THE WOTTON MONUMENTS

By the Rev. L. E. C. Evans, B.C.L.(Oxon.)

Boughton Malherbe may be called the centre of Kent, for that county is divided from north to south into East and West Kent the boundary running, *vide* Hasted, through the east ends of Headcorn church and of this church and to the east of Lenham church. The county is also divided into two parts as upland or the open land, the true Gwent, and the weald or forest. This boundary is debatable in places; in the west it is reputed to follow the Pilgrims' Way, but a court has held, not surprisingly, that this does not hold in Aylesford, while here there can be little doubt since the parish has always been divided into Boughton Upland and Boughton Weald, the boundary running along the crest of the hill where the church stands. It is thus in the extreme south-east corner of the upland of West Kent.

The title to this manor vested in the Wotton family by the marriage of the Corby heiress to Nicholas Wotton, twice Lord Mayor of London. His 'descendants flourished in the parish for many generations afterwards, and their learning, fortune and honours, at times when honours were really such, may truly be said to have been ornaments of the country in general and of this county in particular'.[1] Many of those descendants were buried in Boughton Malherbe church and their monuments there have been noticed by visitors, notably by Izaac Walton and Horace Walpole, with a suggestion, emphatic at least in Hasted, of their lumbering the small chancel.[2] Most of these monuments remain, at least in part, but the visitor might wonder at the comment for, though numerous, they are singularly unobtrusive.

A little study of those remaining may raise some suspicions in the mind. A large brass plate measuring above 6 ft. by 3 ft. is placed immediately above a small brass plate to an uncle, Sir James, completely overshadowing it. The marble bust of an Elizabethan, Thomas, is seemingly set to surmount symmetrically a doorway apparently, and in truth, of Victorian restoration Gothic, while beneath it an inscribed tablet no doubt referring to it, but the plaster conceals any connection, is too high to be legible. (The same is true of one text of the long inscription above the much-admired monument erected by this Thomas

[1] E. Hasted, *History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent* (1797–1801), V, 400.
[2] *Op. cit.*, 413.

in Canterbury Cathedral to his uncle Nicholas, but there an accessible copy is also provided.) Well above this bust is a shield in very different stone, sandstone, the quarterings of which are numerous but not clearly discernible, whereas Harris cites, in connection with Thomas's monument, that the simple shield was adopted by the Wottons from the Corbys. Above the large brass plate which bears its own arms is a small limestone block bearing a simple shield of the original Wotton arms, meaningless where it stands. On the south wall is a brass plate, divided horizontally into three sheets; otherwise of the first pair, to Thomas, second Lord Wotton, both this and the other, to his wife, professing to mark the place of burial.

In a crotcheted Easter sepulchre, or large squint giving from the chancel to the south chapel, are three white marble lions of differing expressions, massively formed, with flattened heads, on bases 2 ft. 5 in. by 1 ft. Lastly on a stone shelf, apparently modern, on the wall of the south aisle are the figures of a man and a woman kneeling as commonly on tombs, but closer examination shows that the man has no legs, and never has had, his body rising, as it were from a tree trunk; the lady's legs are, of course, decently concealed by her robe trailing well behind her.

The lions and figures are clearly not *in situ*, the other monuments, except probably the brasses on the floor of the chancel, were placed in their present positions in consequence of a resolution of the vestry and a faculty, which are recorded but not identical, and of the action taken thereon, of which there is no record. All recollection of these events of 1904–5 seems lost in the village. No reason is given for the resolution, nor for the sites chosen, that of Thomas's bust being apparently determined by the vestry door, and those of the rest by this and a symmetrical use of the space. They were removed from the vestry to which they had been consigned at the big restoration of 1848–50 for which there is no faculty nor plans. There is, however, an unidentified newspaper report of the thanksgiving service held on St. Ambrose's Day (5th April), 1850, which also records something of the restoration, and enumerates some of the monumental remains then to be seen in the newly-built vestry against the north wall of the chancel.

It reports that on the 'south wall are affixed two large brasses in memory of members of the Wotton family'. It quotes the wife's inscription, and proceeds 'above this is a small tablet'. High up on the east wall of the vestry is a shield and opposite a bust within a sunken circle around which on a band are these words, '*Jesus Christus fati dominus mortis victor mea vita*'—words worth quoting besides identifying the object. This bust is carved in the round set in a concave hemisphere, surrounded by this band; the inscribed stone now below,

if not in fact attached, may be the small tablet, or this may be stone with the *cross paté* still above the lady's brass, or again Sir James's brass now below. The word brass as used is ambiguous, but the adjective large and the quotation can leave little doubt to what it refers. It does not mention all the monuments now in the chancel nor that of Hester, *née* Pickering, first wife of Edward, later first Lord Wotton, whose cracked tablet has remained in the vestry. Not being accessible, several lines thereof difficult to read, and the last broken away, it may be well to set it out:

Unica nata patris spes unica conjugis Hester
Chara patri mater amata viro
Tres habuit natos quor^{m} *Deus abstulit unum*
Natar superest unica viva trium
Nata^{m} *equitis sponsa sponsalis equiti Xoque dicata*
Conjug [ ] *morte beata fuit.*

which perhaps may be completed on the model of the second line, and the antithetical style, reminiscent of the poet Henry, her brother-in-law: *Conjugi vae morte beata fuit.* The elder surviving son died in his father's lifetime; the '*unica superest*' was Phillippa who married Sir Edmund Bacon, nephew of the Chancellor, grandson and heir of the Lord Keeper, and closest correspondent of Sir Henry Wotton, and of whom we shall speak again. This tablet presumably formed part of a monument in the chancel; it now closes a small stone box, contents unknown.

On Boxing Day, 1904, a special vestry on the promise of £50 from Sir Aretas Akers Douglas, then Home Secretary, and of other sums, decided that a Douglas and some Best tablets should be removed from the chancel and two brasses and five mural tablets from the vestry to the chancel walls. The reference to 'chancel walls' makes clear that 'brasses' is used in the same sense as above, while many might hesitate to call the two shields, and still less the bust, 'mural tablets'; yet the numbers seem to tally, though again the one 'brass' is certainly divisible into three and the other perhaps into two. The faculty merely repeats the resolution omitting 'mural' for no apparent reason.

We have, therefore, only the *disjecta membra* of the noted monuments set on wall-space specially provided as appropriate or necessary. It seemed, at first, to the writer, on account of the unusual size of the 'brasses' and of the design appearing to be intended to be vertical, that this assumption was correct. It almost certainly was not. The newspaper report gives hint of their earlier state as 'forming part of the dilapidated tombs of the Lords Wotton'. There were, in fact, but three lords, and the last was buried in Canterbury Cathedral, where no memorial remains. The only other item of the restoration concerning us here is the extension

eastward of the chancel some 5 ft., 'this part of the old church having been unusually small', this served to install a solid stone altar, very unusual, probably quite illegal, and raised a further 18 in. above the floor. The step across the whole chancel between stalls and rail, which is on the line of the old wall, now serves no purpose, but may well mark the old sanctuary a little over 5 ft. deep, the old wall having continued the line of the chapel wall. The foot of the stone bearing the older true brass, that of Nicholas, son of the first Wotton, died 1499, runs with this step, while the stone of his grandson, Sir Edward, with the second brass, extends from this to the chancel steps, thus filling the centre axis of the old chancel outside the sanctuary.

Those who noticed these monuments did not, with one exception, describe them, nor even with one exception enumerate them; such failure Horace Walpole censured as a great defect in Hasted on his first publication. Harris (1719) gives a rather vague list:[3] 'of Thomas (Argent a saltyre sable) of Mary daughter of Sir A. Throckmorton, of Thomas Lord Wotton, a pyramidal monument of Daniel ONeale, Postmaster General of Great Britain and Ireland in Charles I reign who married Katharine Countess of Chesterfield, died 1663 of a daughter of that countess, and of the countess herself; another of Sir James Wotton brother of Edward 1628, another of Nicholas Wotton 1491, another of Sir Edward son of Robert Wotton married Dorothy Read 1522; lastly of Hester Wotton daughter of Sir Wm Pickering and wife of Edward Wotton 1592'. Some details are incorrect, but each is recognizable and of each something remains. There is none to Edward, first Lord, while the pyramid serves for three who died in 1662, 1663 and 1667.

Hasted's *octavo*, the edition more usually available, is ambiguous and *prima facie* hearsay. He writes of the church 'The inside of it is much ornamented by the several monuments of the Wotton family most of whom lie buried in it, but there was one of them, a large pyramid of black marble supported by three lions couchant on a deep base, erected to the memory of Henry Lord Stanhope, his wife Lady Catherine, Countess of Chesterfield, her third husband Daniel ONeal and several children, injudiciously placed within the altar rails eastward and filled almost the whole space of it but has lately been taken down to make room for an altar and railing.'[2] This implies no personal knowledge of the monument, the probable absence of both table and rail, since their provision is the object and consequence of removal, so that 'Within the altar rails' means where these now are, or where they should have been, possibly on the step still existing.

The *folio* edition, in this case sixteen years earlier, corrects some

[3] Harris, *History of Kent*, London, 1719, 48–9.

conclusions, without making the matter clear; it reads from 'placed':[4] 'just within the altar rails eastward, and fills up almost the whole space there insomuch that there is no room for a table, or for the rector to administer the sacrament with common decency'. This seems to prove that the table was never set to the east wall, or was still brought out for celebrations, and that if there was a rail, it must have been some 3 ft. west of the step (to give passage between them) dividing the chancel in half, a curious arrangement. Later ascriptions of this monument are vague and varying, apparently derived at first or second hand from Hasted. Lord Stanhope died on 4th December, 1634, as entered in the Bishop's transcript, where burial is not specifically asserted, and deaths of important persons are sometimes recorded, but Daniel O'Neale did not die until 1663. Why a widow who for thirty years had erected no memorial should then desire to do so, and to associate a third husband, omitting a second, is puzzling, as is the burial of the Chesterfield heir, so far from home. Harris's ascription to persons dying contemporarily seemed probable, and may have been the popular and Latinless ascription, while Hasted's vagueness may not be carelessness, but difficulty in reading an inaccessible Latin inscription in a dark corner.

There are as paving in the vestry, sadly defaced and somewhat mutilated, three triangular black marble slabs, once engraved. A recent examination showed on the first *'mater faemina optima'* and below *'MDCLXVII'*, on the second *'filiarum'* immediately over *'Henricus'* and lower down *'Maria'* and at the foot *'aetatis suae obiit MDCXXXV'*. The third yielded a longer inscription in English, of beautiful lettering to Daniel O'Neale, clearly by the widow, who erected to him this monument as one of the last marks of her kindness to shew her affection longer than her weake breath could serve to expresse it'. He died in A.D. 1663, aged 60, showing by and to whom the monument was erected, and that the Latin inscriptions were posthumous.

Mrs. Ireland, an artist then living beside the church, very kindly made rubbings of the second and third stones and most of the first. The first was fruitless, the third added but details of public offices, but the second yielded a good deal. This inscription runs to 32 lines, but as most are blank or meaningless a facsimile would waste space. The lengths of the lines vary greatly, both with the shape of the stone, and the layout of the inscription. The numbers indicate the line of the words following:

1—*Hic jacet* 2—*Spe vitae futurae et melioris* 3—*ricus Baro Stanhope* 4—*(heres comitis) de Chesterfield* 9—*(Katharinam) Wotton* 11—*Bocton Marherb* 14—*(uxo)rem duxit* 15—*dem prolem* 16—*fore filiarum*

[4] Hasted, *op. cit.*, ii, 437.

17—*habuit* (?whole line) 18—*(q)u (oru)m (natu) maximus Henricus* 19—*Baronis ob* 20—*ter Philippus (pecu)lis et patrimonio avi sui* 21—*nimi merito fruitur* (whole line) 22—*Ex filiabus prim(oris) cui nomen Maria* 23—*Innuba decessit* (whole line) 24—*Altera Katharina Baroni Allington* 25—*matrimonia conjuncta fuit* 26—*Quae (ta)men (protin)us decubuit* 27—*Vir fuit venustus venerabundus integer* 28—*summa virtute insignis* 29—*Vir supra laudem & supra titulos* 30—*Vicessimo septimo anno aetatis suae obiit* 31—*anno domini* 32—*MDCXXXV*

These stones have a base measurement of 54 in. which is a minimum, the mutilation being unknown. The lions must have been placed at the angles, they are fully carved and clearly intended to be seen. The centre of support on the head is 9 in. behind the front edge of the base. We know nothing of the great base but that it was 'deep', meaning probably high. The height of the lions is 18 in. This gap and the sloping sides of the pyramid seem to call for a large base. A circle is described around the bases which, if not necessarily the most likely form, yet gives some idea of the area required. It is 82 in. in diameter. If the base followed more closely the plan, its protuberances were probably ornamented, embossed and thus enlarged. Certainly the monument could not have stood on a 5-ft. pace. Its form and three inscribed faces call for a free-standing position, such as the centre of so small a chancel, but that is inconsistent with Hasted's account, and moreover would encroach upon the oldest memorial, that of Nicholas whose brass and stone appear untouched. As has been said, his and his grandson's stones run from step to step, but closer inspection shows that they are not on the centre axis of the chancel but a foot nearer the north wall, leaving over 7 ft. to the south. This eccentricity might be original but there is a stronger probability.

The Rector complaining to Hasted was probably the Rev. Robt. Foote, Prebend of Rochester and Treasurer of Bangor, who died here in 1804 and whose monument is in the south chapel, now high above the aisle arch, quite illegible, no doubt an act of restoration. All priestly graves are in this chapel, Michael Stanhope apparently lying south to north across the arch, and Foote's infant brother to the north of the altar, under the Easter sepulchre. The elder Foote was presented by his brother-in-law Galfredus Mann after and in the year of sale of the estate by the great, fourth, Earl of Chesterfield. His son was born in 1754, died in 1762, and lies under a 6-ft. stone (surely ample and honourable provision) bearing these words:

Though infant years no pompous honours claim
The vain parade of monumental fame

To better praise the last great day shall rear
The spotless innocence that resteth here.

The elegiac note is unmistakeable, and any interested may remember that Gray's *Elegy* was first printed in 1751. Nor is it fanciful to detect the first complaint against the Wotton monuments, more especially if Katharine's large monument blocked the opening above, as its lions still do.

These probabilities, and the doubts that may be felt as to the failure to remove the table to the east wall of the chancel require some consideration of the characters concerned. The first brass is to Nicholas son of the founding Lord Mayor: he is shown kneeling opposite his wife, three sons behind him and seven daughters behind her, true date 1499 and not as in Harris. One of the sons is Robert, his successor and father of Edward of the second brass. This is incomplete, recording only the death of the wife in 1529 (not 1522) and possibly never was completed for him who survived to 1552 and married again. The offices he held were not great, but his influence must have been for he and his brother, another Nicholas, first Dean of both Canterbury and York, an experienced and able ambassador hold a unique record, the first having been offered by Henry VIII the Lord Chancellorship and the other the Archbishopric of Canterbury by Elizabeth, both answering in effect—and meaning—*nolo episcopare*. Nevertheless, Henry's opinion of them is attested in his making both executors of his will, and in the events which followed, despite the machinations of the great, Somerset, Northumberland and Philip II, it was that will that prevailed. This Edward, while no great partisan, eagerly studied the new doctrines, and the parson he presented in 1541 was deprived in 1554. His son Thomas, but for imprisonment at his uncle's request, might have risen for Lady Jane Grey, his cousin. His nomination as Knight of the Bath was cancelled by Mary. He voluntarily, or otherwise, presented one Thos. Langley who resigned in 1564. One inducted as Richard Elmson, who became in 1583 Elmstone, continued incumbent to 1611, outliving his patron by 24 years, and, no doubt, establishing in the parish a definite churchmanship. Thomas has left a letter-book and other memorials of a cultured man living on his estate and interested in local and county affairs, and thus of more influence in Boughton than his forefathers or most descendants. He was on one or more of the High Commissions, but complains that a decision of his and his neighbours has been overruled by other Commissioners. He intervened on behalf of 'preachers' and for their widows, including those at variance with Whitgift. He corresponded with puritans in particular with Cartwright whom he assisted financially, and who is described as 'the head and most learned of the sect of dissenters then called

puritans', for the reconciliation or suppression of whom the court to which he had been appointed, existed. He later complains of being dropped from the grand jury, the absurdity of 'representation' on instruments of government not having been dreamt of. He was not in full accord with all Elizabethan policy. He died in 1587.

He was followed by Edward who seems to have been reared among Spaniards in Naples, and whose religious views remained a puzzle to Mendoza. He, too, was a diplomat, in particular on an embassy to Scotland, and held court appointments which would have curtailed his time at Boughton. On Elmstone's death, he presented Robt. Barrell who survived him, but becoming a pluralist he discharged his duties here by curates though sometimes himself writing or signing the transcripts. In view of the charge against him, it may be said that these are always firmly, clearly and neatly written. His living was sequestered by the Lords, following that of Maidstone, the principal plea in this case being that he had enough money of his own. Edward emparked his mansion and with it the church. His wife's Hester's monument has been quoted and records the family. The elder son, Pickering, went abroad with Sir Henry Wotton, and later died in Spain in penury. In such state he is said to have been perverted to Rome, and to have written an account which coming into his father's hands produced the same result. Though it is generally thought that Edward died a Roman Catholic, and Henry's remarks as to the danger occasioned by him to his grand-daughter Hester clearly point to the same, yet at that time a man showing such diplomatic reserve on the matter would not have interfered with established public worship. He is usually said to have died in 1626, Hasted says 1628 and is no doubt, correct, for his will is dated 22nd August, 1626, but was proved 11th May, 1628. The buildings of St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, on dissolution remained with the Crown. They were later granted to Lord Cobham, on his attainder to Robert Cecil, and on his death in 1612, were leased to this Edward who then made them his residence, his son Thomas occupying Boughton where his children were baptized. Thomas was of weak health, his interests in steeplechasing. He did not long survive his father, dying in 1630.

His eldest heiress, Katharine, brought this property to her husband, the heir of the Earl of Chesterfield, who died at an early age in 1634, when full control came to her. She was left with three surviving children, two girls and a boy, later in 1656 the second earl. The young widow was proposed to by Lord Cottenham, a leading statesman, and by van Dyke, who painted at least two portraits of her, the fee for one of which she disputed. When the Dutch sought the hand of the Princess Royal, she set an example by marrying the ambassador, becoming a Dutch Baroness, was appointed governess to the princess and accom-

panied her to The Hague. There she was at the centre of royalist circles with the speedy arrival of the Queen and later of Prince Charles in the charge of Lord Colepepper, her neighbour in Kent and legatee of her grandfather, all dependent at times even for food on the princess. William III greeted the second earl with a reminder that he had been brought up to the age of ten in his mother's house. Hyde is said to have been jealous of her influence, and if so, at the expense of the fullness and perhaps the accuracy of his account, he gets his own back by omitting all mention of her. He and his people, as the Nicholas papers show, kept a close watch on her doings, viewed with apparent suspicion her dutiful intent to nurse her husband in illness, received tittle tattle about how the future William III was fed, that 'the great governors here in the Princess Royals family and business are the Lady Stanhope and her husband and the great men with them are Lord Percy and Daniel ONeile'. A Scots correspondent politely refers to Katharine as the she friend of the last who with many others enjoyed her and the princess's hospitality. Her strong, perhaps unique, position as the wife of a nobleman of a country usually friendly at times courted by the usurper, holding unsequestered estates entailing relations with his government, is not utilized but highly suspect. Her heir, after adventurous journeyings on the Continent, lived in England with the Earl of Northumberland, his father-in-law, while his wife lived; and, later, a more rakish life in town when his banns were three times called at St. Martin's with the only child of Fairfax, who then married the Duke of Buckingham. He was offered a daughter and a commission in his army by the Protector, who had also angled for the Duke of Buckingham. O'Neale, a man of 'notorious courage' and nephew of Owen Row O'Neil, the Ulster leader, was one of the professional soldiers who joined the royal cause. He was, says Hyde, 'loved of the M. of Ormond and much esteemed by him' and accompanied him on his dangerous reconnaissance in England in 1658 as well as making another or others alone. On Cromwell's death, it was Lord Colepepper who pointed at once to Monck, in command of the best army in the island, as the object of their diplomacy, while O'Neale's report and appreciation is far nearer the course of events than Hyde's account clouded with uncertainties, hesitation and distrust. Whatever part she played in the events and counsels of the day, Katharine obtained on the Restoration the unique honour of Countess in her own right with the rank of earl's daughters to her children. She had already obtained a new peerage for her Dutch son, Baron Wotton of Boughton Malherbe, by patent dated at Perth, 3rd August, 1650, when Charles came to take the Covenant. The Scots then removed from him all his attendants, and O'Neale, being an Irishman who had been in arms for Charles I, was liable to death, and signed a remarkable document agreeing to be

executed if found again in Scotland. Though her faith may have been warm, as attested by the fine silver-gilt vessels of Dutch fashion presented by her and worthy of illustration as well as description in Scott Robertson's articles on Kent church silver,[5] yet such a woman married for nearly twenty years to a Dutch Protestant is not likely to have worried much about the position of the table, moreover, the south chapel of the same length and three-quarters the width of the chancel was always available and is not cut off from the nave by five 5-in. steps, no small obstacle to the aged and infirm.

Katharine may have seemed to return in triumph, but hers was an unhappy homecoming. Her husband died in the March; the Princess followed Charles and her to England, fell ill, was nursed by her, and died of smallpox, her death postponing the Coronation. Mary, her daughter, died in January 1661/2 her younger daughter later the same year 'protimes', and O'Neale, whom she had married, in the following year. Well might she speak in her will dated 15th December, 1666, of 'the travailes I have made in the wearisome pilgrimage of this life, and hoping to obtain everlasting rest in the highest heaven'. She went on to desire to be buried 'near the body of my late dear deceased husband Daniel O'Neal' and refers to him more than once in these words making no mention of the first. She gave directions as to a monument clearly not erected but proposed, at least, when the directions for drafting were given. 'I do desire that my sonne Philip Earl of Chesterfield do erect and order a monument to be erected for Master ONeile in the parish church of Bocton aforesaid if I do not in my life time take order thereon by providing of such a monument for him as I would have sett up upon which monument I would have it left to posteritie what Master ONeile was and my relation to him.' The difference in the language and lettering of the inscriptions can leave little doubt that she completed in fact or purpose the O'Neale monument. She was buried on 18th April, 1667. Her will proceeds immediately 'and my further desire that my sonne Charles will by such way as he shall think best in his good discretion order and dispose *the place used for the burial of my family* in the said church of Bocton by making a vault or isle or otherwise thereof in decent manner for the laying and distinguishing of the Bodies of my said family'. £300 and no more was to be laid out on the whole project. This implies that no vault existed and none is known; the 'place used' can only be the chancel and contained all the burials so far noticed. The words disclose the lady's idea of the purpose of the chancel. The directions in all might also imply a knowledge that the size of the monument contemplated would lead to the displacement of a central stone, and if this was the occasion of such removal, it would mean that the monument was

[5] *Arch. Cant.*, xvi (1886), 355; xvii (1887), 296.

placed in the south-east corner, where one side at least would be difficult of access and reading, the more so beneath a window containing much old glass.

There remain the two figures on the south wall. The immediate provenance of these is within living memory, but the details are obscure. They are said to have been dug up in the south chapel, and this must have happened when on his arrival in 1927, the Rev. Travers Macy cleared out this chapel which had been used as a dump, and laid a parquet flooring. Their state is consistent with their having been buried. The right shoulder of the female figure is broken away. The clothing and armour are said to be of the early seventeenth century. This is all to be known from their side. The period is that of Sir Henry and Edward, first Lord Wotton. In his will, the latter directed that his 'earthly tabernacle be buried in the high church of Boughton Malherbe as neere to the font (the place where I received my Baptism) as conveniently may be, if it please God to take me out of this life in any place from which my body may be conveniently carried thither'. This will, dated 22nd August, 1626, is not in near contemplation of death, and was proved at Canterbury on 11th May, 1628. His lady, who seems to have assumed control of this matter, had her own ideas of convenience: she removed the font and interred the body on the site. On this proceedings were brought against her in the court of High Commission. In his last report to the king of January 1632–3, Abbott, Archbishop, wrote: 'The Lady Wotton in Kent hath set up a bold epitaph upon her Lords tomb, and will not be persuaded to take it down. We have called her into the High Commission, where by excuse of sickness she hath not appeared, but at the next term, God willing, we intend to proceed with her; which is but necessary for the avoiding of scandal in the country.'[6] They did proceed, possibly *in absentia*, that Hilary term. Few records of this court have survived the destructive malice of the Puritans whose exaggerated abuse of it those records probably belied; that of this case is not among them. But there is a letter of 6th February, 1632/3, from Sir George Gresley to Sir Thomas Pickering,[7] possibly a relative of the deceased's first wife, the Hester above, reporting that the Lady Wotton was fined £500 last week for an inscription that he died a true Catholic of the Roman Church, and for removing the font. Sir Henry Wotton wrote on 25th April following, to Edmund Bacon of whom we have spoken: 'From my Lady, my sister, at Canterbury we hear nothing; I believe she is in travail with her own thoughts, about defacing the inscription of the tomb as far as Catholico and Catholica amount unto. But I could wish, as she took your advice

[6] W. Land, *Works of William Land*, 1847–60, v, 311.
[7] (Ed.) T. Birch, *The Court and Times of Charles I*, 1848, ii, 227.

in the intention and word upon the marble, she had done so in the rest: but in that you were no apt councellor.'[8]

This language might be thought light and trifling, but the writer's style is always easy; his legal learning and acumen are great, undoubtedly he is dealing with the *ratio decidendi*. He is writing to a dear friend, an able man who might be thought to have failed a near female in distress, and he brings out the narrow basis of complaint. The deceased's will begins with a very long confession of his Christian hope, with thanksgiving for his being made 'a member of his holy catholic church militant here on earth'. The language follows closely the Catholic wording of the Book of Common Prayer, and seems to the writer unobjectionable in form. But words may by implication or context acquire another intention, and the court seems to have spoken of such intention, and is echoed in Henry's 'Intention and word upon the marble'. 'Word' is singular, is apparently quoted, and, if suitably placed, and in another gender, might properly have applied to the church. Sir George applies it only to the man. The large fine which bulks large in the lay view may well have been a *sub poena* only, imposed *in terrorem*, a further persuasion to that compliance the Archbishop sought, a means of obviating execution in which this court, like some other jurisdictions, seems to have been weak. 'The rest' may well refer to the removal of the font. It all seems a striking example of that evil to the denunciation of which Sir Henry dedicated his own monument to the exclusion of his name: '*Disputandi pruritus ecclesiarum scabies*', therein vindicating in the ruin of his country and church, and of this his brother's monument, the family claim to prophecy which is also made on the other unscathed monument in Canterbury Cathedral—'*cantionem cigneam prophetice canens*'.

These facts have frequently been related, often with wrong dates without these considerations and without the real evidence now to be adduced. The font in Boughton Malherbe church is in an unusual and, as any who is called to serve there will soon discover, a most inconvenient position: halfway up the nave and close against the only pillar of the south arcade. The probable position in such a church with south door and aisle and west door is at the west end of the nave, to the west of the south door, or in the tower chamber, in that order of probability. Just within the tower arch at Boughton is a large and defaced slab with broken rusted clamps exposed, in a condition it is difficult to suppose a good mason would have left it. There is a happy note in the brief account of the restoration that the font had been replaced in its original position; meaning no doubt, that in which it was found. They added the Gothic cover.

Soon after the above judgment, his position undermined by Laud's

[8] L. Pearsell Smith, *Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, Oxford, 1907.

influence, and his Pharisaic refusal to deal with one whose hands were, however innocently, stained with blood, Abbott resigned, and Laud ascending his throne became the usual president of the convicting court, as well as being bishop of the diocese where the scandalous monument stood, perhaps less offensive to his accommodating eyes; but he held stricter and more definite views regarding the font and its proper place, as may be seen in his Canon and Constitution for the Church of Scotland of 1636—'it should be placed somewhat near the entry of the church as anciently it used to be'. Had Lady Wotton complied with the judgment, she would have altered the letter, and re-erected the tomb elsewhere, possibly with removal of the body. Had Laud by some process executed the substance of the judgment, he would not only have removed the tomb; but replaced the font. Either should have made good the paving; probably neither acted. The rough state of the probable site might speak of violence, haste and hate. Popish and superstitious inscriptions were the specific targets of Puritan legislation and destruction, and this had been condemned even by the High Commission. The sound Puritan views of the family would not serve. The first heiress Katharine was with the Princess Royal and the young Charles, while her youngest sister's husband rose in 1643 and headed the Kent rising of 1648. There were during these years two Wotton dowagers, Margaret and Mary, a fact often overlooked, the former ordinarily resident at the 'Palace'. She was aunt to Lord Wharton, a busy-body of the parliamentary peers, to whom Cromwell addressed several letters in Carlyle's collection, but such connections did not save her from being twice plundered, her furniture destroyed, and a large picture 'two ells square of the passion of Christ' taken and burnt by the authority of the mayor, to the edification, no doubt, of the inhabitants of Canterbury. She outlived Mary in whom the 'palace' never vested, as Hasted states, though it passed by her will to the rebellious Hales. Margaret's will is undated but made after her ruin and in close expectation of death, and was proved in London on 12th April, 1659. There is no register in Boughton, but St. Paul's records her death at the 'pallace in the parish of St Pauls' and burial at what they call Bawton Mallard on 17th March, 1658. She left her body to 'be buried in the church of Boughton Malherbe neere to the place where the body of the truely honoured and most deare lords body is interred'. There is no mention of tomb, nor of the font; the words imply an unencumbered site, and probably that where she had laid him. Harris knew not this tomb, while Katharine's language in her will is more consistent with the monument's being confined to the chancel, than with the probably most conspicuous one being elsewhere.

The two figures tell somewhat of the same tale. The injury to the lady's shoulder speaks of violence. The burial in the south chapel,

perhaps then the sanctuary, tells of fear, care and desire to save them from destruction. They are not likely to have been put there by the restorers in 1848, such was not their method. This tomb was no doubt destroyed by the Puritan soldiery which swarmed in Kent, the scene of suspected Royalist landing.

In all, it may be doubted if the Wotton monuments were ever as imposing as some notices suggest, nor were all ever co-existent. Remnants of all that Harris knew survive: the true brasses are little, if any, altered, the brass plates are entire, though the centre sheet of the lords seems of different brass and records facts long posterior to the death commemorated, it was originally on the ground, though the other may always have been on the wall. In her will referred to on her brass, Mary left £40 'for such tombstone and sheet of brass to be laid upon me as I have layd upon my lord and husband by whom I desire to be buried', a direction not so easily performed if she was to lie with him in the usual way. There is halfway down the aisle a large gravestone of the same area as the lord's plate having many holes, probably stud-holes, which are mostly round the edges and in two double lines across it. The lowest sheet of his plate is smaller than the other two, and its measurements agree with those of the eastern space enclosed by these holes; while the holes along that edge correspond with the equidistant studs at the bottom of this plate. There is no similar stone apparent or known. James's modest plate might suffice, but there is in the tower chamber at the foot of the ladder a stone with matrices of a shield and below it a plate, the dimensions of which are those of his plate, so it too was probably upon the floor. Thomas erected the splendid monument in Canterbury Cathedral to his uncle who died twenty years before him. His bust and frame here have much of the same Italian style and excellence. It probably pre-existed the monument into which it was incorporated, his first wife and mother of the commemorating son had died three years before his uncle, the sandstone coat of arms with its Gothic flourish would not easily match with this, but Harris mentions no wife, as he does elsewhere, and inconsequently, as it seems, recites Thomas's arms: Argent saltyre engrailed sable, the Corby shield adopted by the Wottons on occupying the manor, while the other seems to have nine quarterings of which this is, of course, the first. He may put it first in his list on its merits, and not as the most conspicuous. Its simplicity befits a pacific retiring Puritan. There is less left of Hester's tomb and quite unstylized, but Harris gives more personal particulars of her than of any: 'daughter of Sir Wm. Pickering & wife of Edward Wotton 1592'. She was, in fact, buried on 12th May, 1592. Her tomb must have borne another inscription at least as long as that which has survived and giving these more usual particulars. They might have been placed on either side of a

classical altar or even larger tomb. Edward might then have contemplated a common tomb, and the coat of arms might belong here. Investigation throws no light on the provenance of the shield with the cross *paté fiché*, the original Wotton arms, borne by the first Nicholas and resumed by the second Lord appearing on his plate and the Countess's chalice. It might have been on the deep base of her black marble monument.