

## NOTES AND QUERIES.

---

### 1. *Proclamation against Sir W. Wyndham.*

Among some correspondence of the late J. Luttmann Ellis, Esq., long Coroner for West Sussex, occurred a document which has been kindly forwarded to me by his executor, H. Upton, Esq., of Gorehill, as an interesting link in the history of Petworth. Several articles relative to the quaint old town have appeared in S. A. C.; the following may, therefore, serve as an *addendum*.

Those were critical times, when the subjoined warrant reached Petworth. The Duke of Somerset, "the first Protestant peer of the country," the firm friend of the Hanover Succession, was then the owner of Petworth House. His son-in-law, Sir W. Wyndham, the distinguished statesman, of opposite tendencies, had just made his escape from Orchard Wyndham, in Somersetshire, and was deemed likely to take refuge at Petworth. The warrant for his arrest was issued on the 23rd of September, 1715. On the 21st, Lord Mahon tells us, "the very day of the adjournment of Parliament," Stanhope brought down to the Commons a message from the King, desiring their consent for apprehending six members of their House—Sir W. Wyndham, Sir John Packington, Mr. E. Harvey, Mr. Forster, Mr. Anstis, and Mr. Corbet Kynaston. Consent was granted. Harvey and Anstis were in London, and were at once taken. Harvey stabbed himself in the breast in two or three places; but his wounds were not mortal. Sir J. Packington was apprehended at his residence in Worcestershire. Forster, as is well known, took up arms in the North. "Sir William Wyndham was seized at Orchard Wyndham, while asleep in bed; but pretending to go into an inner room to take leave of his wife, who was with child, he made his escape through a postern."

Reference to this appears in the Proclamation, which has on the back this address:—

"To the Chief Officer of  
the Town of Petworth  
at Petworth  
in Sussex."

"for his Maj<sup>ties</sup> Service."

Its wording runs thus:—

"By the King,  
A Proclamation,

"For Apprehending Sir William Wyndham Baronet.

"George R.

"Whereas Sir William Wyndham Baronet, has been lately Apprehended and Seized, by Virtue of a Warrant of One of Our Principal

Secretaries of State, on Suspicion of High Treason, and on the Perusal of Papers found in the Custody of the said Sir William Wyndham, at the time he was Apprehended, as aforesaid, it manifestly appears, That he has Entered into a most Horrid and Traiterous Conspiracy, not only for the Encouragement of the Rebellion now Carrying on in Our Kingdoms, in Favour of the Pretender, but also for the Abetting and Promoting an intended Invasion of Our Kingdoms: And whereas the said Sir William Wyndham has made his Escape, and is Fled from Justice; We therefore have thought fit, by the Advice of Our Privy-Council, to issue this Our Royal Proclamation, hereby Requiring and Commanding all Our Loving Subjects whatsoever, to Discover and Apprehend, and cause the said Sir William Wyndham to be Apprehended and Discovered, and to Carry him before some of Our Justices of the Peace or Chief Magistrate of the County, Town, or Place, where he shall be Apprehended, who are respectively Required to Secure him, and thereof to give Speedy Notice unto Our Privy-Council, or One of Our Principal Secretaries of State, to the end he may be forth coming, and be Dealt withal and Proceeded against According to Law. And whosoever shall Apprehend or Discover the said Sir William Wyndham, and bring him before such Justice of the Peace, or Chief Magistrate, shall Receive for Reward the Sum of One thousand Pounds; which said Sum of One thousand Pounds the Lords Commissioners of Our Treasury are hereby Required and Directed to Pay accordingly.

“Given at Our Court at St. James’s, the Twenty third Day of September, 1715. In the Second Year of Our Reign.

“God save the King.”

Sir W. Wyndham did not go to Petworth. The £1,000 offered for his discovery was received by no one. He went to London and put himself into the hands of his brother-in-law, Lord Hertford. The Duke of Somerset offered to be responsible for him, at a Privy Council at which George I. was present—but in vain. He was committed to the Tower. His opponents, however, did not dare to bring him to trial. Pope’s oft-quoted panegyric of him—

“Wyndham, just to Freedom and the Throne,  
The master of our passions and his own”—

scarcely harmonises with the stern prose of the Proclamation; but as Secretary at War, and Chancellor of the Exchequer, he will ever be remembered as one of the most eminent statesmen of the Reign of Queen Anne, and his wit, ability, and eloquence have been greatly lauded by his contemporaries.

F. H. ARNOLD.

## 2. *King Edward the Fourth’s Jacket.*

But few notices of visits to Sussex of this monarch have been preserved. “In 1479 he was at Chichester, when he constituted many Justices of the Peace” (“VI. S. A. C.,” 53). From an entry, however, in the Issue Roll 11th, Edw. IV., it appears that he

also visited the city in 1472. The following is a curious illustration of the dress of this tall and handsome sovereign:—"May 16 (1472). An order from the exchequer to pay £9 : 6 : 8 for 3½ yds of cloth of gold to make a 'jaquette' for the King's person, also 20/ for 8 yds of fustian & 3 yards of satin to braid and plait the King's said jaquette & £2 : 8 : 4 for 2 ells of linen cloth & 3 yds of damask for the said jaquette & for points & laces purchased for the King also 6s 8d for making the said jaquette & 5s paid for horse hire to carry a pair of brigganders & the said jaquette from the city of London to the Lord the King at Chichester."

King Edward IV. seems to have paid almost as much attention to the adornment of his person as did Queen Elizabeth. "In his reign," says Monstrelet, "jackets, doublets, or pourpoints were cut shorter than ever, and the sleeves of them slit, so as to show their large, loose and white shirts." Whether in this splendid jacket of cloth of gold, the King appeared before the citizens of Chichester, is not mentioned. In the third year of his reign an Act had been made, prohibiting the use "of cloth of gold, cloth of silk of a purple colour, and fur of sables to all knights under the estate of lords." Among other entries in the same roll, relative to this monarch's dress, is a payment to Hugh Brice for mending one of the King's garters, "50s for a pair of leggeharnes & for a pair of gauntlets," and "£23 : 0 : 8 for half a yard of black velvet for double cuffs, with fifteen yards of crimson velvet, for a cloak for the King's person."

F. H. ARNOLD.

### 3. *Anderida*.

I am induced to offer to the Sussex Archaeological Society a few remarks on the subject of *Anderida*, suggested by Mr. Elliott's paper in the 27th volume of the "Collections" of the Society, in which he dissents from Mr. Hussey, and confidently claims for Newenden the site of *Anderida*.

I shall endeavour to confine my observations to a few striking points, which, I submit, must decide that Mr. Elliott has not taken into full consideration the main arguments of the case. I base my views upon the opinions of, I believe, the latest writer on *Anderida*, Mr. Roach Smith, and my personal examinations of the grand Roman remains at Pevensey. I admit, I have not visited Newenden; but, unless Roman masonry be there, it must remain entirely out of the question as regards *Anderida*, and for obvious reasons.

Mr. Roach Smith, as one of his main arguments, presents the fact, that all the stations or *castra* on the *Littus Saxonicum* were strong walled fortresses, the remains of which are yet visible in more or less of their pristine grandeur. That at the mouth of the Portus Adurni is the only exception, for Bramber Castle shows no Roman masonry; and it is possible, if not probable, that the Roman *castrum* (like that at Felixstowe) may be submerged. All the rest, from Brancaster to Pevensey, speak for themselves in their unmistakable ruins. The very fine Roman remains at Pevensey, so well shown in the *illustrated "Report"* by Mr.

Roach Smith<sup>1</sup>—the result of researches made by himself and the late lamented M. A. Lower—are not excelled by any in this country; and, therefore, they claim a name.

I am not aware that similar remains are anywhere to be found unrepresented by an ancient name; and these being situated upon the Saxon shore, we find the name in the very place where we should expect to find it. Anderida follows Dover and Lymne, and precedes the Portus Adurni. There is no instance of Roman *castra* of this kind being constructed of earth; they were invariably walled fortresses, with barracks for the troops. It is quite impossible, as far as I can see, to imagine soldiers hibernated in such a place as Newenden.

The word *Chester*, as in Andredschester, most certainly does denote generally a walled station or town. The Saxons, as conquerors, named the place from the great adjoining district, the Andredes-leah, or *Silva Anderida*. The Romano-British population certainly in other instances took advantage of the walled towns to oppose the Saxon invaders. The Britons of this period were very different from the Britons of the time of Julius Cæsar; they no longer lived in their hill fortresses; but, although preserving a certain nationality, had become much amalgamated with the Romans, and had adopted much of their civilisation. The Romans had not taught them how to combine their forces, and so the Saxons found them easy to conquer.

It is in confirmation of Mr. Roach Smith's opinion, that all the stations on the Saxon Shore are of comparatively late date, that they have yielded no lapidary inscriptions. The inscribed altar found at Lymne, in the wall of the *castrum*, he shows, had previously belonged to the *Portus Lemanis* near which the fortress, garrisoned by the Turnocenses, was erected to help repel the Saxons.

My argument may be also credited with the additional authority of Mr. Crake's new and interesting work, which, though in part a work of fiction, he has been careful to ground, especially as regards places, on correct history.<sup>2</sup>

JOHN HARRIS.

Howrah Villa, Belvedere, Kent,  
Nov. 27th, 1878.

#### 4. On some Recently-discovered Ancient British Urns.

A very fine example of the Cinerary Urns of the Early British period has just been discovered on the Downs in the parish of Beddingham, near the hamlet of Itford, on the eastern bank of the river Ouse. Its dimensions are probably as large as any of those previously found

<sup>1</sup> "Report on Excavations made upon the site of the Roman Castrum at Pevensey, in Sussex." By Charles Roach Smith. Printed for the subscribers. London, 1858.

<sup>2</sup> "The Andred's Weald; or, the

House of Michelham." A Tale of the Norman Conquest. By Rev. A. D. Crake, B.A., Fellow of the Royal Historical Society; author of "Æmiilius," "Algar the Dane," &c. James Parker and Co., 1878.

in England, the measurements being  $21\frac{3}{4}$  inches high,  $16\frac{1}{2}$  diameter at the top, 6 inches at the bottom, and the greatest circumference 59 inches. It was brought to light by some labourers whilst digging for flints, and is happily uninjured, except one small hole made by the pick. In common with other similar urns, it was in an inverted position, and contained, or rather covered, a quantity of charred human bones.

It is to be regretted that the metal pin with which it was the custom to fasten the coarse cloth, in which the remains were enveloped, was not discovered, and there were no traces of stone or other implements. The ornamentation and general outlines are very similar to those of an urn of the same period found at Trentham, and figured in Jewitt's "Ceramic Art in Great Britain," vol. i., p. 5. A general idea of its proportions may also be derived from a specimen figured i. S. A. C., p. 54. The urn was placed in a hole about three feet in diameter, cut out of the solid chalk. It was surrounded on all sides with blackish-grey ashes, and covered above with flints. At distances of about six feet from the centre of the urn were found four smaller ones; these, however, were all so much broken that it was found impossible to make out more from the fragments than that they were apparently of about half the size of the largest one described above. They were deposited under precisely similar conditions and were about one foot from the surface, which was level; no appearance of any mound having been made above them being visible.

A list of urns which have previously been found in the county may be interesting:—

- 1849. Three small specimens at Alfriston.
- 1851. One near Lewes racecourse.
- 1853. A very perfect example from Mount Harry, near Lewes (now in the Society's Museum).
- 1859. Two at Langford (in the Chichester Museum).
- 1861. Two at East Blatchington Churchyard.
- 1870. One at Coombe, near Lewes.

Several other examples have been discovered in West Sussex, one of which, from Storrington, is figured in i. S. A. C., p. 54, and another in Cartwright's "History of the Rape of Bramber," p. 128—from Sullington Warren.

JOSEPH COOPER.

Kingston-by-Lewes,  
December, 1878.

---