

The University College Statue of James II

By THE LATE K. A. ESDAILE and M. R. TOYNBEE

IT is curious how persistent the legend is that the famous Grinling Gibbons statue of James II, concerning the proper placing of which controversy recently raged,¹ is the only one known. This supposed absence of statues of James II is ascribed to his unpopularity. He was in fact far more widely commemorated in his lifetime than his rival, William III, who owed one of his contemporary statues, that on the second Royal Exchange, to the death of his popular wife and the impossibility of putting up a statue to her alone. Five other statues of James besides the Gibbons are on record, a remarkable number for so brief a reign. Only one of these, however, still survives:² a statue which stands on the western gateway, on its southern side, of University College, and which is here reproduced.³

The University College statue of James II, erected in 1686/7, shows him, as in the case of three of his other statues, in Roman dress. Beyond the fact that it came from a London yard, the College paying carriage,⁴ nothing is known of its authorship. We have only style and probability upon which to go. As to probabilities, it should be borne in mind that statues of James by Gibbons and John Bushnell had just been erected. The Oxford statue is certainly not by Gibbons, but its weak points are precisely the weak points of Bushnell commented upon by Vertue when discussing a statue of Alexander the Great by this sculptor: 'the head the most wretched to the neck. the hands ill form'd. the feet crippl'd. as bad as possible cou'd be.'⁵ But the unquestionable vigour and swing of the body and the swirl of the drapery are all equally characteristic of Bushnell, and his *James* on the town hall at

¹ In spite of vigorous protests, the statue was placed in front of the National Gallery. See *The Times* for 28 October, 25, 28, and 29 November, and 6, 8 and 16 December 1947.

² For the four statues no longer extant, consult the Appendix at the end of this article.

³ A small photograph appears in Aymer Vallance's *The Old Colleges of Oxford*, p. xxvi (1912). We are greatly indebted to the Master and Fellows of University College for permission to have the King's statue photographed and to Mr. F. D. Stott who took a photograph on our behalf in 1947 before the statue was cleaned (Pl. VII, A). We are also very grateful to the Master and Fellows for permission to reproduce the photograph taken for the College by Miss Elizabeth Franks in 1949 after the statue was cleaned (Pl. VII, B), and which was reproduced in an illustrated brochure issued to members of the College in connexion with the seventh-centenary celebrations. I (M. R. Toynbee) am further much beholden to the College authorities for allowing me to examine the archives for evidence about the erection of the statue.

⁴ 'For bringing down from London & setting up his Majty's Statue (k James ye 2d) 14.14.11.' This important entry occurs in vol. ix, p. 261 of the Transcripts of William Smith (1651-1735) at University College. The Bursar's Journal for the year 1686-7 from which Smith copied this item (adding the words 'k James ye 2d') is missing, so Mr. Arthur Oswald kindly informs us.

⁵ *Notebooks*, I, 86.

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE STATUE OF JAMES II

Southwark had the cloak disposed in the same fashion and hanging over the left arm. The odd hose emerging from the still odder armour are also typical of Bushnell.

The circumstances attending the gift of the statue of James II to University College are of peculiar interest. The gift constitutes not the least spectacular incident in the vigorous Romanist revival that took place in the College during the years 1686 to 1688, and of which, moreover, it affords the only enduring memorial. The central figure of this revival was the Master, the tragic and somewhat enigmatic Obadiah Walker (1616-99), the full story of whose life has yet to be written. The dramatic sequence of events is well known and need be only briefly recalled. In January 1685/6 Walker was summoned to London by James; in March his conversion (long suspected) was announced, and shortly afterwards he began to have Mass said privately in his Lodgings; in May he, together with three fellows of Oxford colleges (two of them from University), was dispensed by the King from attendance at Anglican prayers, etc.; about the same time he received a licence for printing Roman Catholic works of controversy, the precursor of the propagandist press set up in the College in 1687; and in August a Romanist chapel, the expenses of which were later defrayed by the appropriation of the stipend of a vacant fellowship, was opened there for the public celebration of Mass. The erection of a statue of the 'Papist' James in February 1686/7 was, therefore, no common expression of loyalty to the Crown, but an act of religious significance.

For the only surviving description of the proceedings we are indebted to Anthony Wood, who notes: 'Feb. 7 M., the great ceremony at University College upon the setting up of the king's statua over the gate within the quadrangle. I have a larg accompt elsewhere.'⁶ This 'larg accompt' runs as follows:

1686

Feb. 6 being Sunday the ceremony of the Kings day⁷ could not be well pformd at Univ. coll. according to their mind in setting up the Kings statua over the comon gate, within the quadrangle.

Feb. 7. munday about 10. or eleven the morn, was set up the said statua carved from portland stone. At wch time a partie of horse standing in the street (on hors-back) opposite to y^e comon gate, did upon notice given y^t it was up, discharge each

⁶ *Life and Times*, ed. Andrew Clark, vol. III, p. 209. The 'larg accompt' is contained in Wood MS. D.19 (3), ff. 68 and 68v, in the Bodleian Library. It is printed by Clark, *ibid.*, pp. 209-10. Our transcript reproduces the original with the exception of a few awkward contractions. William Carr, in his *University College*, p. 144 (1902), was mistaken in saying that another account is contained in a letter from Thomas Creech to Arthur Charlett printed in *Letters written by Eminent Persons*, vol. I, p. 46 (1813). This letter is dated 9 September 1687, and refers to the visit of James II to the College: the passage quoted by Carr as coming from it is really an extract from Wood's 'larg accompt'.

⁷ The second anniversary of the accession of James II.

THE LATE K. A. ESDAILE AND M. R. TOYNBEE

his pistoll : wch being done the spectators in the quadrangle, & those in y^e streets gave a great shout. Afterwards as soon as they could charge their pistolls they gave two more, at wch two shouts followed.

Afterwards the quadrangle being emptied, they let in all such officers & others y^t were invited to dinner & being conducted into the comon hall mr Edw. Hales a Gent. com. spake at a desk an eloquent english speech before them, all by hart.

Afterwards the master of the coll. mr Bertie a nobleman of y^t house & the officers sitting at the high table, & all other guests at the other tables, was a most noble feast, all sorts of wine—sack, claret, smyrna. At such time the Univ. music plaid, being their musik day by appointment.

At 7 in the evening were candles set up in all the windows of the cha^{bs} looking in the quadrangle, & in those looking into the street, as also in the chappell windows—three candles in every light—y^t is 6 candles in every window, wch continued burning till 9 at night—musick in the comon cha^b most of the while.⁷

The manner of the celebration is reminiscent of the similar *festa* held at King's Lynn in April of the previous year when the statue of James II there was unveiled.

The accomplished young orator, Edward Hales, to whose 'eloquent english speech' we shall shortly revert, was the eldest of the five sons of Sir Edward Hales, third baronet, of St. Stephen's (Hackington, near Canterbury), Kent, the defendant in the famous case of *Godden v. Hales* (1686). Edward must have been born in 1670, since his parents were married in July 1669 and he himself is described as being fourteen years of age when he matriculated on 4 July 1684. The reasons for choosing him to make the speech are not far to seek. Over and above the facts of his being the heir to a baronetcy and a gentleman commoner in his third year—one, too, clearly gifted with a retentive memory—Edward Hales possessed an outstanding claim to the distinction: he was a Roman Catholic. According to an entry in Evelyn's *Diary* for 5 May 1686, Hales's conversion was due to Obadiah Walker, and Wood hints as much.⁸ As, however, Edward's father had, as will be seen, entertained secret leanings towards the Church of Rome for years before his formal reconciliation in November 1685, it seems probable that the son may have been influenced by that step. Be that as it may, young Hales was certainly a favourite of Walker's. When James II paid his memorable visit to Oxford in September 1687 and was naturally received with acclamation at University College, Hales made another English oration, which the King graciously accepted,⁹ but he was not, as will be noted later, unduly favoured by James in consequence. The same month Edward went into France with his tutor. He was evidently

⁸ *Life and Times*, vol. III, pp. 213 and 214.

⁹ Wood MS. D.19 (3) f. 85v, and *Life and Times*, vol. III, p. 233. The text of the speech is preserved in Wood 423 (63) which is a printed sheet inscribed in Wood's hand 'published at Lond. 14. Sept.'. The speech lauds James's religious policy and stresses the part played therein by University College.

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE STATUE OF JAMES II

an outspoken youth with the courage of his convictions : he used to tell Wood that the latter was a 'trimmer'.¹⁰ When his father was created Earl of Tenterden by James in May 1692, Edward was described in the patent as 'a youth, by the brightness of his wit, the politeness of his manners, the greatness of his mind, very dear to us', and as having been 'killed in Ireland, at the battle of the Boyne, as he was courageously fighting against the enemy'.¹¹ Hearne noted his death in similar terms.¹² His portrait by an unknown artist hangs in the hall of University College.¹³

We now come to the important and interesting question of the identity of the donor of the statue of James II, a question concerning which needless uncertainty has been expressed by some modern writers, as for example the late Mrs. R. L. Poole.¹⁴ Whether or not the donor wished to stay temporarily anonymous, the fact remains that Edward Hales did not reveal the name in his speech of 7 February 1686/7. 'I shall conclude,' he said, 'with our humble thanks in the nae of the college & all good subjects to y^t worthie pson, who by his exeplary generositie towards the nurse of his youth in bestowing upon us this durable representation of our prince, hath occasion'd this present & joyfull assemblie'.¹⁵ By way of explanation, Wood wrote in the margin 'S^r Edw. Hales B^t, father to'. It is this gloss which has been the source of the doubt, which even the authorities of University College themselves have only now resolved.

Wood was an eye-witness of the events which he relates as occurring on 7 February 1686/7, and, as we have seen, was personally acquainted with young Hales. Yet quite apart from the unlikelihood of a son referring to his father in such a detached fashion, only a small amount of investigation is needed to prove Wood's gloss to be wrong. The donor of the statue was showing 'generositie towards the nurse of his youth': therefore he must have been educated at University College. But reference to Foster's *Alumni Oxonienses*

¹⁰ *Life and Times*, vol. III, p. 214.

¹¹ William Betham, *The Baronetage of England*, vol. I, p. 133 (1801). We owe this reference to the kindness of Mr. Clifford Smith.

¹² *Collections*, vol. II, p. 143.

¹³ See Mrs. R. L. Poole, *Catalogue of Oxford Portraits*, vol. II, p. 4. For a discussion of the 'Hales Family Group' by Lely, which, after passing from the possession of the Hales family, was acquired by Sir Charles Cheers (afterwards Viscount Wakefield and is now the property of the Corporation of London, see C. H. Collins Baker, *Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters*, vol. I, pp. 152-3, and C. Reginald Grundy in the *Connoisseur*, September 1916, pp. 12-14. I (M. R. Toynbee) am of the opinion that the painting represents the second baronet, his wife, and family, and that accordingly the traditional identification of the eldest boy there portrayed, as Edward Hales, son of the third baronet, is wrong. My view is supported by R. B. Beckett in his *Lely* (1951), who assigns the group to c. 1656 (Catalogue, p. 47).

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, loc. cit., note 2.

¹⁵ We have much cause to be grateful to Wood who alone has preserved this speech for us. See Wood MS. D.19 (2), ff. 53 and 54v, and Wood MS. D.19 (3) where f. 54 of D.19 (2) has become inserted between ff. 33 and 34. Printed in *Life and Times*, vol. III, pp. 210-12.

THE LATE K. A. ESDAILE AND M. R. TOYNBEE

shows that the third baronet was not only not a member of University, but that he was never at Oxford at all. The author of the article on Hales in the *Dictionary of National Biography* in stating that he was educated at Oxford, relied upon the misleading passage in Dodd's *Church History of England* (1742)¹⁶ which runs as follows: 'Sir Edward Hales . . . was educated in the university of Oxford, under the inspection of Obadiah Walker: who from the beginning gave him a favourable *Idea* of the Catholick religion, which he cherish'd in private, till the reign of King James II.' Now Dodd had access to original papers connected with Hales, and it seems probable, therefore, that his statement is based upon a misconception and is not wholly erroneous. Walker, who had been ejected from his fellowship at University College in 1648, and had eked out a living during the Interregnum by acting as a private tutor, largely abroad, was reinstated in his position at the Restoration, but soon afterwards (according to Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*)¹⁷ 'he travelled again with certain young gentlemen'. He enjoyed almost continuous leave of absence from the College between August 1661, and about the middle of 1665.¹⁸ It may well be that at some point during the period Walker acted as tutor to Sir Edward Hales (who was born c. 1645, and succeeded to the baronetcy in 1660), though not at Oxford. It is significant that whereas Sir Edward's father had been a Magdalen man, two of the third baronet's younger brothers, John and Charles Hales, matriculated at University College in 1664 and 1668 respectively, and that he sent his own eldest son there: a previous connexion with Walker might well account for the choice.

It is a remarkable fact that all the while incontrovertible but neglected contemporary evidence has existed at University College regarding the real donor of James II's statue, evidence which has not been cited even by those scholars who, like the late Aymer Vallance¹⁹ and Mr. Clifford Smith,²⁰ have identified him correctly. We are indebted to another Oxford antiquary, Hearne, for the rediscovery of this piece of evidence. Both Andrew Clark and Mrs. Poole refer to Hearne's statement on 25 October 1708, printed in the *Collections*,²¹ that the statue was 'set up wholly at y^e charge of M^r. W^m. Rogers a very honest Roman Catholick of Gloucestersh. who was once of this College [i.e. University], & has always had a most gratefull Respect to that Society'. This entry, however, does not stand alone. On 17 October 1706, Hearne has another note about Rogers: 'M^r. William Rogers of Gloucestershire (the same

¹⁶ Vol. III, p. 451.

¹⁷ Vol. IV, p. 438, ed. Philip Bliss (1820). See also Walker's own statement in a letter of 1675 preserved in Smith's Transcripts, vol. X, p. 198.

¹⁸ University College Register, vol. I, pp. 79-83.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 14.

²⁰ Unpublished Catalogue of Plate of University College, Oxford (1943).

²¹ Vol. II, p. 143.

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE STATUE OF JAMES II

Rogers who put up y^e Statue of King *James* over the Gate of University College);²² and again, on 10 November 1724, he is alluded to as 'honest Will. Rogers' who 'put up the good Statue to K. James IId at Univ. Coll.'. ²³ But most important of all, on 13 December 1709, Hearne gives a list of benefactors to University derived from 'a Copy that was taken from the original in y^e Possession of the Master of this Royal College'.²⁴ This volume is deposited in the Master's Lodgings and contains the following conclusive entry:

'GULIELMUS ROGERSIUS de Panswick [sic] in Agro Glocestriae, hujus Collegii olim Commensalis, ultra quod Bibliothecae contulit Jacobi II. Regis Angliae &c. Statuam Lapideam proprii [s] Sumptibus Erexit A.D. MDCLXXXVII.'²⁵

Strangely enough all the information vouchsafed by the College antiquary William Smith (who became a fellow in 1675 and must, therefore, have been well acquainted with the facts), in his *Annals of University College* (1728),²⁶ is the statement that the 'statue was presented to us by a Roman Catholick'. Here Smith's religious and political prejudices seem to have got the better of his antiquarian zeal. It is also strange that Wood who, like Hearne,²⁷ was personally acquainted with Rogers, should have fallen into error regarding his friend's gift. On the other hand, it is interesting to record that a tribute to Rogers was paid by the loyal Cambridge antiquary Joshua Barnes (1654-1712), who became professor of Greek in his university in 1695.²⁸ Under date 17 July 1706 Hearne notes: 'Other extempore verses by M^r. Barnes. . . . In *Gulielm. Rogerium* qui *Jacobi II* statuam posuit Coll. *Universitat*. [Greek hexameters].'²⁹

What then do we know about 'honest Will. Rogers'? Quite a substantial amount, though we should like to know even more. He was son and heir of William Rogers, of Painswick, and he matriculated from University College on

²² *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 295.

²³ *Ibid.*, vol. viii, p. 293.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 325-6. We owe this reference to Mr. Oswald.

²⁵ f. 49. This handsome volume of general benefactions, the last entry in which is dated 1695, is preserved in the Browne Library in the Master's Lodgings, together with two similar books, one of benefactions to the College library (bearing date 1674 and having a chain attached) and the other of gifts of plate, or money in lieu of plate, from 1610 to 1733. By courtesy of the former Master, I (M. R. Toynbee) was allowed to consult these invaluable manuscripts which contain, *inter alia*, several entries relating to members of the Hales family, one of which has settled beyond dispute the identity of the donor of an almsdish dated 1674. The re-emergence of these volumes, after lying for long disregarded, is a matter for congratulation.

²⁶ Pp. 259-60.

²⁷ *Collections*, vol. i, p. 323. 'M^r. Will. Rogers, . . . formerly of University College, afterwards a zealous Roman Catholick, tells me . . .'

²⁸ *His Life of Edward III* (1688) was dedicated and personally presented to James II.

²⁹ *Collections*, vol. i, p. 273. It has not been possible to trace this poem: it does not appear to be among the Barnes MSS. at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where permission to search was kindly given by Professor Norman Sykes.

THE LATE K. A. ESDAILE AND M. R. TOYNBEE

3 June 1663 at the age of sixteen, so that he must have been born *c.* 1647. On 19 May 1666 he was admitted to Lincoln's Inn,³⁰ and he was called to the bar on 24 April 1673:³¹ from the frequent references made to him by Wood there is every reason to suppose that he practised in London. At what moment Rogers declared himself a Roman Catholic is unknown;³² he was apparently not sufficiently important to find a place in Dodd's *Church History*. But it is probable that at University he came under the influence of Abraham Woodhead (1609-78), with whose works it is clear that he was closely acquainted, and of Obadiah Walker. When James II visited Oxford in September 1687, Rogers was with him. Wood (who was absent at the time) records: 'Afterwards going out of the convocation house into the Apoditeriu, mr Will. Rogers one of his retinew said Sr this convocation house is the place where they conferr degrees, &, Sir, I hope you will let mr Hales who stood behind him (son of Sr Edw. Hales) be created m. of A. No No saith the k. not yet—time enough for y^t.'³³ It is odd that in this instance Wood should have prefixed the formal 'Mr.' to his friend's name, but there can be little doubt of the identity of the Rogers in question, especially in view of his interest in young Hales. There is also good cause to believe that the 'Mr. Rogers' who in September 1689 visited prisoners in the Tower (one of them was Charles Hales, who was lodged there together with his eldest brother and Walker after the Revolution) was our William Rogers.³⁴ It has not been possible to discover the exact date of his death, but it had taken place by 27 August 1730, for on that day Hearne refers to 'Old Will. Rogers of Gloucestershire (now dead)'.³⁵

That Rogers was a man of cultured and varied interests is shown by the list of manuscripts and printed books which he presented to his old college in 1670 when he was still a student at Lincoln's Inn:

'GULIELM^s ROGERS de Panswick [*sic*] in Agro Glocestrensi nuper Collegij hujus Commensalis, jam vero in hospitio Lincolniensi Juri patrio studens dedit, MDCLXX.'³⁶

Theology and ecclesiastical history preponderate; it is perhaps worth noting that Rogers owned a mutilated manuscript Missal of the Use of Hereford as

³⁰ *Records of the Honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn*, vol. 1, *Admissions*, p. 297.

³¹ *The Black Books*, vol. III, p. 88.

³² He was required to receive the Sacrament in Lincoln's Inn chapel before publication in 1673, and there is no record of his having refused to do so.

³³ Wood MS. D.19 (3), f. 91. Printed in *Life and Times*, vol. III, pp. 238-9.

³⁴ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1689-1690, pp. 241-2.

³⁵ *Collections*, vol. X, p. 323.

³⁶ MS. book of benefactions to University College library.

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE STATUE OF JAMES II

early as 1668.³⁷ But the presence of Evelyn's *Parallel of Architecture* and Inigo Jones's *Stonehenge* among the printed books is indicative of other tastes.

So much for the donor of the statue: there remains the problem of the inscription. To-day the King's figure is left to speak for itself—there is no inscription: but that this was not originally the case we know from Hearne. On 17 October 1706 (in a passage already noted in another context), he speaks of the statue, 'which they neglect at present, the Inscription under being worn almost out'. Further, on 10 November 1724 (in another entry previously quoted), when writing of the annual speech delivered at Oxford in honour of Sir Thomas Bodley, Hearne records that the speaker mentioned the 'Statue of the Earl of Clarendon at the new Printing House (which Statue is a very poor one) and took occasion to commend the Duke of Brunswick, commonly called K. George, for founding the Lecture of modern History and modern Languages. . . . Mr Haslam, I am told, stiled the Duke *optimus princeps*, a Title condemn'd in honest Will. Rogers, when he put up the good Statue to K. James II'd at Univ. Coll. & the word *optimus* was ordered to be erased'. The neglected condition of the inscription and the erasure of the word *optimus* were obviously due to the political changes which occurred at the Revolution. But it is clear that even in 1686/7 the erection of the statue had not been popular with all the fellows of University College, for Smith complains in his *Annals*:³⁸ 'And after . . . the charges the Society was at in putting up the Statue of King James the 2d . . . Mr. Walker that had the King's Ear, and entertain'd him at *Vespers* in their Chapel, and shewed the King the painted Windows in our own; so that the King could not but see his own Statue in coming out of it, never had the Prudence nor Kindness to the COLLEGE, as to request the least Favour to the Society from him.'

In studying the statue as we see it now the attention is arrested by two puzzling features which call for explanation. The first is that fact that the figure of James not only rests upon a fresh-looking stone (a fragment of what appears to be the top of the original pedestal remains to the side) but is also mounted upon a tall and clumsy block of newish-looking stone, behind the base of which protrude on either side the ends of a narrow horizontal stone of the same texture as itself. This tall block has never borne lettering, and must at some time have replaced the original pedestal, which one presumes carried the inscription: considerations of proportion demand a pedestal, since the statue is far too short for the very high niche in which it stands. The second

³⁷ No. LXXXVIII A. For this and the other MSS. given by Rogers see H.O. Coxe, *Catalogue of Oxford College MSS.*, Part I (1852), and R. W. Hunt, 'The Manuscript Collection of University College, Oxford' in *The Bodleian Library Record*, vol. III, no. 29, January 1950.

³⁸ Pp. 259-60.

THE LATE K. A. ESDAILE AND M. R. TOYNBEE

odd feature is the empty tablet below the niche : this must at some date have been cut for an inscription, but there is no sign that letters have ever been carved upon it : why it was left bare remains a mystery.

The large block may have been *in situ* in 1786, for possibly it was this which in that year excited the curiosity of a contributor to the *Gentleman's Magazine* under the signature of Bexleyensis. He writes : 'Over the gateway within side the old quadrangle, between the windows of the undergraduates' library, is a good statue of King *James II.* The inscription beneath it, probably written by Obadiah Walker, is now concealed by a flat stone, which was placed before it on the accession of King *William* to the throne.'³⁹ Unfortunately for the theory of Bexleyensis, the notion that the inscription was covered up after the Revolution does not tally with Hearne's explicit statement about its neglected condition in 1706 : nor would a solid block have been necessary for such a purpose. The composition of the inscription seems to have been due not to Walker, but to Rogers.

In conclusion, the writers of this article venture to suggest that it would be a graceful and grateful act on the part of the Master and Fellows of University College (which in 1949 celebrated the seven hundredth anniversary of its endowment by William of Durham) to place an inscription on the empty tablet recording the name of King *James II.*, the date of the gift, and the identity of the giver—surely worthy of public commemoration—'honest Will. Rogers'.

APPENDIX

LOST STATUES OF JAMES II

A. GRINLING GIBBONS. THE ROYAL EXCHANGE

By an order of the Court of Aldermen dated 11 November 1684,⁴⁰ twenty of the City Companies which had not yet promised Royal statues for the new Exchange to replace those destroyed in the Great Fire, were recommended to do so. Third on the list comes the Merchant Taylors' Company which appears to have taken no steps in the matter when Charles II died on 6 February 1684/5. Three days after this event, however, we find recorded in the Company's Minutes :

'This Court takeing in consideration what Kings Statue should be Sett up by this Company on the Royal Exchange Doth thinke fitt and soe Order that the Statue of the p'sent King James the Second be sett up by this Company in regard he is a Member of this Society.'⁴¹

³⁹ Vol. 1, p. 7. Mrs. Poole gives the reference, but the page is misprinted as 67.

⁴⁰ Repertory 90, ff. 3v-4.

⁴¹ Court Book, vol. xii, 1679-88, f. 308. Our thanks are due to the Clerk for permission to examine this book and to quote the extracts relating to the statue. By a slip I (K. A. Esdaile) stated in *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. LXXXIX, p. 254, that the statue was set up by the Armourers' Company.

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE STATUE OF JAMES II

The usual deputation was appointed to attend the Court of Aldermen in order to prefer the Company's request, a request recorded as having been granted by the Court on 12 February.⁴² By 20 February a committee had been appointed by the Company to find a sculptor,⁴³ but as late as 4 June nothing had been settled except that the King's figure was to be 'in Armour'. Between June and December Gibbons was chosen to do the work: he had already that year completed three other statues on the Exchange; the *James I* for the Clothworkers, the *Mary I* for the Mercers, and the *Edward VI* for the Drapers. His *James II* did not advance quickly. On 16 December:

'It is ordered and two of the Wardens are desired to goe and see what forwardnesse Mr. Gibbons is in who is to make his p'sent Ma:ties Statue and to hasten him therein.'⁴⁴

Not until 12 March 1685/6 do we find, after Gibbons had been ordered, on 1 March, to attend the next Court of Assistants:

'Ordered & the Master so desires to Mr. Gibbons 40^{ll} in full for erecting and guilding his p'sent Maj:ties Statue upon the Exchange & this to be our Master's discharge for soe doing.'⁴⁵

It may be noted that Gibbons received £50 apiece for his other three Exchange statues.

Probably the earliest reference to this statue of James II is that in Edward Chamberlayne's *Angliae Notitia* for 1687: speaking of the Exchange he writes: 'And lately is erected the Statue of the King now reigning *James the Second*.'⁴⁶ In the phrase employed by Edward Hatton in his *New View of London* (1708), the King was 'habited like a *Roman Caesar*',⁴⁷ a new departure for the Exchange. Thomas Allen in his *History and Antiquities of the City of London* (1828) describes the *James II* as being 'in Roman costume, cuirass, and mantle; in right hand a truncheon, left on the hilt of the sword; a wreath of laurel round the temples'.⁴⁸ Fortunately there is a sketch of the statue by John Carter (1790) in the possession of the Royal Exchange Assurance Company: from this it appears to have been not unlike, though stiffer than, the famous Gibbons statue of the King, which was finished by the end of 1686.⁴⁹

The niche occupied by the *James II* was the most easternly on the northern side. After the second Exchange was destroyed by fire in January 1838, several of the statues were sold by order of the Gresham Committee on 29 August of that year.

⁴² Repertory 90, f. 47-47v.

⁴³ Court Book, vol. xii, f. 309.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 337.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 346.

⁴⁶ P. 394.

⁴⁷ Vol. II, p. 615.

⁴⁸ Vol. III, p. 458.

⁴⁹ In the summer of 1948 a bronze statuette of a figure dressed as a Roman emperor, laureate, with cloak and cuirass, was purchased by the Victoria and Albert Museum, the authorities of which have identified it as James II, but not as the work of Gibbons. In any case it could not be the model for the Exchange statue, for whereas in the latter the King held a truncheon in his right hand, while the left rested on the hilt of his sword, in the statuette the right hand clutches a fold of the cloak upon the breast and the empty left hand is extended. After examining the statuette I (M. R. Toynbee) must confess to grave doubts as to the correctness of the identification.

THE LATE K. A. ESDAILE AND M. R. TOYNBEE

The *James II* appears as Lot 41 in the catalogue issued by Joseph Pullen and Son (Guildhall Library Pamphlet 1620), but the price given for it is not among those recorded by the *Gentleman's Magazine* and the *Annual Register*. Its ultimate fate is unknown.

B. JOHN BUSHNELL. OLD TOWN HALL, SOUTHWARK

This statue (under its true identity) appears altogether to have escaped the notice of modern investigators. In Hatton's *New View* there occurs this entry in his list of London statues :

'JAMES II. on the S. side of the Sess. House *Southwark* : It is finely cut in Stone, represented in his Royal Habiliments with a Sceptre in his Right Hand (but no other part of the Regalia, standing erect in a beautiful Nich adorned with Columns, Entablature, &c, of the Corinthian Order.'⁵⁰

The building accounts of the old town hall at Southwark are contained in the Bridge House estates records preserved in the Records Office of the Corporation of London.⁵¹ From these documents it has been possible to recover the complete story of the erection of the statue.

The previous town hall (or court house) at Southwark was burned down in 1676, but it seems that it was not until September 1683, that its rebuilding was considered.⁵² Even then the scheme remained in abeyance until April 1685.⁵³ On 8 October of that year we get the first mention of a projected statue of King James.

'It is thought fitt and ordered by this Court [i.e. the Court of Aldermen], that the statue of his Ma:^{tie} shall bee set up on the Courthouse now building on St. Margetts hill in the Borough of Southworke And it is Recommended to the Committee for letting the Bridghouse lands to take care that the same be performed And it is Ordered that the charge thereof be paid out of the Bridghouse. And the Clerck of the Bridg-house to attend the said Committee at their Meeting on Wednesday next, and give them Notice of this order.'⁵⁴

On 21 October the order of the Court of Aldermen was referred to the Committee of Bridge House Lands and it was agreed : 'The Neece for y^e Statue to stand in to be agreed for wth the Mason.'⁵⁵ On 22 October :

'This Court [i.e. the Court of Aldermen] did now agree to a Modell here presented of the stonework (called a Neece) to be set in the ffront of the Courthouse on St Margetts hill in Southwarke whereon is to be placed his Ma:^{ties} statue directed by a late Order of this Court. And it was now agreed between this Court and Wise the Bridghouse Mason that he performing the same

⁵⁰ Vol. II, p. 801.

⁵¹ We are much indebted to the Guildhall Librarian, Mr. Raymond Smith, for this information. Mr. Smith found the entry relating to the sculptor of the statue before we examined the relevant documents.

⁵² Journal of the Bridge House Committee, vol. 3, f. 34.

⁵³ Bridge House Committee Papers 1684-1700. Committee business for Bridge=house lands 8^o April 85.

⁵⁴ Repertory 90, f. 142v.

⁵⁵ Bridge House Committee Papers. Committee Buisnesse 21^o Oct. 1685.

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE STATUE OF JAMES II

well and substantially according to the said Modell should have for the same the sume of fifty Pounds.⁵⁶

At a meeting of the Committee of Bridge House Lands held on 4 November, a big step forward was taken when the names of possible sculptors for the statue came under review :

‘ Ordered that M^r Bushnall M^r Peirce & M^r Coleine [i.e. Quellin] bee sent to, to meet ye Committee abt setting up the Kings Statue on St Margaretts Hill.⁵⁷

By 18 November Quellin had evidently been ruled out, for on that day, under the heading of ‘ Comittee Buisnesse ’, we find :

‘ M ^r Bushnall & M ^r Peirce	}	The King’s Statue for St. Margaretts Hill. ⁵⁸
---------------------------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------------------------------

The upshot of the meeting’s deliberations was that :

‘ It is wholly referred to S^r Peter Daniel and S^r Peter Rich to treat and agree wth whom they shall thinke fitt for y^e Kings Statue to bee sett up in y^e front of y^e Court=house on St Margaretts Hill.⁵⁹

The choice of Daniel and Rich fell upon Bushnell as we learn from their certificate ‘ touching severall matters to them referred ’ dated 10 February 1685/6 :

‘ That M^r Bushnell bring a draft of such a statue as hee intends to make for St. Margaretts hill by this day seavenight for the Comittee to agree upon hee agreeing to referr the price or value of it to the Comittee when it is done.⁶⁰

On 12 March the Committee ordered this report to be confirmed.⁶¹

Nothing more is heard of the statue until it was finished three months later. Among the Bridge House signed receipts occurs the following entry :

‘ Order—Recd 10 th of June 1686 of the said Bridge Masters by the hands of M ^r Philip Oddy the sume of four-score pounds in full payment for the King’s Statue at the front of the Courthouse on St Margaretts hill in Southwarke in pursuance of an Order from S ^r Peter Daniel and S ^r Peter Rich beareing date the 9th day of June instant I say recd the said sume	}	80 00 00
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	----------

ϕ John Bushnell.⁶²

Among the Orders of Court contained in ‘ The Rentall of all the Rents . . . belonging to London Bridge for one yeare ending Mich Anno Dmi 1686 . . . ’ occurs the entry :

‘ Paid June the 12th to M^r Bushnall in full for makeing the King’s Statue at St. Margaretts Hill by Order of the Comittee o80 : 00 : 00.⁶³

⁵⁶ Repertory 90, f. 150v.

⁵⁷ Journal, vol. 3, f. 61.

⁵⁸ Bridge House Committee Papers 18^o November 1685.

⁵⁹ Journal, vol. 3, f. 62.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, f. 76.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, f. 77.

⁶² Vol. 6, f. 216.

⁶³ There is no pagination, but it is actually the nineteenth folio.

THE LATE K. A. ESDAILE AND M. R. TOYNBEE

The figure of James II remained *in situ* for just over a hundred years, that is until 1793, when the town hall erected in 1685-6 was demolished. The statue was then removed and set up by some private individuals upon a pedestal of brick and stonework, containing a watch-box in the centre of Three Crown Court in the Borough High Street.⁶⁴ In 1833 the figure was again removed, and in April 1834, was standing in a garden in St. George's Road, Kent Road.⁶⁵ At the time of its original removal, and subsequently, it was known as Charles II,⁶⁶ although the references in the documents of 1685 and 1686 to 'his Ma:^{tie}', and 'y^e King' make it abundantly clear that Hatton (as also Aubrey in his *Natural History and Antiquities of Surrey*) was correct in calling it James II. The ultimate fate of this statue is also unknown. All that can be recorded is that:

'The statue. . . later was found in a field near Hayes in Middlesex. It was purchased by some Kensington dealer, and when he proceeded to remove it he was surprised to find a solemn crowd and a watchful lawyer in attendance. There was a local legend that underneath a treasure of gold lay hidden. The present whereabouts of the statue, seen by Wilfrid Whitten in Kensington in 1915, is unknown.'⁶⁷

Unfortunately, the only extant engraving of the Southwark town hall of 1686 is a late one,⁶⁸ and it is impossible to be sure how accurately the costume of the figure, there seen standing in its niche, is rendered. The King wears a wig and a large falling lace collar, the Greater George collar, a cloak, which is thrown across in front and draped over the left arm, long hose, and buckled shoes: the sceptre mentioned by Hatton is wanting. The interesting point to notice is that James was represented at Southwark in Royal robes.

C. UNKNOWN SCULPTOR. KING'S LYNN

This statue is also in need of being rescued from oblivion. In Vertue's *Notebooks* there occurs the following jotting among the passages dealing with his tour of the East of England in 1739:

'at Lynn a very large market Place the statue of King James 2^d standing on a Pedestal—King Charles 2^d at the Custom House Key King Charles I in Kingstoffer yard.'⁶⁹

Benjamin Mackerell's *History and Antiquities . . . of King's Lynn* (1738) contains a detailed narrative of the circumstances attending the erection of the statue.

'An Account of King JAMES the II^d's Statue and the Rejoycings at the Setting up the Statue of him in the Market.

⁶⁴ See the account in M. Concanen and A. Morgan's *History and Antiquities of the Parish of St. Saviour's, Southwark*, pp. 62-70 (1795). This account was used by O. Manning and W. Bray in their *History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey*, vol. III, pp. 550-1 (1814).

⁶⁵ Robert Wilkinson, *Londina Illustrata*, vol. II (re-issue c. 1835).

⁶⁶ Concanen and Morgan describe it as a 'pedestrian statue of Charles II'. Manning and Bray, while adopting 'Charles II' in the text, express doubt in a note: 'Qu. James II?'

⁶⁷ This account, taken from his *Encyclopaedia of London*, p. 463 (1937), was sent by Mr. William Kent to *The Times Literary Supplement*, 2 October 1948, in reply to a letter of inquiry from the present writers. Mr. Kent had been under the impression that the statue represented Charles II.

⁶⁸ It is by Dale after Ravenhill and was published by Wilkinson in 1825. By courtesy of the Chief Librarian and Curator of the Southwark Central Library and Cuming Museum, Mr. F. Helliwell, we have been allowed to consult a copy.

⁶⁹ v, 122.

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE STATUE OF JAMES II

On the 13th [*sic*] Day of April, 1686 which was the Anniversary of their Majesties Coronations the same was kept with all due Solemnity ; the Mayor, Aldermen, and the rest of the Body, meeting in their Formalities in the *Guildhall*, after Divine Service at the Church, proceeded from thence, attended with Musick, to the Great Market-Place ; in the Middle whereof, by the Gentlemen, and other Loyal Inhabitants of the Corporation, was then erected the Effigies of his Sacred Majesty upon a Pedestal, with several Carvings and Embellishments, inclosed with a Pallisade of Iron, under it thus inscribed,

*Non Immemor
Quantum Divinis Invictiss. Principis
JACOBI II
Virtutibus debeat
Hanc Regiae Majestatis Effigiem
Æternum Fidei & Obsequii
Monumentum, Erexit
S.P.Q.L.
Anno Salutis 1686.*

A translation of the inscription follows, and then we learn :

'*N.B.* The King, Queen, and the rest of the Royal Family's Healths were drank ; and the Day was concluded with Ringing of Bells, Bonfires, all Sorts of loud Musick, Fireworks, discharging the Great Guns, with all other Demonstrations of Joy and Loyalty.'⁷⁰

Unfortunately the borough records are silent about the sculptor of the statue and the amount paid to him. The only references are the following entries in the Corporation Hall Book No. 10 :

'19th April, 1686. On Friday next being the anniversary day of His Majesty's Coronation. A statue the effigy of his sacred Majesty being that day intended to be set up in the Market place at the comon charge of many of the Loyal Inhabitants of this Burgh. Order the said day be solomnized with ringing bells, this house here meeting in their formalities to attend divine service and from thence with the town music to the uncovering of the said statue and the day to be ended with bonfires and fireworks.

'Friday, 1st March, 1689. Order publication be made of 40s reward to any person that shall make discovery of the disorderly persons that of late broke the statue in the market place.'⁷¹

The absence of any record of payment to the sculptor in the Corporation books suggests that the matter was transacted by a private individual. A possible clue to the identity of the artist does, however, occur to me (K. A. Esdaile). The statue of Charles II on the Custom House mentioned by Vertue was the gift in 1683 of Alderman Sir John Turner. From the similarity of the style of this *Charles II* with that of the work of Caius Gabriel Cibber (the likeness between the shield of arms below the statue and the one which Cibber executed for the Steelyard, the headquarters of the Hanseatic League in London, now in the Guildhall Museum, should

⁷⁰ Pp. 253-4.

⁷¹ We are greatly indebted to the Town Clerk of Lynn, Mr. Frank Reeves, for help most readily given, and for permission to quote these extracts, which he has had transcribed for us.

THE LATE K. A. ESDAILE AND M. R. TOYNBEE

be particularly noticed), I would suggest that it may be by Cibber. Moreover, we know from a letter preserved among the Rutland MSS. that Cibber visited Lynn in 1682 in connexion with the Rutland monuments upon which he was engaged for Bottesford Church. It seems not unlikely that the sculptor employed by Turner would also have been employed by the gentlemen of Lynn: so that if Cibber did indeed do the *Charles II*, he may likewise have been responsible for the *James II*.

Judging by the tiny representation of the statue which occurs in William Rastrick's map of Lynn (1725),⁷² James was portrayed as a Roman soldier: a baton is clearly visible. The market cross (1710) before which it stood was taken down in 1831, about which time a new market house was built on the site of the neighbouring Angel Inn. It seems probable that the statue was removed at this date, but no record appears to exist of this or of what became of it: it may possibly be lurking somewhere in Lynn or its vicinity even now for it is hard to believe that it was deliberately destroyed.⁷³ To-day the *James II* is confused with the statue of Charles I which Vertue noted in 1739:⁷⁴ this stands in a niche on the front of the House of Excise in King Staithe Square, and is described as *James I* in some histories of Lynn: hence, perhaps, the mistake.

D. WILLIAM LARSON. NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE

The last statue of James II to be erected was this fine equestrian one 'in moderne Habitt' which was set up in August or September 1688. The sculptor, Larson, was the artist whom Pepys visited in 1668/9 to have his face cast. Unhappily, it was pulled down in May 1689, thus encountering a worse fate than the Lynn statue, which can have been only partially damaged. Representations of the Newcastle statue, including a bronze statuette, are in existence.⁷⁵

⁷² A copy of this map is prefixed to Charles Parkin's *Topography of Freebridge Hundred and Half* . . . (1762). Frank Goodwin made a drawing in 1814, which is said to show the market cross and its attendant buildings and which would presumably depict the statue.

⁷³ Mr. Reeves has unsuccessfully attempted to obtain information on the subject through the local press.

⁷⁴ This appears to be a post-Restoration figure, and was possibly erected when the building, then the Custom House, was 'beautified' in 1667.

⁷⁵ See K. A. Esdaile, 'Pepys's Plaisterer' in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 2 October 1943, and two articles by M. R. Toynbee, 'A Statuette of James II' in *Country Life*, 29 September 1950, and 'Fresh Light on William Larson's Statue of James II at Newcastle-upon-Tyne' in *Archæologia Aeliana*, 4th series, vol. XXIX, pp. 108-17 (1951).



A



B

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

Statue of James II on south side of western gateway.

*Phh.: F. D. Stott and
Elizabeth Franks*