

## P R E F A C E.

A DISPOSITION to investigate critically the history and nature of our early institutions, and the characters and actions of the eminent individuals by whom they were founded or sustained, was remarkably prevalent about the era of the Commonwealth, a season apparently unfavourable to the success of such undertakings.

Some years previously to the re-establishment of the Monarchy, one of the most ardent labourers in this peculiar field of literature commenced the collection of materials for a comprehensive work on the ORDER OF THE GARTER, the publication of which was, however, not accomplished until after the restoration of the royal family. The valuable Commentaries of Elias Ashmole, Windsor Herald, (which were presented by the duke of York to the Sovereign and the Knights-companions in chapter on St. George's day 1674,) have always been held in high estimation. Clear and precise in the classification of the various subjects of which they treat, they have left nothing to be desired for all purposes of reference upon points affecting the laws and ceremonies of the Order, from its foundation to that time.

An authentic chronological list of its earlier members, which, owing to circumstances about to be adverted to, Ashmole failed to supply, was, nevertheless, required to complete the history of the illustrious fraternity; and the present compiler having, in common with other genealogists, occasionally felt the want of such a document, was, long since, induced to revise the existing catalogues, with a view to fix the exact succession of the Knights; a work requiring much research,

and to which the necessary attention could only be given, amidst other avocations, at remote intervals.

To the lists, in manuscript, by Dethick, Glover, and Vincent, collected in the reigns of Elizabeth and James the First, and those printed by Milles and Heylin in the latter and the following reign, succeeded Ashmole's catalogue, which, notwithstanding its anachronisms and other defects, exposed by Anstis in the beginning of the last century, has continued to be cited, and was re-printed, without improvement, by Pote and Buswell, the only continuators of the series.

When the difficulty of access to the public records, from the want of arrangement and proper indexes, the dispersion or concealment of private muniments during the civil troubles, and other obstacles, are considered, it will be no disparagement of the industry and skill of Ashmole to remark, that he has mistaken the persons of two of the Founders (Grey, and Audeley); and that his list, though far less imperfect than its precursors, still abounds with errors.

Of the discrepancies, observable in that list, it may be sufficient to advert to those which affect the elections during the first three sovereignties.

Under that of Edward III, the names both of sir Fulk and sir William Fitzwarine are inserted; but the former, although a very distinguished commander in the wars of that period, was not honoured with the Garter.

Richard Fitzalan earl of Arundel, and sir Thomas Felton, are incorrectly comprehended within that reign; they having been elected by Richard II.

Henry Percy the first earl of Northumberland, William Ufford second earl of Suffolk, Thomas Holand second earl of Kent, and Thomas Percy earl of Worcester, are wholly omitted; whilst William Beauchamp lord Bergavenny, sir Thomas Granson, and sir Robert Namur, who were elected during the reign of Edward III, are placed under that of Richard II; and sir John Sully, called "Sulby," who had been also elected by the royal Founder, is numbered among the knights chosen by Henry IV.

Under the sovereignty of Richard II, the names of Michael de la Pole earl of Suffolk,<sup>1</sup> sir Robert Knolles,<sup>2</sup> and sir Robert Dunstanville,<sup>3</sup> are given; but there exists no evidence that they were knights of the Order.

Richard lord Grey is stated to have been chosen by Richard II; but was in fact admitted into the Order under the reign of Henry IV. Robert de Vere duke of Ireland, sir Henry Percy, called "Hotspur," Thomas le Despenser earl of Gloucester, and John Montacute third earl of Salisbury, who were elected by Richard II, are altogether omitted. The earl of Arundel and sir Thomas Felton (as before observed), the count Palatine duke of Bavaria, John Beaufort earl of Somerset and marquess of Dorset, sir William Arundel, the Soudan de la Trau, and sir Simon Felbrigge, who were all elected by Richard II, are misplaced under other reigns; the two first under Edward III, the four following under Henry IV, and the last under Henry V.

The catalogue during the reign of Henry IV, incorrectly describes William, as *Gilbert* lord Roos; omits Richard Beauchamp fifth earl of Warwick, and Henry lord Scrope of Masham; and transfers the kings of Portugal and Denmark, and Henry lord Fitzhugh, who were elected into the Order under this Sovereign, to the reign of his successor.

These errors, attributable in a great measure to the loss of the records of the Order,<sup>4</sup> antecedent to the reign of Henry V, could only be rectified by minute inquiry into the personal history of the several individuals, and by such evidence as might be gathered from incidental references to the Order in public accounts of expenditure, and other authentic con-

<sup>1</sup> Heylin's Hist. of St. George, p. 360; where it is rightly supposed that the earl of Suffolk alluded to, was *William Ufford*, who had been elected temp. Edw. III, and whose name is omitted by Ashmole.

<sup>2</sup> See the argument against the

election of Knolles in Anstis's Introduction, vol. i. p. 31.

<sup>3</sup> There is no evidence of the existence of such individual. See Anstis, vol. i. pp. 29. 155.

<sup>4</sup> A list of the known registers of the Order will be found in the Appendix.

temporary documents; and it must be borne in mind that this chivalrous society, having been, from its origin, placed under the sole control of the Sovereign, unconnected with the government of the state, and not subservient to the ordinary legal jurisdiction of the country, few relative entries could be expected to appear amongst the public records; its official transactions being exclusively confided to appropriate ministers, and its statutes and ordinances authenticated by its peculiar seal.

The principal means of ascertaining the members of the Order in the three first reigns are derived from the so-called "French" or "Windsor Tables;" the accounts of the Great Wardrobe; and such Plates as are extant in the stalls of the royal chapel. Respecting these sources the following remarks may be made:—

1. In the reign of Charles the Second there were still preserved in the chapter-house at Windsor two tables, containing, in the French language, the names of the Founders, and of the successors to their stalls, down to the reign of Edward IV, with a few additions to the succession in each stall to about the middle of the reign of Henry VII. These tables which, if not coeval with the foundation, are proved to have been in existence about fifty-five years after that event,<sup>1</sup> were formerly, and in the time of Heylin,<sup>2</sup> suspended in the choir of St. George's chapel, on either side of the altar. They were removed into the deanery in or about 1689;<sup>3</sup> and, disappearing shortly afterwards, were probably, during some repairs of the castle, removed or destroyed. Heylin and

<sup>1</sup> *Computus Thomæ Martin, præcentoris Windsor, 1 Hen. 4, in ærario ibidem*—"Johanni Page pro scriptura nominum, videlicet, Reg. Princip. et aliorum militum de Garterio in *Tabul. iiii.*" *Comp. Joh. Marchford præcentoris, 4 Hen. 4*—"pro intratione militum Garteræ, in *Tabul. xx.*"

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. of St. George, p. 346*, where the tables are described to

be "a monument almost eaten out with time, then [temp. Car. 1.] placed in the choir of Windsor, on each side one."

<sup>3</sup> At a chapter held in the refectory at Whitehall, 3rd April 1689, sir Christopher Wren was instructed "to make ready a proper room in the deanery of Windsor to keep the Acts and *Tables of the Order.*" —*Garter's regr. vol. ii. p. 77.*

Ashmole,<sup>1</sup> fortunately printed their contents. As they, however, recited merely the succession to the stalls, the names of the numerous knights-elect, who had died without the honours of installation, are omitted; and those of installed knights, who had been degraded during temporary ascendencies of opposite parties in the state, or upon attainder or outlawry, were probably, from time to time, erased.

2. It appears that, in the first century which followed the institution, it was the custom to supply, annually, from the office of the Great Wardrobe, mantles and other parts of the knightly habit for the use of such knights as were at the time in England, and expected to attend the celebration of St. George's feast; and, as the names of the individuals for whom the robes had been issued, were usually specified in the official accounts, those documents offer *prima facie* evidence of the then existing knights. But the wardrobe accounts, which were properly in the custody of the chamberlain and king's remembrancer of the exchequer, have not been duly preserved; and it is doubtful whether, after the arrangement of the public records now in progress shall have been perfected, a regular series of the curious and historical documents in question will be recovered. The industry of Dugdale and Ashmole brought several of them to light; others have recently been discovered; and it may save some trouble to future inquirers, if, together with a specimen of the document, a list of such accounts as have been found, of dates between the institution of the Order and the third year of Henry V, when the annals commence, be given in the Appendix.<sup>2</sup>

3. It was decreed, by the statutes of the Order promulgated by Henry V, that after the decease of an installed knight, an escocheon of his arms, made of metal, should, together with his helm or crest, be affixed to the stall which he had occupied in

<sup>1</sup> Appendix to Ashmole, in whose time they had been removed from the choir into the chapter-house; but were missing in the reign of

George I. when Anstis compiled his work on the Order.

<sup>2</sup> Appendix, N<sup>o</sup> I.

the royal chapel, and remain there as a perpetual memorial. Anciently, this ordinance was strictly obeyed; but, as no term had been appointed within which the affixion should take place, it may be presumed, from the inaccuracy of several of the inscriptions, that a more considerable interval, than was contemplated by the royal Founder, had been allowed to elapse in those particular cases. Before the third year of Henry VII, it had become customary to place these memorials, as now, previously to or at the time of installation;<sup>1</sup> and, by a statute of Henry VIII, the performance of this duty was not to be delayed beyond one year after such ceremony.

It has been observed by Ashmole<sup>2</sup> that, for many years after the institution, the plate whereon the arms were engraved, bore no other inscription than the name of the deceased knight beneath the arms; and even that was sometimes omitted. Afterwards, his chief title of honour was added; and, towards the commencement of the reign of Henry VIII, all the titles of dignity, whether honorary or official, were inserted. About the same time, as it had become the practice to give, in public instruments, the description of "Knight of the Order" to a person enjoying that honour, so that style was then added to the titles on the plate. The arms were, nearly at the same period, surrounded with the Garter, having thereon the device of the Order,<sup>3</sup> and set forth with the exterior ornaments of supporters, coronet, and motto.<sup>4</sup>

A subject of some interest, connected with the annals of

<sup>1</sup> Anstis, vol. ii. p. 231 *note*. This custom is evident by the plate, dated in 1504, of Henry Stafford, who was created earl of Wiltshire a<sup>o</sup> 1 Hen. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Page 628.

<sup>3</sup> The plate of sir Frank van Hale, elected in the reign of Edward III, and that of Charles duke of Burgundy, elected by Edward IV, have the arms surrounded with

the Garter; but both are evidently of the fashion of the plates during the sovereignty of Henry VIII.

<sup>4</sup> The arms on the plates of the duke of Somerset [temp. Hen. VI], and of earl Rivers [temp. Edward IV], are engraved with supporters; it may, however, be doubted whether they were contemporary memorials of those knights.

the Order, remains to be noticed. It is well known that claims of doubtful validity have at various times been preferred for the admission of several distinguished names into the list of knights; and it may be proper to submit, in this place, a brief review of the most remarkable of those cases.

I. A question arises, whether RUPERT, or ROBERT, COUNT PALATINE OF THE RHINE, DUKE OF BAVARIA,—or ALBERT, or AUBERT, who bore the same titles, and became count of Holland, Hainault, and Zealand, was the knight of the Order elected to the eighth stall on the Sovereign's side, after the removal of Thomas of Woodstock?

The printed copy of the lost Windsor tables, in enumerating the successors to that stall, contains the following passage:—

“— apres luy [le duc de Gloucestre] vint le comte Palatyn Duc de Bavayre, Robert. Apres luy vint le roy D'anmarch —”

Ashmole, in his list of the knights, adds, upon no certain authority, to the name of “Robert”—“after [afterwards] Emperor of Germany,” and places his admission to the Order in the reign of Henry IV.

Now there were two Ruperts, father and son, counts palatine, dukes of Bavaria, and successively electors of the empire, who both did homage and became liege-men to king Richard II. Rupert senior, although called in history “Le Petit,” but, more commonly, “Le Tenace,” was considered to be one of the greatest captains of his age. He had, in 1388, conducted, with inferior resources, a successful war against the emperor Wenceslaus; and, after the death of his uncle Rupert I, in 1390, he, by a course of skilful warfare, re-united to the palatinate all the towns of which the emperor Charles IV. had deprived his predecessor. His martial qualities induced the English government to purchase his homage, according to the custom of that period, with a pension of 1000*l.* which was settled on him for life on the 9th September 1396;<sup>1</sup> and, on the 28th Octo-

<sup>1</sup> Exit. Pell. Mich. 21 Ric. 2.

ber in the year following, a pension of 1000 marks was granted to Rupert junior.<sup>1</sup> The act of homage, or vassalage, was personally performed by both these princes in a most solemn manner between the hands of king Richard's ambassadors—by the father, at Oppenheim, on 30th May 1397;<sup>2</sup> and, by the son, at Heidelberg, on 23rd August in the same year.<sup>3</sup> The elder Rupert died on the 6th January 1397–8;<sup>4</sup> and, the son, having succeeded to the electorate, was, upon the deposition of Wenceslaus, chosen king of the Romans on the 21st or 24th August 1400, and crowned at Cologne on the 6th January following.

The style of "emperor" not having been added in the passage cited from the Windsor tables, it might have been supposed that the Garter worn by the duke of Gloucester, had been conferred on duke Rupert senior; but the latter had been some time dead when robes were prepared for a "duke of Bavaria" against St. George's feast in 1399.<sup>5</sup> Was then the Order conferred on Rupert *junior*? Such a fact would have been highly probable; as, from the period of his accession to the imperial dignity, he continued in close alliance with England. In 1401 a marriage was contracted between his eldest son Lewis of Bavaria, and Blanch the eldest daughter of Henry IV.<sup>6</sup> According to a MS. chronicle,<sup>7</sup> the emperor was an honoured guest at the English court in 1402; and the affectionate terms in which he and his son communicated to Henry the lamented death of the princess Blanch, on 23rd May 1409,<sup>8</sup> attest the continued friendly intercourse which subsisted between the two sovereigns until near the emperor's decease, which took place on the 18th May 1410.

It cannot be imagined that, under such circumstances, the

<sup>1</sup> Exit. Pell. Mich. 21 Ric. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Rymer, vol. vii. p. 854.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 859.

<sup>4</sup> Exit. Pell. Mich. 22 Ric. 2, where credit is taken for the payment of the pension, calculated to the day of its cessation by the duke's death.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 254, and Anstis, vol. i. p. 13, note *f*.

<sup>6</sup> Rymer, vol. viii. p. 170, &c.

<sup>7</sup> F 9, in Coll. Armor. fo. 8. An anonymous chronicle, in 4to. of 36 folios, containing a succinct history of England from the accession of Richard II. to that of Henry VII.

<sup>8</sup> Cotton. MS. Vitell. E x. p. 80b.



emperor Rupert, if a knight of the Garter, would not have continued to be a member of the Order during his life; but we find that, in the years 1408<sup>1</sup> and 1409,<sup>2</sup> the number of knights was complete without including him; and that the king of Denmark (the Sovereign's son-in-law, and the recorded successor in the stall of the "duke of Bavaria") was then in possession of the eighth stall.<sup>3</sup>

II. The grounds for substituting the name of ALBERT, COUNT PALATINE OF THE RHINE, DUKE OF BAVARIA, for that of Rupert, in the list of knights, are the following:—

1. That, in a public instrument under the great seal of Henry VI, dated 1st July 1428 (*twenty-four years only after Albert's death*), it is distinctly asserted that he had been a knight of the Garter.<sup>4</sup>
2. That this assertion is repeated in a letter from the same king, addressed to the burgesses of the town of Ceriçée, in Zealand, 14th December 1435.<sup>5</sup>
3. That a "duke of Bavaria" (by which title,<sup>6</sup> as well as that of duke of Holland,<sup>7</sup> Albert was designated in official documents) received robes of the Order for St. George's festival in 1399.<sup>8</sup>
4. That Albert died in 1404; and that we find Eric king of Denmark (who had married Philippa daughter of Henry IV.) in possession of the eighth stall in 1408, when the emperor Rupert was still living, and in relations of perfect amity with the English court; and,
5. That it is not unreasonable to suppose that the transcriber of the French tables may have mistaken *Robert* for *Aubert*, the titles *by birth* of both dukes being identical.

<sup>1</sup> Computus Will'i Loveney cust. M. garderob. inter festum Scī Mich'is a° 8° [1407] finiente, et primum diem Maii tunc prox. seq. a° 9 Hen. 4 [1408].—*Queen's Remembrancer's office.*

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Ricī Clifford, c. m. g. à 1° Maii a° 9° [1408] usque f<sup>ca</sup>.

Sci' Mich. a° 10 Hen. 4 [1409].

—*Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix, N° XIII. sec. 4 & 5.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* N° XIV.

<sup>5</sup> Monstrelet, edit. 1595. vol. ii. p. 124.

<sup>6</sup> Rymer, vol. vii. p. 604.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 374. <sup>8</sup> See p. 254.

III. From a wardrobe account, containing charges for the preparation of robes against St. George's feast in 1401, it might, on a first view, be presumed that the then KING OF SPAIN had been a knight of the Garter. The entry, referring to habits provided for that occasion, is in the following words:—

“*Regi Ispanie* dño principi Waff duci Baverr. duci Ebor duci Geldr Thome señ Angl & al comitibz baronibz & militibz de societate Garterior<sup>o</sup> ac Wiffo Epō Winton *Regine Ispanie* regine Portugat ducissabz Ebor<sup>o</sup> Hiñ comitissabz Hunt Somš Kanc<sup>o</sup> Sar<sup>o</sup> Westmł & aliis div<sup>s</sup> dominabz de dono regis cont<sup>a</sup>. festū Scī Georgii dcō anno scō” [1401.]<sup>1</sup>

The name, however, of Henry the Third, then king of Castile and Leon, not occurring in the Windsor tables, or in connection with the Order, in any historical document, this wardrobe account excepted; and there being, from the political relations of that monarch with England, no assignable ground for the omission of the name of a knight of his exalted rank; we have not felt ourselves justified in receiving that name into the list, upon the isolated authority above cited. At the same time we must observe that no fact might have been more probable, considering his close alliance with our Henry IV, whose half-sister, Catherine of Lancaster, he had married, than that the Order should have been conferred upon him. But the number of the knights was, during four centuries and upwards, strictly and undeviatingly limited to that of the original institution: we were, therefore, bound to inquire what stall could this king have occupied in the royal chapel? whom did he succeed? and who was his successor in the Order? The result<sup>2</sup> of an investigation of these points has decided the exclusion of his name from our list.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Custod. M. garderob. de emptionibus & liberaco'ib's, 2-3 Hen. 4.—*Queen's Remembrancer's Office.*

<sup>2</sup> See the presumed states of the stalls on the 23rd April 1401, and 25th December 1406, in Appendix, N<sup>o</sup> XIII. sec. 3 & 4.

Gifts of robes and habits of various kinds were commonly distributed, at that period, by the king amongst his family and the members of his court. May it then not be supposed that Henry IV. designed presents of this description for his sister and his brother-in-law; and that the accountant inadvertently classed the robes ordered with those which were issued for the celebration of the annual festival of the Order?

It is certain that the wardrobe accounts are not free from inaccurate entries of this nature. In an account (remaining among the records of the queen's remembrancer, rendered by Richard Clifford, keeper, for the period from the 1st May, 9 Hen. 4, 1408, to the 29th September, 10 Hen. 4, 1409,) deliveries occur of cloth, furs, &c. for robes made for the prince of Wales, the kings of *Spain* and Portugal, the *dukes* of Holland and Bavaria, the *count of Estrevent*, the lords Thomas, John, and Humphrey, sons of the king; the duke of York; the earls of Somerset, Westmoreland, Arundel, Warwick, and *Salisbury*; the lords Grey de Codnore, Roos, and Willoughby, and "other lords and knights of the society of the Garter;" as also for the bishop of Winchester, the lady Joan queen of England, the queens of Spain, Portugal, and Denmark, the *duchesses* of Holland and Bavaria, and *countess Estrevent*, the duchesses of York and Ireland, the countesses of Somerset and Huntingdon, the ladies de Burnell and de Beaufort, and divers other lords and ladies, against the feast of St. George in the 10th year [1409].

In the account of Peter Swan, the king's embroiderer, on the same roll, there is a charge for embroidering 1492 round garters, of tartarin and card, worked with silk and cyprus gold, with the motto "hony soit qi male y pense," as well for the king as for *the king of Portugal and other kings*, and dukes, earls, queens, duchesses, and foreign ladies, of the livery of "the Garter fraternity of St. George," against the feast in the month of May 1409.

It would be inferred, from the former of these items, that

all the male personages therein mentioned, except the prelate, had been knights of the Order. The following facts, nevertheless, oppose such inference:—

1. John II, at that time king of Castile and Leon, and nephew to the Sovereign, was an infant, and had just entered his fifth year, having been born on the 6th March 1404-5; and, had all the stalls not been full at St. George's feast in 1409 (as they will be shown to have been by the scheme in the Appendix),<sup>1</sup> his tender age would have made his admission into the Order previously to that date improbable. The circumstance also, that, although he lived until 1454 and in amity with England, his name does not again occur as a knight of the Order, precludes our belief of such admission. His mother, queen Catherine (daughter of John of Gant by Constance of Castile), and his uncle Ferdinand, afterwards king of Arragon, administered the government of Spain, at the date of this wardrobe account, during the minority of king John; and, as on the 14th of August in the same year Henry IV. granted a commission to the sire de Montferrand and sir Thomas Swynborne, mayor of Bordeaux, to proceed to Bayonne at Michaelmas following, in order to settle, with commissioners on the young king's behalf, the terms of a truce,<sup>2</sup> it is probable that a present of robes for the mother and son may have been sent on the occasion of that embassy.

2. "The *dukes* of Holland and Bavaria and *count of Estrevant*," mentioned in the account, were one and the same person. William duke of *Bavaria* count of Hainault, *Holland*, and *Zealand*, generally called "*the duke of Holland*," had been admitted into the Order in 1390, by the name of *Count of Ostrevant*, a title which he bore during the lifetime of his father duke Albert. He succeeded

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, N<sup>o</sup> XIII. sec. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Rymer, vol. viii. p. 593.

the latter in 1404, and had not any issue male; and we are not aware that he had ceded the territory of Ostrevant, or granted the title, to any other individual. He was familiarly known in England (at which court he had occasionally appeared as a visitor) by that title, and it is ascribed to him in the Windsor tables, without adverting to his succession to a higher. The relative error in the wardrobe account may thus have arisen. There was, besides, no stall vacant, in 1409, for a second count of Ostrevant.

3. Thomas de Montacute fourth earl of Salisbury appears to have been restored to that earldom (forfeited in 1400 by his father's attainder), about the time of St. George's feast in May 1409; for he was, on the 26th of October following, summoned to parliament by that title; and, being highly favoured by Henry IV, the king may have presented him with a robe, and invited him to attend the feast: but there was then no stall vacant for him; and he was, according to the Windsor tables, not admitted into the Order until after the death of sir John Stanley, which happened on the 8th of January 1413-14, at the commencement of the reign of Henry V.

We discover, moreover, a similar inaccuracy in the wardrobe account of the year preceding,<sup>1</sup> wherein robes of the Garter are stated to have been issued, against the festival, 23rd April 1408, for the kings of Portugal, Denmark, and *Spain*, the duke of Holland, the prince of Wales, the duke of York, the lords Thomas, John, and Humphrey, sons of the king; the earls of Somerset, Arundel, Kent, Warwick, and Westmorland; the barons de Grey, Willoughby, Roos, Lovell, Charleton, and Burnell; the knights Beaufort, Erpyngham, Beauchamp, Felbrigge, Vache, and Stanley.

Here are twenty-six knights *besides* the Sovereign; and, as

<sup>1</sup> See p. xiii. note 1.

all the knights mentioned, except the king of Spain, were, at that time, of the Order,<sup>1</sup> it is evident that the name of the young king was inserted by mistake; but presents of robes were probably then made to him and to his mother whose name also appears in the account.

IV. LEWIS DUKE OF BRIGA. This duke is placed in Ashmole's catalogue<sup>2</sup> as having been elected into the Order by Henry V; but, for the reasons assigned by Anstis,<sup>3</sup> it is clear that he never received that honour.

V. GILLES DE BRETAGNE, seigneur de Chantocé. This remarkable person (the third son of John V. duke of Brittany, by Jeanne of France, daughter of king Charles VI, and grandson of John of Montfort duke of Brittany and earl of Richmond, K.G.) is stated, by the continuator of Monstrelet's *Chronicles*, to have been nominated *constable of England and a knight of the Garter*, and to have been put to death by his brother, duke Francis, for having accepted those pretended favours from our Henry VI.<sup>4</sup> His connection with England is proved by a public record; for, after having appeared in London in 1432, as ambassador from his father,<sup>5</sup> it would seem that he entered, in the year following, into the English allegiance; as a pension of 250 marks was then settled upon him by the crown.<sup>6</sup> The story, however, of his high military appointment, and his admission into the Order, was the invention of a private enemy.<sup>7</sup> He was arrested by order of his brother in 1446; released after a long detention; again imprisoned; and, finally, strangled in 1450.<sup>8</sup>

VI. SIR PHILIP WENTWORTH. Ashmole has included this person in his catalogue, as elected in the reign of Henry VI,<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix, N<sup>o</sup> XIII. sec. 5.

<sup>2</sup> N<sup>o</sup> 118.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. i. p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> Monstrelet, ed. 1595, vol. iii. p. 31.

<sup>5</sup> Morice, *Hist. de Bretagne*, tom. i. p. 517; Rymer, vol. x. p. 515.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 563.

<sup>7</sup> Artur de Montauban, who

caused a letter to be forged, as from the king of England to duke Francis, claiming Gilles as his constable and knight of his Order. — *Chartier, Hist. de Charles VII*, p. 212.

<sup>8</sup> D'Argentré, *Hist. de Bretagne*, sub anno.

<sup>9</sup> N<sup>o</sup> 168.

upon the authority of Aldrydge's incorrect version of the proceedings at a chapter of the Order, held on the 22nd April 1452.<sup>1</sup> Wentworth was in fact installed on that day by the earl of Shrewsbury and the lord Sudeley; but *as proctor* only for the duke of Norfolk.<sup>2</sup>

VII. PAUL BAPTIST SPINOLA, a noble Genoese, is stated by the historian of his family, Maximilian Deza,<sup>3</sup> upon the authority, as it should seem, of a narrative in the Martyrology of the knights of St. John of Jerusalem, by Goussancourt,<sup>4</sup> to have had the Garter conferred on him by Edward IV. Two exploits are related of this warlike individual.—“Forming part of the English garrison of Boulogne, when that place was besieged by the French, Spinola, during one of the numerous sallies, had the good fortune to make a Frenchman of rank his prisoner, who, in contemptuous speech against the Italian nation, declared that he would rather have died than surrendered to a Genoese. Being conducted to London, he was placed with others at the disposal of Edward. But Spinola, unable to brook the insult to his country, offered a large sum to the king for his prisoner's liberty, which was graciously, and without such consideration, bestowed by the monarch. Spinola thereupon supplied his late adversary with arms, a horse, and all other necessary equipment for his journey; but, with the king's approbation, challenged him to single combat. Many knights of both nations came to witness the duel: the challenged, however, declined to present himself.” The other achievement, in which Spinola distinguished himself, obtained a great reward from Edward, and immortalized his own name. “During a seditious movement, in the English capital, against the king's person, the chiefs of the conspiracy were already on their way to the royal palace, when Spinola, mindful of his allegiance to the prince whom

<sup>1</sup> Anstis, vol. ii. p. 146.

<sup>2</sup> MS. copy of regist. Chartac. in Ashmol. Coll. at Oxford.

<sup>3</sup> Istoria della famiglia Spinola da Massimiliano Deza, 1694, p. 274.

<sup>4</sup> Matthieu de Goussancourt, Martyrologie des Chevaliers de S. Jean de Hierusalem, 1564, lib. viii. p. 273.

he served, collected a small band of Italians, and having attacked the conspirators on a bridge, totally routed them. For this service the king constituted him a knight of the Garter, and assigned to him, together with a pension out of the customs of the realm, the privilege of quartering the White Rose with the armorial bearings of Spinola. He then fixed his residence in England; and left, among his descendants, that Edmund, dean of Winchester, who transcended the glories of his ancestors by suffering death for the catholic faith under the cruel persecution of queen Elizabeth; being the first who introduced into his family the crown and palm of martyrdom."

We shall not stop to refute such evident fictions to which, in truth, it would scarcely have been necessary to allude if a most respectable antiquary had not imagined that Paul Baptist Spinola might be identified with the "COUNT OF MONT GRISON," who figures in the Garter catalogues<sup>1</sup> as a knight of the Order, elected in the reign of Edward IV.<sup>2</sup> The individuality and history of this unknown stranger, and the occasion of his admission into the Order, had so wholly eluded the researches of Vincent, Heylin, Ashmole, and Anstis, that the latter, "after a diligent inspection of the historians and genealogists of the kingdom of Naples," his asserted country, in the hope of throwing light upon "a dark entry" in the Black Book, had begun to doubt that such person had ever existed.<sup>3</sup>

The historiographers of the Order owe the failure of their endeavours to verify this point partly to Aldrydge's careless translation of a passage in the *Registrum Chartaceum*, and possibly to some indistinctness, in the orthography of the name in question, in the original text.

In reciting the acts of a chapter of the Order held on the

<sup>1</sup> Ashm. N<sup>o</sup> 198.

part i. p. 301.

<sup>2</sup> Gent. Mag. vol. xcix. [1829.]

<sup>3</sup> Anstis, vol. i. pp. 48-50.



22nd April, 7 Edw. 4, 1467, Aldrydge has thus rendered the French minute:—

“Domino Principi, Regi Neopolitano & Domino de Montgryson Apuliæ, jam ante delectis ad illustrissimum ordinem, sedes reservatæ sunt.”<sup>1</sup>

Anstis observes, that “if Ferdinand king of Naples had ever used the addition of *Dominus de Montgryson* in his titles, as our kings did formerly that of *Dominus Hiberniæ*, the kings of Spain *Dominus Cantabriæ*, &c. and the kings of Portugal *Dominus Ceutæ*, &c. then there would be no difficulty [in interpreting the passage]; as the construction would be, that two stalls were reserved, one for the prince of Wales, and the other for the king of Naples, who was also *lord of Montgryson*.”<sup>2</sup>

A copy, however, of the original register among the Ashmolean manuscripts (of which a *Catalogue raisonné*, compiled by Mr. William Henry Black, is now in the press), has placed the meaning of the mysterious passage out of doubt. According to this document, *fourteen* knights, including the Sovereign, were assembled in chapter on the day above-mentioned; excuses were offered for *nine* who were absent; and, in order to note the *three* remaining stalls, the following entry was made:—

“Vacants ( Le stalle de Prynce.  
non pas ( Le stalle pur le roy de Poleyn q' est eslu.  
installe ( Le stalle pur le counte de Mont Grisone de  
Naeples q' est eslu.”

The election, therefore, of a Neapolitan count into the Order, either at that or some antecedent chapter, is proved; and a reference, in the course of our researches, to the Pell roll of the exchequer for the same seventh year of Edward IV, has enabled us to insert in our list of knights the true name of the noble individual. This record contains entries of payments, on the 9th of November 1467, of *8l. 13s. 4d.* being

<sup>1</sup> Anstis, vol. ii. p. 184.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. vol. i. p. 49.

the cost of a gold Garter, of the livery of St. George, transmitted by the king to the COUNT OF MONT ORIZO, chamberlain to the king of Naples, then also a knight of the Order; and of 33*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* for the charges attending the conveyance of the ensign to its destination.<sup>1</sup>

The personage thus honoured was INIGO D'AVALOS COUNT OF MONTE ODORISIO,<sup>2</sup> who, in that year, filled the high ministerial office of *Gran Camerlingo*, great chamberlain, or treasurer of Naples, under king Ferdinand I. of Arragon. He was the son of Roderigo or Ruis d'Avalos, count of Ribadeo in Catalonia, constable of Castile; had accompanied Alphonsus of Arragon (the father of king Ferdinand) into Italy; and, after the conquest of the kingdom of Naples, had been rewarded for his eminent services by divers grants of lands, fiefs, titles, and honours. Amongst the splendid guerdons bestowed upon him were the hand and fortunes of Antonella d'Aquino, the daughter of Berardo Gasparo sixth count of Loretto and marquess of Pescara, and sole heiress of her brother Francesco Antonio. Her father, Berardo, was son to Francesco d'Aquino, gran camerlingo, count of Loretto and Satriano, and, by marriage with Giovannella, daughter and heiress of Ciego del Borgo, count of Monte Odorisio, marquess of Pescara and viceroy of Naples, acquirer of the titles and honours of that illustrious house; all which devolved, in right of Antonella, to Inigo d'Avalos, who, however, bore only the title of count of Monte Odorisio during the lifetime of his brother-in-law.

<sup>1</sup> From the Pell Roll, 7 Edw. 4. "Die lune ix die Novemb. Thome at Wode aurifabro In denar sibi lib'atis p' m<sup>s</sup> p'pr' p' uno Garter de auro de lib'ata S<sup>c</sup>i Georgij ab ip'o empt. & misso p' dnūm regem Comiti de monte Orizo Cam'ar' regis de Naples p' brē de p'vato sig' sup'dct'—vij*l.* xiijs. iiij*d.* Rob'to Donne misso p' dnūm regem cū d'co Gartero ad comitē de monte Orizo In denar' sibi lib'atis p' m<sup>s</sup> p'pr' p' custubus & expens' suis eund & redeundo ex causa p'dc'ta p' brē

p'dcūm—xxxiiij*l.* vis. viij*d.*"

<sup>2</sup> The title is variously written by Italian authors. *Monte d'Orisi*, by Capecelatro, *Origine della Citta &c. di Napoli*. Nap. 1769, p. 33. *Monderisi*, by Campanile dell'Armi, &c. di Napoli, Nap. 1618, p. 108. *Monterisio*, by Gius. Campanile, *Notizie di Nobilta di Napoli*, Nap. 1672, p. 255. *Montederisi*, by Aldimari, *Memorie, &c. di Napoli*, Nap. 1691, p. 241. But the true orthography is *Monte Odorisio*, the name of a town in Apulia.

The powerful influence of this nobleman on the political affairs of Italy at that period, and the friendship of his royal master which he enjoyed in an eminent degree, may sufficiently account for Ferdinand's desire that his prime and confidential minister might be admitted into a fraternity which he himself highly valued. At whatever date such admission took place, it results, from a reference to the state of the Order in 1467,<sup>1</sup> that the count of Monte Odorisio must have been elected to fill the twelfth stall, on the Sovereign's side, which had been designed for sir William Chamberlayne. There is no evidence of his installation; and the Windsor tables are also silent respecting Chamberlayne, whose plate, nevertheless, is still affixed to that stall. Count Inigo died 2nd Sept. 1484,<sup>2</sup> and had sepulture in the chapel, within the

<sup>1</sup> Appendix, No XIII. sec. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Inigo d'Avalos had issue, by Antonella d'Aquino, three sons and three daughters. The eldest of the former, Alfonso, bore, after his father's decease, the title of marquess of Pescara, and died in 1495, leaving, by his wife Diana di Cardona, Francesco Ferrante or Ferdinand d'Avalos, the celebrated marquess of Pescara who commanded the imperial forces at the battle of Pavia, and died at Milan, in 1525, without issue by his wife, the no less celebrated Victoria Colonna. The marquess was not only distinguished for his martial talents. Having been taken prisoner in 1512 at the battle of Ravenna, he composed, in his prison, a dialogue on "Love," which he dedicated to his consort, the daughter of Fabricio Colonna, great constable of Naples, a lady remarkable alike for her beauty and her mental graces, and whose poetical effusions are said to have classed her among the most happy imitators of Petrarch. Roderigo, the second son of Inigo, inherited the fief and title of count of Monte Odorisio; was an eminent military commander; and fell in battle at Isola in Arpino, without

having been married. Inigo, the third and youngest son, was created marquess del Vasto, and married Laura San Severino, daughter of the prince of Salerno, by whom he had two sons Alfonso and Roderigo, and a daughter Costanza duchess d'Amalfi, authoress of several sonnets which, together with those of Victoria Colonna, were printed at Sessa, in 1558. Alfonso d'Avalos, the eldest son, afterwards known as the marquess del Guast or Vasto, and as lieutenant-general of the army of Charles V, forfeited all the reputation he may have acquired as a soldier, by his disgraceful flight at the famous *journee* of Cerisoles. His boasting, at a ball given to the ladies of Milan two days before the battle, exposed him to the ridicule of Brantome. He died in 1546. Alfonso married Maria of Arragon, daughter of the duke of Meritalto (an illegitimate descendant of Ferdinand I.), and was ancestor of the present family of Avalos, possessors of the dignities of Pescara, del Vasto, and Monte Odorisio. The armorial bearings of Avalos are a tower, or castle, upon a field Argent.

church of Monte Oliveto at Naples, which is appropriated to the family, and bears the name of AVALOS.

We have thus attempted to put the reader in possession of the principal facts and inferences upon which we have ventured to introduce some apparent novelties in our Catalogue of the Knights of the Garter. With respect to the concise biographical notices which occupy the greater part of the present volume, we shall only permit ourselves to observe, that we have not yielded without regret to the necessity of limiting them to the lives of the individuals who were elected under the sovereignties of the royal Founder and his immediate successor. Our researches and collections were adapted for the inclusion of memoirs extending to a much later period; but the time, which we have been able to devote to the pursuit, has proved insufficient for the completion of that branch of our original plan. We are but slightly consoled by the reflection that our distinguished precursors, Ashmole and Anstis, experienced a similar disappointment,—and from the same cause; namely, the difficulty, almost insuperable, of adequately supporting by coetaneous testimony the narratives and assigned dates of transactions belonging to the early part of our history; and without which a compilation of this nature would be comparatively of little value.