

# DERBYSHIRE ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY.

---

## The Pole Family and the Forty-Five.

---

By R. E. E. CHAMBERS.

---

AS no published comment seems to have been made upon several errors and omissions in "Derby and the Forty-Five," by L. Eardley-Simpson, M.A., LL.B., it is hoped that the following corrections and information which add some new facts to family history will supply certain details relevant to the Jacobite tradition at Radbourne.

To the author occupied with the difficult problems of his subject little reproach attaches for repeating long standing errors in the early history of the Poles, but they are thereby perpetuated and some others have been added. Thus, on page 124 *et seq.*, "The ancient family of Pole was originally of Newborough in Staffordshire but removed in the fourteenth century to the Derbyshire village of Hartington and thence to Wakebridge . . ."

Quite definitely the de la Poles of Hartington were there from the beginning of the reign of Edward III, 1327, and had not removed to it from Newborough in Staffordshire where, on the contrary, they were acquiring land within a decade of that date: nor did they remove from Hartington

to Wakebridge. The statement that "Radbourne originally belonged to the Lawton family from whom it descended to Chandos and thence to the Poles," is new but altogether incorrect. The descent of the Manor of Radbourne has often been set forth in the history of the County and as recently as 1930 in the *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*, N.S. 5.

Referring to German Pole of Radbourne in 1745, the author states, on page 125, that "The Jacobitism of the Poles has been questioned because the name of Pole occurs in the list of officers serving in the Elector's Army at Culloden. This was in fact a nephew of German," namely Colonel E. S. Pole, born 1718, died 1780, son of Lieut-General Edward Pole. "It was he who served at Culloden . . ." "The theory of German Pole's service in the Elector's Army having been disposed of . . ." Now where is this 'list of officers serving in the Elector's Army at Culloden' which includes the name of Pole? Where the proof that E. S. Pole fought at Culloden? Or where the 'theory' mentioned? The name of Pole is, of course, in the army of George II, but of the two above officers, neither the father nor the son fought at Culloden.

The writer is aware of the very natural family belief that Edward Sacheverell Pole was at the battle of Culloden. But it is an error. He entered the army the year before the rebellion, being appointed Ensign or 2nd Lieut. in the Royal Welsh Fusiliers, 25 June, 1744, and, doubtless with a view to obtaining promotion was appointed Ensign in the Coldstream Guards on 1 May, 1745, from which he was promoted, 5 August, 1746, Captain in the Royal Welsh Fusiliers. That was three and a half months after the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745-6 had been crushed at Culloden and neither regiment had served in Scotland during those years.

The error doubtless arose from the fact that the portrait of Colonel E. S. Pole at Radbourne shows him wearing,

suspended by a ribbon round his neck what in books of medals and history is wrongly called 'the Culloden medal.' Moreover, the gold medal itself and its ribbon, pink with green borders, are still at Radbourne. But it is not a war medal.

It was a medal of ten guineas' price, struck for each member of 'the Cumberland Society,' which was instituted at Inverness the 17th day of April 'in grateful Remembrance of the Service done our King and Country by his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland in extinguishing the Rebellion at the battle of Culloden.' At its institution the day after the battle, John, Marquess of Granby was appointed Perpetual President. Under him Colonel Edward Sacheverell Pole was serving when elected a member of "The 'Cumberland' Society," in April, 1762, he being at home that spring from the Seven Years' War in Germany, as was also Lord Granby. The number of members was not to exceed the age of the Duke of Cumberland who was 25 years old the day before the battle—his kinsman and adversary being six and a half months older—and on his birthday each year the Society was to meet for the election of a new member and to fill up vacancies. There were several distinguished members and not all were soldiers. An article "The 'Cumberland' Society," in the "Journal of the Society of Army Historical Research," July, 1927, gives full particulars.

The best reference to the stated visit of Prince Charles Edward to Radbourne on the 4th December, 1745 is in "Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals," by the Rev. J. Charles Cox, LL.D., F.S.A.; Vol. I, 310-311, and is as follows: "The abortive effort to restore Charles Edward Stuart to the throne in 1745, had special interest for Derbyshire, as his forces succeeded in penetrating to the heart of the county. It will have been noticed in the long list of subscribers to the fund for resisting the Highlanders, given in the last section, that the names of the various

Derbyshire recusants are absent. Evidence reached us some years ago from two different sources that we cannot doubt (for in each case the tradition had only passed through two people, and was supplied by those who had received it from their grandfathers who were present), that Prince Charles Edward, on December 4th, when marching from Ashbourne to Derby, turned aside for an hour or two at Mr. German Pole's of Radbourne, where he met by previous secret arrangement several of the leading recusants of Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Staffordshire, as well as representatives of other families. Mr. German Pole was not himself a recusant, though of strong Jacobite tendencies, but was a connection of the well known Poles of Spinkhill, and others of his own branch of the family were Romanists. Our information leads us to believe that the Prince here made up his own mind that retreat was necessary before ever he had entered Derby, one of the reasons being the non-arrival of a large sum of money which was to have met him here from the Jacobites in Leicestershire and the south midlands, and which was afterwards coolly appropriated by the Derbyshire yeoman entrusted with its custody."

It would have been much to the point had Dr. Cox told us how the 'evidence' or 'tradition' reached him and the names of his informants. Left unenlightened but critical, a doubt arises whether he may not have been as much misled into this statement as into the belief, so contrary to decisive evidence, that the Prince made up his mind at Radbourne that retreat was necessary.

To establish the truth of the picturesque incident of the visit to Radbourne would certainly be interesting but this has not been done. Still less is it assured that the Prince gave or sent later his portrait to the Squire of Radbourne—why indeed should he? Moreover, the identity, origin and history of the portrait now reproduced as a frontispiece in the book, remain undetermined there. If

there is no record of the quantity of Stuart tartan at Radbourne, how can its presence there be explained? Could it have been left behind in Derby by the retreating Scots and afterwards purchased?

But if Major Eardley-Simpson has been unable to solve any of these mysteries the wider attention he has drawn to them may lead indirectly to their solution.

No account of the family mentions that in 1745 Mrs. Pole of Radbourne, German Pole's second wife, Mary, daughter of Robert Gayer, of the Old Manor House, Stoke Poges, came of a family ardently Jacobite. Yet the fact may have some bearing upon the Jacobite tradition and relics at Radbourne, even upon the portrait if it were proved to be of the Stuart Prince, Charles Edward, who came to Derby about the middle of her married life. She died in 1762, a fact which should be noticed, as Major Eardley-Simpson, on page 124, has misplaced her as the first wife—Sarah Bagnall, who died in 1725.

With regard to the portrait at Radbourne which now forms a frontispiece to "Derby and the Forty-Five" and is described there as 'Charles, Prince of Wales and Prince Regent,' the author admits that there have been doubts concerning it and writes on pages 126-7: "No other copies have been traced, and it is only fair to say that doubts have been cast upon the authenticity of the picture, or the fact that it represents the Prince at all; it has even been stated to be a portrait of Prince William of Hanover!" A dozen lines later the author appears to be satisfied that "beyond any reasonable doubt" it is a portrait of Prince Charles Edward; but although he has apparently taken some trouble to identify it the result cannot be regarded as conclusive. If the opinion has been ventured upon before that it is a portrait of Prince William, Duke of Cumberland, something more can be said for that view now. Some resemblance between these two Princes, as between their fathers, perhaps

existed and may be discernible in the portrait, but that can well be due to their kinship, James I being ancestor to both. Any such likeness would doubtless have been more in evidence before the Duke's increasing weight blunted the outline of his face and added heaviness to features as well as figure. The words, however, with which Major Eardley-Simpson would point a likeness in the portrait to Prince Charles seem quite as appropriate to a comparison of it with Cumberland. The allusions to the forehead and the curves of the hair, a fulness of the upper eye-lid, the nose, mouth and double chin seem indeed to apply even more to Cumberland. Already in 1746 he had that amount of double chin, absent in his rival for many years, and it is clearly shown in the profile of his head on the obverse of the medal of 'the Cumberland Society.' The eyes of the portrait are not described but Cumberland's were blue, Prince Charles's brown.

The portrait at Radbourne appears to have a definite likeness in face and figure to the Duke of Cumberland at that age and this identification is supported by the uniform and Field-Marshal's baton, and perhaps by the dark blue ribbon of the Garter adopted in 1745 to distinguish it from the light blue used by the Stuart Princes after 1688 and continued by them.

Cumberland's passionate devotion to the army which he did so much to build up and train was well known to its officers, as the letters of James Wolfe and others attest, and what more natural than that Colonel E. S. Pole, a member of the Cumberland Society, a recognised admirer of his Commander-in-Chief, should have had his portrait at Radbourne?

Again, if German Pole never had any intention of supporting a Jacobite rising there would still be nothing incongruous in his collecting or preserving Jacobite relics after the historic event which came so near to Radbourne. This applies equally to his successor—soldiers have always

found interest in mementoes of their adversaries. Surely it presents a more natural pursuit than the glass-smashing devastation suggested on page 128 by Major Eardley-Simpson.

It seems unfortunate that the author of "Derby and the Forty-Five" omitted to mention that German Pole of Radbourne in September, 1745, subscribed £50 in support of a movement for raising 600 men in the county for King George and his Government and that his next brother, the Rev. Samuel Pole, Rector of Radbourne, is in the same list of subscribers for the defence of the county against the invaders.

Their kinsfolk, Margaret and Mary Pole, of Chesterfield, subscribed £5 to the same cause and with all due deference to the above author, there seems no reason whatever to doubt that their brother, Francis Pole of Park Hall, Barlborough, High Sheriff of Derbyshire in 1708, with whom they lived, also subscribed as he said he would, though naturally preferring to do so at Chesterfield near his home; and this was understood to be his intention by the High Constable who had asked him to subscribe elsewhere as mentioned in Simpson's "Derby," i, 239-240.

These anti-Jacobite subscriptions of the Poles are ignored by Major Eardley-Simpson, except in the case of Francis Pole whose actual payment is unrecorded, like many others, and to him Jacobitism is gratuitously attributed by the comment on page 136—"One wonders whether Mr. Pole forgot"—to pay.

Now German Pole's substantial subscription—and comparison with others shows it to have been that—to a fund for raising a regiment for the defence of the county against the Stuart Prince, is not a sure foundation for strong Jacobitism. It is certainly a fact to be stated and reckoned with before accepting the less reliable evidence of tradition and conjecture.

The third brother, Edward Pole, later Lieut.-General,

and Colonel of the 10th Foot, in which he had not served, had been present at the battle of Malplaquet under the Duke of Marlborough in 1709 and on active service in Scotland in the suppression of the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715-16, and was in 1745-46 in the army in Ireland. He inherited Park Hall about 1755 and died in 1762. His son, Edward Sacheverell Pole, later Colonel, said to have been at Fontenoy in 1745, served under the Duke of Cumberland in England in 1745-46, in the Coldstream Guards and as Captain, 5 Aug., 1746, in the Royal Welch Fusiliers, and in the Netherlands in 1747-48. He served in the defence of Minorca and with distinction through the Seven Years' War commanding the Royal Welsh Fusiliers in which he was wounded at Minden and taken prisoner at Campen. Having been promoted Colonel in the Army on the 19 February, 1762, he was elected two months later a member of the Cumberland Society, as already stated, and in 1765 succeeded his uncle at Radbourne. Two more of the family, at least, nephews of German Pole of Radbourne, were in the army of George II; one during 1737-40 only, the other joining the year after Culloden.

The facts, including the anti-Jacobite military service and subscriptions, do not accord well with the theory maintained in "Derby and the Forty-Five." Indeed the assumed Jacobitism of the Poles is not very evident and if it has been and is questioned that is not merely as Major Eardley-Simpson implies, on page 125, because Colonel E. S. Pole was in the Army of George II in 1745-46. Not only is a due consideration of circumstances adverse to the author's theme somewhat disparaged but early in the book, on page 17, the reader is given to understand of German Pole of Radbourne, that there were "circumstances which leave little doubt of his Jacobite sentiments," and that "what must have been known as to his political past" was even more conclusive.



Yet when he stood as a parliamentary tory candidate for Derby in 1747, what more was known of 'his political past' than that he had also stood as a tory in 1742? There is no proof in that of his favouring Prince Charles's cause any more than did his supporters in December, 1745, although, as in 1715, it still served the Whigs as a party device to have the Tories confounded with Jacobites.

While it is not doubted that German Pole of Radbourne had Jacobite friends and connections and maybe shared with them some sympathies for the Stuarts such associations and intercourse could come by chance and without the significance ascribed later. For example, Major Eardley-Simpson, on page 46, referring to Sir Rowland Hill in 1745 as a Jacobite and leading Shropshire Tory, adds: "Hill's wife being a Pole of Radbourne." The Jacobite Cause was long dead when Mary, a daughter of German Pole by his 2nd wife, married Hill in 1776, as his second wife and her second husband; and so the date prevents a wrong impression.

Summing up his case for the Jacobitism of the Poles, the author writes on page 128, "And it is also a fact, known to others beside the author, that Colonel R. W. Chandos-Pole, the late Squire, who died in September [20th Oct.], 1930, stated quite openly that a mortgage on the estates which had originally been raised to send financial support to the Stuarts, had only been paid off in his own lifetime. This, in itself, would appear to conclude the matter, quite apart from the supposition that the High Toryism of German Pole would naturally incline him to the White Rose." Here the unstated date is still more important, for if the mortgage was raised to supply financial aid to Charles I or during the exile of Charles II it would have no bearing upon the Jacobitism of 1745.

Granted the Poles were loyal to the Stuarts in their day, yet like others they moved with the times and in the direction of stable government. Strong adherents of the

House of Lancaster as they were long before Peter de la Pole of Radbourne, Knight of the Shire in 1400-1, had acquired that Manor in the reign of Richard II, by his marriage with Elizabeth, the niece and eventual sole heiress of the great Sir John Chandos of Radbourne, Knight Founder of the Garter, Viscount of Saint-Sauveur in Normandy, Knight-Banneret, Constable of Aquitaine and Seneschal of Poitou, it was natural that their son and successor, Ralph de la Pole, Justice of the King's Bench, should thrive under Henry VI, the last Lancastrian king. Yet the Judge's son and successor, Ralph de la Pole of Radbourne, Esquire, who married a rich heiress and survived the Wars of the Roses, flourished under the House of York, was High Sheriff of the Counties of Nottingham and Derby in 1476-7 in the reign of Edward IV, and wore the Collar of SS. at the time of his death in 1492 in the reign of Henry VII, when still in possession of his considerable estates. So with varying fortune his descendants passed through Tudor and Stuart times, encountering many difficulties but avoiding disaster. Now and again they were Sheriffs of Derbyshire, as all the owners of Radbourne have been from 1694 to 1930, as well as some others of the family.

In the armies of George I and George II they served against the Jacobite Risings, in Scotland in 1715-16 and in England in 1745-46, and subscribed financially against the latter invasion. For these, and the other reasons given above, the truth about the Pole family and the Forty-Five appears somewhat detached from the tradition at Radbourne and the author's enthusiasm for his cause in "Derby and the Forty-Five."

From the very nature of the task there must have been many difficulties to contend with but no convincing evidence is found in this interesting work of the Jacobitism of the Poles of Radbourne, nor does acceptance of it seem to be supported by more than a tradition curiously at variance with if not disproved by the facts of contemporary family history.