The Banqueting House, Whitehall

C. A. Hereshoff Bartlett Esq., LL.B.

To cite this article: C. A. Hereshoff Bartlett Esq., LL.B. (1893) The Banqueting House, Whitehall, Royal United Services Institution. Journal, 37:187, 967-988, DOI: [10.1080/03071849309416928](https://doi.org/10.1080/03071849309416928)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03071849309416928>

Published online: 11 Sep 2009.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 11

View related articles [↗](#)

Friday, May 12, 1893.

GENERAL G. ERSKINE (Chairman of Council) in the Chair.

THE BANQUETING HOUSE, WHITEHALL.

By C. A. HERESHOFF BARTLETT, Esq., LL.B.

THERE are few places in London so intimately associated with the names of great men and with many of the important incidents in their lives as the building standing in Parliament Street, diagonally opposite the Horse Guards, and known as the Banqueting House. Its graceful proportions and perfect construction are living evidences of the skill and thoroughness of its designer and builders.

On this spot, prior to 1619, there stood a wooden structure, known also as the Banqueting House. It had been the scene of many festivities and Royal pageants. It was falling into ruin when, on Tuesday, January 12, 1619, the building caught fire, and in an hour it was entirely consumed. Meanwhile, the crowd which had gathered broke into the rooms of the palace (finding their way into the King's and Princes' lodgings), tore down the hangings, and actually stole the bed on which the King was accustomed to lie.

James I resolved on the immediate erection of a new Banqueting House on the same site. The City offered to rebuild it, but the offer was graciously declined by the King. Inigo Jones was entrusted with the preparation of estimates for the erection of the new building, and in April, 1619, he furnished an estimate for the work amounting to 9,850*l*.

The elaborate design for a new palace at Whitehall, on which Inigo Jones displayed the genius of a master mind, has become historic. The beautiful proportions and grandeur of the undertaking are preserved in the plans still to be seen at the British Museum, Windsor Castle, and at Oxford. The initial step was to be the building of that portion of the stately pile known as the Banqueting House, and in the west view of the original plans of the new palace the part erected is easily distinguished. Unfortunately for the architectural beauty of London, this great design was never carried out. The money to complete the work was not available. The times were full of intestine strife, and the reigning monarch was too often at war with his own Parliament to be able to raise the money necessary for such an undertaking.

The first stone of the new Banqueting House was laid June 1, 1619, and on March 31, 1622, the building was completed, at a cost of

14,940*l.* 4*s.* 1*d.* The stone used was quarried on the Isle of Portland, county Dorset.

The Exchequer was frequently exhausted, and it was not uncommon to replenish the State coffers by means of forced exactions and outrageous fines imposed on officials and others, under the pretence of offences committed against the Crown. When the Banqueting House was begun there was little ready money on hand. The Exchequer was empty, and if it had not been for a melancholy scandal at Court it is questionable if the money requisite for carrying on the work would have been forthcoming, and whether the building would have been erected. There had been a bitter quarrel between Frances, second wife of Thomas, Earl of Exeter—a lady of great virtue—and Lady Lake, wife of Sir Thomas Lake, and her eldest daughter, wife of Lord Roos. The cause of the quarrel does not satisfactorily appear, but Lady Lake and Lady Roos did not hesitate to accuse the Countess of the most disgraceful crimes. These accusations threw the Court into a perfect uproar of excitement, in consequence of which His Majesty sent for the Countess. In the most pitiable manner she protested her innocence before the King. To offset this denial, Lady Lake and her daughter deliberately forged what purported to be a written confession of guilt on the part of the Countess of Exeter, and, gradually becoming more deeply involved in the plot, they perpetrated one forgery after another, until the King became suspicious and personally investigated the charges. These he soon found to be nothing but fabrication. He valued Sir Thomas Lake as an old friend and trusted servant, so he besought him not to embark in the quarrel, which in no way reflected on him, but to leave his wife and daughter to the law. Sir Thomas, however, always a man of high character and honour, excused himself from following His Majesty's advice, and, declaring that "he could not refuse to be a husband and a father," put his name with theirs to a cross bill in the Star Chamber. The King presided in person during the five days occupied in the trial. Lady Roos in the midst of the trial made a complete confession of the entire plot, which resulted in her getting off free; but Lake and his wife were sentenced to pay a fine of 10,000*l.* to the King, and 5,000*l.* damages to the Countess of Exeter, and to be imprisoned during His Majesty's pleasure. It was the payment of half of this fine that replenished the empty Exchequer and enabled the officials to appropriate 1,000*l.* towards the building of the Banqueting House. Thomas Locke, writing to Sir Dudley Carlton, June 9, 1619, says: "There is no money in the Treasury. Sir Thomas Lake hath paid 5,000*l.* of his fine, whereof 1,000*l.* is assigned towards the building of the Banqueting House. This is the chiefest stocke they have in the Exchequer, as the Exchequer men say."

Inigo Jones built the Banqueting House under his appointment as surveyor of the King's works. He was assisted by Nicholas Stone as master mason, whom, a few years later, Charles I appointed master mason of Windsor Castle. Stone not only proved himself to be in fact a master mason, but he excelled also as a statuary. There are several of his monuments in Westminster and St. Paul's. The fine

sculptured memorial of Sir Francis Vere at Westminster Abbey is attributed to him, and is a further proof of his genius. So highly is it esteemed as a work of art that a *fac-simile* of it confronts the visitor as he enters Kensington Museum.

The first occasion on which the Banqueting House was used was before its completion. In April, 1621, King James I kept St. George's Feast in the grand room, which, in a letter from John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carlton, is described as being too fine, and not suitable to the rest of the house.

Peter Paul Rubens came to England in the spring of 1629, as Ambassador from Flanders, sent by the Infanta Isabella. Rubens possessed, to a marked degree, the virtue of being faithful to whatever he undertook to do. During his various embassies he devoted his entire attention to the duties of his mission, laying aside, for the time, the profession he loved so well. The special business with which Rubens was entrusted to England was no easy task to accomplish, and his reception by the English Court was viewed with some apprehension. Through the diplomacy of Carlisle, Cathington, and Carlton, he was, however, received, feasted, and entertained, with many demonstrations of regard. The King's passionate love for the fine arts is well known. He had excellent taste, possessed keen and accurate judgment, and was a thorough critic. For several years he had admired the marvellous genius of Rubens, and at the time Rubens came to England many of his paintings had preceded him here. It is not generally known that as early as 1621 Rubens had been selected to paint the pictures for the ceiling of the Banqueting House. Undoubtedly this was largely due to the influence of the Duke of Buckingham, who had formed the personal acquaintance of Rubens while at Paris. What the great painter himself says about this work and his own qualification to execute it, possesses unusual interest. "As to His Majesty and the Prince of Wales," wrote Rubens to W. Trumbull, in September, 1621, "I shall always be very pleased to receive the honour of their commands, and, with respect to the hall in the new palace, I confess myself to be, by a natural instinct, better fitted to execute works of the largest size rather than little curiosities. Every one according to his gifts. My endowments are of such a nature that I have never wanted courage to undertake any design, however vast in size or diversified in subject." But, while he was thus early selected for the work, it is not probable that he was commissioned to execute it until his first and only visit to England, in 1629—some eight years later—when he made the sketches for the pictures. Owing to his diplomatic engagements and other work, Rubens did not finish the painting until the summer of 1634. When completed, the canvas remained in Antwerp rolled up and cracking, because no one saw to its removal. Charles I's agent at the Hague, B. Gerbier, was chagrined to hear the gossip that idle tongues spread abroad regarding the King's neglect to pay and send for the painting. He did his best to urge immediate action in this respect. In August, 1634, he wrote to the King himself, entreating him to send for the painting. "May I then relate," he says, "what malicious tongues

and ignorant spirits utter, seeing the great work of Sir Paul Rubens hath made for your Majesty's Banqueting House lie here as if for want of money. Spaniards, French, and other nations talk of it." The same day he uses less reserve in a letter addressed to Sir Toby Matthew, exclaiming: "For God's name must he (Rubens) be expedited, that ye world may have noe subject to talke." Through his exertions the duties were removed, and the canvas was permitted to pass free. Rubens found the pictures somewhat injured from having been long rolled up, and as he was suffering from a severe attack of gout, and feared it would be impossible for him to go to England and see the painting placed in the Banqueting House, he set to work and retouched and finished it. The painting was finally encased and shipped to England in October, 1635. Still Rubens remained unpaid. He gave a power of attorney to Lionel Wake, Jun., to receive payment, which was made in different amounts and at different times, stretching over a period of several years, until June 4, 1638, when the last of the 3,000*l.* was paid. The King caused a medal and a rich gold chain to be presented to Rubens as a special mark of his appreciation of his work.

This painting, which forms the ceiling of the Banqueting House, is executed in the rich and brilliant style which distinguishes Rubens' best pictures. It is considered to be one of his greatest productions. Competent judges esteem it to be one of the finest ceilings in the world. "I cannot leave this place," says Ralph, "without taking some notice of the admirable ceiling performed by Rubens, which is, beyond controversy, one of the finest things of the kind in Europe. 'Tis, indeed, not so generally known as one could wish, but it needs only to be known to be esteemed according to its merit."

The work was executed at Antwerp, and in it Rubens was assisted by his pupil, Jordeans. The ceiling is divided into nine compartments. The oval contains the apotheosis of King James I. This represents the King on his earthly throne, turning with honour from Mars and other of the discordant deities, and giving himself up to Commerce and the Fine Arts. On the two long sides are large friezes with genii, 9 ft. in length, who are loading with fruit and sheaves of corn chariots drawn by lions, bears, and rams. The other two pictures in the centre range represent King James as Protector of Peace, enthroned, and appointing King Charles I his successor. Four pictures at the sides contain allegorical representations of Royal Power and Virtue. The original sketch for the middle compartment was preserved at Houghton. It belonged to Sir Godfrey Kneller, who is said to have often studied it, as is evident from Sir Godfrey's original sketch at Houghton, for the great equestrian picture of King William at Hampton Court.

Rubens' pupil, Anthony van Dyck, who had visited England in 1621, returned in 1629, when his work grew rapidly in public favour. The decoration of the ceiling of the Banqueting House made it all the more necessary to embellish the walls of this magnificent chamber appropriately, and to Van Dyck is due the credit for having designed what, had it ever been completed, would have been one of his largest and finest productions. He confided to Sir Kenelm Digby his idea of

painting the history of the Order of the Garter on the walls of the Banqueting House, and, through the latter's kindly offices, the proposal was made to Charles I and received with every demonstration of approval. The subjects chosen were the institution of the Order by Edward III, the procession of the Knights in their habits, the ceremony of the installation, and St. George's Feast. It is stated that the King intended to have them worked in tapestry. There is no question but that Van Dyck made a sketch of his design. It was in the Royal collection at the time of its dispersion. In the inventory of Royal effects we find among other articles "at the armory at St. James: No. 2. A sketch on two boards of the Procession of ye Knights of the Garter, by Vandike, 005.0.0. Sold to Mr. Wagstaffe, ye 16 July, 1650, for £5." This sketch subsequently came into the possession of Sir Peter Lely, as appears from a printed catalogue of his pictures, where it is stated to have been in King Charles' possession. It was owned by the Earl of Northington in 1782, and engraved by Robert Cooper, etched, and afterwards aquatinted, and printed in brown in imitation of the original sketch. When, at Lord Northington's death, his pictures were sold, Sir Joshua Reynolds purchased the sketch for 6*l*. It is now in the Duke of Rutland's collection at Belvoir Castle. The order for the work, however, was never given. Whether the price demanded by Van Dyck or the troubles of the King was the cause of its being abandoned does not appear. The estimated cost—something like 80,000*l*.—would, in itself, be quite enough to prevent the execution of the design, a sum quite beyond the then possible resources of the Exchequer. Well might we exclaim with Vertue: "Inigo Jones, Rubens, and Van Dyck! Europe could not have shown a nobler chamber!" Van Dyck was knighted by the King, and his early death would have prevented the completion of this work had it been begun. He died at Blackfryers, December 9, 1641, and was buried in St. Paul's, near the tomb of John of Gaunt.

Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones were the joint authors of several of the elaborate masques performed by Royalty in the Banqueting House. The last masque in which they appeared as joint authors was "Chlorida," and it was the placing by Ben Jonson of his name before that of Inigo Jones which gave the latter serious offence, and caused a bitter and lasting quarrel between these former staunch friends. This masque was intended to personify the rites of Chloris and her nymphs, and was presented by Her Majesty and her ladies at Shrovetide, 1630. The masque was in celebration of some rites done to the Goddess Chloria, who, in a general council of the gods, is proclaimed Goddess of Flowers. In the masque Zephyrus holds a dialogue with Spring, in which the former sings:—

Come forth, come forth, the gentle spring,
And carry the glad news I bring
To earth, our common mother:
It is decreed by all the gods
The heav'n, the earth, shall have no odds,
But one shall love another.

Their glories they shall mutual make,
 Earth look on heaven for heaven's sake;
 Their honours shall be even:
 All emulation cease and jars,
 Love will have earth to have her stars
 And lights, no less than heaven.

Inigo Jones's power at Court enabled him to deprive Jonson of the Court patronage, and resulted in the City of London temporarily withdrawing an annual payment of 100 nobles, which had been paid him as the City's Chronologer since his appointment to that office in September, 1628. They gave, as a reason for its withdrawal that Jonson "had not presented any fruit of his labour"; but in September, 1634, through the strenuous exertions of his friends, the City ordered his yearly pension to be continued and the arrears paid. Ben Jonson was always an improvident manager, and when he had money in his pocket he spent it with thoughtless prodigality. The loss of the Court patronage so crippled him financially that he was finally reduced to penury and want. His quarrel with Inigo Jones was the downfall of Ben Jonson's social and political ascendancy at Court. Thenceforth he was without the influence of Royal favour, was shunned by the Court, and abandoned by his aristocratic associates. He was left alone to work his revenge in withering satire upon his former faithless friends. The Banqueting House, therefore, can be said to have been indirectly associated with the misfortunes and ruin of Ben Jonson. His declining years were clouded with disappointment. On the marble tablet to Jonson in Westminster Abbey there is a carved masque—a touching reminder of the dramatic art, in which his wonderful genius displayed itself in those masques, many of which were so brilliantly rendered in the Banqueting House.

In 1632 William Prynne published his "Histriomastix," aimed generally at all dramatic performances, and as the Queen was then particularly prominent in the parts she assumed in the brilliant masques rendered at the Banqueting House, the book was at once said by her friends to be an infamous libel against Her Majesty. As is well known, Prynne was tried in the Star Chamber, and with all the infernal wickedness too often brought into use in that ill-famed apartment. The denunciatory sentence pronounced by the different members of the Court has rarely been exceeded in malignity and extreme enmity, culminating in the Earl of Dorset's decree that the prisoner pay a fine of 10,000*l.*, be perpetually imprisoned, branded in the forehead, slit in the nose, and have his ears cropped. Prynne actually suffered the infliction of this sentence. It is true that his book was characterized by gross and defamatory aspersions against those indulging in harmless amusements; but it may be questioned whether the book itself was solely responsible for the rigorous proceedings brought against its author. It is possible that Charles I had had for some time past his eye upon Prynne, whose ready pen had been actively employed in scathing terms against one of the King's foibles. His Majesty wore his hair in long, flowing locks, especially

one or more locks on the left side much longer than the rest. This is readily seen on his seals and in nearly all of his pictures. William Prynne had a great dislike for these long locks of the King's, and for this reason, it is said, he wrote and published, in 1628, a tract entitled "The Unloveliness of Love Locks," a work aimed indirectly at His Majesty. Naturally the King must have smarted under its bitter invective, but he was unable to take any notice of it, for to do so would have been confession that the shaft had not only been aimed at him but had struck home. The affront thus given, however, was not overlooked, and later the King had ample retaliation in Prynne's condemnation in the Star Chamber. He was imprisoned several years in the Fleet, the Tower of London, Carnarvon Castle, in North Wales, and on the Isle of Jersey, until he was discharged in November, 1640. After his liberation he returned to London, where he was received with great popular demonstration of rejoicing, and was almost immediately chosen to Parliament. But his sufferings appear to have ripened and mellowed his judgment, and his views became broader and nobler. He soon saw through the plot to dethrone the King, and from the first he became one of His Majesty's most staunch and devoted adherents. He seems to have completely thrown aside all remembrance of whatever cruelty had been inflicted upon him, and, with a magnanimity almost unequalled, to have defended the King from pure conviction of justice and right. On December 4, 1648, he delivered a memorable remonstrance to Parliament in opposition to their proceedings against the King. "I do here solemnly protest," he said, "against the proceedings as altogether null, void, unparliamentary, illegal, unchristian, if not perfidious and treasonable." Noble words, fearlessly spoken, and at a time when to have uttered them might have cost him his head. At the Restoration, Charles II was not insensible to Prynne's heroic efforts in behalf of his father, and, besides making him the recipient of many Royal favours, he gave him the custody of the Records in the Tower of London, and continued him in that office until the day of his death.

When Prynne was so cruelly punished public feeling ranged itself into two great factions, one censuring Prynne and his book and applauding his punishment, the other encouraging his independence and condemning his persecutors. Among the former were the four Inns of Court, which took sides against their professional brother, and to manifest their opinion of Prynne's new learning and serve to confute his "*Histrionastix*" against interludes, they provided their Majesties with a magnificent masque on Candlemas Day, 1634.

It was called "The Triumph of Peace," and was written by James Shirley, while the music was composed by the celebrated William Lawes and Simon Ives, and the scenery was designed by Inigo Jones. The theatre for this grand display was the Banqueting House, a stage being erected at the lower end opposite the state. The gallery behind the state at the upper end of the Banqueting House was reserved for the gentlemen of the Inns of Court. The grand masquers were four gentlemen of each Inn of Court, selected on account of their personal appearance, dancing, and dress; and it was ordered that

they should be drawn in four chariots, four masquers in each chariot, by six horses to a chariot. It appears, however, that a difference arose about the order of their going, which of the Inns of Court should have the first chariot, and so on; and also how the several grand masquers should sit in the several chariots, who in the first or most prominent place, and who in the second, third, and last place. To satisfy this rivalry, it was proposed and assented to by the committee that the cars should be made after the fashion of the Roman triumphant chariots, which, being oval in form, would avoid any choice in the different seats. In selecting the colours and in determining the precedence of the chariots, it was agreed that one representative from each of the Inns of Court should throw dice, each society to be bound thereby. On the evening of the masque, the masquers and their company proceeded in gorgeous procession from Ely House, in Holborn, to the Banqueting House. The spectators thronged the streets in thousands, and the Banqueting House was so crowded with fine ladies, glittering with their rich clothes and fairer jewels, and with lords and gentlemen of great quality, that there was scarce room for the King and Queen to enter. Their Majesties stood at a window to see the masque come by, and they were so delighted with the splendour and magnificence of the show that they sent to the marshal and requested that the procession might again pass before them. "The masque," says Whitelocke, "was incomparably performed in the dancing, speeches, music, and scenes; none failed in their parts, and the scenes were most curious and costly." The Queen joined in the dance with some of the masquers, and the great ladies of the Court were very free and civil in dancing with every one. The masque continued until it was nearly morning. The cost of this spectacle is said to have amounted to 21,000*l*.

There is no incident in English history more fascinating in its dramatic surroundings than the closing scene of the life of Charles I. The precise spot from which he passed upon the scaffold has been the subject of long and frequent discussion, and yet one would infer that the circumstances surrounding an event so public would have been easily determined. These circumstances, however, have always excited the greatest public interest, as well as stimulated the historical and antiquarian student to the most thorough research.

While thousands of spectators beheld the execution of the King, the exact point out of which he passed from the Banqueting House to the scaffold has been so variously stated as to lead to doubt and confusion. Few questions have excited more controversy, and few have remained subject to greater dispute. There is not any statement or theory of this most public occurrence which is not controverted by evidence of high respectability, so that, whatever opinion you may have adopted as the true one, you are liable to have your views questioned. One fact, however, has remained beyond dispute, and that is that Charles I passed through the Banqueting House to the scaffold on which he was beheaded. He left this building to meet his martyrdom. Whether from this spacious Banqueting House he passed to the north, to the south, to the east, or to the west upon the scaffold

makes comparatively little difference to the majority of people. The important and historical fact remains that here in this identical building he passed, unflinchingly, to his death. If, however, we analyze the different accounts of the execution we shall find that all of them, with one exception, can be reconciled. The single exception alluded to is the assertion by Pennant, that the King passed out of a small building then attached to the north end of the Banqueting House. But Pennant's statement is so overwhelmingly contradicted that it cannot be relied on. It is beyond dispute that the scaffold was erected adjoining the Banqueting House. It was not adjoining the building to the north of the Banqueting House. Why, then, should those who arranged the details of the execution have resorted to a passage made through an adjoining building instead of gaining access to the scaffold through the building adjoining to which the scaffold was erected? Not only this, but there is the testimony of Sir Philip Warwick, who was assured by a friend of his who had so placed himself in Wallingford House that he could easily see all that was done upon the scaffold, that he saw the King come out of the Banqueting House on to the scaffold. Wallingford House stood on the site of the present Admiralty. But should this statement of Sir Philip Warwick be said to be mere hearsay—the reflection of something said—there is still another bit of evidence on the point which appears to have been overlooked. The "Moderate Intelligencer" for the week beginning January 25, 1648-49, and ending February 1, 1648-49—covering the day of execution—not only states that the scaffold was erected against the Banqueting House, but that it was made from a window thereof. If the King came out of the Banqueting House he certainly did not come out of a building to the north of the Banqueting House. The positive, affirmative assertion of this fact by an eye-witness, transmitted through so reliable an authority, should be accepted in preference to negative statements by persons who were not present.

But, besides this direct evidence, there is such an improbability in Pennant's statement, when considered in the light of the circumstances immediately connected with the King's death, as to impair its credit and reliability. If we consider the motives which actuated the leaders in the tragedy we perceive that, prior to the convening of the High Court of Justice, his enemies sought every means to humiliate and debase the King. When brought a prisoner to Windsor, the House ordered those about him to refrain from bending the knee; the members of the High Court of Justice remained covered in his presence; soldiers were permitted, unrebuked, to spit in his face and smoke in his chamber; they would not give him a cushion to sit upon; they scoffed at him most vilely; he was beheaded with the common malefactor's axe and by the common executioner; the place selected for his execution was in front of the Banqueting House, the scene of so many of his festivities and of meetings between the King and his Parliaments; and finally the George which he gave to Bishop Juxon on the scaffold, and which was intended for his son, the Prince, was ordered by Parliament not to be delivered to him. It was quite a harmless thing to have requested, and the officious prohibition

against this remembrance of a dying father to his son illustrates the venomous hatred which rankled in the breasts of the King's persecutors. Nothing that might degrade and humiliate his kingly pride was omitted. The committee appointed by the High Court of Justice to select a place for the King's execution evidently had this purpose in view in selecting the Banqueting House, "so from thence," as Perrinchief wrote, "where he used to sit on his throne and show the splendour of majesty, he might pass to his grave, there parting with the ensigns of Royalty, and laying them down as spoils where he had before used them as the ornaments of Empire. Thus did they endeavour to make their malice ingenious and provide triumphs for their revenge." Bearing in mind the motive by which the committee were actuated, for them to select a building other than the Banqueting House would seem most improbable. To do so would be to destroy the very object they had in view, which was to debase the King as much as possible by executing him as a common felon amid the scenes and surrounded by the associations of his former power and magnificence. We must, therefore, lay aside the narrative of Pennant and his friends and turn to one more probable from the evidence we have at hand.

The remaining accounts on this question can be briefly summarized as follows:—Herbert says there was a passage broken through the wall by which the King passed on to the scaffold. Jesse and Walcott both say immediately in the centre of the building, between the upper and lower windows, a passage had been broken in the wall through which the unfortunate King passed, Eachard, Kennet, Heath, and an early account printed in 1681—the Journal of the High Court of Justice, attested by Phelps, the Clerk—state that he was conducted to the scaffold by a passage made through a window. Ludlow asserts that the King was conducted out of a window. William Sanderson (1658), William Winstanley (1659), W.H.B., printed by Henry Bell (1660), and Sir S. Baker (1660) say he went out of the great window, which was enlarged; while the three Scotch Commissioners sent to England by the Kirk of Scotland, consisting of the Earl Lothian, Sir John Cheisly, and Robert Blair, on the very day of the execution, wrote to the Commissioners of the Kirk at Edinburgh as follows:—

Covent Garden, 30 January, 1649-49.

Right Rerd. and Honble.,

This day about two of the clock in the afternoon His Majesty was brought out by the window of the balcony of the Banqueting House of Whitehall, near which a stage was set up, and his head struck off with an axe, wherewith we hold it our duty to inform you; and so, being in haste, we shall say no more at this time, but that we remain

Your most aff. friends to serve you,

LOTHIAN.
JO. CHAISELIE.
RO. BLAIR.

*For the Rt. Rerd. the Comrs.
of the Kirk of Scotland, met at Edinburgh.*

At first these different statements appear to be impossible of reconciliation. With the single exception of Pennant, however, they are all capable of intelligent explanation.

An examination of old prints and engravings shows that, at various periods during the last century, the Banqueting House was represented as having one or more blank windows. It is not probable that the artists who drew these pictures, which bear evidence of great detail and accuracy, would have inserted blank windows unless they existed. They would not misrepresent such an important feature of the building. Therefore, we can safely assume that at those different periods (as well as at the present time) there were blank windows in the Banqueting House. For instance, there is an engraving of the Banqueting House by Samuel Wale, published in 1761, which shows the windows on each side of the centre window as blanks; a picture of the Banqueting House by B. Green in "Noorthonck's History of London," published in 1773, and a print in the British Museum, dated 1794, show the same thing; an engraving by T. Malton in 1781, as also a plan of the first floor of the Banqueting House, made in 1796 by J. T. Groves, Architect and Clerk of the Works at Whitehall, represents the 2nd, 3rd, 5th, and 6th windows as blanks.

The statements of Jesse and Walcott that "immediately in the centre of the building, between the upper and lower windows, a passage had been broken in the wall through which the unfortunate King passed" are most improbable. An examination of the interior of the building is all that is necessary to demonstrate the impossibility of adhering to a literal interpretation of this statement. Taken literally, the passage referred to must have been made between the windows facing the main floor and those above, on a line with the gallery or with the windows of the basement below. To do this you would have to destroy the gallery or the floor of the hall, and permanently damage the structure of the building itself. But the reference by Jesse and Walcott to the upper and lower windows was not a reference to altitude, but to position. What they referred to were the windows at the upper and lower end of the room. In an account of the coronation ceremonies of Charles II in the Banqueting House we find reference made to the upper and lower end of the building; in describing the reception of the Spanish Ambassador in January, 1629, Lord Dorchester said that the ladies "stood from ye state to ye lower ende of ye Banqueting House"; Whitelocke, who was personally instrumental in getting up the masque by the four Inns of Court in 1633, says that the gallery behind the state was reserved for the exclusive use of the gentlemen of the Inns of Court, and that the scenes were prepared at the lower end of the Banqueting House; while in the account of the masque published at the time by Shirley, its author, we are told that at the lower end of the room opposite the state a stage was erected.

It is evident, therefore, that the ends of the Banqueting House were commonly distinguished as the upper and lower end, and that the end where the state or throne was placed was known as the upper

end. This is the south end of the building, directly underneath the large high window; for, in describing the saving of the Banqueting House from destruction during the fire of January 5, 1693, Sir Christopher Wren says he placed a bricklayer "in a very dangerous post in the high window over the throne."

We may assume, therefore, that the allusion by Jesso and Walcott to the upper and lower windows was used in the same way that the expression was used in the instances referred to. Their description of a point immediately in the centre of the building between the upper and lower windows, in view of the contemporaneous writings quoted, undoubtedly had reference to a point midway between a window at the upper end and a window at the lower end of the Banqueting House. This would be what is now the centre window. This window was probably a blank window at the time, and the removal of the obstruction might well be spoken of as breaking a passage through the wall. Considered in this light we have the exact position before us—a blank window; this blank window in the centre of the building; windows at the upper and lower ends of the building; and the removal, partial removal, or enlargement of the obstruction with which the central or middle window was closed.

Turning to Herbert's account, we are told there was a passage broken through the wall. This statement cannot be taken literally, any more than that of Jesso and Walcott. The wall of the Banqueting House is composed of solid masonry, and is several feet in thickness. Its massive stonework and columns preclude the probability of such an unnecessary and destructive act. It would have been a senseless waste of time and money, and a shameless destruction of property, to break a hole through the wall of the building, and there was no necessity for such an act with the windows facing the street. The wall spoken of by Herbert must have been the obstruction which blocked up the centre window, the removal of which might very easily have been taken for the breaking of the wall itself.

An examination of the narratives of Eachard, Kennet, Heath, and the Journal of the High Court of Justice already mentioned shows that the King was conducted to the scaffold by a passage made through a window. In considering these statements we must not lose sight of the fact that it is alleged that the King did not pass through a window as one would ordinarily do if there was nothing peculiar about it, but that it was by a passage *made* through a window. Mark the word *made*. It represents action, force expended, something done. Ordinarily there is nothing necessary to be done to a window in order to obtain ingress and egress. If the window is of glass you can open the frames or smash the panes; if of wood you can open the blinds or break them. You make nothing doing so. The window is there already, and the passage also. But where the window is a blank, and presents a solid face of bricks and mortar, then, in order to pass through it, a passage has to be made, and it was such a passage undoubtedly to which these and all other chroniclers refer. Ludlow asserts that the King was conducted out of a window,

and in the absence of any other reference we can safely fix on that window as being at the point given by Jesse and Walcott, to wit, "immediately in the centre of the building"—a point identical with the window of the balcony mentioned by the Scotch Commissioners. We may therefore take for granted that at the time of the execution of the King there were blank windows in the Banqueting House, as we know there were at a later period—perfectly-constructed windows, but filled up with masonry or obstructed in some way so as to practically form a wall. Any other theory renders the accounts worthless and, in fact, absurd from their mere impossibility, while the assumption of the fact of the removal of the material with which the centre window must have been filled makes them harmonize and agree.

In the other accounts to which we have referred, it will be noticed that special mention is made of "the great window" and "the window of the balcony." A glance at the Banqueting House will show that the balcony is before the three centre windows. Yet the question remains to be determined what particular one of the three windows was *the great window* and *the window* of the balcony. All the windows are alike in height and breadth. Therefore the word "great" was not applied to the size or proportion of the window. The word "great" was more likely used as designating its position, prominence, and use. The balcony windows are central and conspicuous, and if the centre window was opened it might naturally be called the great window and necessarily the window of the balcony. If the centre window was not the window referred to by Sanderson, Winstanley, W. H. B., Baker, and others, as the great window, and by the Scotch Commissioners as the window of the balcony, to what window did they refer? Where else in the Banqueting House is a window to be found which comes anywhere near answering the designation? There was no reason why the Scotch Commissioners, all men of high reputation and integrity, and friendly to the King, should state anything but the truth. Their letter was written on the very day of the execution and while all the horrible details were present before them. In point of time it is contemporaneous with the event. Then, again, it is not the expression of a single individual, but the deliberate and united report of three men of recognised position and influence. Their business in London was connected directly with the King and with an effort to spare his life if possible from the resentment of his enemies. Therefore, of all people in the world they would be the most likely to know all the circumstances relating to the King's execution, and their report is a conclusive affirmation of the theory which we have adopted in explanation of the less definite statements of the writers whom we have quoted.

To sum up the evidence, we finally arrive at the conclusion that, on the one side there is Pennant, with a statement intrinsically improbable, single-handed, and alone, while arrayed against him there are a score and more of authorities whose accounts are all capable of reconciliation, and, when reconciled, lead to but one intelligent conclusion, to wit, that Charles I passed from the Banqueting House upon the

scaffold out of the centre window, an obstruction to which had been removed for that purpose.

Even the present generation retain the respect of their ancestors for the sanctity of this spot. It has always been a place towards which the adherents of the dynasty of the Stuarts have turned as a pilgrim does to the sacred city of his faith; and generation after generation have been accustomed to venerate the place where Charles I died as the spot where the blood of a martyr was shed. To this day you can see the exemplification of this feeling of love in the silent homage paid by many of those who pass beneath the Banqueting House touching or lifting their hats. It is an affecting sight to behold this inborn fealty for the dead King finding its outward expression amidst the noise and rumbling traffic of the great city.

On December 16, 1653, the Articles of Government were signed and Oliver Cromwell was proclaimed Lord Protector. He drove from Whitehall Palace to Westminster Hall between two lines of soldiers, attended by the Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal, the Barons of the Exchequer and Judges in their robes, the Council of the Commonwealth, the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Recorder of London in their scarlet gowns, and many of the distinguished officers of the army. At the conclusion of the ceremony at Westminster, the Protector returned in state to the Banqueting House, the Lord Mayor, bare-headed, carrying before him the Sword of State, the soldiers shouting, and the cannons firing. At the Banqueting House, Nicholas Lockier, one of Cromwell's chaplains, made an address, after which the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Judges departed. Cromwell was dressed in a suit and cloak of black velvet, with long boots and a broad gold band around his hat.

A few years later the country beheld the spectacle of its Parliament obsequiously tendering the title of King to the Lord Protector, while he, craving the gift, dallied with the offer, as a child might with forbidden fruit, restrained as he was from pushing his ambition too far by the dread of his own army. The scene of these conferences between Parliament and the Lord Protector was the Banqueting House. Parliament appointed a Committee of its distinguished members to wait upon Cromwell at the Banqueting House and tender him the title of King. There were many meetings held between the Committee and the Lord Protector in this building. On April 11, 1657, the Committee again repaired to the Banqueting House, when the Lord Chief Justice addressing Cromwell said, "The name of King is a name known by the law, and the Parliament doth desire that your Highness would assume that title." The Lord Protector, however, was still uncertain in his own mind regarding public feeling and did not dare to proceed to such an extreme measure hastily. Therefore he procrastinated and put the Committee off. But before long he became convinced that the nation would not support his adoption of the title of King. He found the majority of the army, on whom he mainly depended, strongly opposed to his assumption of regal honours, and finally his heart failed him in carrying out this skilfully conceived scheme. Having requested the Committee to once

more meet him at the Banqueting House on May 8, 1657, he addressed the Speaker, Sir Thomas Widdrington, and declined the offer, using, in the course of his speech, the memorable words, "I cannot undertake this Government with the title of King."

Cromwell and his family were not accustomed to the manners and surroundings of the aristocracy. Their sudden transportation into the palatial precincts of Whitehall found them but indifferent hosts and quite incompetent to perform the ordinary functions of Court duties. But Cromwell endeavoured to follow in the footsteps of his Royal predecessors. He received Ambassadors, interviewed his Parliament, and entertained at banquets his Officers of State and others within the stately Banqueting House. Some strange tales have come down to us regarding the manners of his Court and the domestic economy exercised in the management of his household affairs. One of these refers to a banquet given to the Members of Parliament in the Banqueting House in 1659. A woman who happened to be near Cromwell's table when the sweetmeats were served desired a few candied apricots. Colonel Pride, who was sitting at the table, instantly, with both hands, threw some wet conserve into her apron and stained it all over. As if that had been the signal for the beginning of the hilarity, Cromwell caught up his napkin and threw it at Colonel Pride, who returned it with the same vigour, while every one at the table became engaged in the scuffle. The noise and tumult made the guests rise from the tables before the sweetmeats were placed upon them, believing, as they did, that the banquet was over, whereupon they entered into frolic with the Lord Protector. Whether Cromwell desired to imitate the customs of the Anglo-Saxons or not does not appear; but this feast reminds us forcibly of one of them. Each man when he sat at table did not take his seat according to his own fancy, but according to his age, rank, and position. At the Court of King Cnut, the nobility and officers of the household were commanded to their places according to rank, and those of the same rank according to their seniority in office; and if any one took a higher place than belonged to him, he was degraded to the lowest and all the company were permitted to throw bones at him without being guilty of rudeness or liable to challenge.

At the Restoration, Charles II made his stately entry through the City of London to Whitehall Palace. In the evening, both Houses of Parliament waited upon the King in the Banqueting House and tendered him an address of congratulation. In answer, the King desired to be excused from making a long reply owing to extreme weariness, but he told them they should not be more ready to propose anything to him for the good of his people in laws, liberties, and religion than he would be to grant them. The Speaker and all the Members then kissed His Majesty's hands. The King was dressed in a plain stuff suit with a plume of red feathers, the Duke of York with a white one, and the Duke of Gloucester, green.

The extent to which the Banqueting House figured in connection with the coronation of Charles II forms another interesting link in the chain of associations with this historic building. The ceremonies

were of a splendour and magnificence rarely witnessed. Sixty-eight Knights of the Bath, six Earls, and six Barons were created in this building. Attired in suits of white satin, with surcoats and mantles of crimson taffeta lined with white, white gloves, white boots, and white hats with white feathers, the candidates presented a brilliant array as they entered the Banqueting House, and were duly invested with the dignity of knighthood by His Majesty, who sat under the Cloth of Estate. Among those invested with the kirtle and hood were—Edward, Lord Hyde, Lord Chancellor of England, who was created Earl of Clarendon; Arthur, Lord Capell, created Earl of Essex; Thomas, Lord Brudnell, created Earl of Cardigan; Arthur, Viscount Valentia, Earl of Anglesey; Sir John Greenvile, Earl of Bath; and Colonel Charles Howard, Earl of Carlisle.

Immediately after Charles II returned to England he proceeded to re-establish the ancient Royal customs, and in the summer of 1660 he began to touch for the King's evil in the Banqueting House. The surgeons caused the sick to be brought up to the throne, where they knelt before His Majesty. The King stroked their faces with both hands at the same time, while the chaplain, attired in his vestments, said: "He put His hands upon them, and He healed them." This was repeated to each supplicant. After they had all been touched in this way they came up again in like order, when another chaplain, kneeling and having angel gold (pieces of money so called from having the figure of an angel on them) strung on white ribbon on his arm, handed them one by one to His Majesty, who put them about the necks of those who had previously been touched as they passed, the chaplain at the same time repeating, "That is ye true light who came into the world." The religious part of the ceremony consisted of the reading of the gospel, an epistle, the liturgy, prayers for the sick, and the blessing.

St. George's Day was often celebrated in the Banqueting House by the Companions of the Order of the Garter. That held in 1667 was the occasion of a great feast. The King sat alone at a table placed at the upper end of the hall, while the Knights had a table at one side reaching the entire length of the room. Opposite to them was an elaborate sideboard containing gilded plate. At the lower end musicians were placed, as well as trumpets and kettledrums in the gallery. The King was waited on by the Lords and Pensioners, who brought up the dishes. At the middle of the dinner the Knights drank the King's health. Then the King drank theirs, whereupon the trumpets sounded and the music played. The Queen entered the apartment and stood on the left of His Majesty. Each Knight had 40 dishes to himself, so that they were piled five and six high. The room was beautifully decorated, and was hung with the richest tapestry.

A somewhat surprising use to which the Banqueting House was put was that of a lottery under the personal patronage of the King. Charles II permitted one of his favourites, Sir Arthur Slingsby, to have his lottery in the building. Among those present were the King, the Queen-mother, the Queen-consort, the Duchess of York,

and, of course, His Majesty's favourite beauty, Lady Castlemaine. Those who should have known said some pretty hard things regarding this lottery. Pepys found it good sport seeing how many who paid their 10*l.* went away with only two globes, although it was said there was only one blank. The King and Queen fared no better than the others present. There was one wise man present, however, a Mr. Cholmley, who did a good stroke of business by going among the vast concourse of distinguished people present and insuring them against drawing the blank number for the sum of 12 pence a head. As it happened a gentlewoman, whom he chanced not to insure, drew the blank. Evelyn attended the lottery, but was disgusted. He did not hesitate to denounce its author as a shark.

For nearly a century foreign Ambassadors were received in the Banqueting House. It was the grand audience chamber where all the ceremonies of state were held with much splendour. The throne, with its rich cloth of state, was placed at the upper or south end of the room. Here the Ambassadors from the different countries of the world presented their credentials to the King. They did not come quietly and without ostentation. On the contrary, the different representatives vied with each other in the splendour of their pageants and the number and costumes of their retinue. The Muscovite Ambassadors brought presents of furs of the black fox, sable, and ermine, cloth of gold, hawks, and Persian horses; while those from the Barbary States came with horses and lions as Royal gifts. The details of these audiences would in themselves fill a volume. It was at the Royal banquet given in the Banqueting House to the French Ambassador, Count Colbert, that Evelyn first saw pineapples served. This then rare fruit was cut up by Charles II, and passed to those near him as a mark of special favour.

At the close of the 17th century there were two serious conflagrations at Whitehall, one on April 1, 1691, and one on January 5, 1698. The first broke out at night in the upper part of the Duchess of Portsmouth's lodgings, and before it could be extinguished all the buildings fronting the privy stairs were burnt. The greatest apprehension was felt for the safety of the palace and the Banqueting House. The second fire was that which doomed the palace of Whitehall, and of all that stately and historic collection the only building that escaped the ravages of the flames was the Banqueting House. The King was so concerned about the Banqueting House that he sent messenger after messenger from Kensington urging every means for its preservation. Sir Christopher Wren claimed the credit of saving the building. When the fire got into the building adjoining on the south he saw that the danger would be in its breaking through the large high window at the upper end of the Banqueting House, and that if he could have the window bricked up it might stop the fire. Therefore he ordered a labourer to procure any bricklayer he might find, who happened to be one John Esaus, and he, with the assistance of labourers then at hand, stopped up the window according to Wren's directions, and the building was saved.

The destruction of Whitehall, including the Chapel Royal, induced

the King to set aside the Banqueting House for the purposes of a chapel. This must have been done at once, for in June, 1698, Sir Christopher Wren had been some time at work in fitting up the Banqueting House for that purpose. In 1724 George I directed that the duty of preaching in this chapel should be performed by 24 priests, one-half of whom were to be Fellows of the University of Oxford and the other half from Cambridge; two of them to be recommended monthly by the Dean of the King's Chapel, with salaries of 30*l.* per annum; certainly not a very Royal allowance. The first sermon under this regulation was preached on Easter Sunday in April, 1724.

The Banqueting House, thenceforth known as the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, year after year, was the scene of the distribution of the Royal Bounty on Maundy Thursday. The ceremonies associated with this ancient custom have, therefore, a peculiar interest when considered in connection with this building. Maundy Thursday, as many know, is the Thursday before Good Friday. The greatest diversity of opinion has existed as to the derivation of the name and the origin of the custom. One theory is that the word is derived from the Saxon word *maud*, which later became *maund*, a name for a basket. Thus Shakspeare says: "A thousand favours from her maund she drew." Hall, in his satires, speaks of "a maund charged with household merchandize." Drayton tells of "a little maund being made of osiers small;" while Herrick says:

Behold for us a naked graces stay
With maunds of roses for to strew the way.

He also speaks of maundie as alms:

All's gone, and death hath taken
Away from us
Our maundie; thus
The widows stand forsaken.

The more generally accepted theory, however, is that maundy is derived from *mandatum*, from the mandate of Christ to His disciples to break bread in remembrance of him, or from his mandate after he had washed their feet: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another."

Whatever its origin may have been, the custom is among the most ancient of those ecclesiastical observances connected with the English Church. In the Royal use of the maund in England the number of doles (or its equivalent) was, and still is, according to the age of the reigning monarch. James II was the last King who performed the ceremony of washing the feet of the poor. Since then this ancient rite has been deputed, and the Lord High Almoner has officiated as the King's representative. The distribution of doles was retained until 1738, since which time the maundy men and women have received money instead of the dole.

Not the least of the incidents in the history of the Chapel Royal has been its participation in the glory associated with the victory of

English arms over her enemies. In May, 1811, amidst the acclamation of thousands of spectators and the sound of martial music, a company of grenadiers, supported by a brilliant escort of military and headed by the Dukes of York and Cambridge, bore the eagles and colours captured in the late war to the Chapel Royal. Among the eagles was one taken at Barrosa by the 87th. There was not any colour remaining on the standard—that had been shot away—but it was unlike the other eagles in having a wreath around its neck. Among the colours was the so-called Invincible Standard taken in Egypt. It was so tattered that the mottoes were not legible, a bugle in the centre being the only figure discernible. The ceremony in the Chapel was most impressive. As the words of the *Te Deum*, "We praise thee, O Lord," were sung, twelve grenadiers silently entered the right and left doors bearing the trophies, and accompanied by an escort with fixed bayonets, they proceeded to the front of the altar, where they halted. The choir again took up the *Te Deum* and sang it through, after which the six eagles were elevated against the two semi-circular divisions of the altar piece, three on each side, the butts about 6 ft. from the floor and the upper parts held by double gilt chains. The six French colours were arranged horizontally over the gallery. There is an interesting legend connected with the eagle taken at Barrosa. The French eagles, as a rule, were attached to the staves on which they were borne by a screw, so that in case of extreme danger they might be taken off and saved from falling into the hands of the enemy. Napoleon, however, when he presented this particular eagle to the 8th, observed that it was impossible this standard should ever be taken by any foe from so fine a body of men who had on so many occasions exhibited proofs of the most determined valour; for which reason he desired the eagle might be riveted to the staff. His wish was complied with, and, but for that order, this trophy would probably not have fallen into the hands of their opponents on the heights of Barrosa—the gallant 87th.

A year later the eagles and colours taken from the French in Spain were deposited in the Chapel Royal with much ceremony. The Royal Family were present. Two of the eagles were captured at Salamanca. These were very much mutilated. Two taken at Madrid were in a state of better preservation, while the fifth was found in the channel of a stream near Ciudad Rodrigo, into which it had been thrown by Massena's army when pressed by the British cavalry on the retreat from Portugal. Among the standards was the garrison flag of Badajoz, which was like a sieve and stained with human blood.

January 18, 1816, was appointed a Day of General Thanksgiving to Divine Providence on the re-establishment of peace in Europe, and it was selected as the occasion for placing the eagles captured at the Battle of Waterloo amidst the other trophies of war. Among those present in the Chapel Royal were their Royal Highnesses the Dukes of York and Gloucester, the Earl of Liverpool, and there was a brilliant and distinguished assembly. As soon as the first lesson had been read by Archdeacon Owen, the Chaplain-General, two squads of sergeants

bearing the eagles entered by the two doors, and marching up to the communion table to the strains of martial music, fixed upon it their consecrated banners.

One more circumstance remains to be mentioned. It is perhaps the most pathetic of all. History has not only recorded the staunch stubbornness of Napoleon on the field of Waterloo, but its pages have left a touching memento of the faithful "Marengo," who, with distended nostrils and fiery eye, bore his rider safely and with undaunted courage amidst the perils and carnage of that awful struggle. Death at last silenced both horse and rider. The character and life of Charles I always possessed a particular fascination for Napoleon. He admired his culture and love for the fine arts; he delighted to read of his reign, to peruse the course of his melancholy wanderings when driven practically a refugee from the capital, and to dwell upon the black record of his condemnation and death. But how wonderful, how startling is the irony of fate! Here, within the Banqueting House, the scene of the glory and death of Charles I—the hero of Napoleon's admiration—will stand all that remains of the faithful "Marengo." It is remarkable that, of all places in the world, his bones should find sanctuary within the very building where the King whom his master loved so well went to his death. Tried friend and companion of better days, ever faithful and loyal! You had your master's love, while we our admiration give and homage pay to the brave and illustrious "Marengo."

This ancient building—the last remaining link that connects us with the Whitehall of the past—has come into your hands as the worthy custodians of its keeping. Your Institution is representative of the valour, strength, and integrity of the nation. To you, who through years of steadfast duty to your country have braved perils on land and sea, Her Majesty the Queen has entrusted this historic edifice—a fitting repository for the precious mementoes and relies you possess. Guard it, treasure it, and preserve it; and may you unite in pledging yourselves to never let it be said that the Banqueting House was, but is no more!

THE CHAIRMAN (General Erskine): Ladies and gentlemen, I feel quite sure that you will all agree with me in thinking that we have listened to a very interesting and most instructive lecture. Accordingly, we should give our best thanks to Mr. Bartlett for having produced it and taken the trouble to come here to read it to us. In this theatre it is usual for the Chairman to reserve any remarks which he may have to make until the end of the proceedings, but to-day I must ask you to allow me to deviate from that practice, inasmuch as I have been summoned to the Commander-in-Chief's office. Before I go I wish to say a few words, not in the shape of criticism, but rather as a supplement to what has fallen from Mr. Bartlett. You are aware, or most of you must be aware, that we are about to leave these dingy premises, and I think we are all very glad to go. You have heard a great deal lately about evicted tenants and tenants living under the apprehension of eviction, and a good deal of sympathy has been shown to these people. But I think the rule is that wherever a tenant pays his rent he is pretty safe to remain where he is. Unfortunately, with regard to the United Service Institution the case has been different. Ever since our formation, about 60 years ago, we have been the tenants of these premises, and, although we have paid our rent most punctually whenever it became due, yet we have been living for the last 20 years

Downloaded by [Universite Laval] at 06:07 26 June 2016

Downloaded by [Universite Laval] at 06:07 26 June 2016

Downloaded by [Universite Laval] at 06:07 26 June 2016

Downloaded by [Universite Laval] at 06:07 26 June 2016

Downloaded by [Universite Laval] at 06:07 26 June 2016

Downloaded by [Universite Laval] at 06:07 26 June 2016

appears at a very opportune time, when the Institution is going to be installed in the memorable building; and I think I am expressing the feeling of all present in hoping that it will increase the interest everybody must take in the future housing of the Institution. A remark was made that we are not going to imitate our ancient predecessors and hold lotteries in the building; but I may call attention to the fact that it is the intention to hold a bazaar there, and although that function will not be conducted with any of the discreditable incidents of the lottery held there so long ago, I hope it will take the form of a lottery in some respects, and that many people will come out leaving a great deal more money in the building than they anticipated doing when they went in, and that the result will largely benefit the funds of the Institution.

Captain O'CALLAGHAN: I should like to know whether the lecturer can add to the deep obligation under which he has placed us by his instructive lecture, by giving us information on one or two points on which he has not touched. I think he has cleared up almost absolutely the difficulty and the difference of opinion with regard to the place at which Charles I made his exit from this building; but he has not mentioned—and there appears to be some doubt on the point—how the King came into the building. Perhaps also the lecturer may give us some information as to the object of the two strange arches which were disclosed at the south end of the building when the Dover House stables were demolished. These arches are very curious, and I have not heard any even plausible theory as to the reason of their construction. Perhaps the lecturer may be able to give us some information on this subject.

Mr. C. A. HEMESHOFF BARTLETT: With regard to the first enquiry as to the way the King entered the Banqueting House, I may state that the Banqueting House was the northern part of what was an accumulation of structures constituting the Palace of Whitehall, and that ingress and egress to the Banqueting House was had through the galleries of the Palace. On the morning of the execution the King was escorted through St. James's Park to Whitehall, and passed through the gallery into his cabinet chamber, where he had to remain several hours. When summoned to the scaffold by Colonel Harker, he passed from his bed chamber along the galleries and into the Banqueting House. The question about the arches is one that I cannot answer. Probably they have something to do with the original plans of the new Palace contemplated by Inigo Jones, and an examination of the maps and plans now at Oxford, and in the British Museum, and at Windsor Castle, might throw light upon them. The only thing I recognise is the large window which must have been filled up by Christopher Wren at the time of the Fire.

Captain O'CALLAGHAN: The peculiarity about the two arches which attracted my attention is that they appear to have been built at the same time; because they had each of them a stone at each end which is common to both. It is extraordinary they should have built a semicircular stone arch with a low pitched brick arch immediately under it. The architect has had a beautiful photograph taken of the end of the building by the Stereoscopic Company.

Mr. C. A. H. BARTLETT: It is nothing more than proper I should state that the remarks made with reference to the building are very much condensed. There are many questions connected with this most interesting building which the limited time and space have prevented my going into, but I have not neglected them, and this Institution will have the benefit of whatever information I have gathered.

The CHAIRMAN (Admiral Boys): I am sure I shall be authorized by every one here to give our very best thanks to the lecturer to-day for bringing forward this subject, and also for explaining the history of the new buildings which we are so soon to inhabit.