The Families and Descendants of Susannah and Sarah Cradock.

PART TWO

Sarah Cradock & The Appendices.
SARAH CRADOCK (1667-1748) & THE BOULTER FAMILY

As noted, Sarah was the eldest daughter of Richard and Hester (Palmer) Cradock and the sister of Susannah (Cradock) Blunt. She was born in 1667 and baptized on 2nd April, 1667, at St. Mary’s, Hornsey.

Sara Cradock the Daughter of Mr Richard Cradock and of Mrs Esther his wife. Baptized the second day of April 1667.

On 25th June, 1713, at the age of forty-six, Sarah married Jonathan Boulter at All Hallows, Staining. She was his second wife and there were no children.

June 25th
Jonathan Boulter, of Bermondsey in Surry & Sarah Cradock, of St Clement's Eastcheap
+ Licen: Marry’d by Mr. Heath.

We know little of Sarah (Cradock) Boulter’s life. Abraham Cropp’s will mentions a charity school in Lambourn Road, Bermondsey, belonging to her and that is about all. That is, until right at the very end, when an incident occurred at Sarah’s house on 11th October, 1748, the day before she died, and which was reported by The London Evening Post on 13th October.

This event heralded the beginning of a long and complicated court case involving Sarah’s will and her intentions34. The plaintiff in the case was Gilbert Jodrell, the husband of

34 Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the Arches and Prerogative Courts Canterbury, and in the High Court of Delegates: Containing the Judgements of the Right Hon. Sir George Lee, by Joseph Phillmore, 1833.
Sarah’s niece Mary (Cradock) Jodrell (died March, 1745). The defendants were the Balchen family supported by members of the Cropp and Roffey families. The incident described below, which Elizabeth (Balchen) Cumberland and her mother Martha (Hitchcock) Balchen observed, was later re-told by them in graphic detail during the trial.

The London Evening-Post.

From Thursday October 13, to Saturday October 15, 1748.

Last Tuesday Night three well dress’d Men went to the House of Mrs. Boulter, a Bedridden Gentlewoman of eighty Years of Age, in Crutched-Fryars, and Relict of Mr. Boulter, formerly in Partnership with Mr. Roffey, an eminent Distiller in Barnaby Street, Southwark, and demanded Admittance into the House, under Colour of being Heirs at Law to Mrs. Boulter, who was very ill at that Time; on which Mrs. Balchen, who had the Care of the Family, sent a Message to Mr. Cropp, an eminent Merchant in Fenchurch-Street: (who is Mrs. Boulter’s next Heir by Marriage) who came to the House next Morning; but on being denied Admittance, he applied to Sir Daniel Lambert, Knt. Alderman of Tower Ward, who order’d the Peace Officers to force open the Door, on which the Company, who had taken Possession of the House, retir’d to a Two-pair of Stairs Room, the Door of which was also broken open, and the Persons secur’d.

London Evening Post, 13th October, 1748

Last Tuesday Night three well dress’d Men went to the House of Mrs. Boulter, a Bedridden Gentlewoman of eighty Years of Age, in Crutched-Fryars, and Relict of Mr. Boulter, formerly in Partnership with Mr. Roffey, an eminent Distiller in Barnaby Street, Southwark, and demanded Admittance into the House, under Colour of being Heirs at Law to Mrs. Boulter, who was very ill at that Time; on which Mrs. Balchen, who had the Care of the Family, sent a Message to Mr. Cropp, an eminent Merchant in Fenchurch-Street: (who is Mrs. Boulter’s next Heir by Marriage) who came to the House next Morning; but on being denied Admittance, he applied to Sir Daniel Lambert, Knt. Alderman of Tower Ward, who ordered the Peace Officers to force open the Door, on which the Company, who had taken Possession of the House, retir’d to a Two-pair of Stairs Room, the Door of which was also broken open, and the Persons secured.
Sarah Boulter died on 12\textsuperscript{th} October, 1748, and was buried on 20\textsuperscript{th} October at St. Magnus the Martyr (see burial record below – second to last line).

![Burial Record](image)

**Boulter Mrs Sarah Boulter .................................................. 20**

Note that the record above also shows the burial of Sarah’s brother Richard Cradock, Jnr. on 20\textsuperscript{th} July, 1748 (third line from the top). It was in part Richard’s death before Sarah’s which precipitated the crisis over Sarah’s will and which led to the “home invasion” described in *The London Evening Post* (above). Another death, that of Sarah’s niece Mary (Cradock) Jodrell’s on 12\textsuperscript{th} March, 1745, also contributed to the legal wrangling as to who should benefit under Sarah’s will. The men who pushed their way into Sarah’s house claiming to be Sarah’s ‘heirs at law’ were under the orders Sarah’s niece’s husband, Gilbert Jodrell.

![Fish Street Scene](image)

**Above looking along Fish Street, toward the Monument and St. Magnus**
Eighteenth century burial records often vary in how much description is given as to where a particular person is buried. Although a burial record may state ‘In the church’ this could also mean in the graveyard of the church and not necessarily inside the building itself. If someone was buried within the church then usually on the burial record the location within the church is given such as ‘chancel’ or ‘middle aisle’, etc.

For instance, there were three other burials, besides Richard and Sarah’s, at St. Magnus the Martyr involving members of the Cradock family. In each case their burials occurred within the church and a description of the location is given on the record.

First, Susannah (Bourne) Cradock, Richard Cradock, Snr. and Susannah (Cradock) Barnes’s mother and Sarah (Cradock) Boulter’s grandmother. Susannah was buried on 14th February, 1695/96 at the age of 91 in the South chapel near the vestry door.

Second, Susannah (Cradock) Barnes daughter of the above Susannah and Richard Snr.’s sister. She was buried on 27th April, 1706, likewise in the vault near the vestry door [fifth name on the list below].
Barnes Mrs Susanna Barnes was Burried in the Vault near ye Vestrey Door on ye 27th April 1706

Third, Richard Cradock, Snr. was buried on 13th June, 1712, and again the location is in the vault by the vestry door.

Thus at least three members of the Cradock family are buried within St. Magnus the Martyr. Whether Sarah and Richard, Jnr. were as well we cannot tell from the record itself but the absence of any location suggests they were buried outside in the churchyard. However, those who had been buried in the churchyard were subsequently removed and buried elsewhere as a result of the building of a nearby access road for the new London Bridge at the beginning of the 19th Century. The images below show on the left St Magnus the Martyr and on the right the Old London Bridge being torn down circa 1824 with St. Magnus the Martyr in the distance.
After her death Sarah’s household effects were put up for auction.

To be SOLD by AUCTION,

On Wednesday next the 10th Inst. and the Two following Days;

THE Household Furniture and valuable Effects of Mrs. SARAH BOULTER, deceased; at her late Dwelling-House in Crutched-Friare, the Corner of the Gateway going into Savage-Gardens.

Consisting of Variety of Household and Kitchen Furniture, Linnen, fine Chints, Quilts and Counterpanes, Sideboard of Plate, fine old China and Japan both useful and ornamental, two exceeding fine new Persia Carpets, the deceased’s Wardrobe of Wearing Apparel, Jewels, and Town Coach with Harness, and one Coach Horse, etc.

The whole to be viewed to the Time of Sale, which will begin each Day at Half an Hour after Eleven o’Clock; and Catalogues deliv’r’d the Days of viewing at the Place of Sale.
The Will of Sarah Boulter

Sarah’s will was prepared on the 4th April, 1745, some three years before her death, and proved on the 6th March, 1754 (a long time). She is described as Sarah Boulter, widow, of Crutched Fryars, London. Her executor and main beneficiary was intended to be her unmarried younger brother Richard Cradock, Jnr. of the Middle Temple but, as we have seen, Richard died before Sarah. Whom Sarah intended in the place of Richard, as well as the disposal of her estate in general, led to the court case already referred to.

Sarah leaves a series of small legacies mostly of one hundred pounds or less to each of the following:

A. Children and grandchildren of her sister Susannah:  
Mrs. Susan [Banner] Cropp [wife of Abraham]; Mr. Richard Cropp; Mrs. Sarah [Cropp] Long; Richard Banner and his wife [Mary (Davies)]; unnamed Mrs. Purcell, now living with the said Richard Banner. [The identity of Mrs Purcell is a puzzle although the most likely candidate is Catherine (Brooke) Purcell, Richard’s sister Esther (Banner) Purcell’s sister in law]

B. Children of her brother William Cradock: Mary (Cradock) Jodrell [wife of Gilbert]; Sheldon Cradock and his wife, unnamed.

C. Cousins – The Balchens: Mr. Henry Balchen, living in Goodman’s Fields; Ms. Elizabeth Balchen [wife of George Cumberland, Snr.]; Susan Balchen; Mary Balchen [wife of John Man]; and unnamed Balchen [Ann], sisters of the said Elizabeth Balchen; Mr. James Balchen and Mr. William Balchen; Widow (Martha) Balchen [née Hitchcock]. She was the mother of Susan, Ann, Mary [Man], Elizabeth [Cumberland], James, and William [Balchen]. In her will Sarah notes that Elizabeth Balchen had been living with her and caring for her for six years.

D. The Roffeys: Mrs. Mary Roffey, widow [of Nathaniel Roffey, Snr.], of Peckham, Surrey and her sons: William Roffey, distiller, of Barnaby Street, Surrey, and his wife [unnamed]; Samuel Roffey, distiller, of the same place, and his wife [unnamed]; James Roffey and his wife[unnamed]; Nathaniel Roffey, Jnr.,
merchant, of Devonshire Square near Bishopsgate and his wife [unnamed]; John Roffey, “who is now beyond sea”; and Jonathan Roffey.

E. Others: Mr. James Watson, of Peckham and his wife, unnamed. [He may be the Dr. Watson also mentioned in the wills of Jonathan Boulter, Susannah (Cradock) Blunt, and John Blunt.]

F. Servants: Coachman Samuel Medley; Housekeeper Hannah Penn; and “the rest of my servants who shall be in my service at the time of my decease.”

Sarah leaves the bulk of her estate to ‘My loving brother, Richard Craddock, Esq., of the Temple, London’ including:

‘all my wearing apparel both Linen and woollen to be disposed of as he shall think fit together with all my diamonds, jewels, and plate and I give devise and bequeath to my said brother Richard Craddock all my South Sea stock Bank stock Old and New South Sea Annuity stock and the dividends and interest and produce now due or hereafter to grow due thereon and all my ready money arrears of Rents Rates and Securities for money and all the rest residue and remainder of my estate whatsoever and wheresoever and what nature or kindsoever to hold absolutely forever and I do hereby institute and appoint Richard Craddock sole executor….’

Sarah then adds a ‘Memorandum’ dated 11th June, 1748, in which directs the administrator of her estate to:

... pay Elizabeth Balchen, now living with me; her mother Martha Balchen; Martha Balchen’s other children, William Balchen, Susannah Balchen, Mary [Man] Balchen and Ann Balchen, Mr. Henry Balchen and his wife.

Unfortunately she does not specify the amount that the Balchens are supposed to be paid which only added fuel to the fire in the court case that followed her death.

THE BOULTER, ROFFEY, and TYERS FAMILIES

Jonathan Boulter married twice. His second marriage to Sarah Cradock we have already noted while his first to the widow Elizabeth (Tyers) Roffey took place on 29th April, 1690, at All Hallows, London Wall (as shown below, last line). There were no children of this marriage either.
Before her marriage to Jonathan Boulter, Elizabeth née Tyers had first married James Roffey, although the record for this has not yet been located. James and Elizabeth (Tyers) Roffey had two sons: Nathaniel and James.

In 1683 James Roffey, distiller, died and was buried on 7th October, at St. Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey. He is the fifth burial entry on the parish record below.

James wrote his will a few days before he died on 3rd October, 1683. In it he identifies himself as a distiller, living in the parish of St. Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey in Surrey. He leaves his entire estate to ‘my dear and well beloved wife Elizabeth’. He names his two sons – Nathaniel (who would marry Jonathan Boulter’s niece Mary Welden) and James – who are both very young. One of the witnesses to James Roffey’s will was Jonathan Boulter who would later marry James’s
widow Elizabeth (Tyers) Roffey.


James Welden bachelor of St Pancras? and Sarah Boulter spinster of St Giles the Fields

James and Sarah (Boulter) Welden had three children: Mary the wife of Nathaniel Roffey who was the son of James and Elizabeth (Tyers) Roffey (details below), James, and Sarah who married William Gouge on 21st January, 1698, at St. Mary Sommet.

In 1705 James Welden died although his burial record has not been located. In his will dated 25th February, 1705, James Welden names his three children and makes his wife Mary his main beneficiary.

In 1710 Sarah the widow of James Welden died although so far no burial record has been located. In her will dated 6th March, 1710, Sarah (Boulter) Welden, widow of James Welden of St. Giles in the Fields and sister of Jonathan Boulter, bequeatheth the bulk of her estate to her daughter Mary
The Will of Jonathan Boulter

(Welden) Roffey wife of Nathaniel Roffey, Snr., as well as a small legacy ‘unto my Brother Jonathan Boulter and his wife’ [Elizabeth (Tyers) (Roffey) Boulter].

In 1712 Elizabeth (Tyers) (Roffey) Boulter died and her burial, which took place on 7th July at St. Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey, is recorded on the last line below.

![Image of a burial register entry]

7 Elizabeth the wife of Jonathan Boulter a distiller

In her will dated 7th July, 1711, but not probated until 7th December, 1733, Elizabeth refers to herself as:

The Wife of Jonathan Boulter of the Parish of St Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey in the County of Surrey, Distiller and late wife and relict of James Roffey distiller deceased.

Elizabeth’s will mentions a marriage settlement dated February, 1689, made between herself, Elizabeth Roffey widow and her husband Jonathan Boulter as one party and her brothers Thomas and Jonathan Tyers, Woolbuyers, as the other party. For some reason, this marriage settlement may have caused legal problems which kept Elizabeth’s will from being probated for over twenty years. Her will also names Jonathan Bradley as her sister’s son.

Thus to summarize – Jonathan Boulter married twice, first to Elizabeth Tyers, widow of James Roffey, and second to Sarah Cradock, but had no children by either marriage. Elizabeth’s son Nathaniel Roffey, Snr., by her marriage to James Roffey, married Jonathan Boulter’s niece Mary Welden, the daughter of his sister Sarah, wife of James Welden.

James and Sarah (Boulter) Welden’s son James, Jnr. married an Anne unknown and they had a daughter Sarah Welden who married her first cousin William Roffey, son of Nathaniel and Mary (Welden) Roffey (see chart).
In August, 1742, Jonathan Boulter died and his passing was reported with surprising accuracy by The Universal Spectator and Weekly Journal on 21st August, 1742, as follows:

On Saturday died, in the 85th Year of his Age, Mr. Boulter, an eminent Distiller in Barnaby-Street, who was never known to have had any Sickness till his Death: He had two Wives, the first whereof was the Widow of Mr. Roffey, a Distiller; and the last a Sister of Sir John Blount, with whom he had a Fortune of 20,000 l. that was settled upon her as a Jointure; but had no Issue by either. He died worth upwards of 100,000l. the greatest Part thereof will fall among the Family of the Roffey's, Grandchildren to his first Wife by a former Husband.

The reference to Sarah as Sir John Blunt’s sister is typical of the eighteenth century where the distinction between a sibling and an in law was not always maintained.

The Will of Jonathan Boulter

We are fortunate to have a number of wills of the Boulter, Roffey, and Tyers families and from them we are able to better understand the relations among these families.

In his will Jonathan Boulter describes himself as a 'London Distiller' of the parish of St. Olave, Hart Street. He appoints his daughter Mary, the wife of Nathaniel, Snr., as his main beneficiary and sole executrix. He signs his will on 21st July, 1733, and probate was granted to Mary (Welden) Roffey on 25th August, 1742.
The appointment of his daughter Mary might lead one to assume that Jonathan had a daughter however, as we have seen Jonathan had no issue and so he may well have ‘adopted’ his niece Mary as his daughter, especially as Mary’s parents James and Sarah (Boulter) Welden had died quite young. Of course in the eighteenth century ‘adoptions’ were not regulated or administered and adopting could be quite informal. Whatever the case Jonathan makes Mary his executor and main beneficiary.

Jonathan Boulter’s mother, Mary, made a will dated 9th August, 1705, in which she refers to herself as a widow living at Syston in the county of Leicestershire. Among others, she names her granddaughter Mary Welden as the daughter of her daughter Sarah (Boulter) Welden. This would confirm that Mary was Jonathan’s niece, not his daughter as stated in his will.

The lease of the house in which Jonathan and his wife Sarah are living at Crutchet Fryars, and where Sarah eventually died, is to revert to Mary after Sarah’s death. Sarah is also to enjoy a certain annuity.

Mary inherits: Messuages, Barns, Garden, and Appurtances there belonging situate and being at Enfield in the County of Middlesex; real estate at Siston in the County of Leicestershire Manor of Steeple Grange and Maylin, and all that my Messuage, lands, tenements and hereditaments thereto belonging, and all other my Mannors, hereditaments, lands and premises in the said county of Essex; my Freehold and Copyhold estate situate lying and being at King’s Walden or elsewhere in the County of Hereford; my Freehold estate at Shipley or elsewhere in the County of Sussex; my Freehold and Copyhold estate most near Hammersmith in the Parish of Fulham in the County of Middlesex; My messuages tenements and appurtances Situate and being in Queen Street and Parker Lane in the parish of Saint Giles in the Fields in the County of Middlesex or some other parish near adjoining.

Jonathan was also entitled to the Revision of a Small estate Near Dorking at or near adjoining in the County of Surrey.

He then bequeaths to his six surviving Roffey ‘grandsons’ [in fact his great nephews] in birth order: James, William, John, Samuel, Jonathan, and Nathaniel, Jnr.
Nephew Henry Boulter and Mary his wife and his children.
James Welden [his nephew being the son of his sister Sarah
and her husband James Welden].

‘My niece Sarah Welden only daughter of my nephew James Welden’ [This is his
great niece who married William Roffey].
My cousins William and Sarah Gough [actually Sarah was the sister of
James Welden who married Jonathan’s sister Sarah Boulter.
Sarah’s husband’s name was William Gouge]
My Niece Mary Noons.
Lady Blount [Susannah (Cradock) Blunt - his sister-in-law].
My brother Doctor Watson and his wife [Also named in the
wills of Sarah Boulter, Susannah (Cradock) Blunt, and John
Blunt but whose identity is not known].
My brother Richard Cradock [his brother-in-law]
The Reverend Mr. Read and Mr. Newman.
The children of my cousin Thomas Robinson deceased.
Mr. [Abraham] Cropp and his wife.
Cousin Anna Starcy of London, Milliner.
Jonathan Bradley [the brother-in-law of Elizabeth his first
wife?].

He forgives ‘Susan [Susannah] Balchin all sums of money she shall be indebted to
me at the time of my decease.’ Susannah (Barnes) Balchen was the
daughter of Henry and Susannah (Cradock) Barnes; she
married John Balchen and was Sarah (Cradock) Boulter’s
first cousin. She was the grandmother of Elizabeth
(Balchen) Cumberland and Mary (Balchen) Man.

Susannah (Barnes) Balchen died in November, 1737, aged 74,
four years after Jonathan wrote his will and five years
before his death and so nature took care of her debts.

In an advanced Age, at her House in Mansel-
street, Goodman’s Fields, Mrs. Balchen,
Mother to Capt. Balchen, Commander of the
Onlsow, in the Service of the East-India
Company.

Jonathan bequeathes: ‘All my part or share in Captain Balchin’s ships which I am
part owner of.’

This is Captain John Balchen, the son of Susannah (Barnes)
Balchen whose debts were forgiven, the uncle of Mary Man
and Elizabeth Cumberland, and whose will Abraham Cropp executed. The ships were the Onslow and the James & Mary.

*Parker's Penny Post* reported on 30th August, 1732:

**Tuesday last:** a large Ship was launch'd at Blackwall and call'd the Onslow in Compliment to the Right Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons. She is designed for the East India Company's Service, and is to be commanded by Capt. Balchen.

Jonathan also bequeatheth sums to the poor of the village of Ratcliffe On The Wreake in Leicestershire where he was born, as well as to the poor of the parish of Siston (now Syston) in Leicestershire.

For details on the properties that Jonathan disposed of in his will see Appendix X.
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*A map of Bermondsey. Barnaby street dissects the map in a south easterly direction*

There is an earlier Cradock connection with Bermondsey through Sarah (Cradock) Boulter’s mother Esther (Palmer) Cradock who inherited property located on Bermondsey Street in Southwark from her uncle Doctor Baldwyn Hamey.
NATHANIEL ROFFEY, Snr. AND MARY WELDEN

Nathaniel Roffey Snr., was the son of James and Elizabeth (Tyers) Roffey. His baptismal record has not yet been located.

Nathaniel Roffey, Snr. and Mary Welden married on 7th May, 1706, at St. Bennet Fink, Threadneedle Street. Mary was the daughter of James and Sarah (Boulter) Welden, the niece of Jonathan Boulter.

Nathaniel Roffey of St Mary Magdalen in Surry & Mary Welden of St. George in ye Fields was married ye 7 day of May 1706

Nathaniel and Mary (Welden) Roffey had a number of children, perhaps as many as thirteen. However beyond just two grandchildren, there appear to be no descendants.

In 1718 Nathaniel Roffey, Snr. was appointed Sherriff of Surrey:
And typical of a merchant of the time Roffey advertised for the return of lost documents:

**LOST or mislaid, an East India Bond for 100l. No. 4141, dated April 16, 1724, payable to Sir Gregory Page**. Whoever brings it to Nathaniel Roffey, Esq; Distiller in Bermondsey-street, Southwark, shall have Ten Guineas Reward, and no Questions ask’d.

*NB. It is of no Use to any but the Owner, Payment being stopt at the India-House.*

Nathaniel, Snr’s death in June, 1733, was noted by the newspapers:

**Yesterday died at his House in Bermondsey, alias Barnaby-street, Southwark, Nathaniel Roffey, Esq; an eminent Distiller, and one of his Majesty’s Justices of the Peace for the County of Surrey.**

Below Nathaniel Roffey Snr.’s burial record dated 30th June, 1733, at St. Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey; he appears on the last line.

---

35 Gregory Page, followed in his father's footsteps as a merchant. He was elected MP for Shoreham in West Sussex in December 1708, a seat he retained until 1713. He was created a baronet on 3rd December, 1714. Page regained the seat in 1715 and held it until his death. His wife, Dame Mary Page (née Trotman - daughter of Thomas Trotman of London), with whom he had four children, died on 11th March 1728 aged 56 and was buried at Bunhill Fields in the City of London. Like the Roffeys, the Pages were ‘dissenters’.
In his will dated 1733, Nathaniel names the following seven children: James, John, William, Samuel, Jonathan, Nathaniel, and Sarah. Mary their mother who would die thirty-two years later likewise names all these children in her will except for Jonathan who appears to have died by then (1764). (The Appendix contains a detailed description of some of the property belonging to Nathaniel Roffey, Snr.)

The distribution of Nathaniel Roffey, Snr.’s estate caught the attention of The London Journal on 7th July, 1733:

Nathaniel Roffey Esq; one of his Majesty’s Justices of the Peace, who died a few Days ago at his House in Southwark, has left by his Will to his six children, viz. five Sons and one Daughter, 1000l. each, payable at the Age of Twenty-three; and the Residue of his real and personal Estate to his Wife, during her Life, and after her Death to devolve to the said Children.
On 25th March, 1764, aged 83 years, Nathaniel’s widow Mary (Welden) Roffey died and her passing was noted by the papers on 27th March, 1764.

On Monday died at her house at Clapham, Mrs. Roffey, mother of Samuel Roffey, Esq; Banker in Lombard-Street.

And again:

Below the burial record for Mary at St. Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey, on 2nd April, 1764; the cost of which appears to have been £1 17s. 8d., excluding the Warden who cost 6s.

The monumental inscription below is taken from a description of St. Mary Magdalene found in The History and Antiquities of the Parish of Bermondsey by G. W. Phillips.
Some of the Roffeys and Weldens were ‘dissenters’ i.e. Baptists or Quakers, and some were not which is perhaps why the latter show up as baptized/married/buried in Anglican churches, and the former do not.

**THE SONS OF NATHANIEL ROFFEY, Snr. AND MARY WELDEN**

**WILLIAM ROFFEY and SARAH WELDEN**

Notices of William Roffey’s birth and baptism have not been found, nor have those for his wife Sarah Welden.

On 7th May, 1734, at St. Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey, William Roffey the son of Nathaniel and Mary (Welden) Roffey, Snr. married Sarah Welden the daughter of James and Anne (unknown) Welden, Jnr. William and Sarah were first cousins.
William Roffey son of Nathaniel and Mary (Welden) Roffey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May</th>
<th>1734</th>
<th>Roffey &amp; Welden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Were married William Roffey of the parish of St. Mary Magdalene Bermondsey in the County of Surry Batchelor and Sarah Welden of the same parish Spinster by a metropolitan licence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

William and Sarah (Welden) Roffey had two surviving children Boulter and Sarah. One child, Nathaniel, was born at Bermondsey but died and was buried on 27th May, 1740, at St. Mary Magdalene. The record is accompanied by an itemized list of the cost: Minister 5s. 3d., Clark 1s. 6d., Sexton 2s. 6d., Grave Diger [sic] 9s., totaling: 17s. and the additional cost of tolling the bells 3s.

27 Nathaniel son of Wm Roffey Bermondsey Street
Buried in the Church.

On 19th August, 1745, a case was brought against John Farmer at the Surrey Assizes for forging a Bill of Exchange which he attempted to cash with William and Samuel Roffey. However, Farmer managed to elude arrest and so the case against him could not proceed.
These are to Certify That at the Session of Oyer and Terminer and General Gaol Delivery holden at Kingston upon Thames in and for the County of Surry on Thursday the Fifteenth day of this Instant August John Farmer late of the Parish of St. George Southwark in the sd County of Surry Labourer was and Stands indicted for that he on the Twentieth day of April now last past feloniously did falsely make forge and counterfeit a certain Bill of Exchange purporting to be signed by One Mary Williams & for feloniously uttering and publishing the same as a true Bill of Exchange then knowing the same to have been false forged and counterfeited with an intent to defraud William Roffey and Samuel Roffey of the Sum of Thirty Pounds against the Statute in Such case made & provided To which said Indictment He the said John Farmer hath not as yet pleaded Nor been arraigned thereupon Dated this Nineteenth day of August in the Nineteenth Year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King George the Second. 1745

A poem to William appeared in 1750 in *Juvenilia: Poems on Various Subjects of Devotion and Virtue*, by Thomas Gibbons. The first page is reproduced below left and its author right. Thomas Gibbons (1720-1785) was Independent minister of Haberdasher's Hall (1743) and tutor of Mile End Academy (1754). He received the honorary degrees of M.A. from the College of New Jersey (1760) and D.D. from Aberdeen (1764).
A marriage license was issued at Long Ditton in Surrey on 24th November, 1763, to William Cowley of Long Ditton, gentleman, bachelor, aged 28, and Sarah Roffey [daughter of William and Sarah (Welden) Roffey] of Kingston, aged 25. Witnessed by Thomas Jones of Long Ditton, gentleman. Sarah died a few years later on 7th June, 1767, probably in childbirth.

The painting below by Sir Joshua Reynolds of the Roffey family, shows William in the center seated, his wife Sarah (née Welden), their daughter Sarah, and son Boulter.

The date of the painting is not easily fixed. Most sources have Reynolds painting this picture in 1765. For example, one recent work, Sir Joshua Reynolds: A Complete Catalogue (2000) by David Mannings agrees on this date. Reynolds was paid £200 on 20th May, 1764, (see the last line in his account book below) which would suggest that the painting was done sometime between 1763 and 1765 when Sarah was still living.
Although Sarah married William Crowley in November, 1763, her husband does not appear in the painting which is somewhat odd. What may have happened is that Sir Joshua having painted the Roffey family after Sarah’s marriage, did not originally include her as she had by then established her own household at her husband’s domicile. However in 1767 Sarah died and Sir Joshua may have been asked to add her.

This was not the only painting Reynolds did of the Roffeys. In September, 1765, he painted William and wife Sarah. He also painted two portraits of William alone: one in January, 1766, and another in June, 1769. In October, 1765, he painted a portrait of son Boulter.

In Sir Joshua Reynolds: First President of the Royal Academy by Sir Walter Armstrong, William Roffey is mentioned as being someone frequently visited by Sir Joshua although the author expresses complete ignorance as to who these Roffeys were or as Armstrong puts it: “... of whom I know nothing but that Sir Joshua seems to have visited him [William] a good deal.”

36 One hundred and fifty years later, a direct descendant of Henry Man’s, Sir Hugh Casson, was also made President of the Royal Academy.
In September, 1785, William Roffey’s death announcement appeared in *The Gentleman’s Magazine*:

DIED.] On Monday at Surbiton-house, near Kingston upon Thames, William Roffey, Esq. aged 72.

William Roffey of Kingston upon Thames, Esquire, made his will on 11th February, 1784, in which he appoints his wife Sarah as sole executrix. He names his son Boulter and his son in law William Cowley as beneficiaries. His daughter Sarah is not mentioned having died in 1767.

The following transcription of a wall monument in the parish church at Hammersmith is from *The History and Antiquities of the Parish of Hammersmith...* by Thomas Faulkner, and memorializes William Gouge, his widow Sarah (the sister of James Welden who married Jonathan Boulter’s sister Mary), Sarah (Roffey) Cowley, the daughter of William Roffey, and William himself.
William Roffey son of Nathaniel and Mary (Welden) Roffey

Underneath this stone lies interred the body of
William Gouge, Gent.,
of this Parish, who departed this life the 9th day of April, 1738,
in the 77th year of his age.
Also the body of Mrs. Sarah Gouge,
widow of William Gouge, Gent.
who departed this life Dec. 14, 1759, aged 80 years.
Also the body of Sarah Cowley,
daughter of William Roffey, Esq. of Kingston-upon-Thames,
who died ye 7th of June, 1767, aged 32 years.
Also the body of William Roffey, Esq.
who died 5th of September, 1785,
aged 72.

According to Faulkner the Gouge family ... resided at the house, opposite Bradmore Lane. Mr. Gouge was a benefactor to this Parish [Hammersmith], and in the year 1738, he paid £5. 5s. for liberty to bury in the Church, and £5. 5s. for laying down a stone.

Although we are unable to confirm conclusively we believe that William Gouge who married Sarah Welden was the great grandson of William Gouge (1578-1653) and grandson of Thomas Gouge (1609-1681) who were well known non-conformist ministers who made their home in Hammersmith.

William Roffey corresponded with a number of well-known dissenting ministers such as Phillip Doddridge, Isaac Watts, and Benjamin Colman – see the appendix for some of this correspondence as well as the lives of the two Gouges.

SAMUEL ROFFEY

As with his other Roffey siblings no record of Samuel’s birth or baptism has been located. He was a Quaker and although he started out in the family distilling business he eventually became a banker, having his business at No. 71 Lombard Street, and his residence at Lincoln’s Inn Fields.
Samuel Roffey married twice. First to Ann Baker, as indicated in the Allegations for Marriage Licences Issued by the Commissary Court Surrey (1673-1770): ... 

On 3rd October, 1739, Samuel Roffey of St. Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey, distiller, bachelor, 21, and Ann Baker of Camberwell, spinster, 21; were married at Camberwell in the College Chapel of Dulwich.

The event was later reported in the newspapers on 11th October:

The same Day Mr. Roffey, of Barnaby-Street, Southwark, was married to Miss Baker (Daughter to Mr. Baker, a Haberdasher near the Monument) an agreeable young Gentlewoman with a handsome Fortune.

Ann was born on 17th July, 1718, the daughter of William and Elizabeth Baker and baptised on 30th July.

Ann (Baker) Roffey died ten years after her marriage to Samuel (apparently without issue) as the following newspaper announcement dated 11th September, 1749, notes:
A few Days since died Mrs. Roffey, Wife of Mr. Roffey, a very eminent Distiller in Barnaby-street, Southwark; and last Saturday her Corpse was inter’d in Bunhill-fields Burying Ground, in a very handsome manner. - She was the Daughter of Mr. Baker on Fishstreet-Hill, and in all Scenes [of] Life behaved so amiably, that she gain’d the Affections of all that knew her, and therefore is most justly lamented.

Ann’s burial record has not been located as she was interred in the Friend’s burial ground at Bunhill and whose records for that period have not been preserved.

Five years later, Samuel married Mary Warner on 20th June, 1754. She was aged thirty-eight.

Last Thursday Night was married, with a special Licence, Samuel Roffey, Esq; of Lincoln’s-Inn-Fields to Miss Warner, of John’s-Square, an Heiress with a Fortune of 50,000l.

Mary was born in 1716, the third daughter of Poulett Warner and Mary Brooksbank. Her father, Poulett, was born on 17th December, 1689, the eldest son of Andrews Warner, and his wife Elizabeth, only surviving child of Richard Cutts, of Clare. Poulett Warner was married on 12th May, 1713, to Mary the eldest daughter of Joseph Brooksbank, of London, by Mary the daughter of . . . Stamp, of Ockingham. Poulett Warner died on 26th August, 1721, aged thirty-two, and is buried at Wickhambrook. (For more details on Mary’s family see Appendix)

Samuel Roffey’s Career

Having continued a while the family distilling business Samuel founded a banking house at the sign of The Union at No.71 Lombard Street. His partners were originally Mr. Neale and Mr. James who were later joined by Mr. Alexander Fordyce with disastrous consequences as we shall see.
Like many a banker, lost bills of exchange were advertised such as the one that appeared on 28th December, 1765:

In May, 1765, a fire at Montreal in Canada destroyed over 110 homes and hundreds were killed. Among the most generous subscribers for the relief of the sufferers was the firm of Roffey, Neal & Co. who contributed £21.

Another advertisement for lost bills of exchange appeared on 26th February, 1766:

The letter below was placed by Samuel in the papers on 7th October, 1767, and indicates that he had Parliamentary ambitions.
To the Worshipful the Bailiffs and Burgesses of the Corporation of SCARBOROUGH.

GENTLEMEN,

PERMIT me to return you my best and earliest thanks, for the kind reception and encouragement I have met with, in my canvass for becoming one of your representatives in parliament, at the next general election. Allow me also to assure you, that if you shall confer this honour upon me, I will do my utmost endeavour to render myself worthy of it, by a faithful discharge of every duty, that my King, Country, and Constituents, can possibly expect at my hands. I am, Gentlemen,

Your most obliged,

and most devoted humble servant,

Lincoln's-inn-fields,

Oct. 5, 1767.

SAMUEL ROFFEY.

A short notice mentioning Roffey's bank appeared in The Royal Magazine of March, 1768:

THURSDAY, March 3.

A lad picked up, in Cheapside, a note of hand of Mess. Roffey, Neale, and Co. for 112 l. and immediately went and received in Bank 100l. and the remainder in cash.

Samuel was a generous supporter of the founding of two colleges in North America – Dartmouth in New Hampshire and Brown in Rhode Island.

From Benjamin Franklin's accounts of 4th August, 1767, we learn that he obtained a draft for £12 7s. 6d. 'in favour of Roffey for a Degree of Doctor of Divinity.'
In 1768 Roffey is found among the trustees of the Indian Charity School run by Eleazar Wheelock and which was the precursor of Dartmouth College in New Hampshire.

An exact Copy of the Declaration of Trust of the Indian Charity Money,
Dated 14th of May, 1768.

To all men to whom these presents shall come, The Right Honorable William, Earl of Dartmouth; the Honourable Sir Sidney Stafford Smythe, Knight, one of the Barons of his Majesty's Court of Exchequer; John Thornton of Clapham in the County of Surry, Esquire; Samuel Roffey of Lincoln's Inn Fields in the County of Middlesex, Esquire; Charles Hardy of the Parish of Saint Mary-le-bonne in the said County, Esquire; Daniel Wale of Chrift-Church, Spitalfields in the County of Middlesex, Esquire; Samuel Savage of the same Place, Gentleman; Joshua Roberts of the Parish of Saint Edmund the King, Lombard-street, London, Gentleman; and Robert Keen of the Parish of Saint Boodolph Aldgate, London, Gentleman; Send GREETING:

Whereas

Below from: Life, Times, and Correspondence of James Manning, and the Early History of Brown University ... By Reuben Aldridge Guild:

A letter written by James Manning from London on 10th August, 1770.

We have had a great loss in Mr. Roffey who died in April last and through whose further good offices I hoped your college would have been considerably benefited But God will I hope raise up friends.

The above passage is footnoted by the editor as follows:

Mr. Roffey it appears was a benefactor of Rhode Island College. From the records we find that at a meeting of the corporation held at Newport Nov 16, 1769, it was voted that the thanks of the corporation be transmitted to Mr. Samuel Roffey for his generous benefactions to this institution by the secretary.
Below the founding charter of Dartmouth College showing Samuel Roffey of Lincoln’s Inn Fields.

A history of the founding of Dartmouth College includes the following passages:
Among the subscribers thus obtained to the first funds of the college are the names of our own countrymen, Benjamin Franklin and Benjamin West, both residing in London at this time; Thomas Llewelyn, LL. D.; Samuel Roffey, Esq., whose name appears upon the earliest records of the corporation as a benefactor of the college.

Last week a banker [Samuel Roffey] gave me twenty guineas, with a promise of much more, on condition that the College, from time to time, will correspond with him, and show fairness and fidelity in the management of what money he and others intrust us with.

I must desire, therefore, that the College will embrace the first opportunity to begin that correspondence, and acknowledge his kindness. You may direct to Mr. Samuel Roffey, banker in Lombard street, London. You must observe, also, that in England, as in Ireland, I solicit for money towards endowing the College, and therefore take care that you all attend to the design of the donors.

An English board of trustees was established with Lord Dartmouth as president, Robert Keene as secretary, and Samuel Roffey as one of its members:

![Trustee List Image]

On 13th March, 1770, Samuel is listed as one of the Stewards supervising the Anniversary feast held at Merchant Taylors Hall in Threadneedle Street for the Governors of the London Hospital in Mile End Road as part of an effort to raise money.
Less than a month later, Samuel Roffey’s death was announced in the newspapers on 10th April, 1770:

On Sunday died at his House in Lincoln’s inn-fields of the Gout in his Stomach, Samuel Roffey, Esq; in Partnership with Mess. Neale, James, Fordyce and Down.

From the above it is not clear what Samuel’s cause of death was. Historical sources say rather unhelpfully that the phrase ‘Gout of the Stomach’ was used to describe Coeliagra, a rarely used term for a sudden painful affection of the stomach or other abdominal organs. From the Greek Koilia (belly) + agra, seizure.
Roffeys were generous benefactors of a number of orphanages and hospitals in and around London including the London Hospital in Whitechapel shown below in 1756.

Unfortunately, the bank that Roffey founded under the sign of The Union did not survive the speculations of one of its partners – Alexander Fordyce. See the appendix for the story of the collapse of Roffey’s bank.

Thirty three years after Samuel, Mary died in March, 1803, and was buried on the 15th of that month at the Quakers cemetery at Bunhill Fields. Her burial is recorded on the last line below, her age being eighty-five.
The Will of Mary Roffey the Wife of Samuel

Mary Roffey widow of Lincoln’s Inn Fields made her will on 18th March, 1790, with a codicil dated 2nd June, 1802, in which she appoints her sister Lady Elizabeth Duckinfield as her sole executrix. She leaves £5,000 of bank stock to Caroline Maitland the wife of Alexander Maitland and to any surviving children of them. When Mary wrote her will there were no Maitland children, although there soon would be. Alexander’s residence is at Kings Arms Yard, Coleman Street.

She leaves to Caroline (Busby) Maitland her house along with its contents at Peckham in the parish of Camberwell in the County of Surrey as well as a house in Portugal Row at Lincoln’s Inn fields.

She names the following legatees: The Reverend Mr. Bentley, and the Reverend Mr. Smith.

Her relations include: Mr. Nathaniel Warner Bromley and his wife, Mrs. Barrett (mother of Nathaniel’s wife), Mr. Probyn and his wife, Stamp Brooksbank Esquire and his wife, Mr. William Brooksbank and his wife, Mr. Ward and his wife. She also names Mrs. Mary Brooksbank and Mrs. Elizabeth Brooksbank.

Two servants Thomas and Margaret Grinson receive five hundred pounds each and their two children (aptly named Samuel and Mary) fifty pounds each.

Charitable institutions that benefit (based on her husband’s will) include: The Orphan Working School in the City Road; The Asylum in or near St. George’s Fields in the County of Surrey; The Magdalene House for the Reception of Penitent Prostitutes in or near St. George’s Fields; The General Hospital at Bath and The Paupers School at Bath.

37 Nathaniel Warner Bromely was the son of William Bromley and Elizabeth Barret. He was born 15th September, 1756, at Gray's Inn, Holborn and died 8th April, 1844.
38 He was Rector of Gedding, Suffolk 1738-83. He was born 1726 and died in 1802. His wife was Anne Gataker.
The Will of Mary Roffey

The Magdalene Hospital for the Reception of Penitent Prostitutes in St. George’s Fields

All the remainder of her estate goes to her sister Dame Elizabeth Duckinfield, widow.

In a second codicil dated 2nd June, 1802, she adds:

It is my desire to be buried quite private in the vault in Bunfields with my late dear husband and I request Mr. Alexander Maitland to do everything in his power to assist my dear sister that she may have as little trouble as possible for which I beg his acceptance of one hundred pounds.

Boulter Roffey had benefited from his uncle Samuel Roffey’s will but Boulter predeceased Mary, and so certain property that Boulter had inherited from Samuel had reverted to Mary as the following indicates:

A house at Peckham now occupied by Mr. Rees and four small houses adjoining, a house in Bermondsey Street, a farm in Reigate and a piece of garden ground at Hammersmith mine for life only since Mr. Boulter Roffey death I have given them to Mr. Mathew Freeman an eldest brother of the late Mr. John Freeman whose Bonds have given up.

The reason Boulter’s share of Samuel’s will went to Mathew Freeman is that in Samuel’s will he states that should Boulter die without issue then whatever Boulter inherited from Samuel should go to John Freeman. Since John Freeman had died Mary then bequeaths John’s share of Boulter’s estate to John’s brother Mathew Freeman.
Probate was granted to Mary’s sister Elizabeth Duckinfield on 18th March, 1803. Elizabeth would only live a few months after her sister.

Alexander and Caroline (Busby) Maitland had a child whom they named Samuel Roffey Maitland (1792–1866). His grandson Frederic William Maitland (1850–1906) was the founding father of the study of legal history in the United Kingdom.

According to Wikipedia:

His written style was elegant and lively. His historical method was distinguished by his thorough and sensitive use of historical sources, and by his determinedly historical perspective. Maitland taught his students, and all later historians, not to investigate the history of law purely or mostly by reference to the needs of the present, but rather to consider and seek to understand the past on its own terms. His death in 1906 at Gran Canaria from tuberculosis deprived English law and letters of an outstanding representative.

**JAMES ROFFEY (16?? – 1769)**

From the parish record of St. Bennett’s Sherehog, James Roffey, of St. Gabriel, Fenchurch Street, a bachelor and Rebecca Dunwell, of St. Giles, Cripplegate, a spinster were married by metropolitan license in April, 1730.
Sarah (Cradock) Boulter in an addendum to her will states that she wishes that her diamond necklace and her diamond buckle should go to James Roffey’s wife.

In 1765 James’ wife Rebecca died and was buried on 5\textsuperscript{th} March, in the chancel of Bath Abbey\textsuperscript{39}.

James Roffey, a widower without children, died at Landsdown near Bristol in December, 1769, and was buried in the chancel of Bath Abbey on 24\textsuperscript{th} December. He left a will of twelve pages.

\begin{quote}
James Roffey, Esq; who died last Week at Landsdown, we hear has left 1000l. to the General Hospital at Bath, and 100l. per Annum to the Poor of the Parish of St. Peter and Paul in that City.

28th December, 1769
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{39} The Registers of the Abbey Church of SS. Peter and Paul, Bath. Volume 2, p.452.
NATHANIEL ROFFEY, Jnr.

As with his other Roffey siblings, no birth record has yet been located for Nathaniel, Jnr.

A record showing that Nathaniel, son of Nathaniel of Peckham in Surrey was apprenticed to a James Roffey of London, Merchant, on 15th May, 1736, is shown below (first line). This James was probably Nathaniel’s uncle.

On 3rd June, 1743, Nathaniel, Jnr. married Mary (Molly) Chamberlain at St. Sepulchre, Holborn. The Universal Spectator and Weekly Journal noted the marriage in its issue of 23rd July, 1743:

A few Days since Mr. Roffey, an eminent Merchant in Copthall-Court, Throgmorton-Street, was married to Miss Molly Chamberlain, of Steward Street, Spital-Fields, an agreeable Lady, with a Fortune of 5000l.

At some point in the early 1740’s Nathaniel entered into a business partnership with William Chamberlain/Chamberlin and, typical of persons engaged in a commercial enterprise, a lost note is sought:

WHEREAS a Bill of Exchange was drawn from Gibraltar, the 7th of February, 1746-7, on Mess. Roffey and Chamberlin, of London, for £280 12 2, and protested for Non-Acceptance, the 3d of July, 1747, by Mr. Anthony Wright; the said Bill was afterwards protested for Non-Payment; but not known by what Notary Publick; a Copy of the said Protest is wanted by Persons who will be obliged, if the Gentleman who did it, will leave his Name at the Bar of Lloyd’s Coffee-house, when he will be applied to about it.
Listed in the Yale University’s library guide to the William Beckford Collection is a letter from Beckford to Roffey and Chamberlin dated December, 1756 (Box 4 Folder 82).

Unfortunately Nathaniel, Jnr. was not as successful as his father and brothers, declaring bankruptcy in the autumn of 1747. And, over a twenty five year period and long after Nathaniel had deceased, the process of paying creditors off wound its way through the bankruptcy courts as the following notices indicate:

THE Creditors of Messrs. ROFFEY and CHAMBERLIN, Bankrupts, (as well those who have executed the Deed of Trust of Oct, 8, 1747, as those who have proved their Debts under the Commission) are desired to meet the Assignees of the said Bankrupts To-morrow the 13th Instant, at the Black Swan Tavern in Bartholomew-Lane, at Four in the Afternoon, on special Affairs.

Mess. Roffey and Chamberlin, of London, Merchants, having assigned all their Effects to Mess. Barrows Smith, John Stevens, Josiah Knight, Samuel Roffey, and Edward Maude, in Trust for the Satisfaction of their Creditors; All Persons indebted to them, are to pay the same to the said Trustees, or some of them, forthwith, or they will be sued without further Notice. And all Persons who have any Effects of the said Roffey and Chamberlin in their Hands, are desired to give Notice of the same to the said Trustees, and such as have any Claims on their Estate, are desired to bring them in to the Trustees.

On 11th December, 1764, The London Gazette reported:
The Commissioners in a Commission of Bankrupt awarded and issued forth against Nathaniel Roffey and William Chamberlain, of London, Merchants and Partners, intend to meet on the 11th Day of January next, at Eleven of the Clock in the Forenoon, at Guildhall, London, in order to make a Dividend of the said Bankrupt’s Estate and Effects; when and where the Creditors, who have not already proved their Debts, are to come prepared to prove the same, or they will be excluded the Benefit of the said Dividend. And all Persons, who have made any Claims, are to come and prove the same, or they will be disallowed.

No death record for Nathaniel, Jnr. has yet been located. His will was written on 8th April, 1753, and proved on 9th January, 1756. He made his wife Mary his sole benefactor and executor. There were no children. Mary may well have been the sister of Nathaniel’s business partner William Chamberlain.

There were two more sons of Nathaniel and Mary (Welden) Roffey, Snr.’s viz. John and Jonathan but so far we have been unable to locate any records that refer to them. Both these sons are mentioned in Sarah (Cradock) Boulter’s will and John is referred to as being “now beyond the sea” which suggests he may have been a mariner.

Tuesday the 14 Day of March 1748
and in the twenty second year of the reign of King George the second of Great Britain

Calvert Mayer

This Day Mr. Nathaniel Collyer Keeper of the Guildhall having presented this court Nathaniel Roffey life made free of this City the second of three granted unto Mr ? by the court the 11th of October last for the Mayoralty of Sir Robert Lodberton it is ordered that the said Nathaniel Roffey be admitted into the Freedom of this City by the ----- in the Company of Wheelwrights paying unto the Chamberlain for this citizen’s life the sum of forty six shillings and Eighteen pence

NB if this order is not within William Man Distiller

Thos Schackelton Haberdasher 14th March 1748
Andrew Boson Vintners Allowed & taken
Robert Walker for Security in
ELias Jones Carman the Lord Mayors
J Knapp Wax Chandler Court London
Boulter Roffey the son of William and Sarah (Welden) Roffey

Roffey
  └── James Roffey
    │     └── Nathaniel Roffey, Snr.
    │         └── 1. Jonathan
    │             2. John
    └── Samuel Roffey

Tyers
  └── Elizabeth Tyers

Boulter
  └── Jonathan Boulter
      └── James Roffey, Jnr.
          └── Nathaniel Roffey, Jnr.
              └── Mary (Molly) Chamberlain

Welden
  └── James Welden
      └── Sarah Welden
          └── James Welden
              └── Sarah Welden

Sarah Welden
  └── William Gouge

Tyers
  └── Mary (Molly) Chamberlain

Welden
  └── James Welden
      └── Sarah Welden

Sarah Welden
  └── William Gouge

Boulter
  └── Sarah Roffey

Roffey
  └── Sarah Welden
BOULTER ROFFEY - The Son of William Roffey

Boulter was the son of William Roffey and Mary Welden. His birth is recorded as being on 15<sup>th</sup> February, 1742/43, in Barnaby Street, Bermondsey. His ‘baptism’ among the dissenters’ records is listed as occurring on 30<sup>th</sup> March 1743.

Boulter Roffey apprenticed to Edward Grubb of St. Olave as an Attorney. Boulter would have been about eighteen (last line).

Boulter never married.

There is a record dated 5<sup>th</sup> February, 1765, of Boulter Roffey apprenticed to Edward Grubb of St. Olave as an Attorney.
At the end of January, 1783, a short news item appeared in *Parker’s General Advertiser* and *Morning Intelligencer* declaring that Boulter had been apprehended on a charge of attempting ‘to commit an unnatural crime’ with a male servant whose last name was Davis. The information upon which the warrants for Roffey and Davis’s arrests had been made was provided by someone the paper named as Landsdown.

According to *Parker’s General Advertiser* of the 28th January, 1783, Boulter and his servant were brought before the magistrates at Kingston, and were released on bail for £800 and ordered to stand trial at the next Surrey assizes.

On Friday last was apprehended at Kingston, in Surry, B_____ Ro_____, Esq; and a servant of the name of ________ D________s, in consequence of a warrant granted upon the information of _______ Lansdown, he having detected the said persons in an attempt to commit an unnatural crime. The gentleman and servant were admitted to bail before the magistrate of Kingston in the sum of 800l. to take their trials at the next assizes for Surry.

On Friday last was apprehended at Kingston, in Surry, B_____ Ro_____, Esq; and a servant of the name of ________ D________s, in consequence of a warrant granted upon the information of _______ Lansdown, he having detected the said persons in an attempt to commit an unnatural crime. The gentleman and servant were admitted to bail before the magistrate of Kingston in the sum of 800l. to take their trials at the next assizes for Surry.

The person named above as Lansdown was in fact a foot soldier by the name of John Langridge. B_____ Ro ____ is of course Boulter Roffey, identified as a gentleman, and ____ D ____s his servant Davis.

Boulter’s next appearance in the newspapers is three months after his arrest although not as a defendant but rather as a plaintiff. From *Parker’s General Advertiser* and *Morning Intelligencer* 22nd March, 1783:

> Yesterday a cause came on to be tried at Kingston, wherein Bolter Roffey, Esq. of Kingston, was plaintiff, and Charles Legh and William Rowlis; Esq. defendants. The action was for a trespass; when the jury (which was special) found a verdict for the plaintiff, with fifty pounds damages and costs of suit.
How exactly this case relates to the earlier charge made against Roffey and Davis for committing an ‘unnatural crime’ is not apparent, but what Boulter may have been attempting to do was in some way ‘pre-emptively’ clear his name before his case came to trial.

And who were the defendants Charles Legh and William Rowls?

They were in fact two brothers namely Charles and William Legh Rowlls. Their mother was Elizabeth, the daughter of Lucy Francis Legh and Peter Davenport. She married John Rowlls (sometimes written Rowls) of Kingston upon Thames in 1752. She was his second wife. John Rowlls, was a brewer and Receiver General for the county of Surrey. He died in 1779. Their children were: John, William, Charles, and Elizabeth.

Mrs. Elizabeth Rowlls inherited the estate of her uncle, Charles Legh, of Adlington Hall in Cheshire, upon whose death on 26th July, 1781, the male Legh line became extinct. Elizabeth (Davenport) Rowlls then took the name of Legh by Royal Licence on 5th October, 1781. When in 1806 she died without surviving issue, the Adlington estate went to a cousin Richard Crosse.

Charles and William Rowlls, like their mother, took the name Legh and their names were sometimes written Legh Rowlls. Thus when Boulter Roffey took Charles Legh and William Rowlls to court who he took to court were in fact the brothers Charles Legh Rowlls and William Legh Rowlls.

Given that William Roffey, Boulter’s father, and John Rowlls were in the same trade and both families lived in the same town, the likelihood of the two families knowing each other is considerable. The question remains as to how the case for trespass brought by Boulter against the Legh
Rowlls brothers relates to the earlier charge brought against him and Davis by Langridge.

Given that the person bringing the charge against Boulter and his servant, Langridge, was just a foot soldier and not a native of Kingston and that the Legh Rowlls brothers were of the same social standing as Boulter it is feasible that they were the ones guiding Langridge’s actions and whom Boulter refers to in his letter (published below) as being the ‘diabolical instigators’ of the whole affair, i.e. his being charged with attempting to commit an ‘unnatural crime’.

Eight months after Boulter’s arrest, and five months after his successful prosecution of the Legh Rowlls brothers, the following advertisement appeared in a number of newspapers including the Morning Chronicle and London Advertiser on 26th August, 1783, and again on 11th September, 1783. From this we gather that the case against Boulter and his servant could not proceed because Langridge, as the one bringing the indictment, had failed to appear.

**The Morning Chronicle, and London Advertiser.**

WHEREAS John Langridge, late a soldier in the 70th regiment of foot, at the last Lent Assizes for the county of Surry, preferred an indictment, which was brought on to be tried at the Assizes for the said county, held at Croydon, but the said John Langridge did not appear to prosecute the said indictment. A reward of FIFTY POUNDS is hereby offered to any person who shall discover where the said John Langridge now is, if living; or if dead, a reward of Ten Guineas will be given to any person discovering when and where he died, by applying to Mr. Thomas Combe, Stationer, Bishop’s-court, Chancery-lane.

N.B. John Langridge was born at Limpsfield, in Surry, supposed to be about thirty years of age: He is short, and rather thick set, with short lank brown hair, of a sallow complexion, thin lips, a squaking voice, and a jerk in his gait. His business a labouring gardener, formerly worked at Hampton Court, and since at Kingston, and is supposed to have gone from thence into Kent.

JOHN LANGRIDGE.
to any person discovering when and where he died, by applying to Mr. Thomas Combs, stationer, Bishop's-court, Chancery-lane.

N.B. John Langridge was born at Limpsfield, In Surry, supposed to be about thirty years of age: He is short, and rather thick set, with short lank brown hair, of a sallow complexion, thin lips, a squeaking voice, and a jerk in his gait. His business a labouring gardener, formerly worked at Hampton Court, and since at Kingston, and is supposed to have gone from thence into Kent.

A year after his successful prosecution of the Legh Rowlls brothers for trespass, Roffey had caused to be printed a letter signed by himself along with three sworn notices / affidavits which were placed in London newspapers such as The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser on 6th May, 1784, and two days later in The General Evening Post (below).
CERTIFICATE (A COPY.)

Ightham, Kent, August 16, 1783.

We do hereby certify, that John Langridge, late of the parish of Limpshfield, in the county of Surrey, and who had resided in this place as a labourer to Robert Batt, Farmer, ever since, on or about the 1st of May last, departed this life on the 20th of June last, at the House of Charles Knight, Victualler, in the said parish of Ightham, and that he was buried there on the 22d of June, at the expense of the said parish of Ightham. As witness our hands the day and year above said.

Buried by M. DRURY, A.B.
HENRY HEASTREET, JAMES COUCHMAN, Clerk.
CHARLES KNIGHT.

COPY of AFFIDAVIT.

ROBERT MORLEY, of Crown-Street, Westminster, Gent. and John Smith, of Kingston upon Thames, in the county of Surrey, Butcher, severally make oath and say, and first this deponent, Robert Morley, for himself saith, that the certificate hereunto annexed, respecting the times of the death and burial of John Langridge therein mentioned, is true to the best of this deponent's knowledge and belief, he this deponent having examined the same with the registry of burials kept in and for the parish of Ightham, in the county of Kent; and this deponent further saith, that he did, on the 16th of August last, see Mr. Drury, Curate of the said parish of Ightham, and also Henry Heastreet, James Couchman, Clerk of the said parish, and Charles Knight, both inhabitants of the said parish, severally sign the said certificate.

And this deponent, John Smith, for himself saith, that he knew and was well acquainted with the above mentioned John Langridge in his lifetime, and that he was a late soldier in his Majesty's 70th regiment of foot, and was in March last quartered in Kingston upon Thames, aforesaid, and was the same person as is mentioned in the certificate hereunto annexed.

ROBERT MORLEY,
JOHN SMITH.

Sworn at my house, In Southampton-row, Bloomsbury, this 13th day of Sept. 1783, before me. A. THOMSON.
On the 6th of November, 1783, Knight made the following affidavit in the King's Bench. The King against —— Roffey, Esq., and Davis.

"CHARLES KNIGHT, of Ightham, in the county of Kent, victualler, maketh oath, and saith, that this deponent knew and was well acquainted with John Langridge, late a foot soldier in his Majesty's 70th regiment of foot, formerly of Limpfield, in the county of Surrey, and had to known him for several years before his death, which happened at or about the time herein after-mentioned. And this deponent further saith, that the said John Langridge came to lodge at this deponent's house about two months before his death; that on the 20th of June last, in the morning, this deponent was informed by one of his servants, that there was a dead man in the house; upon which this deponent asked what he meant; the servant desired this deponent to go up stairs; this deponent accordingly went up stairs and looked over the chamber door through a large crevice, and there saw the said John Langridge dead, lying across one corner of the bed with his throat cut, whereupon this deponent immediately called some of his neighbours, and they broke open the door, which was fastened within side, and soon after application was made to the Coroner, and an inquest was held upon the body of the said John Langridge, and a verdict brought in lunacy. And this deponent further saith, that he hath heard the said John Langridge say, he must go to the assizes in Surrey, and hang two people. And the deponent saith, that after Langridge's death, Langridge's father came to this deponent's house, and in conversation told this deponent, that his son John Langridge had desired that none of his family would tell any body where he was (if they knew) for that some people wanted him to go to the assizes, but that he did not mean to be there. And the deponent verily believes, that something lay on Langridge's mind, for some time before his death, this deponent having frequently heard him fetch deep sighs.

(Signed)  
CHARLES KNIGHT.  
Sworn at Serjeants-Inn,  
Nov. 6, 1783, before  
W. H. ASHURST.

What appears to have happened is that the foot soldier Langridge, claiming to have observed Boulter and his servant Davis attempting to engage in some form of sexual activity, provided information that led to Boulter and Davis being arrested, charged, and told to appear at the next assizes in Croydon.
Before his trial, and perhaps in an attempt to clear his name, Boulter brought a case of trespass against the Legh Rowlls brothers, who may have had sufficient influence over Langridge such that he was willing to provide information which led to Roffey and Davis’s arrest.

However, when their case came up for trial (probably in April/May 1783) it could not proceed because the main witness, Langridge, did not appear. The reason for this was (unknown at the time) that Langridge had had a change of heart which would lead to his suicide on 20th June, 1783. At the end of August, 1783, a search for Langridge was started and an advertisement seeking his whereabouts was placed in the newspapers (see above).

It was then put about that Boulter was somehow responsible for Langridge’s non-appearance, (‘it was industrially propagated that I had secreted him, and bought off his testimony’). Perhaps these rumors even went so far as to claim that Boulter had arranged Langridge’s death. Thus the certificates and affidavits above were attempts by Boulter to rebut those rumors and to show that Langridge’s non-appearance was a result of his death at his own hands and no one else’s.

The testimony of one witness who sees Langridge’s body through a crack at the top of a locked door and the fact that the door had to be broken down is given as evidence in support of the foot soldier having killed himself. Likewise his state of mind is inferred as depressed from his fetching ‘deep sighs’.

One deponent, Charles Knight, claims that Langridge had begged his father that none of his family was to divulge to anyone his whereabouts because ‘some people wanted him to go to the assizes, but that he did not mean to go there.’ Who were these people? Were the Legh Rowlls brothers pressing Langridge to follow through with his evidence? Perhaps the idea that his testimony could lead to the hanging deaths of Roffey and Davis was too much for Langridge to bear. And, as far as we can tell, the case against Boulter and Davis was never brought to trial.

In the appendix a description of the subsequent lives of the Legh Rowlls brothers is given and provides a possible motive for their ‘trespass’ against Boulter.
A part of a letter addressed to the actress Mrs. Yates from the actor David Garrick expresses some animosity toward Boulter Roffey. Unfortunately, the context in which it was written is too little known to give us a full understanding of Garrick’s intent.

I hope .... I shall be well Enough to see you in a day or two or three Expect Banquo's Ghost to appear in his pale-brown terrors before you - I would not frighten you if I could, but would always wish [to] give you a little flutter - this Sentiment is ye only one, I have in Common with Boulter Roffey, Esq.

Yours Ever most Affects

D. GARRICK

The editor of the letters adds: It was at the house of Boulter Roffey that Miss [Frances] Cadogan met Mrs. Yates the actress and Mrs. [Frances] Brooke.

Frances Brooke – writer  David Garrick - actor  Mrs. Yates - actress

The article below appeared on 17th November, 1785, and is the last article in the newspapers to mention a member of this particular Roffey family.
"Last Night the House of the Rev. M. Moody of this Town was broke open, and robbed of Linen, Wearing Apparel, &c. to the Value of betwixt 20l. and 30l. The same Villains, it is supposed, broke open the Stable of Boulter Roffey, Esq. next Door to Mr. Moody, and took out a Horse, with which it is imagined they carried away Mr. Moody's Property. The Horse was found by the River Side early this Morning by the Watchman."

Boulter’s death record has not been located but must have occurred between 1800 and 1802. He wrote his will on 16th July, 1800, while residing at Upper Wimpole Street, Marylebone; although much of his life seems to have been spent at Kingston upon Thames. His will was probated in 1802.

In his will Boulter leaves the bulk of his estate to John Conway Philip Astley (1768-1821) to whom he was not related. Astley began his career as an equestrian performer and his prowess in the ring graduated into an aptitude for writing and performing popular dramas and he eventually became a circus proprietor. As such, he was one of the leading proponents of ‘Hippodrama’ which featured large and spectacular battle scenes. After a philandering youth he married his co-star, Hannah Waldo Smith (d. 1843), niece of the political economist Adam Smith.
Boulter Roffey the son of William and Sarah (Welden) Roffey

Boulter Roffey and Astley may have been close neighbors as, shortly after his marriage, Astley bought a country house at East Sheen, near Kingston in Surrey. Although Astley had great successes he was not the best businessman and as his debts increased so did his drinking. He died in Paris of a liver complaint, on 19th October, 1821, and was buried in Père Lachaise cemetery.

None of Nathaniel and Mary (Welden) Roffey, Snr.’s children, other than William, produced children and the two that William did produce had no issue. Thus this Roffey family became extinct.
THE TYERS FAMILY

As noted above, Jonathan Boulter, before he married Sarah Cradock, was married to Elizabeth (Tyers) the widow of James Roffey. James had a brother Richard who was a Citizen of London and like many a Roffey also a Distiller (see Chart).

Richard Roffey married, although the record of this has not been located and so we do not know his wife’s name. However they had a child who was baptised Elizabeth and who married a man called Thomas Taylor. Thomas and Elizabeth (Roffey) Taylor did not have children.

Richard Roffey died in March, 1676/77, and his burial took place on 29th of that month at St. Olave, Bermondsey, and is noted among the parish records in the left margin under the word ‘Burialls’.

Richard Roffey, a widower, wrote a will dated 20th March, 1676/77, in which he leaves most of his estate to his only child, Elizabeth, the wife of Thomas Taylor of the Parish of Saint Giles in the Fields. So far no record of Thomas Taylor and Elizabeth Roffey’s marriage has been located.

In November, 1677, Elizabeth (Tyers) Taylor’s husband, Thomas, died. His burial which is dated 22nd November, 1677, at St. Olave notes that he is from St. Giles.
Thomas Taylor, distiller of St. Giles in the Fields, made a will on 8th November, 1677, in which the main beneficiary was his wife Elizabeth (Roffey) Taylor. In his will Thomas states that he wishes to be buried at the parish of St. Olave in Bermondsey.

Having inherited from both her father (Richard Roffey) and her husband (Thomas Taylor), the widow Elizabeth (Roffey) Taylor had acquired enough of a fortune to capture the attention of Thomas Tyers who was five years younger than her, and seven months after her husband’s death, she married Thomas on 19th July, 1678.

From: Allegations for Marriage Licences Issued by the Dean and Chapter of Westminster 1558-1699.

Thomas Tyers was the brother of Elizabeth who first married James Roffey and then Jonathan Boulter and thus he was the maternal uncle of Nathaniel Roffey, Snr. who married Mary Welden. His wife Elizabeth (Roffey) (Taylor) Tyers was also the cousin of Nathaniel Roffey, Snr. (see chart).

Elizabeth (Roffey) (Taylor) Tyers died on 1st December, 1697, and was buried at St. Olave in Bermondsey, on 10th December.

There were no children from this marriage. Elizabeth does not appear to have made a will.

From a description of the interior of St Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey, in London Riverside Churches by A. E. Daniell:

A stone on the floor of the north aisle is inscribed to the memory of Elizabeth Tyers who died in 1681; nine children of Nathaniel Roffey and Mary, his wife, who all died young.

The above Elizabeth Tyers who died in 1681 is probably the mother of Elizabeth who married James Roffey and Jonathan Boulter and the mother of Thomas who married Elizabeth (Roffey) Taylor and Ann Thomas (see chart).

This Elizabeth Tyers’ burial at St. Mary Magdalene took place on 1st December, 1681 (first entry below):
In the National Archives there is a:

**Probate lawsuit Roffey and Brady [Bradley?] v Tyers, concerning the deceased Elizabeth Tyers, widow, of St. Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey, Surrey. Allegation and interrogatory.** (1682)

What this case is about and how exactly it relates to the parties we have discussed here has yet to be determined, except that 'Elizabeth Tyers, widow' is the above mentioned Elizabeth who died in 1681 and whose burial record is shown above.

There is another possible mother and father for Elizabeth (Tyers) (Roffey) Boulter and her brother Thomas and that is Grace (Marsh)Tyers who married Nathaniel Tyers of Braintree in Essex (see Appendix under Jonathan Boulter’s land)
1. James Roffey m. Elizabeth Tyers. They had 2 sons. James hen died.
2. Elizabeth (Tyers) Roffey m. Jonathan Boulter. No children. She then died. He married Sarah Cradock. (Not shown here)
3. Elizabeth Roffey m. Thomas Taylor. He then died.
4. Elizabeth (Roffey) Taylor m. Thomas Tyers. She then died.
5. Thomas Tyers m. Anne Thomas. (see Tyers family tree)
6. Nathaniel Roffey m. Mary Welden. They had several children including:
7. William Roffey m. Sarah Welden.

Also note the marriage of Sarah Welden to William Gouge

Elizabeth Roffey’s first marriage was to Thomas Taylor. Her second marriage was to Thomas Tyers. For Thomas Tyers second marriage to Ann Thomas see tree below.
After Elizabeth (Roffey)(Taylor) Tyers died her husband Thomas Tyers married Ann Thomas on 7th February, 1697 at St. Margaret Pattens.

And they had three children: Elizabeth, Jonathan, and Ann. In April, 1721, Thomas’ wrote his will which was witnessed by his nephew Nathaniel Roffey, Snr.

The son of Thomas and Anne (Thomas) Tyers, Jonathan, would become one of the 18th century’s most successful entrepreneurs and a considerable patron of the arts. He was the owner and proprietor of the Vauxhall Gardens. The Tyers family tree subsequent to Thomas’s marriage to Anne Thomas is shown below.

According to The Cumberland Letters, in the summer of 1774 Mary (Balchen) Man’s niece, Sally Balchen, the daughter of
her brother William, was being courted by a young man named James Read. James was an attorney and according to George Cumberland was “... the son of a Mr. Read a Baker in the Burrough, he has no Fortune but he is going into partnership with his Uncle who is an eminent Attorney, and who 'tis said will leave him the business very soon, having acquired a tolerable fortune ... He is a gentleman about 19, excessively thin, and pitted with the Small pox, a Man of few words and what is remarkable in a young Attorney or indeed in any profession A Modest Man...” p. 64

As part of the proceedings a party group gathered and headed off to the pleasure gardens at Vauxhall. George Cumberland, Jnr. wrote:

I went with them all the other night to Vauxhall for the first time this Season. We staid till Eleven o’ Clock and the lover [James Read] proposed a Supper but a Young lady in company an Acquaintance of Cousins insisted on going home; it cost me 3/. p. 64

Three years later in July, 1777, George dined with William Read who by then had married Sally Balchen. Afterward, George joined a group of friends that included his Balchen cousins, and together they re-visited Vauxhall Gardens. Later, George wrote to his brother Richard:

... we all agreed that it was the stupidest place in the World, we join'd in saying we would never go there again.

The Cumberland brothers were probably not aware of the various connections that lead from them to Jonathan Tyers.
The following description of the painting below appeared in *The Burlington Magazine* titled: ‘A Hayman Portrait of Jonathan Tyers’s Family’ by John E. Ruch. This is a summary:

The profile medallion over the mantel is Frederick Lewis, eldest son of George II. Tyers was grateful to Frederick for his patronage which took the form of frequent visits to summer entertainments at Vauxhall Gardens. Tyers was well aware of the Prince's popularity and the magnetic value of his presence. He provided a specially furnished supper box for Frederick's use situated on the principal axis of the main court of the gardens.

Tyers's children were named Thomas, Jonathan Jr., Margaret, and Elizabeth. The youth far left in the painting wears the academic dress of a university 'commoner', and holds a diploma. Thomas Tyers matriculated in December 1738, and thereafter attended Pembroke College, Oxford as a 'commoner' until he graduated in 1742. Thomas matriculated when he was close on thirteen which was exceptional, even in that age of young undergraduate students.

In the centre of the group are two younger children. They pose between their mother (Elizabeth) and father, in contrast to the elder brother and sister (Margaret), who are on
the outer sides and therefore, symbolically, about to leave their parents' care. The girl pouring tea was Jonathan Tyers's younger daughter Elizabeth. The younger son would be Jonathan Jr., who eventually succeeded his father as sole proprietor of Vauxhall.

The older girl, far right, is Margaret. At this time she was a young lady of perhaps eighteen years. She stands having just risen from the chair which still supports her skirt. She is in the act of putting on her gloves, as if she were about to leave home. Needless to say, the woman beside her is her mother [Elizabeth].

The atmosphere is quiet and domestic, comfortable and bourgeois. There is modest pride in material success and family accomplishments. On the other hand there is no flamboyance, and little of the flair for advertisement which might have been expected in the exploiter of a popular, public amusement park. Yet this is the man who had the sagacity to employ Handel, Roubiliac, and Hayman with commissions for Vauxhall.

This group portrait of Margaret Tyers (1722-1786) and her husband George Rogers (1718-1792) was painted by Francis Hayman. Margaret was the eldest daughter of Jonathan and Elizabeth (Fermor) Tyers. There were no children from this marriage.
Above Jonathan Tyers, plaster cast by Roubiliac at the Victoria and Albert Museum and right a caricature of Jonathan Tyers directing William Hogarth in the painting of an outdoor panel for his amusement park at Vauxhall.
Painted in about 1750 by Francis Hayman this painting shows Jonathan Tyers the elder seated next to his youngest daughter Elizabeth. The man standing is Elizabeth's husband John Wood. The painting was probably executed on the couple’s betrothal. Although Elizabeth and John had seven children they appear not to have any descendants. Note the pug dog, a favourite of William Hogarth's and a symbol of loyalty.

This group portrait, painted in 1750/52, also by Francis Hayman, shows seated in the middle Jonathan Tyers’ daughter Margaret and to her right holding the shot pheasant her husband George Rogers and to Margaret's left her husband's sister Margaret Rogers. George Rogers was an amateur painter. He married Margaret in 1742. His sister Margaret married Jonathan Tyers, the younger, Margaret's brother, in 1756. The Rogers family lived in Southampton and it was there that Elizabeth (Fermor) Tyers, the wife of Jonathan Tyers the elder died.

Here ends the ‘narrative’ part of this paper. The following pages are the appendices which give more detail on what has been discussed in the preceding sections.
APPENDIX ONE: The Three Cases of John Blunt, Susannah his wife, and Stephen Child

The three cases of John Blunt, Susannah Blunt, & Stephen Child being their petitions to Parliament in the hope of having the levies made on their estates, following the collapse of the South Sea Company, reduced.

The CASE of Sir John Blunt, Bart.
His Wife and Family.

That by near Forty Years diligent Labour and Application to Business, he hath acquired an Estate of about 180,000 l. Value, of all which by a Bill brought up to the Honourable House of Lords, he will (if it pass into a Law) be devolved; and out of the same no more is to be allowed him than 5000 l. for the Subsistence of himself, his Wife and Family.

He humbly craves leave to say, That as to several of the Facts which have been charged as Crimes on the late Court of Directors of the South-Sea Company; and in particular, The Enlarging and Diminishing the Money Subscriptions, The Selling any Stock or Subscriptions mortgaged to the Company, The Excess of the First Loan of 500,000 l. upon Stock at 250 l. per Cent. he was no way privy to.

Nor did he ever know what was issued on the other Loans, having never seen any Book or Account thereof, 'till after the same was ordered to be laid before their Lordships, he not being of the Committee of Treasury, to whose Care the Subscriptions and Loans were committed.

Nor did he vote for, or approve of the Dividends of 30 and 50 per Cent. Nor act any thing in the Execution of the South-Sea Scheme, but in conjunction with the rest of the Court of Directors, And what at the time of doing, he apprehended to be for the Benefit of the Company.

And he humbly hopes he hath not been guilty of any Crime which can deserve so unpresumtuated a Punishment, as to be deprived of so large an Estate, without referring necessary Support or a Bed to lie on, for himself and numerous Family, he having Seven Children living by his first Wife, and his present Wife (with whom he had a large Fortune) having Eleven Children and Grand-Children, and he settled on Marriage with her only the Amount of her own Estate, the Income whereof will by the said Bill (as it now stands) be taken away during his Life.

Therefore it is humbly hoped, That their Lordships will compassionately the Case of him, and his Wife, and their Families, and grant him such an Allowance as may be in some Proportion to his Estate and Family, and to the Allowances made to other Directors, who stand equally charged with him in the said Bill, or that his Wife may be permitted to enjoy in present Possession, the Fortune she brought him in Marriage, which she will be intituled to at his Death.
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The CASE

Of Dame Susanna Blunt, Wife of Sir John Blunt, Barrister, one of the late Directors of the South-Sea Company; and of Abraham Crop of London Merchant, and Susanna his Wife, Daughter of the said Dame Susanna Blunt, by her former Husband, John Tanner, deceased.

BY Lease and Release, in consideration of a Marriage then intended, between the said Sir John and Dame Susanna, he settled her then Dwelling House at Stratford in Essex, with the Garden and Orchard, Tenement and Cottage adjoining, to the Use of Sir John for Life; then to herself for Life, if she survived; and then to the Heirs and Executors of the Survivor of them.

And in Case the survivor Sir John, That then she should have all the Household Goods, which at, or any time before his Death, should be in or about and used with her said Dwelling House.

That in consideration thereof, and of her other Fortune, then computed at Ten Thousand Seven Hundred and Fifty Pounds (all which came to Sir John on the Marriage, and is now all in the Hands of the Trustees for the South-Sea Company), he covenanted, that if she survived, then his Heirs or Executors should pay her to 350 L. but if she survived, then he should pay 4000 L. to each of her Issue by her former Husband as she should appoint.

And it is thereby agreed, That if she die first, she might appoint her said Dwelling House and Premises (after Sir John's Death) to any of her Children by her former Husband. And in such Case, the same, together with the said Household Goods, is to be taken as 1450 L. part of the said 4000 L. So that then he should pay only 2550 L. to her said Issue by her former Husband, which are ten Children and Grandchildren; but she hath no Issue by Sir John.

And the said Dame Susanna did, in the Marriage Articles of her said Daughter with the said Abraham Crop, in March 1713, appoint 4000 L. to be paid after the Death of the said Dame Susanna (only out of the several Sums payable to her or her Issue as aforesaid) as an additional Marriage Portion for her said Daughter, and to be settled upon her and her Issue; in consideration whereof, the said Abraham Crop covenanted to add 5000 L. out of his own Estate, to make a further Provision for his said Wife and her Issue.

Dame Susanna made her Claim before the Trustees for the said Sums of 10450 L. or 4000 L. or 2550 L. (as the Case should happen), to be paid out of Sir John's Estate in the Trustees Hands when the same should become due, and likewise for the said Household Goods.

But the Trustees have disallowed her Claim, as well for the said several Sums of Money as for the said Household Goods: And the Judges, on her Appeal, have confirmed those Disallowances, as being contingent Debts, omitted to be provided for by the Act of Parliament. And consequently, not only the said Dame Susanna is deprived of the Provision made for her as aforesaid by her Marriage Articles; but also the said Abraham Crop and his Wife are deprived of the said 5000 L. additional Portion.

And, by an Act of the 9th Year of his Majesty's Reign, the said Dame Susanna and her Issue, are barred of all Remedy against Sir John, his Heirs or Executors, for any Part of the Premises. So that as the Case now stands (unless they are relieved by Parliament) the said Dame Susanna, and also Mr. Crop and his Wife, have a Right without any Remedy.

Wherefore they humbly hope that the Honourable House of Commons will take their Case into Consideration, and admit of a Clause in some Bill for their Relief out of the Estate of Sir John Blunt, in the Hands of the said Trustees, which amounts to Two Hundred Thousand Pounds; out of which he hath allowed him by Parliament but Five Thousand Pounds for the Subsistence of himself and Family; and he hath living by a former Wife seven Children, besides Grandchildren, none of whom can receive any Benefit by the Relief now prayed.
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THE CASE OF

Stephen Child.

In the Year 1717, he was chosen a Director of the South-Sea-Company, and for that Year past was seldom employ'd in any thing particular, besides attending upon the Preparing and Sealing of the Company's Bonds. He never was admitted into any private Consultations about the Company's Affairs, nor had any hand in Contriving the Scheme which has introduc'd so much Mischief to the Publick.

The Fictitious Stock enter'd in the Company's Books, he neither had it in, nor dispos'd of, nor ever knew there was any such, till complain'd of in the Honourable House of Commons, nor was any ways concern'd in the Increase or Decrease of the Subscriptions, or had the least advantage thereby.

He joyn'd in directing Differences should be taken for such Moneys as the General Court had allow'd to be Lent upon Stock, but never was at any Court or Committee when Money was permitted to be Lent upon Subscriptions, nor knew of the disposing of any Stock or Subscriptions transfer'd or deposited as Securities for Money Lent by the Company.

In the beginning of June 1720, when Stock was Sold for 717 l. per Cent. and upwards, he Borrow'd of the Company 3000 l. on 1000 l. Stock, (half of which was for a Friend) and procur'd for another 5000 l. (tho' by mistake charg'd to the said Stephen Child's Account) as mentioned in the Inventory and Abstract of his Estate, besides which he neither Borrow'd for himself, or procur'd to be Lent to others, above the Summ of 5000 l.

He was not present at the passing of the Company's Cash Account, from the beginning of June to September, being in the Country for his Health the greatest part of that time.

He brought into the Company 40000 l. and it appears by the Account of his Effects delivered in to Parliament (without the least Concealment, that the chief part of his Estate still remains in the Company, and (after his Debts paid, and the Incumbrances he is under shall be discharged) is little encreas'd beyond what he had at first there, which shews the small advantage he had by being a Director.

He doubts not but it will appear he was as little concern'd as any, in those Measures which have occasion'd the publick Calamities; and fine he is, that he never acted with the least design to prejudice any Person in the World, nor doth know wherein he hath in any degree contributed to it.

Wherefore, and in regard he hath no Employment, and is out of Trade and Business, and has a Wife and young Children unprovided for. He humbly hopes his Circumstances will be consider'd by this Honourable House, on whose Justice and Compassion he entirely relies.
APPENDIX TWO: The Banner Family & its Charities

As we have already noted, Susannah (Cradock) (Banner) (Tudman) Blunt’s father in law, Richard Banner, was secretary to the Saddler’s Company and established a charity by a deed dated 6th July, 1698, whereby:

...in consideration of £200, the gift of Richard Banner, the Saddlers Company charged an annuity of £8 on Banner’s certain messuages belonging to them, to be applied for putting forth every year a poor boy, the son of a freeman of the Company, or a poor boy bred up in Christ's Hospital or any poor boy, as the wardens and assistants of the Company should appoint, to a fit master in trade.

However the charity was not properly administered and various legal proceedings to ensure its proper administration occurred during the 19th century.
admitted that the charitable purposes had not been carried into effect, that they had retained the rents, and had in their hands between 700l to 800l for arrears. They admitted the small number of objects who had been benefited by the charity; they had advertised when vacancies had occurred; they had not derived any benefit from non-performance of the trust, and no application had been made by Christ's Hospital.

Mr. KINDERSLEY appeared for the defendants. Lord LANGDALE directed a reference to the Master to settle a scheme, with liberty to the governors of Christ’s Hospital to attend.

A further inquiry noted that:

The former Commissioners found that up to the date of their inquiry the trust had been only partially carried out, the applications for the benefit of the Charity having been infrequent, owing, as was alleged, to the inadequacy of the fee, and under these circumstances they certified the case to the Attorney-General, who filed an information against the Company.

In the result of proceedings in the Court of Chancery direction was given for the investment of an accumulated fund arising from unapplied income, and a Scheme was established on the 16th March, 1840, whereby provision was made for the application by the Company of the income of the Charity in apprenticing poor boys, the premium in any case not to exceed £50. After a sale of £88. 8s. 5d. Consols for payment of taxed costs, the accumulated fund was represented by £613. 10s. Id. Consols, afterwards increased to £1,048. 13s. 0d. like stock by investments of surplus income, but again reduced to £131. 10s. 1d. by a sale in 1877, the proceeds of which were applied in aid of income.
Richard and Samuel Banner's Birmingham Charity

The first Richard mentioned below is the father of Samuel Banner the ironmonger and Richard Banner of Saddlers Hall, and grandfather of the Reverend Doctor Richard Banner and John Banner who married Susannah Cradock.

In a trust deed of 1716 it was declared that Richard Banner had bequeathed £100 with which Samuel Banner was to purchase land, the income to be used to buy six alms-coats annually for poor men of Birmingham, and the residue to apprentice poor boys. Samuel Banner, with the principal and interest upon it, and with an additional sum of £29 5s. 9d., bought land in Erdington, and directed his son Richard [the Reverend Doctor] to put the land in trust, with the additional provision that 25s. was to be expended annually on the purchase of alms-gowns and petticoats for poor women. Richard made these arrangements in 1716. In 1827 most of the income of £20 was spent on clothes for from six to 10 poor men and ten to 30 poor women. It was later said that at that date no money was in practice spent on apprentices, and the last application from an apprentice for a grant was said to have been in 1862.

By 1931 the income, which was then from property in Holly Lane and Moor End Lane, Erdington, and in Caroline Street and Regent's Place, Birmingham, had greatly increased, and was expected to be £120 to £130 a year. About £60 was being spent on clothing for
poor people, and there was an accumulating surplus. By a Scheme of 1932 half the income was to be used in the purchase of clothing for poor men and widows in the city, and half in the assistance by apprenticeship, education and otherwise, of poor boys. In 1956-7 there was an income of over £94 from rents and £26 from investments, and sums of £70 were spent on clothing and £89 10s. on apprenticing and education.\(^{40}\)

**APPENDIX THREE: GRIFFITH DAVIES THE UNCLE OF RICHARD BANNER’S WIFE**

As we have noted Richard Banner, the eldest son of John and Susannah (Cradock) Banner, married Mary Davies the niece of Dr. Griffith Davies. Here we detail some parts of the professional life of Griffith Davies.

The following extract from *An Inventory of the Church Plate of Leicestershire* ... by Andrew David Hedderwick Trollope adds a few details on Griffith Davies. He was the son of:

**William Davies**, gent. of Dryslwyn in Carmarthenshire; he entered Jesus College, Oxford, at the age of 17, on 17\(^{th}\) December, 1684, [which would mean he was born 1667] from whence he took his B.A. and M.A. degrees, finally taking that of M.D. on 4\(^{th}\) July, 1698. Dr. Griffith Davies lived in St. Phillip's parish, Birmingham, and practiced in that town as a physician. He had become connected with Theddingworth, by buying from Sir R. Newdigate, Bart., circa 1715, the manor and advowson. Dr. Davies married in 1710, Elizabeth, only daughter of Sir John Burgoyne, 3\(^{rd}\) Bart.; which lady died on 29\(^{th}\) July, 1726, aged 47, leaving a daughter Elizabeth, who inherited his estate.

Below, a letter from Dr. Griffith Davies to Sir Charles Holt written on 14\(^{th}\) July, 1699, concerning a person who ‘...voided many Hydatides in her urine’ published by the Royal Society in *Philosophical Transactions* (1683–1775) pp. 897–898. Holt is named by Davies in his will as his ‘good friend’ and his daughter Holt is bequeathed twenty guineas by the doctor.

---

\(^{40}\) A History of the County of Warwick: Volume 7: The City of Birmingham.
1. A Letter from Dr Davies to Sir Charles Holt containing a relation of a person who voided many Hydatides in her Urine.

A Gentlewoman between 40 and 50 years of age, in the Autumn 97, drank Some Aluminous Waters for a month or five weeks, and in a months time after the use of these Waters, found a pain in the Renal region, where she never had been afflicted with any before; this pain returned after the first Paroxysm, in about a month, and afterwards more frequently, till about the Christmas following it visited her every day, about which she sent for me, and had when I came to her the Symptoms of a Stone in her Left Kidney, viz. a grinding, and sometimes a very acute pain on that side of the Spina Dorfi, a Vomiting, her Urine during the Paroxysm tinged with Blood, and in it Bloody Ramenta; but what most surprised me, a dozen at least of Hydatides, some of the biggest of them 1 inch long, their circumference equalled that of an ordinary Goose-quill, in shape they exactly represented the Vescula Natatoriae in Fish, growing smaller about the middle, as those generally do, and were filled with a Liquor, which by taste and smell made me believe to be Urine; I never discovered any Pus in her Urine, nor had she any pain at the Sphincter of the Bladder, nor in the Meatus Urinarius, either before, at, or after making Urine. The Paroxysm lasted generally 5 or 4 hours; as soon as these Hydatides came away, (which they did not all at once making water, but at several times) the pain in her Back, &c. abated very sensibly, and she continued easy and well the rest of the day, excepting an external soreness, which the pain had caused.


Part of a letter to the publisher from Dr. Davies in 1701 concerning an "Unusual Colic" (Philosophical Transactions (1683-1775) pp.965-966):
Part of a Letter to the Publisher from Dr Davies concerning an unusual Colic.

Birmingham, Oct. 3d 1701.

Sir, Last May, my Ingenious Friend Dr Shaw of Tamworth, was pleased to desire my assistance in the following case. A person, aged between 50 and 60, had been for 3 or 4 years last past troubled with Gripes, which generally returned once a month, or thereabouts; his Body for the most part costive, and therefore was forced to spur Nature with Daffy’s Elixior Aloes; sometimes the smoking a Pipe of Tobacco, supply’d the use of these Medicines. Last April, coming from London heated himself very much with his Journey, having walked a good part of the way, and as soon as he came home, had a return of his Colic pains, which continued upon him for 18 days, notwithstanding the methods commonly used in that case, during which time he had no Stool, besides what the first and second Clysters brought away; his complaint upon his seizure was of a pain in his right side in the Regio Iliaca. Some time before he dyed his Belly swelled much, and was as tense as any Drum, he vomited for 2 or 3 days at the beginning, which left him, and returned not till just before he dyed, which was at the expiration of the 18th day, at which time he brought up 2 or 3 mouthfuls of black Choler, but never during his whole illness vomited any excrement. Dr Shaw who lived upon the spot, prevail’d to have an hasty Inspection of his Abdomen, the Relations (being a thing Male same in that Neighbourhood) desired it might be done with all secrecy and expedition, which prevented the Doctor taking so nice a view of all the parts within the Abdomen as he would otherwise have done. He found some black Choler in the Stomach, the Duodenum and the rest of the Intestina tennia void of excrement, but incredibly distemper’d with Wind, and tracing the Canalis of the Guts as far as the Cacum, found that of a blackish colour; and from thence for about a yard in length, the Colon mortified and so rotten, that the Excrements had made their way thro’ it at several places into the Cavity of the Abdomen; about 2 inches of the moribund Gut was fastened to the Perituneum on the right side. This part of the Colon was so extended with excrements of a left coliculence, that they when taken out filled two Chamber-pots; at the extremity of the mortification, towards the Rectum the obstruction which occasioned all these misfortunes offer’d itself to view very plainly, for about ten inches of the Colon was doubled, as if you had taken a piece of Tape, and fold’d it the two contiguous surfaces of the duplicature adhered so firmly together, that you could not separate them without tearing the exterior coat of the Intestine. Upon separating this coalescence, there fell from that part a whitish Mucus, the adhesions were about 3 inches broad; the middle of the Duplicator which made the acute angle, and where the excrements stopped, was smaller, and the Membranes thinner than in any other part of the Gut, from thence towards the Rectum the Colon was found, and void of excrements, occasion’d by the frequent use of Clysters.
where the excrements stopped, was smaller, and the Membranes thinner than in any other part of the Gut from thence towards the Rectum the Colea was found, and void of excrements, occasioned by the frequent use of Clyfters.

APPENDIX FOUR: The Henckell Family

As noted, Susannah Banner’s husband Abraham Cropp had a sister Elizabeth, the daughter of James and Abigail (Bush) Cropp, who was born on 5th September, 1678, and baptised on the 8th at St. Gabriel’s, Fenchurch:

She married a London merchant of Dutch origin, Abraham Henckell, on 5th October, 1697, at St. Botolph, Aldgate (last line).

They had the following children:
James born on 12th March and baptized on 14th March 1699/1700 at St. Dunstans in the East, Isaac baptized on 26th December, 1704 at St Laurence Pountney (who died), Jacob born on 24th March 1707 and baptized on 7th April, at St Laurence Pountney, Isaac 1st September, 1708 at St. Laurence Pountney, Peter baptized on 10th August, 1718 (who died) Levinus.
Jacob Henckell son of Abraham & Elizabeth Henckell was Baptized January 7 1705 by Dr Whinrop

Peter Henckell son of Abraham & Elizabeth Henckell was Baptized August 10 1715 by Dr Bultor

Mr Peter Henckell A Child & son of Mr Abraham Henckell died in this Parish & was Buried at Abchurch December ye 15 1715

Isaac Henckell son of Abraham and Elizabeth Henckell was Baptized December 26 1704 by doctor Whinrop

Levinus Henckell son of Abraham & Elizabeth Henckell was Born September 19 1717 & Baptized by Mr Oliver October 3 1717

Mr Levinus Henckell A child & son of Mr Abraham Henckell died in this parish & was Buried in St Mary Abchurch October 8 1717

Abraham Henckell, like his brother in law Abraham Cropp, placed advertisements in the newspapers which were typical for merchants in those days.
Whereas the Mail from Bristol was robbed the 24th Instant of several Letters, amongst which (as ’tis supposed) was one directed to Mr. Abraham Henckell, with the following accepted Bills, payable in London to him or Order, viz. 2 for 160 l. each, on Mr. Brice Webb, 3 for 100 l. each, on Mr. Robert Smith, 1 for 127 l. 10 s. on Mr. Robert Smith, 1 for 140 l. on Mr. Arthur Goodwin, 1 for 75 l. 10 s. on Mr. Joseph Beck. This is therefore to caution everyone not to Discourse or take in Payment the said Bills or any of them, as not being indorsed by the said Mr. Abraham Henckell; and whoever will bring them to his House in Lawrence Pountney-lane Cannon-street, shall have one Guinea Reward, and no Questions asked, they being of no Use to any but the Owner.

25th July, 1719

Susannah (Cradock) (Banner) (Tudman) Blunt appointed Abraham Henckell and Henry Balchen as joint trustees of her estate.

As elders of the Dutch Church, Abraham Henckell and James Cropp (father of Abraham and Elizabeth), were involved in the churches administration as the following letter indicates:

---


[Original in Dutch.] We feel sure that our two last Letters of 4 and 11 May have reached you, as we have learnt from other quarters that Dom. Bolswerck has already been examined and qualified for the administration of the Sacraments, and we had expected to hear from you that he was preparing himself for the journey hither, but having received no tidings from you, we hope that you will soon let us know when we may expect him. We hear with surprise that it is rumoured in Holland that our present Minister, Dom. Bishop, does not desire a Colleague and second Minister, and that not all the Members of the Consistory are in earnest regarding the election of a Second Minister and merely wish to defer the election from time to time. This is a calumny invented to injure not only our Minister and the Consistory, but the whole Community, and we trust that neither you nor anyone else will believe it. As evidence of the truth of what we now say, this Letter is signed by a larger number of Members of our Consistory than is customary. We trust, therefore, that you will proceed with what we have requested of you, and that you will assure Dom. Bolwerck and his father, that he may have the same aspiration as anyone else who is coming hither on trial. London, den 22 Meij 1708. Uijz last en naam des Kerkenraets W: Bishop, V.D.M.

Elders:
Jan de la Chambre, Daniel Van Mildert, Cornelius Noortwijk, Jan Luijs of Walpergen.
Jasper Van den Buseche, James Cropp.
Charles Lodewick, Abraham Henckel.

Descous:

1 This Letter occurs on Fol. 699 of the Register or Copy-book D, described above in the Note to No. 812. It is addressed as the two preceding Letters, q.v.
Abraham and Elizabeth (Cropp) Henckell’s son, James was likewise a successful merchant in the City of London being elected a number of times as a Director and Sub-Governor to the Royal Exchange Assurance Company. It might have been this connection with the Royal Exchange that paved the way to George Cumberland’s early career as a clerk in the company’s offices.

Below, an 18th century business card of the Royal Exchange Assurance Company showing a boat sinking on the left, while on the right flames leap from a building from which a man safely carries away his goods. Unfortunately, on a very cold January night in 1832 the Royal Exchange Assurance office burned to the ground.

Some of James Henckell’s life as a merchant is reflected in the newspapers of the age.
Whereas the Warehouses and Accompting House at Dyers Hall in Thames Street have of late been Four Times broken open in the Night Time, and sundry Parcels of Linnens, and other Things of Value, stole from thence: His Majesty, for the better discovering and bringing to Justice the Persons concerned in the said Robberies, or any of them, is pleased to promise His most gracious Pardon to any one of the Persons concerned therein, who shall discover his Accomplice or Accomplices, so as he or they may be apprehended and convicted thereof.

HARRINGTON.

And as a further Encouragement to such Discovery, James Henckell, of Lawrence Poultney Lane, London, Merchant, does hereby promise, That whoever shall discover the Person or Persons concerned in the said Robberies, or either of them, so as he or they may be convicted thereof, shall, upon such Conviction, receive from him as a Reward the Sum of Fifty Guineas.

James Henckell.
APPENDIX FIVE: The Cropp - Bush - Bennett - Munck Connection

The following Codicil was added by Abigail (Bush) Cropp a year after she wrote her will in July, 1724, and is reproduced here almost verbatim as it is curious and leads to a number of genealogical connections which would probably otherwise not have been made:

A Codicil to be annexed to the last will and testament of me Abigail Crop: Whereas my late brother James Bush of Red Lion Square in the County of Middlesex Esqr departed this life since my making my said will [dated 11th July, 1724] and was at his death possessed of and entitled unto a very considerable estate having first made his last will and testament in writing and after giving and making some specific legacies and dispositions therein contained the said James Bush did by his said will nominate and appoint Judith Bennett spinster sole Executive of his said will and Residuary devisee and legatee of his estate but the said Judith Bennett dying in the life time of my said brother James Bush and it being now pretended that my said Brother did duly make and execute a codicil to his said will and thereby nominate and appoint Mrs. Sarah Bush widow
[Sarah was the wife of James Bush’s son Levinus Bush and hence James’s daughter in law] his sole executrix of his said will and residuary legatee and devisee of his Estate in the Room of the said Judith Bennett And Whereas I have great Reason to believe that the said pretended codicil was very unduly obtained and that my said Brother at the time of the pretended execution thereof was and for some time before had been so impaired and destroyed in his memory and understanding as to be incapable of duly making a will or codicil and that the said pretended codicil is really invalid and ought to be annulled and condemned as void and a suit hath been ____________ and is now depending in the proper Ecclesiastical court touching the Validity of the said pretended Codicil and I am endeavouring to obtain letters of administration of the Personall Estate of my said Brother’s estate to be granted to me as a sister and next of Kinn with his said will annexit (?) in which suit if I shall prevail I shall be instituted to most part of my late Brother's estate I do therefore by this my Codicil .... and my Will and meaning is that in case I my Executors and Administrators or Legal Representatives shall by Virtue of that said Suit or otherwise recover or obtain all or part of the estate of my said late Brother.

(and she then details how, if that happens, the property is to be disposed of).... Signed 21st May, 1725.

As noted above Abigail (Bush) Cropp’s codicil refers to Sarah (Carter) Bush who was the widow of Abigail’s nephew Levinus Bush. Below the marriage of Levinus Bush to Sarah Carter on 23rd March, 1707 and took place in the chapel at Whitehall.

Mar 23 Levinus Bush of Red Lion Square in the Parish of St Andrew Holbourn Batchelor and Sarah Carter of St. Clement Danes, Spinster. At the chapel at Whitehall formerly the Banqueting House.

The chapel at Whitehall where Levinus Bush and Sarah Carter were married
Below the marriage record of Levinus Bennet and Judith Boevey on 6th July, 1653, at All Hallows, London Wall.

There is some confusion as to whom Judith (Boevey) Bennett’s parents are. Some have mistakenly made her the daughter of William who married Catherina Riches, but that William is her cousin. Judith’s parents were William and Anne (Lucie) Boevey. James Boevey, the uncle of Judith, was a renowned philosopher (See chart above).

On the death of the brothers Richard and Thomas Bennett, a monument was placed in Babraham church by Sir Levinus Bennett with the following inscription:

Here lie buried Richard and Thomas Bennett, two brothers, and both of them Baronets: they lived together, and were brought up together, at Schoole, at the University, and at Inns of Court. They married two sisters, the daughters and heires of Levinus Munck, esq, Sir Richard died Aprill ye 12, 1658, aged 61. — Sir Thomas died June ye 28, 1667, aged 71.
The above monument is said to be one the finest examples of Jacobean sculpturing in England.

**Benet, Leinus.**

Son of Thomas Benet (created baronet 1660, died 1667), of Babraham, Cambs. Leinus Benet erected a remarkable monument in the Parish Church of Babraham to his father and his uncle, Richard Benet, which describes them as “two Brothers, and Both of them Baronetts: They lived together, and were brought up together, at schoole, at the University, and at Inns of Court. They married two Sisters, the daughters, and Heires, of Leinus Munke Esq.” On a separate dedicatory marble, Leinus Benet describes himself as “utriusq Hares.” (See also Burke, Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies, in which, however, there is no note of Richard Benet’s baronetcy.)

Lev. Benet is possibly the “Mr Benet Junr.” who was admitted to S. Cath. as a fellow-commoner in 1645 under Mr Lynford (see “Lynford” below) as tutor. (Coll. rec.) Nos. 43, 65, presented by Benet, once belonged to Lynford. Sir Leinus Benet, Bt, died 5 Dec. 1693.

In James Bush’s will as well as that of his son’s Leinus Bush each desires to be buried in a family vault in the parish church at Babraham in Cambridgeshire.

At the National Archives is a catalogue description of “two bills and two answers”.

Plaintiffs: James Bush, Esq. of Red Lion Square, St Andrew Holborn, Middlesex and Mary [Bennett] Bush his wife, Judith Bennett, spinster of Red Lion Square, Dorothy Page, widow of London, Edward Alexander, Esq. of London and Levina Alexander his wife, James Mitchell, Esq. of London and Jane Mitchell his wife (the said Mary Bush, Judith
Bennett, Dorothy Page, Levina Alexander, and Jane Mitchell being grand-daughters and co-heirs of Sir Thomas Bennett Bart. of Babraham, Cambridge, and daughters and co-heirs of Sir Levinus Bennett, Bart., son and heir of said Sir Thomas Benet). Defendants: Maximililain Western, Esq. and Elizabeth Bennett, widow. Year 1717.

Also at the National Archives:

Probate lawsuit Bush v Cropp, concerning the deceased James Bush, Esq. of Red Lion Square, Middlesex. Allegation. (1724).

Below is the death announcement of Judith Bennet on 3rd October, 1724. Although referred to in various sources as Mrs. she was in fact not married.

Some days since died Mrs Bennet, one of the Daughters and Co-Heiresses of Sir Levinus Bennet of Bab‘ram near Cambridge, and has left a very considerable Estate to her Nephew Mr. Bennet Alexander, Son of Mr. Edward Alexander of Doctors Commons.

An early historical account of the charity established under the wills of James Bush, his son Levinus Bush, and James’s sister in law Judith Bennett taken from A Topographical Description of Babraham, co. Cambridge, published in The Gentleman’s Magazine (1815) is as follows:

Levinus Bush, Esq. by his will bearing date 1722, devised an estate at Babraham, consisting of a portion of the manor, to his aunt, Judith Bennett, on condition that she should give 1000l. at her death to charitable uses. J. Bennett, by her will bearing date 1723, after noticing this legacy, and a legacy of the same amount bequeathed to her by the will of her brother in law, James Bush, then living, for the purpose of building and endowing a free-school and almshouse, gives a further sum of £1000 to charitable uses, and directs that £500 shall be expended in building a school and an alms-house for six poor widows and old maids; that £85 per annum be charged on her estates for the purpose of apprenticing children, and £100 per annum for the support of the school and alms-house. In consequence of Mr. [Levinus] Bush having died before Judith Bennett, his legacy of £1000 became void, and the income of the school and alms-houses was reduced to £50 by a decree of the Lord Chancellor in 1733. The affairs of the Charity having been negligently managed, and considerable arrears incurred, proceedings were from time to time instituted in the Court of Chancery. Trustees were appointed, the arrears ordered to be laid out in stock, and the application of the dividends regulated by
decrees and orders bearing date 1757, 1762, and 1793. The whole of the funds of the Charity having amounted to £1353 of Old South-Sea Annuities

Below, the School-house which was established under the wills of Abigail (Bush) Cropp’s brother James Bush, her nephew Levinus Bush’s will and that of her brother’s sister in law Judith Bennett.

And, over the door is this inscription:

THIS SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL WERE ERECTED AND ENDOWED BY THE MUNIFICENCE OF MRS. JUDITH BENNET, DAUGHTER OF S. LEVINUS BENNET, BAR, AND AUGMENTED BY THE LIBERALITY OF JAMES BUSH, ESQ. AND LEVINUS BUSH, ESQ. HIS SON. ANNO DOMINI 1730.

On the genealogical chart above, the number of persons of Dutch origin is considerable. One of these, Levinus Munck was born in Ghent in about 1558. He came to England around 1592 and very soon thereafter was employed by Lord Robert Cecil 1st Earl of Salisbury (1563-1612) and soon rose to be
his chief secretary and greatest confidant. He married Elizabeth, daughter of Peter Tryan, a Dutch merchant living in London. He worked devotedly for his master in his lifetime and defended his reputation after his death. He also provided Cecil with friendship and support as well as efficient service. His master’s confidence in his integrity and ability was reflected in the importance of the work he did. For instance, he took down Guy Fawkes’ and Thomas Wintour’s confessions when they were imprisoned in the Tower on the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot. In November, 1608, Salisbury's close friend Sir Walter Cope extolled Munck's "Honestie and efficacy".

Munck retained his position after Cecil’s death dealing with business from all over Europe. When Munck died in 1623 he left his three daughters property in London, Surrey, and Buckinghamshire, as well as twelve thousand pounds. Below Munck’s notes taken at the inquisition of Thomas Wintour.

---

41 See The Secretariats of the Cecils, circa 1580-1612 by Alan G. R. Smith in The English Historical Review.
Against one sentence of Munck’s notes below is added in the handwriting of King James (image left) ‘uncleare phrase’:

Andreas Boevey who appears on the above chart was of Courtrai in Flanders, and was brought to England in 1573 at the age of seven by his parents, who being Huguenots had fled the Low Countries following their invasion by the Duke of Alva. Andreas had nine children by his first wife Esther Fenn and two, including James the philosopher, by his second wife Joanna der Wilde. The order in which Andreas’s marriages occurred is reversed on the chart for display reasons.

Edward Alexander married Levina (Bennett) Alexander, whose sister Mary married James Bush. Edward assumed the surname of Bennett by Act of Parliament in 1742, and was succeeded in 1745 by his son Richard Henry Alexander Bennett (1742-1814).

married in 1779 Hugh Percy (1742-1817), Second Duke of Northumberland. Elizabeth Anne Burrell (1757-1837), married firstly in 1778 Douglas Hamilton, 8th Duke of Hamilton (divorced in 1794); she then married secondly in 1800 Henry Cecil, 10th Earl of Exeter and later 1st Marquis. The brother of these four Burrell sisters, Peter Burrell (1754-1820) 1st Baron Gwydyr, married Lady Priscilla Barbara Elizabeth Bertie daughter of the Third Duke of Ancaster (1761-1828). Elizabeth’s parents were Jane Brownlow and Peregrine Bertie 2nd Duke of Ancaster (see below).
APPENDIX SIX: The Houghton Connection

We should note that in Abigail (Bush) Cropp’s will there are references to the Houghton family, in particular Olimpea or Olympia whom Abigail refers to as her cousin. William Houghton and Henry Balchen are also involved in the distribution of Susannah (Cradock) (Banner) (Tudman) Blunt’s will.

The following is the marriage record for William Houghton and Olympia Maes at St. Olave, Hart Street, on 26th December, 1682.

Dec 26 William Houghton of St Dunstans in ye West & Olympia Maes of St. Andrew Holbourne

A son Daniel was baptized on 13th February, 1688, at St. Andrew, Holborn.
Another son Richard was baptised on 17th January, 1692, at St. Andrew, Holborn.

A daughter Olimpea was baptised on 23rd April, 1695, at St Dunstan’s in the West.

Some generations later there is a Houghton and Burridge Leigh marriage but how exactly the generations connect has not yet been established:

John Burridge Leigh, Esq. of Rushall, Staffordshire and Olympia Houghton, of St. Mary, Aldermanbury, London, were married by licence on 6th June, 1751.

However some twenty three years after this marriage, John Burridge Leigh committed suicide and the following inquest was held:
An Inquisition Indented, taken for our Sovereign, taken for our sovereign Lord the King, at the Parish of Saint James within the Liberty of the Dean and Chapter of Collegiate Church of St. Peter, Westminster, in the County of Middlesex, the Twenty first day of July in the Thirteenth Year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord GEORGE the Third, before Thomas Prickard, Gentleman, Coroner of our said Lord the King for the said City and Liberty, on View of the Body of John Burridge Leigh Esquire then and there lying dead, upon the Oath of ..... good and lawful Men of the said Liberty, duly chosen, who being then and there duly sworn and charged to enquire for our said Lord the King, when, how, and by what Means the said John Burridge Leigh came to his Death, do upon their Oath say, That the said John Burridge Leigh not being of sound Mind Memory and Understanding but Lunatic and Distracted on the Twentieth Day of July in the Year aforesaid at the Parish and in the Liberty and County aforesaid a certain Pistol charged with Gun powder and a leaden Bullet which he the said John Burridge Leigh then and there had and held in his Right hand, to and against the Head of him the said John Burridge Leigh did then and there shoot of and discharge by means whereof he the said John Burridge Leigh did then and there give unto himself with the pistol aforesaid in and upon the Head of him the said John Burridge Leigh, one Mortal Wound of the breadth of One Inch and of the depth of three inches of which said Mortal wound he the said John Burridge Leigh then and there instantly Died And so the Jurors aforesaid upon their Oath aforesaid so say that the said John Burridge Leigh not being of sound Mind Memory and understanding but Lunatic and Distracted in Manner and by the Means aforesaid did Kill himself. 

John and Olympia had one son William who was born in 1752. The following is from Bibliotheca Staffordiensi s: or, A Bibliographical Account of Books and other ...

Leigh, Very Rev. William, born Rushall Hall, Walsall, 1752; son of John Burridge Leigh (High Sheriff, Staffs., 1754) and Olympia (dau. of Henry Houghton, Esq., of Ongar, Essex), his wife; Matriculated Univ. Coll., Ox., 7th Dec, 1771; LL.B.; Rector of Plumstead, Norfolk; Lord of the Manor of Rushall on death of his father, 1773; Dean of Hereford; m. (1) Ann, daughter of — Bedingfield: (2) Elizabeth, dau. of Stratford Canning, Esq. A Sermon, preached at Ashbourn on the 25th February.

Elizabeth (Stratford) Leigh’s nephew was Stratford Canning, 1st (and last) Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe.
APPENDIX SEVEN: The Purcell and Brooke Families

The purpose of this pedigree tree below and the next page is to be found at the very bottom of the page where it states that: "Richard Giffard [of Saredon] had also a daughter Mary, married to Francis Purcell". This Francis was the grandfather of John Purcell who married Esther Banner.

Giffard of Chillington.
Cuddlestone Hundred.
Arms—Azure, three stirrups with silver shoes or.
Crest—A panther's head couped affrontée and sejant on a sprig of hawthorn, flames issuing from the mouth, gules.

Thomas Giffard of Chillington, = Joyce, dau. to . . .
co. Stafford, Esq. = Frances.

Robert Giffard of Cassandra, dau. of
Chillington, Esq. = Humphreys.

Jane, dau. of . . . Sir John Giffard, = Elizabeth, dau. of . . .
Hord, 1st wife = Chillington, Knt. = Gresley, 2nd wife.

* Joyce was dau. of Sir Robert Francis.
† Robert Giffard died 4 June 1498. His wife Cassandra, who was the dau. of Thomas Humphreys, remarried John Bridgley, and died Jan. 1527. (M.I.)
‡ Sir John Giffard died 19 Nov. 1556. (M.I.) His first wife Jane was the dau. of Thomas Horne of Bridgnorth (Ped. of Hord in 'Toy and Gen.' i, 34), and his second, Elizabeth, is stated to have been a dau. of Sir William Gresley.
The wills of Doctor John Purcell’s two sisters and his brother and sister in law

The Will of Mary Purcell

Mary Purcell, of the parish of St. Andrew, Holborn, a spinster, wrote her will on 4th January, 1731, which was proved on 18th January, 1739. She appoints her brother-in-law Thomas Penson, husband of her sister Catherine, as her executor.

Mary’s will, bequeaths sixty pounds to her sister Winifred and ten pounds to her nephew James, eldest son of her brother John Purcell [and Esther Banner], doctor of physic. Mary’s will states that she is entitled to a proportionable share along with her brothers and sisters in certain collieries and coalmines heretofore belonging to
her brother Thomas Purcell, deceased, which they have not yet got the “quiet possession of”. The will goes on to say that if the “peaceable” possession of the collieries and coalmines can be recovered at law or in equity, etc. by which she is entitled to a share and which she is empowered to dispose of, she appoints Henry Cranmer of Grays Inn to administer as a trust the moneys payable to her (Mary) from those collieries to her sister Winifred £40, and then to allow her brother-in-law Thomas Penson and Catherine his wife to receive the rents for their lives and that of the longest liver of them, and after the death of the survivor, to assign over half of her share to her nephews John and Joseph Penson, and the other to her niece Mary Penson the children of Thomas and Catherine for the rest of the term. The residue of her goods and chattels and her real and personal estate goes to her brother in law Thomas Penson, sole executor.

Signed: Mary Purcell
Witnesses: James Rider, Wm Leece.

Codicil 5th January, 1731/32, The executor is to pay to her nephew John Penson £10 above what is given to him in her will.

Thomas Penson died before Mary and so he was unable to administer her estate and in his place, his wife Catherine was appointed. Catherine likewise died before she could administer Mary’s estate and so finally her sister Winifred stepped in and on 9th June, 1752, letters of administration were granted to her and the estate was finally settled.

The Will of Winifred Purcell

The Will of Winifred Purcell, spinster, of the parish of St. George the Martyr, Queen Square, was written and witnessed on 21st November, 1758. In it she bequeaths to her niece Mrs. Maria Teresa (Purcell) Cotton (widow and daughter of her brother John) her ‘green damasked gown and unaltered tabby’. She bequeaths seven pounds to her brother Edward and five guineas to her nephew Edward (her brother Edward’s son). She gives her clothes to the daughter (unnamed) of her brother Edward, of Broseley, co. Salop. She also names her brother Edward’s other son Thomas Purcell, and her friend Mary, widow of the late William Lacy. To Frances Lacy their daughter she gives two guineas and ‘my large silver spoon and my bureau’. She appoints her friend Mary Lacy sole executrix to whom she also gives her China
tea kettles, tea spoons, tea tongs, and her quilt. The will was probated exactly two years later on 21\textsuperscript{st} November, 1760.

**The Will of Thomas Penson, the brother in law of John Purcell MD**

Thomas Penson of Gray's Inn, writes his will on 8\textsuperscript{th} June, 1736, and names his wife Catherine, sons John and Joseph, and daughter Mary Penson. Probate was granted on 13\textsuperscript{th} July, 1737, but with a further admon\textsuperscript{42} being granted 1\textsuperscript{st} December, 1740, to Joseph Penson, one of the surviving residual legatees, because Catherine, the widow, was by then deceased intestate.

**Catherine (Brooke) Purcell**

We have noted above that John Purcell’s brother Thomas left a widow Catherine with whom John was not entirely pleased. Neither it turns out was Catherine pleased with her own family and in writing her will she expresses her displeasure with them while ignoring her Purcell in-laws entirely.

Catherine was the daughter of Thomas Brooke (d. 1675) and Anne Comberford/Cummerford. Thomas Brooke was the son of Thomas and Anne (Nevill) Brooke and Thomas’s father was Sir Basil Brooke the inventor of smelting iron and the so called father of the industrial revolution.

We have already noted that Catherine’s great great grandfather, Sir Robert Brooke, was The Speaker of The House of Commons during the reign of Queen Mary and that John Purcell, Snr. was also a direct descendant of Robert’s via his daughter Mary Brooke who married Sir Thomas Leveson (See Chart).

---
\textsuperscript{42} Admon (or administration) is the granting of probate where there are no executors to give probate to. Probate (or proof of a will) is granted where executors do exist.
The Will of Catherine (Brooke) Purcell

Catherine (Brooke) Purcell late of the Hay in the parish of Madeley in the County of Salop, but now of Saint Andrew Holborn in the County of Middlesex, widow, wrote her will on 10th December, 1744, and it was proved on 1st September, 1746. She could be the Mrs. Purcell living with Richard Banner, Esther’s brother, mentioned in the will of Sarah (Cradock) Boulter dated April, 1745.

Catherine’s sister Mary Brooke had married Sherrington Grosvenor and in her will Catherine gives her two nieces Ann and Mary Grosvenor daughters of Sherrington Grosvenor of Holt in the Parish of Kingsbury in the County of Warwick five hundred pounds. To her nephew Sherrington Grosvenor Esq. one pound one shilling to buy a mourning ring.

Her nephew Sherrington Grosvenor married Rose Austen daughter of Sir Robert Austen. Roses’ aunt Rose Austen married Comberford Brooke the brother of Catherine (Brooke) Purcell (see chart and the section on the Austen family).

She bequeath[es] to her ‘dear Brother John Brooke’ the sum of fifty pounds for mourning and twenty shillings for a ring.

But I declare they [probably her brother and her nephew] do not deserve anything from me they not having given me the least relief though I have for several years last past been driven to such extremities as often to want common necessaries of life and must have perished for want had I not been relieved by my Executors hereinafter named I give to Richard Foster for his kindness towards me the sum of twenty pounds and to Elizabeth and Janet Vaughan Daughters of Thomas Vaughan of Essex Street in the parish of Saint Clement Danes in the County of Middlesex Esq. as a token of my Gratitude for the great Kindness and civility he has shown me the sum of five hundred pounds to be divided between them in such proportion as my executors ... shall direct. She also names William Morris the infant son of Thomas Morris: now living in Brooks Market in the parish of Saint Andrew Holborn in consideration of the great kindness often showed me by the said Thomas Morris and for his procuring me a friend and for several expences he has been at in my support and maintenance and in consideration of the love and affection I have and bear towards the said William Morris for whom I wish I could better provide the sum of five hundred pounds.

She bequeath[es] all the remainder of her estate to her friend Thomas Morris and appoints Thomas Morris and Thomas Vaughan joint executors.

Catherine must have been quite a well off lady before her marriage to Thomas Purcell having inherited from her...
grandmother Catherine (Bates) Comberford. This Catherine made her will on 18th January, 1715, and states that she is of Staffordshire and a widow. She leaves the bulk of her estate to her two granddaughters Catherine Brooke and Mary Grosvenor (wife of Sherrington Grosvenor of the Borough of Tamworth). She leaves her two granddaughters all her land and property situated in Wigginton in the parish of Tamworth, Staffs, which she had originally purchased from William Brampton. Also all land and property lying in Hopwas, Staffs, currently occupied by Henry Ashmore and a small meadow in Cawford Meadow within the Parish of Tamworth. She grants to her Grandson John Brooke land called The Wall Furlonge in Tamworth which she bought from James Pritchard deceased and presently occupied by a Mr. William Pritchard. But she gives this land to John Brooke "on the express condition" that within two years of her decease he pays forty pounds to help his two sisters (Catherine and Mary) so that they may use that money to pay her debts and legacies. And if he fails to do this then he must give the land she has given him to his two sisters.

She has another property at Hopwas which she had brought off Francis Astbury and which is now occupied by Thomas Astbury and which she gives to her two granddaughters Catherine Brooke and Mary Grosvenor. She also gives both her granddaughters one thousand pounds "at present held in the hand of Lord Cobham". She gives to her "Cosen Isabell Palin wife of Thomas Palin" [maybe Valin] of Downesdale in Staffs twenty pounds. She gives to her grandson Francis Brooke ten pounds. She also gives Catherine, the daughter of her grandson Francis Brooke Twenty Pounds. Likewise to her grandson Edward Brooke Ten pounds. She makes her two granddaughters Mary and Catherine along with her good friend Richard Nevill joint executors. Probate was granted three years later on 24th November, 1718.

Edward Purcell, the Brother of John Purcell, MD

Edward Purcell who married Elizabeth Langley was the younger brother of Doctor John Purcell. It appears that this Edward Purcell got deeper into debt as the newspaper announcement from 12th July, 1743, indicates:
The following Persons being Prisoners for Debt in the Custody of John Brown, Esq; Bailiff of the Town and Liberties of Much Wenlock, in the County of Salop, hereby give Notice, that they intend to take the Benefit of the late Act of Parliament made in the Sixteenth Year of the Reign of his present Majesty King George the Second, intitled, An Act for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors, at the next General or Quarter Sessions of the Peace to be held in and for the said Town and Liberties, or at the Adjournment thereof, that shall happen next after thirty Days from the Publication hereof, viz. Edward Purcell, late of the Parish of Broseley, in the said County of Salop, Gentleman. Peter Bott, late of the Parish of Much Wenlock, in the County of Salop, Needlemaker. George Pott, late of the Parish of Broseley, in the County of Salop, Collier.

N.B. If any Person in the foregoing List of Prisoners shall find, on the Perusal of this Gazette, that there is any Error, such Error shall, upon Notice, be rectified in the next Gazette Gratis.

Extracted from: *Broseley and its Surroundings* by John Randall:

Edward, the brother of Doctor John Purcell, married Elizabeth Langley whose father Herbert Langley was possessed of the manor of Broseley. This manor afterwards passed to Edward Purcell. And it would seem that as each member of the family came into possession of the manor he appears to have done his best to plunge the estate into debt. In 1728, from an indenture that Edward Purcell of Stafford and Elizabeth his wife, and Mary Langley, widow of Herbert, late of Broseley, (mother and father of Elizabeth (Langley) Purcell), Christopher Ward, and Phillip Purcell, both of Stafford aforesaid, Gent., of the one part, and Michael Stephens of Broseley, in the County of Salop, agreed to a certain release of encumbrances of £2,990, with regard to certain tenements and lands at Broseley, by a sale of a portion of the premises of the Manor of Broseley amounting to about 112 farms, messuages, houses and lands. The case was appointed to come before the Court of Common Pleas Westminster in Easter Term, 1728. Purcell got deeper into debt, and Michael Stephens to whom Purcell was indebted, having taken proceedings, the estate was subject to much litigation.
Edward Purcell was indebted to Mr. Stephens in two bonds; one for £60 and another for £50, and that “.... he had at different times lived with Mr. Stephens, and kept a servant and two horses, and had washing and lodging, meat and drink for himself, servant, and visitors, most of the time for twenty years, and for which he, Stephens, had obtained judgment for £200.” It concludes by saying that “Mr. Stephens delivered him a Bill 5th December, 1729, which is really and justly due £951 6s”

What is curious about this episode of Edward Purcell’s indebtedness is that in 1728/29, while imprisoned at the Marshalsea, Joseph Grano writing in his diary refers to a Mr. Purcell - a gentleman - who was well liked by all who knew him. For details on Grano’s time at the Marshalsea see Appendix Eight. However the editor of the diary refers to this Purcell as Thomas.

APPENDIX EIGHT: MISCELLANEOUS NOTES ON THE BROOKE FAMILY

As we have noted above, one of John Purcell’s ancestors was Robert Brooke. He was the eldest son of Thomas Brooke of Claverley in Shropshire, and Margaret, daughter of Humphrey Grosvenor of Farmcote in the same county.

The inscription on Robert’s tomb at Calverly church reads:

Here lyeth the body off Robert Brooke, famous in his time for virtue and learning; advanced to be Com'on Serjaunt of the Citie of London, Recorder of London, Serjaunt at the Law, Speaker of P'lyament, and Cheife Justice of the Com'en Pleace, who, visiting his frendes and country, deceas'd the 6th day of September, 1558, after he had begotten of Anne and Dorothee, his wiefs, xvii children. Upon whose sowles God hav mercy.

Below the tomb of Sir Robert Brooke showing him between his two wives Anne Waring and Dorothy Gatacre.
John Brooke (son of Sir Robert and Anne (Waring) Brooke) was born in 1538 and married Anne Shirley. John died in 1598, and was buried at Madeley.
The inscription, which was once on John Brooke's tomb in the old Madeley Church, but which is now on the wall outside the present church, reads:

Here lies John Brooke, Esquire, the son of Robert Brooke, Knight, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and of Anne the daughter and heir of Francis Waring, Esquire. After he had lived, distinguished for his knowledge of the Science of Law and other learning, being of an extremely liberal mind, and famous for his good deeds, he made a holy and pious death in his 60th year, on October 20th in the year of Our Lord 1598.

Anne’s inscription reads:

Here lies Anne the wife of John Brooke, Esquire, descended from the very ancient and renowned family of Shirley. She had by her husband two sons, Basil and Francis, and also three daughters, Dorothy, Priscilla and Milburga. She was a woman of strict discipline, strongly attached to the faith of her ancestors, and an example to all in the way she carried out her duties as a wife and mother. She died at the age of 70, in the 10th year of her widowhood, on September 29th in the year of Our Lord 1608.

Madeley Court, home of the Brooke family painted by John Homes Smith in 1824
On his father's death John Brooke inherited the Madeley estate (bought from the King by Sir Robert in 1544). He passed it on to his son Basil who, in his turn, passed it to his son Thomas, the father of Catherine (Brooke) Purcell.

John's brother, Richard Brooke (baptised on 29th July, 1546) inherited another estate called Lapley. He married Mary, daughter of John Giffard of Chillington. Because the family was Recusant (Catholics who refused to conform to the Church of England) Richard Brooke of Lapley had two thirds of his estates sequestered (confiscated) by order of Parliament at Westminster on 29th January, 1607. His son Walter Brooke inherited the Lapley estate.

The next image on the left is Basil Brooke, the above Robert’s grandson and the son of John Brooke, of Madeley, and Anne, eldest daughter of Francis Shirley, of Staunton Harold, Esq., and was grandson of Sir Robert Brooke, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas to Queen Mary.

Thomas Brooke, Basil’s son, married Margaret Nevile daughter of Thomas whose ancestor George Nevile is shown below. Thomas Neville’s wife was Mary Sackville the sister of the 1st Earl of Dorset.
The father of William Fitzherbert who married Basil’s daughter Ann Brooke was Sir Anthony Fitzherbert (1470–1538) who was an English judge, scholar and legal author, particularly known for his treatise on English law, New Natura Brevium (1534).

Below, the title pages of some of the works of Sir Robert Brooke ancestor of John Purcell who married Esther Banner, the granddaughter of Susannah (Cradock) (Banner) (Tudman) Blunt.
APPENDIX EIGHT: Miscellaneous Notes on the Brooke Family

Thomas Moore who married Basil Brooke’s daughter, Mary, was the great grandson of Cardinal Thomas More executed by Henry VIII. Thomas and Mary (Brooke) Moore’s son Thomas married Mary the daughter of Rose Brooke and John Giffard. Below the family of Thomas More by Rowland Lockey.

Above, Sir Thomas More and his family; two of his descendants (both named Thomas More) married members of the Brooke family.
The tree below shows Catherine (Brooke) Purcell’s mother as the last child Anne aged 7 on 30th March, 1663, and her grandmother Catherine (Bates) Comberford/Cumberford.

NOTES on following Brooke Family Chart. The different colored boxes represent different families - pale blue is Leveson, green is Giffard, yellow is Grosvenor, etc. A key at the bottom of each chart indicates what color is which family. Not all family members are shown and so for instance Thomas Brooke and Anne Comberford also had a daughter Margaret who married Walter Mildmay. John Brooke and Ann Shirley had at least another four daughters: Dorothee married Hugh Starkey, Priscilla married Robert Middleman and Milburga married Robert Banfield, etc.

The portrait of the lady below is traditionally identified as Lady Dorothy Shirley, daughter of Sir John Gifford of Chillingham. Lady Dorothy's date of birth is not known.
Dorothy Shirley mother of Anne who married John Brooke

She first married John Congreve, by whom she had two daughters, and then in 1535 Sir Francis Shirley of Staunton Harold and Ettington (1505-71), who was High Sheriff of Warwickshire and Leicestershire in 1556. Lady Dorothy Shirley died a few months after her husband in 1571 and was buried with him in a joint alabaster tomb monument in the church of St Mary and St Hardulph at Breedon-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire. Their daughter Anne married John Brooke.
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APPENDIX NINE: The Brooke and Austen Families

Susannah Cradock’s daughter Esther Banner married John Purcell. John’s brother Thomas married Catherine Brooke. Catherine’s brother Comberford married Rose Austen. Catherine’s nephew Sherrington Grosvenor married Rose Austen the niece of Rose (Austen) Brooke. The elder Rose Austen was the daughter of Sir John Austen (2nd Baronet, 1641-1698). Sir John married Rose, daughter of Sir John Hale, of Stagenghoe in Hertfordshire. His brother Robert was an MP and married Judith Freke. In 1698 Sir John Austen was succeeded by his eldest son Sir Robert Austen (3rd Baronet, 1664-1706) who married Elizabeth Stawell daughter and coheir of George Stawell, of Cotherston in Somersetshire leaving issue three sons including Sir Robert (4th Baronet, 1697-1743), his successor, and five daughters including Rose who was married to Sherrington Grosvenor, of Holt in Warwickshire. Rose (Austen) Grosvenor’s brother, Sir Robert Austen (4th Baronet and last), married Rachel the sister of the well-known rake Sir Francis Dashwood. It is claimed that this Austen family connects with the novelist Jane Austen’s but exactly how is obscure. Also, Judith Freke who married Robert Austin MP is related to Elizabeth Freke who married Richard Brownlow (see Brownlow & Freke family).
Hall Place home of the Austen Family of Kent

Sir Francis Dashwood whose sister Rachel married Robert Austen.  He is seated next to his mistress Frances Barry
APPENDIX TEN: The Bequests of Charles Long to the National Gallery, London

THE NATIONAL GALLERY - On Monday last the fifteen pictures which had been bequeathed to the nation by the late Lord Farnborough were placed in this gallery. They are all pictures of good reputation, as may be supposed; they are of various schools, but chiefly those of the Low Countries, and they are in general of a small size, though some are of good dimensions, particularly a landscape, *i.e.* A Scene in Venice, by Canalelli; it is also a work of considerable merit, and is in high preservation. The number of pictures now in this gallery amounts to 163; of these nearly two thirds (105) have been bequeathed to the nation by several royal and noble personages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Painting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Paul Rubens</td>
<td>A Landscape with a Shepherd and his Flock</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="A Landscape with a Shepherd and his Flock" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaletto</td>
<td>Venice: The Grand Canal with S. Simeone Piccolo</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Venice: The Grand Canal with S. Simeone Piccolo" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pier Francesco Mola

The Rest on the Flight into Egypt

David Teniers the Younger

A Man holding a Glass and an Old Woman lighting a Pipe

David Teniers the Younger

The Covetous Man
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nicolaes Maes</th>
<th>A Little Girl rocking a Cradle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aert van der Neer</td>
<td>An Evening View near a Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of Pier Francesco Mola</td>
<td>Leda and the Swan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TEN: Charles Long’s Bequests to the National Gallery London

Studio of Willem van de Velde
- *Calm: Two Dutch Vessels*

Gaspard Dughet
- *Tivoli (?)*

Nicolaes Maes
- *A Woman scraping Parsnips, with a Child standing by her*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist/Style</th>
<th>Painting Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willem van de Velde</td>
<td>A Dutch Vessel in a Strong Breeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributed to David Teniers the Younger</td>
<td>Peasants making Music in an Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of Anthony van Dyck</td>
<td>The Horses of Achilles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another painting, Sunrise by Claude Lorrain, was purchased by Sir Joshua Reynolds around 1775 and was bequeathed by him to Sir Abraham Hume and then to his son-in-law Charles Long, who dying without issue, left it to his nephew, Samuel Long Jnr., the son of Charles’s brother Samuel. It was then put up for auction after Samuel’s death and eventually found its way to the Metropolitan Museum in New York City.

Charles Long’s father in law’s art collection was nothing to sneeze at either as some the examples below indicate:
Aristotle with a Bust of Homer by Rembrandt at the Metropolitan Museum, New York

The Maas at Dordrecht, by Aelbert Cuyp

The National Gallery of Art, Washington DC

The Adoration of the Shepherds by Catena (Vincenzo di Biagio) at the Metropolitan Museum New York

Portrait of a Woman and Child

By Anthony van Dyck at the National Gallery of Art, London.
APPENDIX ELEVEN: THE NORTH FAMILY OF GLEMHAM PARK

As we have seen, Jane Long, the daughter of Beeston and Sarah (Cropp) Long married her cousin Charles Long whose father was Beeston’s brother Charles Long and whose mother was Mary North. Mary North was the daughter of Dudley and Catherine (Yale) North. Below is a summary of the North family taken from The Gentleman’s Magazine of 1829. Some material has been added and edits made to the original article.

Memoirs of the North Family of Glemham.

I. Sir Dudley North, (1641-1691) being the great grandfather of Charles Long who married his first cousin Jane Long (see chart). Sir Dudley was the first possessor of the Lordship of Glemham Parva, and was the third son of Dudley the fourth Lord North, of Kirtling, in Cambridgeshire, by Anne, the daughter and co-heir of Sir Charles Montagu of Cranbrook in Essex and Mary Whitmore daughter of Sir William Whitmore.

He was born in London on 16th May, 1641, and being initiated at an early age into commercial affairs, pursued for many years the highly honourable occupation of an English merchant. He resided for a long time in Turkey, at Smyrna and Constantinople, and was Treasurer to the Levant Company there.

Having made a substantial fortune, on his return to his native country, he became memorable for the contests for the London shrievalty on the side of Toryism and in 1682 he was ‘elected’ one of the sheriffs of London:

"At Midsummer, the election of new sheriffs was attended with many circumstances in direct violation of the rights of the city; but the court party being determined to effect their object, Dudley North, Esq. brother to the Lord Chief Justice [Francis] North, and Mr. Peter Rich, two persons entirely devoted to the king's pleasure, were finally appointed, though their opponents, Papillon and Dubois, had a most decided majority on the poll." In other words, Dudley was forced on the citizenry of London with an express view to secure verdicts for the crown in state trials.

Dudley North, Levant Merchant and Economist
One of the consequences of the North’s ‘election’ was a flurry of pamphlets either supporting or vilifying the outcome.

Above the title page of Thomas Papillion’s three page attack on the rigged election of North and Rich. Right, a one page response from the government welcoming the newly elected Sheriffs.

Dudley was knighted, and appointed a commissioner of the customs, and later of the treasury. Having been elected a member of parliament under King James II, he took the place of manager for the crown in all matters of revenue. However, after the Glorious Revolution in 1688 when James was overthrown and replaced by William and Mary, he was called to account for his alleged unconstitutional proceedings in his office of sheriff.

North’s fame today rests mostly on the contribution to political economy made in his Discourses upon Trade: Principally Directed to the Cases of the Interest, Coynage, Clipping, Increase of Money, published anonymously in 1691. This work attracted little attention until reprinted in 1822, after James Mill had hailed the importance of North’s ideas as summarized in the biography by his brother, Roger North, published in 1744.

The Discourses, though brief and aphoristic, are probably the most thoroughgoing statement of free-trade theory made in the 17th century. Although the older mercantilist view was that trade was the exchange of goods not needed by the producing country, the Discourses insisted:
“that the whole world as to trade, is but as one nation or people, and therein nations are as persons.” Sumptuary laws (laws that attempt to regulate habits of consumption) and legal restrictions on interest rates are denounced as harmful and ineffective. Subsequent monetary doctrines are anticipated in the insistence that the supply of money can be left to free market forces “without any aid of politicians.”

As already noted, he joined Richard Cradock on the Court of Directors of the Royal African Company.

He deceased on the 21st December, 1691, and was interred in the chancel of the church at Glemham Parva.

He married Anne, the daughter of Sir Robert Cann, of the city of Bristol, and the widow of Sir Robert Gunning, of Cold Ashton, near that city, by whom he had issue two sons; viz. Dudley and Roger. The latter turned out to be quite wild and profligate and died young without issue.

II. Dudley North, (1684-1730) He married Catherine, the eldest daughter of Elihu Yale, Esq. late Governor of Fort St. George in Bengal. He had divers children, whereof some dyed infants, and an only son, Dudley North, of Glemham, Esq. and two daughters, Ann and Mary survived. Catherine, their mother, died in the life of her husband.

Below from the History of Parliament website:
‘Amply provided for’ by his father, who had purchased the Glemham estate shortly before his death, Dudley North was described in 1705 when aged 21 as an agreeable young man, ‘for goodness and ingenuity beloved by everybody’, but in later life he came
to be dismissed as a ‘cipher’ and a pompous snob (‘so great a clown of a fine gentleman’ that he would not visit his poorer relations). Defeated at Thetford in 1708, where he stood with his kinsman Sir Thomas Hanmer [see chart], he was returned unopposed in 1710. In July, 1712, he was reported as absent through ill-health, though without official leave. On 3rd March 1713 he was appointed to the drafting committee for a private bill on Great Yarmouth harbour, and six days later was nominated to draft a bill to curb wool smuggling. There is nothing to indicate that North had followed Hanmer into ‘whimsical’ opposition in this Parliament: he was classed simply as a Tory when re-elected in 1715. He had nevertheless retained his seat with Hanmer’s support. North died on 4th February, 1729/30, in London, was interred in the chancel of the church of Glemham.

Below, a double portrait of the North’s children Dudley (1706-64) and his sister Anne (1709-89). Both are painted full length, he standing, wearing a red velvet coat and a blue cloak and holding a bow, she seated, wearing a golden dress with a spaniel on her lap, a landscape beyond. Signed and dated RB [Robert Byng] 1714. One daughter not shown, Mary, married Charles Long the brother of Beeston.
Dudley North married Catherine Yale whose father, Elihu, had an interesting career which was as follows:

Elihu Yale was a native of America (born in Boston, Massachusetts, on 5th April, 1649). In 1652 his father David Yale decided to return his family to England and Elihu never saw America again. He began his working life as a clerk in the East India Company and was sent by the Company to Bengal. He became governor of Fort St. George on 25th July, 1687, and appears to have ruled the colony with most oppressive authority (at least according to his detractors of whom there were many). An anecdote, illustrative of his arbitrary disposition, is recorded as follows: his groom, having rode out a favourite horse two of three days for the purposes of airing and exercise, without first obtaining leave to authorise his so doing, the Governor caused him peremptorily to be hanged up, for daring to use such a supposed discretionary power. For this murder Yale was ordered to return to England; and, having been tried for the crime, by some undetected oeillet (loophole) of the law he escaped the punishment of death, and only suffered a heavy pecuniary fine.

He was also remarkable for his auctions. The first of
these was about the year 1700. He had brought such quantities of goods on his return from India, that, finding no one house large enough to stow them in, he had a public sale of the overplus; and that was the first auction of the kind in England.

Yale died at Queen Square, London on 8th July, 1721, and his body was taken to Denbighshire where it lies buried in the churchyard of Wrexham. On his tomb is the following inscription:

Under this tomb lyes interred Elihu Yale, of Plas Gronow, Esq. born 5th April, 1648, and dyed the 8th of July, 1721, aged 75 years.

Born in America, in Europe bred,
In Affric travell’d, and in Asia wed,
Where long he liv’d and thriv’d, at London dead.

Much good, some ill he did, so hopes all’s even,
And that his soul, through mercy’s gone to Heav’n.

You that survive and read this tale, take care
For this most certain exit to prepare,
Where, blest in peace, the actions of the just,
Smell sweet and blossom in the silent dust.

It was, in part, his money that helped found a college in New Haven, Connecticut, named after him.

III. Dudley North, (1706-1764) son of the above Dudley and Catherine (Yale) North, was born in 1706. He married Lady Barbara, the only daughter of Thomas Herbert, the eighth Earl of Pembroke and fifth Earl of Montgomery, by his second wife Barbara, the daughter of Sir Thomas Slingsby of Scriven in Yorkshire, Second Baronet and Dorothy Cradock his wife.
From left to right: Dudley North as a young boy, his wife Barbara Hebert daughter of the 8th Earl of Pembroke; Dudley North as a young man and his wife Barbara.

Lady Barbara (Herbert) North died without issue on 31st December, 1755, aged 44 and was interred in the chancel of the parish church of Glemham. Her husband deceased on 6th June, 1764, aged 58, and was buried in the same place.

Having no children, Dudley bequeathed, by his last will, after his legacies and donations to charitable uses (which were very considerable) were discharged, the remainder of his fortune, real and personal, to his two sisters, Ann and Mary.

IV. Ann North (1709-1789), the eldest sister, married on 8th July, 1737, the Honourable Nicholas Herbert, the seventh son of Thomas, the eighth Earl of Pembroke and fifth Earl of Montgomery, by his first wife Margaret, the sole daughter and heir of Sir Robert Sawyer, of High Clere, in the county of Southampton and Attorney General in the reign of Charles II. Nicholas was thus the half-brother of Barbara who married Ann’s brother Dudley North (above). Nicholas Herbert was born in 1708 and died in 1775 and his remains were interred in the church of Glemham, where, on a mural tablet, is this inscription to his memory:
Sacred to the memory of the Hon. Nicholas Herbert, Esq. youngest son of Thomas, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, who departed this life the 1st day of February, 1775, aged 67 years. He represented Newport and Wilton in many Parliaments, and was a Member for the last at the time of his death. He was Secretary of the Island of Jamaica. He was possessed of many amiable qualities, and married Ann, eldest sister and co-heiress of Dudley North, of Glemham-hall, in this county, Esq. by whom he left one only-surviving child, Barbara, married to Edward, Earl of Aldborough. This monument was erected by the Hon. Ann Herbert, his relict, anno Domini 1779.

His wife deceased on 22nd January, 1789, and was buried in the same place, with this inscription:

Sacred to the memory of Ann, relict of the Hon. Nicholas Herbert, who departed this life the 22d of January, 1789, aged 80 years. She bequeathed this estate to her nephew, Dudley Long, requesting him to take and use the surname and arms of North. This tablet further serves to record his gratitude to so worthy and affectionate a relation.

Robert Sawyer (1633-1692) whose daughter Margaret was the mother of Nicholas Herbert who married Ann North

Thomas Herbert, 8th Earl of Pembroke who married Margaret Sawyer, daughter of Robert (left), and then Barbara Slingsby

Barbara Slingsby second wife of Thomas Herbert, 8th Earl of Pembroke whose daughter Barbara married Dudley North

Nicholas and Ann (North) Herbert had issue one son, Elihu, who died in his infancy, and two daughters; viz. Ann, who was born in 1738, and who died on 25th December, 1751, and Barbara, who was born in 1739, and who, in 1765, married Edward Stratford, the second Earl of Aldborough, by whom she left no issue. The Countess of Aldborough deceased before her mother on 11th April, 1785, and was interred in the church of Glemham.
Glemham Hall home of the North family, inherited by Charles Long. Left an eighteenth century print and righe hall today.

**V. Mary North** (1715-1770), the second daughter and co-heiress of Dudley and Catherine (Yale) North was born in 1715, and married Charles Long, of Hurts Hall, in Saxmundham in Suffolk, the brother of Beeston Long. As noted above they had two sons: Charles who married Jane Long daughter of Beeston and Sarah (Cropp) Long and Dudley on whom more below.

**APPENDIX TWELVE: The Longs of Hurts Hall**


Thus the two branches of the Long family can be distinguished by their residences: The Longs of Hurts Hall and The Longs of Hampton Lodge. Other homes were purchased
over the centuries but these two were there from the beginning; although Hurts Hall was demolished at the end of the Nineteenth Century. We begin our look at the Long family with the grandfather of Beeston Long and Charles Long, Jnr. of Hurts Hall, and Samuel Long of Hampton Lodge namely:

I. Samuel Long of Jamaica. According to the histories, this Samuel Long, who became the chief justice of the island, was a very able, ambitious, and resolute man. He was elected as a member for Port Royal in the first meeting of the Jamaica assembly.

Between 1672 and 1675 he was chosen as Speaker of the Jamaica assembly for four successive sittings. On the last of these he was voted in by the members, not the governor, which then became the established practice. In 1674 he was appointed chief justice. He played an important part in supporting the council’s claim for the constitutional right of assembly against the governor’s. In doing so he demanded that the assembly should enjoy the same privileges in Jamaica as the House of Commons did in England. Anticipating many of the claims later made by the North Americans during the American Revolutionary War, he insisted that the assembly alone should have the right to tax the colony. After the first meeting of the assembly, he was charged with treason. The reason for this was because he had succeeded (assisted by his ally and fellow planter William Beeston) in the passing of various acts which gave the legislature, not the governor, control of the revenue even before these powers were assumed by the House of Commons. Unfortunately, his ‘political activism’ caused him to be suspended from the council in 1675 and he was dismissed as the chief justice. Five years later, in 1680, he was arrested with William Beeston and sent back to England where he was put on trial and later acquitted. During this time he acted informally as the colony’s agent in London and obtained permission for a permanent agent to represent Jamaica in Britain. He died in Jamaica on 28th June, 1683, and was buried in the parish of St. Katherine’s. According to the DNB Samuel Long:
‘... had accumulated seven plantations, which were among the largest, best cultivated, and most productive in the colony consisting of 11,183 acres in six parishes, and 288 slaves. He kept a particularly splendid residence in the capital at Spanish Town, far more elaborate than his plantation houses, which had a hall large enough for sixty chairs and seven tables. His career was synonymous with the rise of the sugar planters who dominated island politics. He and William Beeston had created an assembly in Jamaica which surpassed the claims of peer institutions in North America even though the island did not rebel in 1776.’

II. Charles Long, son of the above Samuel, of Longville, Jamaica, a member of the Council settled eventually at Hurts Hall in Saxmundham, and was chosen a member of Parliament for Dunwich in 1715. He married, firstly Amy the eldest daughter of Sir Nicholas Lawes, Governor of Jamaica, by whom he had issue one son (Samuel) and one daughter; and, secondly, Jane, the daughter and heiress of Sir William Beeston, Knt. the Governor of Jamaica, and relict of Sir James Molyford, Bart, by whom he had issue three sons (including Beeston and Charles) and five daughters; including Susannah shown below.

![Susannah Long one of the daughters of Charles Long](https://placebo.com/susannah-long.png)

*The History of Parliament* has this to say about Charles:

Succeeding as an infant to the largest property in Jamaica, Charles Long bought an estate in Suffolk [Hurts Hall], not far from Dunwich, for which he was returned in 1715, voting with the Government. In 1720 he and a number of other persons obtained a patent granting them all gold and silver mines in Jamaica for 31 years. Long and his associates put up £150,000, a large part of which he, as treasurer, invested in South Sea stock at the height of the boom, with disastrous results. As a result, his grandson [Edward Long] writes, ‘My Grandfather was not able to bear up under the accumulated pressure of calamities, which had almost annihilated his fortune and involved him in a
labyrinth of intricate accounts and lawsuits beneath which the powers of his mind entirely sank, and he soon fell into a decline of health from which he never recovered’. Nevertheless he stood again in 1722 for Dunwich, declaring, it was said locally, ‘that he would spend £5,000 rather than lose it’. Defeated, he died on 8th May, 1723, and was succeeded by the eldest son (Charles) of his second marriage to Jane Beeston.

One of the daughters, Susannah (image above), was born on 22nd July, 1717. She lived at South Audley Street in London, and dying unmarried on 16th April, 1820, at the advanced age of 102 years, was interred in the church of Tunstall, Suffolk.

III. Charles, (1705-1778) the eldest son by the second marriage of Charles Long and Jane Beeston. He was born in 1705, and married Mary, the second daughter and co-heiress of Dudley North, of Glemham by Catherine Yale, his wife. They had two sons, Charles (IV) and Dudley (V). She deceased on 10th May, 1770 and eight years later Charles died on 16th October, 1778. They were both interred in the south aisle of the church of Saxmundham.

IV. Charles, (1747-1813) the eldest son of Charles and Mary (North) Long, was born in 1747, and married on 26th December, 1786, his first cousin, Jane the daughter of Beeston Long, of London, Esq. and Sarah Cropp and by her had issue two sons, Charles and Dudley, who both died in their infancy. (see above section on Jane Long).

V. Dudley, (1748-1829) was baptized on 14th March, 1748, and was the second son of Charles and Mary (North) Long. He was educated at the school of Bury St. Edmund, from whence he was removed to Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he proceeded to the degree of B.A. in 1771, and to that of A.M. in 1774. He represented the borough of Banbury in 1796, 1802, and 1806. In 1812 he was returned for Richmond in Yorkshire. On the decease of his aunt Anne (North) Herbert in 1789, and in pursuance of her last will and testament, he assumed the name and arms of North; and, in 1813, on the death of his elder brother, Charles Long of Hurts Hall, he took the name and arms of Long, in addition to those of North. He married on 5th November, 1802, Sophia, the eldest daughter of Charles Anderson Pelham, the first Lord Yarborough, by Sophia, the only daughter of George Aufrere, of Chelsea, Esq.
Mr. Dudley Long-North died without issue, at Brompton, near London, at the age of 80, on 21st February, 1829, and he was buried at Glemham church where his widow erected a full length Italian marble statue of him.

He was a gentleman of distinguished and accomplished manners, and a consistent Whig and he associated, likewise, with literary and political men of a different character, among whom was Dr. Samuel Johnson. The following is from Boswell's *Life of Johnson*:

*Mrs. Thrale gave high praise to Mr. Dudley Long (now North). Johnson: “Nay, my dear lady, don’t talk so. Mr. Long’s character is very short. It is nothing. He fills a chair. He is a man of genteel appearance, and that is all”. Here Johnson condescended to play upon the words long and short. But little did he know that, owing to Mr. Long’s reserve in his*
presence, he was talking thus of a gentleman distinguished amongst his acquaintance for acuteness of wit, one to whom, I think, the French expression "Il petille d'esprit" [a sparking spirit?] is particularly suited. He [Long-North] has gratified me [Boswell] by mentioning that he heard Dr. Johnson say, "Sir, if I were to lose Boswell, it would be a limb amputated."

In another passage Johnson had the following to say about Long-North:

His [Johnson's] notion of the duty of a member of Parliament, sitting upon an election-committee, was very high; and when he was told of a gentleman upon one of those committees, who read the newspapers part of the time, and slept the rest, while the merits of a vote were examined by the counsel; and as an excuse, when challenged by the chairman for such behaviour, bluntly answered, 'I had made up my mind upon that case.'— Johnson, with an indignant contempt, said, 'If he was such a rogue as to make up his mind upon a case without hearing it, he should not have been such a fool as to tell it.' 'I think (said Mr. Dudley Long, now North,) the Doctor has pretty plainly made him [Dudley] out to be both rogue and fool.'

The DNB states that: “Unwarranted dejection about the state of his finances exacerbated the ill health which dogged Long North's later years ... A pallbearer at Edmund Burke's funeral, a mourner at Sir Joshua Reynolds's, and a patron of the poet George Crabbe, Long North was a popular member of both literary and political circles, but few of his witticisms are preserved: they were for the most part confined to his friends.”

Sophia (Anderson) Long-North, Dudley’s wife, had an interesting family. Her mother was Sophia Aufrere. She was the daughter of George Aufrere who was a very successful London merchant. According to the latest edition of the DNB, after he retired, George:

“.... retreated to the magnificent Chelsea mansion and gardens that had once been the home of Sir Robert Walpole and which he had purchased in 1759. Surrounded by a widely acclaimed collection of paintings and statues that he and Joshua Reynolds assembled (contemporaries considered it one of the best private collections in Britain at the end of the eighteenth century). Aufrere supported the many exploratory schemes of his nephew’s Sir Joseph Banks”.

George Aufrere’s wife Arabella Bate was cousin to Brownlow Cecil 8th Earl of Exeter (see Brownlow family below).
Above left a bust of Arabella (Bate) Aufrere and right a temple at Brocklesby Park that is dedicated “... by veneration and affection to the memory of Arabella Aufrere, with a grateful sense of the many virtuous sentiments imbibed often on this spot from her highly cultivated mind.”

Below the ancestor of the Norths, Sir Charles Montagu, in his tent taken form his monument in Barking church. His brother Edward was the ancestor of the Dukes of Manchester and from this Edward Montagu a direct descendant (Margaretta Waddington) married Marmaduke Cradock a direct descendant of Richard Cradock’s.

Sir Charles Montagu asleep in his tent.
His daughter married Dudley North, 4th Baron
Edward North, 1st Baron, (1496-1664). Born about 1496, the only son of Roger North, a citizen of London, by Christian, daughter of Richard Warcup of Sinnington in Yorkshire. He studied at St. Paul's School, and then Peterhouse, Cambridge; but he seems never to have proceeded to a degree. He entered one of the Inns of Court, was called to the bar, and became counsel for the city of London. In 1531 he was appointed clerk of the parliament. In 1541 he was appointed treasurer of the court of augmentations, a court created by the king, Henry VIII, for dealing with the estates which had been confiscated by the dissolution of the monasteries. In 1541 he was knighted, and served as High Sheriff of Cambridgeshire for 1543. In 1545 he was one of a commission of inquiry as to the distribution of the revenues of certain cathedrals and collegiate churches, and about the same time he was promoted as sole chancellor of the court of augmentations. In 1546 he was made a member of the privy council, and managed by prudence to retain the favour of his sovereign, though on one occasion towards the end of his reign Henry VIII was induced to distrust him, and even to accuse him of peculation, a charge of which he cleared himself. He was named as one of the executors of King Henry's will, and a legacy of £300 was bequeathed to him. He died at the Charterhouse London on 31st December, 1564.

Below two images of Edward North and the title page of his great, great grandson’s biography of him.
Roger North, 2nd Baron, (1531-1600). Little information survives about his boyhood and youth. He may have been a student of Peterhouse like his brother Thomas, the translator of Plutarch, but his admission to Gray’s Inn in 1561 was probably honorary. Young North excelled at tilting, and at one tournament Princess Elizabeth rewarded him with a scarf of red silk, a token which figures proudly in a fine contemporary portrait. He became a member of Elizabeth’s household upon her accession and was created knight of the Bath at her coronation. Doubtless his father’s prestige and influence procured North’s first election to Parliament in 1555 at the age of 24, when he was returned as senior knight of the shire for the county of Cambridge.

Despite his father’s standing at court, North voted against a government bill and his absence from the next Parliament may be attributable to this opposition. His Protestantism later took a Puritan form. In later life he was to remain an active magistrate in Cambridgeshire, and to become high steward of the borough, while
winning national fame at court and on the battlefield. He died on 3\textsuperscript{rd} December, 1600. In 1682 his book *Light in the Way to Paradise* was posthumously published.

**Thomas North (1535-1603) (translator).** He is supposed to have been a student of Peterhouse, Cambridge, and was entered at Lincoln's Inn in 1557. In 1574 he accompanied his brother, Roger, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Baron North, on a diplomatic visit to the French court. He served as captain in the year of the Spanish Armada (1588), and was knighted about three years later. His name is on the roll of justices of the peace for Cambridge in 1592 and again in 1597, and he received a small pension (£40 a year) from the queen in 1601. He translated, in 1557, *Guevara's Reloj de Principes* (commonly known as *Libro áureo*), a compendium of moral counsels chiefly compiled from the meditations of Marcus Aurelius, under the title of *The Diall of Princes*.

North translated from a French copy of Guevara, but seems to have been well acquainted with the Spanish version. The book had already been translated by Lord Berners, but without reproducing the rhetorical artifices of the original. North's version, with its mannerisms and its constant use of antithesis, set the fashion which was to culminate in John Lyly's *Euphues*. The images below are taken from *The Diall*. 
North’s dedication to Queen Mary, dated 20th December, 1557, sought the queen’s encouragement, the author ‘beinge yonge, to attempt the like enterprise’ on further occasions. His next work was The Morall Philosophie of Doni (1570), a translation of an Italian collection of eastern fables, popularly known as The Fables of Bidpai. The first edition of his translation of Plutarch, from the French of Jacques Amyot, appeared in 1579 and was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. It was followed by another edition in 1595, containing fresh lives and a third in 1603. It is almost impossible to over-estimate the influence of North’s vigorous English on contemporary writers, and some critics have called him the first master of English prose. The Lives translation formed the source from which Shakespeare drew the materials for his Julius Caesar, Coriolanus, and Antony and Cleopatra. It is in the last-named play that he follows the Lives most closely, whole speeches being taken directly from North. North’s Plutarch was reprinted for the Tudor Translations (1895), with an introduction by George Wyndham.

John North (1550-1597) son of the above Roger and father of the following Dudley, died within his father’s lifetime and the Baronetcy was inherited by his son. He married Dorothy, daughter and heiress of Sir Valentine Dale.

Dudley North, 3rd Baron (1582-1666). He was the son of Sir John and Dorothy (Dale) North. Dorothy was the daughter and heiress of Sir Valentine Dale. Dudley succeeded his grandfather, Roger North, 2nd Baron North, at the age of nineteen. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and married in 1599 Frances, daughter of Sir John
Brockett of Brockett Hall in Hertfordshire. He travelled in Italy, took part in the campaign of 1602 in the Netherlands, and on his return became a conspicuous figure at court, excelling in athletic exercises as well as in poetry and music, and gaining the friendship of Prince Henry (left). [Henry was the son of James I and died of typhoid fever at the age of 19, paving the way to the throne of his doomed brother Charles I]

In 1606, while returning from Eridge to London, he discovered the springs at The Pantiles, Tunbridge Wells, which cured North himself of a complaint and quickly became famous. He also recommended the Epsom springs to the public. He supported and subscribed to the expedition to Guyana made by his brother Roger North (c. 1582 – c. 1652) in 1619, and when Roger departed without leave Dudley was imprisoned for two days in the Fleet. In 1626 he attached himself to the party of Lord Saye and Sele in the Lords, who were in sympathy with the aims of the Commons; and when the civil war broke out he was on the side of the parliament.

In 1641 he was a member of the Lords committee on Religion, and was one of those who approved the sentence of death for Archbishop Laud, whereby Laud was beheaded for attempting to:

.... introduce an arbitrary and tyrannical Government, against Law; and to alter and subvert God's true Religion by Law established in this Realm, and instead thereof to set up Popish Superstition and Idolatry; and to subvert the Rights of Parliaments, and the ancient Course of Parliamentary Proceedings; and, by false and malicious Slanders, to incense His Majesty against Parliaments...
After his Parliamentary career, Dudley passed the rest of his life in retirement at Kirtling in Cambridgeshire. He died leaving a daughter and two sons, the elder of which, Sir Dudley, succeeded him as the 4th Baron North. Dudley North wrote *A Forest of Varieties* (1645), a miscellany of essays and poems, another edition of which was published in 1659 under the title of *A Forest Promiscuous of Several Seasons Productions*.

His daughter Dorothy (1605-1698) (image below) married Richard Lennard, 13th Lord Dacre and then Challoner Chute.

**Dudley North, 4th Baron, (1602-1677),** was the elder son of Dudley North, 3rd Baron North and his wife Frances Brockett. He was admitted to St John's College, Cambridge in 1619 and Gray's Inn in August, 1619. He married Ann Montagu, the daughter of Charles the brother of the 1st Earl of Manchester. In 1620 he joined the volunteer regiment for the relief of the German Palatinate and served in Holland. He travelled in Italy, France,
and Spain. In 1628 he was elected Member of Parliament for Horsham and sat until 1629 when King Charles decided to rule without parliament for eleven years. In April, 1640, North was elected MP for Cambridgeshire in the Short Parliament. He was re-elected in November, 1640, as MP for Cambridgeshire in the Long Parliament. In 1660, North was elected Member of Parliament for Cambridge in the Convention Parliament. On the death of his father in January, 1667/66, he succeeded to the title of Baron North. He was an accomplished man, of studious bent, and wrote on economics and religious subjects. He published, besides other things, passages relating to the Long Parliament, of which he had himself been a member. North died in 1677 and was buried at Kirtling in Cambridgeshire on 27th June, 1677.

Dudley North and Ann Montagu had five sons and three daughters. We will briefly summarize the lives of some of these children. One daughter, Christian North (1648-1708), married Sir George Weneyeve of Brettenham in Suffolk. They had a daughter Frances who married first Charles Vesey and then John Tudman Doctor of Physic of Hammersmith. This John Tudman was the brother of Benjamin Tudman who married Susannah (Cradock) Banner. We know little of their lives except for a court case which will appear later. For now a chart showing the relationship among these families appears below.
Charles North, 5th Baron North and 1st Baron Grey (1636-1691), son and heir apparent to Dudley, 4th Baron North. He married Katherine, daughter of William Lord Grey of Werke. He had two sons, William his successor, and Charles who died unmarried; also two daughters who died young. (His son Charles and daughter Catherine are shown below).
Samuel Pepys comments in his dairy on Charles’ getting married that: ‘he is the happiest man in the world’ and that ‘I am sure he is an ugly fellow; but a good scholar and sober gentleman’. However, in a recent biography (1999) on his brother Dudley North, Charles is described as being: ‘... the most insecure, mediocre, unimaginative, and petty’ of the North brothers. King Charles II considered him ‘the one fool in the North family’.

Francis North, 1st Baron Guilford (1637–1685) was the third son of the 4th Baron North, and was created Baron Guilford in 1683, after becoming Lord Keeper of the Great Seal in succession to Lord Nottingham. He had been an eminent lawyer, Solicitor-General (1671), Attorney-General (1673), and Chief Justice of the Common Pleas (1675), and in 1679 was made a member of the Council of Thirty and on its dissolution of the Cabinet. He was a man of wide culture and a staunch royalist.

He was hostile to Lord Jeffreys, and regarded the future Chief Justice, Sir Robert Wright, as utterly unfit for any judicial office. He was generally respected for integrity, but sometimes accused of self-importance and a lack of any sense of humour; for example his excessive agitation at the ridiculous rumour spread by Sunderland and Jeffreys that he had been seen riding on a rhinoceros. In 1672 he married Lady Frances Pope, daughter and co-heiress of Thomas Pope, 3rd Earl of Downe, who inherited the Wroxton estate, and he was succeeded as 2nd baron by his son Francis (1673–1729). (From Wikipedia)

Roger North (1653-1734), the following is adapted from ‘The History of Parliament’

Brother of the above Charles, Francis and Dudley the Turkey Merchant of Glemham Parva. Roger North made his career in the law like his brother Francis. When Roger graduated, he was immediately called to the bar, his practice prospered. In 1682 ‘my brother got me made of the King’s counsel, which let me in to advanced fees’. He was
ordered to assist the attorney-general, Sir Robert Sawyer\textsuperscript{43}, in state trials, notably those that followed the Rye House Plot. After his brother Francis became Lord Keeper, his own professional income rose to £4,000 p.a. ‘I made myself a piece of a courtier,’ he wrote, ‘and commonly on Sundays went to Whitehall’, and in 1684 the Duke of York appointed him his attorney-general. In the new reign he became solicitor-general to the Queen (Mary of Modena). By his own account: “All these steps were without my making court: my brother obtained them, and I had only to kiss the King and Queen’s hands.” Indeed so powerful became the Norths that nothing could ‘happen or fall’ but a North was present … it was as if … ‘they had a monopoly on preferment.’

He wrote industriously, principally on music, though none of his works, except \textit{A Discourse of Fish and Fish Ponds}, was published in his lifetime. He prepared his \textit{Examen} as a vindication of Charles II and of his own brother, the lord keeper, in reply to White Kennett’s \textit{History}, published in 1706.

\textsuperscript{43} His daughter Margaret married the 8\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Pembroke and their son Nicholas married Ann North, the sister of Mary who married Charles Long, Jnr.
He was an MP for Dunwich, and was returned unopposed for the borough at the general election of 1685. He became a very active member of James II’s Parliament and was appointed to 20 committees.

On 16th June he opposed the motion for a bill to naturalize all Protestant refugees (e.g. Huguenots), on the grounds that a general naturalization ‘made no distinction, the scum of all Europe might come and be officers and juries’. The effect was to delay the introduction of the bill, which was much disliked at Court, but not to kill it.

He was among those instructed to draft a clause forbidding any motions in either House to alter the succession to the throne. He was ordered with two others to draft a bill for registering the deaths, burials, marriages and issue of the nobility and gentry. He was appointed to the post of attorney-general to the Queen.
At the age of 32, North’s career had already reached its apogee. His legal practice declined when he was exposed to the full force of Judge Jeffreys’ hostility. He was an earnest student of architecture, acted as executor of Sir Peter Lely, and became an accomplished and enthusiastic musician. At Court, however, the times began to grow sour, “... I could perceive at the King’s levee and at the Queen’s court I was looked upon with an evil discouraging eye, which made me forbear. I thought my person was no agreeable object, and it was better court to keep it away.”

In 1691 he bought the Rougham estate, where he rebuilt the Hall, brought up a large family of orphan nephews and nieces, experimented in agriculture, and acted as arbiter in local disputes, though he never became a J.P.

The ruins of Rougham Hall. It was built by Roger and pulled down by his grandson Fountain North who said he had such bad memories of his father and the Hall that he wanted it destroyed.

At the age of 43 he married Mary Gayer the daughter of ‘a stiff and furious Jacobite’ (Sir Robert Gayer), who brought him a considerable access of fortune, as well as a large family. In 1721 his name was sent to the Pretender as a Jacobite supporter, though by this time he had become a studious recluse. Occupied with his valuable biographical accounts of himself and his brothers, he retained his vigour and brightness of intellect to the end. He died on 1st March, 1734.

John North (1645-1683) was the fifth child Sir Dudley North, 4th Baron North, and brother of Charles, Dudley, Roger, and Francis. John North was educated at Bury St Edmunds and entered Jesus College, Cambridge, in February 1660/1. He graduated BA in 1663/4, and (by Royal mandate) became a fellow of Jesus in 1664. In 1672 he migrated to Trinity College, and was Regius Professor of Greek from 1672 to 1674. Made Clerk of the Closet in 1673, he was a prebend of Westminster from 1673 to 1683 and chaplain to the King from 1676 to 1683. He was Master of Trinity from 1677 to 1683.
John North

Dr. North appears to have been a man of great probity and learning, but, upon the whole, to have been better qualified for private than public life. Although his conversation was fluent, he had great wit, yet he had an uncommon timidity of temper; and there is much reason to think that the ungovernable state in which he found Trinity college, and the vexatious insolence of some of the fellows, had a tendency to produce that imbecility which rendered his last years useless. His only publication, except one sermon, was an edition of some pieces of Plato, whose philosophy he preferred to that of Aristotle, as more consonant to Christian morality. He is buried in Trinity College Chapel.

William North, 6th Baron, (1673-1734) was born on 22nd December, 1673, and succeeded, on the death of his father, Charles, in 1690, as sixth Lord North, and second Lord Grey, of Rolleston in Staffordshire. He took his place in the House of Peers, in January, 1698. In the reign of Queen Ann he was appointed lord lieutenant of Cambridgeshire, governor of Portsmouth, and made a member of the privy council; but his chief merit was his military conduct; and having served, with great honour, under the Duke of Marlborough, he was appointed lieutenant-general of the British forces; and particularly distinguished himself at Blenheim, where his right hand was shot off.

An active participant in the House of Lords, North was a staunch Tory throughout his career and with the Hanoverian succession he began to exhibit his Jacobite sympathies more openly. Although he stayed out of the 1715 Rising, he was implicated in the Jacobite plots that followed the South Sea Bubble's collapse and was associated with what was known as the Atterbury Plot, which involved a plan for an armed uprising. North was commissioned by the Stuart Pretender as Lieutenant-general and Commander-in-Chief for London and Westminster, thus being singled out to play a
crucial role in the takeover of the capital. North was given the Jacobite title of Earl North and also designated Lord Regent for the Pretender's restoration.

Anticipating his arrest, North made a failed attempt to escape aboard a smuggler's yacht but did not get further than the Isle of Wight, after which he was committed to The Tower of London in October, 1722. (It was this Lord North and Grey that John Purcell MD visited in the Tower of London to treat for a fever). He never stood trial and was released on bail on 28th October, 1723. Shortly thereafter he retired, and after years of solicitations North, aided by the Jacobites' most prominent military exile, James, Duke of Ormond, received a Spanish army commission in 1728. The same year he showed his loyalty to the Jacobite cause by converting to Roman Catholicism and subsequently spent his remaining years in embittered exile in Spain.

Maria Margareta North  
Cornelis de Jonge van Ellemeet  
Cecilia, sister of Margareta

Lord North died at Madrid on 31st October, 1734; and left no issue by his wife, Maria Margareta, daughter of Cornelis de Jonge van Ellemeet, Receiver-General to the States of Holland. Charles, his only brother, died unmarried, at the siege of Lisle; and the barony of Grey, of Rolleston, became extinct. That of North, descended to his cousin
Francis North, 2nd Baron Guildford, who was afterwards created an earl by the same title.

After Lord North's death, his widow Maria Margaretha de Jonge (d. 1762), married in 1735 Patrick Murray, 5th Lord Elibank, who has been described as a 'brilliant man of great knowledge'. He wrote among other things: Essays on Paper Money, Banking, etc. (1755) Thoughts on Money, Circulation, and Paper Currency (1758), Inquiry into the Origin and Consequence of the Public Debts (1758/9); Remarks on the History of Scotland (1773), etc. Alexander Carlyle, in his autobiography, described Lord Elibank as one of the most learned and ingenious noblemen of his time, and as having a mind that embraced the greatest variety of topics and produced the most original remarks. There was no issue.

Dudley North, (1706-1764) whose sister Mary married Charles Long, married Barbara Herbert daughter of Thomas Herbert, the 8th Earl of Pembroke. Thomas’ son, as noted above, Nicholas Herbert, married Ann North, Dudley’s sister. There was no issue.

The Guildford line of the North family flourished and is still producing descendants to this day. A picture gallery of some of the Guildford branch of the North family is shown below.
Francis, 1st Baron Guildford

Francis North, 2nd Baron

Frederic (1732–1792), 2nd Earl

Francis North (1704–1790), 1st Earl

Frederic (1732–1792), 2nd Earl

Francis 4th Earl

Frederick 5th Earl

Dudley Francis 7th Earl
APPENDIX FOURTEEN: The Beckford – Beeston – Long Connection

Beeston Long’s father, Charles, married his mother Jane Beeston in 1703. She was the daughter of William Beeston, Governor of Jamaica. There is some speculation as to whether or not Peter Beckford married Jane’s sister, Bridget Beeston, and whether or not the Beckfords are descended from this marriage or a later marriage of Peter’s to Ann Ballard. Two trees support the Beckford-Beeston descent pattern. The first tree below is taken from Matthew Parker’s 2011 book The Sugar Barons and shows Peter Beckford marrying Bridget Beeston and having descendants. Likewise, the second tree taken from Records and Letters of the Family of the Longs by Robert Mowbray Howard supports Parker’s position.
The tree below shows not only Peter Beckford marrying Bridget Beeston and having a family by her, and not Ann Ballard, but also the latter Long-Beckford connection with the marriage of Edward Long to Mary Ballard Beckford. Edward was Beeston Long’s nephew.
However other genealogists and biographers (such as the DNB) have Anne Ballard as the mother of Peter Beckford’s children.

As already noted, Jane Beeston was Charles Long’s second wife. Before Jane there was Amy Lawes. Charles and Amy (Lawes) Long had a son Samuel. This Samuel married Mary Tate, only child of Bartholomew Tate. Their son Edward Long married on 12th August, 1758, Mary Ballard Beckford. She was the daughter of Thomas Beckford shown on the above tree and the one below. Edward Long (1734–1813) was chief judge of the vice-admiralty court, Jamaica, author of the history of that island and Beeston Long’s (half) nephew.

Mary Ballard (Beckford) Long died on 16th July, 1797, aged sixty-two. Edward Long died on 13th March, 1813, at Arundel
Park in Sussex. Their daughter Elizabeth Long married Lord Henry Thomas Howard-Molyneux-Howard, Deputy Earl Marshall of England and the younger brother of the 12th Duke of Norfolk. In turn, their daughter, Henrietta Anna Howard, married (as his second wife) Henry John George Herbert, the 3rd Earl of Carnarvon.

There were other marriages to the peerage of this branch of the Long family too numerous to mention (see following chart).

Below two extracts from the recollections of Edward Long that refer to his uncle Beeston Long and the Cropp family:

The Scotch rebellion at this period had thrown all London into Tumult. Guards were posted at all the City Gates who stopped every carriage to search for concealed arms, and all the brave Citizens were training themselves to the exercise of the firelock: among the rest the first object I recollect that struck me on entering the saloon hall of my Uncle Beeston’s house was Mr. [Richard] Cropp, at that time a jolly plump young man who, arrayed in his Military accoutrements, was practising the manual Exercise with an old Sergeant.

In another passage Edward Long refers to a family rift which his father, Samuel Long, tried to heal:

I do not exactly recollect in what year it was, that my Father was favoured with a general rendez-vous of several relations—among the number were my Uncle Tate and his first wife, my Uncles Charles and Beeston [Long] and probably several others whom I have forgot. My Father and Mother embraced this occasion to bring them together again, and bury all former differences in oblivion; and they in some degree affected a truce, but not a peace, for the reconciliation was not permanent and they soon
separated again for ever. My Uncle Beeston was either just married, or about entering into marriage with Miss Cropp daughter of Jonathan [Abraham] Cropp, a merchant in London, with a fortune of £30,000. He was the gayest of the whole party, and employed himself in making a variety of fireworks; thus with the addition of Balls, and Entertainments of every kind, the whole house was a scene of jollity for some time.

In a letter written by Jane Catherine Long (who married Henry Dawkins’s son Richard) she refers to Charles Long (Baron Farnborough) as ‘the beauty’.

Below are Charles Edward Long and his first cousin Henry Lawes Long painted by Henry Bernard Chalon. The former is not shown on the Long family chart below because of lack of space.

Charles Edward Long was the only surviving son of Charles Beckford Long and Frances Monro Tucker. Long was educated at Harrow School and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1845 he compiled a volume called *Royal Descents: A Genealogical List of the Several Persons Entitled to Quarter the Arms of the Royal Houses of England*. He presented many valuable documents relating to Jamaica to the British Library and wrote many notable publications. Returning from a visit to Hamburg, Long died unmarried at the Lord Warden Hotel, Dover. He was buried in the churchyard at Seale, Surrey.
Below a family tree from *The Gentleman’s Magazine* showing the Tate family and some descendants. Samuel Long, Beeston’s half-brother married Mary Tate (as shown).
Mary Tate’s sister Catherine married Charles Hedges the son of Sir William Hedges (1632-1701). William was the first governor of The East India Company in Bengal.
APPENDIX FIFTEEN: The Collapse of Roffey’s Bank

Parts of the following description of the fall of Roffey’s bank are adapted from A Handbook of London Bankers, with additional material from contemporary newspapers.

In the year 1767 Roffey’s bank took into partnership Mr. Alexander Fordyce, a decision which was to prove fatal to the bank. Fordyce was said to have been a man of handsome appearance and possessed of considerable energy with a flow of natural eloquence and a marked suavity of manner. He no sooner became a partner in Roffey and Neale & Co. than he began to speculate in the public funds hazarding large sums.

However, the nature of Fordyce’s character may have been revealed earlier on by his behavior toward Thomas Hughes as reported in the newspapers on 29th February, 1764:

On Tuesday last was tried at Guildhall before Lord Mansfield, by a special jury of Merchants, an action, brought by Mr. Thomas Hughes, of Little Ormond-street, against Mr. Alexander Fordyce, Banker, in Lombard-street, for seizing the Plaintiff’s goods, under pretence of a commission of bankruptcy; when, after a short trial, the Plaintiff had a verdict; and the said Mr. Fordyce was, by order of Court, directed to restore to Mr. Hughes all his estate and effects seized under the said commission.

At first Fordyce was fortunate and in 1767 when he speculated largely in East India Company stock for a rise they went up even higher than he anticipated leaving him in possession of nearly £100,000. He then purchased an estate at Roehampton, gave great entertainments and in June, 1770, some months after Samuel Roffey died, he married Lady Margaret Lindsay second daughter of the Earl of Balcarres.

His extravagance knew no bounds and he continued his speculations which after a time turned out badly. Even though his luck turned against him, he continued borrowing from every one he could when at last the Bank of England and other bankers refused him further assistance.

In 1772 he is said to have visited a Quaker for the purpose of borrowing money but the worthy man was too shrewd to be taken in. He wittily parried the application with “Friend Fordyce I have known many people ruined by two dice but I will not be ruined by four dice”. The Quaker was right for shortly afterwards Fordyce absconded and the
firm that Samuel Roffey founded was hopelessly bankrupt discovery being made that Fordyce had put his name to bills in circulation to the amount of four millions sterling.

The following account from the Annual Register of the memorable Monday 8th June, 1772, which came to be called ‘Black Monday’, gives an idea of the prevailing agitation that took hold of the City of London:

*It is beyond the power of words to describe the general consternation of the metropolis at this instant. No event for fifty years [ie since the South Sea Bubble] has been remembered to give so fatal a blow to trade and public credit. An universal bankruptcy was expected. The stoppage of almost every banker's house in London was looked for. The whole City was in an uproar. Many of the first families were in tears. This melancholy scene began with a rumour that one of the greatest bankers in London [Roffey's] had stopped which afterwards proved true. A report at the same time was propagated that an immediate stop of the greatest must take place. Happily this proved groundless the principal merchants assembled and means were concerted to revive trade and preserve the national credit.*

Below from: The History of Coutts Bank on the topic of ‘Black Monday’ (8th June, 1772) as it affected Scotland.

This ‘Black Monday’ was a great calamity in England, but it proved almost fatal to the banking interest in Scotland. The news of the failure of Roffey’s bank when it arrived in Scotland had the immediate effect of breaking nearly all the banks in the northern kingdom. One after another, they stopped payment and the panic at Edinburgh and Glasgow was such as to threaten a revolution. The excited multitude claiming cash in exchange for their notes [resulted in] a human stampede, not to be arrested by any amount of sound sense and reasoning, and the consequence was, that the banks had to declare themselves insolvent [...leaving, in the words of a Scottish writer, “an amount of destruction in its wake such as Scotland had not experienced since the wreck of the Darien expedition”]

The contagion did not stop at the North Sea, it spread across Europe where there ‘was such an extensive crash, that there seemed to be a universal wreck of credit’. In Russia the Empress herself was said to have ‘stepped forward to ward off the impending calamity’ (See Sheridan, R. B. (1960) The British Credit Crisis of 1772 in The Journal of Economic History, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 161-186)

The East India Company suffered too. With the sudden tightening of credit, its main lender, The Bank of England, curtailed loans to the company such that the Company had to be rescued by the British Government with a loan of £1,400,000 as well as special

---

44 An attempt to establish a Scottish colony in what is now Panama in the late 1690’s. The disastrous failure is said to have weakened Scots resistance against the Act of Union in 1707.
concessions with regard to the export of tea to the American colonies. These concessions would eventually lead to the imposition of a stamp duty on the colonies which resulted in the dumping of tea into Boston Bay and other expressions of frustration.

The West Indies also suffered and Governor Leyborne of Grenada wrote in June, 1773 ‘The distressed situation of this island, owing to the failure of credit, the low price of coffee, and the scarcity of money is beyond conception.’

In the North American colonies farmers and planters had long depended on lines of credit from London and Glasgow merchants, a habit which Lord Sheffield wrote disapprovingly of: “… the Colonists have at all times had too much credit; they have been in every age greatly indebted and it seems to have been a favourite principal with them to prevent or retard recovery of debts”. It was unfortunate then that, along with the general lack of credit that had set in as a result of the collapse of the banks, beginning with Roffey’s, the aggregated price of sixteen commodities dropped from 148 in June, 1772 to 98 in May, 1774 (Sheridan, R. B. (1960), p. 175).

As a result, the debt burden of farmers and planters in the colonies increased rapidly and became a source of growing unrest that undermined the already strained relations with the mother country. In a letter to the Virginia Gazette Robert Carter Nicholas wrote in 1773 that the misfortunes arising from the collapse of the banks in Scotland resulted in ‘the greatest misfortunes in this Country’ (Sheridan, R. B., p. 178). Another wrote that: “… the consequences have extended to this part of the world to a violent degree, and unless our principle export, Tobo., can be kept up in value at home, I don’t see how we shall be enabled to discharge our debts on your side of the water.” (see Sheridan). Some, such as Thomas Jefferson, had a simple if not revolutionary solution to the problem.

Back in England, at the sale of Fordyce's effects at Roehampton in 1772, a man (Samuel Foote) who attended almost every day bought nothing but a pillow. On being asked what particular use he could have for a single pillow “As a narcotic,” said he “for if the original proprietor could sleep so soundly on it at the time of owing so much as he did it may be of singular service to me on many occasions.”

The following notes on two portraits of Alexander Fordyce and his wife Margaret are taken from: An Exhibition of the Works of Thomas Gainsborough, R.A. by F. G. Stephens.

Portrait No. 160. The second daughter of James, fifth Earl of Balcarres, by Anne, daughter of Sir Robert Dalrymple. She married, first, Alexander Fordyce, a member of Roffey’s banking firm of Threadneedle Street, “… whose catastrophe on ‘Black Monday’ brought Britannia, Queen of the Indies, to the precipice of bankruptcy.” There are records that give terrible accounts of the deluge of bankruptcy which occurred in this
instance, and they indicate the ruin of thousands. After the death of Fordyce, Lady Margaret, in 1812, married Sir James Bland Burges, Bart., "... who had been an early admirer, but had married twice in the interim." Lady Margaret died in 1814.

Her portrait by Gainsborough is said to be one of his ‘masterpieces’ although an image of the portrait has so far not been located. Further on in the book by Stephens is a note on Gainsborough’s portrait of Alexander Fordyce.

Lent by the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres. A portrait of the husband of Lady Margaret Lindsay, a banker, whose history is partly epitomized in the account of the picture of that lady, No. 160 (above).

Again, the location of this portrait has yet been established.

A PREQUEL

In early September, 1770, Alexander Fordyce, his wife, and one other were upon the highway as reported in the newspapers:

Tuesday night, about dusk, Alexander Fordyce, Esq; and his new-married lady, were attacked near Roehampton, by seven footpads, who surrounded the chaise, and robbed him and Lady Margaret of their watches and money.

6th September, 1770

Tuesday night, about dusk, Alexander Fordyce, Esq; and his new-married lady, were attacked near Roehampton, by seven footpads, who surrounded the chaise, and robbed him and Lady Margaret of their watches and money.
There were seven men concerned in the robbing of Alexander Fordyce, Esq; and his new married lady, near Roehampton, on Tuesday fo'night in the evening. Two of the men went to the coachman and footman, and produced pistols, bad them to look up, or they would blow their brains out; the others went to the coach and demanded the money of them; Lady Margaret gave her purse, containing 20 guineas, and her gold repeating watch; Mr. Fordyce gave all the gold he had in his pocket, amounting to a considerable sum; but Mr. Wood, who was likewise in the coach, during the time they were receiving the money from Mr. Fordyce and his Lady, contrived to put his gold on the seat behind him, and when they demanded his money, he gave them a few shillings and half-pence only. It is supposed the villains did not get less than 50l. besides Lady Margaret's gold watch.

It turned out that one of the perpetrators was a man called John Joseph Defoe whom The Annual Register claimed to be the grandson of Daniel Defoe the celebrated author of Robinson Crusoe.

On Wednesday last were committed by the Sitting Magistrates at the Public Office in Bow-street, John Clark and John Joseph Defoe, otherwise Smith, charged with divers footpad robberies near London; and it clearly appears, that most of the robberies which have been committed near London for these four months past, have been committed by the above offenders.

Yesterday two prisoners were capitally convicted at the Old Bailey, viz. John Clarke and John-Joseph Defoe, alias Brown, alias Smith, for feloniously assaulting Alexander Fordyce, Esq; on the highway, near Kensington, and robbing him of a gold watch and a sum of money. At the same time they robbed his lady of a gold repeater.
On Thursday last John Clark and John-Joseph Defoe, otherwise Brown, otherwise Smith, were capitally convicted at the Old-Bailey, before Mr. Baron Perrott, for robbing Alexander Fordyce, Esq; and his Lady, on the highway, near Chelsea. It seems there was another indictment against them, upon which they were not tried, and two detainers for the county of Surry for the like fact; and it also appears that most of the footpad robberies which have been committed near London within these six months past, have been committed by the above two offenders.

10th December, 1770

One commentator has noted that:

“There seems to have been no distinct identification of De Foe as one of the parties committing the robbery; but in those days juries did not stand upon trifles, and he had but little grace accorded to him.”

On 2nd January, 1771, Defoe and Clarke were executed at Tyburn.

Yesterday the four convicts, mentioned yesterday, were executed at Tyburn, Mark Marks, for a robbery in Whitechapel, denied his being guilty of the crime. John Joseph Defoe concerned with John Clarke in robbing Alexander Fordyce, Esq. on the highway, it is said was the grandson of Daniel Defoe, Author of the True-born Englishman, Robinson Crusoe, &c.

3rd January, 1771

Alexander Fordyce (1729-1789) had three brothers: David (1711-1751), James (1720-1796), and William (1724-1792); and all four Fordyce brothers have entries on the DNB. David was an academic, James was a Scottish minister and ‘moralist’, and William was a physician. Below, the sister of the four brothers, Mrs. Greenwood.
APPENDIX SIXTEEN: The Family of Mary Warner who Married Samuel Roffey

As we have seen, Mary (Warner) Roffey was born in 1716, the daughter of Poulelt Warner and Mary Brooksbank. Poulelt was born on 17th December, 1689, and was married to Mary Brooksbank on 12th May, 1713. Mary was the eldest daughter of Joseph Brooksbank and Mary Stamp. Mary Stamp was the daughter of Richard Stamp of Ockingham (see Chart below).

Joseph Brooksbank was born in Elland in Yorkshire in 1654. At the age of sixteen he left for London to become a haberdasher's apprentice. He was described as prosperous and a promising young man, whose enterprising spirit was rewarded with the title of Citizen for the City of London in 1681. In 1679 he married Mary Stamp daughter of Richard Stamp, merchant of Reading in Berkshire, and niece of Thomas Stamp who became Lord Mayor of London in 1691.
Joseph Brooksbank was later appointed a Master of the Haberdashers Company in 1718. He did not forget his local roots and in 1712 he founded Brooksbank School in Elland. Brooksbank’s son, Stamp Brooksbank, born in 1694, became a director of the Bank of England.

Poulett Warner, who married Joseph’s daughter Mary, died on 26th August, 1721, aged thirty-two, and is buried at Wickhambrook. Poulett’s father was Andrews Warner of Badmondisfield. Andrews Warner married Elizabeth, only surviving child of Richard Cutts, of Clare, Suffolk, by Elizabeth, his first wife, daughter, and at length sole heiress of Henry Poulett, of Preston Torres, in Somerset, brother to John, 1st Lord Poulett, of Hinton St. George. Elizabeth (Cutts) Warner was born on 27th December, 1661, and died on 2nd August, 1742, aged eighty-one (see Chart). Andrews Warner died 17th December, 1717, aged sixty, and is buried at Wickhambrook.

Andrews Warner was the eldest son of Francis Warner and Eleanor the daughter of Thomas Andrewes, Lord Mayor of London. Francis Warner had estates at Lower Boulney, in the parish of Harding and also Harpden, near Henley-on-Thames, in Oxfordshire.
Sir Thomas Andrewes, the father of Eleanor who married Francis Warner, was a London financier who supported the parliamentary cause during the English Civil Wars, and sat as a commissioner at the High Court of Justice for the trial of Charles I.

In the 1620s and 1630s Andrewes followed the lead of his father Robert and traded with the Plymouth Colony as well as the New England colonies. He was a member of the guild of the Leathersellers and ran a successful wholesale linen drapery business at the White Lion, Fish Street Hill. Andrewes was a devout Puritan who in the late 1630s followed
Sydrach Simpson to Rotterdam to join his congregation. When Simpson first returned to London his congregation met at Andrewes' house.

In 1642 at the start of the Civil War Andrewes was a member of the committee which oversaw the City of London militia, a body of men willing to defend London against the Cavaliers. It was also during 1642 that he became an Alderman of the City and a Sheriff of London. Thanks to his financial success, he was able to lend large sums to help parliament finance the war, and involved himself in the financial administration of the parliamentary cause.

Between 1642 and 1645 he held a number of administrative offices, of which the two most significant were commissioner for the customs (appointed 1643), and, in 1645, one of the treasurers for war. For his own financial benefit and to improve his social status he purchased lands sequestrated by parliament from various bishops.

Andrewes sat as a commissioner at the trial of Charles I in January, 1649. He attended the trial in Westminster Hall and on the 27th January he, along with the other commissioners present, stood up to indicate his assent to the death sentence. He did not sign the warrant, but was present at the King’s execution on 30th January, 1649, and in March, when the Rump Parliament passed the Act abolishing the Office of King, he was responsible for proclaiming the abolition of monarchy in the City of London.
In April, 1649, Andrewes was appointed to succeed Abraham Reynardson, the Royalist Lord Mayor of London. Having served until the following October, he was, after a year’s interval, again chosen for the year 1650–1651. His successful performance of his duties during his second period as Lord Mayor was of importance to the Commonwealth as he was responsible for keeping the capital quiet, and a bulwark against any resurgence of Royalism in support of Charles I during the third English Civil War. During the Interregnum his support for Oliver Cromwell earned him a knighthood in 1657.

There is no record of the place and date of his death, but he was buried on 20th August, 1659. A year later the political landscape had changed and the monarchy had been restored. Under section thirty-seven of the Indemnity and Oblivion Act, he, like the other dead regicides, was not exempted from the general pardon so that his property could be sequestrated by the state. According to the latest edition of the DNB:

To the Royalists he was peculiarly obnoxious, as one of the High Court of Justice, where he had assisted in the condemnation of other illustrious characters, besides the unhappy monarch. ... Had he lived to have seen the return of his banished Sovereign, he would either have expiated his crime by an ignominious and painful death, or spent the remainder of his life in poverty and imprisonment.

We have noted above that Thomas Andrewes’s daughter Eleanor married Francis Warner, that they had a son Andrews Warner whose son Poulett was the father of Mary Warner who married Samuel Roffey. We should note that Eleanor Andrewes had a brother, Francis Thomas Andrewes, who married Damaris Cradock daughter of Mathew Cradock (Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Company).
Mathew Cradock may be related to Richard Cradock and thus to Sarah and Susannah. The DNB says that Mathew Cradock was the cousin of a dissenting minister Samuel Cradock, whose brother Zachary Cradock (Provost of Eton College) is referred to by Thomas Cradock in his will as ‘my cousin’. Since Thomas was also Richard Cradock’s cousin we arrive at a tentative and unsubstantiated putative connection between Richard Cradock and Mathew Cradock.

Damaris, daughter of Mathew Cradock by his first wife, Damaris Wyn, was baptized at St. Swithin's, Canongate, London on 1st November, 1623. She married first Francis Thomas Andrews, son of the Lord Mayor, and they had a son, also Thomas, and a daughter Damaris.

Francis Thomas Andrewes died and Damaris (Cradock) Andrewes next married Sir Ralph Cudworth who was a philosopher and theologian of note and a Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. He was also Regis Professor of Hebrew, and wrote many works on religious subjects.

They had one daughter Damaris Cudworth who was born in 1658.

Dame Damaris Cudworth, daughter of Matthew Cradock and the relict of Francis Thomas Andrewes, was buried at High Lavers, Essex, in 1708. A marble tablet bears this inscription:
Damaris Cudworth.
Relict of Ralph Cudworth, D. of Divinitie and Master of Christ's College in Cambridge. Exemplarie for her Pietie and Virtue, for her Studie of the Scriptures, Charitie to the Poore, and Good Will to All, and An Excellent Wife, Mother, Mistress and Friend, Lies buried in the Middle between this and the opposite Wall. She was born the XXIII of October MDCXXIII And, after a Life made easie to herselfe and others, by the unalterable Evenness of her Temper, She died as one that goes to sleepe without Disease or Paine the XXV November MDCXCV, in full Hope and Expectation of a happy Resurrection.

The daughter of Francis and Damaris (Cradock) Andrewes was Damaris Andrewes who became the wife of Sir Edward Abney, LL.D; however the path to marriage was not easy. Edward Abney was educated (circa 1649) at Christ's College, Cambridge. While under the tutelage of the master of the college, Ralph Cudworth, Edward met and became enamoured with Cudworth’s stepdaughter Damaris Andrewes, and marriage was considered. One problem though for the Abney family was the political stance of Damaris’ grandfather, Thomas Andrewes. As we have noted above, Thomas was one of Parliament's main financiers during the Civil War against Charles I. On the other hand, Edward's father, James Abney, had supported Charles in his war with Parliament.

Edward Abney wrote a series of letters to his father seeking his consent to marry Damaris. Edward is bold and often direct on “... this business, which has caused the greatest trouble and perplexity of mind to me”. Earnestness turns to despair as his father seems to dither over the question of giving his consent. Edward uses all means he can to persuade his father, in whose hands his future effectively lay. He emphasises the
social and intellectual qualities of his proposed bride, “a very comely and descreet person neither hath she any of the too common defects of lameness or crookedness” and “who has been piously educated”. The relationship with the eminent and influential Ralph Cudworth was important.

His father consented and Edward married Damaris Andrewes on 20th July, 1661, in London. Their wedding announcement read: "Edward Abney of Willesley, Derbyshire, gentleman, bachelor, aged 29 second son of James Abney of the same. Esq., and Damaris Andrewes spinster, about 18, daughter of Thomas Andrewes the younger, late of St Margaret's, New Fish Street, London, deceased, with consent of her mother Damaris Cudworth, alias Andrewes, now wife of Dr. Ralph Cudworth, Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, to be married at St. Gregory's or St. Dionysus Backchurch London."

Edward Abney left Cambridge in 1670 when he obtained a highly lucrative position as one of six clerks in Chancery. He was knighted at Whitehall by King Charles II on 2nd August, 1673. In 1685 he stood for Leicestershire but was defeated.

In 1687 his wife, Dame Damaris (Andrewes) Abney, died and was buried at Willesley on 9th June, 1687. After the death of Damaris, Edward married secondly Judith Barre on 18th December, 1688. She was the daughter of Peter Barre, merchant of London.

Abney was appointed a judge in the court of King's Bench and subsequently elected as a Whig to the House of Commons for Leicester in 1690 at the age of nearly 60 and served until 1698. As the oldest surviving son he inherited Willesley Hall from his father in 1693 and died there aged 96 in 1728, having been blind for the last 20 years of his life.

In drawing up his will Edward Abney excluded his eldest surviving but mentally unfit son [from his marriage with Damaris Andrewes], leaving his estates in Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Staffordshire to his youngest son, Thomas by his second marriage.
The only daughter of Ralph and Damaris (Cradock) (Andrewes) Cudworth was Damaris, born in Cambridge, on 18th January, 1658. She married Sir Francis Masham of Oates, in High Lavers, Essex, baronet and widower, then aged 30. Lady Damaris (Cudworth) Masham wrote a number of religious and philosophical works, and was a friend of the philosopher John Locke, who lived with the family and whose life she wrote an account of in the Great Historical Dictionary. Lady Masham died on 20th April, 1708, and is buried in the middle aisle of Bath Abbey. Her son Francis Cudworth Masham, accountant general to the Court of Chancery, died on 25th May, 1731, the last of his branch.
The Dissenters were 'very powerful' at Colchester. In 1727, Stamp Brooksbank, a Presbyterian, made his political debut there as its MP, though it was claimed that he was returned 'by the most notorious bribery and corruption'...
APPENDIX SEVENTEEN: Jonathan Boulter’s Land

Although there are no descendants of the children of Nathaniel Roffey, Snr. and Mary Welden beyond a second generation, interest in the family has occurred over the years. For instance in 1869 a notice appeared in the 'East Anglian Notes and Queries' (Volume 4) as follows:

Steeple-Grange, and Maylin, co. Essex. Jonathan Boulter, of the parish of S. Olave, Hart Street, London, Distiller, who died 14th Aug., 1743, by his will, dated 21st July, 1742, proved 25th Aug., 1743, devised to his grandson James Roffey, of London, merchant, eldest son of his late son-in-law Nathaniel Roffey, Esquire, deceased (who married testator's daughter Mary [actually niece]), subject to the life interest of testator’s wife Sarah [Cradock], it being part of her jointure, and to an incumbrance of £4. per annum; "All that my Mannor of Steeple Grange and Maylin, and all that my Messuage, lands, tenements and hereditaments thereto belonging, and all other my Mannors, hereditaments, lands and premises in the said county of Essex,' for his life, remainder to the sons and daughters of the said James Roffey in turn, in default, to his trustees for sale." I shall be glad to have these estates identified, and to know their previous and subsequent history. W. Consitt Boulter FSA 6, Park Row, Hill. P.252

Saint Olave, Hart Street, the parish in which Jonathan Boulter resided. It was at this church that George Cumberland, Snr. and Elizabeth Balchen were married.

Consitt Boulter's query received the following response in the 'East Anglian, or, Notes and Queries’, Volume 4:
The Manor of Steeple Grange, a little way south-east of the church, is in the record said to be in the parishes, vills, or fields of Steeple St. Laurence, Woodham Mortimer, and Shoebury. It belonged to James Roffey, Esq., in or about 1772, had been previously granted by King Henry VIII, to Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, who sold it to John Stonard. The manor of Steeple Hall, and the manor of Maylin, Mayland, or Mayland Hall, both now belong to St. Bartholomew’s Hospital, in London.—C. Golding, London.

APPENDIX EIGHTEEN: THE EARLIER TYERS FAMILY

There are very few records relating to the Tyers family before the generation of Elizabeth (Tyers) Roffey who married Jonathan Boulter. However some indication is given from the will of Joseph Marsh of Braintree in Essex who had a sister Grace who married a Nathaniel Tyers. Unfortunately, there are no records as to Nathaniel and Grace having children although it may well be that they were Elizabeth’s grandparents. Elizabeth’s brother was named Nathaniel which helps support the possibility of a connection.

Grace (Marsh) Tyers/Tyres was the daughter of John Marsh and Grace Baldwin of Braintree, Essex. No record of her baptism has been located. She was named in her father's will dated 15th April, 1627; she is not yet 19. A marriage to Nathaniel Tyers took place, although no record has yet been located. Grace and her husband Nathaniel Tyers are named in her mother's will dated 29th January 1657. Her death occurred 15th March, 1696.

(1) 15th April, 1627, John Marsh of Banktry, Essex, clothier, leaves 100 pounds to his daughter Grace when she should become 19.
(2) 29th January, 1657, Grace Marsh, widow of John Marsh of Braintree in Essex, wrote her will, leaving to her son-in-law Nathaniel Tyers and Grace, now his wife, her daughter, 7 pounds yearly for life, and then to the "heirs of the body" of Grace, lawfully begotten. If Grace has no such heirs, to be paid to the children of her son John Marsh, Graces’ brother. She also leaves to Grace a pair of Virginals and certain household stuff during her life, and after her decease, if not leaving issue, to the children of her daughter Lidia.
(3) 22nd May, 1676, Joseph Marsh the older of Braintree, Essex, brother of Grace (Marsh) Tyers, wrote his will, leaving his freehold lands and tenements lying in Braintree, called by the name of Clay Hills, now in the occupation of John Harris, to his sister Grace Tyres
[Tyers] during the term of her natural life. Then within one year after the decease of his sister Grace (Marsh) Tyers the said Freehold Lands are to be sold and the money arising thereof to be equally divided among Joseph’s sister Shorey’s two sons and his brother John Marsh's six children, and his sister Martin's six children. He also appoints her executrix with his kinsman Joseph Marsh, and his brother-in-law Nathaniel Tyres as overseer. Summary of the beneficiaries of Joseph March’s will, being his nephews and nieces:


The following is extracted from a publication called Marsh Genealogy by Dwight Whitney Marsh (Carpenter & Morehouse, Amherst, MA, 1895).

The following document from records in the office of the Secretary of State of Connecticut, of date May 15, 1705.

A case was then brought by John Marsh, Samuel Marsh, Jonathan Marsh, Daniel Marsh, Hannah Marsh, Lydia Marsh and Grace (Martin) Phelps, seven of the nephews and nieces of Joseph Marsh the older [Grace (Marsh) Tyer’s brother] late of Braintree in the county of Essex, clothier, deceased, residing in New England. It states that Grace Tyres [Tyers] died about the fifteenth day of March one thousand six hundred ninety and six [1696]. It was among other things ordered and decreed that the said Estate of the said Joseph Marsh (brother of Grace), the Testator, should be forthwith sold to the best purchaser and the money arising by sale thereof should be paid [and] divided among the plaintiffs. On 5th December, 1700, in the same (court) it is mentioned that Jonathan Boulter has bid more than any other person who offered to purchase the said premises, it was thereupon ordered by the said court that the said Jonathan Boulter should be the purchaser of the same for the sum of one hundred and seventy one pounds, and that upon payment thereof Marsh [the trustees of the estate of Joseph Marsh] should convey the said premises unto the said Jonathan Boulter and the said Jonathan Boulter and his heirs should pay unto each of the nephews and nieces of the testator that were in England their several proportions of the said purchase money, and the residue thereof unto such of the said testators other nephews and nieces as were overseas; and that the said Jonathan Boulter and his heirs should hold and enjoy the said premises and be in quiet possession of them by the authority of this.
And whereas we, whose hands and seals are hereunto set and subscribed, are credibly informed that Jonathan Boulter of the parish of St. Mary Magdalene Bermondsey in the county of Surrey Distiller hath actually purchased the said Estate pursuant to the said decree for the sum of one hundred and seventy one pounds of lawful money of England and hath paid to said executor and such of the said legatees and relatives of said Testator as do reside in old England their seven shares and proportion thereof, being six pounds two shillings eleven pence and one farthing apiece

Now know that we the said John Marsh, Samuel Marsh, Jonathan Marsh, Daniel Marsh, Hannah Marsh, Lydia Marsh and Grace Phelps, have nominated and appointed in our stead our trusty friends Joseph Merriam, formerly of Boston in New England, gent., now residing in London and Allyn Buckham of the Parish of St. Johns, Wapping, Distiller, our two lawful and irrevocable attorneys to ask, demand, receive and take of the said Jonathan Boulter, our several respective shares of the said purchase

Thus to summarize and conclude, Joseph Marsh’s will was made on 22nd May, 1676; that under it Grace (Marsh) Tyres held the Clay Hills property until her death which occurred on 15th March, 1696; and that on 27th June, 1700, an order was made in the Court at Westminster for the sale of this property to the highest bidder; that on 5th December, 1700, the same court decreed that Jonathan Boulter be the purchaser for £171, and that the seven heirs in England having received about $30.75 apiece, release was given to him 23rd June, 1701, and that the seven heirs in America were now, 15th May, 1705, seeking their share that would cost them more than their English cousins and if equal would only be £6. 2s. 11d. and one farthing apiece or some $215 in all. The lawyers and courts up to 1705, seem to have been nine years about it and to have taken over 20 per cent. of what they divided. (Some things never change)

These are the names of the brothers and sisters of Joseph Marsh, in the order given in his will dated 22nd May, 1676: 1. Grace Marsh m. Nathaniel Tyres [Tyers] and died on 15th March, 1696; 2. Mary Marsh m. John Shorey; 3. John Marsh, b. 1618 [died unmarried]; and 4. Lydia Marsh, m. -- Martin.
APPENDIX NINETEEN: The dispersal of Nathaniel Roffey, Snr’s Estate.

Below two auction notices that appeared in The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser on 13th May, 1765.

To Be Sold by AUCTION
By Mr. PHIPPS and SON.
At Gararway’s Coffee-house in Exchange-Alley, on Friday the 17th of May, at twelve o’clock at noon precisely, pursuant to the will of Nathaniel Roffey, Esq. deceased, in two lots.

Lot 1. A Valuable Freehold Estate, situate in Bagnio Court, Newgate-street, consisting of eight substantial brick-houses, one of which is the Royal Bagnio, lett to sundry persons at the yearly rent of 332 l.

Lot 2. A large substantial brick dwelling house, divided into two, situate in Barnaby-street, Southwark, 72 feet wide in front, together with large warehouses, yard, stables, mill-house and loft, vaults for holding spirits, with iron doors, &c. lett on lease to Mess. Freeman and Co. distillers, of which there are fourteen years unexpired, at the yearly rent of 50 l. clear of land tax. The whole premises are 160 feet deep, made very convenient for the distillery, or wool business, and are much underlett. The premises may be viewed any time to the day of sale, and further particulars, with conditions of sale, had gratis of Mr. Phipps and Son, upholsters and auctioneers, at the Ship in Leadenhall-street.

N.B. Soon will be sold the following estates of the above mentioned Nathaniel Roffey, viz. A farm called Town Court, near Chislehurst, in Kent, lett at 8 l. per annum; a farm at Shipley, near Horsham, in Sussex, lett at 23 l. per annum; a moiety of a farm near Hitchin, Hertfordshire, lett at 4 l. per annum; a farm at Braintree, in Essex, lett at 9 l. 10s per annum; a farm at Lye, near Ryegate, lett at 7 l. per annum.
To be Sold by AUCTION,
By Mr. PHIPPS and SON,
On Saturday the 18th day of May, at twelve o’clock at noon precisely, on the premises, pursuant to the will of Nathaniel Roffey, Esq; deceased.

The following Freehold Estates, in six distinct lots: A large handsome brick Dwelling-house, at Peckham, in Surrey, late in the occupation of Mrs. Mary Roffey, deceased, with convenient offices, court-yard, stabling for six horses, coach-house for three carriages, also a large pleasure and kitchen garden, walled round and planted with the choicest fruit trees; likewise a pasture field, called the Image Field, containing about four, situated behind the above-mentioned dwelling-house, let on lease to Mr. Joseph Lawrence, at the yearly rent of 8l. Likewise a field adjoining to the above, now used as gardeners ground, containing about six acres, and a public-house known by the sign of the Orange Tree, let to Mr. Shepherd, at the yearly rent of 12l. and which the said Mr. Shepherd now lets at 18l. per annum. Likewise a large handsome brick dwelling-house, with coach-house, stable-yard, and garden, situate at Peckham aforesaid, let on lease to John Brown, Esq; at the yearly rent of 44l. Likewise four small tenements, situated next adjoining to Mr. Brown’s, and let to Messrs. Nisbitt, Cockrill, Warton, and Warner, at the yearly rent of 21l. 10s. Likewise two small freehold houses, situated at Deptford-Green, near the old church, let to Messrs. Waggoner and Stubbs, at the yearly rent of 11l. 16s. Mr Brown’s house, at Peckham, may be viewed on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, from eleven o’clock till three, and the other estates any day to the time of sale; by applying to the place of sale, the late Mrs. Roffey’s at Peckham, where farther particulars, with conditions of sale, may be had, and of Mr. Phipps and Son, upholsters and auctioneers, at the Ship, in Leadenhall-street.
Among the properties left by Nathaniel Roffey, Snr. was The Royal Bagnio in Newgate Street. Contemporary writers have described the Bagnio as follows:

"A neat contrived building after the Turkish mode, seated in a large handsome yard, and at the upper end of Pincock-lane, which is indifferent well-built and inhabited. This Bagnio is much resorted unto for sweating, being found very good for aches, &c, and approved of by our Physicians."
— Strype, B. iii., p. 195.

"The Royal Bagnio, situate on the north side of Newgate-Street, is a very spacious and commodious place for sweating, hot-bathing, and cupping; they tell me it is the only true Bagnio after the Turkish model, and hath 18 degrees of heat. It was first opened Anno 1679. Here is one very spacious room with a cupola roof, besides others lesser; the walls are neatly set with Dutch tile. The charge of the house for sweating, rubbing, shaving, cupping, and bathing, is four shillings each person. There are nine servants who attend. The days for ladies, are Wednesdays and Saturdays, and for gentlemen, Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays; and to shew the healthfulness of sweating thus, here is one servant who has been near twenty-eight years and another sixteen, though four days a-week constantly attending in the heat." — Hatton's New View of London, 8vo, 1708, p. 797.
Among the Benjamin Colman Papers held by the Massachusetts Historical Society is a letter from William Roffey (London) to Benjamin Colman about his concern for the state of ‘religious indifference’ in the churches. The letter is dated 3rd March, 1736.

The reason of my sending the inlcos’d is that some time ago the Pious and Ingenious author Mrs Rowe of Frome in Somersetshire desir’d I would send one to you and I heartily wish you the same Entertainment & I hope Improvement which I have received I am no Stranger to your Character tho’ to your Person & sincerely requires that Pureity of Principles found with as correspondent Practices and so happily confined in the Gentleman I am no Friend to Biggotry Censouriousness & Uncharitableness But with Sorrow I speak it the Religion of Jesus is not only openly struck at by Infidels in our isle but its Sublime and Important Doctrines are secretly undermined by Multitudes who are _____ by his name Whose intentions seems to bringing another Gospel I need not particularly knowing you are intimately acquainted with my worthy Pastor Dr. Watts, I conclude with requesting your earnest Crys at the throne of Grace That Jesus the Almity Phisian would put an effectual stop to the Growing Contagion for should he now Come he would hardly find Faiths on the Earth from Sir your unknown Friend and Servant

William Roffey

[Received May 1736]
Mr. Roffey is a young gentleman, a distiller, in pretty good circumstances for so young a man, but our late Act of Parliament against gin & distilled liquors must sink tho’ not ruin the trade. He & his wife are both members of our church. He is truly pious, & has a taste of ingenious writing. He is very intimate with Mr Rowe, & I sent him ye packets for her & Mr Slanden, last week when I received them. He is gone that way this week himself.

Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe of Frome in Somersetshire whose work ‘Friendship in Death’ William Roffey sent to Benjamin Colman
In his letter above to Benjamin Colman, William Roffey refers to ‘my worthy Pastor Dr Watts’ who was another dissenting minister. However in a letter to Phillip Doddridge (another minister) dated 15th June, 1740, Roffey warns of Watts’s growing infirmity.

"Dear Dr. Watts is but indifferent, and I am afraid that his usefulness will be less and less. So burning and shining a light in the sanctuary, though not extinguished, yet grown dim, calls for deep humiliation."  

---

45 The Life, Times, and Correspondence of the Rev. Isaac Watts by Thomas Milner.
FROM WILLIAM ROFFEY, ESQ.  TO PHILLIP DODDRIDGE
London, June 15, 1740.

DEAR SIR, Through the unmerited bounty of an indulgent Providence, I reached my habitation in peace; and may blessings and thanks attend you for your late instructive, pious, and delightful converse at Northampton.

I have met with several inquirers as to your conduct towards Mr. Whitfield, and I fail not to inform all such persons, that you acted entirely consistently with yourself—the gentleman, affectionate Christian, and wary friend, shining with the highest lustre. Your interests, worthy Sir, lie very near my heart, and more especially as I apprehend that the cause of real religion is greatly concerned in your reputation, which, may Heaven guard, in spite of those diabolical spirits who set themselves against you. Oh may you triumph over the malignant freethinkers, who falsely arrogate to themselves that glorious title, and over those equally malicious men, of pretended infallibility, I mean the ignorant, proud, pharisaic, bigoted Antinomians, who lately sent their missionary Hill to disturb the peace of the churches in your parts.

Mrs. Roffey's and my own most sincere and affectionate service wait on Mrs. Doddridge; the first moment I saw her, I could not but wish her happiness most tenderly; for a radiance of soul shines through the mortal clay, which must needs powerfully strike the mind: may you ascend to Heaven together; but in compassion to the degenerate age, may your flight be long retarded.

However changeable I may be in my judgment as to persons and things, my strong attachment to you and yours can never be lessened. I know of but one failing in you, and that is, that you do not plainly tell me of my faults; reproof would come sweetly from you. Dear Dr. Watts is but indifferent, and I am afraid that his usefulness will be less and less. So burning and shining a light in the sanctuary, though not extinguished, yet grown dim, calls for deep humiliation; Oh then let us unite our requests that more labourers may be sent into the harvest, of catholic spirit, and of pure and undissembled Christianity. It revives my spirits whenever I think of the truly noble designs you are continually executing, in relation to the gentlemen under your care: may the pleasure of the Lord every way prosper in your hands. I bless God we all continue well, as I hope this will find you and your little olive branches.

I am, dear Sir, Your most affectionate and obedient Servant, W. Roffey.

There are some references to the Roffey family in letters Doddridge wrote to his wife, such as the following:46

---

46 *The Correspondence and Diary of Philip Doddridge, D. D.* by Philip Doddridge.
I begin my travels on Wednesday. Would you were to perform them with me. First I go to good Dr. Miles, at Tooting; then to [...] the next day to Croydon, where good Mrs. Roffey will meet me on horseback to, convey me to her house. Thence I am to go to Maidenhead the next day, in a manner which Mr. Roffey's kindness will make very easy ... In the meantime, if you write to me by the next post after you receive this, or by Thursday's, direct to me at Mr. Roffey's; for there I lie on Saturday night.

P S. Mr. Roffey has made a recantation of the verses for which you chide him; and if you can get your confinement over by next long vacation, he will take you down with his lady to Chatsworth, the Peake, &c.

William’s enthusiasm for Doddridge was not always reflected in Doddridge’s for William. In a letter to his wife Doddridge remarks on the fashion warn by Mary (Welden) Roffey:

TO MRS. DODDRIDGE.

My Deares, 27th July, 1749.

Poor Mrs. Roffey looked dreadfully, in consequence of the abominable manner of dressing the head, which some evil demon has introduced to destroy the works of God. The foremost plait of the fly cap is nearer the back of the head than the forehead; the hair on the forehead and sides of the face is all combed up straight, and that behind is tucked up under the cap; and the wings of the fly are pinned back, and stand up, that it may seem as if the wind had blown the cap off, or at least turned it quite back; and poor Miss Roffey was in the same monkey form. May you, my dear, and my sweet girls, be preserved from the detestable fashion, though all the rest of your sex should be corrupted with it.

Another dissenting-minister connection to William Roffey comes through the marriage of William Gouge to Sarah Welden. Sarah’s brother James Welden married Sarah Boulter the sister of Jonathan who married Sarah Cradock. William Roffey’s mother was Mary the daughter of James and Sarah (Boulter) Welden.

William Gouge placed a memorial in Hammersmith church which we have already referred to and which lists his wife Sarah (Welden), Sarah (Roffey) Cowley, the daughter of William Roffey, and William Roffey. William Gouge was the great grandson of William Gouge (1578-1653) and the grandson of Thomas Gouge (1609-1681).
GOUGE, William (1578-1653). A Puritan divine. He was born at Stratford-le-Bow, Middlesex, Dec. 25, 1578; was educated at Eton and Cambridge; became preacher at St. Anne's, Blackfriars, London, in 1608, and continued there till his death, Dec. 12, 1653. He was one of the leading members of the Presbyterian party in England, sat in the Westminster Assembly, and was prolocutor of the first provincial assembly of London in 1647. At college the strictness of his life gained him the name of the "arch Puritan," and later he was known as the "Father of the London Ministers." As a writer, he is best known by his elaborate Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (1655), to which is prefixed a life by Thomas Gouge.

GOUGE, Thomas (1609-81). A nonconformist divine and philanthropist, born in London, Sept. 29, 1609, the son of William Gouge (q.v.). He was educated at Eton and Cambridge, and was vicar of St. Sepulchre's, London (1638-62). Here he won distinction by well directed efforts to provide work for the able bodied poor. In 1662 he resigned his living because of the Uniformity Act and retired to Hammersmith. In 1672 he began making semiannual journeys to Wales for the purpose of establishing schools where English should be taught and circulating religious books. He wrote himself several works and numerous tracts, some of which were translated into Welsh. His collected works were published in London (1706).

Below the title pages of some of the publications of William and Thomas Gouge.
APPENDIX TWENTY ONE: Benjamin Tudman, Jnr. & The Marshalsea

When Benjamin Tudman Jnr.’s mother died in 1690 he was seven years old. Eighteen years later when he was twenty-five his father married Susannah (Cradock) Banner and when his father died in 1712 he was twenty-nine.

Unfortunately, Benjamin owed money and, as was often the case at the time, he was imprisoned in The Marshalsea until such time as he could discharge his debts. This usually meant a family member or friend stepping forward to offer relief. If not, then his own death would take care of his debts for him. In Benjamin’s case it was the latter means that finally saw his release from prison.

While he was incarcerated a fellow prisoner by the name of John Grano kept a diary which was published in 1998 under the title Handel’s Trumpeter: The Diary of John Grano edited by John Ginger. Grano began the diary in 1728 and finished it upon his release from The Marshalsea in 1729.

From the diary we learn that Grano and Tudman did not get along and in it Grano is full of angry denouncements of Tudman’s various affronts to him. As a result, we have perhaps one of the more detailed accounts of any one of the lives of those mentioned in this paper. However, because the description of Tudman is penned by someone who detested him, the picture we have of him is not at all flattering.

In came a young fellow of this profane college [The Marshalsea] to let me know that Capt. Tudman wanted to speak with me, but knowing his infamous character some time ago I declined to go to him.  p.29

Whenever Tudman would enter a room, Grano’s dislike of him would propel him out as the entry for 16th September, 1728, shows:

Capt. Tudman came up to Mr. Acton while he was thus talking to me, upon which I immediately took my leave.  p. 92

The diary’s editor comments that: It seems that Tudman had joined a class of inmates who were perpetual residents with no family or friend willing to rescue them.  p. 167.

Grano continues his diary:
30th January, 1729. Sent downstairs to examine how the Coals stood, being informed at a distance that People stole them not withstanding they were under lock and key, and by what I heard and could judge by guess, I thought there was very near half taken away, the which gave me a good deal of uneasiness.

2nd February. Awoke between three and four in the morn, when I heard Capt. Tudman and his Chum a wrangling in a very high manner, by which (and there being a Board loose in my Room and the Ceiling plaster broke in his) I could understand every word they said, and in the Heat of Blood as also the influence of Liquor (for they were both seemingly drunk) The Capt.’s chum told him [Tudman] that he [the chum] did not steal Mr. Grano’s coals – to which he [T] made answer how could he [T] do any such thing not having a key to my [Grano’s] padlock? The other (the chum) retorted who the devil has a turnkey and picklock in the room but himself [T] [i.e. only Tudman had the means to access Grano’s coals]. As for me (the chum), says he (the chum) every time was my turn to buy coals I sent old Hand (a Ranger or a watchman of the park ie guard) for half a bushel of Coals and gave him a half pence for bringing the same, but I [the chum] know where you [T] had yours, you Villain! What the Devil quoth the Captain (T), this old rascal [the chum] has a mind to swear my life away.

This sort of conversation lasted till about half an hour after the watchman in the Borough had cried, Past four o’Clock! And all confirming that Vile man Capt. Tudman was the person who had Robb’d me of my coals.

Later that day .... Captain Tudman sent me a Note wherein he desir’d to speak with me, but I did not go to him. p. 184.

13th February. I was not out of bed before Mr. Tudman, approaching to my bed, desired to know what I meant by aspersing his character in reporting he stole my coals, to which I replied I never reported no more than what his chum (pointing to him) had informed me – which put the old fellow (the chum) much to the blue; but Mr. Tudman did not resent the same as he ought. However I was quite easy about the affair: made a shift to get up while Harry Glover came to me to let me know there was a gentleman in the Lodge who wanted to speak with me. While I was preparing to go Mr. Tudman sputtered and spoke more like Porter than the fine Gentleman he pretends to be, for he did nothing but swear, curse and “You lie like a rascal... etc. “ When I came into my Room again everybody but Mr. Purcell was gone. I was sorry they were, being I should have made an end to the affair somehow or other which now is at sixes and sevens. pp. 190-191.

21st March. A little before locking up there was, and has been a custom for some time past, a great deal of noise in the room over me and a sort of tongue quarrel between Capt. Tudman and Mr. Smith, the former very much in the wrong. p. 207.
22\textsuperscript{nd} March. Before I went to Breakfast Mr. Smith came to borrow my sword saying he could not avoid challenging him [Tudman] for the proceeding night’s insult – which I readily granted knowing by experience the Noble Capt. would not fight and, as I conjectured coming to me about three hours after, Mr. Smith informed me he had sent to him [Tudman] but he would not appear, and had him [Tudman] cried about the place, but he hid himself. p.207.

Other terms used by Grano to describe Tudman and others like him include ‘scandalous’ and a ‘very great scoundrel’.

10\textsuperscript{th} June. I found a good many of my neighbors a dancing and Mrs. Smith being with them and Capt. Tudman not there I went up and staid till 5 in the morning. p. 266

However toward the end of his stay at The Marshalsea Grano’s dislike of Tudman had softened and the two were on much friendlier terms.

24\textsuperscript{th} August. I soon sent for another Person [i.e. Tudman] who sometime ago did offend me very much but, having forgiven the same, made him drink a glass [of wine]. The last person, namely Capt. Tudman away [left the room] as they were locking up. p. 313.

The last reference to Benjamin in Grano’s diary is: A bowl of punch in Capt. T’s room.

Benjamin married Barbara Crawford although so far no marriage has been located and they had a daughter Penelope who was baptised on 19\textsuperscript{th} February, 1711/12 at St. Marylebone.
Benjamin Tudman died at the end of November, 1730, while still a prisoner of The Marshalsea and was buried in the churchyard at St. George the Martyr, Southwark, located a few hundred yards south of the prison, on 3rd December, 1730, aged 48. (last line below)

His wife’s sister was called Hetty Crawford.

According to the editor of Grano’s diary, before entering The Marshalsea, Tudman had been a Lieutenant in the Third Dragoon Guards until about 1717 and had served under the Duke of Marlborough at the Battle of Oudenarde. He was imprisoned in The Marshalsea in May, 1725, owing £145. His dependents lived nearby on the south side of Mint Street. Considering his sister Margaret married Samuel Child the son of one of the richest men in England (Sir Francis Child) it seems odd that not even family ties would help.

Below, Benjamin’s will dated 13th November, 1730:
In the Name of God Amen I Captain Benjamin Tudman now a Prisoner in the Marshalsea Prison in Southwark being sick in body but of sound and disposing mind memory and judgment do make and constitute this my last Will and Testament in manner and form following hereby revoking and disannulling all and every Will or Wills by me at any time heretofore made or done Imprimus I leave and bequeath unto my dearly beloved Wife Barbara Tudman for her sole benefit and use all my estate real and personal my goods Chattells of what nature or find soever I am now possessed of or instituted unto either in Law or Equity Lastly I nominate and appoint my said beloved Wife Barbara Tudman the sole Executrix of this my said Will and Testament In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal this thirteenth day of November on thousand seven hundred and thirty 1730 Benjamin Tudman Witnessed by Thomas Earle, Thomas Baldwin, Hugo Monro.
APPENDIX TWENTY TWO: Ann Balchen & The Marshalsea

The Balchen family had its own brush with The Marshalsea in the form of Mary Man and Elizabeth Cumberland’s younger sister Ann (Nancy) Balchen. Ann was born on 29th January, 1728, and baptized on 23rd February, 1728, at St. Mary Aldermanbury. She was thus ten years younger than her sisters.

In The Cumberland Letters, Clementina Black surmises this about Nancy:

Ann Balchen was the sister of Mrs. Cumberland [and Mrs. Man], whom, from the circumstance that her nephews always spoke of her as "Nancy" I surmise to have been considerably younger. p.42

Clementina is correct in her surmise and she goes on:

She [Nancy] was evidently an ungovernable person, and had, I believe, been imprisoned for debt. She may possibly have been suffering from one of those obscure brain diseases which lead to violent and irresponsible conduct. p. 42

Nancy gave birth to three illegitimate sons who were placed in the care of The Foundling Hospital. Two were twins born in 1750 whom she named after her brothers in law George (Cumberland) and John (Man). They were registered as number 602 and 621 by Thomas Coram the founder of the hospital and they were both baptized on 17th June 1750 (see the third to last entry on the left hand page below for George and the last entry on the right hand page for John). Another illegitimate son of Nancy’s, Isaac, was also baptised at the Foundling Hospital on 25th October, 1747 (IGI C067701). Their subsequent history is not known.
Baptisms of George and John Balchen at The Foundling Hospital

Above The Foundling Hospital established by Captain Thomas Coram (left) who registered Nancy’s illegitimate twins George and John Balchen

It would appear that Nancy received an annuity from rent derived from a house which was distributed to her by a friend of the family’s known in The Cumberland Letters only as Mr. Tapp. This annuity was paid out twice a year, at Michaelmas (29th September) and in the summer and each payment should have been enough to tie Nancy over until the
next, but given her unruly character, such was not the case.

In May, 1773, George Cumberland writes:

I am shocked to hear what a miserable situation Nancy has reduced herself to by Her Folly & Imprudence, tho’ it is no worse than what every Body who knew Her expected. I think however something should be done for Her at least to prevent Her being driven thro real Want to bring further Disgrace on Herself & Family. p. 43

On 18th July, 1774, George informed his mother that her sister:

Nancy (I should have said Miss) has paid Mr. Tapp another visit lately, she asserted so many lies before his Customers and vented so much abuse, because he would not pay her beforehand, that he was obliged to turn her out of doors. p. 63

In a letter to his brother Richard written on 6th June, 1777, George adds a terse postscript:

Nancy is going to Prison for £4 again. p. 135

On 25th September, 1777, Elizabeth (Balchen) Cumberland wrote to her son George:

The News of Nancy’s Confinement gives me great Concern and must beg you will let me have the pleasure of hearing she is Released as I think there will be half a year due upon the House at Michaelmas. p. 150
The effect that Nancy had on George Cumberland was surprisingly profound in a very unhappy way as the letters extracted by Clementina Black on this topic indicate. He appears to have wished to have nothing to do with his mad aunt and in particular to have kept his place of employment a secret from her. However this attempt to evade Nancy appears to have been threatened by someone who visits George in October, 1777. From a letter that George wrote to his brother on 2nd October, 1777, we learn of George’s reaction to his visitor and how peculiarly apprehensive he is at the idea of being discovered by his manic aunt.

The person who comes to visit George is also called George and so to avoid confusion we shall call him George X (GX). George Cumberland we will call GC and Mr. Tapp (T). The identity of George X is a mystery.

About an hour ago he [Mr. Tapp] sent George [GX], who had been with him [T] to receive Nancy's annuity, to my office to ask charity of me [GC] for her [Nancy], telling him [GX], as he [GX] tells me [GC], "that he [T] knew of none in the family who would grant her [Nancy] any assistance, unless it were George Cumberland who he [T] believed if applied to would help her."

I [GC] am sorry to say that this one action [of Mr. Tapp sending GX to speak to GC about Nancy], so malicious, so mean and unworthy of any man, even to a person that had offended him, has in one moment given me the most disadvantageous opinion of a person [Tapp] whom I had before thought incapable of such a thing. He [Tapp] well
must remember, for it was our conversation the last time I was at his house, the uneasyness I expressed at the thought of her [Nancy] discovering me [GC] and then he [Tapp] in a joking manner, said he [Tapp] would send her [Nancy] to me [GC]. He (T) has now seriously as good as fulfilled his promise for George [GX] in all likelihood will some time or other inform her [Nancy], or his wife [GX’s wife], and in that case, my life will become really unhappy, as I shall go [about] my business full of apprehension. Is not this a glorious and friendly act? When he [GX] first addressed himself to me I denied having any such relation and wanted to persuade him [GX] he had mistaken the person but he soon convinced me he was not to be put off, by telling me who he came from [i.e. Tapp’s office]. In the greatest confusion imaginable I had nothing to do but to tell him I had not seen the unhappy wretch [Nancy] a great many years, and had determined not to own her, and therefore begged he would not trouble me about her, as I was determined to do nothing. He entirely agreed that what I said was very reasonable, said that he out of compassion for her [Nancy’s] distress (of which *tis possible he might be a cause), had taken her out of Prison [The Marshalsea], and given his joint note with hers, to pay her debt at £1 1s per quarter for 7 Qrs that he had taken her home where she lay on his chairs, being so dirty as not to be fit to go into a bed, that instead of thanking him, "she had, according to her wont, been abusive to him and his family," and had kicked up several rows, however as he had known something of her he was willing if possible to take care of her provided she had some clothes to wear. I considered some time, and at last came to a resolution to give him one guinea, for the following reasons, tho’ I could ill spare it at the same time making him [GX] promise never to say to any one that he had got anything from me, but to lay it out in coarse clothing for her use as if of his own accord and by no means to let her know where I was or mention my name. I considered that if I sent him away without any thing he [GX] might possibly be induced to send her to me, out of revenge for having lost his labour, that if it was properly applied (which he desired me to call and see done) it would be a means of really assisting her, if such a thing can be done and if he put the money in his own pocket (which I since hope he will) that will effectually prevent his sending her where she may be informed of the cheat.

But none of these expectations can render me quite easy. It will lay a dead weight on those spirits which lately had been quite lightened, and serve often to depress a person but too much "alive to fame". If she comes I shall not dare to stay, or fly, if I retreat she will stay and abuse me and family, to people who will perhaps half believe her, or listen for diversion, if I converse with her the Evil will be equal either way. I shall never be able to hold up my head again such a crime it is to have an infamous relation I cannot bear the thought of it. I have [ ] great inclination to write to him [Tapp], to entreat [him of what] offence [I had] given to be so persecuted, and wherein he has been cavalier [ ] but as I should choose to write on my guard, I shall defer it till to-morrow when if I am in the same mind, I think I can make him feel wrong, and satisfy him that, though I know when to be silent, I am neither a Stock or a Stone, and can defend myself when ill-treated. I know how cautious I ought to be in the matter, and that I ought to keep a copy for it is not unlikely that if I let fall any word that could be misconstrued JB [John Balchen, the
son of George's great uncle Henry] may take that opportunity to turn it to my
disadvantage either by telling Mr. C. [probably Richard Cropp] that I have ungratefully
offended Mr. Tapp or something of that nature to open a door to injure me for I firmly
believe J.B. [John Balchen] to be at the bottom of it all. p.153

George wrote to his brother Richard on 5th October, 1777:

As to Nancy: Mr. Tapp has ordered her shoes and stockings and some money for tea,
but she is very ungovernable, and tells Mr. Smith, she does not understand having cold
Mutton and broth, and desires to have Chicken, and Veal, which she has been always
used to. ... In the Marshalsea I find she beat all the women that came in her way, and
accompanied her blows by opprobrious expressions, but sometimes she had the worst
of it in short if she had not been released I think they would have given her her liberty to
keep the prison quiet. p. 156

According to Clementina George Cumberland learned, a few
weeks later, on ‘unimpeachable authority’, that the author
of his discomfort was not John Balchen but James Man, the
son of his aunt Mary (Balchen) Man. What advantage James
Man would have gained by this we do not know and
considering James and George kept up an amiable
 correspondence over the years and that George
was one of the beneficiaries of James’s will it seems somewhat
unlikely.

Whoever was responsible for his discomfort, some ten days
later, his nerves somewhat more settled, George responded
to a letter from his brother Richard who must have tried to
have ‘put things in perspective’.

I receive your answer to mine as a kind endeavou to make a disagreeable circumstance
appear trifling and I myself do not feel it so severely as I did at first, because like other
Uneasynesses it is not so fresh in my memory. You speak of N.B. [Nancy Balchen], as if
you knew nothing of her frenzy, her artifice, her plausibility, volubility, and other
abilities for which she is famed could I bear an office where she came? or live in a house
where she had called on me? in short you talk like a person living at Driffield, and having
no apprehension of her taking so long a Journey to annoy you. If you read my Letter you
will find I do explain why she came to beg of me, she having nothing to clothe her. The
money she had of Mr T[app] having been expended in taking her out of prison ... For my
own part I Could not think of acting in the affair, for fear of a discovery, and I knew not
who to employ or ask such a favor of. If I had it in my power to relieve her which it was
not, having myself one evening, gone to the Prison, to be informed of her situation, and
finding it would require £10.
Clementina comments that: It must be admitted that Miss Balchen was a troublesome relative, either to serve or to offend; but it does strike a twentieth-century reader that George was more discomposed than most nephews nowadays would have been by her proceedings. It is true that he knew her, and that we do not.

Clementina Black notes Nancy’s last appearance in The Cumberland Letters:

In January 1780 occurred the death in the work house of Nancy Balchen, and Richard [Dennison] Cumberland reported that his mother had been much affected by the sad end of her sister and had wept; although the event must, in one sense, have been felt as a relief by all surviving members of the family. p. 251

As no burial record for Nancy has been located, it may be that she was given a paupers funeral.
Before leaving The Marshalsea we should make a note of Mr. Tapp who is very much in evidence throughout The Cumberland Letters. In those letters the Cumberland brothers refer to him only as Mr. Tapp and no clue is given as to who he is or how he might, if at all, be connected to the Balchen or Cumberland families.

However, Mr. Tapp’s identity has been recently established. Henry Balchen, the uncle of Elizabeth (Balchen) Cumberland and Mary (Balchen) Man, first married a Mary Holford at St. Peter's, Roydon in Essex, in 1729 (see chart).

Mary (Holford) Balchen's father was Robert Holford and her mother was a Mary Tapp (see chart). The marriage between Robert Holford and Mary Tapp took place on 30th January, 1703 (last line), at All Hallows, London Wall.

Mary (Holford) Balchen, the daughter of Robert and Mary (Tapp) Holford, was baptised on 29th April, 1704, at St. Botolph without Aldgate. She died in January 1742/43 at Mansell Street, Goodman’s Field, and was buried at St. Mary, Whitechapel (last line). The number 38 refers to her age.
Mary (Holford) Balchen’s uncle (her mother’s brother) was William Tapp of Roydon in Essex and his son was William Tapp and he is the Mr. Tapp who appears frequently in *The Cumberland Letters*.

On a list of apprentices (last line) in the year 1737 Henry Balchen appears as a Draper located in the City (of London) and whose apprentice is Will son of Will Tapp of Roydon in Essex. In other words, Henry is the master of his wife’s first cousin.

On a later apprentice list dated 29th July, 1761, Will Tapp is the master and the apprentice is John Balchen (1745-1785). This Balchen was probably the son of Henry by his second wife Mary Scott.

Thus for two generations the Balchens and the Tapps were master and apprentice, their roles reversing from one generation to the next.

The senior William Tapp, Gentleman of Roydon, made his will on 6th November, 1732, and appoints as his executors his brother in law Richard O’Neale and his esteemed friend Henry Balchen. They are given the governance and
guardianship of his only child William. Probate was granted in February, 1733.

William Tapp’s brother in law Richard O’Neale, Pewterer and Citizen of London, had a daughter Sarah who married William Balchen, the nephew of Henry Balchen shown above. (see also the Balchen family tree)

William Tapp, Jnr. (the Mr. Tapp of The Cumberland Letters) married Hannah Claveley on 28th November, 1743, at St. Mary Magdalene, Old Fish Street.

William died in December, 1786, and was buried on 21st December at St. Matthew, Bethnal Green.

William Tapp, Jnr., Linen Draper of Friday Street in London made his will on 6th December, 1780. He appears not to have had children naming only his wife Hannah (née Claveley) as the sole beneficiary of his estate. He appoints his good friends John Balchen [son of Henry] of Milk Street and Charles de Last(?) of Hertfordshire as his executors. However, John Balchen died before William, on 9th January, 1785, and in his place William appoints his wife as joint executor with Charles. Both she and Charles de Last died before either could administer William’s will and it was not until 1813 that administration was given to a Sarah Bailey.
As noted, William Balchen the nephew of the above Henry married Sarah O’Neale, the daughter of Richard whose sister married William Tapp Snr.

According to William Balchen’s will, Sarah his wife had property in Roydon in Essex over which a court case ensued entitled Read versus Cropp.

James Read (an attorney) married William's daughter Sarah (Sally) Balchen whom George Cumberland accompanied to Vauxhall Gardens (see above).

We have also noted above under Richard Long that the Cumberland brothers tutored the children of Beeston Long and his partner Henry Dawkins. Just prior to this arrangement letters were exchanged between George and his brother regarding having John Balchen son of William and Sarah (O’Neale) Balchen stay with Richard and how he would be compensated.

George in London to Richard at Driffield. 1st January, 1778.

[Mr. Tapp] said to me the other day that he should by no means think of John's being with you without paying in some way for the trouble he gave. I told him you had I was sure, no such wish, and that you would readily afford him any service in your power, without any interested motive but he rejoined that He could not by any means agree to his being with you, unless you would be paid for his board &c, and in that case, nothing he thought would be more likely to restore his health especially as John earnestly desires it. p. 163

Richard at Driffield to George in London. 5th January, 1778.

What Mr. Tapp mentioned of paying for John's Board rather vexes me, as I look upon it as a Cut of humble Pie, the natural Consequence of some late Transactions. I shall oppose accepting any thing as far as possible as I should be exceedingly glad of his Company as a Visitor but not as a Boarder for a few weeks. Mother begs you'll make her Compts to Mr and Mrs Tapp and tomorrow being his Birth Day, is determined to drink his health in a glass of his own Wine wishing him many happy returns of the Day. This as opportunity serves. p. 165
Richard Dennison Cumberland observes that when John arrived he was as stout [i.e. strong] as ever and that he frequently walked 8 or 10 Miles a Day.

However, John and his siblings did not survive long, each one dying of consumption while still young adults. In August, 1778, Richard Cumberland visited his Balchen cousins and reported to his brother George that: ‘Susan[nah] is dying indeed - but John is better - I fear for Mary’. p. 203.

Susannah (image right) died a few months after Richard’s visit in November, 1778, aged 25, and was buried on the 17th; John died in May, 1783, aged 22, and was buried on the 23rd; and Mary died in October, 1786, aged 30, and was buried on 2nd November. All burials took place at St. Mary, Whitechapel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newington Middx</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>decline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susannah Balchin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Mary Newington Butts</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>Decline.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Balchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Mary Newington Surrey</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>Consump</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Balchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX TWENTY FOUR: DAGNAMS PARK – The home of the Neave Family.

(From: http://lh.matthewbeckett.com/houses/lh_essex_dagnams.html)

In 1772 the estate of Dagnams Park and the neighbouring one, Cockerels, were sold to Sir Richard Neave, Bt. (b.1731 - d.1814 - created Baronet in 1795). He had made his fortune trading in the West Indies and the Americas and had, at various times, been chairman of the Ramsgate Harbour Trust, the West Indian Merchants and the London Dock Company, as well as a director of the Hudson’s Bay Company and was made deputy Governor of the Bank of England in 1781 and promoted to Governor in 1783; a position he held until 1785. He lived in the nearby Bower House in Havering-atte-Bower but sought to elevate himself from merchant to country gentleman.

Neave had the original Dagnams demolished, probably between 1772 and 1776 and replaced by a red-brick Georgian house nine bays wide by four deep with a curved central three-bay projection to the south front.

Neave then set about consolidating his position by instituting a land purchase policy in 1785 which his successors continued for the next 100 years, ultimately creating one of the largest estates in south Essex. Estimated at approximately 500 acres in 1772, by 1846 it extended to over approximately 1,700 acres of land in Havering and Romford, and by 1876 to 1,800 acres reaching its zenith in the early 20th century when it extended to over 2,700 acres.
As with many country houses, the end of the First World War also signalled the start of the decline and often the demolition of the English country house which was to last until the 1970s. Before WWI Dagnams employed over 40 staff, however, in 1919 the 5th Baronet, Sir Thomas Neave, sold 2,200 acres, including 1,500 acres in Romford and Havering, leaving 500 acres surrounding Dagnams.

Sir Thomas died in 1940 and the house was requisitioned and soldiers were billeted in it with the grounds used as a transport park. If this wasn’t enough to contend with, the house was severely damaged by a German V2 rocket in January 1945 which landed nearby. The explosion opened up large cracks in the walls.

The final nail in the coffin for the estate and the house was the Abercrombie report after the Second World War which recommended creating new housing estates on green field sites around the edge of London to house those who had lost their homes in the War. The aim was to build in the park but to retain the house as a community centre. London County Council compulsorily purchased Dagnams and the remaining 500 acres for £60,000 (approximately £1.6m today) in 1947.

The house might have survived this radical change but for the actions of the caretaker installed by the council. Employed at a wage of 30s per week and the use of 5 rooms for accommodation, he sought to supplement his income by promptly stealing and selling the lead from the roof. His actions earned him an 18-month prison sentence but, worse, water penetrated the building and especially the cracks left by the V2 rocket explosion. The combination of the bomb damage, the wear and tear of the soldiers, the extensive water damage, and the lack of a clear need to preserve the house sealed its fate. Dagnams was demolished in late 1950 with the demolition team taking their payment in the form of the rubble to be sold as building material. The grounds became a public park and remain so to this day.
APPENDIX TWENTY FIVE: The Dayrell, Sherrard, and Brownlow Families

As we have noted, Francis Dayrell married Elizabeth, daughter of Peter and Elizabeth (Sherrard) Whitcombe of Braxted Lodge in Essex and in turn their daughter Mary married Richard Cropp. Both Francis and Elizabeth (Whitcombe) Dayrell appear in the picture below known as 'The Belton Conversation Piece'.

The picture (circa 1725) shows John Brownlow, 1st Viscount Tyrconnel, standing next to the artist, Philipe Mercier, seated on the left. John’s brother William looks out from the right. The man holding a rope is Savile Cust. He was the half-brother of Richard Cust who married Ann Brownlow, the sister of John Brownlow, 1st Viscount Tyrconnel. In the middle sitting on a swing is Elizabeth (Whitcombe) Dayrell. Her husband, Francis Dayrell, stands beside Eleanor (Brownlow) Brownlow, Viscountess Tyrconnel, who is sitting in her invalid chariot with a pug dog on her lap, attended by her African servant. Eleanor (Brownlow) Brownlow and Elizabeth (Whitcombe) Dayrell were first cousins. Eleanor was also the third cousin of her husband John Brownlow. Francis Dayrell was the executor of Eleanor Brownlow’s sister Alice’s will. Alice was the wife of Francis North, 2nd Baron Guildford (see chart).

Elizabeth (Whitcombe) Dayrell, the mother of Mary who married Richard Cropp, has an interesting family. Her father, Peter Whitcombe, married Elizabeth Sherrard who was the daughter of
Richard and Margaret (Dewe) Sherrard. Richard Sherrard’s parents were John Sherrard and Elizabeth Brownlow (d. 1658) (see chart). Their marriage took place in February, 1614, at St. Andrews, Holborn, and which is not recorded in the genealogies. Sherrard is sometimes spelled Sherard.

Richard Sherrard, son of John and Elizabeth (Brownlow) Sherrard, married Margaret, daughter of Lumley Dewe, of Bishop-Upton in Herefordshire, and they had three sons: John, Richard, and Brownlow (all successively baronets, of which the son of the 3rd (i.e. the 4th) was the last baronet) and two daughters, Elizabeth Sherrard who married Peter Whitcombe and whose daughter Elizabeth married Francis Dayrell, and Alice (1659-1721), who married her second cousin Sir John Brownlow (1659-1697) (see chart).

John and Alice (Sherrard) Brownlow had four daughters:

1. Elizabeth (1681-1723), who was married to John Cecil Sixth Earl of Exeter. He was a member of the House of Commons for Rutlandshire, in 1695 and 1698, when he was Lord Burleigh. He took his seat in the Upper House, on the death of his
father, in 1701; after which he was appointed, on 11\textsuperscript{th} December, 1712, lord lieutenant of the county he had before represented in parliament. The earl died on 24\textsuperscript{th} December, 1721, and was buried with his ancestors, at Stamford. He first married Arabella, daughter of John Bennet, Lord Ossalston, who died without issue, in August, 1698. He then married Elizabeth, eldest daughter and co-heir of Sir John Brownlow, of Belton in Lincolnshire. The children of this marriage were five sons and one daughter: John and Brownlow, the two eldest sons, became, successively, the seventh and eighth earls of Exeter.

2. Alice (1684–1727) who married Francis North, second Baron Guilford (1673–1729). Francis’s cousin Dudley North was the father of Mary North who married Charles Long, Jnr.

Eleanor (1691-1730) married her third cousin Sir John Brownlow 1\textsuperscript{st} Viscount Tyrconnel, son of William Brownlow and Dorothy Mason (see chart). Eleanor is shown in the 'Belton Conversation' (above) seated in an invalid's chair. Her husband is shown on the left of the picture standing next to the artist. There was no issue.
John Brownlow’s mother Dorothy (Mason) Brownlow (1664 - circa 1700) and father Sir William Brownlow are shown below.

Above we have listed the marriages of the four daughters of Alice Sherrard who married John Brownlow. Alice’s sister, the second daughter of Richard and Margaret (Dewe) Sherrard, Elizabeth, married Peter Whitcombe of Braxted in Essex. Peter and Elizabeth (Sherrard) Whitcombe were the parents of Elizabeth Whitcombe who married Francis Dayrell and whose daughter Mary Dayrell married Richard Cropp.

The first two sons of Richard and Margaret (Dewe) Sherrard: John 1st Bart. (Abt. 1662-1725) and Richard 2nd Bart. (Abt. 1665-1730) did not produce heirs. Richard’s death announcement is below.
Sir Richard Sherrard of Lobthorpe in Lincolnshire, Bart. He died a Batchelor at Paddington; so that the Dignity and Estate devolve on his Brother, now Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart. one of the Gentlemen-Ushers of the Privy Chamber.

13th June, 1730

The third son, Brownlow Sherrard, 3rd Bart., (1667-1735), brother of John and Richard, married Dame Mary Anderson, widow of Sir Richard Anderson, and daughter of John Methuen who was chancellor of Ireland, and sister to Sir Paul Methuen (c. 1672 – 1757). Brownlow’s Methuen-in-laws are shown below.

Unfortunately for his wife, Brownlow Sherrard was an unpleasant individual who on occasion beat and imprisoned her. The following passage is from ‘At the Limits of Liberty: Married Women and Confinement in Eighteenth-Century England’ by Elizabeth Foyster in Continuity and Change. Vol. 17 (1), 2002, pp. 39-62.
Brownlow Sherard had similar intentions to those of Peter MacKenzie (i.e. he wanted to have control over his wife’s finances) when he visited Claudius Gillart, the keeper of a private madhouse near Shoreditch, in July 1705. He told the madhouse keeper that he had a wife ‘that was very much out of order and was very extravagant and could not govern herself or her affairs’, and that he believed that ‘three months restraint might be of service to her’. He requested a ‘convenient handsome’ room for his wife ‘because she was a person of fashion’, and requested that he might also have a room in the house, so that he might deal with any visitors that she might have. Even as he was confining his wife to a madhouse, Sherard was concerned that others would remember and respect his social status.

At the root of many of these cases of marriage breakdown were disputes over the wife’s separate property. Mary Sherard, who had been a widow before she married Brownlow, told the church courts how, prior to his attempt to confine her in a madhouse, her husband had repeatedly beaten her to make her sign over her jointure to him.

Mary’s mistreatment at the hands of her husband was originally described in some detail by Randolph Trumbach in *Sex and the Gender Revolution: Heterosexuality and the Third Gender*. pp. 356-357.

After the marriage he began to beat Mary in an attempt to force her to sign over her jointure. He locked her in her dressing room, pinched and kicked her, and held a sword over her head and a pistol to her breast. She eventually signed the deed as well as a statement that he was a good husband and she a devil. He once threatened to murder her if she would not deny that they were married because he said the he abhorred the thought of a wife. He beat her because he said he did not like her looks. He dragged her down two pairs of stairs and threw her out of the house because she had said that the neck-cloth he wore that day was made of muslin. When she asked him not to let a prostitute into their house, he beat her for two hours. He mistreated her during her pregnancies and after childbirth. He pulled her out of bed after their first child was born, called it a bastard, and threatened to kill it. During her second pregnancy he struck her in her belly with a wooden window bar. While the child was being delivered he pretended to go away to sea. He left her no money and took out an advertisement not to give her credit. Finally after five years of marriage Sherrard and his brother Richard tried to force her into a madhouse, at which point she sued for divorce. (The original source for this is at The London Metropolitan Archives: GLRO: DL/C/151, fols. 240-245)
Elizabeth (Sherrard) Whitcombe whose daughter Mary married Francis Dayrell and who was the grandmother of Mary Dayrell who married Richard Cropp. Elizabeth was also the sister of Brownlow Sherrard (right).

The surviving child of this unhappy marriage was Sir Brownlow Sherrard 4\textsuperscript{th} and last Bart. (abt. 1702–1748). On 10\textsuperscript{th} October, 1727, the nasty 3\textsuperscript{rd} Bart was appointed Gentleman-Usher to the King.

\begin{verse}
Whitehall, October 10.
John Anderson, Brownlow Sherrard, and Joseph Ashley, Esqrs. are sworn Gentlemen Ushers of His Majesty's Privy-Chamber.
\end{verse}

\begin{verse}
Brownlow Sherrard, Esq; Brother to Sir Richard Sherrard, Bart. has resign'd his place of Gentleman-Usher of his Majesty's Privy-Chamber to Capt. Robert Hemington, one of the Grooms of the Privy Chamber.
29\textsuperscript{th} February, 1729.
\end{verse}

\begin{verse}
Sir Brownlow Sherrard hath charitably subscribed 100l. per Annum towards maintaining the New Infirmary at Hyde-Park: Many other Persons of Quality and Distinction have largely contributed to the said pious Undertaking...
\end{verse}

Sir Brownlow Sherrard, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Bart. (1667–1735) who was the father of the last male Sherrard and who beat his wife (image from BBC web site)
Undertaking.
5th January, 1734.

Five months before dying on 30th January, 1735, the newspapers began running a series of short speculative pieces reporting on Brownlow’s slow demise.

Yesterday Sir Brownlow Sherard, Bart. lay dangerously ill at Guildford in Surrey.
15th September, 1735.

Last Night Sir Brownlow Sherrad, Bart. lay dangerously ill at his House in Cork-street, Burlington Gardens.
30th October, 1735.

The Report of Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart. being dead, is without Foundation.
22nd December, 1735.

There are some Hopes that Sir Brownlow Sherrard Bart. will recover his Indisposition.
22nd December, 1735.

'Tis said that Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart. who for some time past has been dangerously ill, is likely to recover.
29th December, 1735.

Jan. 30. At his House near Hanover-square Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart.
5th February, 1736.

Brownlow Sherrard, 3rd Bart., on his decease on 30th January, 1735, was succeeded by his son Brownlow, 4th Bart. Brownlow married Mary Sidney, the eldest daughter of Thomas Sidney, of Ranworth in Norfolk, and granddaughter of Robert, 4th Earl of Leicester, (by Elizabeth, the daughter of John, Duke of Bridgewater). Mary’s father, Thomas Sidney, was the only son of the 4th Earl to have married but he produced only daughters and he died in his elder brothers’ lifetimes. Mary (Sidney) Sherrard was the niece successively of the 5th, 6th, and 7th (and last) Earls of Leicester. She was also the great great aunt of the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley.

Below left a bookplate showing Sir Philip Sidney beneath which is written 'In the Collection of Sir Brownlow Sherrard Bart.' Right is Sir Brownlow Sherrard painted by George Knapton in 1746. Knapton painted a series of portraits of the members of
the Society of Dilettantes of which this of Brownlow is one. He also drew Mary Sidney “... whole-length, in white satin, seated on a sofa of rich yellow damask in frame of richly carved open work.” Where this painting is located today has not been determined.

The papers at the time were much taken with the events leading up to the marriage between Brownlow Sherrard and Lady Mary Sidney:

7th April, 1737
The same Day Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart. set out, with a very handsome Retinue, for Leicestershire, in order to espouse Miss Sidney, Neice to the Right Hon. the Earl of Leicester.

19th February, 1738
A Treaty of Marriage is on Foot, and will speedily be consummated, between Sir Brownlow Sherrad, of Lobthorp in the County of Lincoln, Bart. possess'd of an Estate of 5000 l. per Annum, and Nephew to Sir Paul Methuen, and the Lady Philoclea Sidney, Niece of the Earl of Leicester, a most accomplish'd Lady, an Heiress of 30,000l.

16th July, 1738
Sunday the Right Hon. the Earl of Leicester, with his Niece Miss Sidney, and Sir Brownlow Sherard, Bart. set out with three Coaches and Six, and a grand Retinue, for the Seat of the Lord North and Guilford at Epsom, there to solemnize the Marriage of Sir Brownlow Sherard with Miss Sidney.
A few days before Brownlow Sherrard’s wedding, his steward, Richard Bates, had an unfortunate encounter with a bean shell.

Tuesday Evening Mr. Richard Bates, Steward to Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart. going down Holborn-Hill, and treading on a Bean Shell, fell, and broke one of his Legs.

The following tree and accompanying query were placed in The Gentleman’s Magazine. The tree neatly illustrates the way in which the earldom of Leicester ran out of male heirs.
Brownlow and Mary (Sidney) Sherrard had no issue and so the male line of this branch of the Sherrard family died out which is why Mary Cropp’s mother, Elizabeth (Whitcombe) Dayrell, was one of the co-heiresses (with her sister) of this last Sir Brownlow Sherrard.

The death of Brownlow at the end of November, 1748, was reported by the newspapers on 1st December and likewise that of his widow Mary (Sidney) Sherrard on 31st March, 1758.
Last Week died Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart. whose Death is much lamented by his Lady, one of the Coheiresses of the late Earl of Leicester, and by all who had the Pleasure of his Acquaintance.

1st December, 1748.

Last Tuesday Night died, at her Lodgings at Hampton-Court, the Lady Sidney Sherard, of Penshurst in the County of Kent, Niece and Coheir of the late Jocelyn Earl of Leicester, and Relict of the late Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart.

1st April, 1758.

This Morning the Corpse of the Hon. Lady Sidney Sherrard was carried from her late Dwelling-House in Dover-Street, to be interred near the Remains of her late Husband, Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart. at Northwitham in Lincolnshire. Her Ladyship was one of the Nieces of the Right Hon. Jocelyn late Earl of Leicester, deceased, but not the Aunt of Sir George Yonge, Bart. as inserted in this and other Papers by Mistake.

4th April, 1758.

With the male line of the Sherrard family dying out (along with the Sidney family) it was left to the daughters to continue the Sherrard line: Alice Sherrard, as we have seen, married her second cousin John Brownlow and they produced four daughters as noted above.

Alice’s sister Elizabeth Sherrard married Peter Whitcombe and produced two daughters: Elizabeth who married Francis Dayrell and Mary who married Thomas Paget. It is this last marriage that we will note briefly here.

Thomas Paget was the son of Henry Paget and grandson of William Paget 5th Lord Paget of Beaudesert. Thomas and Mary (Whitcombe) Paget had a daughter Caroline who married Sir Nicholas Bayly. Nicholas and Caroline (Paget) Bayly had a son Henry Paget Bayly who became the 1st Earl of Uxbridge and his son was William 1st Marquis of Anglesey (see chart).
Brigadier-General Thomas Paget who married Mary Whitcombe and father of Caroline

Caroline Paget, daughter of Thomas, and who married Nicholas Bayly

Nichols Bayly who married Caroline Paget (d. 1782)

Left Beaudesert, home of the Paget family and right William Bayly Paget (1506-1563) progenitor of the Paget family
Below Richard Brownlow (1553-1638), Protonotary of the Court of Common Pleas and the progenitor of all those Brownlows found on the chart below as well as marriages into at least five families of earls or dukes, e.g. Guildford, Uxbridge, Exeter, Ancaster, and Brownlow.
Sir John Brownlow (1594-1679)

Alice Pulteney, Lady Brownlow (1604-1676)

Belton House
Sir John Shirley whose daughter Jane was the mother of Elizabeth Freke

Elizabeth Freke who married Richard Brownlow, the younger

Richard Brownlow, the elder (1553-1638)

John Cust (1718-1770) Speaker of the House of Common who married Etheldred Payne
This Cust family group painting shows the widowed Anne Brownlow, Lady Cust, and her children in 1741. She and Sir Richard Cust had nine children, none of whom had children themselves except one – Sir John Cust (see chart above). Those represented here are, from left to right, Francis Cockayne Cust, MP, KC (1722-91); Captain William Cust, RN (1720-48), pointing at a map of a naval engagement; Jane Cust, subsequently Mrs. Fane, then Mrs. Evelyn (1725-90); Peregrine Cust, MP, DCL (1723-85); Savile Cockayne Cust (1698-1772) with dog. He was not the son of Anne (Brownlow) Cust but the much younger half-brother of Lady Anne’s husband Richard Cust and thus ‘half-uncle’ to the her children. Savile also appears in the Belton Conversation piece. Rev. Richard Cust, DD (1728-83); Sir John Cust, 3rd Bart, Speaker of the House of Commons (1718-70); his mother Anne Brownlow, Lady Cust (1694-1779); Lucy Cockayne Cust (1732-1804); Elizabeth Cust (1724-69); Dorothy Cust (1729-70). Sir John holds a miniature of Etheldred Payne (1720-75) whom he would marry in 1743. Hanging on the wall is a portrait of an unidentified (deceased?) boy. Sir John’s grandson (John Cust (1779-1853)) married Sophia Hume whose sister Amelia married Charles Long Baron Farnborough.
Etheldred Payne, the second wife of Sir John Cust and her son Brownlow Cust

Jocosa Katerina Drury, Lady Cust (1748/9-1772) and her niece Lady Caroline Hobart later Lady Suffield (d. 1850). Jocosa was the first wife of Sir John Cust

Frances Bankes, wife of Brownlow Cust and her son John Cust

Brownlow Cust (1744-1808) father of John Cust 1st Earl Brownlow

John Cust 1st Earl Brownlow who married Sophia Hume, Charles Long’s sister in law
APPENDIX TWENTY SIX: THE DAYRELL FAMILY

Above we have looked at the family of Elizabeth Whitcombe who married Francis Dayrell and who was the mother of Mary Dayrell who married Susannah (Cradock) Banner’s grandson Richard Cropp. Below we look at the Dayrell family.

We begin our short history of the Dayrell family, based on A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Commoners of Great Britain ..., Volume 2, with:

Francis Dayrell. He married Barbara Powell but he pre-deceased her and she went on to marry Eusebius Andrew and after his death Edward Hinde/Hynde of Maddingley. She died in 1667 in the 89th year of her age. Her memorial appears below. Francis and Barbara (Powell) Dayrell had a son -:
Also in the Chancel of the sd church of Castle Camps lyes interr'd the body of BARBARA Lady HINDE Daughter of ANTHONY POWELL als HERBERT Esr first ye wife of FRANCIS DAYRELL Esqr to whom she bare ye Sd Sr Thomas Dayrell & also Susanna afterwards wife of THOMAS WYNNE Esr. Her 2d husband was EUSEBIUS ANDREW of Edmonton Com Middx Esq (father of Coll EUSEBIUS ANDREW who was Beheaded Augs. ye 22d 1650) by whom she had issue Katherine afterwards Married to Sir JOHN LENTHALL of Burford in ye County of Oxford Kt who died Ano 1691 in ye 72d year of her Age & was buried near her Husband in the Parish Church of Besilslee in the County of Berks. Her 3d Husband was Sir EDWARD HINDE of Madlingly in this County Kt whom she survived many years & died Ao Do 1667 in ye 89th year of her Age.

Patri Optimo et Charismo Officicio pietatis et memore ergo
Hoc Monumentum
Posuit
M. D.

Sir Thomas Dayrell (son of Francis and Barbara (Powell) Dayrell) resided at Shudy Camps, in Cambridgeshire. Of Sir Thomas it is recorded on his monumental inscription that:

"... he was eminent for his loyalty and services to their Majesties Charles I. and II. in the Civil Wars; was universally esteemed for his great learning, and beloved of all who knew him, and particularly by the county of Cambridge, where, in his old age, he served in the quality of deputy lieut. and justice of the peace to the time of his death. In his younger years, he was of Lincoln's Inn where from the comeliness of his person, he was chosen, by the consent of the four inns of courwt, to command that grand masque (in which many gentlemen of eminent note and quality in the succeeding times had their several parts) that was represented before their Majesties the King and Queen, in the banqueting house, at Whitehall, on Candlemas night, in the year 1663, and a second
time, by special direction from their Majesties to Sir Ralph Freeman, then lord-mayor of London, at Merchant Taylors' Hall, when his Majesty, as a mark of his royal favour, was pleased to confer on him [Thomas Dayrell] the honour of knighthood."

Sir Thomas Dayrell married Sarah, daughter and co-heir of Sir Hugh Windham/Wyndham of Pilsdon Court, Stilton in Dorset (image below), and had four sons: Thomas who died of smallpox in 1664; Francis (Sir); Marmaduke (Sir); Wyndham (died unmarried aged 22 of smallpox on 23rd September, 1674); and one daughter Sarah (other sources have her as Frances (see chart)).

Sarah Dayrell daughter of Thomas and Sarah (Wyndham) Dayrell married Francis Wyndham/Windum of Cromer Hall, Norfolk (only son of George) on 27th March, 1679 at St. James, Duke’s Place. Sarah Wyndham who married Francis Dayrell and Francis Wyndham who married Sarah Dayrell, the sister of Francis, were first cousins (see chart).
From this marriage are descended the Wyndhams of Cromer Hall in Norfolk. Thomas Dayrell died on 26th March, 1669, and was succeeded by his son:

**Sir Francis Dayrell**, of Shudy Camps, married on 24th February, 1671/72, Elizabeth Lewis who was a minor and since her parents were both dead her brother gave his consent to the marriage. Sir Francis died of smallpox and without issue and was succeeded by his brother Marmaduke in 1676. His widow Elizabeth married William Morgan. This second marriage of Elizabeth’s was not happy.

Margaret the mother of Elizabeth (Lewis) (Dayrell) Morgan and the widow of her father Edward Lewis of the Vann in County Glamorgan afterwards married a man by the name of Banaster and after his decease she then married Charles Stuart 3rd Duke of Richmond and 6th Duke of Lennox (1639-1672) (she died 6th January, 1667).

Francis Dayrell was succeeded by his brother Marmaduke.

The descent of the Dayrells from Francis who married Sarah Wyndham to Francis who married Elizabeth Lewis from Le Neve’s Knights is given below. (Note that Le Neve puts Marmaduke before Francis)
Sir Marmaduke Dayrell, of Shudy Camps, married first Mary, only daughter of Sir Justinian Isham, Bart., of Lamport, Nottinghamshire. Their marriage is recorded as happening on 12th November, 1678 at St. Bartholomew the Great.

Mary (Isham) Dayrell died on 5th June, 1679, of smallpox. There was no issue.
Mary Isham who was the first wife of Marmaduke Dayrell

Sir Justinian Isham father of Mary and Vere Isham

Vere Isham

“Mary and Vere, young ladies learned bey'ond their sex and years, the first in the Latin tongue, the second in Mathematicks and Algebra.”

Marmaduke married secondly, Mary, daughter and heir of William Glascock, Esq. of Farnham in Essex on 23rd February, 1681, at St. Peter Upon Cornhill.

February 23 Marmaduke Darell of Grays Inn in the County of Midlesex Esq: and Mary Glascock of Farnham in the County of Essex Licence from the ?

Below from Visitation of Essex showing Mary Glascock daughter of William.
William Glasscock married Elizabeth Shiers, daughter of George Shiers. Their daughter Mary Glasscock married Marmaduke Dayrell.

Sir Robert Shiers, his wife Elizabeth and son George (right) whose daughter Elizabeth married William Glasscock. Monument at Great Popham Church in Surrey. The male line of both the Shiers and Glasscock family became extinct.
Marmaduke and Mary (Glasscock) Dayrell had three sons (including Francis the father of Mary (Dayrell) Cropp) and two daughters. Below a monumental inscription to Francis’s father Marmaduke Dayrell who married Mary Glasscock.

In Memory of Sir MARMADUKE DAYRELL Son of Sir Thomas Dayrell of the ancient family of the DAYRELLS of Lillington Bucks; who for his Various and Eminent Services had the Honour of Knighthood conferred on him by his Majesty King JAMES the Second. His first Wife was MARY Daughter of Sir JUSTINIAN ISHAM of Lamport in the County of Northampton. He afterwards married MARY Daughter of WILLIAM GLASSOCK Esq. of Farnham in the County of Essex by whom he had issue three Sons and two Daughters his Eldest Son dying in his Life time he was Succeeded in his Estate by his second Son FRANCIS DAYRELL Esq. by whose direction in grateful remembrance of his Father this Monument is erected by his grandson MARMADUKE DAYRELL Esq.
FRANCIS DAYRELL Esq. by whose direction this Monument is Erected by his grandson. MARMADUKE DAYRELL Esq.

Below the gravestone of Sir Marmaduke Dayrell.

Under this Stone
Lyeth Interred the Body of
Sr MARMADUKE DAYRELL
Knt.
Late of SHADY-CAMPS
in this County
He dyed the 17th of Oct: 1729
Aetat: 82

Marmaduke left at his decease, in 1729, a son and successor:

Francis Dayrell, Esq. of Shudy Camps married Elizabeth, daughter of Peter Whitcombe of Braxted Lodge, Essex, and Elizabeth Sherrard one of the co-heirs of Sir Brownlow Sherrard, Bart., of Lobthorp, in Lincolnshire. They had two sons Marmaduke and Brownlow and two daughters Mary who married Richard Cropp and Sarah who married Christopher Jeaffreson.

From: Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505-1905:

Dayrell, Francis: son of Marmaduke, born at Shudy Camps, Cambs. School not given. Admitted fellow-commoner under Mr. Withers 14th October, 1704. Age not given. Resided till Lady Day 1707. Admitted at Gray's Inn 1st February, 1701. Grandson of Sir Thomas of Shudy Camps (admitted 1622) and son of Sir Marmaduke by his second wife, Mary Glascock of Farnham, Essex. Sir Marmaduke's first wife was Mary, elder daughter of Sir Justinian Isham (adm. 1627). Francis married Elizabeth daughter of Peter Witchcombe [Whitcombe] of Braxted Lodge, Essex, coheir of Brownlow Sherard of Lobthorp, Lincs. by whom he had two sons: Brownlow (adm. 1736) and Marmaduke (1740).

Below the monument erected by Marmaduke Dayrell to his father Francis Dayrell.
To the memory of FRANCIS DAYRELL Esqr late of Shudy Camps in the County of Cambridge, Son of SIR MARMADUKE DAYRELL of the Antient Family of LYLINGSTON DAYRELL, in the County of Bucks. He Served the office of High Sheriff in the County of Lincoln in the year 1740 was in the Commission of the Peace and one of the Deputy Lieutenants of the County of Cambridge. He married ELIZABETH Daughter and Coheiress of PETER WHITCOMB Esqr. of Braxted Lodge in the County of Essex. By whom he left Issue two Sons, BROWNLOW and MARMADUKE both unmarried and three Daughters, ELIZABETH who married to JOHN FULLER Esqr. of Rosehill in the County of Sussex. MARY now the Wife of RICHARD CROP Esqr. and SARAH the Wife of CHRISTOPHER JEAFFRESON Esqr. both of the County of Cambridge. He Died much Lamented September 26th 1760. Pursuant to his Will and in Grateful remembrance of his Father. This Monument was Erected by his Son MARMADUKE.
Elizabeth (Sherrard) Whitcombe whose daughter married Francis Dayrell

Below left a view of Braxted Lodge in Essex, home of the Whitcombe family and below right a detail from The Belton Conversation Piece of Elizabeth (Whitcombe) Dayrell holding onto a swing.

Braxted Lodge, home of the Whitcombe family

Below the monument to Mary (Dayrell) Cropp’s mother Elizabeth (Whitcombe) Dayrell, wife of Francis Dayrell.
To the Memory of

Mrs Elizabeth Dayrell Widow of the late Francis Dayrell of the Parish of Shudy Camps in the County of Canbridgeshire. She was one of the CoHeirs of Sir Brownlow Sherrard of Lobthorpe Hall in the County of Lincoln Bart. Had Five Children Two sons Brownlow and Marmaduke and Three Daughters Elizabeth first Married to John Fuller of Rose Hill in the County of Sussex Esq and after to Nash Mason of the County of Kent Esq. She died in 1762 and was interred in the Abbey Church at Bath. Mary Married to Richard Crop of Westow Lodge Esq and Sarah to Christopher Jeafferson Esq of Dullingham both in the County of Cambridge.

The above named Mrs Dayrell was Greatly Esteemed and Died much Lamented by all who had the Happiness of her Acquaintance on the 28th Day of June in the Year of Our Lord 1768 Aged 67.

Below the gravestone to Mary (Dayrell) Cropp’s mother
Elizabeth (Whitcombe) Dayrell, wife of Francis Dayrell.

Here lieth the Body of
Mrs Elizabeth Dayrell
Widow of Francis Dayrell
Esq. late of this Parish.
She Died June
the 28th 1768 Aged 67.
Mary Cropp’s father Francis Dayrell of Shudy Camps Esquire wrote his will on 10th April, 1757. He wishes to be privately entombed in the chancel of the chapel at Shudy Camps on the north side of the Altar. He directs that after his decease he would like to have one hundred pounds spent in erecting a monument on the north said of the altar at Hinxston in the County of Cambridge in the memory of his father Sir Marmaduke Dayrell (see image above) and another one hundred pounds on another monument on the south said of the alter to his mother Dame Mary Dayrell, his sisters Sarah and Caroline Dayrell, and his brother Marmaduke Dayrell. He also wants spent another one hundred pounds on a monument dedicated to himself on the north side of the alter at Shudy Camps (image above).

To his wife Elizabeth (Whitcombe) Dayrell he bequeaths his house at Lillingston-Dayrell in Buckinghamshire, as well as his house at Long Sutton in the County of Lincoln, as well as the use of his house in Saville Row in London and then after her death or her ‘after-marriage’ (whichever comes first) the same properties to his son Marmaduke. To his unfortunate son Brownlow47 (who was insane) he gives “nothing more than the law obliges”. To his daughter Elizabeth Mason one hundred pounds for mourning.

To my daughter Mary Cropp I give and bequeath the sum of three thousand pounds upon condition that her husband Richard Cropp Esq. does within six months after my decease give sufficient security that he will settle and secure to my said Daughter a Jointure or annuity of three Hundred pounds a year for her life clear of all deductions whatsoever and without prejudice to her Right of power But in Case her said Husband shall neglect or refuse to make such settlement or Give such Security as aforesaid then and in such case I do hereby Give and bequeath to my said daughter Mary Cropp an annuity or Rent charge of Two hundred pounds a year during the term of her natural life and not the aforesaid sum of three thousand pounds ....

He also gives his daughter Sarah Dayrell (who married Christopher Jeaffreson) the sum of three thousand pounds. And to his son Marmaduke Dayrell he gives his house of Shudy Camps and its contents.

To his daughter Mary Cropp he adds another legacy to which he attaches the following ‘special condition’ that she sometimes lives and resides at Shudy Camps and not at her husband’s estate at Westoe Lodge in Cambridgeshire.

He also names his cousins Edmund Dayrell of Lamport House in the parish of Stowe in Buckinghamshire and now residing in the Western Indies and Doctor Richard Dayrell of Lillingston Dayrell in Buckinghamshire.

**Marmaduke Dayrell**, Esq. of Shudy Camps who succeeded his father Francis, married Henrietta, daughter of Warner Tempest, Esq. of the island of Antigua. He was the brother of Mary Cropp. They had several children. Marmaduke died on 14th April, 1790 at Shudy Camps.
At his seat at Shudy Camps, co. Cambridge, aged 67, Marmaduke Dayrell, esq. son of Francis D. esq. of the same place, by Elizabeth, daughter of Peter Whitcombe, esq. of Braxted Lodge, co. Essex, and one of the co-heiresses of Sir Brownlow Sherrard, bart. of Lodbethorpe Hall, co. Lincoln. He was descended from the antient and noble family of the Dayrells, who came to this kingdom with William the Conqueror, and whose names are entered in the roll of Battle Abbey. He was a good husband, an affectionate parent, and a friend to the poor; and his death is sincerely lamented. He has left, by his present lady, two sons and three daughters, the eldest of whom, Marmaduke Dayrell, esq. is a fellow-commoner of Christ’s College, Cambridge.

Marmaduke Dayrell, Esq. of Shudy Camps, (son of Marmaduke and Henrietta (Warner) Dayrell above) married in 1797, Mildred-Rebecca, daughter of Sir Robert Lawley, 5th Bart., and sister to Lord Wenlock, by whom he had issue: Francis, his heir. Thomas, in holy orders and rector of Marston, Yorkshire, born in 1802, married Maria, daughter of the late Mr. Hawksworth, and has one son and one daughter. Christopher Jeaffreson, born in 1808; Robert-William, born in 1812; Jane-Elizabeth, married to the Rev. Fitzgerald Wintour, of Barton, co. Nottingham, and has two sons and two daughters. Mr. Dayrell died in August 1821, and was
succeeded by his eldest son, Francis Dayrell, Esq. of Shudy Camps.

Two views of Cranwell Hall in Staffordshire the home of the Lawley family.

The history of the Dayrell family above fails to mention Mary a daughter of the first Sir Thomas Dayrell who married Sir Henry St. George (1581-1644) in 1614. Sir Henry was garter King of Arms and died in Oxford in 1644 while in service with Charles I.

APPENDIX TWENTY SEVEN: THE TWO SISTERS OF MARY (DAYRELL) CROPP: ELIZABETH AND SARAH

Elizabeth Dayell, the sister of Mary (Dayrell) Cropp, and daughter of Francis and Mary (Whitcombe) Dayrell, married twice. Her first husband was John ['Jacky'] Fuller (1706-1755), ironmaster and gun-founder. He was the eldest of the ten children of John Fuller and his wife, Elizabeth, daughter Fulke Rose of Jamaica. In 1723 ‘Jacky’ went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, and in 1724 was admitted to the Middle Temple. On the death of his father in 1745 he took over Rose Hill in Jamaica, the family estate, as well as
the family ironworks which produced rifles and other arms in a period of great demand for ordnance. In August, 1746, at Croydon, Surrey, he married Elizabeth, daughter of Francis Dayrell, of Shudy Camps, Cambridge. There were no children from the marriage. In December, 1754, Fuller was elected as MP for the duke of Newcastle's constituency at Boroughbridge in Yorkshire. He died on 5th February, 1755, at Rose Hill in Sussex, and was buried on 12th February at Waldron. The family business was taken over and run by his brother Rose Fuller (1708-1777). Jacky’s widow Elizabeth (Dayrell) Fuller then married Nash Mason of Kent.

According to the records of the Old Bailey on 4th November, 1785, the Mason’s home on Queen’s Square in London was broken into by William Simon Bowyer who removed one linen table cloth, one linen table napkin, two pairs of silk stockings, and three linen handkerchiefs. He was found guilty and was transported (to Australia) for seven years.

Below from *The Gentleman's Magazine* an article describing Northfleet church in Kent.

In the nave, on a blue stone;
“Everard Goodman, gent. one of the sworn clerks in the high court of Chancery, Ob. 1743, an. aet. 67.
And Anna, wife of Everard Goodman, formerly wife of John Mason, late of Maidstone in Kent, esq. ob. 1745, 71.”
Near the last is another blue stone;
“Nash Mason, esq. of Queen’s-square, Middlesex, son of Ann Goodman by John Mason, her first husband, late of Maidstone, esq. ob. 10 October 1788, 82.”

‘Mad Jack’ Fuller ‘Jacky’ Fuller’s nephew and son of his brother Rose Fuller, eventually inherited Rose Hill and had the artist Turner paint a view of the estate:
An engraving based on Turner's 'View of Rose Hill'

Rose Hall, Jamaica, the plantation home of the Rose family
1. Elizabeth Sloane first married William Sotheby and then William died.
2. Elizabeth (Sloane) Sotheby next married Nash Mason, but Elizabeth died soon thereafter.
3. Elizabeth Dayrell first married John ‘Jacky’ Fuller, but he died.
4. Elizabeth (Dayrell) Fuller then married Nash Mason.
5. Elizabeth Langley first married Fulke Rose, but Fulke died. Elizabeth next married Hans Sloane.

- Fulke Rose married Elizabeth Sloane, who then married William Sotheby.
- Elizabeth (Sloane) Sotheby next married Nash Mason.
- Elizabeth Dayrell first married John Fuller, and her niece Mad Jack Fuller married Hans Sloane.
- Elizabeth Langley married Fulke Rose, and her brother William Sotheby married Elizabeth Sloane.

John Fuller's nephew, Mad Jack Fuller, married Hans Sloane.
APPENDIX TWENTY EIGHT: The Jeaffreson Family

As noted above, Mary (Dayrell) Cropp’s sister Sarah married Christopher Jeaffreson of Dullingham House in Cambridgeshire.

There are two pieces of evidence that can be used to support an argument that there is a connection between this Jeaffreson family of Dullingham House and Thomas Jefferson of Monticello in Virginia.

First is the use of coats of arms: on the left are the arms of the Jeaffreson family of Dullingham House and on the right are those used by Thomas Jefferson. It is said that Jefferson used these arms because he had old family papers that bore them and so he felt entitled to use them. The monument below for Christopher Jeaffreson who died in 1725 likewise uses the arms on the left.

![Jeaffreson Family](image1.jpg) ![Jefferson Family](image2.jpg)

Also, during the 17th century, the Jeaffresons developed a wide range of commercial interests in the Leeward Islands in the West Indies; thus placing the family close to Virginia. Samuel Jeaffreson, born in 1607 at Pettistree, Suffolk, emigrated to St. Kitts/St. Christopher’s Island where he was to become the founder and Governor General of the islands. He had three sons all of whom are supposed to have emigrated to Virginia.

From the same family was John Jeaffreson, a merchant of London, who was involved in schemes to colonise the West
Indies. He first came to America in about 1618 on the ship, "Bona Nova", and was an official of the Virginia Company. He was granted 250 acres of land at Archer's Hope near the first settlement of Jamestowne, Virginia, and was a member of the First Assembly there in 1619, representing Flowerdew Hundred.

John Jeaffreson escaped the infamous Indian Massacre of 1622 at Jamestown, by being away on business for the Company back in England. In 1624 he was asked by Sir Thomas Warner, a friend and neighbor living at Parham some five miles away, to accompany him on the ship, "Hopewell" in his adventure to found the Leeward Islands in the West Indies.

Having built up a large fortune based on his mercantile adventures in the West Indies John returned to England in the 1650s a wealthy man, and purchased the Dullingham estate in Cambridgeshire. John later participated in the 1653 Anglo-Dutch war by commanding the merchant ship, "William and Mary" with 140 men. He died in 1660 so he would have to have been about seventy years old to have achieved all that he did.

Samuel Jeaffreson, John’s nephew remained in the West Indies and raised a family including a son named Samuel. This son moved to Antigua and he MAY have been the father of Thomas who moved to Henrico Count, Virginia. Given this assumption then it is from this Samuel who moved to Antigua that Thomas Jefferson, third president of the United States, is descended.
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Samuel Jeaffreson I

Joseph Jeaffreson M. Anne

John Jeaffreson (d. 1660)
M.1 Mary Parkyns
M.2. Ann Sharpe Phipps
Settled at St. Kitts then
bought Dullingham House

Samuel Jeaffreson II
of Pettistree
in Suffolk
M. Elizabeth

John Jeaffreson
Of Nacton and
Roushall
M. Anna Doggett

Samuel Jeaffreson
Ramsholt & Clopton
died in 1693
M. Mary widow of
Samuel Pope of
Bawdsey

Christopher Jeaffreson
(b. 1651)
Arrived at St. Kitts in 1676
d. 1725
M. dau George
Gamiell
No Issue.

Christopher Jeaffreson
(b. 1651)
Arrived at St.
Kitts in 1676
d. 1725
M. dau George
Gamiell
No Issue.

Capt. Samuel Jeaffreson
born Abt. 1607 at
Pettistree
of the Red House
Plantation at St.
Christopher
died 12 December 1649 at
St. Kitts

Samuel Jeaffreson
moved to Antigua
about 1669

John Jeaffreson
d. 1747
of Rouse Hall Clopton
M. 2 Oct. 1698
Ann Scott d. 1751
Buried at Clopton 31 Oct. 1751

Christopher Jeaffreson
b. 12 July 1699 died 18 Jan
1748/49
M. Elizabeth Shuckburgh
died 12 July 1778 aged 78

Christopher Jeaffreson
M. Sarah Dayrell
Whose sister Mary married
Richard Cropp

Thomas Jefferson
1677-1731
Of Henrico County
Virginia
M. Mary Field

Peter Jefferson
1707/08-1757
M. Jane Randolph
1720-1776

Thomas Jefferson
President
Below some Jeaffreson monuments: the first is for Christopher son of John (see Chart). There was only one surviving child of this marriage, Christopher, who married (to Henrietta Robinson) but no more male descendants from there on. The second is for Christopher Jeaffreson who married Sarah Dayrell.

Near this place lyes Interred in hopes of a blessed Resurrection ye body of CHRISTOPHER JEAFFRESON of this County Esq. The son of Colonel John Jeaffreson of St. Andrews Holbourn in ye County of Middlesex and of MARY his Wife Daughter of Aden Parkins Esq of ye County of Nottingham. He departed this Life ye 1st of August 1725 in ye 75th year of his Age.

His Emminent good Qualities were so many and his Impartiality in Administering Justice in his Country so Conspicuous that he died Greatly lamented by all who had ye happiness to know him.

In a Vault near this Place are deposited the Remains of CHRISTOPHER JEAFFRESON, Esq.

The Tenor of whose Life displayed
All that could conciliate Regard or command Respect.
As a Husband and a Parent. He was kind and affectionate.
As a Friend, zealous and sincere.
As a Magistrate judicious and impartial.
He sustained a long and painful illness with exemplary Fortitude.
And died full of Christian Hope on the 26th Day of September 1789
Aged 55 Years.
He married SARAH the Daughter of FRANCIS DAYRELL, Esqr
of Shudy Camps in this County
by whom he had four Children but left only two to lament his Loss
CHRISTOPHER and SARAH ELIZABETH.
In the same Vault have since been deposited the Remains
of
SARAH Widow of CHRISTOPHER JEAFFRESON, Esq
who died June 10th 1702. Aged 62 Years.

The third monument is for Mary (Dayrell) Cropp’s niece
Sarah Elizabeth, the daughter of Christopher and Sarah
(Dayrell) Jeaffreson.

This Monumemt
the last sad tribute of fraternal
affection is erected to the Memory of
SARAH ELIZABTH Daughter of
CHRISTOPHER JEAFFRESON Esq
and SARAH his Wife
who died the 11th of May 1804,
Aged 40 Years.
Elegant by nature, accomplished by education, and good by principle.
she attracted the regard of all who knew her,
and having lived most affectionately beloved
she died most sincerely lamented.

Before leaving the Dayrells and their Brownlow /Sherrard /
Jeaffreson, etc. connections we will look briefly at the
Freke family.
Above No. 3 Raphe Freke who married Ciceley Culpeper was the third son of Thomas Freke and Elizabeth Tayler. Raphe’s elder brother shown at the very bottom of the page was John Freke who married Jane Shirley, the daughter of Sir John Shirley (1565–1632) of Isifield. John and Jane (Shirley) Freke were the parents of Elizabeth who married Richard Brownlow. Raphe Freke, John’s brother, had a number of daughters one of whom, Judith, married Robert Austen of Herendon in Kent. Robert Austen’s niece married Comberford Brooke (see Austen above) thus uniting in a very round about fashion Esther Banner’s Purcell family with Richard Cropp’s Dayrell family. Judith (Freke) Austen’s
sister Elizabeth wrote a ‘Remembrance’ which was published in 2001 as ‘The Remembrance of Elizabeth Freke 1671-1714’. Elizabeth (Freke) Brownlow and Judith (Freke) Austen were first cousins.

APPENDIX THIRTY: BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE CUMBERLAND BROTHERS:

From his obituary in The Gentleman’s Magazine:

Rev. R. D. Cumberland, LLB Jan. 31. At Driffield, near Cirencester, after long and severe sufferings from the stone, aged 72, the Rev. Richard Denison Cumberland. He was of Magdalen College, Cambridge; was presented to the Vicarage of Driffield, with the annexed Chapelry of Harnhill, by Thomas Smith, esq. in 1776, and took his degree of LL.B. in 1780. During his long ministry he scarcely ever quitted the care of his churches, contributing always willingly to the comforts of the labouring poor, and fulfilling the necessary duties of a good Magistrate and Rural Dean. Liberal to others on all occasions, and temperate in the use of the goods of fortune himself, he died without having created an enemy by his own fault.

His descent was from Dennison Cumberland, Archdeacon of Northampton, whose son was the celebrated Richard Cumberland, Bishop of Peterborough, the author of Saochoniatho’s Phoenician History, the Law of Nature, and a Treatise on Hebrew Weights and Measures, &c. He was also grandson to John Cumberland, whose noble invention of bending ship timber by means of steam in cases of sand, has been the means of saving millions to this country, and in which he expended a large fortune, without receiving any adequate reward. His descent on the maternal side was equally honourable, being in a direct line from the renowned Admiral Balchen, who was lost in the ship Victory, and to whose memory Government erected a monument in...
Westminster Abbey. He has left a widow, and one only daughter, married to the Rev. J. P. Jones, A. M. of Brecon.

Unfortunately the claim that RDC was a direct descendant of Admiral Balchen’s is wrong. There is probably a distant family connection but it has yet to be proved. The following appeared in Jackson’s Oxford Journal on 12th February, 1825.

GEORGE CUMBELAND

(b London, 1754; d Bristol, 1848). English writer, collector and amateur artist. He became a clerk on the death of his father in 1771, until freed from financial necessity by a legacy in 1785. In 1788 he left for Rome, where he studied the work of Raphael, Marcantonio Raimondi and Giulio Bonasone, and collected prints and curios. Cumberland returned to England in 1790 and lived near Southampton, adding to his collections and corresponding with Thomas Johnes (1748–1816) of Hafod in Cardiganshire (now Dyfed), who praised his Poem on the Landscapes of Great Britain, written in 1780 but not published until 1793. By this time he was living near Windsor and proximity to London allowed him greater intimacy with William Blake, whom he had met through Thomas Stothard before 1788. In 1793 he published Some Anecdotes of the Life of Julio Bonasoni, prefaced by A Plan for the Improvement of the Arts in England, which urged the establishment of a national gallery. An Attempt to Describe Hafod (1796), Johnes’s estate, contains a folding map engraved by Blake, who also provided eight of the 24 plates illustrating Thoughts on Outline (1796), a subject to which he returned in Outlines of the Ancients (1829), which contains three further Blake engravings. In 1808 Cumberland settled in Bristol, where he became an influential figure in artistic circles. His landscape sketches and watercolours produced
at this time have a simple directness of vision, reminiscent of those of his friend John Linnell (e.g. Bristol, Mus. & A.G.). He catalogued his collection of prints, which he presented to the Royal Academy and the British Museum, in the *Utility of Collecting the Best Works of the Ancient Engravers of the Italian School* (1827).

Below the last drawing William Blake ever did – George Cumberland’s visiting card.

![George Cumberland’s visiting card](image)

In a letter of 12th April, 1827, Blake wrote: "The little card I will do as soon as Possible but when you Consider that I have been reduced to a Skeleton from which I am slowly recovering you will I hope have Patience with me."

In a comment later added to the letter, Cumberland noted "My little Message card was the last thing he executed."

Blake died in August of that year

---

**APPENDIX THIRTY ONE: The Elton Family**

It was mentioned above that Mary (Elton) Prescott, George William’s mother, was the daughter of Jacob Elton, a merchant of Bristol, and the sister of Isaac Elton, one of the original partners of Bristol Bank. The bank was started in 1750 as this extract from the archives of The Royal Bank of Scotland indicates and it was eventually taken over by Prescott’s Bank:

This private bank was opened in Bristol in 1750 as Tyndall, Isaac Elton, Lloyd, Miller, Knox & Hale by a partnership of Onesiphorus Tyndall, a West India merchant and drysalter; Originally called Bristol Bank, it became known as Bristol Old Bank from 1752.

The following notice from *The European Magazine*...
In 1776 the bank moved premises from 42 Broad Street to Clare Street and then, in 1798, to what became 35 Corn Street. From 1750 to 1826 there were many partnership changes. It acquired Cave, Ames & Cave in 1826. The bank ceased to issue banknotes in 1844. In 1891 it was taken over by Prescott’s Bank.

Mary (Elton) Prescott was the daughter of Jacob Elton, who in turn was the second son of Sir Abraham Elton, 1st Bart. Mary’s brother Isaac was Sheriff of Bristol in 1765, and married first Sarah, daughter of Samuel Peach of Bristol, by whom he had a son, who died unmarried. Sarah likewise died on 16th December, 1763. Isaac then married on 20th October, 1768, Ann, daughter of James Tierney of Theobalds in Hertfordshire by whom he had another son Isaac Elton of Stapleton House, co. Gloucester. This Isaac married Katherine, daughter of Major Bayard, by whom he left four sons and three daughters. James Tierney was the uncle of the politician George Tierney (1761-1830).

Thomas Gainsborough painted Mrs. Isaac Elton of Bristol (see below) and her portrait later came up for auction at Christie’s where it was described as follows:
Clevedon Court, home of the Elton Family
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Sir Abraham Elton, 1<sup>st</sup> Bart (1654-1727)

Mary (Jefferies) wife of 1<sup>st</sup> Bart

Abraham Elton, 2<sup>nd</sup> Bart (1679–1742)

Abigail (Bayly) wife of Abrahm Elton 2<sup>nd</sup> Bart

Sir Abraham Elton 3<sup>rd</sup> Bart (1703-1761). Died unmarried.

Capt. Jacob Elton, RN (1712–1745)

Caroline (Yates) Elton wife of Capt. Jacob Elton

Sir Abrahm Isaac Elton (1718-1790) 4<sup>th</sup> Bart
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Sir Abrahm Isaac Elton (1718-1790) 4th Bart

Elizabeth Read (1725–1755) Lady Elton wife of 4th Bart

Elizabeth Elton (1716-1790) daughter of Sir Abrahm Elton 2nd Bart

Anne Tierney, Mrs. Isaac Elton. Painted by Thomas Gainsborough

Reverend Sir Abraham Elton (1755–1842) 5th Bart

Mary Elton Mrs Oldfield Bowles
The Elton Family of Bristol

Abraham Elton 1st Bart 1654-172/28 M. Mary Jefferies

Abraham Elton 2nd Bart 1679 - 1742 M. Abigail Bayly

Isaac Elton M. Sarah Peach M2. Ann Tierney

Isaac Elton M. Mary Mortimer

Jacob Elton M. ? ___ Small

Mary Elton M. George Prescott

Rev. Abraham Elton 5th Bart M. Elizabeth Read

Mary Elton M. Oldfield Bowles

Elizabeth Elton M. Sir Abraham Isaac Elton 4th Bart. 1717-1761 M. Elizabeth Read

Captain Jacob Elton RN d. 29 March 1743 M. Caroline Yates

George William Prescott m. Sarah Long

Abraham Elton 3rd Bart 1703-1761 d. unmarried

Isaac Elton M. Sarah Peach M2. Ann Tierney

Mary Elton M. Oldfield Bowles

Sarah Long

Rev. Abraham Elton 5th Bart M. Elizabeth Read

Mary Elton M. Oldfield Bowles

Isaac Elton M. Sarah Peach M2. Ann Tierney

Mary Elton M. Oldfield Bowles

Sarah Long
APPENDIX THIRTEEN: The Brothers Legh Rowlls

As we have seen above, a case of trespass was brought by Boulter Roffey against Charles and William Legh Rowlls. How that case related to Boulter being charged with committing an ‘unnatural crime’ with his servant Davis is obscure but the possibility is strong that there was perhaps an attempt on the part of the brothers to blackmail Boulter. A slither of support for this can be gleaned from the brother’s lives as revealed in a number of sources.

There is a court case, unrelated to Boulter’s, involving the Legh Rowlls family in an intra-familial dispute over a marriage settlement (see Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the High Court of Chancery. Volume V: Legh versus Haverfield. Published in 1827). In the report it states that: ‘The sons (Charles and William) had been dissipated young men living abroad’.

Charles died in 1795 in the City of Bruges and had possibly gone there to avoid his debts.

The above newspaper announcement and the comment from the court report would suggest that Charles had not lived an exemplary or frugal life and his finances were probably in disarray.
The Death of William Legh Rowlls

In 1784, a year after Boulter's successful prosecution of the Legh Rowlls brothers, William died as a result of being shot in a duel. The newspapers reported on 19th June, 1784, the case as follows:

"Yesterday morning a duel was fought at Kingston-upon-Thames, between the famous Dick England, well known on the turf, &c., and Mr. Roll, jun., brewer, of that place, in which the latter was killed. As soon as the fatal event was known, the friends of the deceased attended by peace officers, set off post for different sea ports, with the view of apprehending Mr. E. on his route for the Continent. The duel arose from an old quarrel: Mr. England had won 200l. from Mr. Roll at play; Mr. Roll suspected that the dice were loaded, and refused to pay. Mr. England still demanded the money whenever he met Mr. Roll, and using some severe epithets at Ascot races, they agreed to meet. After discharging a brace of pistols without effect, the seconds interfered, but in vain, and the fourth shot taking place in Mr. Roll's bowels, he fell, and died before he could be removed off the ground.

On 24th June, 1784, the following article appeared.

"Yesterday the Coroner's Inquest sat upon the body of Mr. Roll, who was killed on Friday last in a duel, at Cranford Bridge; when, after an enquiry which lasted several hours, the jury brought in their verdict Wilful Murder, against Richard England, the principal, Capt. Dennis Sharpe, and a person unknown to the Jurors, who acted as friends. The witnesses were bound over.

Below from the papers 23rd June, 1784."
After almost twelve years in exile in France Dick England risked returning to London and was promptly arrested and charged with Legh Rowlls’ murder. He was tried, found guilty and sentenced to one year in prison.

Who was Dick England? The following is extracted from various sources found on the internet.

Munday’s was an inn of very considerable business, where many coaches arrived, and from whence as many departed to all parts of the country. Here Dick England, the noted gambler and black-leg, was accustomed to resort, and was constantly on the watch for raw Irishmen coming to town by the coaches, whom he invariably contrived to pluck. His rapid success soon enabled him to repair to an elegant house in St. Alban’s-street, where he engaged various masters to teach him the polite arts, and he gained a slight knowledge of the French language.

At Munday’s coffee-house on certain days at four o’clock, Dick England generally presided. On these occasions his manner was polite, and his conversation shrewd, evincing the industry he used to supply the defects of education, of which he affected at times to make a shew, by introducing classical terms in his conversation. Being at times the hero of his own story, he unguardedly exposed some of his own characteristic traits, which his acquired self-possession, in general, enabled him to conceal. His conduct among men of rank and family, with whom he happened to associate in the way of his profession, was so polite and guarded, that he gained general respect; but he was resolute in enforcing payment of sums he had won. One evening he met a young tradesman at a house in Leicester-fields, to have an hour’s diversion at rattling the bones [playing dice], when he contrived to lose a few score pounds, for which he gave a draft upon Haulley’s; but requested to have his revenge, in a few more throws, when he soon regained what he had lost, and as much in addition.
Upon which, being late, he proposed for both to retire, being past three in the morning; but the tradesman, conceiving himself tricked, refused payment of what he had lost. England then tripped up his heels, rolled him in the carpet, took a knife from the sideboard, which he flourished over him, and using menacing language, at last cut off the young citizen's long hair, close to the scalp.

Dreading worse proceedings, the youth, on being allowed to gain an erect posture, gave a check for the amount, wished the captain a good morning civilly, and although he frequently saw England afterward, never spoke of the circumstance.

England had at one time a fat cook, whom he, after a little acquaintance with her, elevated from the kitchen to the head of his table. George Mahon, one of his competitors, was a frequent visitor at his table; and she proved so unfaithful, as to tamper her affections, and in a few weeks she eloped with Mahon; which England soon discovered, but concealed his knowledge of the affair, until he had an opportunity of taking some revenge on the enamoured swain. He persuaded Mahon to meet him at an inn at Barnett, on a pretended trotting match, when he threw him on the floor, and with a sharp knife he had provided bereft him of his queue, and kicked him into the street. England afterwards remarked, "Had it been my wife, I could have forgiven him; but to seduce my wh—e, it was not to be endured." At loading a dye he was unrivalled.

England fought a duel, at Cranford-bridge, June 18, 1784, with Mr. Legh Rowlls, a brewer at Kingston, from whom he had won a large sum, for which a bond had been given; and not being paid, after a considerable time, he arrested his late friend, which ended in the duel, fatally to Mr. Legh Rowlls. England fled to Paris, and was outlawed; but it is reported, that in the early period of the Revolution, he furnished some useful intelligence to our army, in the campaign in Flanders, for which he was remunerated by the British Cabinet. While in France, he was several times imprisoned, and once ordered to the guillotine, but pardoned, through the exertion and influence of one of the Convention, who also procured a passport, by which he once more reached his native country. After an absence of twelve years, he was tried for the murder; and found guilty of man-slaughter, fined one shilling, and sentenced to one year's imprisonment. During his trial he conducted himself respectfully.

From the trial we learn that Charles Legh Rowlls was very inebriated and when he was asked several times whether he wished to proceed, Dick England having said he would withdraw if Legh Rowlls did, but Charles refused. It was suggested at the trial if Charles had been in a more rational state of mind he might likewise have agreed to withdraw. Also, Charles's mother was one of the main instigator's of the trial against England who otherwise might have gotten away with what he did.

After his release, Dick England passed the remainder of his life in obscurity, at his house in Leicester-square, where he lived to the age of eighty, and was found, on being called to dinner, lying dead on his sofa.
Given the gambling debts of William and probably also those of his brother Charles, a possible motive behind Boulter Roffey’s arrest begins to emerge although we will never be able to pass beyond speculating.

THE END