delivered this speech in 1623, claiming an absolute supremacy for Parliament, a view totally at variance with the King's theory of the divine hereditary right of himself and his successors. The Grosvenors all through this period did their best to keep the Stuarts on the throne, but James the First started with pretensions that had no sanction from either English history or character, and James the Second, by trying to put them into practice, wrought the ruin of his race.

* * *

Besides the election address, Sir Richard gave two charges, "to the Jury at the Quarter Sessions held within the Shire Hall of Chester," one dated Tuesday, 24th Jan. 1642, and the other without date. In each he levels heavy blows against those "who are made

drunk with the cup of the whore of Babylon." As to priests and Jesuits, "the law hath commanded them as noisome vermin not to infest the country: not to dare to set footing in this kingdom, which, if they transgress, it hath been designed them to a place fit for them, the gallows."

"And there is great reason why King and State should be more severe against them now than at other times, which we shall easily be persuaded to believe if we consider the jealousies that His Majesty hath of the Princes of the House of Austria, upon whom our recusants wholly depend for the under-propping of their staggering religion: so that, if there should be an invasion, as there was in '88, they would sooner take parts with them than with their own natural Prince, although they were sure to find from them no other favour in conclusion but what the Cyclops of Homer promised to Ulysses, to eat him up last of all; and this is the reason why the State holds it not safe to trust these men with the keeping of their own arms."

After these onslaughts upon the Catholics, he proceeds to deal with other offenders, amongst them the ale-houses,

"the very bane of this country, a receptacle for knaves and harlots, the robbers Council chamber, the beggars nursery, the drunkards academy, the thieves sanctuary. . . . A drunkard can make no speed, what haste soever my business requireth, for if the ale-house be in his way, it serves instead of a trammel to take off his speed; and he must needs visit mine hostess as he passeth by. And when he cometh forth (if by chance he call to mind his errand) he finds his feet so unwilling to go forward (which he perceiveth by their reeling and making indentures), that he is easily persuaded to return (without dispatching his business): and he thanks them for doing him so good service if they carry him back from whence he came, before he fall asleep."

Sir Richard then falls foul of the poachers,

“such as are enemies to the sports and pleasures of gentlemen, to whom the law allows such recreations as are not held fit for persons of a meaner condition; and these are those who destroy hares by tracing them in the snow, or kill them with hare-pipes, or other engines. Likewise those who take pheasants, or partridges with nets, or any other device: and as you must present these, so also stealers of deers and conies. You must also present those that shoot in pieces at hares, pheasants, partridge, pigeon, heron, duck or any other fowl prohibited, of which kind of offenders this our neighbour city affords plenty, who (by their boldness in continual offending) proclaim that they think the Charter and privilege of their City should patronise and protect them from punishment in the country. Myself have heretofore caused divers of them to be indicted, but I never heard yet that any of them were punished. Where the fault is I know not.”

He has something to say also to those who erect cottages without laying 4 acres of land to them, and the forestallers, “who make your markets scarce and dear”; and the extortionate inn-holders, who prey upon travellers, and many others. After reading these lengthy indictments interspersed with no fewer than 23 Latin quotations in one charge, one is not surprised that the Parliamentary History records that “Sir Richard Grosvenor here out of his papers read the House a large lecture”!

THE FLEET PRISON

IT is much to be regretted that the last years of Sir Richard's life were clouded by serious pecuniary embarrassments, as well as the Civil War. Through no fault of his, he and his family had to migrate to North Wales, some years before the war began. The trouble was caused by Peter Daniell, of Tabley, who married Sir Richard's sister, and was returned to Parliament with Sir Richard in 1626. Sir Richard went bond for Daniell, and through dishonest means had heaped upon him liabilities that overwhelmed him. He sat in Parliament till 1629, but soon after was put in the Fleet Prison, where he remained some years. In 1638 he was in the Fleet, and had 34 processes of outlawry against him, and on Christmas Eve of that year Daniell advanced some security in a document which indicates some of the story:—

“And whereas the said Sir Richard Grosvenor att the speciall instance and request of the said Peter Daniell and as his suretie and for the proper debts of the said Peter Daniell became ingaged to diverse and sundrie persons (Creditors of the said Peter Daniell) for the payment of severall great summes of Money amountinge to many Thousand pounds att certeyne dayes and times nowe long since past. By reason of which said debts and ingagements and tedious and wearisome ymprisonment for the same for many yeares together The said Sir Richard Grosvenor hath byn greatlie dampnified in his estate And for part of the said

debts the said Sir Richard Grosvenor hath out of his owne proper meanes given satisfaction by payment of great sumes of money to divers of the said Creditors, and for some other part of the said debts the said Sir Richard Grosvenor doth lye in execucion in the prison of the fletee."

The Churchwardens' Accounts at Eccleston are without Grosvenor signatures from 1634 until 1651, but we do not know exactly the place the family migrated to; all we know is that it was in North Wales. As Sir Richard's son, Richard, married a daughter of Sir Roger Mostyn, possibly the Grosvenors took refuge on her father's estate.

While the first baronet was in the Fleet he wrote two letters¹ in the year 1629. "Such is the misery," he writes to Lord Dudley, "of my present condicon, that (being with others ingaged much for an unfortunate, but more dishonest Brother-in-law) noething will serve the Creditors but present payment, which is impossible for mee to doe, which moves mee to flie at this tyme to the goodnes of my gracious Sovereigne, and to implore his mercie; not to defraud any (God is my record) but to gett from my fellow sureties, and the principall, what assistance I can." He got protection for a while, and things gradually came round, in spite of Daniell, and Cromwell.

* * *

There lived years ago in Norwich a charming historical writer, Dr. Augustus Jessopp, who was attracted by some manuscript at Eaton and asked leave to see it. This was readily granted, and, as often happens, Jessopp's discursive mind lighted on

¹ *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, Vol. 4, pp. 97 and 102.

another manuscript, so little examined that the pages clung together over the sand that had dried the ink. Dr. Jessopp was delighted; it was all about the Fleet Prison, a subject new to him and everybody else. It dealt with one of the many protests raised by the prisoners against their ill-treatment by one Harris, their Warden, and is entitled, *The Oeconomy of the Fleete: or An Apologeticall Answeare of Alexander Harris unto XIX Articles sett forth against him by the Prisoners.*

Dr. Jessopp copied the 660 folio pages of this manuscript, and edited it for the Camden Society in 1879. It is curious that he gives no reference to this indictment against Harris having been thrashed out in the House of Commons, and the Warden admonished by the Speaker, and his proceedings described as "Worse than the Inquisition of Spayne, or Gallies among the Turkes." (*Journal of the House of Commons*, 17 Feb. and 2 June, 1621.) It is not improbable that the first Grosvenor Baronet beguiled the weary hours of his imprisonment by copying this manuscript, the pages of which had not been drawn asunder for over two hundred years.

To show what unexpected things come to light during research, I note here that in the *Journal of the House of Commons*, 31 March, 1663, there is a record that the roof of Westminster Hall got out of repair, "so as the Passage through the Hall in rainy weather, is very bad," therefore the House ordered the Warden of the Fleet to attend, "To-morrow Morning, to give an Account, whether he be not liable to take care for

the keeping of the said Hall in Repair." On April 7 the House "Ordered, That the Warden of the Fleet do attend Mr. Attorney and Mr. Solicitor General; and do shew unto them by what Title he does claim the Shops standing in Westminster Hall; to the end that, if he cannot make out a good Title thereto, the Rents of the Shops may be employed towards keeping the Hall in repair." Dr. Jessopp quotes from Madox (*History of the Exchequer*, p. 356) an entry dated 1197, about Nathaniel de Leveland and his son Robert, who are "To have the custody of the King's Houses at Westminster and of the Fleete Prison which had been their inheritance ever since the Conquest." The custody of the royal palace and prison seems to have become a hereditary perquisite of the king's servant. "For the Palace," writes Dr. Jessopp, "without the Warden's licence, none might *go in*; for the Fleet Prison, without his release, none might *go out*. He made his profit by the fees levied and by exactions imposed upon ingress and egress; but it is certain that the Wardenship of the Prison was the more profitable office. From the miserable more can be wrung than from the prosperous." (Fleet Prison, *Journal of the House of Commons*, Vols. 11 and 12.)

SCROPE *VERSUS* GROSVENOR

WITH these documents revealing the first baronet's political and religious opinions, as well as his imprisonment, there came a still larger collection showing his care for the history of his family. Macaulay's estimate of the English squires of the 17th century was prejudiced, but he was correct as to their passionate attachment to their own heraldry and genealogy. This care was not confined to private individuals. Itinerant Heralds, servants of the Crown, made Visitations to each county, and noted the pedigree and armorial bearings of every considerable landed proprietor. These records were not pattern-books for stationers or silversmiths, but practical lists of persons eligible for the functions of national defence and local government; and, in a society where much property was hereditary, these Visitations were often produced in courts of law in disputed cases.

Sir Richard the first had a pedigree, founded on the traditional genealogy, inscribed and illuminated on sheets of parchment. He also had a copy made of the evidence in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial, and collected a number of manuscripts of general interest, on the list of which he wrote :—

“A perticuler of such manuscripts as Sr Richard Grosvenor hath as they are bound up in severall volumes. And it is myne earnest desire to my Sonne; that (as I have

freely bestowed them, wth all my other Bookes, upon him) he will alsoe leave them, and all such other Bookes, as hereafter I shall furnish him wthall, as freely and intirely to his sonne, and heire, and soe from heire to heire of my family; whilst it shall please God to preserve the same in my name. february : 18 : 1634 : Anno Regni Caroli Regis decimo. Richard Grosvenor."

I cannot help thinking that when Burton bore into the hall at Eaton a volume bound in green leather, containing no fewer than 500 odd vellum pages, and weighing over 16 lbs., there must have been some searchings of soul. What is to be done with this? It is too tall for a book-press, and too large for the withdrawing-room table. Besides which, who can translate the 14th century French? Surely the bride must have asked what it was all about, and who had gone to the expense and trouble of having it made. I can imagine her sensitive husband making a well-considered reply, so that no hint of social distinction should transpire, but simply an explanation that as her uncle Sir Thomas Davies rose to eminence in the City of London, and recorded a coat of arms for his family in the College of Arms, so, in the days of Richard II, when Sir Robert Grosvenor went fighting with the King of Scotland, he bore upon his banner a blue shield with a gold bend across it, which he said his ancestors had borne since the Conquest.

Full of interesting suggestion is a comparison between the armorial bearings of the bride and bridegroom. One the adaptation of early Cambrian heraldry to the requirements of a successful London tradesman, the other the traditional military badge of a feudal family.

No one can suppose that the families of Davies, Harvey, or Bonfoy, recorded their arms because they intended to go out fighting under banners decorated with crosses, stars, hearts, and rabbits. They used the College of Arms as a register of relationship, to support, if need be, their claim to the kinship and cash balances of Hugh Awdeley. The arms borne by Sir Thomas Grosvenor belonged to another category. They were inherited from his ancestor Sir Robert, who went with Richard II to fight in Scotland, and while Sir Robert and his archers were gathered round this beautiful banner, up came Sir Richard Scrope, 1st Baron Scrope of Bolton, who told Grosvenor he had no right to bear azure a bend Or, as it was the scutcheon of the Scrope family. And very touchy Scrope was about his coat armour. Only a few years before he had challenged "one called Carminow of Cornwall," and the dispute being referred to six knights, they found that Carminow had borne the device since the days of King Arthur, and Scrope since the Norman Conquest, so both were permitted to retain it.

In the Scrope and Grosvenor dispute a general proclamation was made in August, 1385, throughout the army in Scotland, that all who were interested should come and give evidence before the court of chivalry presided over by Thomas Duke of Gloucester. The depositions of the witnesses were taken by commissioners at various places, such as Plymouth, Tiverton, Abbotsbury, St. John's church Chester, the Chapter House of York cathedral, Nottingham, Leicester, St. Margaret's Westminster, and the Refectory of Westminster Abbey. Many of the original documents are preserved in the

Record Office, and the information given here is from the edition of these published by Sir Harris Nicolas.

Whatever may have been the rights in this case, one thing is certain the Cheshire knight had small influence compared with that of Baron Scrope, who had served as Lord Treasurer, Steward of the King's Household, and Chancellor of England. All the military magnates came forward to testify to Scrope's habitual use of this shield on the battlefields of France and England. There was John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, King of Castile, son of Edward III, and father of Henry IV, who went about this time with an army to recover his Spanish domains and before he embarked at Plymouth, down came the Scrope and Grosvenor commissioners, and the illustrious witness, on behalf of Scrope, deposed that he had seen and known Sir Richard bear these arms, and had heard from many noble and valiant men, since deceased, that these were the arms of Sir Richard's ancestors. He also gave an account of the Scrope and Carminow dispute. Following him we get his son, the Earl of Derby, afterwards Henry IV; Sir Henry Percy, the renowned "Hotspur"; the poet Chaucer; and nobles, knights, and abbots from all parts of England. They nearly all say the same thing about meeting Scrope bearing the arms, or seeing charters sealed with the same, or glass or tombs emblazoned with them. One of Scrope's witnesses, a Cheshire man, Hugh de Calveley, brother or nephew of the famous warrior, Sir Hugh de Calveley, "deposed that he had seen and known Sir Richard Scrope armed, and with his banner, Azure, a bend Or; but that he had heard that Sir Robert

Grosvenor had greater right to the said arms than Sir Richard Scrope."

It is a great pity that the depositions of nearly sixty witnesses for Grosvenor are lost. From what remains it is easy to see that although Grosvenor could not gather illustrious soldiers from all parts of England to testify to his bearing these arms on various battlefields with sufficient prominence to be widely recognized, yet the country gentry of Lancashire, Cheshire, and north Wales, did testify that the Grosvenors had for generations used this coat of arms, that it was on the seals of charters, and in the windows of churches. The abbot of Vale Royal said "that for 20 years past he has seen a shield of the said arms . . . in the church at Budworth . . . where Robert de Grosvenor, grandfather of Monsieur Robert, who now is, was buried, as he has heard." There is in the British Museum (Harl. MS. 2151, Fo. 76) a list of coats of arms in the windows of Lymm parish church made in 1592, and among them is Azure, a bend Or, for Grosvenor. Also one of Scrope's witnesses named Adam Neusom, deposed as follows: "But touching Sir Robert Grosvenor, he said that he is come from the Grosvenors of the County of Chester, and that his ancestors lie interred in the Abbey of Chester; but the arms are not depicted in colours on their bodies, but are depicted in glass of the windows in the said abbey in colours, as would be found throughout the country." Sir Harris Nicolas thought the last words to mean "as might be learnt from the general reputation of the county."

On October 15, 1386, depositions were taken before

Sir John de Derwentwater in the refectory of Westminster Abbey, and on this occasion the Poet Chaucer gave evidence in favour of Scrope, with whom he had served in France. "Being asked whether he had ever heard of any interruption or challenge made by Sir Robert Grosvenor or his ancestors, said no, but that he was once in Friday Street, London, and walking through the street, he observed a new sign hanging out with these arms thereon and inquired 'what inn that was that had hung out these arms of Scrope,' and one answered him, saying, 'They are not hung out, Sir, for the arms of Scrope, nor painted there for those arms, but they are painted and put there by a Knight of the County of Chester, called Sir Robert Grosvenor.'"

Among the many interesting witnesses was the Welsh patriot Owen Glendower, a very remarkable character, who experienced a very romantic career. When Glendower gave evidence in favour of Grosvenor he was 27 years of age and deposed that he had seen many ancient deeds with these arms upon them, and testified that it was a matter of common knowledge in Cheshire, Flint, and the neighbouring counties, that these arms belonged to Sir Robert and his ancestors.

One heroic witness deserves to be recalled. "Sir John Sully, K.G., of the age of 105 years, and armed 80 years," deposed that he saw a Scrope with those arms at the battle of Halidon Hill, 1333; at the battle of Cressy, 1346; at the battle of Poitiers, 1356; and at the battle of Najara, in 1367. He was in Gascony with the Black Prince in 1355-6, and his eyes probably rested many a time on the country which surrounds the

Duke of Westminster's home in the Department of the Landes, where he perchance chased the wild boar over the same ground. "In 1361 he obtained the following singular grant from the King: that he might once in every year during his life, in any of the royal forests, parks, or chases in the realm, have one shot with his bow, one course with his hounds, and one chase for his dog called 'Bercelette.'" At the age of nearly 90 Sully is recorded as "being about to serve in Aquitaine." After this he retired, in company with his faithful esquire Richard Baker, and, I hope, the offspring of Bercelette.

The hearing of evidence went on till 12 May, 1389, when the Duke of Gloucester as Constable, gave judgment in favour of Scrope, awarding to Grosvenor as his arms "Azure, a bend Or, with a plain bordure, Argent, for difference." This coat Grosvenor refused, and appealed to the King, who appointed commissioners to rehear the case, and pronounced sentence upon it in person on 27 May, 1390. He confirmed the Constable's judgment in favour of Scrope, but cancelled the differenced coat awarded to Grosvenor, because a plain bordure "was no sufficient difference for a stranger in blood." Thenceforward Grosvenor assumed, Azure with a sheaf of gold. After a dispute about the heavy costs of the suit, Scrope and Grosvenor were reconciled to each other in the presence of their sovereign in Parliament.

Such was the end of this famous case, and whether we like it or whether we do not, we have to admit that the human race loves both heraldry and genealogy: We

all respect a man who speaks with pride of "my father," or "my son." Shakespeare felt it,

"It is an honour 'longing to our house,
Bequeathed downe from manie Ancestors,
Which were the greatest obloquie i' the world,
In me to loose."

When the first Grosvenor baronet got into the Fleet prison, through no fault of his own, he wrote to the King's secretary, "It were a killing misery for mee to be the overthrow of soe ancient a family, as hath continued in Cheshire ever since the Conquest." Anything to save the old stock from downfall and disgrace. This pride in honourable perpetuation is a natural and valuable social instinct. There seems also a wide-spread appetite for heraldry. In the most revolutionary sections of society banners and badges abound.

THE KING'S PARDON

SIR ROBERT GROSVENOR, of the Scrope and Grosvenor dispute, by his second wife, left one son, Thomas, who joined the forces of the Percys and Owen Glendower, and after the battle of Shrewsbury was compelled to sue for pardon to King Henry IV. There is preserved in the Record Office (*Chancery Warrants*, Series 1, File 1406, No. 42) a copy of his petition to the King, of which the following is a translation from the French :—

“To our Sovereign Lord the King Beseeches most humbly your humble Chivaler Monsieur Thomas Grosvenor of the County of Chester. That whereas by great folly and also obstruction and high treason, by the evil enticement, fine words, and promises of Monsieur Henry Percy, He took up arms with the said Monsieur Henry against you heretofore in this your honourable battle. May it please your very gracious Lordship of your especial grace, and by way of mercy and pity, tenderly to consider the great repentance and abhorrence that your said suppliant has for the said offence and rebellion thus committed against your royal person and crown, and moreover of your more abundant grace to grant him grace and charter of pardon of the said offences and rebellion together with all his goods and chattels, lands, tenements, rents and other possessions whatsoever, in whatsoever parts or counties they are in your realm of England or elsewhere, which are forfeit to you by this rebellion, for God's sake and as a deed of charity.”

Below this is written :—

“This bill is granted by the Lord the King, and delivered to the Chancellor at Pomfret to be executed.” [The date of the patent of this pardon is 15 August, 1403, at Pontefract.]

As an appendix to the foregoing comes another document, No. 43 :—

“To our Sovereign Lord the King, Beseeches humbly your humble Chivaler Monsieur Thomas Grosvenor of the County of Chester. That whereas you of your especial grace granted pardon to your said suppliant of his rebellion and offence against you committed, and also granted to him that he should have his lands, tenements, rents, goods and chattels, and other things, and his charter as well of his goods and chattels as of his person. And thereupon the Lord Chancellor will not grant to your said suppliant his charter of his goods and chattels without a fine, but has granted the charter of his person and life. May it please your very gracious Lordship to command your said Chancellor to issue and deliver his charter of his goods and chattels aforesaid as you of your special grace granted to him, for God's sake and as a deed of charity.”

Below this is written :—

“This bill is granted by the Lord the King at York, and delivered to the Chancellor to execute.”

Within six months, and on 11 January, 1404, the Prince of Wales (afterwards Henry V) issued a mandate to Sir Thomas Grosvenor, to hasten to his properties on the Marches of Wales, to defend them against invasion; a prudent piece of royal diplomacy.

A few years after this pardon comes another on the Gascon Roll (112, m. 5), to “Henry Skyrowe, Lieutenant of the castle of Founsak, John Grosvenour, constable of the same castle, and the garrison there, for

all rebellions, misprisions, contempts, etc., against the King, or his predecessors, 23 May, 1422." I do not know who this turbulent John was, but possibly a Cheshire soldier of fortune, like Sir Hugh de Calveley.

* * *

Of course, when one glances back to "young Harry, with his beaver on," we begin to think about the Cheshire archers, and the roll of them given under the name of Thomas Grosvenor, printed in the Deputy Keeper's 42nd Report:—

"SAGITTARII ASSIGNATI THOME GROSVENOUR, CHIVALER

Ranulphus Sondebayche	Ranulphus Kilbery
Hamo Wynnynton	Thomas Dane
Johannes Lytteley	Ricardus Berynton
Willelmus Brydde	Ricardus Furnevale
Willelmus Croft	Thomas Warde
Ranulphus Yarwoode	Thomas Falous
Thomas Kenworthy	Henricus Gropenall
Thomas Stathom	Henricus Glaskyryon
Johannes Clyff	Thomas Aleyn,"

and then we recall the many ancient yew trees still surviving in the gardens and graveyards of the County Palatine, and mingle with this vision the words of de Comines, "The English, who are the flower of the archers of the world." (*Memoires*, Book I, Chap. III.) But immediately we are reminded that this story belongs to the 17th century, and that this book is already too full of digressions. It was all very well for de Comines to gush about the 15th century archers, but if he had survived until the epoch of Mary Davies, I fear the English toxophilists would have met with a less favourable comment. The Middlesex Sessions Calendar for 1638-1644, for

example, records that John Burgoine, of Drurie Lane, victualler, "hath caused a pair of butts to be made in his garden or backside, being an inconvenient place for that purpose," and that people have been often endangered and "hurted" by such as exercised shooting there; and in particular the Lady Moreton had an arrow shot so close to her that it touched her neck, her second son was shot in the arm, and the mother of John Bonas at whose house Lady Moreton lodged, was shot through the nose . . . Order made committing the said Burgoyne to prison till the said butts are demolished.

THE PEDIGREE

SURELY it is a natural and intelligent desire in us that seeks to know where and when our ancestors lived, and what they did. It is all very well for the poet to tell us that the grand old gardener and his wife occupy front seats in the lightly dressed circle of the empyrean, smiling at the claims of long descent; but what we want to know is the sort of expression on their features, when the inspired Evangelist poured out two long genealogies from themselves, to the Mother and Foster-father of the Redeemer. Interest in one's ancestors is not snobbery, snobbery is a superfluous interest in oneself. The bridegroom's stock in 1677, had been in Cheshire over 500 years, and lived at Eaton for more than 200. There are two pedigrees of the Grosvenor family, one traditional, put forward by Sir Robert Grosvenor, Knight, during the Scrope and Grosvenor dispute about coat armour in 1385, the other a critical genealogy, advanced 500 years later by Mr. W. H. Bird, in Vol. I of *The Ancestor*. The traditional pedigree is open to objections, which are impartially and well stated by Mr. Bird. These are confined to the first few generations, which include the supposed descent from Hugh Lupus. The traditional pedigree begins in the 11th century, the critical in the 12th, and there I leave it. It is a rich lode to sap and sift, as *The Ancestor*, Vol. I, and *The*

Herald and Genealogist, Vols. 4 and 5, prove, and if any gain could have come to this volume from trying to establish that this man's father was that man's son, I would have worked the claim, but a good bridegroom needs no loftier tree.

The traditional Grosvenor pedigree was set out with coloured shields on sheets of parchment, possibly by Randle Holme, in the time of the first Grosvenor baronet, and must have been handed in by Burton to Sir Thomas and his Lady for inspection. I imagine the sheets were then joined into one long roll, as they are to-day. For some years they were unfortunately cut up and insecurely framed.

It is quite possible that further research may clear up the genealogical difficulties of the traditional pedigree, that turn to a certain extent upon the name, which may be a patronymic, but was probably official. There seems to have been some consciousness of this in the family during the 16th century, because among the hundreds of early deeds carted up from Eaton Boat to the new Hall, are a group of family documents, between 1549 and 1600, consisting of wills, leases, etc., 90 per cent. of which spell the name Gravenor; and in a grant of the Talbot crest, made by Sir William Dethick, Garter, dated 20 August, 1597, to Richard Grosvenor of Eaton, he is described as "lineal heir male of the name and family of Grandvenour, called Grosvenor or Gravenor of Hulme in the county Palatine of Chester."

I have had the privilege of receiving from Sir George Sitwell, Bart., an essay on the subject of the name,

which I give here, as I believe it will be of interest to many readers :—

AN ESSAY ON THE NAME OF GROSVENOR

By Sir George Sitwell, Baronet

Sixteen years have passed since Mr. Bird's article, "The Grosvenor Myth," appeared in the opening number of *The Ancestor*, yet from that day to this no one has ventured to take up the gage of battle he cast down, or to break a lance with him in defence of the cherished traditions of the Heralds' College. As to the value of the article there can be no two opinions. He has presented his facts exceedingly well, making the way plain for those who follow, and some of his conclusions are never likely to be upset.

Like other modern critics, Mr. Bird will have nothing to do with the "honourable and powerful office of le Grosvenor," whether in Normandy or England. He argues very reasonably that we have no evidence that such a post existed, that we never meet with a "Groschamberlain," a "Groschancelier," a "Grosmareschal," a "Grosbotiller." In France the master huntsman to the King was known as "le Grand Veneur," not "le Gros Veneur," and it is as late as 1413 that he gains this distinction; before that he is "Mâitre Veneur," or "Mâitre de la Vénerie," in earlier times only "le Veneur." The prefix "Gros" must therefore have had in its origin a personal application, and Grosvenor, as Helsby first pointed out, means simply the "fat hunter."¹ One is sorry for this conclusion, as it strips the romance from the name; nevertheless a genealogist is justified in paying attention only to hard historic fact. In 1386, the year of the famous Scrope and Grosvenor controversy, the family knew little of their early ancestry, and Mr. Bird suggests that since Earl Hugh of Chester is depicted in history and legend as at once a

¹ Ormerod's *Cheshire*, 3, 144. The mediæval *grossus*, when applied to an individual, properly means, not fat, but big or tall; large in point of bulk or stature. The Anglo-Saxon vocabularies render *grossus* as "great." Karl der Grosse was so called because of his imposing height, and there is no reason to suppose that Bishop Grossetête suffered from a swelled head.

mighty hunter and a man of huge bulk, they boldly annexed him as "the original *Grossovenator*."

But stop a minute! Why "*Grossovenator*?" To those of us who can still remember painful interviews with the headmaster in our schooldays, Mr. Bird has administered a severe shock! And, as luck would have it, that one fatal word has knocked the bottom clean out of the argument he was building up with so much learning and forensic ability. The false concord is not of course his mistake. He and Helsby, like careful honest archivists, give what they believe to be the correct form of the name, taking it from an early charter,¹ probably more than one, in which the genitive *Grossovenatoris* is found. Mr. Bird thinks that *Grossovenator* is not due to carelessness on the part of the lawyers and clerks. I agree. He thinks that it is the original Latin rendering of the surname. I agree again. But why did the clerks refuse to accept the *grossus* as applying to the *venator*? Obviously because they knew it didn't mean "fat hunter." There could be only two reasons for writing it so. Either (1) they were fairly beaten by the name, didn't know what to make of it, or (2) they knew very well that it meant something quite different. What else could they take it to mean? Well, I will deal later with the difficulty offered by the ablative form. But when I find the surname of the inimitable Pepys spelt as "Peeps" in seventeenth century newspapers, I know that is how the men of his own day pronounced it; when I find Grosvenor twice rendered in early charters as Grauntvenor,² I shrewdly suspect that is how the people of that day understood it.

Can then *Grossus* be the equivalent of *grandis* or *grandus*? Undoubtedly it can, whether reference be made to the bulk of an individual, or the importance of an office. Du Cange quotes passages from mediæval authors in which *grossus* may be rendered alternately as *magnus*, *dives*, *nobilis*, *potentior*. It may also express superiority of degree, just as *major* would do. The *grossi* are the same people as the *grandi*; magnates, men of wealth, position and power;

¹ Ormerod, *Cheshire*, 3, 145.

² *Ancestor*, 1, 176.

grossa domus is equal to *familia nobilior*, *grossa causa* to *causa majoris momenti*; *grossa justitia* is "haute justice," *justitia major quae vulgatius Alta appellatur*. Furthermore, as Littré points out in his great "Dictionnaire de la Langue Française," at one time "gros" was habitually substituted for "grand," a usage now obsolete. "L'habitude de dire un gros seigneur," he says, "de gros messieurs, avait fait substituer généralement gros a grand, et l'on disait un gros général pour un grand général; cela ne se dit plus. On dit cependant encore: gros major." It seems then, after all, that there may have been a Groschamberlain, a Groschancelier, a Grosmareschal, a Grosbotiller, in common parlance, though not in official documents or in chronicles. However, as none of these grand personages are met with until the middle or end of the fourteenth century, their existence or non-existence has little to do with the problem before us.

Littré does not specify the period during which this colloquialism of using "gros" for "grand" prevailed. That it began very early is shown by the substitution of "grossi" for "grandi" in the fourteenth century, of *grossa res* for *magna res* by Amalarius of Trêves in the days of Charlemagne. But the practice goes back much further than that; indeed, it found its way into the Romance languages from Imperial Rome. In the Vulgate the word abounds, and the fourth century Roman must have preferred in his speech *grossus* to *grandis* as *cavallus* to *equus* and the Greek *bassus* to *humilis*. The origin of the word is unknown; there is no probability that it is related to *crassus*, and we are told that chronology forbids it to be the old High German *grôz*, or great. This may be so, but some German words, such as *burgus*, came into the Latin language very early.

Littré quotes only a single instance of the colloquial use, namely a sentence from the "Nuits de Straperole" in *La Curne*:—"En cette façon ceux qui avoient esté gros seigneurs en ce monde icy, gaignoient leur pauvre, méchante, et paillardie vie la bas." I propose however to add another example of the usage which may seem rather to the point, as it shows the inhabitants of the Yorkshire forest of Galtres

in the fifteenth century, perhaps earlier,¹ speaking of a master huntsman as *le Gros Veneur*:—

The story of Bishop Bek of Durham and Hugh the black huntsman of Galtres will not be forgotten, "how the busshop chasid the wild hart in Galtres forest, and sodainly ther met with him Hugh de Pontchardin that was afore deid, on a wythe horse; and the said Hugh loked earnestly on the Bushop, and the Bushopp said unto him, 'Hughe, what makethe thee here.' And he spake never word, but lifte up his cloke, and then he shewed Sir Anton his ribbes set with bones and nothing more; and none other of the varlets saw him, but the Bussshop only. And the said Hugh went his way, and Sir Anton toke corage, and cheered the dogges, and shortly after he was made Patriarque of Hierusalem, and he saw nothing no more. And this Hugh is him that the silly people in Galtres doe call Le Gros Veneur, and he was seen twice efter that by simple folk, afore yat the forest was felled in the tyme of Henry, father of Henry yat now ys."²

I don't know whether Mr. Bird will maintain that there can be such a thing as a fat spectre, but, if he does, this passage will hardly help him, as the departed Hugh de Pontchardin offered the most convincing evidence that he had no flesh upon his bones.

There seems therefore to be little or nothing in the point that in France the master huntsman was known, not as *le gros*, but as *le Grand Veneur*. The two adjectives were equivalent, for a time were interchangeable, and one of those subtle variations in meaning or association to which words are subject might make *grossus* preferable for a particular purpose in the twelfth century, *grandus* in the fifteenth. Indeed such a change may actually be traced, for during the interval the import of the former word tends to move from greatness to coarseness. In the fourteenth century "gross" is finding its way into the English language. It is met with in Wyclif and Trevisa, though not, as far as I know, in

¹ The Master huntsman in France may have been known as "le Grand Veneur" or (colloquially) as "le Gros Veneur" long before he had the official title. "Maître Veneur" and "Maître de la Vénerie" are more awkward, less simple, less imposing.

² Surtees Soc. 40, page 161.

Chaucer. The New English Dictionary lays down that the English word "has developed several senses not to be found in the French," and it may be that this tendency towards insular variation goes far back in the history of the Norman-French word in England. "Gross" may be rendered in some passages as (1) "entire, total, whole," (2) "in a general way generally," (3) "in full, nothing being omitted or withheld."¹ If these senses are old, and there seems to be some evidence that they are, Robert le Grosvenor may have been so named because he held the office of *Venator* generally throughout the Earl's dominion, and not merely in a particular forest.

But the difficulty about the ablative *grosso* still remains? True, and this may prove to be the key of the whole position. The phrase *in grosso*, or "in gross," has a technical legal meaning peculiar to England, being used of a thing that is entire, not dependent upon another. "Waif," as personal to the King, was *grossum de Corona*; "common in gross" was that held by a grant for life, or to a man and his heirs, independent of any holding in the manor; a serf was *villanus in grosso*, when attached, not to the land, but to the body of his lord; an advowson was *advocatio in grosso*, when the patronage was a personal possession, not appertaining to any fee. This seems to be the exact character of the office held by Robert le Grosvenor, namely that it was a thing entire, existing in its own right, not dependent upon any fief or honour. If Hugh Keveliok appointed Robert le Grosveneur *in grosso venatorem*, we have at once an explanation of the surname and of the strange Latin form in which it is found.

The convenience of such an official designation and the probability that it would develop into a surname must be obvious. A chief huntsman belonging to the Knightly class would desire not to be confused with the ordinary "Veneur," who was often a poor free-tenant. It will be remembered that Richard II in 1384-5, made a grant of sevenpence halfpenny a day to Nicholas Wittell, one of his huntsmen, in order to enable him to support the estate of a gentleman, to which

¹ It should be noticed that in hawking "to fly gross" is to fly at great birds.

the King had advanced him.¹ This desire to define the position of the Master huntsman is shewn in the thirteenth century by the invention of cumbrous phrases such as "Mâitre de la Vénerie" in France, in England "Veneur le Roy dengleterre," "Surveyor and superior Keeper of the King's game."² In Cheshire the prefix "gros" seems to have given just the distinction that was needed.

I think then that to the mediæval Englishman, Grosvenor meant "Grand Veneur" or "Mâitre de la Vénerie." The old English equivalent is "Maister of Game," and the office in early times was one of honour and dignity. Domesday shows that under Hugh le Loup it was held by one of his barons, Gilbert de Venables, known also under the soubriquet of *Venator* or "le Veneur." There seem also to have been Masters in the two principal forests, and their descendants as Knights of the Earl of Chester followed him in his wars.

The early history of the Mastership in England has not been traced, but in the opening years of the fifteenth century it was held by a grandson of Edward III, Edward Duke of York, who between 1406 and 1413 wrote the famous treatise entitled "The Mayster of the Game." In this and the earlier Gaston Phoebus we obtain something more than a passing glimpse of the Master and his duties. The French miniatures show him to us breakfasting in the open air in anticipation of a good day's sport. We see him in his long-skirted hunting dress on a white mount with a horn at his side and a baton in his hand, while before him a limer or track hound is questing for the hart. Or in a magnificent robe of vermilion embroidered with golden birds he sits on a chair of state with a ring of hounds and huntsmen about him. We may learn also his devoir to his sovereign, in Cheshire to the Earl, as in England to the King. In preparation for a royal visit he gives orders to the foresters and others, decides who shall unharbour the deer, where the hounds are to uncouple, where the King shall stand with his bow. At the tryste, fair lodges of green bows are set up to keep the King and Queen, the ladies and also the grey-

¹ *The Master of Game*, page 168.

² Patent Rolls, 8 and 9 Ed. 2.

hounds from sun and evil weather. All being ready, the Master mounts upon his horse to meet the King and bring him to his place. Then, when the King is at his standing or his tryste, should he blow the three long notes for the uncoupling, for hart hounds and harriers abide upon the Master's blowing. When the harriers have well run, and have made the rascal deer void the covert, the hart hounds must uncouple nigh to the best lying for a hart, enchasing him well and lustily, so that he go to the bows and be smitten. Last of all, when the woods have been drawn and cleared, and the King would hunt no more, the Master (if the King will not blow) must blow a note and stroke with a note in the middle, and every follower may blow a stroke as often as he likes, if they have obtained that which they hunted for; so that men may know as they stroke homeward whether they have well sped or not. The Master leads the King to the Curée at the forest hall, where the harts are laid in two or three rows by themselves, according to whether there be many or few, the rascal deer in the same way by themselves. After that, "if the King wishes to stay he may; nevertheless he usually goes home." Then is the time for every man to draw to his supper, and to make himself as merry as he can. We too, may turn our steps homeward, for the day's hunting is over.

*

*

*

AN EPITAPHE OF SR THOMAS GRAVENER, KNYGHT

Under this stone ther lyethe at rest
 A frendly mane a worthie knyght
 whose hert and mynde was ever prest
 to favor truthe to farther ryght

The poores defence his neighbors ayde
 most kynde always unto his kyne
 That stint all stryf that myght be stayed
 whose gentell grace great love dyd wyne

A man that was full earnest sett
 To serve his prince at all assayes

no sycknes coulde hym from that lett
which was the shortnynge of his dayes

His lyf was good he dyed full well
The bodie here the sowle in blys
with lenght of wordes whie shoulde I tell
or farther shewe that well knowne is

Sins that the tears of more and lesse
Right well declare his worthynes

w

Vivit post funera Virtus.

From a manuscript copy of Sir Thomas Wyatt's poems in
the British Museum. (*Harl. MS. 78, fo. 28d.*)

RACING RHYMES

AMONG the papers at Eaton is a folded sheet of foolscap docketed "Sluggard's Character," and on it are four pieces of poetry which I reproduce here, exactly as they are written, not because of their literary merit, but on account of their early date, the allusion to the Wirrall, and the names of the horses. The term "Elegiacallie," and the allusions to Æsop, Pegasus, Hercules and Issachar, lead one to think it possible that the poet was the first Grosvenor baronet. Some years ago, my friend Mr. R. D. Radcliffe published a very interesting pamphlet, *An old racing stable at Wallasey in Wirral*, and identified from a 1735 map the site of the old race-course, and the stables of the Grosvenors and Vyners, the ruined remains of which were still visible in 1894. From this ruin an architect made a sketch giving a faithful idea of the original Grosvenor stables, reproduced on Plate 19.

ST. GEORGE'S DAY AT CHESTER. 1627.


The Sluggard's Character.

Elegiacallie.

Plucke downe your Capps with Care
clasp hands and cry aloud
Since Slugg, hath by the Mare
tooke fall by beinge proud

Who by his hackney speede
soe sluggish leaden heel'd

Plate XIX



GROSVENOR RACING STABLES AT WALLASEY

Hee rann as swift as Need
and trottinge lost the ffeild

Which shewes his speede was such
were Dorie's Nagg alive
Hee could performe as much
as Slugg; 'tis tenn to five

ffour furious Steeds oppos'd
this fierie Milhorse swift
By fault may bee enclos'd
for Slugg hee prov'd the fift

Yet maugre ffault and ffate
Sluggard would followe kind
Hee lost praise yet wonn hate
and gott the pricke behind

As that Conspicuouslie
hee firmly to it stood
When others free did fly
hee stay'd all bath'd in blood

His Ryder made it knowne
that Sluggards must bee prick'd
His weapons were his owne
thoughe Master's horse hee nick'd

In most blasphemous wise
trustinge to strength of horse
Slugg's blood and wounds arise
Without the Least remorse

Whilst Slugg wch had noe Peere
to purchase Glorie's sheild
Stay'd to bringe upp the Reere
at length enforc'd to yeild

Thus spurr'd and scutch'd at length
Sluggard thou must resigne

Although thou Loose thy strength
thy Colours yet are thyne

Let your domestique Cracke
beware henceforth to bragg
Least Gray Mare breake your backe
as now, and you come Lagg.

(Wirrall) beware of Prophetesies
Least they prove faulse (as this)
The Mare shall winn the prize
when Slugg shall come and kisse

GRAY DAINITIES CONGRATULACON

Goe on (Gray Daintie) growe thou gray with yeares
In yearely Tryumph, thou hast borne the Bell
ffrom Speede itselfe, and didst forerunn the Peeres
With peereles footinge; therefore ring a knell
Of deepe despaire, that they may truly see
How slacke and sluggish they are all to thee.

May thy backe bowe with Trophees; may thy Name
Beare honour Annuall while all stately Steedes
Come jaded to behould thy flyinge fame
And pyne with Envie at the famous deedes.
Beware you dayntie Coursers how you runn this Course
Least Dayntie Gray-Mare prove the better horse.

But thou (thou Sluggard) for thy bold adventure
Shalt bee transtitl'd Bayard for thy pride
How durst thou in the Lists with Gray to enter
The Ryder sure the saddle sate beside
ffor nether thou, nor hee, with all your force
Deserved the name of Gramarcie horse.

Let Æsop's Steedes best happ betide thy worth
That Asses may encounter thee, and shame
The sluggish Genetrix that brought thee forth
To beare that Nature and that sluggish name.

Let him that speakes thy praise bee truly quitt
With Issachar his blessinge, truly fitt.

Then let thy deedes themselves (thou Dayntie Gray)

Speake in their nakednes with Trump of ffame,
Soe shall thy worth and not thy wordes display

Thy daynty goodnes and thy dayntie name,

'That all the World may by Experience say

Thou art noe Slugg, but Speede, the Daintie Gray.

SLUGGARD'S ENCOMIUM

Cast upp your Capps with joy

Clapp hands and shout aloud

Since Slugg hath gott the day

from his Corrivalls proud.

Who by his Courage greate

Couragious, swift, and stout,

In bloud hee fine did beate

Noe one could Coate him out..

Which shewes his Spiritt such

were Hercules alive

Hee durst not dare as much

as thus to combate five,

ffive fierie Spiritts oppos'd

'gainst him that fights alone

By ffate may bee inclos'd

or els 'tis five to one.

Yet maugre ffates despight,

with vigour well display'd

Hee in that bloudie fight

sure fortitude bewrayd

As that Conspicuouslie

hee flyinge firmly stood

And unto every Eye

bath'd all his ffoes in blood.

Their Ryders made it knowne
 to frustrate dire disasters
 Their weapons were their owne
 although the Steeds their Masters,
 In most blasphemous wise
 with blood and wounds and sides
 Their spurrs they exercise
 till eich had galled their hides.

While Slugg with flaminge ire
 to purchase Glories Sheild
 As one compos'd of fire
 enforc'd eich Horse to yeild
 Thus spurr'd and scutch'd at length
 they all resigne to Sluggard
 Who by his Peareles strength
 did put their Prides in hazard.

Let forraine Crackers lowd
 beware henceforth to meddle
 With Cheshire's Palfrey prowde
 Least hee their Breech Bumfiddle
 Since Wirrall thus divines
 hee hardly will bee beaten
 By them or their Assignes
 though nere soe much they threaten.

SLUGGARD'S CONGEDELEERE

Ynough Brave Slugg since thou hast done ynough
 to merritt Glorie and most bright Renowne
 Wittnes those Coursers, who with Courage tough
 thou hast (Brave Spiritt) most bravely overthrowne :
 And with thy nimble (All out Capringe) hooves
 hast proudly ledd them such a Morris Daunce
 As all those Heroes that true worth approves
 must needes with Glory gloriously advaunce
 Thy flames faire splendor; for had Nature fram'd
 thy Lineaments to correspond thy name

Thou beinge a Sluggard, easly hadst bene tam'd
by eich base Sculker; And unto thy shame
Hadst bene soe poorely Baffled; As thy ffrendes
mought well have wisht that thou hadst nere bene gott
But Nature (as it seems) to crosse those endes
made thee (in Spleene) to bee extreamey hott
And eke soe fierie; as all Sence may gather
'twixt Name and Nature greate Antipathie;
Whereby it is conjectur'd that the ffather
that soe Eccleep'd thee in thine Infancie
did meane to Cheate; els had hee nam'd thee thus
Proud heire apparant to swift Pegasus.

Well as thou art Triumphant triumph ever
in thine approv'd and all-beloved Course
That when eftsoones thine Enemies persever
in this their Pride; Then proudly let thy force
Bee soe extended; As the world may sweare
That Sluggard in the world hath scarce one peare.

HOME LIFE AT EATON

FROM old account books and other papers, we get details of the home life of Sir Thomas and Lady Grosvenor. The house was not run by a professional staff, like an hotel, but all the details of management passed through the minds of master or mistress. The factotum, Thomas Burton, kept the books, entered debits and credits, whilst Sir Thomas overhauled the accounts, checked the figures, and signed the pages, "Allowed by me T. G.," or "Discharged by me T. G." Sometimes there was criticism; as, for example, when 5s. was paid to Mr. Stringer for a new hat for John Davies, Sir Thomas wrote on the page, "You must make no more clothes for John Davies now the dogs being gon, without farther orders from me, under hand, or by word of mouth." Burton had to buy much clothing. In 1676 he paid 10s. "for five yardes of frise cloth to make Bengemen and Richard Harrison ether a shout of clothes." "Little Ben Marsh" has a "pear of shooes" from William Browne, of Odford. On 23 December, 1680, Burton bought in "Wrixham Market," "one yeard and quarter of Wilsh cloth to make ye swyn-lad Waller, a peare of breeches on."

Some of the prices then given for food are interesting. Lemons 2d. each. Two pounds of double-refined

sugar, 2s. 8d. One quarter of salmon, 2s. 4d. Lobster, 1s. 6d. Two hundred asparagus, 2s. Six "harty Choakes," 1s. 6d. Pot of capers, 4s. Six dozen of larks, 4s. Two pounds of raisins, 11d. A barrel of herrings from Mr. Denteth, in 1676, cost 17s. 6d. In September, 1677, Estienne Masse, a Frenchman, got £4 10s. od. "for one dozen and a halfe of pineapples." "Widdow Murrey," in 1680, supplied "four hundred of cheese at 14s. the hundred." "One dozen of oranges, and 4 quarts of brandy" at 5s. 8d., hardly seems like real life to us nowadays. In 1681, a gross of pipes cost 1s. Charles Moreton, in 1679, got only 5s. "for 3 old geese and 2 young ones." In the same year Thomas Johnson and Richard Ensworth got £55 7s. 5d. "for 9 Irish bullocks and 60 weather sheep."

There are a few entries about wine. In 1681, James Miers, owner of the *Susannah*, got 5s. "For the carrag of one hampier of bottles of Rhenish wine from London to Leverpoole being 4 dossen and 3 bottles; spent by Philip and I Tho: Burton of meat and drinke and on ye horses and ourselves in fetching the hampier to Eatton 2s." In October, 1676, there is an entry, "Pd. Robart Ridge for 12 bottles of Cannary, 6 bottles of whine, 18 bottles of Clarratt . . . £3." As to beer, Alderman Street on 25 March, 1678, got £1 10s. od., "for two barils of strong beare the sum of which came to Eaton." Where the rest went to is not revealed, possibly electioneering, as Mrs. Lingley was paid 10s., 25 March, 1681, "for meat and drinke that ye men did eate and drinke that came to voate for Sir Philip and Sir Robert Cotton, and for tobacco, as appears by her bill."

Tallow was an important item then, as electricity is to-day. On September 13, 1676, Burton enters:—"Pd Widdow Wilshman for the exchaines of the Tallow that I bought of Mr. Hugh Grosvenor, being by pound, and the Tallow that came out of the bullocke yt was killed, made it by five score pound, and shee hath made five score pound of candeles, and for one half shee hath penny half-penny per pound, and for the other halfe a penny per pound, which comes in all to 10s. 5d."

Another important domestic commodity was pewter, and in June, 1676, Burton evidently changes old pewter for new:—"Seven pewter dishes att two pence per pound chaineinge beinge 29 pound comes to 4s. 10d." Timber for wainscot in the new house is brought from London by "George Thorpe Master of Endeavor Ketch of Leverpool," who gets £10 "for the carrag of 430 winescoatin boards, being eight tun and two hundred of dales . . . to ye key att Nesson" (Neston).

A few of the entries refer to domestic animals and sport. In 1677 Mrs. Burrowes was paid "what shee paed for the bringing doune from London the Woolfe dogg, 11s." In the same year we get:—"Bought of Mstr Gouldburn the oyle of scorpyon and ye oyle of swallowes to dress an oxe that was stinged with an adder, 6d." Also, "Pd Mr. Besswell for brimston verdegrase and Quicksillver and allom . . . to kill the mange in the dogs, 1s. 11d." In March, 1676, Burton gave Mr. Hugh Grosvenor £6 "to bett on my Master's horse at farne (Farndon), and all lost." On 10 April, 1690, Burton enters:—"Payd Mr. John Smith Gouldsmith ffor two Ditches (dishes) yt was ranne at ffarnedon

race March, 1689, weighing 106 ounces, £ 30 9s. 6d." Peter Pemberton is paid, 1 September, 1696, "a bill of charges att Wallesey at Jugler's match, £ 1 12s. 6d." In the same year Mr. Rolisson of Whitchurch is paid '£ 10, "Sir Thomas Grosvenor's subscription money for 5 years to Whitchurch Plate": and, under "Running Horses at Hambleton" comes "Pd ye charges of Tho. Philips journey to Hambleton with ye . . . gelding, and ye ringe he pay'd there, and my journey going and coming as by ye bills appear £ 17 15s. 8d." In the same month we get "Pd a bill of charges at Wallasey when Meale ran with ye Ld Ross his white horse Davies."

Occasionally, no doubt, a party would ride and drive in from Eaton to see the sports on the Roodeye, or Chester race-course, where the Mayor had a "gallery," or grand stand, slated and plastered, and strewn with rushes. The Chester archives record that in 1626, "Gregorie" got 4d., "for rushes to Strawe the Gallerie at the runninge of the race of the Lord of Darbie's footeman and Kelley."

There are a few particulars about the garden. In 1682 Burton enters 3s. as paid for "two white lelockes," 1s. for two "surringoes," 6d. for a "morble rose," and 4d. for "one provence rose." In 1683, 17s. 6d. was laid out on damask rose trees, and the year after, Thomas Hall had 1s. for rosemary seed. John Scaplin the gardener went over to Chirk for strawberry and other plants in 1684, and a short while before he reports to Sir Thomas "My Lord Bishop had 2 baskets of fruit," another basket went to "Mr. Hatton the dancing-

master in Chester," others to " Mr. Dawes at Dodleston, and Mr. Wolleyes at Siton " (Saughton).

In 1683, Thomas Broughton is given £1 10s. od., for "removeing of the Banketting house from ye old orchard to the new and framing a new roufe to itt"; and John Hughes had 15s. 4d. for "slating the Banketting house," which was no doubt a summer-house dining-room, transferred from Eaton Boat to Eaton Hall.

The entries about military service are interesting: "Pd 30 May, 1681, to Evan Evanes my Master's tenant for two dayes for carring my Master's armes to trayn two dayes att or about Wrixham. 2s." "Pd Thomas Cooper for two dayes trayning with a pike, 3s. 4d."

Mr. E. K. Willett of Eaton has sent me some interesting figures from the Grosvenor archives, comparing the wage of the carpenter with the price of the hen. It seems that in 1372, the carpenter got 4d. a day and hens were 2d. each. In 1680, the carpenter got a shilling, and the hen cost 5d. In 1912, the carpenter had 7s. 6d. a day, and the hen had advanced to 3s. 6d. In 1920, the carpenter had arrived at 16s. a day, and the hen had soared to 9s. Whether the carpenter pursues the hen, or the hen runs after the carpenter doth not appear, but their movements coincide in a remarkable manner, except that the carpenter's last state is worse than the first.

Among the agent's accounts at Eaton is an item which shows, I think, that Sir Thomas was very conscientious about giving his children a useful education. In 1696 the agent paid the salary of " Monsiur Bruneau,"

evidently a French tutor living in the house, who had then been there over six years.

Contributions to the public revenue were entered thus:— “ 19 May, 1676, Pd Adam Wild constable, for the chimney money of Eaton Hall, 13s.” “ 8 June, 1678, Pd the collectors of Eaton Green, Charles Mone-ton and Adam Wild, for my master’s pole and head, £ 15 1s. od.” “ Pd Edward Simance constable of Eaton, 18 June, 1679, the sum of thirteen pence for ye boat house towards the pay for ye Malishia.” “ Pd Hugh Jones Collector of Burton, 8 Dec. 1677, the munthly pament charged upon the meadows being the third moetty for the building of shipes for His Majesties use 8s.” “ Pd the Constable of Eaton Green the third pament of the great leay for the building of thirty shipes, 24 Dec., 1677.” “ Pd Hugh Thomas Collector of Burton the sum of eight shillings being the fourth payment of the great leay sesed on Burton meadow for the building of seventy shipes of war, 9 March?, 1677-8.”

Among these domestic papers I found a note from one of the poor tenants on Lady Grosvenor’s Millbank property, which I reproduce on account of its refreshing defiance of orthography and punctuation:—

“ Sr. Thomas and honred Land Lord I am yore humbell peteshoner and bags leve to spake the truth in this cas since my husband Thomos Willkson repard your honors hous and laid out mony that hee never got hear which made him very bare of mony and so I found him and and the wash houses and drying hous like to drop and not haveing mony to repar and I being a pore sarvant haveing saved a litell mony which went to repare the wash houses and drying hous it not being enouf for that us was forst to borow so that it have put us be-

hind hand hee being forst to obay ye Lord Peterber and pull on wash hous down and bild on in a nother plas now Sr. my and my husband humbell request is that you will be pleast to consider us so as to bait but on quarters rent of the last year becace wee ear somthing in det which will in able us that we may with God's blesing and hard working honestly pay our rent for the futer I know Sr. you was plesed to alowe fifteen pound tords ye bilding of ye dwelling hous which was not on therd of what was laid out and so your honor will see if ye pleas to walk down your honors humbell petishners
 Tho Wilkinson
 Mary."

In addition to the control of her house and the bringing up of her children, Lady Grosvenor was occupied with social obligations among her neighbours. For instance, there was a Mr. and Mrs. Turnour, who lodged at Hodnet in 1696, and came on a fortnight's visit to Eaton, and tell us that Lady Grosvenor sent her coach and six horses to fetch them, and told them that she had "purposely reserved making her summer visits" till they came. Accordingly, they were driven to dine with Lord Cholmondeley, Mr. Fitzherbert, and Sir James Pool, and paid an afternoon call on Lord Dunmore in Chester. Sometimes the Grosvenors went away for long visits to Bath, Astrope, or London. In 1698 they lodged in Petty France, and in 1699, in Pall Mall, where they entertained freely.

We get a few intimate details about London in the *Observations* of Misson, who lived there about 1698. Writing about theatres, he says:—

"There are two Theatres at London (a third is lately opened), one large and handsome, where they sometimes act Operas, and sometimes Plays; the other something smaller,

which is only for Plays. The Pit is an Amphitheater, fill'd with Benches without Backboards, and adorn'd and cover'd with green Cloth. Men of Quality, particularly the younger Sort, some Ladies of Reputation and Vertue, and abundance of Damsels that hunt for Prey, sit all together in this Place, Higgedly-piggledly, chatter, toy, play hear, hear not. Farther up, against the Wall, under the first Gallery, and just opposite to the Stage, rises another Amphitheater, which is taken up by Persons of the best Quality, among whom are generally very few Men. The Galleries, whereof there are only two Rows, are fill'd with none but ordinary People, particularly the Upper one."

Of the restaurants he writes:—

"There are Cooks Shops enow in all Parts of the Town, where it is very common to go and chuse upon the Spit the Part you like, and to eat it there . . . a Gentleman of 1,500 Livres a Year enters a Cook's Shop without fear of being despised for it, and there dines for his shilling to his Heart's Content. I have often eat in that manner with a Gentleman of my Acquaintance that is very rich, and was a Member of the House of Commons . . . One Word more about the Cooks Shops, to give a full Idea of the Thing. Generally four Spits, one over another, carry round each five or six Pieces of Butcher's Meat, Beef, Mutton, Veal, Pork and Lamb; you have what Quantity you please cut off, fat, lean, much or little done; with this, a little Salt and Mustard upon the Side of a Plate, a Bottle of Beer, and a Roll; and there is your whole Feast."

If we bought a newspaper in those times we should find ourselves confronted by the same comprehensive confidence that holds good to-day in the advertisements of patent cures. Take, for example, this announcement from the *Post Man* for 6 Oct., 1702:—

"The way to get Wealth, by making 23 sorts of English Wines equal to French Wine, and to make Syder, Mead,

Metheg, Rum, Rack, Brandy, and Cordial Water, to help a bad memory, that you may remember all you read or do, to keep your Cloaths dry, tho' in never so much Rain, to Japan, Varnish, to make Corn produce a treble Crop, to feed Cattle fat without Corn, Hay or Grass. 2. The way to save Wealth by living for 2d. a day, to save Cloaths, Coals, Shooes, Soap, Candles, to live 100 years in Health, to improve Land and Cattel. An account of Markets, Fairs, Roads, and where Coaches, Waggons, and Carriers, Inn, and days of going out. . . . 3. 1,000 notable things teaching to Read, Write, and Indite Letters, and to speak any Language speedily. City Lands, to Build cheap, of Gardening, Planting, Angling, curious Physical Receipts, or Dullidge Waters, to make old People look young, of Moles, Riddles, Jestes and strange Stories, and divers other matters. Sold at the Gold Ring in Little Brittain pr. 1s. 6d."

The truth is a visit to London in those times must have been very stimulating for a lady full of spirit and fond of show. Moreover, it was about this time that the heavy depression of incipient mental trouble began to throw a cloud over her life, and she craved for distraction. I doubt if she found Eaton very entertaining. She wrote to Mrs. Turnour somewhere between 1696 and 1700:—

"I have been and am still, Madaam, so ill of a Cold that yet I h'ant left my Chamber, however, am no longer to omitt the answering yours. Though Chester is so near I scarce ever see it, so can tell little what is done there, never enquiring after it. The players are gone to Shrewsbury from thence. I saw none of their plays, but am told they acted well enough. There have been three Balls, one at Mrs. Booth's the first, and att Lord Dunmore's to see Mrs. Hodgson dance, Mrs. Booth's daughter, who they say dances the finest in the world. She's a good pretty young Widow, and went up a Fortnight agoe to London with Sir Thomas.

I was invited, but being the week before Sir Tho. went, and he being then sick, I would not leave him. Every-body hereabouts was there. The other was ye Breaking up of ye Dancing Schoole. Mrs. Davies Daughter, Lord Lybon's sister, is reckoned the prettiest woman in Chester. She's 14, and extremely tall, else only have a pretty Face, but is very unpolished as yet, having been still in Wales. The Ladies play at Cards every week att one another's houses, and raffle att the Indian house is all I can tell you. I am glad little Miss begins to talk, she'll be good Company for you. My 3 Boys are well, and the eldest much your Servant. My Service to Mr. Turner, and believe me to be, Madam, your most humble servant, M.G."

I cannot help thinking that some of her local surroundings wearied her. Few things are more tedious to one reared chiefly in London than the atmosphere of a society immersed in sport. Other types have changed, but the sporting bore of to-day is the sporting bore of her time, admirably depicted by Molière in 1661, the bore who charges his unwilling hearers with minute details of a day's stag-hunting:—

"Well, as I was saying, I mounted, and my joy was extreme at seeing some of the hounds streaming across the plain to cut off the deer. I passed on, and found myself at the heels of the pack in an outlying thicket. Drécar alone was with me. For an hour our stag was hunted to and fro there. I cheered on the hounds, and made a devil of a noise. At last, never was a hunter more delighted, I started him off myself. All was going on smoothly, when a young stag crossed our path! A part of my hounds followed the new comer. I saw them hesitate, as you can imagine, Marquis; and even Finaut was at a loss! Suddenly, to my delight, he turned, and hit off the line. I sounded the horn and shouted, 'Finaut!' 'Finaut!' I caught sight of the slot on a mole-hill, and some of the hounds were coming back

to me, when unfortunately the young stag passed by my friend the country bumpkin. The blunderer began to blow away in fine style, shouting at the top of his voice 'Tally-ho!' 'tally-ho!' My hounds all left me, and followed the old blockhead," etc., etc.

The bore of Molière is the bore of all time, since palæolithic man pursued the mammoth with a flint spear-head, and lulled his cave-companions to sleep with his thrice-told tedious tales.

*

*

*

With regard to the most important item in the domestic life at Eaton, the mutual affection between husband and wife, there is so little correspondence in existence that we should be rash to speak too positively. One thing is certain, Sir Thomas loved his wife with a very sincere attachment, but early in their married career she showed signs of an hysterical temperament, which later on culminated in a sad and serious breakdown. Perhaps she suffered from the effects of her early environment. Her mother's references in after years to her childhood, betray a vulgar prepossession for display, and a total absence of any real education. She says that her second husband Mr. Tregonwell, "lived in the great house and for the credit of the Minor and partly for her benefitt kept 6 horses to his coach which she was to have frequent use of to take the air and all things were carried on with the air of greatness answerable to the fortune she was supposed to have." Not a word about mental or moral training, or useful employment of any kind. What chance had the little girl to cultivate that habitual self-control, that interest in external things

which to-day is, as it ever was, the necessary equipment for a contented mind, an unselfish heart, and a useful life?

There is one letter at Eaton from Lady Grosvenor to her husband, with his reply, more telling than any modern speculation :—

London August the 30th 1683.

Dear Pogg, I received the enclosed last post : it came to Astrope¹ and so here I opened it, by reason if it was no business I need not send it I thought . . . I am going this day to the fair with my Uncle Cholmondeley and his daughters, my Uncle John and several others offered to go with me but I would go with none, you being out of town, but my Uncle Cholmondeley, who I think most proper, there being no hurt in him, for I would not do anything that did not look very well to the eye of the world, and what I thought you liked, especially such a thing as this . . . I am glad Mrs. Hill is well again; My Dear, pray take care of yourself, for in your eyes (? you lies) all my happiness, and though I am not so good at expressing myself yet there is none can have a greater love for a husband than I have for you. So I rest, the cock being come.

your ever constant wife and humble servant
Mary Grosvenor.

On the back of this is a rough draft of her husband's reply :—

“Your unkindness to me sometimes strikes me to the heart, and you do not know the hurt it doth me, the which, if you would but strive to leave I should be the happiest man living, for I love you so well that I am not able to bear the least unkindness, the which, if you will leave, I should think

¹ Astrope, a hamlet in parishes of King's Sutton and Newbottle, five miles west of Brackley, Northants; has St. Rumbold's mineral well, which was used for skin diseases.

all the trouble in the world too little to deserve you, and you shall command my life, Estate, and all things else that I am capable of. If you will not, you shall never find an alteration in my kindness and respects (except it be by an inward wasting, so you find it by my death). This I tell you out of my great kindness I have for you, and my all belief that you have the same for me, so if you value my life you may preserve it, and leave those contradictions that you think little, and those passionate concerns and rash words, when we were to go to Astrop, which struck me to the heart."

That she was quite able to take care of her affairs, and express herself to that effect, and get her own way when she wanted it, may be judged from the following letter dated from Eaton 27 November, 1691, in which she comments reasonably and freely about matters connected with her London property, though the points at issue are not clear, since her mother's letter to her, to which this is an answer, is not forthcoming. She begins:—

"Madam, As to my consent for making the lease you mention . . . if for the improvement of the Estate I am very willing, though it can signify nothing except the levying a fine. But what is for the Estate's advantage they may be sure I shant be over against, but confirm, but for passing a fine for leases . . . I am not willing till I do it for the whole estate together, being the safest way and the cheapest for Sir Thomas . . . For doubtless 'tis a very good portion I think for me to bring what is promised, and the rest is unsettled shall remain in my own dispose. I may hereafter leave it what child pleases me best . . . but I wont be so tied up that I cannot give a relation a farthing or leave a legacy where I please, 'tis very likely Sir Thomas may have it all, but if so, I will give it them myself, and not be obliged to it, and whenever I die I desire to be in a condition

to give something as I said before to a near relation, and, in short, dispose of it to my mind which Mr. Cholmondeley told me lately was very reasonable I should."

The following letter (Grosvenor London Document 0238. Endorsed outside by Mrs. Tregonwell, "My Daughter letter to Mr. Moysar") is equally efficient:—

Eaton August 23th 1693.

Sr, I give you thanks for your letter; and ye words about the child is altered and the Settlemt signed over againe. Sir Thomas tells me you saw Mr. Crosse's lease on Milbank, that t'was right done according to the Settlemts pray lett me know if you think it the most to the advantage of the Estate to make these Leases, I have already signed Crosse's, because Sir Thomas desired it, But I fancy I might have had more Rent, Sir Thomas sayes I could not have a better bargaine, and then about this Jeremy Clarke, he would have: 51 yeares Lease, and pay £10 a yeare rent; and £250 fine; Sir Thomas sayes he cant make a better bargaine, nor more improovable. You haveing been long acquainted with the Estate, I desire you will let me know the truth, but before I signe Clarke's Lease, and in it you will oblige

Your friend and servt

Mary Grosvenor.

Sir Thomas Gives his service.

THE DINNER PARTY

WE get an imperfect picture of the home life at Eaton, if we think only of the physical surroundings of the characters, and do not try to realize their thoughts and conversation. Every English family is part of its own body politic, and stands in close relation with the rest of Europe. What did they talk about when Dame Mary cut the pine-apple, and Sir Thomas sent round the Rhenish wine? The births, deaths and marriages among their neighbours, no doubt; the gossip of Chester, the sport of the county, and beyond that, possibly, the politics of England and the situation in Europe.

Let us imagine a small dinner-party in the Banqueting-House, among the fruit trees in the orchard at Eaton, and the arrival, by carrier, of the *London Gazettes* for the week ending August 25, in the year 1684. Let us read again the news Sir Thomas retailed to his guests, and try to realize their hopes and fears. The European Powers that then counted were England, France, Spain, the German Empire with its capital at Vienna, the Pope, Holland and Turkey. The principal motives that moved the pieces on the board were ascendancy, religion, and over-sea trade; sometimes one, sometimes another. When Protestant England fought Catholic Spain, the religious stop was pulled out. When Protestant Holland fought Protestant England, the

trade trumpet was sounded. When Protestant England and Holland joined Catholic Spain, the Catholic Empire, and the Pope, to crush Louis XIV, the ascendancy note was struck. When that bogey was beaten, and religious controversy died down, everything centered upon over-sea trade. For a great cataclysm had happened. The Turk had come and fallen like a blight on those lands through which the silk and spices of the East found their way to the West. "Selim I," says Rogers, "the Sultan of Turkey, conquered Mesopotamia and the holy towns of Arabia, and annexed Egypt during his brief reign. This conquest blocked the only remaining road which the Old World knew . . . Egypt ceased to be the highway from Hindostan . . . all Eastern trade depended on the Egyptian road being kept open . . . the river of commerce was speedily dried up . . . the Italian cities fell into rapid decay . . . the trade of the Danube and the Rhine ceased." The old routes were blocked, and some solution of the problem had to be found. The remedy was discovered by the enterprising navigators of those days, who argued that as the world is round, the way to the west is also the way to the east, and one party crossed the Atlantic to find the back door of India, and in doing this found the front door of America; while a few years later, another party doubled the Cape and discovered the direct water-way to the East. Henceforth the eyes of men looked west. The old civilization which had clung for countless ages round the sea-board of the Mediterranean, passed to the shores of the Atlantic, leaving Venice and Genoa no longer chief centres of commercial gravity. Spain,

France, England and Holland grappled for the prize of the New World, using religious prejudice, trade jealousy, and ascendancy, to rouse their people. Added to this confusion of motives, were the complications created by royal marriages. Spain not only ruled her own peninsula, but the Kingdom of Naples, the Duchy of Milan, as well as Luxembourg, Burgundy and Belgium. All these isolated patches came by royal marriage. "Throughout the 16th and 17th centuries," says Seeley, "international policy is found to turn in most of the great states of Europe upon royal marriage."

Bearing these points in mind, we can now join the dinner-party at Eaton, and note the various items with which Sir Thomas regales his guests. From Naples we learn there has been a review of the Venetian Fleet at Corfu, commanded by General Francis Morosini. "On board the Venetian Ships and Galleys are 22,000 Foot, and 400 mounted Cavalry to land 600 Noble Venetians. On board the *Gallies* of Maltha are 900 Soldiers; on board those of Tuscany 600; and on board those of the Pope 300." We now know that in 1684 a league was formed against the Turk by the Pope, the Empire, Russia, and the Venetian Republic. A year later Morosini conquered the Morea, and in 1686, besieged and bombarded Athens, unfortunately throwing a bomb into the Parthenon, used by the Turk as a powder magazine, and shattering that venerable fabric, the wrecked sculptures of which now rest in the British Museum.

The policy of pushing back the Turk was as important in 1684 as it was in 1915, for in 1684 Louis XIV

was trying to seize the hegemony of Europe as William II attempted in 1914. Both Louis and William intrigued with the Turk to divert the forces of the nations allied against them. In 1683, the Sultan at the head of 150,000 troops besieged Vienna, and that city, the Empire, and perhaps Christendom, were saved on this occasion by the victory of the Polish army, commanded by their brave king, John Sobieski. To Sir Thomas and his guests the Turk was an Eastern terror, as the Saracen had been to the Crusader and the Persian to the Greek of 500 B.C.

Amsterdam reports letters from Liège saying that the French Resident there had delivered a letter from "his most Christian Majesty" (Louis XIV), to the Magistrates of that city telling them that the Elector of Cologne, their Prince, "having acquainted his Majesty that his Troops were marching towards that City, his Majesty did think it expedient for their own good, as well as for the preserving of the Peace of those parts, That the said Magistrates and Commonalty of Liège should forthwith make the submission that became them to his Electoral Highness." An indication of the pressure Louis XIV was bringing to bear upon the people of Flanders.

From Exeter comes an account "of the joyful Reception of His Majesty's Gracious new Charter of Plymouth, to the great satisfaction of the Inhabitants, and all Loyal persons in the Countrey." An indication of the pressure Charles II was bringing to bear on the Municipal Corporations of England, to secure a servile Parliament.

These serious paragraphs were relieved by a notice to say, "That the Inhabitants of Newport Pannel in Buckinghamshire have given a Plate of Twenty Pounds value to be run for there (3 Heats and 10 Stone) on the second Wednesday in September next. And the Gentlemen have raised a Plate of about 40 Guineas value to be run for (3 Heats and 12 Stone) the next day, and so every second Thursday in September for the two next ensuing years."

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 660 109 0



3 1210 00553 3672

