

## Derbyshire Heraldic Notes.

By F. WERE.



THE following notes, gathered during excursions with the Society, may be interesting to some of its members. On p. 2, vol. xxx., of the *Journal* of the Society occurs the following description of a brass shield: “(2) Daniell, (3) blank”; this is wrong marshalling according to the illustration, since (2) is blank and (3) is Daniell. It has been suggested that this was the coat of Middleton; if so, it has been defaced, and the marks on it rather tend to that conclusion. If it has been proved that Middleton is wrong, then what coat should be the second quartering? This, fortunately, is not far to seek, as all quarterings in Heraldry are brought in by heiresses. On p. 3 of the same *Journal* Sir John Statham says the old brasses were stolen about 1688, and that he “exactly renewed them,” so this would mean that the second quarter was either always blank or contained a wrong quartering, and that the inscription was as it had been originally. The inscription says that Margrett was the daughter of Philip Stapley, whilst the pedigree in Ormerod’s *Cheshire*, vol. iii., p. 497, which is probably correct, gives Margaret as the daughter of Peter de Stapelegh and sister of Philip, who died issueless; therefore she became co-heiress with her sister Elizabeth de Rope, of Peter de Stapelegh, and as she married Sampson Meverill, her arms would be quartered with Meverill.<sup>1</sup> What, then, were her arms? The paternal coat was *Gules three boars’ heads erased close 2 and 1 argent*.

<sup>1</sup> As regards the “i” in Meverill, this scarcely seems to carry out Sir J. Statham’s “exactly,” for at that date it was generally “y,” and the name, at any rate later, generally spelt with an “e.”

This should be the second quartering. Whether she inherited any quarterings to be joined with this is not easy to prove, as all the marriages of her ancestors seem blank.

#### LOWE MONUMENT IN WIRKSWORTH CHURCH.

I find Dr. Cox, in vol. ii., p. 560, of his *Derbyshire Churches*, has omitted the charges of *three mullets* on No. (2) coat in his blazon. It should read “ . . . on a fess engrailed . . . between three crescents . . . as many mullets (? pierced, but did not look so) . . . ” Unidentified at present. I do not think the charges help much to identification, but the blazon is not correct without them. The blazon of the shield would be Baron: In dexter chief, (*argent*) *three roses 2 and 1 (gules) barbed and seeded (proper)*. ROSELL: In dexter base, the No. (2) unidentified, as above, impaling, (*azure*) *a buck trippant (argent)*, LOWE of Denby, *over all a label of three points*. . . . Impaled with Femme Quarterly, 1 and 4. (Or) *three palets wavy (gules) VALOIGNS*. [The co-heiress of Waretius de Valoigns married Sir Thomas Fogge.] 2 and 3 (*argent*) *on a fess between three annulets (sable) as many pierced mullets* (of the field). FOGGE. [Anthony Lowe, buried 1555, married Bridget, daughter of Sir John Fogge, Knt., of Repton, co. Kent.] The marshalling of this shield gives one the idea of having been copied from the matrix of a seal or seals, as everything is reversed. Lawrence Lowe, of Denby, who bore the Buck, given as a Hart in Glover's *Derby*, ii., 367, living in the time of Henry VI. and Edward IV., married . . . heiress of . . . Rosell of Denby, therefore the Baron should be the Buck quartering Rosell, and in this case Lowe impaling both Rosell and the unidentified. If placed in that position we should judge from the heraldry that Lawrence Lowe married two wives, first Rosell, and then the unidentified; but pedigrees only give him one marriage, therefore it looks as if the unidentified was marshalled as a quartering of Rosell to prove Rosell, owing to three roses being a common coat, which could have been properly marshalled,

as quarterly 1 and 4, LOWE; 2, ROSELL; 3, unidentified. But there is a still more curious fact about this "Baron," which the impaling of Fogge proves, which is, that Anthony Lowe<sup>1</sup> was not the son of Lawrence Lowe, but of the latter's eldest brother, Thomas, who bore the other Lowe coat, as seen in Wirksworth Church—"Gules a wolf passant argent," whilst his son, Anthony, should quarter Fawne, *Argent a buglehorn between three crescents sable, each charged with a bezant*—his mother's coat with another unidentified. Unless Anthony was the son of Lawrence, and not of Thomas, either the pedigrees or the heraldry are wrong. I am inclined to think the mistake lies in the heraldic coat. Again, the Femme is reversed, for it was Bridget Fogge, not Valoigns, that Anthony Lowe married, therefore the quarterly impalement should be 1 and 4, Fogge; 2 and 3, Valoigns. The label on the Baron is also a crux, as it should prove that either the bearer was the eldest son or of the eldest line, but the Baron proves that if Anthony bore it, he must have been the eldest son, whereas the pedigree on p. 7 says he was the third. His father, Thomas, being Lawrence's eldest brother, might have borne it; but if it proved the elder line, it might be right, as in Glover, ii., p. 367, the pedigree is carried back two generations; yet, even then, Anthony could not have borne an impaled Baron with a label, nor, indeed, could his uncle, Lawrence, have done so.

#### MUGGINTON CHURCH.

When the Society visited Mugginton Church, I noticed, in company with Mr. Andrew, that Dr. Cox, in his *Churches*, iii., 219, had not read the blazon of the first quartering of the middle shield on the north side of the Kniveton tomb quite correctly, as we made the birds out to be owls, not martlets, and as the first quartering generally indicates the family, it makes a vast difference in settling to whom the other quarters belong. On this account I think it well to bring this puzzling

---

<sup>1</sup> Glover, ii., p. 7.

shield to the notice of the Society, being at present unable to do more than this, owing to my not being able to find any pedigree that gives a real clue. The shield is a quarterly one, *impaling (sable) three greyhounds in pale courant (argent) collared, (or), MAULEVERER.* This marriage I have not been able to find in the pedigrees, but Dr. Cox justly observes that the wife was most probably a sister of the Joan Mauleverer who married Nicholas Kniveton, as on the shield at the top of the tomb. How it came to be marshalled with the other shields otherwise remains a mystery. Yet, as proving a marriage not in pedigrees it is very valuable. The shield is quarterly, 1 *(sable) an escutcheon between owls in orle (i.e., six), (argent), CALVERLEY, alias SCOTT.* John Scott married the heiress of Gospatrick, Lord of Calverley. 2, *Ermine on a bend (metal, query argent or or), three towers or castles, triple turreted (query sable).* Possibly Castellyn or Castyworth. Naturally this would be the marriage of a Calverley with the heiress of this unknown coat, but pedigrees are silent. 3 *(gules), a bezant, GOSPATRICK.* This marriage is proved under 1. Tonge gives in his Appendix, xxxvi., CAVERLIA, quarterly, I., the same as 1 above; II., *gules, a bezant;* but III. and IV. are quite different; however, this would certainly mean that 2, here, was a later marriage than the Gospatrick one. 4, *query per pale . . . and ermines a lion rampant guardant (distinctly full-faced), counter-changed.* I could only find a few ermine spots on the sinister side, and they were filled with white enamel, the whole shield having apparently been properly tintured at some time or other. Now, Burke, in his extinct *Baronetcies*, p. 96, under Calverley, says John Scott married Larderina, second daughter of Alphonsus Gospatrick, Lord of Calverley, and his son, another John Scott, steward to the Empress Maud, bore sometimes a lion rampant counterchanged. Now, for the lion to be counterchanged, the field would have to be party, but what the other tincture was I have not been able to discover, and I could not trace any ermine on the dexter half of the lion, so I think it must be brought in by Gospatrick, not by Calverley.