

Radbourne and the Forty-Five.

By MAJOR L. EARDLEY SIMPSON.

I HAVE read with the greatest interest the able and detailed article which Mr. Chambers¹ contributed to the last number of the *Journal* on the Pole family and the Jacobite tradition; to say that I have perused it with satisfaction or with any desire to kiss the rod he has presented for my chastisement, would be to prefer courtesy to truth—and of that I have never yet been accused.

Mr. Chambers has attempted to convict me of a series of mistakes in the short compass of about 5 pages of *Derby and the Forty-Five*—an approach doubtless designed to sap the foundations of my theory as to the Jacobite sympathies of the Poles so that its destruction might be easier. It is possible that he may be right on his details of Pole family history, but I am wrong—if wrong at all—in very good company. I made no attempt to write a complete history of the Poles or any other Derbyshire family, but I was not foolish enough to dash down on paper a collection of statements for which I had no warrant. A long discussion of the opening points of Mr. Chambers' article would be wearisome, but I gave my authority so that any critic might check me and I will repeat it. The derivation of the ancient family of Pole, its removal to Hartington and from Hartington to Wakebridge, the connection of Lawton and Chandos and certain particulars as to the pedigree of German Pole are

¹ *The Pole Family and the Forty-five*, by R. E. E. Chambers, D.A.J., n.s. Vol. VIII, pp. 1-10.

all taken from Mr. Jeayes' book *Radbourne Charters*,¹ which was printed at the Bedford Press in London in 1896 at the request of the late squire, Colonel R. W. Chandos-Pole. Knowing "the Squire" as I did, I am surprised to find that he allowed such errors to appear in a work which, as the introduction shows, was conceived and completed under his own auspices. If I may say so, I would just as soon be wrong with the Squire as right with Mr. Chambers.

But I must confess to one dreadful error. Misled by the peculiar form of the pedigree, I made German Pole marry his wives in the wrong order, transposing Mary Gayer and Sarah Bagnall. I drew no inferences from my mistake, though I suspected the real second wife, Mary Gayer, of coming from Jacobite stock as Mr. Chambers suggests was the case. To turn this into a proof that German Pole was a convinced adherent of Hanover and registered his devotion to the Elector's cause by taking a Jacobite wife is a piece of special pleading which might rather have belonged to my own profession in its most pettifogging moments.

Before we leave the Pole pedigree, one word as to Edward Sacheverell Pole, born in 1718 and living until 1780. So runs the record on p. xix of Mr. Jeayes' book, and I added the further details that this officer served at Fontenoy and Culloden. Mr. Chambers says he did not because the regiments in which he served were not present at either battle, overlooking the obvious possibility that he might have been attached to some other regiment, or even to the staff. However, on p. xxii, Mr. Jeayes makes the same statement as I, and there I am content to leave the point. It is of no particular moment to me, but if the Pole family can be convinced that their ancestor was not with "the Butcher," I should think they will be

¹ *Radbourne Charters* was printed for private circulation, but a type-script copy is in the Derbyshire Collection of the Derby Public Library.—Ed.

sufficiently gratified to forgive me my error (and that of Mr. Jeayes) in their natural rejoicing. So much for the proof and theory which Mr. Chambers is so anxious to trace; his query makes one wonder whether a reference in a footnote is worth the extra cost of printing.

One other pedigree item. Even if I suppose Mr. Chambers to be a devotee of Hanoverianism or even one of Lockhart's "odd animals the Whimsicals," I do not know why he has fallen foul of my very innocent statement that Sir Rowland Hill married a Pole of Radbourne and was a leading Shropshire Tory. I merely mentioned this marriage as a fact—which Mr. Chambers admits it is—and as showing a Derbyshire connection between the Hills and the Poles. I did not say Sir Rowland Hill was a Jacobite; the most was that the Gowers, who were then Jacobites, supported Sir Rowland at the Lichfield Election in 1734, and that in 1745 he declined to help the Elector's Government. The first fact I had from Colonel Wedgwood's *Staffordshire Parliamentary History*, and the second from a letter from Lord Herbert which I found in the Duke of Devonshire's papers at Chatsworth. I should think Hill probably was a Jacobite, but I did not lay the least stress on his marriage. However, any stick is good enough for a Whig or a Whimsical to use on the poor Tory dog. And I am not so sure that "the Jacobite cause was long dead in 1776"; the old toast was still being drunk in the great Tory Club, and Dr. Johnson was making his celebrated declaration as to what would happen to the Elector and his ministers if the people of England were fairly polled.

Before one approaches the points which really do matter, there are some minor ones which may be dealt with quite shortly. In referring to German Pole's two candidatures for Derby, I suggested that his poll in 1747 was a fair performance in view of "what must have been known of his political past." I did not think these words

were capable of misunderstanding, but I was mistaken. I desired to infer that some hint of his Jacobite connections might very likely have been the subject of rumour in a small community, and I still think so. Then, Mr. Chambers may say, why was he not prosecuted? For the same reason that the Government turned a blind eye on the Duke of Beaufort, Lord Barrymore, Sir Watkin Wynn and Sir John Hinde Cotton—the old Walpolean motto: *quieta non movere*.

Then the mortgage to help the Stuarts is not denied, but it is quite gratuitously suggested that this might have been raised before 1688. The context shews this was not intended, but if I should ever run to a second edition, I will insert the one word "later" which will make the road to my meaning so plain that "wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." For that was the story as it was told.

The authenticity of the portrait of the Prince is a question of more importance than these details. Mr. Chambers admits that I have called attention to a doubt, but appears to complain that, after doing so, I am satisfied that the picture is really what I have represented it to be. I have, as he says, taken some pains to identify it—possibly more than he thinks—but I really could not trouble readers of my book with the details of my investigations. Perhaps I may now be permitted to give a short recapitulation.

Before I ventured to have the reproduction made, a photograph (with full description of colours, &c.) was submitted to Sir Charles Petrie, Bart. and Mr. Grant Francis, as two leading authorities on Jacobite History, and also to Dr. Meikle, of the Scottish National Library, the Directors of the National Galleries, Edinburgh, and the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Secretary of the Royal United Services Institution, and, finally, to the officials of the National Portrait Gallery. Not one of

these authorities gave me a negative reply, while several were quite positive about it; I hold a recent letter from the Assistant to the Director of the National Portrait Gallery, to whom the original enquiry was first made by my publisher, and in this letter he writes, "we thought the identification possible and I still do." Mr. Allan (my publisher) and I carefully compared the picture with all the known portraits of the Prince, apart from the other steps which were taken, and he was, if possible, even more certain than I. It would be interesting to know if Mr. Chambers has compared the Radbourne portrait with that of the Duke of Cumberland by Sir Joshua Reynolds; to my eye there is not the slightest resemblance. Mr. Chambers writes, "some resemblance between the two Princes, as between their fathers, perhaps existed and may be discernible in the portrait," but who ever yet found any likeness between King James the Third and that Elector of Hanover whom historians called George the Second? Just as a side-line, I find a note that a friend submitted a copy of the portrait to a Stuart of Appin who identified it without the faintest hesitation.

The facial characteristics given by me and alluded to by Mr. Chambers were those to which my particular attention was directed on comparing the Radbourne picture with that by Pompeo Battoni as set out in the text; they are nothing like those of Sir Joshua's Cumberland. As to the colour of the eyes, Mr. Chambers is more sure than I on this much debated point, but if he pins his faith to those of Cumberland being blue, I can tell him that the Radbourne portrait is not one of the Butcher; brown is the colour and that is the one which Mr. Chambers attributes to the Prince. The colour of the Garter riband very much resembles that in David's portrait of the Prince as a boy, now in the National Portrait Gallery, and is also shown in that attributed to Nattier—also in

the National Portrait Gallery—of Henry the Ninth. A possible difficulty over these Garter ribands was mentioned by me on p. 58 of "Derby and the Forty-Five," where an explanation was given, but this may have escaped Mr. Chambers' notice.

It may be permissible to add that the identification of the portrait with the "Butcher" Duke was first by a well known peer (since dead) who was the Squire's guest at dinner a good many years ago. One who was present has described to me, with a wealth of quite credible detail, the explosion which overwhelmed the unlucky guesser. It is a significant reminder that the Pole family have no doubts whatever, and it is a fair presumption that they should know something about their own pictures.

Shortly after I had written the first draft of this article, I was honoured by an invitation from Mrs. Chandos-Pole to assist in taking a party from a local Literary Society over the Hall, so that they might inspect the historical relics connected with the Forty-Five. I took the precaution of providing myself with a copy of Reynold's portrait of the Butcher, and asked all the party to compare it with the Radbourne picture; the unanimous verdict was that there was not the faintest shadow of a shade of resemblance, but a comparison with some of the well known portraits of the Prince which I also had with me resulted in a body of support for my identification which, if not "unanimous," was certainly *nem. con.*

While this article was in the press, my attention was called to two further points which may be of interest. In the first place, Sir Godfrey Goodman has referred me to the plaster busts of the Prince which were sold in London in 1750 and from one of which Dr. King's servant made his well-known recognition of the original. These busts were made from one in marble by a Parisian artist and I have inspected a copy; the resemblance to the Radbourne portrait is very remarkable.

The second, and perhaps, more important item concerns the red uniform which has been a stumbling block to many. There I am indebted to some researches, started by Dr. G. F. Keatinge of Derby and followed up by Sir Godfrey Goodman. These have elicited the fact that the Irish Regiments in the service of France and Spain—originally composed of Jacobite refugees—all wore scarlet uniforms so like English ones that, at St. Eustache in the West Indies about 1780, an English garrison was entirely deceived and let in a French-Irish Regiment under the mistaken impression that they were receiving reinforcements. This information comes from O'Callaghan's "Irish Brigades," which gives O'Sullivan—one of the Seven men of Moidart—in a uniform of scarlet and gold and contains a letter from Lord Dunbar at Avignon in 1748 in which he states that the Prince had arrived unexpectedly "disguised in a uniform of Ireland's regiment accompanied only by Mr. Sheridan and one officer of the same regiment"; he adds that the Prince had "in compliment to his hosts, assumed the Irish uniform." Sheridan's Corps was the Regiment of Irlandia in the Spanish Army, and I have little doubt its colour was red; as to the French-Irish regiments there is no doubt whatever as plates exist in the Royal United Services Institution of the regiments of Dillon, Clare and Bulkeley and all are that colour. The only point which remains to be cleared is, I suggest, whether the Radbourne portrait shows the Prince in the uniform of an Irish Regiment in the service of France or of Spain.

The remaining matter is as to whether the Poles were Jacobites or Hanoverians, and I am here put to proof by Mr. Chambers in no uncertain fashion. A well known writer (whose name I prefer not to mention) entered into private correspondence with me after publication of my book, and several letters were exchanged; as a result, he expressed himself as convinced that I was right, but

perhaps Mr. Chambers is made of sterner stuff and, like the brethren of the Rich Man in the Parable, requires that one shall rise from the dead before he will be persuaded. I fear I am unable to assist him to that extent, and can only deal with the material I have. There are, in effect, three points urged against me, and I will deal with them separately.

The first is that although—according to Mr. Chambers—no Pole was at Culloden, at least three members of the family served in the armies at various times. Fiction is no evidence, but I have always maintained that Sir Walter Scott knew more about the Forty-Five than most historians—was not his father “man of business” to Murray of Broughton, who obviously knew most of the secret history? If Mr. Chambers will re-read “Waverley” he will see how Sir Walter deals with the question of sons of Jacobite families accepting the Elector’s commission, and I may perhaps remind him of Barrymore and Westmorland, to say nothing of Oglethorpe and Guest. Lord Stanhope, who was a convinced Hanoverian, doubted the loyalty of the army to the Elector, and the late Dr. Blaikie, whose authority no man can deride, remarked that “even in the regular army there were strong Jacobites”; Woulfe’s confidential and contemporary Report, which I found in the Stuart MSS., alleges that two hundred officers were ready to resign their commissions. The fact that German Pole’s nephew was a member of the “Cumberland Society” has as much to do with proof as the fact that Tullibardine and Lord George Murray had a brother who was a Whig. Even one of Barrymore’s sons betrayed a secret messenger from the Prince to his father, but no one doubts that Barrymore was a Jacobite.

Next, strong comment is passed on my silence as to the subscriptions which the Pole family made to the Derbyshire Association for raising a volunteer force against the Prince.

Here Mr. Chambers has me at an apparent disadvantage for I had not seen a list of the subscribers¹ when I wrote my book but that fact is utterly immaterial. If Mr. Chambers will refer to p. 133 of my book he will see that I have drawn particular attention to the signature of the "Association" itself by German Pole, with the expressed doubt as to whether this was not a similar act of prudence to that shown by the Wynns and Grosvenors in Cheshire and North Wales. Now, when I wrote this paragraph, I knew well that the great Sir Watkin Wynn had subscribed £1,000 to a similar fund while sums had been paid by other Wynns as well as by Sir Richard Grosvenor; I take it Mr. Chambers' scepticism does not extend to Sir Watkin? But if he put up £1,000 as a sort of insurance premium, why should not German Pole pay £50 for the same purpose? The smaller subscriptions of the Reverend Samuel Pole who, by the way, does not appear in Dr. Cox's list and the Misses Margaret and Mary Pole of Chesterfield carry the matter no further and, even with his list at hand, Mr. Chambers has no record that Francis Pole of Park Hall went to Chesterfield to pay in his mite. It may be noted that the latter's relative, John Pole of Spinkhill, is recorded as a Papist Non-juror in 1715.

The last and more general objection is that my evidence is, in the main, founded on conjecture and tradition only. That the story of the luncheon party at Radbourne is traceable to Dr. Cox is not in question, it is from that source that I first heard of it, and, while I am of opinion that the Prince did not—as Dr. Cox suggests—resolve to retreat from what he heard at Radbourne—a false inference does not destroy the original story. Dr. Cox stated he had the tradition from two sources, and that I can well believe, for I have a scrap of evidence to support it. A short time ago, when the Foremark papers were

¹ Printed in Cox's, *Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals*, Vol. I, p. 195.

being examined, a letter was discovered from a Mr. Pycroft to which I referred on p. 193. This letter was written to the then owner of Foremark in 1879, in which he asks, "if there is in your possession any memoranda as to the events of 1745 which the late Mr. Chandos-Pole in 1840 . . . also alluded to." The context shews that Mr. Pycroft—whom I have been unable to identify—visited Radbourne in 1840, and it would appear that there were then some notes in existence which implicated both the Burdetts and the Poles. There is nothing to show how Sir Robert Burdett replied nor is there any trace of papers at Radbourne, but it would seem at least probable that there was something in existence in 1840, and the dates make it by no means impossible that one of Dr. Cox's informants was either a Pole or a Burdett. It is at least clear that Dr. Cox was not the only man who believed that the Poles had something to do with the Forty-Five on the Jacobite side.

But while Mr. Chambers has been quick to charge me with some economy of truth over German Pole's £50 subscription, he appears to have omitted to mention one or two other points to which I drew attention. If the portrait is no evidence, what is the explanation of the bust of the Prince over the great fireplace, and of the portrait of the Duke of Perth? Are we really expected to believe that Colonel Pole, who was not present at Culloden, but so much admired the Butcher, insisted on filling his house with these peculiar evidences of his strongly pro-German sympathies? What becomes of the tradition of the fair Pole who flaunted her tartan sash? And why this amazing collection of Jacobite glass which is believed to be the finest now remaining in private hands? When Mr. Chambers can prove that the houses of the Russells, the Cavendishes, the Pelhams and the rest of the old Revolution families are stacked with Jacobite relics, I may begin to believe that their presence at Radbourne is a proof of Whiggery, but not before.

When one recalls that the retreat from Derby was the signal for a bonfire of papers at Wynnstay, I was not surprised that no scrap of paper was left at Radbourne which would complete the evidence, but I do venture to suggest without the smallest hesitation, that even the ability of Mr. Chambers has been unable to unearth a single fact which displaces the family tradition that in Radbourne the Prince found the welcome of those who wished well to his cause.