

THE MANOR OF KENNINGTON.

By W. H. HART, Esq., F.S.A.

Read at Kennington, 20th April, 1859.

THE locality on which I am about to offer a few observations is one which I have no doubt many persons would think so purely common-place, and so devoid of interest, that time would be fruitlessly spent in the discussion of its merits. Kennington is a place which at first sight appears to be nothing more than a great emporium for omnibusses to every part; varied by a large common or park, a modern and not handsome church, and a turnpike.

Now it is very true that to the mere casual observer, not only Kennington, but also many other parts of the kingdom of Great Britain, present no feature of interest; but it is here that archæology steps in, and bids the thoughtful man pause as he wends his way through the thickly-populated town or suburb while the veil of the past is raised; and he beholds as in a mirror what has gone before, thus opening a new field of inquiry and new source of information which is never without its instruction. The meanest and dullest portion of the metropolis will often furnish the antiquary with a piece of local history in which the ancient nobility of the country have played no mean part, and in streets where now the ordinary trades of life are congregated, will frequently be found reminiscences of the great and illustrious in mansions which even now speak of their former splendour. But to return.

There is every reason to believe that previously to the arrival of the Romans in England, this locality, as well as many others in the immediate neighbourhood, was covered with the water of the river Thames, which was

not confined within its just and proper limits, as at the present time; indeed the general opinion is that previously to the embankment of the Thames, the whole tract of land on the south side of and encircled by the bend of that river was an extensive marsh, covered with high tide, and utterly unfit for the site of a town or any human habitation. Pennant, in his account of London, conjectures that the Surrey side was in all probability a great lake or expanse of water. "This expanse of water," he says, "might have filled the space between the rising grounds at Deptford and those at Clapham, and been bounded to the south by the beautiful Surrey Hills. Lambeth Marsh, and the Bankside evidently, were recovered from the water. Along Lambeth are the names of Narrow Walls, or the mounds which served for that purpose; and in Southwark, Bankside again shows the means of converting the ancient lake into useful land; even to this day, the tract beyond Bermondsey Street is so very low, and beneath the level of common tides, that the proprietors are obliged to secure it by embankments."

The embankment of the Thames, whereby this extensive tract of land was redeemed from the river, is now universally ascribed to the Romans during an early period of their dominion in Britain. Doctor Whitaker, in a letter addressed to the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1787, says:—

"When the Britons were the sole lords of this island, their rivers, we may be sure, strayed at liberty over the adjacent country, confined by no artificial barriers, and having no other limits to their overflow than what nature itself had provided. This would be particularly the case with the Thames. London itself was only a fortress in the woods then; and the river at its foot then roamed over all the low grounds that skirt its channel. Thus it ran on the south from the west of Wandsworth to Woolwich, to Dartford, to Gravesend, and to Sheerness; and on the north range from Poplar and the Isle of Dogs along the levels of Essex to the mouth of the Thames.

"In this state of the river the Romans settled at London. Under their management, London soon became a considerable mart of trade. It afterwards rose to the dignity of a military colony. And it was even made at last the capital of one of those provinces into which the Roman parts of Britain were divided. The spirit of Roman refinement, there-

fore, would naturally be attracted by the marshes immediately under its eye, and would as naturally exert itself to recover them from the waters. The low grounds of St. George's Fields particularly would soon catch the eye, and soon feel the hand of the improving Romans. And from these grounds the spirit of embanking would gradually go along both the sides of the river; and, in nearly four centuries of the Roman residence here, would erect those thick and strong ramparts against the tide, which are so very remarkable along the Essex side of the river, and a breach in which at Dagenham was with so much difficulty, and at so great an expense, closed even in our own age."

Notwithstanding the check which was thus put to the natural current of the river, its waters have frequently broken through their limits, overwhelming the low lands in Lambeth, Rotherhithe, and Bermondsey, and penetrating even as far as Kennington; in consequence of which various commissions have from time to time been issued by the Crown for the repair and preservation of these embankments.

The first we meet with is in the 23rd year of Edward I., when John de Metingham and William de Carleton were directed to view and repair the banks, &c., from Lambeth to Grenewich. This was followed at various times by several others for the same purpose, and among them by one in the 22nd year of Henry VI., which directed Sir John Burcestre and others to view the banks on the side of the Thames and marshes adjoining, as well within the lordships of South and North Lambeth, Lambehite Mersh, and Parysh Garden, as in Southwerk, Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, Deptfordstronde, Peckham, Hacham, Camerwell, Stockwell, Clapham, and Newington in Surrey, and Kent, then broken and in decay; and to repair them, and make laws for their preservation according to the customs of Romney Marsh, with power to impress labourers for that purpose.

Having now been brought safely to dry land, and delivered from the perils of the overflowing Thames, we will glance at the history of the Manor of Kennington.

It may not be known to many of you that Kennington has in its time been ennobled by the residence of several of our English monarchs; and you may also learn for the first time that the spot where we are now assembled

is in close proximity to the site of the palace, if it be not actually situated upon some part of the former royal demesne; but it is to be regretted that all traces of such a residence are totally lost to us, so that we may only allow our imagination to roam at pleasure, while we picture to ourselves the palace which has often sheltered our early kings.

We may trace Kennington as a distinct locality back to the times of the Heptarchy; in fact the etymology of the word tells us that it was the home of royalty at a time when the Saxon tongue was current in this land; we may therefore justly conclude that it was one of the kings of the South Saxons who took up his residence on this spot, whence it obtained its present appellation, Kennington, Cheningtune, or the king's town. This, by the way, is not the only Kennington in England; there is another place of the same name near Ashford, in Kent; the name and etymology are identical. In discussing the derivation of the names of towns and villages, it is always advisable to ascertain whether there be more than one with the same appellation, because in this case we are provided with better means of ascertaining a true etymology, or of checking or correcting, one by the other, a supposed derivation, which by these means may be either confirmed or refuted.

And now I will ask you to transport yourselves back in imagination to times of yore—to times when all these houses, streets, and lanes were not known—when this populous district was as open and free as the country which we now travel miles to behold—when the days of the good King Alfred had passed away, and this kingdom bent to the sway of a Danish monarch: we are bidden by a noble of Denmark, Osgod Clapa, to repair to his house at Kennington, that we may attend the wedding-feast of his daughter Githa with Tovy Prudan, another Danish noble; Hardicanute, the King, honours the nuptials with his royal presence, but in the midst of the festivities, while the wine passes quickly, and the noise of revelry runs high, Hardicanute suddenly staggers and falls, or, as the Saxon Chronicle tells, “as he stood

drinking, he fell suddenly to the earth with a tremendous struggle ; but those who were nigh at hand took him up ; and he spoke not a word afterwards, but expired on the sixth day before the Ides of June ;” and thus the feast is suddenly broken up by the rude hand of death, brought on, as has been supposed, by treachery and poison. This took place in the year 1042. King Edward the Confessor no doubt often resided here, though I have not been able to find any mention of the circumstance ; and there is every reason to favour this supposition, because his successor Harold, the son of Earl Godwin, and the last of the Saxon kings, according to tradition, is said to have placed the crown of England on his own head at the palace here.

I must now slightly travel out of the record, as the lawyers would say, in order to discuss shortly the etymology of the name of a locality not far from this place ; *i. e.* Clapham.

Clapham is commonly supposed to take its name from this Osgod Clapa, the giver of the wedding-feast which terminated so sadly at Kennington ; but I am inclined to dispute this position. This origin of the name is certainly very inviting ; that is, the combination of Clappa, the individual in question, and Ham, Saxon for a town or village, constituting the compound word Clapham ; but I am afraid that Clapham must disclaim the honour of receiving its name from this Danish noble, for in the time of King Alfred, Ælfrid, a duke, gave thirty acres of land in Cloppesham to Worburgh his wife for life, remainder to Ald’hdryth his daughter, and her issue ; and if none, then to his next kin by his father, paying her half the value : the owner of these lands to pay 200 pence a year to the monks of Chertsey ; and therefore it seems obvious that as this name of Cloppesham was current in the days of King Alfred, Osgod Clapa, who lived many years afterwards, could have nothing to do with its origin. But I have no wish to terrify the ladies by leading them into abstruse discussions on Saxon etymologies ; they would doubtless prefer that I should keep to more lively subjects, such as wedding-feasts, as

the ancients wisely termed them, or wedding breakfasts, as the moderns rather inappropriately term them; I will therefore ask my hearers to pass on from the days of King Harold to the time of William the Conqueror, when, through the medium of the great national record, Domesday Book, we have an authentic account of the manor of Kennington, its condition and value. It is described thus:—

“Teodric the Goldsmith holds of the King Chenintune. He held it of King Edward the Confessor. Then it was taxed for five hides, now for one hide and three virgates. The arable land consists of two carucates and a half. In demesne there is one carucate and one villan, and one bordar with two carucates. There is one villei in gross, and four acres of meadow. It was worth and is worth £3.”

In the first year of Richard I. (1189) that king granted the custody of all his demesne lands in this manor, with a barn and other easements without the pale there, conies, rents, perquisites of courts, and all other profits, to Sir Robert Percy during his life, paying to the King 20 marks a year; and the office of steward of the lordship of Kennington, and the keeping of the manor-house there, conies and gardens, during his life; for which office of steward he was to have the accustomed wages, and for the office of keeper four pence a day, to be allowed out of the twenty marks to be paid by him to the King.

With the exception of the foregoing fact, the paucity of the great sources of historical information for a considerable time after Domesday Book, compels me to pass in silence over a lengthened period, when doubtless a royal residence such as Kennington has been, must have beheld scenes of no small interest; but as we approach the times of King John, in whose reign the great body of records commences, we may, by the aid of the chancery rolls and their attestations, which show conclusively from whence they were dated, trace the residence of that king at Kennington with very great exactness; and this is always a point of considerable interest in the early history of any locality which has been a royal residence,

because the means of pointing out the progress of the sovereign are both ample and accurate. Before going further into this point, it will be necessary to observe that throughout the various attestations which I shall notice, the King does not date from Kennington by name, but from Lambeth; this, however, is well understood to signify Kennington, otherwise there might appear to be a discrepancy which it would be difficult to explain. It will, perhaps, give additional interest to this part of the subject if I trace the royal progress, not only through Kennington, but also throughout the whole county of Surrey.

We will commence with the year 1204. King John is resident at Westminster from the 22nd to the 26th of January. On the 27th he visits Lambeth, and on the 28th he departs thence for the Tower of London, and returns to Westminster; on the 29th he is at the Tower and at Lambeth; on the 22nd May he dates from Farnham; and on the 9th June he is at Kingston, where he remains till the 14th, when he leaves for Merton; in October he is again resident at Lambeth from the 10th to the 12th; and on the 13th he dates documents from Lambeth, Westminster, and Waltham.

On Sunday, the 16th of January, 1205, he proceeds from Windsor to Lambeth, and in April he journeys through Farnham, Guildford, Kingston, and Southwark. On August 1st he is at Guildford, the next day at Kingston, and the three following days at Lambeth; whence he proceeds to Essex. On October 29th he is at Farnham, and afterwards at Guildford; on the 28th November he is at Lambeth, and also the two following days; and on December 1st he leaves Lambeth and passes through Rochester and Canterbury, where he remains for a few days, then re-visits Lambeth and passes over to Westminster. On the 21st March, 1206, he proceeds from Windsor to Mortlake, which he quits on the 22nd for Lambeth; and on the 24th he leaves Lambeth for Croydon.

On the 24th April he is at Chertsey and Lambeth; and on the 27th he is again at Lambeth, where he re-

mains some few days; and on the 2nd May he leaves Lambeth for Windsor.

After a visit to the Continent we find him at Farnham and Guildford in December; and on the 1st January, 1207, he is at Lambeth, to which place he returns on the 8th, after visiting Bexley, Canterbury, and Rochester. On the 13th and 14th March he is at Lambeth, and afterwards at Farnham; and from the 15th of April to the end of the month he dates every day from Lambeth and again from the 1st to the 9th of May; from the 28th to the 30th of June he is at Lambeth; and again a few days in July; on the 6th October he dates from Kingston, Lambeth, and Westminster; and the next day from Lambeth and Westminster; and again on the 28th; and at the latter end of December he is at Guildford and Farnham.

On the 21st January, 1208, he is at Lambeth, and afterwards at Farnham and Guildford; in February he dates from Lambeth, Kingston, and Farnham; on May 3rd he is at Southwark, and afterwards at Lambeth for a few days, when he leaves for Rochester, and then returns to Lambeth, where we do not find him again till the 16th and 17th of February, 1209.

On the 4th and 5th of April, 1211, he dates from Lambeth, and again on the 13th and 16th; he was there again on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th of May, 1212, and from thence he proceeded to Odiham, in Hampshire, where he arrived on Sunday, the 6th of May. On the following Monday three shillings were paid at Odiham in the hire of three carts travelling two days and resting one in conveying the wardrobe from Lambeth to Odiham; and to Ferling the huntsman, and Thomas de Porkericiis, with the hounds, 13 pence for their expences in sleeping one night on the road; namely, the night of Saturday after the Lord's Ascension, when the King went from Lambeth to Odiham.

Next we have an expence of 10 pence, paid on the Monday in the week of Pentecost (at Guildford), in the hire of two carts carrying the wardrobe from Odiham to Guildford for one day; and in the hire of a cart to carry

the said warbrobe from Guildford to Ditton for one day, sixpence. On the same day at Ditton, in the expences of the King's huntsmen, hounds, &c., staying by the King's command at Chertsey for two days, £2. 1s. 4d. paid to William Fitz Richard by the King.

On Wednesday, the 23rd May, fourpence was paid for the hire of a boat to ferry the wardrobe over the Thames between Westminster and Lambeth, because London Bridge was broken down.

On the 4th June, payment was made to the persons who attended the wardrobe from Chertsey to London, when the King slept at Ditton at the cost of the Chief Justice Geoffrey Fitz Pierre.

On Monday, the 25th of June, at Carlisle, the King gave two shillings to Wilkin de Meinel, the groom of Philip Mark, Sheriff of Nottingham, who carried to the King's mistress a chaplet of roses from Ditton, when the King was entertained there by his Justiciary Geoffrey Fitz Pierre.

It would occupy too much time to extend this account of the progress of the Sovereign through the county of Surrey any further; I have merely gone through a part of the reign of King John, in order to show, that if the inquiry were pursued through subsequent reigns, it would result in the production of much curious information, illustrative of the objects of this Society.

In 1231 Henry III. kept his Christmas at Kennington with great magnificence at the charges of Hubert de Burgh, his Justiciary.

In 1232 a parliament was held here, wherein an aid of the fortieth part of the movables of the whole nation was granted to the King for the payment of the debt he owed to the Duke of Bretagne; and in 1234 another parliament was held here.

In 1258 Henry III. granted the custody of this manor to Richard de Freimantell. John Earl of Surrey died here in 1304.

Edward I. was here on the 14th August, 1299, as shown by a document dated therefrom; and again on the 22nd of the same month.

Edward II. held his Council here, as appears by the Rolls of Parliament.

In 1316 this with other manors was conveyed by John Plantagenet, Earl of Warren and Surrey (grandson of the last-named earl), to King Edward II., and in the same year a commission under the privy seal was issued to John de Foxle, Baron of the Exchequer, to survey the defects of this manor, and which was re-conveyed by him to the earl; but in the same year the latter again conveyed it to the King, who two years afterwards granted it to Anthony Pessaigne de Janna and his heirs in exchange for premises in London. But by some means it presently reverted to the Crown, for in the next year, 1319, the King granted it with Faukeshall and other manors to Roger d'Amorie and Elizabeth his wife (sister and co-heir of Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester, and niece to the King) and the heirs of the body of the said Roger; and in the next year he had a confirmation of it from the Parliament then held at York. He was among those concerned in the conspiracy against the Spencers; and consequently, on his death, his lands were seized, as those of an enemy and rebel, and were delivered to Elizabeth de Burgh, his widow.

The manors of Kennington and Faukeshall were given to the Spencers on their regaining power; but on their death in 1327, it appears that Elizabeth de Burgh recovered them; for in the eleventh year of Edward III. she conveyed them to the King for the term of her life, in exchange for other manors. And John Lord Bardolph and Elizabeth his wife, eldest daughter and co-heir of the said Roger Lord D'Amorie and Elizabeth de Burgh, released to the King their rights in this manor.

In 1342 Edward III. kept his Christmas at Kennington.

In 1370 the King granted the custody of the manor and park to Helminge Legette for life.

The next owner of this manor we come to is a celebrated personage in English history, Edward, the eldest son of the King, and commonly called the Black Prince,

whose bravery and success in battle will ever cause his name to be reckoned among those of the great warriors of this land.

He was not merely the owner of this manor, but frequently resided here, many of his acts being dated from Kennington.

In 1377 a remarkable mummery was made by the citizens of London for the disport of the young Prince Richard, son of the Black Prince, and at that time only ten years old.

“On the Sunday before Candlemas, in the night, 130 citizens, disguised and well horsed, in a mummery, with sound of trumpets, sackbuts, cornets, shalmes, and other minstrels, and innumerable torchlights of wax, rode from Newgate through Cheap over the bridge, through Southwark, and so to Kennington, besides Lambeth, where the young prince remained with his mother and the Duke of Lancaster (his uncle), the Earls of Cambridge, Hertford, Warwicke, and Suffolke, with divers other lords.

“In the first rank did ride 48 in likeness and habit of esquires, two and two together, clothed in red coats and gowns of say or sandal, with comely vizors on their faces.

“These maskers, after they had entered the manor of Kennington, alighted from the horses, and entered the hall on foot; which done, the prince, his mother, and the lords came out of the hall, whom the mummers did salute; showing by a pair of dice on the table, their desire to play with the prince, which they so handled that the prince did alwais winne, when he came to cast at them. Then the mummers set to the prince three jewels, one after another, which were a boule of gold, a cup of gold, and a ring of gold, which the prince wonne at three casts. Then they set to the prince's mother, the duke, the earls, and other lords, to every one a ring of gold, which they did also win. After which they were feasted, and the music sounded, the prince and lords danced on the one part, with the mummers who did also dance; which jollity being ended, they were again made to drink, and then departed in order as they came.”

Such is the account given by Stow of this entertainment.

Henry IV. dates letters patent from this place on the 16th and 17th June in the third year of his reign; and in the tenth year gave the manor to Sir John Stanley; and in 1420 the King granted to Adam de Egeley the office of keeper of the palace. And this is the last time that, as far as I have been able to carry my

researches, express mention can be found of the existence of the palace which formerly stood here. Camden, who wrote in 1607, says that there was not the smallest remains of it, and that the very name of a palace was unknown.

Henry VI. was here in June 1437, and in May 1439.

The manor of Kennington seems to have been granted by Edward IV. to Thomas Saintleger, "with a Berne and other easements without the pale with the conyngery of the same;" for this grant was excepted out of an act of resumption in the seventh and eighth years of that reign.

On the 7th July, 11 Edw. IV., that King issued his patent, whereby he granted to the Duke of Cornwall a great number of manors, including "the manor and demesne of Kenyngton with the appurtenances."

On the 25th April, 1 Ric. III., the King granted to Robert Percy, knight, the custody of the demesne lands of the manor of Kenyngton, with a barn and other easements without the pale there, at a rent of 20 marks, as paid by Ralph Legh, late farmer thereof; also the offices of steward of the lordship, and keeper of the manor of Kennington, parcel of the Duchy of Cornwall, and of the rabbits and garden there, for his life.

In Henry the Seventh's time Sir Richard Gyldeford was keeper of the manor; and the grant under which he held this custody was excepted out of an act of resumption in the same reign.

King James I., in the eighth year of his reign, settled the manor of Kennington on Henry, Prince of Wales, and on his death in 1612 on Prince Charles, as part of the estate of the dukedom of Cornwall.

On the 17th August, 1614, a lease was granted to Sir Noel Caron of the rents of assize, and perquisites of the courts leet of the manor of Kennington for twenty-one years at the annual rent of £43. 15s. 0½d.

There is on the west side of Kennington Lane, leading from Newington Butts to Kennington Cross, an old mansion which tradition assigns as the occasional place

of residence of King Charles the First when Prince of Wales. It is a red brick edifice of somewhat commanding appearance, though a sombre and staid air seems to hang around the place; it was drawn some years ago in a number of the *Illustrated London News*.

I am unfortunately not in a position to authenticate the fact of Prince Charles's residence here, but am obliged to put forward this statement on very slight grounds.

Within the last few days I have had through my hands several privy seals and signet bills, all under the signature of Prince Charles during the period when he is said to have dwelt here: they are dated from various of the royal palaces, but Kennington does not occur once. Of course this is not to be taken as conclusive evidence that he never lived here, but it would have been satisfactory to have found one dated from this manor-house, as the question would then have been set at rest. This is, I believe, the only existing feature of antiquity in Kennington, all the rest is matter of history; but yet in an antiquarian point of view, the 17th century is comparatively modern, it is a mere yesterday; the reign of James I. or Charles I. is like new port wine,—it wants age, it wants keeping; it is not until we get back to the reign of Henry VII. that the antiquary begins to feel at home, and then the further he retrogrades the better pleased he is, until he reaches primitive times; in fact I believe he is never so happy as when he is kicking his shins over a Saxon landmark, or is engaged in digesting a very obstinate piece of Anglo-Saxon etymology.

The next important change with regard to this manor took place at the time of the Great Rebellion, when, in common with other royal estates, it was confiscated to the use of the State, and was sold by order of Parliament in the year 1649.

Upon this transaction, commissioners appointed by the Parliament made valuations of the property before sale, and returned careful surveys; these documents afford a considerable insight into the condition and value of the estate. The first one was taken in 1649.

Among the tenements standing on the manor is one described thus :—

“A tenement called the Buckshornes, consisting of one hall, one parlour, one kitchen, and a little buttery and three rooms above stairs, and one old room standing at the east end of the said tenement covered with boards, now used for a smith’s forge, one little yard and one little garden.”

It would thus appear that the name or sign attached to this house in which we are now assembled, is of long standing, and that it was current as far back as the year 1649; this, though it may seem a small matter, is a point of local antiquarian interest, not to be lightly passed over; indeed, the tracing back of signs to their origin and first establishment, especially in the metropolis, is a study so often pursued by archæologists that the discovery of the existence of this sign at so early a period would, saving the good opinion of this meeting, be deemed an ample reward for the pains bestowed on the preparation of this paper.

Another item in this survey shows that the stewards and juries of former times were in the habit of conducting their business on the same praiseworthy principles as are followed out at the present day.

“There is and anciently hath been accustomed to be allowed for the defraying of the charges of a dinner for the steward and land-owners at the keeping of a yearly court baron for the said manor the sum of forty shillings, and for the charges of a dinner for the jury serving for the yearly Leet Court held at the same time for the said manor ten shillings.”

There is also mention in this survey of a field called the Gallows Field. This is the place which was made use of in former times for the execution of criminals; and from a comparison of the abuttals of this field, the gallows would appear to have stood somewhere at the north side of the common. It was here that James Dawson—the Jemmy Dawson of Shenstone’s ballad—was hanged, drawn, and quartered, on July 30, 1746. He was concerned in the insurrection carried on by the adherents of the house of Stuart.

Thus far I have traced the descent of the manor, in which I have been materially assisted by the very excellent History of Lambeth written by the late John Tauswell, Esq., a member of this society; but beyond this point, there is nothing of sufficient archæological interest to remark upon; I will therefore proceed to glance at one or two subjects in connection with this locality before bringing this paper to a close.

Near this spot, on the site of Messrs. Beaufoy's distillery, stood a large mansion and park inhabited by a celebrated man of his time, Sir Noel de Caron, Dutch Ambassador to the Court of England during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Here Queen Elizabeth sometimes visited the ambassador, and on the 27th July, 1599, she dined with him.

Among the Public Records are preserved several letters of this ambassador's, dated from his house here in the year 1611, and also in 1621 and 1622.

On the 5th April, 1612, he writes from South Lambeth to Lord Salisbury, and in this letter is contained some mention of the erection of his house, which, if commensurate with the time it occupied in building, must have been a magnificent mansion. The original is in French. He says:—

“I am requested by an honest and young man, whose father has been the principal workman who built my house here at South Lambeth, and after his death this young man, who is still in my service; he informs me that the clerk to the Surveyor at Hampton Court is dead, and that his place is in the disposal of your Excellence; he would desire this place if possible; and because I can witness to his diligence while he was on my work at the least 8 or 10 years, I should be bold to recommend him to you; for if your excellency has not already disposed of that place, I think certainly that I should gain no discredit by him.”

I am fortunate in obtaining also from the Public Record Office two other documents of interest respecting this ambassador's funeral, which took place with much ceremony at Lambeth Church on the 25th January, 1625.

The first one contains a memorandum to this effect:—The Lord Carone's funeral being the 25th of January,

1624, "there was sent to his Grace [the Archb. of Canterbury] 6 yards of fine cloth for himself, and 15 yards for five gentlemen's coats, and one cloke for the Porter Peregrine; viz., to 5 gentlemen, 3 yards apiece."

These gentlemen are thus named:—

"Mr. Comptroller, Mr. Line, Mr. Goodwine, Mr. Broadbridge, Raph Watts, and Peregrine the porter."

The second document commences thus:—

"The proceeding of the funeral of Sir Noell Caron, Ambassador Lieger for the States of the United Provinces solemnized at Lambeth, on Tuesday, the 25th of January, 1624; the proceeding went from his house along Lambeth Street.

" 2 Conductors.

" Poor men in gowns.

" Mr. Lucas Circellus and Segar Circellus, their men.

" Mr. Abra. Books and Mr. Van de Put's man.

" Mr. Burlemach and Mr. Sixson's man.

" Do. Featleye's and Mr. Jacob van de Birk's men.

" Mr. Noel van de Birk's men and Sir Peter van Lore's men.

" Sir Peter Regimortis and Sir Jo. Worseman's men.

" Sir Henry's Martin's men.

" The stands borne by Mr. Wolfers van Diman.

" 27 of the defunct's ancient servants that had been.

" 12 of the defunct's household servants.

" The 2 apothecaries.

" Mr. Bowen and Williamson Proctors.

" Mr. Wigan and a proctor.

" Mr. Machalan and Mr. Jaques de Best, merchants.

" Mr. De Questor, merchant.

" Six of my Lord of Canterbury's gentlemen.

" Mr. Lucas Circellus and Mr. Segar Circellus.

" Mr. Abraham Beck and Mr. Van de Putt.

" Mr. Burlemack.

" The Vicar of Lambeth and Minister of Bagshot.

" The 4 ministers of the Dutch Church.

Knights.

" Sir Peter Vanlor and Sir Peter Regimortis.

" Sir John Worseman and Sir Hen. Martyn.

" Doctor Featley, chaplain to the Archbishop, for the Preacher his Grace of Canterbury.

" The Pennon borne by Mr. Hickman.

" Gauntlet and spurs borne by Mr. Vincent Windsor.

- “ Healme and chest by H. C. Chester.
 “ Sword and Target } by H. S. Richmond for
 “ Coat of Arms } Mr. Clarenceux.

COFFIN.

- “ Mr. Noel Vanden Brock, Principal Mourner.
 Assistants.
 “ Mr. Jacob Vanden Brock ; Mr. Phillip Caron ; and Mr. Duist.
 “ Others without blacks.
 “ Neighbours of Lambeth and others.”

There is a curious entry in one of the Treasury Books at the Public Record Office, concerning a woman, who, about the year 1685, had been apprehended for passing bad money; the laws against which offence were at that time carried out most severely; and it appears that she was in the habit of adopting an ingenious scheme for the purpose of imposing upon the honest inhabitants of Vauxhall and its neighbourhood. It is as follows:—

“ May it please your Ma^{ty}.

“ In obedience to your Ma^{ty} commands signified to me the 24th of Octob^r last by the Earle of Sunderland, your Ma^{ty} Principall Se^cry of State upon the Petⁿ of Katherine Williams to your Ma^{ty} setting forth That the Pet^r in the month of March last at the sessions held at Croydon for the county of Surry was fined 100 li, and ever since for nonpaym^t of the said fine she hath remained prisoner in the Marshalsea. That she is very poore and not able to pay the least part thereof, and alleading that it is the first crime she was ever convicted of w^{ch} she is truly sorry for, and will never more comitt the like offence. Therefore the Pet^r most humbly implores your Ma^{ty} from your princely clemency and goodness to grant the Pet^r by reason of her inability your Ma^{ty} most gracious Warr^t of Pardon to remitt the said fine. I have considered of the said Petⁿ and doe humbly report to your Ma^{ty} that for my informa^{cion} in this matter I referred the same to the warden of your Ma^{ty} Mint and to the Com^{rs} for executing the office of Master and Worker of the Mint, who have by their report dated the 24 of Xber last certified me that they have considered of the said Petⁿ and doe find the Pet^r to be a notorious offender deserving little favour from your Ma^{ty}, she having made it her practice to utter false Guineys at Foxhall, and severall other landing places between that and Greenwich by stopping at such places and sending her waterman a shoare to change her bad

guineys. And they doe humbly conceive that the meeke proceedings, as they stile it, ag^t Clippers and Coyners and their instruments, and much more there being pardoned and perhaps afterwards restoring their estates is in a great measure the reason why your Ma^{ty} subjects are so much infested with criminalls of y^e kind. All w^{ch} is most humbly submitted to your Ma^{ty} great wisdom. Rochester, 13 Feby. 1685."*

There is one more subject on which I must say a word, though it is not perhaps sufficiently archæological to demand a notice. Vauxhall Gardens, though now of somewhat questionable tendency,† have their historical associations in common with Marylebone and Ranelagh, with whom they divide the honour of having afforded to the aristocracy of the two preceding centuries a fashionable place of resort. The gardens of Marylebone and Vauxhall claim greater antiquity than Ranelagh, but Vauxhall remained the longest to delight the inhabitants of London.

Known first under the name of the New Spring Garden, it was much frequented by the fashionable world, and consequently our never-failing friend, Samuel Pepys, is often found visiting these haunts of pleasure, as a few extracts from his Diary will show.

On the 20th June, 1665 :—

“By water to Foxhall, and there walked an hour alone, observing the several humours of the citizens that were this holyday pulling off cherries, and God knows what.

“22 July. To Foxhall, where the Spring Garden; but I do not see one guest there.

* Treasury Warrant Book not relating to money, No. 4, p. 201.

† It is perhaps needless to remark that, since the preparation of this paper, Vauxhall Gardens have been discontinued as a place of public amusement, and their site is now almost covered with buildings, among which stands foremost the interesting church of St. Peter, recently consecrated, in which edifice there are some important architectural features, which will amply repay more than one inspection. Although this is a modern edifice, and consequently not within the scope of my remarks, yet I would beg leave to draw attention to one peculiarity in this church; namely, the use of a triforium around the chancel, and also at the west end; a peculiarity which is pleasing not only in an æsthetic point of view, but also because we are thereby led back in fancy to those days when Christian architecture held up its head in triumph, and was not degenerate, as it too often is now.

"28 May 1667. By water to Foxhall, and there walked in Spring Garden. A great deal of company, and the weather and garden pleasant, and it is very pleasant and cheap going thither, for a man may go to spend what he will or nothing, all as one. But to hear the nightingale and the birds, and here fiddles and there a harp, and here a jew's trump, and here laughing and there fine people walking, is mighty divertising.

"30 May 1668. To Foxhall, and there fell into the company of Harry Killigrew, a rogue newly come back out of France, but still in disgrace at our Court, and young Newport and others, as very rogues as any in the town, who were ready to take hold of every woman that come by them. And so to supper in an arbour: but Lord! their mad talk did make my heart ake.

"1 June 1668. Alone to Foxhall, and walked and saw young Newport and two more rogues of the town seize on two ladies, who walked with them an hour with their masks on (perhaps civil ladies); and there I left them."

And here I will bring these observations to a close. I have done my best in a short space to lay before you everything of importance relating to this locality, and if my remarks have succeeded in exciting your interest in any degree, it will be owing not so much to my exertions as to the intrinsic interest which attaches itself to the former history of the palace and manor of Kennington.