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The History and Antiquities of Haddon Hall is the first book devoted completely to the subject of Haddon Hall. It contains thirty-two drawings of the interior and exterior features of Haddon. One of the drawings, Dorothy Vernon’s Doorway, is shown on the title page. This download RaynerHaddonHall contains the written words of Rayner’s book.

Parts I and III of RaynerHaddonHall are a detailed history of how Haddon Hall was acquired by William the Conqueror in 1066; and how it passed through various noble families until its final acquisition by the Manners family in 1565.

To this end Rayner provides important historical background on George Vernon and his family. “Sir Henry Vernon (died 1515) married the Lady Ann Talbot, daughter of John, Earl of Shrewsbury. His eldest son, Sir Richard Vernon (died 1517) succeeded him at Haddon. Sir George Vernon (1508-1565) was but nine years old at the time of his father’s decease. Sir George Vernon left two daughters, his co-heiresses, Margaret and Dorothy. These ladies were both married at the time of his decease: Margaret, the elder, aged twenty-six, being then the wife of Sir Thomas Stanley, second son of Edward, Earl of Derby; and Dorothy, aged twenty-one, the wife of Sir John Manners, second son of Thomas, Earl of Rutland (died 1543).”

Part II of RaynerHaddonHall is a detailed description of the Haddon Hall and its grounds circa 1836, when visited by Rayner. The History and Antiquities of Haddon Hall contains drawings of many of the features of the Hall at the time of this visit, many of areas which are now inaccessible to the twenty-first century visitor. A second download: www.haddon-hall.com/HaddonHallBooks/RaynerHaddonPicture.pdf contains the thirty-two drawings to which Rayner refers in Part II. It is intended that the reader refers to the appropriate page of RaynerHaddonPicture as Part II of RaynerHaddonHall is being read. The page numbers of RaynerHaddonPicture are the same as the Plate numbers in Rayner’s book.

Rayner brings the legend of Dorothy Vernon into the historical mainstream. “It may be proper to notice a romantic tradition, still current in the vicinity of Haddon, relative to the courtship and marriage of Mr. Manners with the younger co-heiress of Vernon.”

It is clear from the section on William Hage that he and Rayner were in close contact, and that Hage would have noted there was a ‘romantic tradition.’ Rayner does not credit Hage with telling the details of the elopement, but Hage must have told of an escape through what is called “Dorothy Vernon’s Doorway,” as illustrated by Rayner. Rayner reprises the particulars from William Bennet’s novel. “The lover dwelt for some time in the woods of Haddon in the dress of a game-keeper for the purpose of concealment, and in order to facilitate secret interviews with his mistress; and he at length succeeded in persuading the young lady to elope with him, during the festivities of a masked ball. The author of a Romance in three volumes entitled The King of the Peak, published in 1823, has adopted this tradition as the basis of his tale.”
Rayner has begun the process of interweaving Haddon Hall history, fiction, and tradition in such a way that it is difficult, if not impossible to ever separate them again. Thus begins the legend of Haddon Hall’s Dorothy Vernon: either a popular myth of recent origin or a historical story handed down from early times.

Many libraries incorrectly identify S. Rayner as Simeon, who was an obscure author, rather than the correct designation of Samuel, who was a member of the renowned family of Rayner artists.

KINGS AND QUEENS OF ENGLAND KNOWN TO S. RAYNER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1066-1087</td>
<td>William I (of Normandy, the Norman, the Conqueror)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1087-1100</td>
<td>William II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1135</td>
<td>Henry I [William II bro.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1135-1154</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154-1189</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1189-1199</td>
<td>Richard I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1199-1216</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216-1272</td>
<td>Edward I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272-1307</td>
<td>Henry III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307-1327</td>
<td>Edward II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327-1377</td>
<td>Edward III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1377-1399</td>
<td>Richard II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1399-1413</td>
<td>Henry IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1413-1422</td>
<td>Henry V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1422-1461</td>
<td>Henry VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461-1470</td>
<td>Edward IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470-1471</td>
<td>Henry VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471-1483</td>
<td>Edward IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483-1485</td>
<td>Edward V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485-1509</td>
<td>Henry VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509-1547</td>
<td>Edward VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547-1553</td>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553-1558</td>
<td>Mary I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558-1603</td>
<td>Elizabeth I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603-1625</td>
<td>James I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625-1649</td>
<td>Charles I (executed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1649-1660</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660-1685</td>
<td>Charles II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685-1688</td>
<td>James II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689-1702</td>
<td>William III &amp; Mary II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702-1714</td>
<td>Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714-1727</td>
<td>George I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727-1760</td>
<td>George II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760-1820</td>
<td>George III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820-1830</td>
<td>George IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-1837</td>
<td>William IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEDICATION BY S. RAYNER

TO
HIS GRACE
THE DUKE OF RUTLAND, K. G.

MY LORD DUKE,

In soliciting your patronage of this attempt to illustrate the History and Antiquities of one of the most curious and interesting Baronial Mansions in the country, I have been influenced by the consideration that it has come into your possession as a descendant from the illustrious race of feudal proprietors who for some centuries here displayed a splendid example of Old English Hospitality. And the taste and judgment you have manifested, in preserving from decay this almost singular specimen of the domestic architecture of our Nobility and Gentry in the middle ages, render still more appropriate the inscription to your Grace of this literary memorial of former times.

With the utmost respect,
I have the honour to subscribe myself
Your Grace’s
most obliged and obedient servant,
S. RAYNER.

[K. G. is the abbreviation for Knight of the Order of the Garter]
Till within a recent period the highly interesting Baronial Mansion which forms the subject of this work has been but rarely and imperfectly noticed by antiquaries, and has excited comparatively but little attention from the tourist. The historical and descriptive accounts of Haddon Hall hitherto published have been meager and defective, or careless and inaccurate, and all of them unsatisfactory; while it may be safely affirmed that seven or eight years since scarcely any prints could be found but such as were of a commonplace description, by no means calculated to afford clear ideas of the peculiarities of the architectural curiosity.

The discovery of the picturesque beauties of Haddon may indeed be regarded as a circumstance of rather modern date. My own residence in Derbyshire led me several years ago to an examination of the characteristic features of this fine old edifice; and shortly after I had the satisfaction of making them known to my friend Mr. Cattermole, during one of his visits to me in that part of the country. I must also observe that it is chiefly from a series of slight but able sketches by that eminent artist that the accompanying views have been selected; and I would by no means omit to mention that those sketches were presented to me without any remuneration, at a time when more than one publisher was negotiating for the purchase of them.

As soon as it was known that I intended to lay before the public a work on this subject, no less than four or five of my professional friends offered to furnish me with sketches of the structure; a circumstance which shows that Haddon Hall is now no longer regarded with that apathy and inattention to which its beauties had before been undeservedly subjected. Within the last five years especially its attractions have been generally felt and acknowledged; and lying as it does between those frequented watering-places Matlock and Buxton, visitors have frequently been drawn thither by the interesting character of the building, and the charms of the surrounding scenery on the banks of the Wye.

The inspection of the ancient Hall can scarcely fail to excite in the mind of the liberally educated stranger reflections on the varied scenes of feudal grandeur and festive hospitality, which have in former times occurred within these walls. All the apartments are now silent and solitary, though they heretofore echoed the sounds of jovial mirth and gaiety, when the ancestors of the present noble proprietor feasted, with princely magnificence, their friends and retainers; and the neighbouring fields now peaceably inhabited by lowing herds, in days of yore were probably trod by mailed bands of the dependants of the feudal lords of Haddon, gathered at their command and marshalled to be led to the field of battle.
Concerning a place capable of calling forth such associations, curiosity may naturally be felt, as to its probable origin, the history of its owners, and the events with which these scenes have been connected. To gratify such a just and laudable thirst for information, and to afford satisfaction to the admirers of the picturesque who may not have had opportunities of visiting this neighbourhood, the following descriptions and historical sketches have been published.

The first part of this work consists of a review of the history of Haddon, from the original grant of the territorial domain, by William the Norman to his natural son William Peverell, the subsequent transfer of the property from the family of the first grantee to the Avenells, the Vernons, and the family of the present noble owner, the Duke of Rutland; with accounts of such individuals among the successive proprietors as were at all distinguished on account of their talents or offices; and notices of all those national events in which they were concerned. The second part will comprise a description of the house in its present [1836] state, with such information as can be collected relative to the periods at which different portions of it were erected.

I trust that I have corrected some errors into which former writers have fallen relative to the history of the lords of Haddon, and to present the reader with a more connected and less imperfect account of the Vernons of Haddon than has heretofore appeared.

[Rayner’s work is presented in two downloads. This part describes the History of Haddon Hall and the description of Haddon Hall. The other download contains the thirty-two drawings to which Rayner refers.]
Sir Richard Vernon, Knt., the eldest son and successor of Sir Henry Vernon, married Margaret, daughter of Sir Robert Dymoke. By this lady, he left an only son at his death, which occurred August 14, 1517; Sir Richard thus surviving his father Sir Henry [died 1515] a little more than two years. He was interred at Tong, where, at this period, seems to have been the family sepulchre.

Sir George Vernon, the son and sole heir of the preceding, was but nine years old at the time of his father’s decease. “He was,” says Camden, “the last male of this branch whose chief seat was at Haddon, by the river Wye, in Derbyshire, the seat for many years of the Vernons; who, as they were very ancient, so they were no less renowned in those parts, in so much as this Sir George Vernon, who lived in our times, for his magnificent port and hospitality, was called by the multitude, Petty King of the Peak.”

The rank and distinction which Sir George Vernon maintained in the county in which he resided, may be inferred from a paper preserved among the manuscripts in the British Museum. It contains “The names of such as are specially written unto from the Lords of the Counsel, to take care in the good assessing of the Subsidy, 1565.” Doubtless the persons thus employed by the government of Elizabeth, in the execution of an honourable but onerous duty, were selected from among the great landed proprietors of the realm who were considered as the most loyal and devoted subjects of the Queen. The list is arranged by counties. The names for Derbyshire are the Earl of Shrewsbury, Sir George Vernon, Knt., and Thomas Cockan, or Cockayn, Knt.

Sir George Vernon died the same year, 7th Elizabeth [1565], seized of no less than thirty manors. He was twice married: first to Margaret, daughter of Sir Gilbert Talbois; and after her death to Matilda [or Maud], daughter of Sir Ralph Longford, of Longford, in the county of Derby, Knt., and sister and co-heir of Nicholas Longford, Esq. of the same place. He was interred in the parish church of Bakewell [and can still be visited], where also lies his first wife. The second survived him, and took for her second husband Sir Francis Hastings, of North Cadbury, in Somersetshire, Knt., fifth son of Francis, Earl of Huntingdon: she lived till 1596. Sir George Vernon left two daughters, his co-heiresses, Margaret and Dorothy; the former probably, if not both, by his first consort.

These ladies were both married at the time of his decease: Margaret, the elder, aged twenty-six being then the wife of Sir Thomas Stanley, Knt., of Winwick, in Lancashire, second son of Edward, Earl of Derby; and Dorothy, aged twenty-one, the wife of Sir John Manners, Knt., second son of Thomas Baron Roos, and Earl of Rutland, the first of his name and family who held that earldom. In the division of the property of these co-heiresses, Sir Thomas Stanley obtained Harleston, Tong, and other estates in Staffordshire; and Sir John Manners received, as his lady’s dowry, the Derby estates, including Haddon Hall. Thus Haddon, which for a long series of years had been held by successive owners in a direct line belonging to one family, was transferred, by marriage with an heiress, to new lords of a different race, in whose possession it still remains.
John Manners, Esq., a younger son of Thomas, Earl of Rutland (which title was bestowed on him by Henry VIII, by patent dated June 18, 1525), was probably not a very young man at the period of his matrimonial union with Dorothy, the second daughter and co-heiress of Sir George Vernon. That Mr. Manners must have been a person approaching middle age, at the time of his fortunate marriage, may be concluded from the ages of his father and his mother; though we have not been able to meet with the exact date of his birth.

The Earl of Rutland was twice married; and by his first lady he had no children; but he married, secondly, Eleanor, daughter of Sir William Paston, of Paston, in Norfolk, Knt.; by whom he had no less than five sons, and six daughters; John Manners, afterwards settled at Haddon, having been the second son; and on the failure of male descendants from his elder brother, his posterity succeeded to the high titles, honours and estates of the illustrious family of Manners, which they still enjoy. Mr. [John] Manners was one of the gentlemen of landed property and influence who waited on King James, to congratulate him on his arrival from Scotland to ascend the throne of Great Britain after the death of Queen Elizabeth [1603]. He had an interview with his new sovereign at Worksop, in Nottinghamshire; and on that occasion he received the honour of knighthood, April 20, 1603. Sir John Manners (then John Manners, Esq.) had served the office of High Sheriff for Derbyshire, in 1594. He died in 1611, and was interred in the church of Bakewell, where a monument with an epitaph was erected to his memory. Lady [Dorothy Vernon] Manners had died before him, in 1584, and was buried in the same vault with her husband.

Before we take leave of the fortunate successor of Sir George Vernon, in his Derbyshire estates, it may be proper to notice a romantic tradition, still current in the vicinity of Haddon, relative to the courtship and marriage of Mr. Manners with the younger co-heiress of Vernon. The tradition purports that the lover (who was perhaps thirty years of age), having conceived an attachment for Miss Vernon, a beautiful girl of eighteen, dwelt for some time in the woods of Haddon, as an outlaw, or rather in the dress of a game-keeper (probably with the popular reputation of being an outlawed man), for the purpose of concealment, and in order to facilitate secret interviews with his mistress; and that he at length succeeded in persuading the young lady to elope with him, during the festivities of a masked ball, given by Sir George Vernon, in honour of the marriage of his elder daughter, Margaret, with Sir Thomas Stanley, a younger son of the Earl of Derby.

The author [William Bennet] of a Romance, in three volumes, entitled The King of the Peak, published in 1823, has adopted this tradition as the basis of his tale, and had interwoven it with a variety of incidents, details and characters, such as doubtless he thought adapted to heighten the interest of the narrative; but in some points he has manifestly contradicted authentic history; and he has, in what relates to the loves of John Manners and Dorothy Vernon, written in such a method, that it is impossible for his readers to determine what information he derived from tradition, or how far his description and narrative are the fruit of his imagination.
He [William Bennet] represents Miss Dorothy Vernon as having been betrothed, or at least promised in marriage by her father to Edward Stanley, a younger brother of Sir Thomas Stanley, who became the husband of the elder co-heiress of the Vernon property. This young gentleman may be considered as the hero of the tale, for he is everywhere the most prominent character; but he is depicted as a person possessed of daring courage and rashness, approaching to the fury of insanity; and as an unprincipled and reckless adventurer, engaged in contriving plots against the government; in one of which he is stated to have involved his intended father-in-law [Sir George Vernon]. We are told that he was detested by his destined consort [Dorothy Vernon], and by her sister; who were aware of his violent temper and dangerous projects; and it is further stated that Miss Vernon’s dislike to the partner chosen for her by her father, was so deeply rooted and confirmed, that she had resolved at all hazard never to become his wife; a determination strengthened by her attachment to Mr. Manners.

How much of this is true we have no means of ascertaining. From a notice at the end of the third volume of *The King of the Peak*, indeed, it appears that the author drew the character of Edward Stanley from history; but as to his connexion with the Vernon family we are left uncertain how far the account given in the Romance is founded on fact. It seems improbable that Sir George Vernon should have been concerned in a detected conspiracy against Queen Elizabeth, since he was entrusted by that princess with an influential office, two years afterwards, and in the last year of his life. Sir George, however, may possibly have been a conspirator; but in another of his representations the author of the Romance has certainly contradicted authentic history. For, in the last scene of the piece, the Earl of Rutland is introduced as a prominent actor; now, Thomas Manners, eighteenth Baron Roos, and first Earl of Rutland of that name, had been dead twenty years at the time of his second son’s marriage with the younger daughter of Sir G. Vernon.

Sir John Manners was succeeded as a great landed proprietor in Derbyshire, and especially in the estate of Haddon, by his eldest son, George Manners, Esq., who doubtless derived his baptismal name from his maternal grandfather. Mr. George Manners was M.P. for Derbyshire, the 35th year of the reign of Elizabeth [1593]. This gentleman was presented to King James a few days after his father, and he also was knighted by his new sovereign, at Belvoir Castle, April 23, 1603. He married, in 1594, Grace, the eldest daughter of Sir Henry Pierpont, Knt.; and dying in 1623, he was interred at Bakewell.

Sir George Manners had for his successor the eldest of his three sons, John Manners, Esq., who was born at Ayleston, in 1600. On coming into the possession of the family estates, he [John Manners] for several years made Haddon Hall his principal residence; and maintained in his establishment a style of princely hospitality correspondent with the reputation of his maternal ancestors, the Vernons, Kings of the Peak.

He [John Manners] appears to have had a seat in parliament as member for his county, both in the first and in the fifteenth years of the reign of Charles I [1625, 1639]. But this gentleman was destined for higher honours. On the death of his cousin, George Manners, seventh Earl of Rutland, without surviving male issue, in 1641, he [John Manners] succeeded him in the Earldom, as lineal descendant of the personage to whom it had been originally granted by Henry VIII [reigned 1509-1547].
During the ensuing period of civil commotion and open warfare between Charles I and his subjects, this Nobleman [John Manners] interfered but little in public affairs; however he was appointed by those in authority, in 1643, to go on an embassy to the Scots, to desire that they would send an army to assist the Anti-royalists; but it seems that his Lordship disapproved of the measure; and he got permission, on the score of ill health, to be excused from the service. Soon afterwards, he was appointed, in conjunction with the Earl of Bolingbroke and others, a commissioner for executing the office of Lord Chancellor of England.

Lord Clarendon, in his work entitled *The History of the Rebellion*, says that the Earl of Rutland was “so modest, as to think himself not sufficiently qualified for such a trust; and therefore excused himself in point of conscience.” In 1646, the Earl was constituted by votes of the Lords and Commons, Chief Justice in Eyre, north of the Trent. He was one of those moderate men who had opposed the King, not with a view to the destruction of the Monarchy, but for the purpose of reforming political abuses, and executing measures for securing the liberty of the subject. When a treaty therefore was commenced between Charles I and the Parliament in 1647, while the former [Charles I] was a prisoner in the Isle of Wight, Lord Rutland was appointed by the House of Peers, one of the Commissioners to treat with his majesty. During the reign of Charles II [1660-1685], he resided chiefly at his country seats, Haddon and Belvoir; and in 1666, he was appointed Lord Lieutenant of the county of Leicester. He died September 29, 1679, and was interred at Botsford, near his lady, whose death had taken place in 1671.

His Countess [wife] was Frances, daughter of Edward Lord Montagu, of Boughton, by whom he had four sons and seven daughters; his third son, John, was the only one who survived him; and he succeeded to the paternal honours and estates. This gentleman had been called up to the House of Peers during the life of his father, having been created Baron Manners, of Haddon, by Charles II, April 29, 1679. Shortly after Queen Anne ascended the throne [reigned 1702-1714], he was raised to a higher rank in the peerage; for on the 29th of March, 1703, her Majesty bestowed on him the titles of Marquis of Granby, and Duke of Rutland. He died at Belvoir Castle, January 10, 1711, and was interred with his ancestors at Botsford.

Having thus traced the history of the proprietors of Haddon Hall until it ceased to be a family residence, we must here terminate this portion of our narrative; for we trust our readers will do us the justice to reflect that the subject of this work is rather the history of an ancient baronial mansion, and of its successive resident owners, than that of the noble family of its present distinguished proprietor, to which our restricted limits would by no means allow us to do justice. We can therefore merely observe that the House of Manners may boast of several individuals celebrated for their exploits in the council or the field, for the history of which we must refer those who wish for detailed information, to the pages of our national historians, in which they will be found recorded.

We shall conclude this Chapter with observing that the present Duke of Rutland has displayed his taste, his judgment, and his regard for our national Antiquities, by giving directions that Haddon Hall shall be kept in proper repair, so that it may serve as an unique model of an old English Baronial Mansion, and as a valuable monument of the skill and taste of the architects of the middle ages.
In the midst of romantic scenery, on a rocky eminence, at the foot of which flows the river Wye, and not far from its confluence with the Derwent, stands the castellated mansion of Haddon [see Plate 25]. Its embattled parapets and crested turrets, proudly towering above the branching woods in which it is embosomed, cause it, when viewed from the vale, to assume the appearance of a formidable fortress. The building however, in its present form, is not in the least calculated for defence or protection against a besieging force, according to the military tactics of any period; though there can be little doubt that this mansion, which was the work of different ages, occupies the site of a Norman Castle, portions of the lower part of which may be traced in the walls of the towers which overlook both the upper and the lower portals.

The general arrangement of this structure is that of a castellated hall, exhibiting some of the characteristic features of the more ancient castles, which were the residences of the nobles and other great landed proprietors of this country from the time of its subjugation by the Norman William [1066], and his followers, till near the close of the fifteenth century, when the triumph of Henry VII [reigned 1485-1509], over the partizans of the rival family of York, terminated the long and sanguinary contest for the crown between the Yorkists and Lancastrians, in the course of which, great numbers of the ancient nobility and chivalry of England perished in the field or on the scaffold. Peace and good order being to a certain extent established, it was no longer necessary that the dwellings of those belonging to the higher orders of society should be strongly fortified buildings, in which their families and retainers might be protected from the attacks of those whom national discord or private feud had made their foes; for now, those who had been accustomed to decide their quarrels by the sword, more frequently resorted to the courts of justice for the redress of injuries, such as had heretofore been the causes of violence, rapine, and bloodshed, in abundance.

Hence arose the necessity for erecting habitations more adapted for the convenient accommodation of the owners and their domestics than the old castle which they had previously occupied; and a new mode of building was consequently introduced. But it could not reasonably be expected that, under such circumstances, domestic architecture should be exempt from the defects commonly observable in most works of art of a comparatively early date. Those who were employed to construct new habitations or to alter and adapt old ones, at a time when the crenellated bastion, the moat, and the drawbridge, were no longer essential appendages of the dwelling of a manorial proprietor, must have laboured under peculiar difficulties in the execution of the tasks assigned them; and it almost necessarily followed that their modifications and reconstructions must often have displayed characteristics of the ancient fort, and have presented few of the conveniences of, and fewer still of the beauties, which distinguish the noble mansions and palaces of modern times.
There can hardly be conceived a more striking contrast to the sombre grandeur of Haddon Hall, than is exhibited by the splendid magnificence of the neighbouring pile of Chatsworth. The former of these buildings as Mr. King remarks, is “one of the most perfect and most curious of the class of Castellated Houses now remaining; but when viewed as a whole, is almost devoid of all real elegance, or comfortable convenience, and fitted only to entertain a herd of licentious retainers.” In the latter edifice we perceive a unity of design and adaptation of parts, not only beautiful when separately considered, but also deriving new beauties from their connexion with the other portions of the structure to which they belong. The various divisions of the edifice harmonize with each other, and combine with the adjacent scenery to constitute a picture of surpassing elegance and splendor. But how much soever the mansion of Haddon may suffer by comparison with the productions of modern architects, and however deficient it may be in provision for the enjoyment of the comforts and the luxuries of life, yet it cannot be denied that it is not only interesting as a model of the domestic arrangements of noble families in former times, and as a picturesque object, suited to the character of the bold and romantic landscape of which it forms a prominent part, but it is likewise deserving of the exact attention of artists and amateurs, as affording examples of elaborate and beautiful workmanship, in the carved panelling of its wainscoted apartments, and in the elegant tracery of some the ceilings.

The entire structure of Haddon Hall is based on the solid limestone rock, which in the ascent to the entrance, rising from the banks of the Wye, presents its naked front to our view, and again makes its appearance at the north-east angle of the lower court. The plan of the building altogether is an irregular oblong quadrangle; but the elevation on the south side, forming the garden front, is varied considerably by turrets and projecting bows or oriel; as shown in Plates 16, 17, 27, and 32.

The Gardens. The Gardens consist of terraces in succession, one above another. The principal garden, on a level with the house, and extending along the greater part of the south front, is a square piece of ground, measuring one hundred and twenty feet in either direction. In the middle are grass-plots divided by gravel walks, and on the sides, borders with low hedges of box and yew. From this garden is a descent by sixty-five steps (see Plate 17), to a gate leading to an ancient bridge, so narrow as to admit only one person to pass at a time; and which, forming doubtless the only regular approach to the original Castle from the opposite side of the Wye, might have been defended against numbers by a single sentinel. The lower garden (see Plate 32), is divided from that just described by a high wall, supported by ten buttresses of rude construction, but well adapted for their purpose.
Between the principal and the upper garden is a wall crowned by a balustrade, in the centre of which is a flight of steps, shown in Plate 28; leading to a terrace on hundred and twenty-four feet in length. Part of this terrace extends along the eastern side of the mansion, to one rooms of which there is an entrance by a flight of steps, leading to a doorway, of which a view is given in Plate 15. It has obtained the appellation of “Dorothy Vernon’s Doorway,” from a prevailing tradition that through it the young lady passed when she eloped with her lover on the night of her sister’s marriage. The garden of which this terrace forms a portion is laid out in square compartments, planted with holly and yew trees. A flight of fifteen steps at one end of it leads to the topmost terrace, a noble avenue shaded from one extremity to the other by lofty trees; and this is called “Dorothy Vernon’s Walk.” [See Plan of Haddon Hall, Plate 33; North is at the left, and East is at the top of the page. The portal referred to in the next sentence is designated C.] At the north-east angle of the building stands the Eagle Tower, the eastern side of which, with the portal below it, leading into the Upper Court-yard, are shown in Plate 29; a view of the northern side of the same tower is given in Plate 14; and a view of the Watch Tower, or exploratory turret, from the roof of the Eagle Tower, in Plate 12. From this angle the exterior of the mansion presents a line almost uninterrupted [Plate 33: D-E-F-R-Q], except by a square projecting structure with a low roof, supposed to have been a Brewhouse, beyond which, at the north-west angle, is the Entrance Tower, which, with the portal under it, leading to the Lower Court-yard, are shown in Plate 30. A little beyond this entrance, to the west, appears the doorway to a terrace-walk leading by the flight of steps towards the front or garden [or bridge] entrance, already mentioned [see Plate 17].

Having traced the most prominent features of the exterior of the ancient structure, with its pleasure grounds or gardens, and terraces, the interior arrangement of the several parts of the building, and the principal apartments remain to be described. There are two spacious quadrangles or court-yards, around which the various apartments and offices are distributed. On passing through the great arched gate-way that forms the lower entrance under the north-west tower [Plate 30], a flight of angular steps leads into the first or lower court-yard. The exterior of this gate-way, and the steps within side are shown in Plate 2; an interior view of the same entrance is given in Plate 3 [the round hoop is a relic from an ancient brewery tub]; a view of the court-yard from the entrance in Plate 5 [and from the roof of the Entrance Tower in Plate 26, both showing the door of the Banqueting Hall]; and another view from the side of the court-yard opposite the entrance in Plate 6. Mr. King remarks, that the steps within the gate of this quadrangle are placed in such a manner that there was no admittance to the mansion otherwise than on foot; and no horse or carriage could have approached the door of the house.
The range of building on the western side of this court-yard comprises several rooms on the ground-floor, one of which is named by Mr. Lysons, the Steward’s Room, and two others Waiting Rooms [Plate 33: O-P]; and above are the Chaplain’s Room, the Barmaster’s Room, the Steward’s Bed Room, and two more Bed Chambers. At the south-west angle of the lower court, is a flight of steps (see Plate 4 and Plate 33) leading to the Earl’s Bed Chamber, and apartments connected with it. This Court is separated from the Upper Court [Plate 33] by buildings with a porch in the centre leading into a passage behind the screen of the Great [or Banquetting] Hall. The porch, with the tower above it, is shown in Plate 5; and another view of it, with the entrance to the [Banquetting] Hall, is given in Plate 21. On the southern side of the [Banquetting] Hall is the Dining Room [Plate 33: M], and over the latter the Drawing Room; and on the northern side, the Buttery, Wine Cellar, and Pantries [Plate 33: H-I-G]; and beyond them the Great Kitchen, the Bakehouse, Brewhouse, and Store Rooms [Plate 33: F-E-D].

Passing through the entrance between the Banquetting Hall and the offices just mentioned, we reach the upper Court-yard [closed to present day visitors], a part of which is shown in Plate 22 with the Upper Gate-way and the North East or Eagle Tower [also see Plate 13]. Among the apartments on the southern side of this quadrangle in the lower story is one called the Armoury, and others supposed to have been used as Cellars; and over these, extending along the whole of that side of the court is the Great or Long Gallery [Plate 33: A]. The eastern side of the Upper Court is occupied by the State Bed Chamber [Plate 33: B], and other apartments on the first story. Besides these there are many small rooms in the ranges of buildings surrounding both the Court-yards, serving as lodgings for the numerous retainers and domestics of the knightly and noble lords of Haddon, in days of yore, but which do not require any particular notice.

CHAPEL. Among the more interesting and ancient portions of this mansion is the domestic Chapel of Haddon, the turret and entrance to which, from the Lower Court-yard are represented in Plate 4; and the great East Window is shown in Plate 16 [above the Ha of Haddon]. The arched entrance just mentioned, leads into a low Ante-chapel, or Vestibule, whence is an opening into the Chapel itself, through one of the pointed arches communicating with the nave of this edifice which was originally divided into a central and side aisles. The adjoining arch is partly obstructed by the pulpit, reading-desk, and organ loft, as shown in Plate 1; which also presents a view of the partition between the nave and chancel, and of the window at the east end.
The southern aisle [not shown], or that opposite to the entrance, is furnished with long oaken benches, for the domestics of the family when attending divine service. The low massive pillar between the arches of this aisle exhibits the characters of the Norman style of architecture, indicating that this end of the Chapel must have been a part of a more ancient mansion or castle, founded when Haddon belonged to the Peverells or Avenells. These arches were doubtless originally round-headed, and altered to their present form, when the east end of the Chapel was erected, probably in the early part of the fifteenth century. Here also is a Font, apparently coeval with the original structure; and against one of the walls of this aisle is fixed a corbel table, supported by a carved head.

Within the chancel are two large high pews, one on either side, reaching nearly to the altar, in which sate the family and guests of the lord of the mansion. The windows of this chapel were once richly ornamented with stained glass; but seven or eight years since nearly the whole of it was taken out and carried off during one night, and it was thus entirely lost, having, as was supposed, been conveyed abroad; and the offer of a reward of one hundred guineas [guinea = pound + shilling] was made in vain for the discovery of the offenders. In the large window at the east end, is a painting of the crucifixion, in one of the panes, tolerably perfect; and it also contains several fragments carelessly inserted, and mutilated figures, some of which seem to have been intended for the Cardinal Virtues, and others for Saints and Angels. There is in the same window the following inscription, still legible, though a part of it has been misplaced by the glazier: “Orate pro ai'abus Ricardi Vernon et Benedicte uxor's eius qui fecerunt an'o milesimo CCCXXVII” [year 1427]. From the words “qui fecerunt,” in this inscription, it has been inferred that Sir Richard Vernon, who was Speaker of the House of Commons in 1426, rebuilt the Chapel; but the memorial more probably relates to the erection of the painted window only. In the upper parts of the two lateral windows, nearest the altar, were figures (now imperfect), of the twelve Apostles; and in the window on the north side are figures, probably of St. Ann and the Virgin Mary, with St. George and the Dragon on one side, and an Angel, or winged figure on the other. In one of the south windows appear the names of “Wills. Trussell,” and “Mergareta Pype,” persons connected by marriage with the family of Vernon. On the south side of the Altar is a niche for a piscina or holy-water basin. At the west end of the Chapel is an Organ-loft, the mouldings of the wainscot of which, and those of the Pulpit, the Pews, and other wood-work, as the Altar-rails, were decorated with burnished gilding, still visible.
BANQUETTING OR GREAT HALL. Over the great porch in the lower court-yard are two shields of arms, one belonging to the Vernons, and the other to the family of Pembridge. As Sir Richard Vernon, who was Speaker of the House of Commons, married the sole heiress of Sir Fulk de Pembridge, he may with probability be regarded as having erected this portion of the edifice, as well as the greater part of the Chapel; and these are perhaps of an earlier date than any other parts of the building except the bases of the angular towers near the Upper and Lower Entrances, and the substructure of some of the adjoining walls, with the west end of the Chapel; all of which display traces of higher antiquity.

From the passage between the Upper and Lower Quadrangles, a door in the screen opens into the [Banquetting] Hall, which says King, “most undoubtedly was originally considered as the only public dining-room for the lord and his guests, and indeed, after them, for the whole family: for in tracing the ancient apartment there appears manifestly to have been none besides of sufficient magnitude for either the one purpose or the other.” Over the entrance lobby is a music gallery, the front of which, as well as that of the screen, consists of panelling, ornamented with Gothic carving (see Plate 7); and at the opposite, or upper end of the room, is the raised floor, or dais, on which still stands the long oak table (see Plate 20), at which sate the lord of the mansion and his principal guests, carefully placed according to their rank; those of higher quality above the salt, which always occupied the centre of the hospitable board, while persons of inferior degree were stationed below the salt. On the floor below were other tables, for retainers or visitors, not entitled to sit at the table where the lord himself presided. In the comparatively rude ages when such customs prevailed, doubtless many a scene of mirth and glee was here enacted; while unrestrained by the master of the feast, the jovial companions late and long protracted their noisy revels, which did not always terminate without brawls and bloodshed. Laws enforced by penalties, however, were not wanting to prevent or punish improprieties of behaviour in these mixed assemblies; and of one of the regulations contrived for this purpose, a monument remains in the form of a kind of iron hook, attached to the wainscot of the screen of this hall, by means of which a man who refused to take his horn of liquor, or committed some other offence against convivial usages, might have his wrist locked, as in a pillory, as high as he could reach above his head, and while in that position, a quantity of cold water was to be poured down the sleeve of his doublet. But in the early times, when inns were seldom to be found except in towns and cities, the hospitality of the lord of Haddon was not confined to the banquets at which he daily presided, but provision was ever ready for the hungry traveller; and of the Vernon it might be said, in the language of Chaucer,

“His table dormant in his hall alway
Stood ready covered all the long day.”
In the passage, opposite to the screen of the Hall, are four large door-ways, with high pointed arches, extending in a row corresponding with the breadth of the hall. The first of these, near the entrance from the lower court, still retains its ancient oak door, with a wicket in the middle, just large enough to hand out a trencher; and within the room are a great oaken chest for bread, a spacious cupboard for cheese, and a number of shelves for butter. Here was the Buttery, or station of the Butler. From this apartment are steps leading to a large room with stone vaulting, supported by pillars like the crypt of a church, which was manifestly designed for the Beer Cellar; for around it are still remains of a low bench of stone-work, sufficient to hold a considerable number of casks; and before it, is a drain to carry away the droppings. Through this great vaulted room a passage leads to a Brewhouse and a Bakehouse; and adjoining are store-rooms for corn and malt, with an entrance from the outside of the building, but having no communication with the other parts of the mansion except through the Buttery.

The second pointed door-way leads to the Great Kitchen (see Plate 31) through a sloping passage, in the middle of which is a half-door, or hatch, with a broad shelf on the top of it, whereon to place dishes, and so far only the servants in waiting were permitted to have access. In the Kitchen are two vast fire-places, with irons for a multitude of spits; stoves; double ranges of dressers; large chopping blocks; with a massive wooden table, hallowed out into basins by way of kneading troughs. Adjacent to the Kitchen are numerous larders, pantries, and store-rooms belonging to it.

The third of the pointed door-ways affords an entrance into a small detached vaulted room, which has every appearance of having been a wine cellar. And the fourth and last great vaulted arch is at the bottom of a steep stair-case, quite distinct from the ground stair-case of the house, and leading to abundance of small apartments [not available to present day visitors], supposed to have been lodging rooms for guests and retainers. [A Norman Fireplace, possibly from one of these apartments, is shown in Plate 11.]

**Dining Room.** The doorway at the upper end of the Banqueting Hall, shown in Plate 20, leads into a passage, at the end of which is a door opening into the Garden, on a level with the house; and a side door from this passage gives entrance to the Dining Room. A view of this apartment, with its window of eight lights at the upper end, in shown in Plate 19. It is comparatively of modern date, having been fitted up, and perhaps built, by Sir George Vernon, at a time when, through the progress of refinement, it was no longer customary for the lord of the mansion to dine in the great hall, together with his dependants. The ceiling of the Dining Room is divided into bays, by five beams, the mouldings of which were once ornamented with painting and gilding, some traces of which are still perceptible.
Both sides and the lower end of this apartment are lined with fine oak panelling; the upper panels being enriched with carvings of shields of arms, alternating with Boars’ heads, the crest of the Vernons. On one side of the fire-place are two panels, exhibiting the initials of the names of Sir George Vernon and his Lady, in cipher, with an heraldic shield between them, on which are quartered the arms of their respective families; above is carved the date 1545, when probably the apartment was completed.

At the lower end of this Dining Room is a recess, with an oriel window divided into six lights, by thick stone mullions, as represented in Plate 8. The walls of the recess are covered by panelling, ornamented like that already described, with shields of arms and crests; but besides these, there is in one of the panels near the window a grotesque head of a court fool or king’s jester, traditionally reported to have been intended for William Somers, who held that office in the reign of Henry VIII [1509-1547], and probably in that of the preceding monarch [Henry VII], for over a low doorway leading to the garden terrace, are two panels (adjoining the former) with carved portraits of Henry VII and his Queen, Elizabeth of York. [If there was really an elopement, then this is the door Dorothy Vernon most probably would have used.] The panelling throughout the room is bordered by a cornice of carved wood-work; but in the oriel recess this cornice is surmounted by another of a different pattern, well executed, but apparently of an earlier date; and behind this last may be perceived a third and more ancient cornice of stonework. Hence it may be concluded that this oriel was formerly a detached closet, perhaps an oratory, and having been subsequently remodelled and ornamented with the superior cornice, it was yet more recently fitted up with the carved oak panelling, to correspond with the dining room of which it now forms a part.

Drawing Room. The grand stair-case at the upper end of the Banquetting Hall, under the side gallery (shown on Plate 20), leads to the Drawing Room, which is situated over the Dining Room just described. On one side of the entrance to this apartment is a recess, of which a view is given in Plate 10, showing the panelling around the walls, originally adorned with painting and gilding, traces of which are still to be perceived on the mouldings; and the ceiling with its stuccoed ornaments of rosettes and tracery. Opposite to the Oriel is a door opening into the side gallery of the Banquetting Hall, which forms a communication with the numerous apartments over the offices. The wall of the other parts of the Drawing Room are hung with tapestry, above which they are ornamented with a series of cornices in stucco; except on the side opposite the fire-place, where paintings appear to have been suspended.
“Most of the principal rooms being hung with arras, in general still remaining, the doors were concealed behind the hangings, so that the tapestry was to be lifted up to pass in and out; only for convenience, there were great iron hooks (many of which are still in their places), and by means of which it might occasionally be held back. The doors being thus concealed, nothing can be conceived more ill-fashioned than their [the doors] workmanship; few of them fit at all close; and wooden bolts, rude bars, and iron hasps, are in general the best and only fastenings.” King’s Observations on Ancient Castles.

LONG GALLERY. At the head of the stair-case from the Banqueting Hall, is an ascent by six steps, formed of solid masses of timber, to the entrance of the Long Gallery, as seen in Plate 9. The grand apartment extends along a great part of the south front of the mansion [see Plate 33: A], being one hundred and nine feet nine inches in length; with a width of only sixteen feet, ten inches; but having a square recess in the centre of the south side, fifteen feet by twelve its dimensions; and the height of the room is fifteen feet. A view of the Long Gallery with the window at the east end, is given in Plate 18. There are also three bow windows, and one in the square recess, ornamented with painted glass, displaying in one window the royal arms of England, in another, those of the families of Vernon and Manners, and likewise the arms of the Earl of Shrewsbury. The ceiling is decorated with quatrefoils, shields of armorial bearings, and other ornaments in stucco. The sides of this room are covered with oak panelling, exhibiting architectural embellishments in carved work; a frieze and cornice surmounting a series of arches, springing from the capitals of Corinthian pilasters, between which are shields of arms; and the frieze is decorated with carvings of roses and thistles, boars’ heads and peacocks. This has a floor of oak planks, which, according to tradition, were cut from a single tree which grew in the garden.

Lysons says “this room was built in the reign of Elizabeth [1558-1603].” But the style of architecture displayed in the exterior, with its embattled parapet and oriel windows indicate an earlier date; though there can be no doubt but the Long Gallery as it appears at present [1836], was fitted up and ornamented after the transfer of Haddon to the family of Manners, and probably by the immediate successor to Sir George Vernon [John Manners], in the latter part of the sixteenth century.

Near the upper end of the Long Gallery is a passage, with an ascent by a few steps to an apartment, “which” says King, “might be called my Lord’s Parlour, it having obviously been a sort of private apartment destined for his use.” It is now however, perhaps more properly, styled the Ante-room to the State Bed-chamber; with which it corresponds in the pattern of its ornamented cornice. Behind the tapestry of the apartment, are large ill-framed folding doors, opening on a flight of steps which lead to the Upper Garden Terrace, before mentioned (with a reference to Plate 15), in noticing the exterior of this doorway.
STATE BED CHAMBER. Adjoining the Ante-room on the north side, is the State Bed Chamber [see Plate 33: B], which seems to have been fitted up about the same time with the Long Gallery. It has a frieze and cornice like the preceding, formed of rough plaster, ornamented with coats of arms, and the crests of the families of Vernon and Manners, (Boars’ heads and Peacocks), in alternate succession [see Plate 24]; and over the chimney “is an enormous bas-relief, of the same clumsy composition, representing Orpheus charming the beasts.” King’s Observations on Ancient Castles. This room is hung with tapestry, exhibiting designs from Æsop’s Fables, and woven at the famous manufactory of the Gobelins at Paris. Here is the State Bed, which at one time was removed to Belvoir, where George IV [reigned 1820-1830], then Prince Regent, is said to been the last person who slept in it. A view of this bed, with its rich furniture of green velvet, lined with white satin; and of the room in which it stands, is given in Plate 24.

THE EARL’S BED CHAMBER. There is a suite of three tapestried rooms between the Drawing Room and the Chapel, on the south side of the Lower Court Yard, used as a Bed-chamber, Dressing-room, and Valet’s room, when the Earl of Rutland resided at Haddon. An entrance from the Drawing Room, leads through the Dressing-room to the Earl’s Bed-chamber, which is hung with tapestry adorned with groups representing hunting parties and the sports of the field; in which the figures are curious and interesting, as affording patterns of costume in the seventeenth century.

The room beyond this is noticed by Mr. King as “very remarkable, having an odd cornice, with a quadruple frieze, three of four feet in depth, formed of plaster, and adorned with a running foliage of leaves and flowers, in four compartments, like bands, one above another. The room is hung with arras, as the others are; but from a quaint sort of neatness appearing in the whole of it, more than in them, I am much inclined to call it my Lady’s Chamber. There is behind the tapestry, a door leading to the steep flight of narrow steps which descent into the great [lower] court [see Plate 4], not far from the arch belonging to the Chapel, and which gave her an opportunity of going thither, rather a nearer way than the rest of the family, and without crossing so much of the great court.” King’s Observations on Ancient Castles.
**Entrance Tower Interior.** In the north-west tower [*Plate 30*] there are two apartments, one over the other, which, from the style in which they are fitted up, and from their situation, commanding a view of the approach to the Lower Gateway, may probably have been occupied by one of the chief officers of the household. The interior of one of these rooms, with its oak panelling, dentillated cornice, and traceried ceiling, is shown in *Plate 23*.

Adjacent to this apartment, and divided from it only by the winding stair-case of the [Entrance] Tower, is a small room, with a narrow crenellated window, a floor of plaster, a stone seat let into the wall, and looking like a part of the solid rock which forms the foundation of the building; and marks on the side pillars of the door-way, which show that the bolts and bars were outside only. This cell, which has the appearance of being one of the most comfortless dungeons above ground that can well be conceived, could hardly have been intended for any other purpose than that of a prison.

**Bowling Green.** Near the summit of the hill above Haddon Hall is a spacious Bowling Green, occupying exactly an acre of ground, and encompassed by a thick yew hedge. The approach to it is by an avenue of lofty trees, leading to the entrance up a flight of sixteen steps, with a wall on each side ornamented with pilasters; but now in a somewhat dilapidated state, in consequence of the fall of a large horse-chestnut tree, blown down in a high wind, about eleven years ago [1825].

On the north side of the Green, is a Lodge, or Summer-house, with two apartments. Over the entrance to the uppermost, or principal room, are the initials of the title, “John Earl of Rutland, 1696;” indicating the time when the building was erected. It appears to have been handsomely fitted up, and it was nearly finished when the noble founder removed from Haddon; but it was afterwards neglected and exposed to injury, whence it has suffered, not from time, but from the hand of violence, some of the window shutters and panelling having been torn down and carried away.

**From King’s Observations on Ancient Castles.** “Such was Haddon House with its environs; and much it is to be wished, by every lover of antiquities, that this princely habitation may never come so far into favour as to be modernized; lest the traces of ancient times and manners, which are now so rarely preserved in this country, any where, should be utterly lost also here. Nothing can convey a more complete idea of ancient modes of living than is to be obtained on this spot. Many great dwellings, which formerly helped to preserve the same ideas, are now quite razed and gone; and others are only heaps of ruins, so far maimed, that it requires much attention to make out or comprehend what they once in any degree were, or to understand any thing of their original plan.”
RAYNER’S OBSERVATIONS ON HADDON HALL. More than half a century has elapsed since the survey of the ancient mansion excited in the breast of the learned antiquary such feelings of admiration, and so much anxiety for its preservation, as a monument of the domestic arrangements and modes of living among the nobles and gentry of this country in former ages. Much to the honour of the present noble owner of Haddon Hall, the building has been carefully kept in repair, and preserved in as perfect a state as when it was last occupied as a family residence. This is as it should be: for the slightest acquaintance with the edifice must convince any one that an attempt to modernize and adapt it for the abode of rank and splendour, would be the height of absurdity. Nothing less than a total demolition and re-construction of the whole fabric must be the result of such an undertaking; which is therefore most devoutly to be deprecated.

While so much has been done to guard from dilapidation and ruin the towers and halls of Haddon, the visitor may wish that the antique furniture with which the apartments were heretofore filled, had been preserved, to complete the picture of a mansion of the days of yore, when rude abundance crowned the festive board, and the splendid luxuries of modern times were unknown. A few relics only of the furniture are, however, now remaining; and these probably, as might be expected, are of no very ancient date. Besides the State Bed, and other articles already mentioned, there is in the Drawing Room, a pair of andirons, the brass fronts of which are ornamented with open work; and in an apartment called the Guard Room, near the lower entrance, are kept a buff-coat, some jack-boots, a fire lock, and a holster and pistols. According to Lysons, about 1760, such of the furniture of this mansion as was thought valuable, was removed to Belvoir Castle; and at the same time, that which was not wanted was lodged in a barn on the north side of the Hall, one end of which extended into what is provincially called a “bye-water,” being a branch of the river Wye. The whole quantity consigned to this miserable repository amounted to ten wagon loads. Here the furniture was kept till the moisture arising from floods and rain reduced the wood-work to a state of rottenness and decay; and then it was ordered to be used for fuel. Fifteen bedsteads were put into a long room near the house, which had been a granary, and is now a stable; and after being left for a time to fall in pieces, they likewise were ordered to be cut up and burnt. The neglect and consequent destruction to which these relics of antiquity were thus consigned, may be imputed to the person who was then Agent to the Duke of Rutland; and who made this unfortunate use of the discretionary power with which it may be presumed he was entrusted by his noble employer.
This agent, also, when the old building required slating, contrived to raise the requisite funds, or a part of them, by disposing of such of the *useless lumber* (as he no doubt considered it), as was not fit for fuel. For he sold a lot consisting of pewter dishes, and iron and brass utensils, with eighteen guns, and half a dozen swords, to one Matthew Strutt for the sum of twenty pounds. The old man, who now has the care of the mansion, and who acts as a guide to visitors, says, that among the brass articles thus sacrificed, there were curious candlesticks, eighteen inches in diameter at the bottom, with rich mouldings; and he also describes as remarkable, some singular curtain rods, and carved bedposts, having “knobs” in the middle, richly carved, a foot and a half in diameter.

If we suppose some inquisitive antiquary, after ransacking each hole and corner of Haddon Hall, to have rescued from dirt and cobwebs the diary of an ancient retainer of Sir Henry or Sir Richard Vernon, what a treasure of interesting facts and usages, of curious anecdotes and tales of times long past, might be brought to light! But, alas! no revelations of that kind are to be expected; and few and faint are the memorials of the domestic history of the Vernons of Haddon now existing. Indeed this mansion has been so long deserted by its owners, that the recollections of the knights and nobles of the succeeding family of Manners who dwelt here, are become obscure; and but little can now be gleaned from tradition concerning them. In this dearth of intelligence we can only present the reader with a brief extract from the Reminiscences of the Old Guide mentioned above.

This person, William Hage, is a descendant of John Ward, who in 1527 was deer-keeper to the lord of Haddon [George Vernon at age 19], and of whom there is a portrait hanging in the Banqueting Hall, or Old Dining Apartment. According to the statement of Hage, his ancestor was “turned out of the family six times for drinking too much, and at length died drunk.” His son, however, succeeded him in his office; and his posterity in the female line have continued in the service of the proprietors of Haddon Hall even to the present time; the father of William Hage having been groom to the Marquis of Granby [John, who was the son of the 3rd Duke of Rutland, and who died before his father in 1770], and he himself having long had the care of the house and gardens here, and the office of guide to the visitors.”

The following, which is among the stories the old man relates, ludicrous as it is, affords an interesting proof of the free and easy temper, and hospitable demeanour of the old Earl of Rutland, and of the frugal housewifery of the Countess.
“A great Butcher, who used to fit the family at Haddon with small meat, a fat man weighing eighteen stone, named John Taylor, from Darley Dale, came at Christmas time when they were keeping open house. And the old Earl’s wife would not let the butter go into the larder until she had seen it; so it remained in the old family hall (the Banqueting Hall), and stood there for some hours. The Butlers (of whom there were two, one for the small beer cellar and the other for the strong), had for several weeks before missed two pounds of butter every week; and they could not think what had become of it, or who had taken it. So they determined to watch, one Butler spying through the little door, and the other through the great door; when presently the great Butcher came as usual for orders for small meat. And after looking round, he lays his fingers upon the butter, and pops one pound of butter within his coat on one side, and another pound on the other side. This was observed; and the Butler from the strong beer cellar came up to the Butcher saying, “Jack—it is Christmas time—I have a famous Jack of strong beer, and you shall have it before you go. Sit you down by the kitchen fire.” He sat there awhile, when the Butler handing him the flagon, said, “Don’t be afraid of it, I’ll fetch some more.” And as he sat near the fire, the butter on one side melting with the heat, began to trickle down his breeches, into his shoes. “Why Jack,” said the Butler, “you seem a great deal fatter on one side than on the other. Turn yourself round, you must be starved on this side.” He was obliged to comply; and presently the butter ran down that side also; and afterwards, as he walked up the Hall, the melted butter ran over the tops of his shoes. “The Earl,” says Hage, “made a laughing stock of it; but if such a thing was to be done in these days, the man would be turned out of the family.”

“My aunt told me,” adds the guide, “that the old Earl used to sing to the men at Christmas-tide,

‘You’re all heartily welcome, lads; drink what you will;
For here lives John, at the Wooden Oak still.’”

The nobleman to whom this anecdote relates was Sir John Manners, who succeeded his cousin, as Earl of Rutland, in 1641. Some extracts from the Bailiff’s accounts, relative to the expenses of open-housekeeping at Haddon Hall, during Christmas-tide, in 1663, have been published by Mr. Lysons; who says that from 1660 to 1670, although the family chiefly resided in Belvoir, there were generally killed and consumed every year at Haddon, between thirty and forty beeves, between four and five hundred sheep, and eight or ten swine. The successor of this Earl, who was created Duke of Rutland by Queen Anne, is said to have maintained here one hundred and forty servants; and like his father, he kept open houses in the true style of old English hospitality, for twelve days annually after Christmas.

Not long after the commencement of the last [eighteenth] century, the establishment at Haddon Hall was probably broken up; though the building was not neglected, but has always been kept in good repair. A ball was given by the present Duke of Rutland, in the Long Gallery of this mansion, on the occasion of his coming of age. And in 1802, the inhabitants of Bakewell celebrated the treaty of Amiens, by an entertainment, with dancing, in the same apartment.
HADDON is situated in the parish of Bakewell, and it was ancienly included in the extensive manor or lordship of Bakewell. This appears from the survey of Derbyshire contained in the Doomsday Book, which was completed about 1086, after William the Norman [William the Conqueror, also William I, reigned 1066-1087] had extended his sovereign authority over the whole kingdom. The following extract from this national record shows that Bakewell, at the period in question, was one of the royal manors.

“King Edward (the Confessor) [reigned 1042-1066] had in the manor of Bakewell 18 carucates [a carucate = 120 acres], or plough-lands, with 8 Bartons [farms] for which he received rent. The land is estimated at 18 carucates. The King [William I] has now in demesne [ownership], 7 carucates, with 33 Villagers, and 9 Bordars [feudal tenants]. There are 2 Priests and a Church, having under them 2 Villagers and 5 Bordars; all these having 11 carucates. One Knight there has 16 acres of land and 2 Bordars. There is 1 Mill, at the rent of 10s 8d; and 1 Lead-work; and about 20 acres of meadow. The little wood is one furlong in length, and one in breadth. Three carucates of this land belong to the Church. Henry de Ferrers is assessed at 1 carucate in Haddon. The following are the 8 farms of this manor — Cronkesden-grange [in Hartington]; Burton [near Bakewell]; Oneash; Moneyash; Holmhall; Great Rowsley; Hadun [Over Haddon]; Haduna [Nether Haddon, including Haddon Hall].”

The Manor of Bakewell was given by William I to his natural [born out of wedlock] son William Peverell on whom he had previously bestowed very extensive domains, in Derbyshire and other counties. As the Doomsday survey was commenced in 1081, and William I died in September 1087, it is obvious that this donation must have occurred during the intervening period. The individual who, through the bounty of his father thus became one of the great barons and chief landed proprietors of the country, living at a time when the use of surnames was becoming common (among the Normans), adopted that of the family into which, probably after his birth, his mother had married. From the researches of the celebrated heraldic historian and antiquary Sir William Dugdale (1605-1686), we learn the ensuing circumstances relative to this once noble and distinguished race of the English Baronage.

PEVERELL OF NOTTINGHAM. “The first of this name of whom I find mention is Ranulph Peverell, who, at the time of the Conqueror’s survey, held four Lordships in Com. Salop, six in Norfolk, nineteen in Suffolk, and thirty-five in Com. Essex. Which Ranulph was the reputed progenitor of the several families of that name: for having married Maud, daughter of Ingelric (founder of the Collegiate Church of St. Martins le Grand, in the City of London), who had been a concubine to William [I] of Normandy, not only those children which he had by her, but that very William, begotten on her by the same Duke, before his conquest of this realm, had the name of Peverell.”
Of these therefore next to speak: I shall begin with Sir William [Peverell], so begotten of that concubine. This William, in the second year [1067] of the Conqueror’s reign (when all places of strength were committed to the trust of the King’s chiefest friends and allies), had the Castle of Nottingham, then newly built, and situate most advantageously both for defence and pleasure, given to him; and with it, or soon after, divers lands in sundry counties of large extent: for by the General Survey it appears that he [William Peverell] then had forty-four Lordships in Northamptonshire, in Essex two, in Buckinghamshire nine, and fifty-five in Nottinghamshire with forty-eight tradesmen’s houses in Nottingham, yielding thirty-six shillings rent per annum; as also seven Knight’s Houses, and eight Borderars there, (of all which the Honor of Peverell did consist); in Derbyshire fourteen, whereof Bolesover and the Castle of Peke (with the Honor and Forest) were part; and six in Leicestershire.

Of this William it is further memorable, that, upon the breach which happened betwixt Robert Curthose and King William Rufus, he himself with eight hundred men, held the Castle of Helme in Normandy, against Robert Curthose, but upon a siege being laid thereto, was constrained to give it up. And after this: viz. in 1st Stephen [1135] being one of the temporal Lords in that great council then held at Oxford, he is mentioned amongst the witnesses to the laws then made and ratified by king Stephen. Likewise, that in 3rd Stephen conducting the forces of Nottinghamshire, he was one of the chief commanders in that notable encounter with the Scots near North Alverton in Yorkshire, called Bellum de Standardo; and worthily shared in the victory then obtained by the Northern Barons against those bold invaders. But in 7th Stephen fighting stoutly on the King’s part, in the battle of Lincolne; and being there (with him) taken prisoner, his castle of Nottingham was disposed of by Maud, the Empress to William Painell: howbeit, the year next following, his own soldiers recovered it again, by a stratagem, in the night time.

Moreover, he founded the Priory of St. James, near Northampton, and likewise that of Lenton, near Nottingham, for Cluniac Monks; amply endowing it with lands and revenues for the health of the soul of King William [I] the Conqueror and Maud his wife; King William Rufus; King Henry the First and Maud his Consort; as also, for the souls of William and Maud, their children; and likewise for the health of his own soul, and the souls of Aveline, his wife, William his son, and all his other Children.

Of which William his son it is chiefly memorable, that having poisoned Ranulph, Earl of Chester, about the latter end of King Stephen’s reign [1154], and fearing the severity of King Henry the Second, for that foul crime, he fled to a monastery of his own patronage (which doubtless was Lenton), where he caused himself to be shorn a Monk; but being advertised of King Henry’s coming that way from York, he quitted his habit, and privily fled away; leaving all his Castles and possessions to the King’s pleasure.
“Some of which continued many years after in the Crown, as appears by the Sheriff’s Accounts; and at length were given, by King Henry the Second [reigned 1154-1189], to John, Earl of Moreton, afterwards King [reigned 1199-1216, after brother Richard]. But some came to the family of Ferrers, in marriage with Margaret, Daughter and Heir to this last mentioned William: as Higham in Northamptonshire (one of the Lordships whereof William his Father was possessed at the time of the Conqueror’s Survey) afterwards distinguished by the name of Higham-Ferrers. from another of that name, called Cold-Higham, in the same county.”

Hence it would follow that the manor of Bakewell, and its dependent vill of Haddon, belonged to the Peverells during two generations only; but this, as will presently appear, is somewhat questionable. If, as Orderic Vital states, William I gave the custody of Nottingham Castle to William Peverell in the second year of his reign, that personage must have acquired the confidence of his royal father while very young; for the connexion of the Norman Prince [William Peverell] with the daughter of Ingelric [concubine of William I] probably took place when the former made a visit to his relative, King Edward the Confessor, in 1048: the son therefore could not have been more than eighteen at the time of the Norman invasion [1066], and was consequently about twenty when appointed governor of Nottingham Castle.

To the personal history of the Peverells of Nottingham, as given by Sir W. Dugdale, little of importance can be added. The unsuccessful defence of the castle of Helme by the elder Peverell against Robert, Duke of Normandy, took place, according to Simeon of Durham in 1094. As this baron supported the interest of William II against Robert, so after the death of the former, he must, if living, have become the partizan of Henry I; and thus retained all his estates and honours. The following memorandum, from the Pipe Roll of the Exchequer, relates to a payment by William Peverell, after the above period, on account of his Derbyshire possessions:

“Willielmus Peverell de Noting. reddit compotum de xxiii l. vi s. viii d. de placitis Forestæ. In thesauro xi l. xiii s. iii d. Et debet xi l. xiii s. iii d.”

The roll whence this is taken, is supposed to belong to 31 Henry I (1130, 1131); when there is reason to believe that Peverell, the son of William I, was no longer living. Sir W. Dugdale, indeed represents him as alive in 1141, and in this he is followed by Sir Harris Nicolas. But Mr. Rhodes, in his Peak Scenery [1819], informs us, in opposition to the statement of Dugdale, that Lenton Priory was founded, not by the son of the Norman Conqueror, but by his grandson, a second William Peverell, who, according to the Register of the Monastery, died in 1113.
Peverell the father [attributed dates of 1050-c1115], if living in 1141, and only twenty when made captain of Nottingham Castle, must have survived to the age of ninety-three. It is however more probable that he died, at latest, in the beginning of the reign of Henry I [reigned 1100-1135, after brother William II], leaving a son of his own name, who, by his wife Aveline, or Adeline, had a son named William, and other children, as mentioned above, in the quotation from Dugdale. In the Pipe Roll just cited, also appears the memorandum: “In pardonatione, per breve Regis, Adeline matri Will. Peverell de Noting. xviii s.” This lady then seems to have been the daughter-in-law of the first Peverell, the wife of the second, and the mother of a third. The last of these Peverells, and not, as Dugdale represents, the first, was the baron who commanded a part of the English forces at the Battle of the Standard, and who was afterwards engaged in the civil war between King Stephen [reigned 1135-1154] and the Empress Maud.

Among the national events by which the reign of Stephen was distinguished, the battle of Allerton, or, as it has been styled, the battle of the Standard, in which David I, King of Scotland, was defeated by the English, was one of the most remarkable. Henry I in order to ensure the succession to the Crown of England to his own family, had caused his barons, or great feudal retainers, at three different periods, to take the oath of fealty to his daughter and sole heiress, Maud or Matilda, who after the death of her first husband, the German Emperor Henry V, had married Geoffrey Plantagenet, afterwards Count of Anjou. At the head of the princes and nobles who thus engaged to support the hereditary claims of this princess and her descendants to her father’s dominions, were David of Scotland, and Stephen Earl of Boulogne, the king’s nephew, who both held lands in this country, and were consequently vassals of the crown. The latter however, on the death of Henry I in 1135, in defiance and contempt of the solemn engagement into which he had entered, seized for himself the crown, the possession of which he had guaranteed to another. For the success which in the first instance attended his usurpation, Stephen was much indebted to the influence of his brother, Henry of Blois, the rich and powerful Bishop of Winchester. Through him he obtained the support of the archbishop of Canterbury. and the great body of Clergy. In order to propitiate the nobles, he bestowed on them almost absolute power within their own domains, allowing them to build and fortify castles, and govern their tenants and dependants with arbitrary sway. He also made promises to the great body of the common people: engaging to abolish entirely the odious tax called Danegelt, to mitigate the sanguinary forest laws, and to grant new and ample charters of privileges to the townspeople and trading communities.
These measures so far answered his purpose, that he was chosen King, and crowned at Westminster, December 26, 1135, by William Corboyl, Archbishop of Canterbury. In the first year of his reign, Stephen convoked an assembly of the Clergy and Nobility at Oxford, and there confirmed by oath the promises which he had previously made to them. The Chronicler, Richard of Hexham, mentions William Peverell as one of the subscribing witnesses on this occasion, to the charter or deed by which the new king especially bound himself to refrain from encroaching on the rights and privileges of the Clergy.

But Stephen soon found that his utmost concessions would not suffice to secure him in the undisturbed possession of his ill-gotten power. His principal opponents were David King of Scots, the maternal uncle of the empress Maud, and Robert Fitzroy, Earl of Gloucester, a natural son of Henry I, and consequently, half-brother of that princess. David invaded the north of England in 1136, at the same time that an insurrection against Stephen took place in the South, headed by the potent Earl of Devon, Baldwin de Redvers; but the Scots were soon forced to retreat, and the southern revolt was suppressed. The partizans of the empress ere long determined to recommence hostilities against the usurper of her throne. In the summer of 1138, the Scottish King led a numerous body of forces into the northern counties of England, while Stephen was prevented from opposing them in person, by the occurrence of new disturbance in the south, where Robert of Gloucester was the leader of the insurgents.

It was in the campaign against the Scots that William Peverell is said to have in some degree distinguished himself; and on this, as well as on other occasions during the contest for power between Stephen and Matilda, or their partizans, which occupied the greater part of his reign, Peverell seems to have uniformly adhered to the party which he now supported. This is a circumstance more deserving of attention, as it appears to have had a considerable influence on his future fate. The second invasion of England by David King of Scotland, took place in August, 1138, when he crossed the Borders with an army consisting of a vast multitude of ill-armed and undisciplined barbarians, together with some knights, men-at-arms, and other regular troops. Thus accompanied, he ravaged the northern counties, and penetrated into Yorkshire; spreading everywhere devastation and dismay. At first the Scots met with little or no opposition; and they are charged by contemporary writers with having been guilty of the most savage and wanton cruelty; massacring the priests, the aged, the young, and the helpless; they put pregnant women to death by tearing the unborn infants out of the womb with their swords. The northern barons, roused to a sense of their danger, and prompted by the exhortations of Thurstan Archbishop of York, at length hastily collected their retainers, and prepared for resistance.
King Stephen despatched a small body of disciplined forces to their aid, under the command of Bernard de Balliol, an experienced officer. Thus strengthened, the Archbishop and his associates took courage, and a council of war was held, the result of which was an agreement that they should bind themselves, by mutual oaths, to support each other against the common enemy. It was further determined that the Deity should be propitiated by the observance of a three day’s fast, and the distribution of alms, after which, all should receive the archiepiscopal absolution and benediction. The confederates then advanced to the town of Thirsk, and from that place Robert de Brus and Bernard de Balliol proceeded to the camp of the Scottish King on the river Tees. These barons had estates in both kingdoms, and it was therefore their interest to procure and preserve peace between their sovereigns. They besought David to abstain from further invasion of the country, and to return to his own dominions; but he was so little disposed to adopt their advice that their mission was fruitless, and they were treated by the courtiers with insult and menace. Finding that a battle must take place, they renounced their fealty to the Scottish King, and returned to their own camp.

An engagement appearing inevitable, the Archbishop led the confederates to a field near Alverton or Allerton, an estate belonging to the fee of St. Cuthbert; and there they erected their Standard, consisting of the mast of a Ship, with the banners of St. Peter, St. John of Beverley, and St. Wilfrid of Ripon suspended from it, and above was placed the consecrated host; this being designed for their ensign, rallying-point, and leader to the battle. Archbishop Thurstan then sent his suffragan [subordinate], Radulphus Novellus (Bishop of the Orkneys), with other ecclesiastics, to received the confessions, and bestow absolution on the soldiers, and to give assurance of future happiness to such as should fall on their side in the approaching conflict. The prelate himself retired from the immediate scene of action, to pray for their success. The knights now dismounted from their steeds to fight on foot, disdaining flight, and determined to trust to victory alone for their safety. All then gathered round the standard.

The historian, John of Hexham, here gives the names of the great Northern Barons who commanded in this engagement, and among them he says, were William Peverell of Nottinghamshire, with this forces, and Robert de Ferrers of Derbyshire. In the *Annals of Waverley* we are told that the commander in this battle was William Consul, or Count of Albemarle, with whom were William Peverell of Nottingham, Walter Lespec, and Gilbert de Lacey, whose brother was the only one among the Anglo-Norman knights that was killed. Hence it may be concluded that Peverell was not the commander-in-chief of the army, but leader of a considerable division, consisting not only of his own retainers, but probably of others also.
The confederates, in comparison with their foes, were but a handful of men, but they were well armed and disciplined, and inspired with enthusiasm by the exhortation of the priests, they dreaded but little the assault of their numerous half-naked savage opponents. The Scottish King advanced to the attack surrounded by his legions. With the prudence of an able General he would have placed his men-at-arms in front; but the fierce Highlanders and savage Borderers would not be restrained. “I wear no armour,” exclaimed one of their Chiefs; “but no mailed Knight shall march before me this day.” Thus casting aside all caution, they rushed to the conflict, despising their enemies on account of the smallness of their number. But they were received in a very different manner from what they had expected. Flights of arrows from a distance pierced their unarmoured bodies; and when they came to close quarters, they found that with their weapons they could make no impression on their steel-clad adversaries, whose blows in return they were utterly unable to withstand. Yet though thus overpowered and destroyed in crowds, they manifested no want of courage. For nearly three hours they kept their ground, fresh bands continually advancing over the bodies of their slain comrades. But finding it vain to contend under such disadvantages, they at last gave way, and fled in confusion, throwing down their arms and baggage that they might have nothing to impede their flight. In commemoration of this last ignominious circumstance, the field of battle was afterwards called Baggamor.

King David and his Knights endeavoured to maintain the combat, but in vain; they were obliged to consult their safety by flight. The wretched remaining survivors of the Scottish army sought concealment in woods, brakes, and marshes, where many of them perished in consequence of their wounds, and others were taken and slain. The merciless conduct of the Scots in the course of their incursion had exasperated the minds of the English against them; and probably very few who were discovered escaped death. John Bromton, in his Chronicle, says, that ten thousand Scots fell in this battle, besides those afterwards dragged to slaughter from their places of concealment. The Monk of Waverley reckons the whole number of the slain as twelve thousand. This battle was fought on the Octave of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, on the 22nd of August, 1138. Peace for a time between the English and Scots was the fruit of this victory of the Anglo-Norman Barons.

King Stephen doubtless rewarded the services of such of his officers as had particularly distinguished themselves on this occasion, and obtained a triumph for him over a dangerous foe at so critical a season. John of Hexham informs us that William de Albemarle was shortly after made Earl of Yorkshire, and Robert de Ferrers Earl of Derbyshire. The latter of these Barons, or his son of the same name, married the daughter of Peverell the younger; and eventually acquired a share of his extensive domains.
Though the victory obtained by the adherents of Stephen at Allerton obliged the King of Scotland to enter into a treaty of peace with him, yet he soon found himself again under the necessity of having recourse to arms in support of his claims to the crown. In 1139, the Empress herself visited England; rightly judging that her presence would excite the confidence of her friends, and prove advantageous to her cause. She was attended on this occasion by her brother the Earl of Gloucester. Several battles were fought between the opposing parties with various success, in the ensuing campaign. At length in an engagement which occurred near Lincoln, in 1141, Stephen was defeated and made prisoner; and as Dugdale, on the authority of John of Hexham, informs us, his constant friend and partizan William Peverell was taken captive with him.

The Empress Maud now considered herself as sovereign of the realm, and one of her first acts of authority in that capacity seems to have been the resumption of the strong and important Castle of Nottingham, which had been for many years held by her prisoner Peverell and his father, under the grant of William I. This fortress of course that Baron had garrisoned with a trusty band of his retainers, who might have long maintained possession of the place against hostile attacks. It is probable therefore that Peverell was induced to give orders to his Officers to surrender the Castle as the price of his own liberty; for the historian says that Maud “required” it of him (“exegit.”) Having thus obtained possession, she replaced the hostile garrison by a body of her own adherents, and constituted William Painel, one of her partizans, governor of the fortress. That officer, who seems to have been like many of his contemporaries, little better than a freebooter, probably supported his troops from the plunder of the inhabitants of the neighbouring country, who as being the vassals and dependants of Peverell, were regarded as enemies of the new Queen. One of these marauding expeditions [by Painel and his troops] occasioned the re-capture of the Castle [in the following manner].

William Painel led a body of the troops under his command to attack the neighbouring collegiate establishment at Southwell, intending to break through the wall or barrier by which the Church of St. Mary was surrounded, and make a booty of the cattle, provisions, or stores of any kind which he might find there worth removing. But he found the place better defended than he had expected; for the people of the province had fled thither in great numbers, and stood on their guard. One of his men who had advanced near the barrier, and insulted those within with arrogant language, was slain by an arrow. Painel, thus disappointed at not being able to take Southwell College by surprise, according to his plan, waited on the Empress-queen, to request that she would furnish him with a larger body of troops, with which he might return and make himself master of the place.
While intent on this capture, however, he left Nottingham but indifferently garrisoned. In consequence of which, through the contrivance of two young men who had the custody of the Castle Mills, advantage was taken of a dark night to lead a party of the soldiers of William Peverell up the declivity of the rock on which Nottingham stands; and they having mastered the garrison, took possession of the place, and expelled from the town all who had shown a disposition to support the cause of the Empress-queen.

The Empress Matilda was ultimately unsuccessful in her attempt to maintain her own claim to the crown of England by force of arms; and after the war had been carried on for several years, she found it prudent to retire to Normandy, in 1147; and a temporary cessation of hostilities took place. But in 1153 the partizans of her family again assembled in arms under the standard of her son Henry, and the contest was renewed; though happily for the people, it was ere long terminated by a compromise, in virtue of which King Stephen was left in undisturbed possession of his dignity for life, and the reversion of it was assured to his competitor, who subsequently ascended the throne under the title of Henry II.

During the commotions which agitated the realm in the latter part of the reign of Stephen, it is probable that his constant adherent William Peverell maintained himself in full possession of his numerous lordships and castles. The only circumstance apparently recorded concerning him, during this period, is the accusation of having poisoned Ranulph, Earl of Chester. The notices of this affair by ancient historians are brief and unsatisfactory. Gervase of Canterbury says, "The noble and famous Earl Ranulph, of Chester, by a certain William Peverell, according to report, being poisoned (per quendam Will. Peverel. ut fama fuit, veneno infectus) after suffering many torments, this man distinguished for military glory, and insuperable boldness, hardly to be alarmed or conquered but by death, finished his temporal life, and was committed to the grave." The Monk of Waverley, and other writers, also mention this event, but afford no information as to the motives by which the assassin was prompted to the perpetration of so revolting and atrocious an outrage.

The historian Walsingham informs us that, in 1146, King Stephen imprisoned the Earl of Chester, and would not liberate him until he had surrendered his Castle of Lincoln. Hence it may be concluded that the Earl had belonged to the party of the Empress Matilda; and Peverell probably knew enough of the character and sentiments of his royal Master, to prevent him from feeling any apprehension of suffering punishment for an act, however detestable, by which he had destroyed one who was the King’s enemy as well as his own.
But the posture of affairs was extremely different after Henry II had ascended the throne. This prince began his reign by expelling from the kingdom those bands of foreign mercenaries who had long since made themselves the objects of popular terror and abhorrence; by recalling the prodigal grants of his predecessor; causing the numerous recently erected castles which studded the country to be dismantled, or destroyed; and degrading the court-favourites in whom titles of honour had been unworthily bestowed. Such a sovereign was by no means likely to overlook the murder of the Earl of Chester. Peverell became excessively alarmed; and, as if he had expected no mercy from the new King, he determined most effectually to avail himself of the protection of the Church. The King took a journey to York, towards the close of the year 1154, or the beginning of 1155. “On hearing of this, William Peverell, conscious of having been the cause the death of Earl Ranulph, and dreading the justice of the new King, then approaching his territories, sought refuge in a Monastery of which he was the patron, and relinquishing every thing, he assumed the tonsure and cowl of a Monk. The King however returning from York in the month of February, and coming into Nottinghamshire, where the recently professed brother had concealed himself, the conscious criminal took flight, abandoning to the King’s will and pleasure all his rich and valuable possessions.

By this act of desertion Peverell unquestionably acknowledged his guilt; and as a necessary consequence, though probably not without some judicial proceedings, all his property was declared forfeited to the Crown. As to the subsequent transfer of the vast estates of this great Baron it is unnecessary here to inquire, except so far as relates to that portion of his domains which is more immediately connected with the subject of this work. Haddon, or Nether Haddon, which, at the time of the Doomsday survey (as already stated), was a barton or farm appertaining to the lordship of Bakewell, had been granted by one of the Peverells before mentioned to one of his retainers, named Avenell, on the tenure of Knights’-service. And it may be presumed that the flight and outlawry of Peverell the younger, while it caused the forfeiture to the crown of all such estates as were in his uncontrolled possession, had not that effect on those lands and manors which he or his predecessors had bestowed on their dependants to be held by Knights’-service.

There is on record among the petitions presented to the King in parliament, in the fourth year of the reign of Edward III (1330) one from Laurence de Pavelly, whose ancestors had been mesne tenants, by Knights’-service, under the Peverells, and on the forfeiture of William Peverell had become tenants in chief of the crown. The following is a translation of this document, which is interesting, both as it relates to the exiled Peverell, and as it serves to elucidate the relation between the great barons of the twelfth century and their knightly retainers.
“To our Lord the King and his Council, Laurence de Pavelly presents his petition, setting forth that the ancestors of the said Laurence were the feoffees [trustees] of William Peverell of all the lands and tenements which the ancestors of the said Laurence held, in Pirye, Hongton, Rysle, and Wynfel, in the counties of Northampton, Nottingham, and Derby, by the service to be done to the said William and his heirs, as one of his Knights, as his Charter and the King’s Charter of Confirmation testify. Through the forfeiture of the said William, Robert de Pavelly, father of the said Laurence, held the said lands of King Edward, grandfather of our Lord the King, that now is, by the service aforesaid; and he did him service, for one Knights’-fee, in the King’s expeditions to Wales, in the fifth and in the tenth years of his reign; and this is proved by the Marshal’s rolls (et ceo tesmoignent les roules de la Mareschalcie), of the before-mentioned expeditions, for the lands in question; yet nevertheless there is a demand made of £14, for escuage for the same expeditions; the petitioner begs that he may be discharged of the aforesaid £14.”

ENDORSEMENT. “Let it be ascertained from the Marshal’s roll in the Exchequer whether the service was performed or not, let him produce his Charters; and if the Charters are such as the petition purports, and it is found that the service was performed, let him have his reasonable discharge.”

From the preceding petition it is evident that an ancestor of Laurence de Pavelly was enfeoffed of certain manors in Derbyshire and adjacent counties, by one of the Peverells, under the tenure of Knights’-service; and that after the banishment and confiscation incurred by the younger Peverell, the grantee and his heirs continued to hold the same manors, no longer however as his mesne tenants, but as immediate tenants of the crown. The granting of lands to military retainers, to be held by Knights’-service, was a general practice among the great barons in the regions of the Norman Kings of England: and it seems that when the original grantors forfeited their own estates, through the guilt of treason or felony, their military tenants, who had not been implicated in their crimes, shared not in their punishment, and were not otherwise affected by their forfeiture, then as it led to the transfer of their homage from the Baron, to his superior the Sovereign himself. Hence it may be fairly assumed that the Manor of Nether Haddon, and other lands in Derbyshire, passed to the Avenell family, under circumstances very similar to those under which the Pavellys obtained the estates mentioned in the foregoing petition.

The memorials of the Avenells of Haddon are scanty and unimportant. From the Monasticon Anglicanum of Dugdale, we learn that the Manor of Oneash (called in the Doomsday Book, ‘Aneisc’) was given to the Monks of Roche Abbey, in Yorkshire, by William Avenell, Lord of Haddon; and that the same individual gave to Leicester Abbey, Conksbury, near Over Haddon. This seems to nearly all that is known of this branch of the Avenells, except that the last of them left two daughters, his co-heirs, who by marriage conveyed his estates to the Bassetts and Vernons.
The family however continued to flourish elsewhere, when no longer connected with Haddon, and was probably of some note among the lesser barons, or inferior nobility of the kingdom, as may be inferred from various notices of them occurring in records of the thirteenth century. Ralph Avenell was the owner of two buildings or establishments of some kind (perhaps iron works) in the forest of Dean in Gloucesteshire, in 1216; which he held under a charter of King John [reigned 1199-1216]: as appears from a mandate on the Close Rolls, 1 Henry III [reigned 1216-1271] addressed to the Constable of St. Briavel’s Castle, ordering him to remove, without delay, from the forest of Dene (Dean) “omnes fabricas”—“exceptis dominicis fabricis nostris, quae spectant ad Castrum nostrum de S. Briavel, quae debent sustentari de trunciis et veteribus roborisbus ubincunque fuerint in dominicis nostris in foresta; et exceptis duabus fabricis Radulphi Avenell de quibus habet cartam J. Regis patris nostri; et exceptis quatuor Blissahiis Will. de Dene, et Rob. de Alba Mara, et Will. de Abbenhall, et Tho. de Blakeneia, et exceptis fabricis servientum nostrorum de S. Briavel quae omnes sustentari debent de sicco et mortuo bosco.” Another record in the Close Rolls relates to Ralph Avenell, then a minor (possibly the son and heir of the preceding), the guardianship of whose estates, with the right to dispose of his hand in marriage, was granted by Henry III, or rather by his Council (for the King was at that period in his minority), to John de Erleg, in 1217.

There is extant “Memoranda Roll” of 3 Henry III [1218], an entry on which specifies that the Sheriff of Devon had not accounted for 2 marks due by Nicholas Avenell for one Knights’-fee [the amount of land, the holding of which imposed the obligation of knight service, which can include goods or money] that had belonged to William the King’s son (doubtless William Peverell the Elder.) Though unquestionably belonging to the same family with the Lords of Haddon, neither of the Avenells last mentioned could have held that Manor, which had been transferred to other proprietors, either in the beginning of the reign of John, or more probably in that of Richard I [reigned 1189-1199].

Pilkington, the county historian, says, “In the reign of Richard I Haddon came into the possession of Richard Vernon, who married one of the daughters and co-heiresses of the former proprietor. Simon Bassett of Sapcote, in the sixth year of this reign, married the other daughter, and Vernon purchased his share. This last assertion is quite erroneous; for the Bassets, as Lysons properly states, continued to hold a moiety [half] of Haddon in the reign of Edward III [reigned 1327-1377]. A statement of the terms of the covenant or agreement between the husbands of the co-heiresses of Avenell, relative to the division their property, appears in the following extract from an Abridgment of Pleas of the reign of John, preserved in the Chapter House at Westminster, the precise date of which is uncertain.
“Simon Bassett and Elizabeth his wife, and Richard de Vernun and Avicia his wife, have agreed concerning Hadestock, and Hurtlingburch, and Basselaw, and Haddun, as follows: namely, that Hadestock with its appurtenances, and Hurtlingburch with its appurtenances, and the moiety of Basselaw, which he before had in that vill, and besides 50 shillings for which he received the mill with its appurtenances, shall remain to Richard de Vernun and his heirs: and to the before mentioned Simon shall remain the whole vill of Haddun with its appurtenances, and the moiety of Basselaw, which he first had, besides the mill, to be held by him and his heirs.

This certainly was not a final agreement between the parties, and it may be questioned whether it was the first agreement between the co-heiresses and their representatives. Probably Avicia Avenell was married before her sister, and Richard de Vernon received, as her dower, the lands specified in the above covenant, together with the mill, paying his sister-in-law 50 shillings for her share in it. After Elizabeth Avenell married, her husband Simon Bassett renewed the previous agreement, except as regarded the mill, which was assigned to him on this returning the money Vernon had paid on account of it. For some reason or other this arrangement was ultimately found unsatisfactory, and a new one was made, by which Vernon obtained a moiety of Haddon instead of Hadestock and Hurtlingburch.

A roll of Oblations and Fines, of the reign of John, preserved in the Tower of London, shows that Richard de Vernon was a tenant in capite of the Crown; and that he paid 6 marks for one Knight’s fee and a half, in the county of Derby, in 1201. This personage was a younger son of Warine de Vernon, Baron of Shipbroke, by a daughter of Lord Crew, as will appear from the Pedigree of the Vernon family, in which all the members of that family who were proprietors of Haddon are distinguished by figures prefixed to their names, denoting the probable order of succession.

The illustrious family of Vernon, like that of Courtenay, Earl of Devon, seems to have claimed descent from the sovereigns who presided over the Eastern Empire. This at least must be inferred from the following note, prefixed to a pedigree in the British Museum: “Some think the Vernons both of England and France, descended of the Emperors of Constantinople, and of the Justiniani of Venice.” The designation of Vernon is unquestionably derived from the lordship and castle of that name in Normandy, with which the representatives of the family had some connexion. Among the “Feoda Normanniae,” at the end of Du Chesne’s Collection of French, Norman, and English Histories, are “Feoda Loricata de Ballivia Vernon.”—“Robertus de Pinquiniaaco iii Milites singulis diebus apud Vernonem peredinantes. Et quando Rex summonet exercitum suum alio, per xl. dies ad sumptos suos.”

“Galtermus de Vernon i feod. loricat.” Eight other knights are designated as liable to military service;—and it is added: “Omnes isti debent summoneri per litteras de Redonis.”
Hence it appears that Walter de Vernon held one Knights’-fee, in the Bailiwick of Vernon, under the Crown; and was therefore liable to be called upon for military service, at his own cost, during forty days, whenever the King of England (who was also Duke of Normandy), assembled an army. When, therefore, William [I] the Norman invaded England, to wrest the crown from the Saxon Harold, he was attended by a knight of the Vernon family, as one of his own retainers.

The Chronicler Bromton has given a rhymed catalogue, in old French, of the principal warriors who accompanied the Norman prince in his invasion of this country. It purports to be a Catalogue “Des noms de grauntz de la mer
Qe vindrent od le Conquerour
William Bastard de grant vigoure
Lours surnoms issi vous deuys
Com je les trova en escris”—

Among the names are those of
“Peyvere and Peverell,” and
“Vere and Vernoun.”

When the Normans had triumphed over the Anglo-Saxons, the successful leader rewarded his chief retainers with territorial grants; and Vernon thus acquired the manor of Shilbrook or Shipbrook in Cheshire, which became the principal seat of the family. By means of advantageous marriages, or royal grants, different members of the family obtained establishments in some of the adjacent counties, especially in Derbyshire and Staffordshire; and for several centuries the Vernons figured among the territorial proprietors of these provinces. The settlement of this noble race in Derbyshire is the subject of the following verses, which have been already printed [Glover’s Peak District: 1830], but from an imperfect copy, and which are here given, as they may throw some light on the early history of the family.

**Upon the Ancestors of the Vernons**
“A grisly boar, as raven’s feathers black,*
*(An allusion to the Boar’s head, the crest of the Vernons.)
Bred in that land [Normandy] Rollo had by his wife,
Past the ocean, the Bastard’s [William Peverell] part to take
Who Harold reft [deprived] of kingdom and of life:
His offspring since, ranging the Peakish hills,
On craggy cliff a warlike seat did find;
Matched with a Vernoyle [Vernon], who wield at their wills,
Whose gentle deeds declare the gentle kind.
His den [dwelling] both art and nature strong hath made,
Healthful the air, each needful thing is near;
From off the hills the oaks cast pleasant shade,
Under the same a river runneth clear.
The greatest tusked Swine of race and bred
Hath taken to wife a noble Tigress red.”

This genealogical Sonnet has been exactly transcribed from the Harleian Manuscript, No. 1967 [some words have been updated by the editor]. The conclusion of the seventh line [who wield at their wills] is certainly incorrect; but the error is of little importance. Another copy of the verses may be found in “The Topographer,” vol. iii. 1791; but there the faulty passage is likewise grievously mangled and obscure. The last two lines of the Sonnet, as given above, are omitted in The Topographer, or rather expanded, and the copy of verses concludes thus:

“Of which denne [dwelling] hath the greatest tusked swine
A tigress hath taken to her feare [mate],
Of ruby hue, issue of famous line:
In these conjoined rare virtues do appear,
Of them I wish such offspring to proceed
As may them both in worthiness exceed.”

Sir Richard de Vernon, who was the first of his family that became connected with Haddon, in the manner already related, was the son of Warine de Vernon, and younger brother of Ralph de Vernon, successively Barons of Shipbrook. This last personage was styled “Sir Rafe the Old,” because his existence was extended to the unusual period of nearly or quite one hundred and fifty years. The circumstance is thus recorded in one of Randle Holme’s MSS. in the British Museum: “1306. Sir Rafe de Vernon th’ Oulde, who was before his death 145 years old, had by Dame Mary, Daughter to Lord Dacres 3 sons.....he after married the widow of Jack of Hatton, lord of Hatton.”

The Patriarchal age of this Baron is also mentioned in pedigrees of the Vernon family, in one of which he is characterized as “Rudolphus Maer, Dns. de Shipbrooke; qui vixit 150 annos.” Shipbrooke must thus probably have remained the property of a single individual during more than a century; and its venerable possessor may have witnessed the transfer of the estate at Haddon, acquired by his younger brother, to several owners in succession.
Only a moiety of the manor of Haddon was held by the Vernons till long after their original settlement there. As to this point some writers have fallen into strange misconceptions. Pilkington says that the first Sir R. Vernon of Haddon purchased his brother-in-law’s share of the property. The Author of a notice of Haddon Hall in “The Topographer” asserts that “this seat became in the time of Edward III [reigned 1327-1377] the seat of Sir William Vernon, Chief Justice of Chester, in right of his marriage with Alice, Daughter and co-heir of William de Avenel of this place.” Mr. Lysons, after mentioning the division of the property, more correctly states that “the Bassets continued the moiety of Nether Haddon, in the reign of Edward III but in before the reign of Henry VI [reigned 1422-1461] the whole became vested in the Vernons, who had purchased the Bassets’ moiety.”

It seems extremely probable that from the time Sir Richard de Vernon obtained an estate at Nether Haddon, he and his descendants made it their family seat and chief residence. They may also possibly have become provisional tenants of that portion of the manor which had not originally fallen to their share; but there is sufficient evidence, from existing records, that the Bassets retained full possession, as tenants in chief of the Crown, of their property at Haddon, till near the middle of the reign of Edward III; when a transfer of it was made to a new proprietor. From a roll of Fines in the Exchequer, we learn that “Robert Basset de Rishton passed a fine to the King of 40 shillings, that he might have a royal licence to enfeoff his son Thomas with certain tenements in Nether Haddon.” The licence for this conveyance was enrolled in 1305 (33 Edward I), and it merely identifies the ownership of the property. A roll in the Exchequer of the reign of Edward III contains the ensuing entry relative to the alienation of the manor of Haddon. “John Basset passed a fine to the King of 100 shillings, that he might have a licence concerning his manor of Haddon, with its appurtenances, which he holds of the King in capite, to allow him to enfeoff Thomas de Beyghlay with it, to hold for himself and his heirs.”

The descent of the Manor of Haddon from Sir Richard de Vernon, through a long series of proprietors, for more than three centuries and a half, may be traced by means of the annexed genealogical table. [PEDIGREE OF VERNON OF HADDON at the end of PART I on page 36. It is noted that this table does not always agree with Rayner’s narrations.] But the degree of consanguinity [blood relation] between some of the individuals who successively held possession of this estate in the course of the thirteenth century cannot always be exactly ascertained. William, the son of Sir Richard de Vernon, is mentioned in a Writ directed to the Bailiffs of the High Peak, entered on the Close Roll of 7th Henry III [1222], as holding land in Haddon and Basselawe, of the honour of Peverel, subject to homage and service due to William de Ferrars, Earl of Derby, under a grant from King John; and from another Writ addressed to the Sheriff of Buckingham, it appears that he held in the same manner, land at Adistock, also of the honour of Peverel.
Richard, the son and heir of this William de Vernon, seems to have been the personage mentioned in the following extract from the Patent Roll of 49th Henry III [1264] “The King gave to Eleanor, consort of Edward the eldest son of the King, the Manor of Banewell, lately belonging to Ralph Garnett; the Manor of Haddon, lately belonging to Richard de Vernon; and the Manor of Codenor, belonging to Richard de Gray,—Rebels.”

Some time between 1265 and 1278, the Vernon’s moiety of Haddon came into the possession of a person named Gilbert le Franceys, though in what manner it was acquired, or under what tenure it was held, is uncertain. The loss of Haddon by the Vernons, through the confiscation noticed above, seems to have escaped the researches of those who have written on the history of the family; and hence some have supposed le Franceys to have obtained the estate of Haddon in consequence of a marriage with the heiress of Vernon. Lysons says, “The heiress of Vernon in the reign of Henry III, married Gilbert le Francis; whose son Richard took the name of Vernon, and died in 1296, aged 29. This Richard was the common ancestor of the Vernons of Haddon, Stokesay, Hodnet, Sudbury, &c.” The relation between the families of le Franceys and Vernon is differently stated by Mr. Stebbing Shaw, in his History of Staffordshire. According to him, “In the reign of King John, or the beginning of that of Henry III, Gilbert le Franceys was Lord of Harleston, whose daughter and heir married Sir William Vernon, Knt., third son of Richard de Vernon, &c.” It may be questioned however whether either of these statements is correct; for there is reason to believe that the estate forfeited by Richard de Vernon was restored either to the Knight himself or to his family.

Since we learn from proceedings under a Writ of Quo Warranto, in the beginning of the reign of Edward I [1272-1307] that William de Vernon, then a minor, the son and heir of Richard de Vernon, who died seized of the manor of Nether Haddon, successfully vindicated his claim to certain profits of assize from his tenancies within that manor. And it was subsequently to these proceedings, namely about 1278, that Haddon is stated to have been in the tenure of le Franceys; within twenty years after which time it was in the possession of the family of Vernon.

From a record of 6th Edward I [1277], we find that Gilbert le Franceys held the manor of Haddon, and the hamlets of Rowsley, Basslawe, and Bubbenhall, in the county of Derby. From another record of 25th Edward I [1296], it appears that Richard de Vernon had then become the proprietor of Haddon and Basslawe, in the High Peak, which he held as one Knights’-fee. Hence he received a summons for service, as one of the King’s military tenants, in a war with Scotland.—
“Richard de Vernon, Vernun, or Vernoun, was returned from the Cos. of Notts. and Derby, as holding lands or rents, to the amount of £20 yearly value, or upwards, either in capite, or otherwise; and as such, was summoned on a general writ to perform military service in person, with horses, and arms, &c. in Scotland. Muster at Nottingham, on Sunday next after the octave of St. John the Baptist (7th July) 25th Edward I.” Richard de Vernon, (doubtless the same person) was also summoned in like manner, for the Co. of Stafford, to serve against the Scots, in 29th Edward I.

Three or four knights of this family bore the name of Richard de Vernon, in the 14th century; and it is not always easy to discriminate one from another. However “Richard, son of Richard de Vernon and Matilda his wife,” mentioned in a record dated 16th Edward II [1322] as holding half the manor of Nether Haddon, half that of Basslawe at 60s rent, and the moiety of a water-mill, was doubtless the personage of that name, who died in 1322, before his father. His mother, Matilda Camville or Campvill, long survived her husband as well as her son. On the Patent Roll, 11th Edward III [1337] is noticed a grant or confirmation for the manor of Lansthep, in Carmarthenshire, to Matilda, formerly the wife of Richard de Vernon, and Eleanor her sister, the daughters and heiresses of William de Campvill. The estates of her late husband were then held by Richard de Vernon, the grandson, or great grandson, who, in 1330, had obtained from Edward III a grant of free-warren for his manors in Derbyshire and Staffordshire. This knight married Juliana, the relict [widow] of Richard de Pembridge, who becoming a second time a widow betook herself to a convent. The fact of such a retirement in the case of this lady is proved by a memorandum on the back of the Patent Roll of 51st Edward III [1377], relating to a judicial inquiry concerning injurious treatment she had experienced from certain persons of Staffordshire, perhaps in consequence of disputes concerning property in that county. The published notice of this affair is too brief to satisfy curiosity: merely referring to “an inquest against William Bagott and Thomas Maundeville, with others in the Co. of Stafford, because they had ill-treated ("eo quod male tractaverunt") Juliana, who had been the wife of Richard Vernon, Knt.; and who had taken the vow of chastity, and assumed the mantle and the ring, before the Bishop of Lichfield.

It may be presumed that Sir Richard de Vernon, of Haddon and Harlaston, who married Joanna, the daughter of Rice ap Griffith, was the knight of that name who engaged in the insurrection against Henry IV [reigned 1399-1413], under Henry Percy and Owen Glendower, and who being made prisoner in the battle of Shrewsbury, in 1403, was, a few days afterwards, executed. The royalists, commanded by the King, in person, and his son Henry Prince of Wales, defeated the rebels, or insurgents, in a battle which took place near Shrewsbury, on Saturday, July 21, being the eve of St. Mary Magdalen, 1403. Percy was slain, many others fell, on both sides, and “The Earls of Worcester and Douglas, Sir Richard Vernon, and the Baron of Kinderton, were taken Prisoners.” All the latter, except Douglas, were beheaded, on the Monday after the battle was fought.
As Sir Richard Vernon married the daughter of a Welch gentleman, he may possibly have been prompted by her friends to join in the conspiracy against Henry IV, one grand object of which was to render Wales independent of the English government. The execution of this Knight and those who suffered with him taking place so shortly after their capture, it may be supposed that the object of the King was to strike terror into his opponents, by the capital punishment of the most distinguished among his prisoners; and trusting to the effect of this act of severity, he seems to have abstained from the infliction of such further penalties as would have affected the heirs of the offenders.

The baptismal appellation of Richard still belonged to successive Lords of Haddon, in the 15th century; whence some confusion has occurred, and offices and employments held by two individuals, a father and a son, have been attributed to the same person. Stebbing Shaw says that Sir Richard de Vernon, who married Joanna ap Griffith “had issue, by her, Sir Richard Vernon, Knt., who was speaker of the Parliament held at Leicester, in 4th of Henry VI [1426]; and by patent dated May 4, 23rd Henry VI [1445], was constituted Treasurer of Calais; and resigning the latter office in the 29th of the same King [1451], died in 1452, 30th Henry VI.” From a pedigree of the Vernons of Harlaston, published by Shaw, in another part of his work, it appears that Richard, the heir of Vernon, who died in 1403, was then a minor; and in 1418 he was styled Sir Richard Vernon of Pembrugg, Knt.; doubtless because he was at that time married to the heiress of Sir Fulk de Pembridge or Pembrugg, Lord of Tong Castle, in Shropshire. Mr. Edward King, in his Observations on Ancient Castles [1782], published by the Society of Antiquaries, has given an account of Haddon Hall: he says “Over the door of the great porch leading into the hall are two shields of arms, carved in stone; the one containing those of Vernon (which are Fretty), and the other those of Fulco de Pembridge, Lord of Tong, in Shropshire, whose daughter and heiress Isabel, married Sir Richard Vernon, and brought a great additional estate into the family; these properly, are Barry of six, or and azure.” The territorial acquisitions arising from this marriage doubtless contributed to increase the influence and importance of this gentleman, in the county in which he chiefly resided. In the parliament summoned to meet at Westminster, on the Monday before the feast of St. Martins (November 11), 1422, 1st Henry VI, Sir Richard Vernon was elected one of the Knights of the shire for the county of Derby. In 1425 “Sir Richard Vernon of Haddon, Knt.” held the office of High Sheriff of Derbyshire; and in the parliament, which assembled at Leicester, February 18, 1426, 4th Henry VI, this Knight again represented the same county; and he was moreover chosen Speaker of the House of Commons, in that parliament.
By his marriage with the heiress of Tong Castle, Sir Richard Vernon had two sons. Fulk Vernon, probably the elder, apparently named after his maternal grandfather, was chosen member for the county of Derby, in the parliament which met at Westminster, Oct. 10, 1435. Pilkington in his “View of the Present State of Derbyshire, &c.” has given a list of the representatives of the County, in which the name of Fulk Vernon appears as M.P. 13th Henry VI [1434]; but that year of the King’s reign no parliament was summoned: Mr. Vernon must therefore have sat in the house in 1435, 14th Henry VI. He died, without issue, probably between that year and 1442, when his place in parliament was filled by his nephew, who will be subsequently noticed.

Richard Vernon, who must have been the younger brother of the preceding, is characterized in a pedigree in the Harleian Library, as “Captain de Roan,” or Captain of Rouen, having doubtless been a military officer, and held the command of the garrison of that city, which had fallen into the hands of the English during the invasion of France by Henry V [reigned 1413-1422], and was retained till November 1449, when it was surrendered to the French by the Duke of Somerset. But some years previously to that occurrence, Captain Vernon had obtained a more secure office, namely the Treasurership of Calais, which he held under a patent from the Crown, dated May 4, 1444. This he resigned in 1450 or 1451, in favour of his son; and he died in 1452. He appears to have married a lady whose Christian name was Benedicta, or Benetta, but her family name is uncertain; possibly she may have been a native of France; and if, as may be concluded, she was not an heiress, the insertion of the name of her family in the Vernon archives would be thought unimportant.

Sir Richard Vernon, Treasurer of Calais, had by his wife two sons and two daughters. His elder son, William, was chosen representative of the County of Derby, in the parliament summoned to meet at Westminster, on the festival of St. Paul, (January 25) 1442, 20th Henry VI. He was again elected to represent the same constituency, in the parliaments which assembled at Westminster, 28th Henry VI [1449] and 29th Henry VI [1450]. In the latter year, his father having resigned to him the Treasurership of Calais, he probably went thither and spent several ensuing years; though we are unable to ascertain when he returned to his native country. However he had a grant of the high office of Constable of England, for life, being, it is said, the last who held that great dignity in that manner, it being looked upon as too important for a subject to be this entrusted with it; and in future it was only granted on some particular occasion pro vice.
Sir William Vernon was chosen M. P. for Derbyshire, in the parliament summoned to meet at Westminster, June 3, 1467, 7th Edward IV; but it is doubtful whether he ever took his seat in that assembly; for he died on the 30th of the same month. Shaw says “He married Margaret (only daughter and heiress of Sir William Pype, Knt.) who was buried at Tong, near her husband, where the monument erected to their memory still remains.” This statement is certainly incorrect. Sir William Vernon, from the coincident evidence of three pedigrees in the Harleian Library, appears to have married Eleanor, daughter and co-heiress of James Pype, of Spernor, in Staffordshire; while his younger brother, Edmund Vernon, married Margaret Pype, the other co-heiress. But in a pedigree published by Shaw, it is said, that “Sir W. Vernon, Knt. Constable of England, sold his wife’s (Margaret Swynfen) moiety of Spernor, in 1443.” Now the Spernor estate which he is said thus to have disposed of, undoubtedly was derived from the Pype family; but he may have had two wives, one of whom was named Swynfen. From an investigation and comparison of various records, pedigrees, and other documents, it may be inferred that Sir William Vernon was first married to Margaret Swynfen, by whom he had a son named John, who survived him, and succeeded to the possession of his Derbyshire estates; for from a record dated 7th Edward IV [1467], we find that John Vernon, Knt., was then seized of the manors of Haddon, Rollesley, Basselawe, Roworth, and Hasselbach, pertaining to the honor of Tutbury. This Sir John Vernon died, probably without issue, in 1477; for a monument of Sir John Vernon, Knt., with that date, is mentioned by Lysons, as existing in the parish church of Bakewell. There is reason to believe that Sir William Vernon (losing his first wife, Margaret Swynfen, probably soon after the birth of her son), in, or before the year 1443, married the co-heiress of Pype, of Spernor, by whom he had two sons, Henry and Ralph Vernon.

Sir Henry Vernon, the elder son of Sir William Vernon by his second wife, succeeded to the possession of Haddon and other estates in Derbyshire, as the next heir of his half-brother (?), Sir John Vernon, on the decease of the latter without issue. Like his great-grandfather, Sir Henry Vernon was rather a statesman than a warrior; and the first public station in which he appears to have been placed, was that of representative of the county of Derby, in the parliament summoned to assemble at Westminster, January 16, 1478 [7th Edward IV]. But at the period in which he lived every man was more or less a soldier; and among the higher ranks there were few who had not occasionally, at least, led their retainers to the field. Sir Henry then, though his talents qualified him best to shine in civil life, did not shrink from military service.
We have not been able to ascertain whether he took any active part in the brief but fierce contest for the crown, between Richard II [reigned 1483-1485] and Henry of Richmond, afterwards Henry VII [reigned 1485-1509]; but if he did not, he doubtless in some way manifested his attachment to the interest of the conqueror; for he subsequently obtained an extraordinary share of the favour and confidence of that prince. When the throne of Henry VII was shaken by the assaults of the turbulent Yorkists, and John, Earl of Lincoln, nephew of Edward IV and Richard III, appeared in open rebellion, at the head of an army of Englishmen and foreigners, at Stoke, in Nottinghamshire, the King summoned his loyal subjects to his aid. The historian Duchesne has given a catalogue of the nobles, knights, and gentlemen who gathered round the royal standard. Among them, he mentions “Henry Vernon de Pex,” i.e. Sir Henry Vernon of the Peak. A battle took place, June 6, 1487, when the rebels were utterly defeated; [John, Earl of] Lincoln, and his principal officers, with four thousand of their followers, were slain and the insurrection was suppressed. The writer just quoted also specifies “Henry de Vernon,” as one of “les nobles et vaillants Chevaliers,” who joined the King in his march to Taunton, against the unfortunate rebel, Warbek. The latter fled at the approach of the royal forces, his adherents dispersed, and he took sanctuary at Beaulieu, in Hampshire, in September, 1497.

The future services of Sir Henry Vernon were of a more peaceable description: he was entrusted by Henry VII with the offices of governor and treasurer to Prince Arthur, the King’s eldest son, and heir apparent; and when that Prince was created Prince of Wales, and Earl of Chester and Flint, in 1489, Sir Henry was made a Knight of the Bath. When Arthur, who was born September 20, 1486, arrived at a proper age, he was placed under the immediate superintendence of his governor, with whom he resided frequently at Haddon Hall. So lately as 1730, according to Shaw, an apartment in that Mansion was named “The Prince’s Chamber;” and his shield of arms was there to be seen carved in several places. The nominal government of Wales being vested in Prince Arthur, a council was appointed to assist and direct him; and Sir Henry Vernon was one, (probably the chief) of his counsellors. In the 15th of Henry VII [1499], a matrimonial treaty in behalf of his son having been concluded with Ferdinand, King of Castile and Arragon, the marriage articles between Prince Arthur and the Princess Catherine of Spain, were signed by Sir Henry Vernon, as one of the King’s ministers. The marriage did not take place till 17th Henry VII, November 12, 1501; the Prince being then under sixteen years of age, though his consort was several years older. He survived his nuptials but a few months, dying April 2, 1502. to the great regret of the people in general. The talents, acquirements, and character of the Prince are reported to have been such as reflected honour on himself, and on the individual to whom he had been indebted for the direction of his studies, and the cultivation of his faculties.
Sir Henry Vernon served the office of High Sheriff of Derbyshire in 1504; and he probably passed the latter part of his life in retirement. He died April 3, 1515, and was buried at Tong, where a fine monument was erected in memory of the Knight and his lady; who having died on the 17th of May, 1494, had been interred in the same place.

Sir Henry Vernon married the Lady Ann Talbot, daughter of John, the second of his name and family who bore the title of Earl of Shrewsbury; and who, as well as his more celebrated father, distinguished himself in the wars in France, in the reign of Henry VI [1422-1461]. Margaret, another daughter of the Earl of Shrewsbury, relict of Thomas Chaworth, married Ralph Vernon, the younger brother of her sister’s husband. Sir Henry Vernon had by his lady, five sons, and one daughter. His eldest son, Sir Richard Vernon, succeeded him at Haddon; Thomas, the second, was seated at Stokesay, and was living in 3rd and 4th Philip and Mary (1557); Humphrey, the third son, was seated at Hodnet, in Staffordshire, and was the ancestor of the Vernons of that place, and of Houndhill, &c., in the same county, whose heir male, by marriage with the heir general of Sudbury, and partly by will of John Vernon, of the latter place, became possessed of that estate; the fourth son, Sir John, married Ellen, daughter and heiress of Sir John Montgomery, in Derbyshire; thus acquiring a considerable estate and influence in the county, for which he appears to have been High Sheriff in 1523 and 1524; he was also Custos Rotulorum of the county, and one of the King’s Council for Wales; he died, as likewise did his lady, in 1545, and they were buried at Clifton Camville, in Staffordshire; Arthur, the fifth son of Sir Henry, was a priest, and rector of Whitchurch, in the county of Salop; he died August 15, 1517, and was interred with his parents at Tong; Elizabeth the only daughter of Sir Henry and Lady Ann Vernon, married Robert Corbett, of Morton Corbett, in Shropshire; and after his death she is said to have remained fifty years a widow; living to see two hundred and thirty-three of her own descendants, and leaving behind her the character of an amiable and virtuous lady.

The End
Richard de Vernon had a grant of lands in Tideswell, Co. Derby, to Avaicia, daughter and coheir of William from John, Earl of Moreton, Ao. 4, Ric. I. 1192, Custos of the County of Lancaster. Buried at Lenton Priory.


Sir Richard de Vernon had a release of lands in Netherhaddon, from Adam de Herthill, Ao. 31, Edw. I. 1302. Gave Felicia, daughter of Lexinton de Vesy.

Richard de Vernon had a grant of lands in Clifton, Co. Leic. ob. 16 Edw. II. 1322. Maud, da. of Sir William de Camville, living in 12 Edw. III. 1338.


1 Joan, (daughter of Rhese Griffith, and heir of Richard Stackpole,) Sir Richard de Vernon, of Harlaston and Haddon, 2 Juliana, sister and heir of Sir Fulk de Pembroke.

Sir Richard de Vernon, son and heir, et. 9, in 1377; Proved his age on 13 Ric. II. 1389. Ob. 2, Hen. IV. 1401.


Sir William Vernon, heir to his father in 1451. Margaret Swinfen, executor to her husband in 1467. Described on his monument as "Dominus Willielmus Vernon miles, quondam miles Constabularius Angliae." Buried at Tong.

Fulk Vernon, Esq. Living in 1446. Elizabeth, or Isabella, wife of Sir John Stanley, living in 1451 and 1458.

Ralph Vernon married a daughter of Chaworth.

Sir Henry Vernon, of Haddon, Knight of the Bath, Treasurer and Governor to Arthur, Prince of Wales. Died 13 April, 1515. Buried at Tong.

Anne, da. to John Talbot, 2nd Earl of Shrewsbury, ob. 17th May, 1564. Married at Tong.

Benedicta, married to Henry Foljambe of Walton.

Richard Vernon of Haselbach, Co. Derby.

Joan Vernon married John Rose, ancestor of the Roes of Normanton Turville, Co. Leicester.


Sir John Vernon, 4th son, one of the King's coheirs of Sir John Montgomery, et. 9, Ao. 5 Hen. VIII. 1515. Ob. 28, Mar. 3 Edw. VI. 1549.

Humphrey Vernon, of Alice, 2nd dau. and coheir of Sir John Ludlow, Knight. Ob. 28, Aug. 1517.

Now represented by Lord Vernon.

From whom the present Lord Vernon.

1. Margaret, da. and coheir of Sir Gilbert Talboys.

From whom the present Duke of Rutland.

Margaret, eldest daughter and coheir, to Sir Thomas Stanley, 2nd son of Edward, Earl of Derby.

Dorothy, 2nd daughter and coheir, to Sir John Manners, 2nd son of Sir John, Earl of Rutland, June, 1584.

Compiled from original deeds, inquisitions post mortem, heralds' visitations, Parish registers, etc.

ARMS: Ar. a Fret sa. MOTTO. Vernon semper viret.

CREST. On a Wreath, a Boar's Head erased, sa. ducally gorged or.