

# CAPTAIN NICHOLAS TETTERSELL AND THE ESCAPE OF CHARLES THE SECOND.

By FREDERICK ERNEST SAWYER, Esq., F.M.S.

NICHOLAS TETTERSELL (for so he spelt his name, though various writers have given it as *Tattersall*, *Tettersall*, *Tattershall*, *Tetersole*, *Tettersfield*, and *Tedersall*) was the owner of a small coasting vessel, and engaged in the coal trade. Of his early history we know nothing. The name Tettersell does not occur in any early subsidy rolls, petitions, or other documents relating to Brighton before the year 1640.

The Parish Registers of Brighton (kindly placed at the disposal of the writer by the Ven. Archdeacon Hannah) contain the following entries in the name of Tettersell during the 17th century:—

## BAPTISMS.

- 164 $\frac{4}{5}$  Januarii The xxvi<sup>th</sup>. baptized Nicholas sonne of Nicholas Tettersoale  
1645 Septemb (vi.<sup>th</sup>) then bap Robert sonn of Robert Tettersoale  
November (ii<sup>nd</sup>) then bap Nicholas sonn of Stephen Tettersoale  
1646 October (iii<sup>rd</sup>) Then bap Susana daughter of Nicholas Tettershale  
1648 September The first bap Sussana daughter of Nicholas Tettersoale  
1653 July xxx.<sup>th</sup> bap Susana daughter of Robert Tettersoale

## MARRIAGE.

- 1640 November the ix.<sup>th</sup> married Stephen Tettersoale & Joane Howns booth of this

## BURIALS.

- 164 $\frac{6}{7}$  March The viii.<sup>th</sup> buried Sussana daughter of Nicholas Tettershale  
1647 October The vii.<sup>th</sup> buried the widow (*sic. sed qu.* wife) of Nicholas Tettersoale  
1670 May 6. Susan the wife of Captaine Nicholas Tettersole  
1679 Oct 25 Nicholas son of Nicholas Tattershall Esquire  
1682 November 9. buried Stephen Tettersell a child.

Possibly Stephen and Robert Tattersell were brothers of Nicholas, and this view is confirmed by the use of the names of Nicholas and Susanna in each of their families. There are still among the Brighton fishermen some persons of the name of Tattersell, and these are, no doubt, descendants of Stephen and Robert Tattersell.

On the death of Nicholas Tattersell's first daughter, Susanna, a second daughter received that name. The latter subsequently married John Geering, a joiner. The only entry of that name in the parish register is "1681 July 3 bapt Richard sonn of John Geering."

Tattersell first comes into prominence in connection with the escape of Charles II.

There are (so far as Sussex is concerned) three accounts of the King's escape:—1. That dictated by him to Pepys, at Newmarket, on 3rd and 5th Oct., 1680 (printed in "The Boscobel Tracts," &c., edited by J. Hughes, Esq., A.M., 1830). 2. Col. Gunter's narrative (addl. MS., British Museum, 9008, printed in Parry's "Coast of Sussex," 1833). 3. The account in Baker's "Chronicles of the Kings of England." The information in the latter was probably to some extent furnished by Tattersell, as he alone could know the conversation with his wife, the release of his vessel in the Downs, &c. As it refers to Tattersell, "now a Captain in his Majesty's Navy," it must have been written between 1660 and 1674 (the year of Tattersell's death). Col. Gunter died before the Restoration, so that his narrative is the oldest. The first mentioned account of the King's escape forms the basis of the historical part of the late Mr. Harrison Ainsworth's ingenious novel, "Ovingdean Grange."

It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to reprint these three accounts entirely, but rather to collate them, so as to form a connected narrative, as they have been very imperfectly quoted by local historians, and many interesting points omitted.

The King was at Heal (3 miles from Salisbury) early in October, 1651, and whilst there Lord Wilmot persuaded Col. Gunter to undertake to provide a vessel for the King's escape. On Saturday, October 11th, Col.

Gunter made an agreement at Chichester with Tetttersell, through Francis Mansell (a French merchant) to have Tetttersell's vessel ready at an hour's warning. On Sunday (12th) Colonel Philips went to the King to inform him of the arrangements. On Monday Colonel Gunter, with Lord Wilmot, met the King and Colonel Philips near Winchester, and they all passed the night at the house of Gunter's sister (Mrs. Symones), at Hambledon, in Hampshire. Next day (Tuesday 14th) they started at daybreak, and passing through Arundel, Houghton (Howton), and Bramber, arrived at Beeding. Here Gunter left the party, and went on to Brighton.

What then ensued is best stated in the words of the chroniclers:—

“Being come to the said Brightemston, I [Gunter] found all clear there; and the Inne (the George) free from all strangers att that tyme. Having taken the best roome in the house and bespoken my supper; as I was entertaining myselfe with a glass of wine; the King not finding accomodation elsewhere to his mind was come to the Inne; then upp comes mine hoast (one Smith by name). ‘More guests’ saith he. He brought them into another roome I taking noe notice.” (*Gunter*.)

“We went to a place, four miles off of Shoreham, called Brighthelmstone, where we were to meet with the master of the ship, as thinking it more convenient to meet there than just at Shoreham where the ship was. So when we came to the inn at Brighthelmstone we met with one, the merchant,<sup>1</sup> who had hired the vessel, in company with her master,<sup>2</sup> the merchant only knowing me, as having hired her only to carry over a person of quality that was escaped from the battle of Worcester without naming anybody.” (*Charles II.*<sup>3</sup>)

“It was not long but drawing towards the Kings roome I [Gunter] heard the King's voice saying aloud to my Lord Wilmot; ‘Here Mr. Barlow I drinck to you.’ ‘I know that name,’ said I to my hoast then by mee. ‘I pray enquire and whether he were not a Major in the Kings Army.’ Which done he was found to be the man whome I expected; and presently invited as was likely to the fellowship of a glass of wine. From that I proceeded and made a motion to joyne companee, and because my chamber was largest that they would make use of it. Which was accepted, and so we became one companie againe.” (*Gunter*.)

“And as we were all sitting together (viz. Robin Philips, my Lord Wilmot, Colonel Gunter, the merchant, the master and I, [Charles II.] I observed that the master of the vessel looked very much upon me. And as soon as we had supped, calling the merchant aside the master told him

<sup>1</sup> Francis Mansell.

<sup>2</sup> Nicholas Tetttersell.

<sup>3</sup> Narrative dictated to Pepys, as before mentioned.

that he had not dealt fairly with him ; for though he had given him a very good price for the carrying over that gentleman, yet he had not been clear with him ; 'for,' says he, 'he is the King, and I very well know him to be so.' Upon which the merchant denying it, saying he was mistaken, the master answered, 'I know him very well, for he took my ship, together with other fishing vessels at Brighthelmstone,<sup>4</sup> in the year 1648' (which was when I commanded the King, my father's fleet) and I very kindly let them go again. 'But' says he to the merchant, 'be not troubled at it, for I think I do God and my country good service in preserving the King, and by the grace of God, I will venture my life and all for him, and set him safely on shore, if I can, in France.' Upon which the merchant came and told me [Charles II.] what had past between them and thereby found myself under a necessity of trusting him. But I took no kind of notice of it presently to him ; but thinking it convenient not to let him go home, lest he should be asking advice of his wife, or any body else, we kept him with us in the inn,<sup>5</sup> and sat up all night drinking beer, and taking tobacco with him.

"And here also I [Charles II.] run into another very great danger as being confident I was known by the master of the inn ; for as I was standing after supper, by the fireside, leaning my hand upon a chair, and all the rest of the company being gone into another room, the master of the inn came in, and fell a talking with me, and just as he was looking about, and saw there was nobody in the room, he, upon a sudden, kissed my hand that was upon the back of the chair, and said to me, 'God bless you wheresoever you go ! I do not doubt, before I die, but to be a lord, and my wife a lady.'<sup>6</sup> So I laughed, and went away into the next room, not desiring any further discourse with him, there being no remedy against my being known by him, and more discourse might have but raised suspicion. On which consideration, I thought it best for to trust him in that manner, and he proved very honest." (*Charles II.*)

"About a quarter of an hour after, the King went to his chamber, where I [Gunter] followed him and craved his pardon with earnest protestation that I was innocent, soe altogether ignorant of the cause how this had hapned. 'Peace, peace ! Colonell,' said the King, 'the fellow knowes mee, and I him. Hee was one' (whether soe or not, I know not, but soe the King thought all that tyme) 'that belonged to the back staires to my Father ; I hope he is an honest fellow.'

"After this I [Gunter] began to treat with the boatman (Tettersfield by name) asking him in what readiness he was. He answered he could not of [*qu. off*] that night, because for more securitie he had brought his

<sup>4</sup> Baker's "Chronicle" says (p. 541) that Tattersell had seen the King in the Downs, "where he obtained the Release of his Ship loaden from Newcastle."

<sup>5</sup> The King's escape from Dorsetshire was frustrated by the boatman consulting his wife, who refused to let him carry the King.

<sup>6</sup> Gunter describes the innkeeper as kissing the King's hand, and saying, "It shall not be said but I have kissed the best man's hand in England," and adds he had waited at supper. ("Parry," p. 43.) The same incident appears in Pepys's "Diary," May 23rd, 1660, where the King said the innkeeper remarked "He would not ask the King who he was, but bid God bless him whither he was going." Carte says that Smith (the innkeeper) "had been one of the late king's guards." "General History of England," Vol. IV., p. 650.

vessel into a breake, and the tyde had forsaken it ; soe that it was on ground. It is observable that all the while this busines had beene in agitation to this very tyme the wind had been contrarie. The King then opening the wenddowe took notice, that the wind was turned and told the master of the Shipp. Whereupon because of the wind and a cleere night, I offered 10<sup>li</sup> more to the man to gett off that night. But that could not bee. However we agreed, he should take in his company that night. But it was a great business that we had in hand : and God would have us to know soe, both by the difficulties that offerd themselves, and by his help, he afforded to remoove them. When we thought we had agreed the boate-man starts back and saith noe except I [Gunter] would ensure the barke. Argue it they did with him, how unreasonable it was being so well paid, &c., but to no purpose soe that I yeelded att last and 200<sup>li</sup> was his valuation which was agreed upon. But then as though he had beene resolved to frustrate all by unreasonable demands, he required my bond. Att which mooved with much indignation I began to be as resolut as he ; saying among other things, There were more boates to bee had, besydes his, if he would not another should, and made as though I would go to another. In this contest the King happily interposed. ‘Hee saith right’ (said his Matie) ‘a Gentleman’s word especially before wittnesses, is as good as his bond.’ At last, the man’s stomach came downe, and carrie them he would, whatever became of it ; and before he would bee taken, he would run his boat under the water. Soe it was agreed that about tooe in the morning they should be aboard. The boateman in the meane tyme, went to provide for necessaries, and I perswaded the King to take some rest ; He did in his cloaths, and my L<sup>d</sup> Wilmot with him, till towards twoe of the morning.” (Gunter.)

“The King conferr’d with the Master (who being wrought upon by Promises and Money paid down, and his own Loyalty) agreed to transport him to *France*, and departed to call up his Mariners then on Shore (pretending his Ship half laden with Coals was a Drift) ; but coming home for a Bottle of *Aqua-vitæ*, his Wife by the Unreasonable of the Night suspecting the Truth, encouraged him to the Undertaking, not caring (as she said) *if she and her little ones begged their Bread, so the King were in Safety.*” (Baker’s *Chronicles.*)

“About four o’clock in the morning, myself [Charles II.] and the company before named went towards Shoreham, taking the master of the ship with us, on horseback, behind one of our company, and came to the vessel’s side, which was not above sixty tun. But it being low water, and the vessel lying dry, I and my Lord Wilmot got up with a ladder into her, and went and lay down in the little cabin, till the tide came to fetch us off.

“But I was no sooner got into the ship, and lain down upon the bed, but the master came in to me, fell down upon his knees, and kist my hand, telling me that he knew me very well, and would venture life and all that he had in the world to set me down safe in *France*.

“So about seven o’clock in the morning, it being high water, we went out of the port ; but the master being bound for Pool, loaden with sea-coal, because he would not have it seen from Shoreham that he did not go his intended voyage, but stood all the day with a very easy sail, towards the isle of Wight (only my Lord Wilmot and myself, of my company, on

board). And as we were sailing the master came to me, and desired me that I would persuade his men to use their best endeavours with him to get him to set us on shore in France, the better to cover him from any suspicion thereof. Upon which I went to the men, which were four and a boy,<sup>7</sup> and told them truly, that we were two merchants that had some misfortunes, and were a little in debt; that we had some money owing us at Rouen, in France, and were afraid of being arrested in England; that if they would persuade the master (the wind being very fair) to give us a trip over to Dieppe, or one of those ports near Rouen, they would oblige us very much; and with that I gave them twenty shillings to drink. Upon which they undertook to second me if I would propose it to the master. So I went to the master, and told him our condition, and that if he would give us a trip over to France, we would give him some consideration for it. Upon which he counterfeited difficulty, saying that it would hinder his voyage. But his men, as they had promised me, joining their persuasions to ours, and at last he yielded to set us over.

"So about five o'clock in the afternoon as we were in sight of the isle of Wight, we stood directly over to the Coast of France, the wind being then full north; and the next morning, a little before day, we saw the coast. But the tide failing us, and the wind coming about to the south-west, we were forced to come to an anchor, within two miles of the shore, till the tide of flood was done.

"We found ourselves just before an harbour in France called Fescamp<sup>8</sup>; and just as the tide of ebb was made, espied a vessel to leeward of us, which by her nimble working I suspected to be an Ostend privateer. Upon which I went to my Lord Wilmot, and telling him my opinion of that ship, proposed to him our going ashore in the little cock-boat for fear they should prove so, as not knowing but, finding us going into a port of France (there being then a war betwixt France and Spain) they might plunder us, and possibly carry us away and set us ashore in England; the master also himself had the same opinion of her being an Ostender, and came to me to tell me so, which thought I made it my business to dissuade him from, for fear it should tempt him to set sail again with us for the coast of England; yet so sensible I was of it, that I and my Lord Wilmot went both on shore in the cock-boat,<sup>9</sup> and going up into the town of Fescamp, staid there all day to provide horses for Rouen.<sup>10</sup> But the vessel which had so affrighted us proved afterwards only a French hoy. (*Charles II.*)

"In their Passage, the King sitting upon the Deck, and directing the Course; as they call it, conning the ship, one of the mariners blowing Tobacco in his Face, the master bid him go further off the Gentleman

<sup>7</sup> There is a little difficulty here. Charles II. stated to Pepys, on the voyage from Holland just before the Restoration, that all the ship's company consisted of a foreman and a boy. "Diary," May 24th, 1660. Lingard says: "The ship floated with the tide, and stood with easy sail towards the Isle of Wight, as if she were on her way to Deal, to which port she was bound." "History of England," Vol. VIII., p. 328. This is evidently an error.

<sup>8</sup> Fécamp.

<sup>9</sup> Danish. *Kog, Kogge*, a small boat.

<sup>10</sup> Charles II. told Pepys that "at Rouen he looked so poorly, that the people went into the rooms before he went away to see whether he had not stole something or other!" Pepys's "Diary," May 23rd, 1660.

who murmuring, unwittingly replied, 'That a Cat might look upon a King.' (*Baker's Chronicles.*)

"They were no sooner landed but the wind turned and a violent storme did arise in soe much that the boateman was forced to cutt his cable, lost his anchor to savehis boate, for which he required of mee [Gunter] 8<sup>li</sup> and had it. The boate was back againe at Chichester by Friday to take his fraught." (*Gunter.*)

These extracts shew Tetttersell in a much more favourable light than that in which several historians have painted him, and the conduct of his wife entitles her to a high place amongst "the female Worthies of Sussex."

A question of some interest arises as to the exact situation of the George Inn, at Brighton, visited by the King. The house now known by the sign of "The King's Head," in West Street, has been generally indicated as the place, but on a careful examination of the Court Rolls there seems nothing to corroborate this view. The present "King's Head" is not even described as an Inn until 1754 (when it is first called "The George") whilst in surrenders in 1657, 1693 and 1721<sup>11</sup> it is called "the *middle part of a tenement in the lower part of the West Street.*"

There was "an Inne called the George" on the east side of Middle St. (in Brighton Manor) as we find it surrendered by John Howell on Aug. 21st, 1656, to the use of his will. At a Court held April 21st, 1670, the will of John Howell dated Janry. 26th, 16<sup>56</sup>/<sub>56</sub>, was presented, by which it appeared he gave "the house<sup>12</sup> in which then he was dwelling in the Middle Street of Brighthelmeston the brewhouse malthouse and other appurtenances" to his daughter Katherine, provided she paid his daughter Margaret £100 at 18 years of age or marriage, &c. Margaret married John Morren, and on payment released her interest to Katherine, who had married Richard Tidy. The house of John Howell in Middle Street was no doubt that visited by the King, and so far as can be traced it occupied the site of No. 44, Middle Street, now the residence of Chas. Catt, Esq.

<sup>11</sup> Court Rolls Brighthelmstone-Michelham.

<sup>12</sup> It is not improbable that the Inn was given up or turned into a brewhouse between 1656 and 1660.

An interesting incident connected with the King's escape is recorded in a letter from Ellis Hookes to Margaret Fox (wife of George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends). The letter, dated 16th of 11th mo 1669, says:—

“Yesterday there was a Friend with the King, one that is John Grove's mate : he was the man that was mate to the master of the fisher-boat, that carried the King away, when he went from Worcester fight ; and only this Friend and the master knew of it in the ship : and the Friend carried him [the King] ashore on his shoulders. The King knew him again, and was very friendly to him ; and told him he remembered him, and of several things that was done in the ship at the same time. The Friend told him, the reason why he did not come [forward] all this while was—that he was satisfied, in that he had peace and satisfaction in himself, that he did what he did to relieve a man in distress : and now he desired nothing of him, but that he would set Friends at liberty, who were great sufferers or to that purpose ; and told the King he had a paper of 110 that were præmunired, that had lain in prison about six years, and none can release them but him. So the King took the paper—and said, there were many of them, and that they would be in again in a month's time ; and that the country gentlemen complained to him, that they were so troubled with the Quakers. So he said, he would release him six : but the Friend thinks to go to him again for he had not fully relieved himself.”

The letter is endorsed by George Fox :—

“e hookes to m ff of paseges consarning richard carver<sup>13</sup> that carred the King of [on] his backe. 1669”

The editor added the following note :—

“The honest simplicity of his answer, and his appeal to the King on behalf of his suffering brethren will doubtless not be lost on the reflecting reader.<sup>14</sup>”

There is another letter from Ellis Hookes to George Fox :—

“February 16<sup>th</sup> 69”

“Dear G. F

“As for the Friend that was with the King, his love is to thee. He has been with the King lately, and Thomas Moore was with him, and the King was very loving to them. He had a fair and free

<sup>13</sup> Possibly a descendant of Derick Carver, the Brighton brewer, who was burnt at Lewes in 1553.

<sup>14</sup> This letter is published in “A Select Series; Biographical, narrative, &c., of productions of Early Friends,” edited by John Barclay, (London, 1841).



opportunity to open his mind to the King, and the King has promised to do for him, but willed him to wait a month or two longer. I rest thy faithful friend to serve thee.

“E. H.”

The two interviews of Carver with the King were followed up by Moore and Whitehead, and a pardon for 471 Friends and 20 other Nonconformists was ultimately obtained. Amongst the latter was John Bunyan. The facts are fully set out in “The Whole Works of John Bunyan” (Geo. Offor, London, 1862).

It is perhaps the most interesting fact in connection with the King’s escape from Sussex that the intervention of Tattersell’s mate secured the release from prison of the author of the immortal “Pilgrim’s Progress.” Mr. Offor says :—“It is an honour to Christianity that a labouring man preferred the duty of saving the life of a human being, and that of an enemy, to gaining so easily the heaps of glittering gold.”

The vessel of Tattersell was of 34 tons burden, but it must be remembered that the Brighton fishing boats in use formerly were of much greater tonnage than now, and therefore the modern boats are not a correct type of the vessel in which the King escaped.

We lose sight of Tattersell until the Restoration (1660), when, “according to a current [1766] tradition in the town,” he “was appointed at his own request a captain in the navy.”<sup>15</sup> It has been stated by many writers that Tattersell was forgotten by Charles; but this is quite incorrect, as we find by the State Papers that in June, 1661, and subsequently, he was in command of “The Monk” (or “Loyal Monk”), a frigate carrying from 210 to 220 men, and he seems to have held an important position in the navy.

Major-General Pasley, R.E., C.B. (Director of Works in Her Majesty’s Navy) has kindly furnished the following particulars of Tattersell and his ships :—

“‘Tattersal, Nicholas, was appointed Commander of the *Sorlings* in 1660, and in the following year was removed into the *Monk*.<sup>16</sup> It

<sup>15</sup> “Gent’s Mag.,” Vol. XXXVI. (1766), p. 60.

<sup>16</sup> Charnock, “Biographia Navalis,” I., p. 47.

appears from the Calendars of State Papers that the *Monk* was repaired at Chatham about 1664-5 and re-commissioned in the latter year under the command of Captain Thos. Penrose. I have looked over the Navy Lists in Chamberlaynes volumes<sup>17</sup> for 1671, 1684, 1702, & 1723. The earliest one does not enumerate the small vessels, but the *Royal Escape* is given in the other three lists. In the list for 1684 she is described as a 'smack' of 34 tons, 10 men, no guns. The tonnage is not mentioned in 1702, but 10 men still appear as her complement. In 1723 no complement is mentioned. The *Monk* appears as follows:—

	RATE.	TONS.	MEN.	GUNS.
In 1671 .....	3rd	—	260	50
In 1684 .....	3rd	696	340	60
In 1702 .....	4th	—	332	60

In 1723 she has disappeared from the list. As Charnock says<sup>18</sup> she was at Plymouth in 1711, she was probably sold or broken up between that date and 1723. The *Sorlings* appears only in 1671, where she is described as a 5th rate of 250 tons, 110 men, and 22 guns. It was therefore a promotion for Capt. Tattersell when he was removed from her into the *Monk*."

On June 10th, 1661, St. John Steventon (clerk of the cheque at Portsmouth) writes to the Navy Commissioners that "'The Monk' had sailed for the Downs with 212 men"; and on the 16th Tattersell writes to them from "'The Monk. Downs.' That several things were necessary for his ship, which were not in the stores, and he was obliged to put to sea without them."<sup>19</sup> On July 15th, Tattersell, writing from the "*Loyal Monk*" to Sir Wm. Penn (one of the Navy Commissioners), says: "Vice-Admiral Lawson has taken his boat and begs another." Nothing further occurs until January 10th, 1661-2, when Roger Read (boatswain of "*The Monk*"), writing from the Downs to the Navy Commissioners, encloses a "note by Nich. Tattersell and Roger Jones of cables and other stores wanted for '*The Monk*'"; and on the 16th he writes to them again that "he wants another boat, theirs being staved in, sending for a packet on shore in the night from the fleet, which sailed on the 15th." Tattersell writes next day (17th) to Sir Wm. Coventry (secretary to the Duke of York), and "asks

<sup>17</sup> "Angliæ Notitia."

<sup>18</sup> "History of Marine Architecture," Vol. III., p. 279. Charnock did not know where the "*Monk*" was built.

<sup>19</sup> "Cal. State Papers, Charles II., 1661-2," pp. 6, 10, and 38.

an order to send a small frigate to discover the transport of some prohibited goods. Has lost his boat, and some Deal men have bored it in pieces."<sup>20</sup>

On January 20th Roger Reed writes again, giving "particulars of the loss of his boats;" and John Tatnell,<sup>21</sup> in a letter on the 22nd, states that he "provided a long boat for 'The Monk,' but finds she has got one."

Tattersell was evidently blamed by the Navy Commissioners for the loss of his boats, and in reply sent the following interesting letter:—

"Hono<sup>e</sup> S<sup>irs</sup>

"A longe boat Pinnis & yall I haue received w<sup>th</sup> other stores w<sup>ch</sup> hath binn ordred yo<sup>e</sup> Hono<sup>e</sup> and where as y<sup>o</sup> ritt me that it is some neglict that the other ware lost Ile a sure yo ffor my owne partt I was as carfful as lie in me And shalbe ffor the preseruacion of any thing belonging to his Ma<sup>ty</sup> Soe I am

"Y<sup>or</sup> Hon<sup>e</sup> hum<sup>bl</sup> Serv<sup>t</sup>

"NICH TATTERSELL.

"Monck this 26<sup>th</sup>

"of Jan (61)

"The Pinnis is soeould that shee will scarce hange in the backells. I should a giuen yo<sup>r</sup> Hono<sup>e</sup> an accou<sup>t</sup> of the fleett could I a herd ffrom them by any."

The letter is addressed to the Commissioners of the Navy, Seething Lane, and at the foot is a note in another handwriting, "*chide him for sending this by expresse in the next letter we write him.*"<sup>22</sup>

He writes again on Feb. 1st, 1661-2:—

"Hono<sup>e</sup> S<sup>irs</sup>

"Since my last yo<sup>r</sup> Hon<sup>es</sup> we haue had here a very sad stress of weather in soe much that some hath putt a way w<sup>ch</sup> I ffearre hath miscaryed, and other some cuting there Mast by the Board; But as to vs god be thancked we are all well. Hon<sup>e</sup> S<sup>irs</sup> vpon the desire of Cap<sup>t</sup> Jo<sup>b</sup> Shaw Com<sup>and</sup> of a Mirch Shipp the Blessing w<sup>ch</sup> lattly came from Jemecco: he cutting away his mast & other his prouitions ffor his security I haue spared him a Streame Cable of a ii Inches and ioi ffatham

<sup>20</sup> "Cal. State Pap. Car. II., 1661," pp. 240, 246, 247 and 250.

<sup>21</sup> Pepys disliked Tatnell, and says in his "Diary" (March 1st, 1667-8) [Captain], "Tatnell is a very rogue;" and on March 24th, Pepys promised Sir William Coventry to sift Tatnell as to a petition for getting back money paid for places.

<sup>22</sup> "State Papers, Domestic, Charles II.," Vol. XLXIX., No. 90.

whose Owners wilbe accomptable to yo<sup>e</sup> Hon<sup>es</sup> ffor him whose names I haue vnd<sup>e</sup> lined Soe I am

“Y<sup>e</sup> Hon<sup>e</sup> Hum<sup>b1</sup> Serv<sup>tt</sup>

“NICH TETTERSELL.<sup>23</sup>”

“Monck ffeb 1<sup>st</sup> (61)”

“Sir Will Vincent

“Sir Rich ffoord

“Sir Will Rider

“Mr Rich Lantt”

Next day (2nd February) there is a letter from Theophilus Sacheverell (purser of “The Monk”) to Sam. Pepys (“the Diarist,” who was Clerk to the Acts in the Navy), in which he “hopes he and Capt. Tattersell will not be blamed for discharging the men by written tickets,<sup>24</sup> as they have asked twice for printed tickets, but received no answer.”

A note on the letter says: “300 tickets to Capt. Tattersell to distribute & send up his receipt for them.”<sup>25</sup> The tickets were not sent, as Tattersell writes from Deal, on Feb. 6th, to the Commissioners requesting “some printed tickets being forbidden to discharge men by written ones.”<sup>26</sup> He writes again on Feb. 21st, that he “has lent a sail to Capt. Gunne<sup>27</sup> of the Greyhound,<sup>28</sup> who had lost his. He will return it or pay for it in London.” As such a loan of Royal stores might appear very strange, Tattersell carefully adds as a postscript:—

His Ma<sup>tis</sup> intrest being greatt in hir made me the bould<sup>e</sup> to spare him a Saile the Comand<sup>e</sup> tells me his dutise will a mount to at least 10 or 12 thousand pounds.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>23</sup> “State Papers, Domestic, Charles II.,” Vol. L., No. 6. Sir Richard Ford and Sir William Ryder were Commissioners for Tangiers, and are frequently referred to by Pepys.

<sup>24</sup> See Pepys’s “Diary,” Nov. 30th, 1660, and other dates. The seamen instead of receiving their pay in cash were discharged with tickets which were not paid for a considerable time. He states that when the Dutch fleet came up the Thames Englishmen on board the Dutch ships were heard to say, “We did heretofore fight for tickets, now we fight for dollars.” “Diary,” June 14th, 1667.

<sup>25</sup> “State Papers, Domestic, Charles II.,” Vol. L., No. 6.

<sup>26</sup> “Cal. State Pap., Car. II., 1661-2,” p. 267.

<sup>27</sup> Gunn was, and is, a well-known name amongst the Brighton fishermen, so this Captain may have been an acquaintance of Tattersell’s.

<sup>28</sup> This was no doubt the ship referred to in Pepys’s “Diary,” Feb. 9th 1663-4, “Great doubts of two ships of ours, the Greyhound and another, very rich, coming from the Streights for fear of the Turks.”

<sup>29</sup> “State Papers, Domestic, Charles II.,” Vol. L., No. 75.

There is another letter by Tetersell to the Navy Commissioners, on Feb. 26th, 1661-2, reporting "abuses in victualling, the victuallers not taking notice of complaints: the meat is small and very short in weight." He adds as a postscript:—

"The Victullers allowe & victual for but 210 men. I shall contynue my number 220 vnless I haue an ord<sup>e</sup> from y<sup>e</sup> Hon<sup>e</sup>"

Enclosed is the following curious account of deficiencies:—

"From the 26<sup>th</sup> Decb<sup>e</sup> to the 29<sup>th</sup> of Ffeb<sup>e</sup> we want of the weight of Beefe and Porck. Lowing 22<sup>lb</sup> in the Hundred for blud & salt as followeth

	lb.
Beefe .....	9 : 6 : 8
Porck.....	3 : 5 : 2

Peese they lowe vs by the wine pint & ffish two cupell wayes but 22<sup>lb</sup>."<sup>30</sup>

Next day (27th) Tetersell and Reed write to the Commissioners for provisions and stores for "The Monk." On March 15th, the former "sends a survey of the bread room of the Sorlings [Serloines] which is said to be defective;" and on April 4th, 1662, he reports the "damage done to the Pembroke in the late storm and defects in her cables."<sup>31</sup>

In the following month (May) Tetersell was ordered by H.R.H. the Duke of York, afterwards James II., (then Lord High Admiral) to proceed to Plymouth to convoy some ships to Lisbon. We find him writing to the Navy Commissioners on May 10th, 1662, that he had received the order on the previous night, and would sail, "though much in want of stores hopes to get in more provisions at Dover." He writes on 12th that he "has taken some of the Dolphin's gunner's stores but wants gunpowder"; and again, on 14th (still from "The Monk. Downs"): "The Isabella bound for Ireland requested a convoy: expected an order for it, but none came, and meanwhile on a fair wind the vessel sailed without one. Will take in beer at Dover and hasten to Plymouth."<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup> "State Papers, Domestic, Charles II.," Vol. LI., No. 21.

<sup>31</sup> "Cal. State Pap., Car. II., 1661-2," pp. 289, 310, and 331.

<sup>32</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 367, 368, and 370.

Tattersell no doubt proceeded soon after to Lisbon, and then to Tangiers in Africa, which had recently become a British possession by the marriage of Charles II. with Catherine of Braganza.<sup>33</sup> On his return Tattersell writes from Portsmouth on Sept. 8th, 1662, that "he changed his ship master Rogers Jones at Tangiers for Sir John Lawson's<sup>34</sup> master who is 'anshant and weeke.' Wm. Cillam [or Gillam] is an able man, recommends him."<sup>35</sup> He then returned to the Downs, and with Roger Reed, writes on the 19th to the Commissioners with an account of the sails in their ship and stores wanted.<sup>36</sup> This is the last letter by Tattersell that occurs in the State Papers.

In 1663 we find him giving the following certificate to one of his crew, who was concerned in the Royal flight:—

" May 23<sup>d</sup> (63.

" These may sertife whome". itt may Concerne that the Barrer hereof Thomas Tuppon was Sailing w<sup>th</sup> me when I carried his Ma<sup>tie</sup> for frrance.

" NICH : TETTERSELL." <sup>37</sup>

Tattersell was no doubt meanwhile actively engaged in trying to obtain a pension for his services, and in December, 1663, his efforts were successful, as we find by the following note in the State Papers, by the clerk of the Privy Council:—

" December 1663

" Capt Tattersall's annuity

A Grant to him of 100<sup>l</sup> yearly out of ye Revenues arising from Kent Sussex & Surry for 99 years, if Susan his wife, Nicholas his Sonne or Susan his Daughter live soe long."<sup>38</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Catherine arrived at Portsmouth on 20th May, 1661, and was married next day. Tangier (with Bombay) formed part of her dowry, and was taken possession of by Lord Sandwich and a small fleet before the marriage.

<sup>34</sup> Sir John Lawson was Vice-Admiral under Sir Edward Montagu (afterwards Lord Sandwich) at the time Charles II. was brought over from Holland. He was wounded in an engagement against the Dutch on June 3rd, 1665, and died soon after. Pepys was not sorry when he died, because the Admiral had been no friend to him.

<sup>35</sup> "State Papers, Domestic, Charles II.," Vol. LXIX., No. 26.

<sup>36</sup> "Cal. State Pap., Car. II., 1661-2," p. 493.

<sup>37</sup> "State Papers, Domestic, Car. II.," Vol. LXXIV., No. 34.

<sup>38</sup> *Ib.*, Vol. LXXXIV., p. 176.

This sets at rest the varied and conflicting statements which have been made as to the pension, as it was simply an annuity for the longest of three lives. It shows, moreover, the extent of Tattersell's family, viz.: wife, a son Nicholas, and a daughter Susan, the latter of whom are mentioned in the extracts from the Parish Registers already given.

It appears to have been thought that there was a grant of arms to Tattersell, but this is incorrect, as no such grant is recorded at the College of Arms during the reign of Charles II.<sup>39</sup>

In the return to the subsidy of 16th Chas. II. (1665), amongst the Assessors we find "*Nicholas Tattersoll gent. in lands xx*."<sup>40</sup>

Nothing further transpires with reference to Tattersell until 1667, when we find the following letter:—

" June 6<sup>th</sup> (67)

" Gentlemen

In answers to yours of this day . . . . .

" For what Cap Tattershall hath formerly done well I have bin tender toward him in this last businesse, otherwise a messenger had gone for him, but I wrote him a letter wch I believe hath frighted him pretty well.

" I am

" Your aff friend & humble servant

" W. COVENTRYE."<sup>41</sup>

" For The Principall Officers &

" Commissioners of his Majesties Navy  
at ye Navy Office."

The nature of Tattersell's offence then does not appear, but according to one account "he was dismissed for some misconduct in an engagement."<sup>42</sup> It is quite evident from the extracts already quoted from the State Papers that Tattersell was not merely an honorary officer in the navy, but occupied a substantial position.

Francis Mansell, of Ovingdean, who had bargained with Tattersell for the King's escape, was appointed "Customer Inward" in the port of Southampton, from which he received £60 a year. He petitioned the King

<sup>39</sup> The records of the College have been kindly searched for the matter by G. E. Cokayne, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., Lancaster Herald.

<sup>40</sup> Lay Subsidy, 16 Chas. II., 191-409 Sussex.

<sup>41</sup> "State Papers, Domestic, Charles II.," Vol. CCIII., No. 95.

<sup>42</sup> "Gent's Mag.," Vol. XXX. (1766), p. 60.

about June, 1661, for relief, stating that he "was forced to fly for life, being one of the instruments of His Majesty happy escape, and has spent more in solicitation than the 60*l* per annum he receives from his small office, &c." After this he was granted a pension of £200 a year, and on Feb. 26th, 1661-2, petitioned<sup>43</sup> for leave to resign his place, "which through indisposition he was unable to fulfil." As Mansell's pension was £200 a year whilst Tettersell's was only £100, it would appear that the services of the former were considered by the King of more value than those of the latter. Mansell, however, was very unfortunate, for about April, 1664, his pension had become £300 in arrear; and he then petitioned for relief from the privy seal dormant, and on April 11th there is a privy seal for £200 to him "as the King's Free gift."<sup>44</sup> About Feb., 1666-7 he petitions the King again "to permit him to enjoy his pension of £200 a year stayed four years ago. Was outlawed and ruined, and was promised to be made eminent on the Restoration. Capt. Tattershall and others instrumental in the same service towards the safety of His Majesty's person have had a similar favour."

Pepys gives in his "Diary" the following interesting note:—

"Feb 20. 1667. With the 'Chequer men, to the Leg, in King Street, and there had wine for them; and there was one in company with them; that was the man<sup>45</sup> that got the vessell to carry over the King from Bredhemson, who hath a pension of £200 per annum, but ill paid, and the man is looking after getting of a prize ship to live by; but the trouble is, that this poor man, who hath received no part of his money these four years, and is ready to starve almost, must yet pay to the Poll Bill for this pension. He told me several particulars of the King's coming thither, which was mighty pleasant, and shows how mean a thing the King is, how subject to fall, and how like other men he is in his afflictions."

Lord Braybrooke<sup>45</sup> endeavours to identify "the man" with Tettersell, but this is an obvious blunder, as the amount of the latter's annuity was £100. Mansell is evidently referred to.

<sup>43</sup> "Cal. State Pap., Car. II., 1661-2," pp. 21 and 286.

<sup>44</sup> *Ib.*, 1663-4, p. 552.

<sup>45</sup> "Diary of Samuel Pepys," 3rd edition, London, 1848, Vol. XXX., p. 409.



There is a warrant on Feb. 22nd, 1666-7, continuing "his pension notwithstanding the recent order."<sup>46</sup>

There is no reason to think that Charles II. visited Ovingdean as stated in Mr. Harrison Ainsworth's interesting novel, and it would have been a physical impossibility.

In 1670 Tetttersell lost his wife. The parish register of Brighton, as already stated, records her burial on May 6.

During the same year (1670) Tetttersell was High Constable of Brighton, and seems to have been actively engaged in the prosecution of local Nonconformists. The late Mr. M. A. Lower says:<sup>47</sup> "Whether he did this of his own will or only ministerially there is no evidence to show." Mr. Lower, however, appears to have overlooked the fact that serious charges were brought against Tetttersell at once, in printed pamphlets and by respectable persons. On Sunday, May 29th, 1670, some Baptists having met in a house in Brighton, Tetttersell is said to have conceived the idea of prosecuting them, and kept them shut in the house while he sent to Lewes for a warrant to break open the door. When the warrant arrived the door was opened on demand, and no religious ceremony was going on, nor could any minister be found. The parties, however, were summoned to Lewes, and there being no evidence to justify a conviction they were asked to plead guilty, and fix their own fines. They refused, and were fined the full penalty, £20, amongst them Wm. Beard, the master of the house. The following is the account of how the fine was obtained:—"Tetttersol breaks open locks to come at malt, being gotten to the heap fileth without all measure sixty of five bushel sacks which he hath sold to one of his gang for 12<sup>s</sup> per quarter."<sup>48</sup>

The subject has been discussed in angry terms by several local historians, so that further comment is not required.

<sup>46</sup> "Cal. State Pap., Car. II., 1666-7," p. 525.

<sup>47</sup> "Sussex Worthies," p. 298.

<sup>48</sup> Crosby, "History of the English Baptists," Vol. II., pp. 247, 257. The same occurrence appears to be referred to in "Calamy's Nonconformist's Memorial," Vol. III., p. 317, where the malt is said to have been worth 20s. a quarter.

It is stated in "The Boscobel Tracts" that Tattersell brought his bark up the Thames, and moored it opposite Whitehall, "to renew the memory of the service it had performed;" and another authority says that it was subsequently taken into the Royal navy and named the "Royal Escape." The writer has, however, been unable to discover the source of this statement; but on Sept. 4th, 1671, Tattersell was appointed Captain of the "Royal Escape," a fifth rate.<sup>49</sup>

The Brighton Court Rolls record on Aug. 23rd, 1670, a surrender by Henry Bradfold and Anna, his wife (daughter of Samuel Friend, deceased, brother of Edward Friend, formerly of Chichester, deceased), of a cottage and garden in the north part of North Street, adjoining the churchyard, and other property there, "to the use of *Nicholas Tattersall, Esquire*, Edmund Gunter, John Peirse, and John Barton and their heirs upon the trust reposed in them of the rents and profits of the same for the use and enjoyment of the poor of the parish of Brighthelmston." It does not appear whether these cottages were used for a poorhouse, or whether the rents only were applied.

On Aug. 21st (1671) there is a surrender by John Arnold and Johanna, his wife of "One messuage or tenement one stable one garden and one croft of land to the same belonging containing by estimation one rood called the Old Shipp &c in the Hempshares in Brighthelmston to the use of *Nicholas Tetarsall sen Esq.*"

This was no doubt part, if not the original site, of the present "Old Ship Hotel."

In the summer and autumn of 1672 it seems probable Tattersell was in failing health, for he petitioned that his son Nicholas might be continued Captain of the "Escape" after his death, and on Aug. 29th, 1672, a patent was granted. On Oct. 29th Tattersell surrendered his copyhold property in the Manor of Atlingworth, viz.: a messuage and piece of land in "the Middle Streete of Brighthelmston between the Hempshares and the Middle Streete 236 ft long by 46 wide at one end &

<sup>49</sup> Erredge "Hist. of Brighthelmston," p. 131.

39 ft at the other; to the use of himself for life & then to the use of his son Nicholas." A few days later (Nov. 14th) Tetersell settled his freehold property on his daughter, as we find by an Indenture dated 14th Nov., 1672,<sup>50</sup> and made between "Nicholas Tetersall of Brighthelmstone in ye county of Sussex Esq of the one part and John Geering of the said place and County Joyner in ye other part" whereby "y<sup>e</sup> s<sup>d</sup>. Nicholas Tetersall for and in consideration of the fatherly love and affection which hee beareth unto Susanna Geering wife of the said John Geering y<sup>e</sup> naturall and only daughter of him y<sup>e</sup> s<sup>d</sup> Nicholas" granted to the use of Susanna Geering her heirs and assigns for ever a cottage "in the Street called y<sup>e</sup> Hempshars of Brighton" now Ship Street, near the "Old Ship," and on the west side of the street.

Tetersell affixes his mark, which can only be explained by the fact that he was then very ill, as the signatures to letters preserved in the State Papers are in a bold and excellent handwriting. "Edw. Lowe" (probably the then Vicar<sup>51</sup>) was one of the witnesses to the deed.

Tetersell and his son were both admitted to the copyhold property in Atlingworth Manor at a Court on April 15th, 1673. This is the last event recorded in the life of the Captain, and he died on July 26th, 1674.

The will of Captain Tetersell was as follows:—<sup>52</sup>

In the name of God Amen this 26th day of July in the six and twentieth Yeare of the raigne of our Sovereigne Lord King Charles the Second by the Grace of God of England Scotland France and Ireland Defender of the faith &c Anno Dñi 1674, I NICHOLAS TETERSOLE Senior of *Brighthelmstone* in the County of *Sussex* Esquire being sick in body but of good and perfect Memory I blesse God, doe Make and Publish this my last will and Testament in Manner and forme following and doe with a free heart render up my soule into the hands of Almighty God hoping and Assuredly believing that through the Meritts of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ my Saviour I shall receive Pardon and forgiveness of all my Sinnes And

<sup>50</sup> The writer is indebted to Hy. Griffith, Esq., for the loan of a copy of this deed, the original of which is in the possession of Somers Clarke, Esq.

<sup>51</sup> S. A. C. XXIX., p. 206.

<sup>52</sup> A copy of this will was very kindly supplied by Mr. T. C. Noble.

my body I comitt to the earth decently to be buryed in Christian buryall when it shall Please God to put and end to this temporall life. And as for my temporall goods which God hath in Mercy given me I would have them disposed of in Manner and forme following. And first I give and bequeath unto the poore People of Brighthelmstone the sume of Forty Shillings of good and lawfull Money of England to be distributed amongst them in tenn dayes after my decease. Item I give and bequeath unto *Elizabeth Tetersole* my wife one Peece of plate which is a Cupp to be delyvered to her by my executor after my decease. Item I give and bequeath unto my Sonn in law *John Geering* the one half of my plate and the other half of my lynnens to be equally divided to him after my decease. Item I give and bequeath unto him More the sume of Tenn Pounds by the yeare of lawfull money of England to be issuing due and payable out of my yearly revenue granted mee by his Majesty over and above the sume of money and yearely rent which I have formerly settled upon him as by the said conveyance at large appeareth. And to hold the said yearely rent of ten Pounds by the yeare unto the [*sic*] my said sonn *John Geering* his heires and assignes for ever after my decease. Item I give and bequeath unto my said Sonn *John Geering* All that my Piece of freehold land w<sup>th</sup> all the appurtenances thereunto belonging adjoining to that my Messuage called the *Old Shipp* situat lying and being in *Hempshyre Streete* in *Brighthelmstone* late *Richard Gillams* to have and to hold the said Peece of land with all the buildings and th appurtenances thereunto belonging unto my sonn *John Geering* his heires and assignes for ever of the Cheife Lord or Lordes of the fee or fees thereof by the rent and Services thereof due and of right accustomed. Item all the rest of my Goods Chattells and household Stuff and plate unbequeathed together with my Personall Estate my debts legacies funerall expenses being Paid and discharged I give it unto my Sonn *Nicholas Tetersole* and doe Make him sole executor of this my last Will and testament revoking and making void all Wills Whatsoever formerly by mee made. In Witnes hereof I the said *Nicholas Tetersole* have hereunto sett my hand and seale the day and yeare first above written.

NICHOLAS TETERSOLE his X Mark

Sealed signed and acknowledged to be his last Will and testament in the Presence of us *Joh Mockford, Henry fforster, Richard Tidy, Nathaniell Buckell.*

The will was proved by the son, Nicholas Tattersell, on Oct. 30th 1674, in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury.

It appears from the will that Tattersell must have been married twice at least, as his wife Susan died in 1670, and a wife Elizabeth is referred to in the will. There are several references in the Brighton Court Rolls to "Elizabeth Tattersell widow, relict of John Gunter deceased," so that it is probable Tattersell married the widow. A

branch of the Gunter family had been in Brighton from 1624 (if not earlier), as there is a presentment on the death of John Gunter the elder in 1666, of his being admitted to a cottage in North Street in 1624. There is a surrender in 1658 by John Gunter the younger (son of the last mentioned) to the use of himself for life, his wife Elizabeth for life, and to the longest liver, and then to their heirs. It does not appear when John Gunter the younger died, but it was probably about 1669. He left three children, a son John (who must have died in the latter part of 1684), and two daughters, Susanna Burton, wife of James Burton and Mary Freeland. There is a surrender in 1684 by "Elizabeth Tettersell widow, relict of John Gunter deceased and John Gunter son of the said Elizabeth," to secure an advance, while on Jan. 4th, 1685, there is a sale of the same property by "Elizabeth Tettersell James Burton and Susanna his wife sister and heir of John Gunter deceased." Elizabeth Tettersell probably died late in 1692 or early in 1693, as her will (in the Lewes Registry) is dated Oct. 10th, 1692, and proved Feb. 7th, 1693. She gave one shilling to her daughter, Susanna Burton, and the residue of her estate to her daughter Mary Freeland.

The circumstance of Tettersell's widow being already provided for by her first husband, no doubt accounts for the small provision Tettersell made for her.

"The Old Shipp" was partly freehold and partly copyhold. On Jany. 26th, 1670, there is a surrender of copyhold part by John Arnold and Johanna his wife to "Nicholas Tettarsall," and on July 26th, 1674 (the day of his death), he surrendered this property to the use of John Geering (his son-in-law) he paying Tettersell's wife Elizabeth £6 a year during her life.

The connection of Captain Tettersell with this well-known hostelry is a matter of interest, but whether he kept the house as well as owned it does not appear.

The son Nicholas died intestate, and there is a grant of administration in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury on Dec. 22nd, 1701, to "Susanna Tuttersall daughter of Nicholas Tuttersall of Brightelmstone."

Nicholas Tettersell (the son) appears to have had only

two children, viz., Nicholas, who died Oct. 25th, 1679 (as already stated), and Susanna, who afterwards married Dr. Peter White. Nicholas Tattersell (the son) died on Oct. 29th, 1701, and on Jan. 29th, 1671-2, at a Court held for Atlingworth Manor, his daughter Susannah was admitted to the property in Middle Street. Susannah Tattersell must have married some time later in the year 1702, as we find by the parish register of All Saints Church, Lewes :<sup>53</sup>

BAPTISMS.—“ Francis daughter of Peter White MD<sup>54</sup> and Susanna born March 27<sup>th</sup> 170<sup>3</sup>. bap. April 5<sup>th</sup>

“ Mary daughter of d<sup>o</sup> born Sept 16<sup>th</sup> 1704 bap Sept 26<sup>th</sup>.”

Susannah White was admitted to “ the Old Shipp ” at a Court for Brighton Manor, on Feb. 8th, 1714. She is said to have died about 1754.

Colonel George Gunter (or Gounter) of Racton, was as already mentioned, the chief agent in the King's escape. His pedigree is given by Dallaway,<sup>55</sup> and it shows that he married Katherine, daughter of Sir Lawrence Hyde, Knt., of Salisbury. From Colonel Gunter's narrative<sup>56</sup> it appears some assistance was afforded by his kinsman Captain Thomas Gunter.

The State Papers threw an interesting light on the Gunter family after the Restoration. Colonel Gunter had died in the meantime, and the first item we find is about 1662. “ The humble peticon of the afflicted widdow of Collonel Gunter of Sussex who assisted yo<sup>r</sup>. Ma<sup>ties</sup> passage into France after the Battell of Worcester,” for the nomination of a person qualified as an Irish Viscount or for some other provision. “ Yo<sup>r</sup> Matie haueinge often beene gratuitously pleasd to promise a consideration of her condicon.”<sup>57</sup> The object in obtaining this nomination was to get the fees, &c., attendant thereon, and there are many similar petitions in the State Papers of that

<sup>53</sup> Peter White was born Feb. 29th, 1671-2, and died about 1725.

<sup>54</sup> The same register records “ BAPTISMS. Ann daughter of Dr. Benj. White and Dorothy July 12th, 1674, Barbara on Dec. 1st, 1675 (buried Feb. 17th, 1675-6). BURIALS. Dr. White May 9th, 1713.” This must be the father of Dr. Peter White.

<sup>55</sup> “ History of the Western Division of the County of Sussex,” Vol. II., Pt. 1, p. 175.

<sup>56</sup> Parry's “ Coast of Sussex,” p. 29 *et. seq.*

<sup>57</sup> “ State Papers, Domestic, Chas. II., 1661-2,” Vol. LXVI., 125.

date. It is doubtful whether any result was produced by the first petition, and there is another dated March 26th, 1663, by Katherine widow to Colonel George Gounter, to the King for remedy for her own and her eight children's desperate condition. Her late husband's whole estate was engaged for £3,000 debt, chiefly contracted for the late King, and now on his death, the estate, worth £240 a-year will be extended, and his children exposed to the wide world. Endorsed on the petition is a reference to the Lord Chancellor and Lord Treasurer, acknowledging Col. Gounter's services, "especially in providing a ship for His Majesty's escape after the battle of Worcester."<sup>58</sup> Shortly after there is another petition by the widow, stating that the creditors daily threaten to seize her lands for £5,000 debt and interest. Whether anything was done for the widow does not appear, but one of her sons, George, was placed on the foundation of Winchester School, as in 1663 there is a request by Lord Chief Justice Robt. Hyde,<sup>59</sup> that the letter the King had promised to write to the warden of the New College and other electors of scholars from Winchester School, in favour of George, son of the late George Gunter, who conveyed His Majesty over to France after his escape from Worcester, and spent his estate for the late King, may be so drawn as to place him before other candidates, that he may be elected this year.<sup>58</sup>

The following interesting letter was then sent by the King :—

" *George Gounter recom* } Trusty & Wellbeloved Wee greet you  
*to Winchester School* } well! Wee are informed that George  
 Gounter one of y<sup>e</sup> younger sons of Coll Gounter deceased & a  
 child of that foundation is very fit to be elected to y<sup>e</sup> University  
 & because Wee must never forget ye many good & faithfull ser-  
 vices pformed to Our Royal Father & Ourselfe by y<sup>e</sup> s<sup>d</sup> Coll  
 Gounter during y<sup>e</sup> late rebellion & particularly how happy and  
 Instrument hee was of Our escape into France after Worcester  
 fight. It is Our Royall Pleasure that at your elecon of Scollers  
 from y<sup>e</sup> Schoole you place y<sup>e</sup> s<sup>d</sup> George Gounter soe forward  
 upon y<sup>e</sup> Rolls as hee may be secured of an admittance into

<sup>58</sup> "Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1663-4," pp. 87 and 497.

<sup>59</sup> This influence was owing to relationship, the widow being daughter of Lawrence Hyde.

New Coll. Oxon within y<sup>e</sup> compasse of y<sup>e</sup> year. notwithstanding any other Our Lres that are or shall bee written on behalfe of any other ; hauing a p<sup>t</sup>icular desire to gratify this youth & to giue him all y<sup>e</sup> aduantages in his studies w<sup>ch</sup> he is capable of for y<sup>e</sup> regard Wee bear to his father's memory And &c.

“ Given y<sup>e</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> of May 1664.”<sup>60</sup>

The letter seems to bear evident traces of Royal dictation. This is the last reference to Colonel George Gunter's family. The widow, Catherine Gunter, obtained a pension of £200 a year for 21 years.<sup>61</sup> George Gunter (the son before referred to), married Judith, daughter of Richard Nicholl, of Norbiton Place, Surrey.

About Jan., 1661, there is a petition by Thomas Gunter to the King for the Office of Prothonotary or Clerk of the Crown for North Wales, value about £100 a year.<sup>62</sup> This appointment was probably not obtained, for there is a letter dated Nov. 28th, 1664, by the King to the Mayor and Burgesses of Devizes desiring them to appoint “ Thomas Gunter Barrister att Law ” as Recorder of that town, in the place of William Yorke deceased, “ for the constant loyalty & sufferings of his person & family for Our Service, one of his neare Relations hauing been heretofore under the good providence of God very eminently Instrumentall in Our owne escape after the Battle of Worcester.”<sup>63</sup> The “ Calendars of State Papers ” describe Thomas Gunter as nephew of Col. Gunter,<sup>64</sup> but the pedigrees in Dallaway do not show any one who can be thus identified.

<sup>60</sup> “ State Papers, Domestic, Chas. II., 1644.” Entry Book, No. 19, p. 10.

<sup>61</sup> Clarendon's “ Correspondence,” Vol. I., p. 56, *cit.* in Lingard's “ History of England.”

<sup>62</sup> “ Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Chas. II., 1660-1,” p. 495.

<sup>63</sup> “ State Papers, Domestic, Chas. II., 1666,” Entry Book, No. 17, p. 20.

<sup>64</sup> “ Calendar of State Papers, Charles II., 1666,” p. 298.