

New Light on Lucy Walter, 1649-1659

In a deposition made before notary public Willem Guldemont in The Hague on 26 September 1663, Thomas Howard and John Harvey agreed henceforth no longer to prosecute each other but “absolutely” to discontinue and abandon all legal actions, either current or future, “in the case of Miss Lucy Berlon” (GAH605, folio 443). Five years after the decease of Lucy Walter (1630?-1658), a.k.a. Lucy Barlow, Berlo or, as here, Berlon, Charles II’s former mistress and the mother of James Scott, Duke of Monmouth (1649-1685),¹ this agreement put an end to the numerous claims and counterclaims between Thomas Howard (bapt. 8 July 1621-died before 10 June 1682), Master of the Horse to Mary (1631-1660), Princess Royal, and John Harvey, merchant, two protagonists in the story of Lucy Walter’s turbulent stay in the Netherlands in the 1650s. The same document was also the final piece of evidence in the Dutch paper trail of an episode as yet imperfectly reconstructed by modern scholarship.

In a recent article on “the tensions between royal authority and individual agency in exile” , Nicole Greenspan has demonstrated how Lucy Walter was able to “reinvent herself and to evolve from a Welsh gentlewoman of modest lineage to a royal mistress and mother of the king’s son...” (Greenspan 1390). Her account of Walter’s skills in negotiating the social, political, and financial constraints imposed by the conditions of exile is justly punctuated with reminders of how “much of Lucy Walter’s short life remains a mystery”—the assumption being that “[f]or much of the decade 1648-58 the sources are largely silent with respect to Lucy Walter” (Greenspan 1386, 1413). George Scott, Lucy’s most extensive biographer to date, has noted that “for more than a year...we do not know anything about her, or how she fared after she left England [in July 1656]” (166). With the exception of Marika Keblusek, all writers on the subject, including George Scott, Robin Clifton, and Greenspan, have remained ignorant of the existence in Dutch archives of an extensive collection of notarial acts, which are of immediate relevance to Lucy Walter’s life story and help to break the “silence” on events within the decade specified by Greenspan. Keblusek has drawn on some of these documents in a 2008 Dutch-language essay dealing with a manor house near Delft once owned by Walter (Keblusek 159-62). But apart from being acknowledged by Anna Keay in the latest biography

¹ I will be using these or other variants in accordance with the documents in which they appear. For the sake of brevity, and in order to avoid confusion with her brother Justus, I have mostly used the form “Lucy” in the remainder of the text.

of Monmouth, Keblusek's work has not prompted any further archival research (Keay 24, 30). Of the more than forty relevant records that have come to light as part of my investigation, thirty-six are preserved at The Hague City Archives.² Twenty of these are dated in 1657, most drawn up in quick succession (on one occasion four on the same day) by different notaries—a pace reflecting the hectic buzz surrounding Lucy Walter's legal affairs at this point in time. Eight more relevant documents are preserved in the city archives at Delft (four) and Rijswijk (four).

It is the purpose of the present article, on the basis of the available archival evidence, to trace Lucy Walter's whereabouts in the Low Countries, to shed some light on the circles in which she moved, and to assess in some detail her means of subsistence. The documents under consideration are virtually all testimonies or sworn depositions. Admittedly, they contain "no diary...no letters...no correspondence of [Walter's] own" but in a few, both those signed by her and a few others, we do "hear Lucy's voice directly" (Greenspan 1388). Despite their stereotyped nature, they help to paint a fuller picture of Lucy Walter's main preoccupations in the mid-1650s. I have throughout attempted to make sense of the facts and keep an eye on their immediate context while steering clear of some hasty generalizations about Lucy's personality that might be drawn from them. In order to clarify some of these contexts, however, it has proved necessary to go into details that might justifiably be ignored in a more sweeping life narrative but are, I hope, admissible here, if only on account of the sparsity of the historical record. What the newly unearthed evidence demonstrates is that the episode in Lucy's life examined below was not primarily spent in the orbit of royalty, as we may be tempted to infer from her reputation as Charles II's mistress. But the same evidence also raises a number of additional questions which, for the time being, must remain unresolved.

* * *

The earliest, and in several respects the most intriguing, document is a deposition made before notary public Quirijn Stoffelsen Gaeswijck on 19 April 1649 by the sixteen-year old Edward Fen (or Fin), "Englishman", on behalf of "the honourable Miss Lucy Barlow...now also staying here in The Hague" (GAH189 folio 207). A former servant of Captain Robert Killigrew, "garrisoned at Sluys, in Flanders", Fen testified that shortly after Christmas 1648 he himself and his master accompanied Barlow and her cousin on a three-stage journey south by waterways, first, from The Hague to

² See list of Works Cited. All citations marked GAH and chronologically arranged, refer to Haags Gemeentearchief, Notarieel archief (0372-01), followed by the inventory number and the date of the document. The Appendix consists of excerpts from the three notarial documents signed by Lucy, each of them with a different name.

Rotterdam, then on to Antwerp, where the ladies visited the sights of the city for three or four days, and finally to Brussels.³ Barlow had in her possession a “small cabinet” or box, which the boy by his captain’s order carried for her and kept safe in the inns where they stayed. Evidently aware of the valuable contents, Killigrew repeatedly admonished Fen to open the cabinet with a key he gave him, to take out all “the minted silver”, and replace it with a piece of lead, which he had bought for the purpose in Antwerp. Upon sailing for Brussels, Killigrew even urged Fen to drop the cabinet in the water and remember the spot where he did so, threatening Fen to “kick him out” and “chase him” if he did not do so. But Fen refused to comply, arguing that he would never be able to recover it afterwards. On board the barge, however, he later saw his Captain, under cover of his cloak, opening the cabinet himself, taking out “the papers”, and counting the coins of “minted gold”. Although Fen was enjoined to the strictest secrecy, he could not tell whether Killigrew placed the money back. But Killigrew did entrust Barlow’s cabinet to Fen’s care again, ordering him (without telling Barlow) to store it away in the first house where they would stay and to pick it up the next day. When Barlow, after their arrival in Brussels, inquired about her cabinet, Fen by order of the captain told her he left it in the barge. Fen concluded his deposition with the remark that the cabinet had in the meantime been restored to the rightful owner.

The temporal aspect of Fen’s testimony squares with what we know about Lucy Walter’s movements. Until late 1648-early 1649, she resided in The Hague, at the court of William II (d. 1650) and Mary, Princess Royal, and in the company of Charles II, who was still in the city when his father was executed in London on 30 January 1649. One wonders whether sight-seeing in Brussels and Antwerp was the main purpose of Walter’s journey with “her cousin” (and chaperone?), probably a daughter of Lucy’s aunt Margaret Walker and Peter Gosfright, who “had facilitated [Elizabeth’s, i.e. Lucy’s mother’s] flight to Holland with Lucy in 1647” (Keay 10). Six months pregnant with James Scott, born in Rotterdam on 9 April 1649, eighteen-year old Lucy would have realized that a journey, first, up the river Scheldt to Antwerp, and subsequently, via a complex canal system to Brussels in “that snowy and slippery winter” (Arthur 53) of 1648-49 was fraught with danger. If by 1648 she was already “regarded as a Royalist spy” (Scott 75), it seems probable that the journey to the Southern Netherlands was more than a pleasure trip undertaken on a whim, and without the approval of her royal surroundings in The Hague. Both her personal condition, carrying as she did “a King’s Treasure” (Arthur 53), and some weighty “political” assignment may explain why the party was in need of a military escort. And Robert Killigrew (born 1626?) may have considered it a mark of honour,

³ Writing from Paris in May 1652, Charles II interceded with Stadholder Willem Frederik on behalf of a widowed “damoiselle Fenne”, whose husband and brother had both been killed in the King’s service (Vander Motten “Unpublished Letters” 20). If she was Edward Fenne’s sister, this would make the link with Robert Killigrew and the King more likely.

consistent with the royal esteem in which his family had long been held, to be entrusted with the task of protecting Lucy's life and that of her unborn baby. It was no doubt on account of his merits as a professional soldier of fortune that Robert Killigrew was to be knighted at Breda by Prince Charles in 1650 (Vander Motten *Sir William Killigrew* 29-30). By then, the Killigrews could look back on a long-standing and close connection with the Stuart court. During the Civil Wars, Robert's father Sir William (1606-1695) was one of the staunchest defenders of the royalist cause and a special confidant of Charles I, whose favours he enjoyed, "grounded on his assurance, that I preferred his service before my owne interest" (Vander Motten *Sir William Killigrew* 64). One of Robert's aunts, Elizabeth (1622-1681), a former maid of honour to Queen Henrietta-Maria, was to become Prince Charles's mistress and bore him a daughter in 1651. Nor would the Killigrews have been strangers to the Walters. When they moved to London in 1637 or 1638 the Walter family lived in King Street, Covent Garden (Masters 11-2), in the neighbourhood of Robert's uncle Thomas Killigrew (1612-1683), who served both Charles I and his son in various capacities, and was still in touch with Lucy in the 1650s, as the notarial acts discussed below demonstrate.

Whether Charles's trust in Robert Killigrew was misplaced or not Fen's deposition does not allow us to determine. Although Killigrew, the ostensible villain in this episode, initially stated his intention not to accompany the ladies beyond Rotterdam, he quickly changed his mind, eager as he was to lay his hands on the valuables in Lucy's "little cabinet". Premeditation was definitely involved, else he would not have bought a piece of lead with which to replace the silver and golden coins. Apart from this, Fen's declaration leaves us with nothing but questions. Was Killigrew out for the money only—the original text reads "the papers *with* minted gold"? Were the silver and gold Lucy's own or meant to be used as payment to a contact person? Did the cabinet also contain some private documents which needed to be retrieved—Charles's letters to Lucy perhaps, those mentioned in the 1657 notarial acts (see below) or others? Was there even more sensitive evidence, such as that reputedly locked away in the black box of Lucy's confessor Bishop John Cosin, in 1680, proving that she and the king had married (Keay 242)? Such documents being of little personal interest to Killigrew, may he have been acting at someone else's bidding in ascertaining the content of the cabinet—Mary, Princess Royal, no friend of Lucy's, or Charles himself? Whatever the answer may be, Lucy clearly felt that her cabinet was valuable enough to be carried around on her journey. In that case, however, why did she so carelessly allow herself to be misled about its whereabouts? And if, as Fen testified, the cabinet was safely returned into Lucy's hands, what was the purpose of his statement? Why was it made at all, upon Lucy's request, some three months after the events, and ten days after the birth of James Scott in Rotterdam? Did Lucy simply want to have it recorded that she had carried out her task as best she could, despite Killigrew's machinations? Or, now that she

had become the mother of the successor to the English throne, was Lucy subtly signalling, through Fen's account, that she was holding on to written proof of Charles's relationship with her? Such leverage in the form of a notarial act might be appropriate enough at a time when efforts were made by Amalia van Solms, the Princess Dowager of Orange, "to induce the King to court" and marry her daughter Albertine Agnes, in return for "a loan of money" (George Scott 78).

* * *

In the absence of documentary proof, biographers have only been able to determine very tentatively Lucy Walter's whereabouts between 1649 and 1658. A quick glance at some of these may serve to indicate the uncertainty in this respect. Apart from John Evelyn's reliable testimony, dated 18 August 1649, that he had met Lucy in Paris, "a brown, beautiful, bold, but insipid creature" (George Scott 80), modern historians have generally had to resort to speculation in tracing Lucy's toing and froing in the Low Countries. Without adducing any evidence to support the point, one writer has assumed that between February and June 1650, "Charles and Lucy seem to have lived together under the same roof" (Chapman 149). On 23 March 1650, Lucy is believed to have joined Charles II in Ghent, the King's stopping-place on his way to Breda and the negotiations with the Scottish commissioners (Chapman 145; Eva Scott *King in Exile* 130-1). Even the exact birthdate (and the paternity) of her daughter Mary, in 1650 or 1651, has never been definitively established (George Scott ch. xi). Lucy was possibly at Liège in August 1654, where according to rumours circulated thirty years later she was married to the King (George Scott 69). Ronald Hutton has very aptly summed up the state of the scholarship on the subject with his remark that "Lucy's movements during the period 1653-5 are as obscure as most of her story" (Hutton 96).

Between 19 April 1649, the date of Fen's deposition, and March 1657 (see below) the official Dutch records, to the best of my knowledge, provide no further information about Lucy Walter. But the year 1657 amply makes up for this silence, yielding a bumper crop of notarial acts and other documents, some of which allow us to reconstruct with reasonable certainty parts of Lucy's life story in the previous two or three years. So far the best-documented episode of this period has been that of Lucy's journey from The Hague to England, together with her two children, her brother Justus Walter and Tom Howard (see above), in late May 1656 (George Scott, 126-48). As appears from the *Thurloe State Papers*, during their stay in London Lucy herself, Howard (then secretly in Cromwell's pay as a spy), and her maid Anne Hill were imprisoned and examined by the republican government (George Scott 17). The information Lucy provided to the Lieutenant of the Tower as well as to her

travelling companions about her contacts with the King and her destitute state as the widow of a “Dutch captain” was largely a mixture of lies and half-truths. Whether she had been on a spying mission must remain a moot point; the fact that she was discharged from prison and sent back to Flanders on 16 July may militate against this hypothesis. However, she may not have been lying when she told her interrogator on 28 June that “she came over only to looke after 1500 £ left her by her mother”, who had recently died (Birch 169). That her journey was partly motivated by her need for ready cash does not seem unlikely in view of her purchase, less than two weeks before her departure for England, of an expensive piece of real estate in Holland.

On 12 May 1656, the administrators of the seigniorship of Rijswijk, south of The Hague, recorded the sale, to “Mrs Marie Walters her heirs and offspring”, of a “hond” of land [a Dutch area measure varying from 1,200 to 3,300 m²] built with a house, stables, an orchard, and a “plantation”, as well as three “morgens” of grassland [approximately 25,000 m²] (AR541, folio 30). The sellers were Anna, Elizabeth, Johanna, and Cornelia Pentland, daughters of the late Willem Pentland, who had acquired the property in 1644. Named “De Ruit” [“The Lozenge”] by its new owner in 1667 (Graswinckel 194-95), it was situated east of the Delft road connecting The Hague with Delft, and faced the country seat of “Pasgelt” [lit. “Ferry Toll”], the rented home of the Pentland family (Bottema). Willem Pentland (died before May 1654) had been the captain of a company of foot soldiers in the Scottish regiment of colonel Archibald Douglas, in the service of the United Provinces. Pentland may have owed some of his financial comfort to his position as an army “solliciteur”, a person acting as an official money-lender paying advances on soldiers’ wages and other military expenses at interest. Financial need may nevertheless have induced the Pentland heirs to put up “De Ruit” for sale, for after their father’s death, they acknowledged a mortgage of 3,000 guilders to Everard van Loodensteijn, the former mayor of Delft (AD2 folio 95)—a mortgage which Willem Pentland had taken out in November 1653 (AD1 folio 277).

Thomas Howard, also a military man in the service of the United Provinces, was likely the intermediary between the Walters and the Pentlands in arranging Lucy’s acquisition of her Delft country estate. The parties in the May 1656 sales contract were evidently no strangers to each other. As early as January 1656 Lucy had proudly displayed some of her jewellery to Elizabeth and Cornelia Pentland, then still living on what was soon to become Lucy’s home (AD3 folio 309). But the relationship between the Walter and Pentland families was more than purely transactional. On 28 July 1657, the marriage registers of the Dutch Reformed Church at Rijswijk recorded that “Mr Justus Walter and Miss Cornelia Pentlant” had declared their intention to marry (AR707.1 folio 67); the couple had their first banns read the next day. Even before the wedding Justus had settled down with Cornelia at their “Pasgeld” home (see below). In June 1659 Justus Walter professed himself a

member of the Reformed Church at Delft (AD4 folio 32) and after the Restoration the Walters moved to London.⁴ Their courtship cannot have been a long one for Justus had come over from England to Holland as recently as March 1656 (George Scott 126). Upon Justus' introduction into the Pentland household, it is not unlikely that business and sentimental motives became subtly intertwined in Lucy's decision to purchase "De Ruit".

The stereotyped phrase about the buyer's "heirs and offspring" in the (otherwise unsigned) contract of sale may well have been an apt expression of Lucy's hope of passing on her newly acquired property to her children. Her assumption of her five-year old daughter's first name—one of several aliases she used in those years—is almost symbolical in this respect. Contemporary depictions or detailed descriptions of her country house and grounds are not available. Like the average country estate outside Delft, the property was probably quite modest, a conglomerate of renovated, enlarged buildings and plots of farm land (den Hartog 9; van der Wijck 407). While this dubious emblem of affluence could not match the grandeur of the country villas built between Amsterdam and Utrecht by the wealthy Dutch patriciate (Schama 290-94), it could at least provide Lucy with the illusion of belonging to their ranks. Also, and somewhat ironically, at a time when the exiled king on whom she depended for her survival had to beg for bread, to be in possession of a countryside *pied-à-terre* would have offered both her and Justus the prospect of material and familial stability. Anne Hill's testimony in June 1656 that "for ought she perceives, the said lady [i.e. Lucy] maintains her brother" provides a revealing clue in this respect (Birch 161). But the fact that by 1656 the King's former mistress had long been a liability to the Stuart/Orange court at The Hague may also help explain her—either self-imposed or enforced—removal to nearby Delft in 1656.

Until May 1656, Lucy, Justus, and her maid had shared a house on Denneweg [Pine Tree Road] in The Hague (see below). When Anne Hill, who had been Lucy's servant at The Hague since August 1655, testified in London on 2 July 1656 that Walter and Howard lived "very plentifully in clothes and dyet" but "closely in their lodgings," (Birch 178) she may not have been aware of Lucy's recent acquisition of the spacious Delft estate. At a time when a small house in town could be bought for 300 guilders (Schama 619), its sale price amounted to 10,000 guilders. To put its value in perspective: when in January 1658 the large "Pasgeld" estate, situated across the "Delftse Vliet" and rented by the Pentlands, was sold by the De Hertoghe family, who had owned it since 1601 (Willemijn Fock 110; AR541 folio 62-64), it yielded 25,000 guilders. According to the deed of sale, Lucy made a cash payment of 2,000 guilders and signed a promissory note in the amount of 8,000 guilders, which must have been duly paid for there is no documentary evidence of a default on her

⁴ The Cornelia Walter, unidentified by Anna Keay (102), who in 1663 became a member of the Duke of Monmouth's household and received a "modest annual pension" was Justus's wife.

part. This obviously raises the question of the origin and amplitude of the financial support extended to her. Lucy came from an impoverished family of the Welsh lower gentry (Hutton 26) and it is doubtful whether the money from her mother's inheritance ever materialized; if it did, it would only have paid for part of Lucy's manor. And it is highly unlikely that the annual pension of 5,000 French *livres* that Charles, himself impecunious, had retroactively granted her, first in Cologne in January 1655, and again in Paris in January 1656, was ever fully paid (George Scott 114). The funds for the purchase of the Pentland estate as well as Lucy's extravagant life style must therefore have come from another source, probably the sale of property which Lucy owned before May 1656.

Acts signed before notary public Walter Rietraet on 8 February and 11 August 1659, respectively, record the transfer of two separate properties by Elizabeth Croocks (or Crocks) and her son John Harvey to Willem Boers, caretaker in the service of "His Highness", the young Prince of Orange (GAH177 folios 16, 159). Both were located on Denneweg, the sandy road meandering its way from the centre of The Hague to the seaside, and consisted of "a house, stables, and appurtenances." The first, and probably the larger one, was exchanged for one of Boers's houses on "Thoorstraat" [Tower Street] and a surplus payment of 3,700 guilders; the second one was the object of a regular sale, amounting to 3,700 guilders as well. Interestingly, both deeds specify that the property had belonged to [the text reads "come from"] "Luce Barlo", implying that Harvey and his mother had directly bought the property from Lucy Walter. That Lucy had not merely been a tenant suffers no doubt, else the rightful owner's name would have appeared in the notarial act. Her houses in The Hague, the seat of the States-General of the United Provinces and a centre of international traffic where, as one contemporary put it, "all the Gentry and their Coaches assemble,/ In order to see and be seen" [my transl.] (Vander Motten *Lost Years* 313), were the conspicuous signs of her social status. I have been unable to ascertain when she acquired the houses on Denneweg, let alone whether she bought them simultaneously and at what price. But this would have been in 1654 or May 1655 at the latest, when Robert Sanderson, one of the many deponents testifying in favour of Thomas Howard, delivered some valuables to Lucy there (GAH479 folio 42-43r). Her ownership of this real estate, then, undoubtedly coincided with the period when she (reputedly) became the mistress of Howard, who as Anna Keay has plausibly argued would have provided the funds (Keay 24)—or at least some of them.

The Harveys too were more important contributors to Lucy Walter's cause than has been recognized. John Harvey Sr (born around 1580-died before 15 August 1650) was an English merchant, who had lived and worked in The Hague since at least 15 November 1630, when he witnessed an attestation of business partnership between two or three fellow-countrymen (GAH18 folio 98; GAH56 folio 22). After his death, his widow Elizabeth Croocks became the co-trustee of her late

husband's inheritance. In association with her sons Frederick, Dudley—both of them at one time operating from London—and John Jr, Elizabeth continued her late husband's work of trading to and from their home country, as the contracts and attestations strewn with names of English merchants indicate. By the 1650s the Harveys also acted as hosts, donors or financiers for the exiled Stuarts in the Low Countries (Eva Scott *Travels of the King* 290). Unsurprisingly, it was in one of John Harvey's houses that Charles II (and Lucy Walter herself?) spent the night during his stay in Antwerp on 22 May 1656 (Birch 178). And it is no coincidence that another house which Harvey occupied before 1669 in the centre of The Hague was called "De Coninck van Engelant" (GAH402 folio 174). The Harveys' support extended to Lucy as well for in the war of depositions pitting her against Howard, John Harvey Jr consistently defended her interests, not least because he had a financial stake in them. A notarial act dated 24 November 1661 shows that three years after Lucy's demise there were still business dealings between the Harveys and the London-based Frances Gosfright, presumably Lucy's cousin (GAH178 folio 442). That the Harveys could never expect a return on their investments in Lucy's well-being must have been a foregone conclusion. More than simply providing for her basic needs, they pandered to Lucy's appetite for luxury objects—an appetite gluttonous enough to have constituted a drain on the family's own resources. Around July 1655, Lucy had bought a diamond ring from Howard, which he had professedly pawned to a local jeweller for 1,500 guilders at interest, but which he claimed was worth 3,000 guilders (GAH294 folio 25). Although it turned out that the ring had been pawned for 800 guilders only, Lucy paid Howard 1,500 guilders—all of it advanced by John Harvey. And as late as April 1658, a few months before her death, Lucy still owed Elizabeth Croocks a debt of 300 guilders, even though a bond meant for the purpose, in Howard's name, had sat with her for some two years (GAH410 folio 336).⁵ Nevertheless, as was noted long ago, Lucy's relationship with John Harvey was not only about money but just as much in the nature of an "intimate" friendship (Aulnoy 402, 411), a sentiment not readily deducible from the official documents.

On 1 June 1657, during the height of the quarrels with Howard, Harvey was to testify at Lucy's request that "Lucia Berloo, widow, together with two children and her brother" had lived in a house both outside Delft and in The Hague for five months, where he "frequently visited her, saw her children, and talked to her brother" (GAH307 folio 151). Admittedly, doubts may be cast on the accuracy of the first part of this testimony. Why did Lucy continue to describe herself as a widow, when the father of her first child was alive? Perhaps Harvey was prepared to bend his truthful testimony to some extent in order to gain this "widow" a modicum of pity in the eyes of the judicial

⁵ The deponent speaking on behalf of Elizabeth Croocks was one John Floyd, "living in Brussels", probably the "doctor Floid", with whom Lucy had had "another combat", according to one of Cromwell's spies writing from Brussels on 26 August 1658. Although Floyd was said to have "got the worse" and to have "gone for Holland", I have found no trace of him in the notarial records at The Hague.

authorities. If so, the act suggests that in the person of John Harvey Lucy not only found a generous money-lender but also a willing advocate of her cause, a close friend—and evidently a trustworthy agent.

In a deposition made before notary Pieter van Groenevelt at The Hague on 27 April 1657, “Mary Walter” declared having given power of attorney to Harvey to sell her Delft manor, with all its appurtenances, less than a year after she had first occupied it (GAH110 folio 119). Harvey was hereby empowered to collect all the moneys proceeding from the sale, to give the buyer proof of payment, to ensure him or her that the property was unencumbered, to pay the real estate taxes due, and to settle the new owner in his or her property. The notarial act, signed by Lucy in her own hand, stipulated that all of these were to be confirmed by the proper official letters and to be carried out subject to the seller’s approval. In the authorization Lucy’s place of residence is given as The Hague, where by April 1657 she was again accommodated in Harvey’s house on High Street (GAH110 folio 119; Aulnoy 410). On 3 May Harvey had his power of attorney and the sale recorded by the authorities at Rijswijk (AR541 folio 43-4). The actual sale must have been concluded two or three months earlier. At a price of 7,700 guilders—substantially lower than the purchase price—the manor passed into the hands of Dr Thomas Browne, Princess Mary’s Anglican preacher, who no doubt knew Howard and may have heard first-hand of Lucy Walter’s intention to dispose of her property (Kebulsek 155-56). But Lucy and Justus did not easily adjust to the idea of parting with their newly acquired real estate and proved rather unscrupulous in their business dealings with the new owner.

After the sale, on 7 April 1657, Browne lodged a complaint against Justus Walter, living at “Pasgeld” with his future wife Cornelia (GAH162 folio 147). Summoning as witnesses Cornelis Willemsz., Lucy’s former farmhand, and Claes Arentsz., Justus’s next-door neighbour, Browne accused Justus of having cut on his [Browne’s] land, “during last winter’s frost”, several alder trees and taken them to his “sister’s property”. In addition to other accusations of theft, the deponents declared that Justus had dug up some blackcurrant and cherry trees, which he had then planted in “his sister’s garden”. This garden was said to be accessible by “a plank across the ditch *separating the property of the petitioner from that of Walter’s sister*” [my italics]. The wording of the act does not leave much room for interpretation: either Browne already owned property there before he bought Lucy’s estate or her “garden” was a separate piece of land adjacent to “De Ruit” and not implicated in the sale to Browne. If the latter, this makes the true extent of Lucy’s assets during the years at The Hague virtually impossible to assess.

The only indication about Lucy’s reasons for selling her Delft estate is contained in a deposition made at Howard’s request on 23 May 1657 by John Lane, an English merchant, and Maria

Teyckenbeeck, the housekeeper at Delft during Walter's absence in England in 1656. According to the deponents, Lucy had disposed of all her goods, buildings, furniture, and "farming tools" because she now planned to leave Holland (GAH162 folio 51), a decision that she had reached a few months earlier, as the power of attorney given to Harvey proves. Her impatience to leave Delft behind may account for the financial loss she suffered on what was possibly a hastily concluded sale. Trying to elude the King's attempts to kidnap her son, by late July 1657 she settled down in Brussels (Keay 31). But far from relieving her cares, the sale of her Dutch property, even before her removal to the Spanish Netherlands, had become the occasion for an interminable series of barbed disputes relating to matters of ownership—all fought out at the behest of her financiers, Tom Howard and John Harvey.

* * *

A statement made and signed by Lucy before notary van Sterrevelt on 23 May 1657 conveys a faint sense of the nature of the personal belongings she had amassed in the previous years. She declared having "ceded, transported, and transferred" to Mrs Elizabeth Morris various valuables, including two pieces of "Indian" gold, two pieces of "foreign" gold, some Elizabethan and Jacobean coins, a ring set with onyx, and gems embroidered on a ribbon (GAH410 folio 208). The buyer paid the sum of 130 guilders—a considerable sum equalling about two thirds of the amount of a schoolmaster's or preacher's "annual stipend" (Schama 617). Elizabeth Morris, *née* van Tongeren (born around 1629; GAH336 folio 206) was the second wife of Sir Richard Morris, former wagon-master to "His Royal Highness of Great Britain" (GAH37 folio 181, 183), who had long been established in Holland and, like Willem Pentland, had secured a position of "solliciteur" in the army of the United Provinces. After Morris's decease, which occurred before 19 July 1651 (GAH214 folios 126-27), Elizabeth acted as his trustee and was appointed sole inheritor by her five children in February 1654 (GAH336 folio 227). Well-connected in Hague society as notary Abraham van Tongeren's sister, by 20 December 1654 she carried on her late husband's profession as the "sollicitrice" to a company of soldiers under the command of Captain Sir Francis Vere (GAH336 folio 94). As with the purchase and the sale of her Delft estate, the transaction with Elizabeth Morris suggests that Lucy Walter understood how to connect with affluent local merchants and military people by capitalizing on her status as an ostensibly well-to-do exile.

On 26 May 1657, only three days after Lucy had the sale of her jewellery to Elizabeth Morris recorded, Thomas Howard struck back with an extensive attestation meant to claim ownership of the goods with which he had entrusted Lucy in the previous two years (GAH479 folio 42-43r). No fewer

than three deponents, Robert Sanderson, a chamberlain “living with Thomas Howard”, John Lane, and his wife Dirckje Theunis, were summoned to testify before notary Johan van Dijck. Sanderson’s itemized list of luxury objects he had handed over to “Miss Lucia Berlo” at her house on Denneweg around May 1655 was the most extensive. It included two candelabras, two “guéridons” [small ornamental tables], a large jug, a chafing dish, a caudle jar (all in silver) as well as various other costly objects. Shortly before delivering these, he had also brought her a red damask bed with a white satin mattress, another bed covered in red cloth, precious tapestries, and two brown mares “from the stables of Her Highness”, the Princess-Royal. Theunis declared that around April 1656, i.e. even before Lucy bought her Delft property, she had assembled most of the silverware mentioned by Sanderson and sold off, by Berlo’s order, the candelabras, the jar, the chafing dish, and some silver spoons. The same witness also stated seeing at Lucy’s house tapestries which had been put up for sale by Howard but which she [Lucy] professedly wanted to acquire for herself. While some of these—the jug, dish, and ornamental table—were fairly typical of the Dutch average middle-class household, the fact that they were all made of silver indicated “an important step up the hierarchy of domestic display” (Schama 317). The beds covered in satin mattresses and decorated with red damask hangings, especially expensive items, would also have stood out as the unmistakable marks of the owner’s opulence (Thornton ch. VII). And the dizzying amounts of money needed to acquire Lucy’s rings and precious stones equalled those spent on jewellery by the wealthiest of Dutch contemporary patricians (Schama 320-21).

Trying to disentangle the valuables donated or lent to Lucy by Howard (including the gems in the Miller sale?) and Harvey from those which she may have bought from them is virtually impossible. Lane declared that Lucy possessed a golden needle set with diamonds, a jewel which Howard had redeemed at a price of 2000 guilders at interest from one van Eyck, a pawn-broker in The Hague. The question whether Lucy acted with Howard’s approval in selling (or pawning?) her silverware appears to answer itself for she disposed of them during Howard’s prolonged absence from The Hague, when he accompanied the Princess Royal on her visit to Paris, between January and November 1656 (Eva Scott *Travels of the King* 231-2). It does not seem unlikely that, in anticipation of her investment in the Delft estate, she wanted to cash in on these items. Various other attestations of a slightly later date prove that Sanderson’s catalogue was by no means an exhaustive one and that, even after the sale, Lucy had the wherewithal to surround herself with an abundance of movable luxury goods.

With a battery of sworn statements by various local craftsmen in the space of two or three days in June 1657, Howard redoubled his efforts in asserting his ownership of these goods. On 11 June, Hendrick Hageman, a local repairman, reiterated (somewhat confusingly) Robert Sanderson’s

earlier statement, testifying that around February 1656, by Howard's order, he had brought into the house of "Madam Berloo" on Denneweg a wall tapestry, a bedstead covered in red cloth, and two white satin mattresses (GAH175 folio 117). Three months earlier he had already supplied her with a red damask bedstead crafted by him. How far Lucy's relationship with Howard reached back can be derived from the testimony of one Jacob Cristal, a furniture maker, on 13 June. Three years earlier, in 1654 but "without remembering the exact date", Cristal had supplied Howard with a single bed covered in red East-Indian damask, with folding ironwork parts, as well as three white fustian mattresses. These items had undoubtedly been made to order, for Cristal declared that he had seen all of them afterwards in Lucy's house on Denneweg, in the course of 1655 (GAH175 folio 123).

Nor was Lucy's expensive taste confined to flashy household goods only, either donated or lent. In the deposition of 11 June, Hageman's colleague Noë Herle declared that in January 1657 he had met with the chamberlain of "Lord Taft's" in order to transport into Flanders, by Lucy's orders, two brown mares which Howard had "left" at her house near Delft.⁶ Unless she had a trustworthy contact or a place of refuge there, it is unclear why Lucy would have wanted to keep the horses beyond Howard's reach in Flanders. In February 1657, Sanderson had also visited her in order to demand the return of his master's property. Undaunted, Lucy had told him to signify to his master that if he came to Delft himself, she would have the animals handed over to him (GAH175 folio 119). Having bespoken "a coach...lined with red velvet...and gold fringe" during her imprisonment in London the previous year (Birch 178), Lucy obviously enjoyed the notion of having a horse-drawn carriage as a mark of distinction at her disposal. It can be no coincidence that the portrait painted of her by either Gerard van Honthorst (1592-1656) or Johannes Mijtens (c. 1614-1670), and preserved at Knebworth House, shows her in full riding regalia, with "a habit trimmed with ermine", a hat "adorned with red and white feathers", and "a whip in her right hand" (Fea 192, 194-5). Whether the black boy holding the horse in the background was an actual member of Lucy's household matters less than the symbols of nobility and abundance that the painting was meant to radiate.

On 13 June, before a different notary, three separate witnesses were called in to further substantiate Howard's claims, including John Lane and Maria Teyckenbeeck, who had already borne witness on 23 May (GAH162 folio 64-5). Lane, who had been instructed to pick up and store some of Lucy's goods during her absence, repeated his earlier declaration about the diamond needle. Around the time when she may have been prospecting her new estate, Lucy had proudly exhibited the jewel to Lane, Howard, and no less a person than Evert van Lodesteijn, Mayor of Delft (GAH142 folio 92), at

⁶ "Taft" was Theobald Taaffe (c. 1603-1677), second Viscount Taaffe, who in February 1657 reassured Lucy that the King "has noething more in consideration than hir sufferings." (George Scott 155). Writing from Cologne, however, Charles had asked Taaffe as early as May 1655 to "advise her, both for her sake and myne that she goes to some place more private than the Hage, for her stay there is very preiudiciall to us both." (Crist 15).

Miss Pentland's house in March 1656. In Lucy's house in The Hague he remembered seeing "several times" four clocks, two enamelled in gold, two in silver, although admittedly he did not know to whom they belonged. When "Barlow" departed for England [i.e. in May 1656], Lane declared, she left behind several boxes of household goods, including the red cover for the bed belonging to Howard. Teyckenbeeck, Lucy's caretaker during her absence, corroborated Lane's testimony. In the basement room of the house near Delft she saw the woodwork of the folding bedstead with its four damask-covered knobs. Lane's maid Neeltje Cornelis, finally, stated that when Lucy sent for her goods at Lane's house, she found eight bedstead knobs, the so-called "finials" capping off the bed posts (Thornton 176), all of which the deponent had placed in the canal barge connecting The Hague with Delft (Frijhoff 172-73).

* * *

This barrage of detailed depositions, no more than briefly summarized here, was delivered at a time when Lucy's defences had become seriously weakened. The warrant of attorney dated 3 May 1657 stipulated that Harvey had certified that the real estate he had sold on her behalf had not been burdened with a mortgage "during the trial of Mrs Maria Walters." I have been unable to trace any record of the legal proceedings against her but she was almost certainly being prosecuted for debt.⁷ Some of the circumstances can be approximately reconstructed from a handful of statements made by the different parties involved. Following a claim by Thomas Howard, the Court of Holland—the judicial institution handling both civil and criminal cases (Le Bailly 11-12; 22-25)—had issued an apprehension warrant for "Miss Lucia Barlou" on 29 May 1657 (GAH376 folio 241). Three bailiffs, servants of the Attorney-General in The Hague, testified on 8 October 1657 that they had placed her under house arrest in the home of Gerrit Vloet (died before 29 May 1658; GAH488 folio 82) on 29 May, for a period of thirty-five days. Vloet, or "Flut" as he signed his German name in some 1630s records (GAH180 folio 156), was a wine dealer who would have been well-known in the mercantile community of The Hague. He was on sufficiently good terms with John Harvey to witness the latter's somewhat misleading deposition of 1 June 1657, quoted earlier, that Lucy had lived in The Hague and

⁷ On 14 February 1657 Daniel O'Neile informed King Charles that "Mrs Barloe" had tried to kill her maid (Ann Hill?) "by thrusting a bodkin into hire eare as she was asleep", in order to prevent her from revealing the "infamous" way in which she lived with Howard and the two abortions she had had. As O'Neile explicitly added that he managed to avoid "publick scandal" with hush money given to the maid (George Scott 155), it is unlikely that Lucy was ever brought to trial for attempted murder. Keblusek (161) has perceptively noted that Lucy's weapon may have been the diamond "pontson"[French "poinçon" or "pick"] that the Pentland sisters saw in her hands in May 1656 (GAH479 folio 46).

near Delft for five months. Whether by a court order or through Harvey's agency, it remains unclear why Lucy should have served her sentence in the home of Vloet and his wife Aeltgen Claes rather than in Harvey's own house, where she was accommodated after the sale of her Delft estate. But as far as can be inferred from the extant records, the conditions of Lucy's confinement do not seem to have been exceedingly harsh. About a punishment other than this house arrest, the notarial records are frustratingly silent.

Although the Vloets must have been well-to-do, Lucy was expected to pay for part of her upkeep, probably in accordance with the rules governing the practice of house arrest. In the case of a debtor, especially one like the feisty Lucy Walter, this requirement evidently proved hard to enforce and gave rise to various claims and counterclaims made by, or on behalf of, Aeltgen Claes, the beleaguered housewife on the one hand, and John Harvey, ever ready to safeguard Lucy's interests, on the other. At first sight the testimonies documenting these differences of opinion, which went on long after Lucy had been released, may read like the humdrum *petite histoire* of her stay in Holland but in no other notarial records do we come closer to hearing her speak in her own voice.

The Attorney-General's officers entrusted with Lucy's custody declared on 12 June that Claes had so far generously treated "Madam Lucia Berloo and her company"—usually six people at midday and six again at night—to pastries and other foods (GAH307 folio 153). Even on the morning of the 12th, Claes had gone up to Lucy's bedroom and said: "Day and night I have demanded fifty Carolus guilders for your board. Do you think this is too much to ask?" To which she replied in the presence of the deponents: "Not at all. I am prepared to give you a receipt in my hand showing that this money is owed to you and that you could not do with anything less [i.e. with any smaller amount]." As the meaning of the words as reported in the Dutch act are slightly ambiguous, we cannot be sure whether it was merely Lucy's debt that Claes wanted to highlight or her cynical indifference to the petitioner's repeated demands for remuneration, or indeed both. Almost three months after Lucy had been released from custody, the same law officers confirmed their declaration of 12 June, adding that John Harvey, who was mostly with his protégée, had repeatedly met Claes's demands for payment with the reassuring words, "I can guarantee that I will pay you fully for everything" (GAH307 folio 177).

Several months later, on 8 October 1657, at John Harvey's request, Lucy's former guards painted a more variegated picture of her enforced spell with the Vloet family. They now testified that, although initially they had been treated to food and drink by their hosts, they had paid for everything themselves. So indeed had "Miss Barlou", who after the first twelve days had her maid go out and buy her own victuals, even though her host did allow her the occasional bowl of soup. The

deponents further stated that the arrestee was never dined as abundantly as had been declared to the Court and that she had never enjoyed any drinks other than those she paid for herself (GAH376 folio 241). Lucy's maid, twenty-one year old Angenita Cornelis, substantiated this testimony as late as 20 November 1657, pointing out that Vloet had never served Barlow all the food that he had claimed, except once a glass of wine or sugared cider, when he was with her in the company of Mr "Mourits"—probably Sir Richard Morris's son—and his wife and children (GAH376 folio 280).

The deposition of June 12th would not have been made if Claes had been reimbursed in the meantime. Very likely she never was, although the deponents did end their statement with the intriguing remark that a small box containing jewels and some money which "by improper means" (and by way of payment?) had been handed over to Claes had been taken away by Harvey. Soon after Lucy's arrest, by 7 or 8 June, Harvey may have begun to contemplate less subtle ways to secure her freedom. One Jacob Herp, a serjeant-at-arms, insisted on refuting Harvey's allegation that he [i.e. Herp] had ways and opportunities to help escape the "young woman" held at Vloet's house (GAH162 folio 60). In order to help her get away, however, Herp (*dixit* Harvey) would require from her a substantial amount to live on, as he would no doubt be dismissed from his office and have to leave The Hague. Was this an escape plan hatched up by Harvey himself? Or was Herp open to bribery, and in that case, would he have let Harvey in on it? Whatever the answer may be, Harvey was right in suspecting that Herp was one of Howard's henchmen, relaying to him everything that was said regarding the detainee in Vloet's house. For Howard openly stayed in touch with Lucy, using as one other of his go-betweens William Dike, the Princess-Royal's master shoemaker, to discuss with Lucy the terms of her detention and to try and settle the differences between them (GAH376 folio 244).

One of these differences concerned a diamond ring belonging to Howard, which Lucy had wanted to buy at a price of 850 guilders—once again with money advanced by Harvey. Of the three notarial acts documenting the case (including William Dike's tortuous account, dated 27 July 1657), two are water-stained and partly illegible, which makes a full reconstruction of the grievances on either side well-nigh impossible (GAH337 folios 321-22). Both the ring and Harvey's money had been given in trust to a neutral third party, Gerard Graswinckel (1614-1669), a solicitor with the Court of Holland and the city secretary of The Hague (Graswinckel 175-77), pending the outcome of an unsubstantiated claim by Lucy that Howard owed her 15,000 guilders. According to John Lane, in his testimony dated 13 June, Lucy had confided to him that not only did a merchant in Flanders owe her 2,000 guilders, which Howard had raked in in her place, but also that she had "raised" another 6,000 guilders, which except for a sum of 500 guilders Howard had also kept (GAH162 folio 64-5). Howard vehemently denied all these accusations and made an oral agreement with Harvey that, if the latter could not within two months produce written proof of this huge debt, Howard would be entitled to

repossess the ring as well as Harvey's money. Probably playing for time, Harvey afterwards argued that during Lucy's five-week detention, he had been unable to get hold of the documents corroborating her claim. How the disagreement was settled we do not know but Lucy's implicit portrayal of Howard as a defaulting debtor or an embezzler were evidently designed to give him a taste of his own medicine. The fact, however, that the ever-obliging Harvey protested any debts he might incur if he failed to fulfil his agreement with Howard betrays his scepticism about the validity of Lucy's demands (GAH376 folio 172).

As already noted, the resentment between both parties lingered on long after Lucy's trial. On 24 October 1657, Howard produced what would have been his most knowledgeable and eminent witness against Lucy: her brother Justus, styled an "English nobleman" in the notarial act (GAH189 folio 578). Now married to Cornelia Pentland and probably no longer dependent on his sister's support, Justus may have been recruited into Howard's service for any number of reasons, about which it is useless to speculate. His enumeration of the luxury items he testified seeing in his sister's house around July 1656 was by far the most exhaustive and systematic of those recorded until then and need not be rehearsed in detail. Stowed away by his sister after the sale of her estate, most of these items (if not all) had obviously never been returned to their owner. Mattresses, red damask hangings, pillow-cases, and other bedding had been taken to Harvey's house in The Hague. A bed, tapestries, and silverware packed in two cases (with Justus' help) had been transported to the house of Colonel Robert Sidney. Of the jewels set with diamonds, worth 5,000 guilders, which Howard had given her, Lucy had pawned some to one Master Bex, a merchant in London, for £200. It may seem nothing short of remarkable that Sidney, "into whose hands" Lucy "had fallen" when she first came to Holland (George Scott 28) almost ten years earlier, should now have suddenly materialized and helped secure his cast-off mistress's goods. Possibly, and despite his military commissions abroad, Sidney had kept in touch with Lucy. But it is just as likely that it was at Harvey's invitation that the colonel, upon his return to Holland in June 1656 (George Scott 132), had stepped in to lend his assistance. That both men knew each other well is suggested by the fact that on 20 August 1657 John Harvey and his mother Elizabeth had rented to Sidney, for a period of one year and at a rate of 200 guilders, a house with a garden on Denneweg, in The Hague (GAH410 folio 249)—perhaps one that had belonged to Lucy?

* * *

In addition to illustrating Lucy Walter's relentless craving for money (and her predilection for luxurious beds), three of the depositions made on Howard's behalf allow us to catch a glimpse of a social contact that deserves more than incidental attention. The only buyer mentioned by name in Dirckje Theunis's testimony of 26 May 1657 is "Captain Killigrew", who shortly after May 1656 bought Lucy's damask-covered bedstead, some chairs, and a piece of tissue. After his marriage to his second wife, the wealthy, Dutch-born heiress Charlotte van Hesse-Piershil, on 28 January 1655, the courtier dramatist Thomas Killigrew had established himself in The Hague (Vander Motten *Lost Years* 315-7), where he must have crossed Lucy's path many years after making the Walter family's acquaintance. In the course of the same year, thanks to the King's mediation with the Frisian Stadholder Willem-Frederik, Killigrew managed to secure the position of captain of a company of foot soldiers garrisoned in Maastricht, and moved his family to that city. Through his marriage, the ostentatious but chronically indigent Cavalier had gained the right to levy on the Piershil landed property (Vander Motten *Lost Years* 318). He would therefore have found it easy to shell out the exorbitant amount of 600 guilders for Lucy's items of furniture—or, as Lane declared, have the "Lord of Piershil", one of Charlotte's brothers, pay it for him. Through the purchase, one of these items reverted to its original owner. The tissue, as Theunis specified, had been made to order for Killigrew in Italy. Upon his return to England, after his failed mission as the King's envoy to the state of Venice between 1649 and 1652, Killigrew had sold the valuable fabric to none other than Howard, who must have passed it on to Lucy.

Among the objects they had seen in Lucy's house, John Lane and William Dike, in their testimonies of 13 June, and Justus Walter in his on 24 October all highlighted the presence of several expensive portraits. Justus, who having lived with his sister would have been most familiar with the interior of the house, stated that around July 1656 she possessed several works of art, including three small paintings covered in crystal glass, each in a golden box. The first two were portraits of Howard, one of which was blue-enamelled; the third, according to Lucy, was a portrait of Captain Killigrew's first wife. At the time of his testimony, Justus did not know what had become of the portraits. Lane and Dike, though less specific in their description, also declared having seen the portrait of Killigrew's wife. Dike did add that of the two paintings of Howard's that Lucy owned, she had given one to her aunt—probably Margaret Walter, her mother's sister (George Scott 34).

Thomas Killigrew had married Cecilia Crofts, the daughter of Sir John Crofts (McGee 373) and a maid of honour to Queen Henrietta-Maria, on 29 June 1636. Happy as the relationship had been according to Killigrew's biographer, it was cut short by Cecilia's untimely death on 1 January 1638 (Harbage 65, 69). Even after his marriage to Charlotte van Hesse, seventeen years later, Killigrew retained fond memories of Cecilia, as appears from the 1638 painting by Van Dyck, where he is

shown in mourning (Brown 314-16) as well as the letters and official documents of the 1650s in which he wove her intertwined initials into his own signature (Vander Motten and Daemen-De Gelder 83). As has been aptly noted, “[i]t must be more than a coincidence that several of [Killigrew’s] spotless heroines bear the name Cecilia” (Harbage 69). Whether Lucy ever numbered Killigrew as one of her allies in the disputes with Howard we do not know. But there is good reason to believe that her relationship with Thomas, unlike her one-off brush with his nephew Robert in 1649, was a friendly one. Perhaps his purchase of some of her valuables in 1656 had already been meant as a favour—a case of one borrower financially supporting another. The gift of a splendidly decorated portrait of his wife, however, would have been a special token of Killigrew’s affection, which encompassed one of Lucy’s relatives.⁸ For around the time when Cecilia’s portrait passed into Lucy’s hands, in July 1656 at the latest, Killigrew was in touch with an English “literary circle” in exile at The Hague, which included Cecilia’s nephew Will Crofts (c. 1611-1677), a long-time friend and emissary of King Charles’s (Harbage 100; Stephen Porter). Neither the dramatist nor Lucy could have then foreseen that in April 1658, when Lucy’s nine-year old son, the future Duke of Monmouth, was finally taken from her, he was to be “placed in the nominal charge” of the same William Crofts and named James Crofts, “as if he were a relation of his guardian” (George Scott 181-2). In time, Cecilia’s portrait may, ironically enough, have become an unpleasant reminder of the identity of the individual to whose care Lucy’s son had been entrusted.

* * *

More was at stake in the various itemized lists of Lucy’s possessions than paintings, table-silver, gems, and furnishings, no matter how costly. The depositions by virtually all of the witnesses *à charge* made explicit mention of “papers” of great importance to Howard. Both on 26 May and on 13 June, John Lane and his wife Dirckje Theunis declared that around January 1657 they had several times been sent to “Berlo” in Delft in order to demand, by Howard’s order, the return of a “small box” containing letters and documents. Lucy had maintained that she did not keep these in her house in Delft but somewhere in Zeeland—the same version of the facts she gave to Robert

⁸ Other than the painting from Van Dyck’s studio, dated 1637-1638 and too large to have been the portrait given to Lucy, I have found no contemporary portraits of Cecilia Crofts, although there appears to have been another Van Dyck painting, which served as the basis for an etching by Wenceslaus Hollar, dated 1652. See: <https://artuk.org/discover/stories/weston-parks-prestigious-painting-collection-joins-art-uk> and <https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/person/mp90622/cecilia-killigrew-nee-crofts>.

Sanderson, when he came to requisition the letters the following month.⁹ To Theunis, however, she had confided that she did not plan to return the letters until she had been given (an unspecified form of) “reparation” by Howard. By her own account, she could have sold them for good money and had actually been offered a considerable amount in pounds by someone in England. If she did not obtain the “reparation” she required, Lane had also heard her say, she had rather burn the papers than restore them to their owner. Justus Walter’s October 1657 testimony on this point deserves to be quoted in full:

...at the house of Miss Barlow the deponent has seen a great many papers in a large box, which she [i.e. Lucy] said belonged to the petitioner [i.e. Howard], and he [i.e. Justus] has taken these papers out of the box and laid them open on a table, and he has seen among them many letters belonging to the petitioner, and among these also letters from His Majesty of England, Charles II by name, but he [i.e. Justus] has no particular recollection about the quality [i.e. the nature] of any other papers, [*erased in the notarial act, the following words*: but it seems to him, the witness, that the documents included letters of commission concerning the petitioner]...

Lucy’s determination to be given financial satisfaction (the 15,000 guilders she demanded from Howard?) was consistent with the worldly-wise give-and-take impulse that, according to her biographer, had induced the King to settle an allowance of 5,000 *livres* on her: “...unless she were given the recognition due to her she would show up the papers that we know were in her possession, and ... these were of such momentous importance that her threat could be repressed only by granting her this annuity which could not be paid” (George Scott 118-9). How “momentous” Charles’s letters were, whether they included a marriage contract or shed light on the paternity of the Duke of Monmouth are questions which must unfortunately remain unanswered. Perhaps Justus Walter was being purposely vague about the content of the “other papers” relating to Howard, which he had seen in Delft. It is unlikely that the latter would have worried overmuch that his letters might lay bare his infidelity to his Dutch wife Walburga van den Kerckhove (1626-1686), the governess to the young Prince of Orange. After all, Howard’s affair with Lucy, if affair it was, had been instigated by the Princess-Royal scheming to rid Charles from his erstwhile mistress (George Scott 123) and must have been an open secret at the Orange-Stuart court in The Hague. More likely, the letters and papers in Lucy’s possession were politically explosive, in the first place. Justus may have had good reason, as an afterthought, to rescind his statement about Howard’s “letters of commission” in the excerpt cited. If these letters contained evidence that Howard was a Cromwellian spy, for instance, they would have been of uncommon interest to the King—or as Lucy professed, worth a great deal of money to some

⁹ As Middelburg and Flushing in Zeeland had long harboured a substantial community of English and Scottish émigrés, some of whom were sympathetic to the Stuart cause (Hughes and Sanders 137-8), it is not unimaginable that Lucy entertained contacts in these towns as well. In February/March 1655, Charles II himself had gone into hiding in Middelburg, awaiting the outcome of an uprising organised by the “Sealed Knot” in England (Eva Scott *Travels* 93-4).

people in England. But then again, they cannot all have been damning to Howard's reputation and career, else burning them, in Lucy's empty threat, would have suited him rather well.

Before the end of the year, far from being eased, the tensions were exacerbated by an incident that has figured prominently in the incompletely told story of Lucy's stay on the continent—an incident that reverberated all the way to The Hague. On 29 December 1657, Howard gave power of proxy to one Cardinael, a Brussels lawyer, to prosecute until the very end his case against "Luce Barlo alias Walter" and "Charles Bosvelt", who had "in a murderous manner" inflicted a serious injury upon the deponent (GAH175 folio 274). A few months earlier, Lucy and her son had found refuge in the capital of the Southern Netherlands. There it was that Charles Bursfield, a cousin on her mother's side, in response to a request for assistance, came to her rescue, first vainly challenging Howard to a duel and afterwards, on 24 August, nearly succeeding in assassinating him with a dagger. The assaulter fled and was never apprehended; Howard narrowly escaped with his life. How the legal consequences were handled by Howard's lawyer remains unknown. Before Christmas 1657, however, while under house arrest and closely watched by the Spanish ambassador, Lucy was still "threatening to publish Charles II's letters to her unless she was paid her promised pension" (Keay 31-3).

With Lucy's departure from The Hague, the steady flow of notarial documents came to an abrupt end, even though the disputes were by no means settled. Not until September 1663, as I have pointed out in the opening of this essay, did John Harvey and Thomas Howard reach a kind of gentleman's agreement no longer to prosecute each other. Until then, neither had been given full reparation for their material support of Lucy Walter, one as a friend, the other as a (reputed) lover. Instead, Howard hung on for several more years to his professional occupations at the court of Orange. Harvey, as a merchant of "English wares", continued his work of buying, selling, borrowing, and lending, as the extensive post-1660 record in the notarial archives shows. After her brief (and as yet incompletely documented) stay in Brussels, Lucy Walter spent the remainder of her all too short life in obscurity. She probably died in France, in the final months of 1658, separated from the King and from her young son, the later Duke of Monmouth.

* * *

The notarial archives at The Hague contain the single most extensive and coherent collection of contemporary evidence about Lucy Walter, providing a detailed record of the legal matters in which she became embroiled in the mid-1650s and of the social and financial status she no doubt strove to achieve. As opposed to other expatriates scraping a meagre living from occasional

donations, she acquired expensive real estate and most probably did so without falling back on the depleted resources of the inimical Stuart court in exile. While this testifies to the liberality (though not the motives) of Lucy's main financiers—a Master of the Horse and a local merchant—it also highlights “the abandoned woman's” (Arthur) efforts to build a life in her temporarily adopted homeland. It would seem that this life was in large measure lived not in the immediate orbit of royalty but among the mercantile classes of The Hague. The notarial acts allow us to identify a number of *burghers*—both local people and British émigrés, such as Elizabeth Croocks, Elizabeth Morris, the Pentlands, Gerrit Vloet, Aeltgen Claes, Thomas Killigrew, and countless others—whose names have never figured in Lucy's life story but who were all in some capacity part of her brave new world in exile. Unlike the “gossip, rumour and innuendo” (Greenspan 1386), then, that has become attached to Lucy Walter's name and reputation, the archival evidence has provided a more solid foundation for my investigation into this brief episode in her life. Yet, despite the wealth of details that can be derived from the notarial acts, the foregoing account has necessarily been one-sided, based as it is on official documents primarily concerned with money matters and on depositions by parties which were less than disinterested.

Much, therefore, about Lucy's stay in Holland remains shrouded in mystery, including the origin of her relationships with her sponsors, the content of the papers she so jealously guarded as of 1649, her contacts with those unconcerned by her legal wrangles, her connections with the Spanish Netherlands, and several other issues. Only access to ego-documents, such as her correspondence, if any there was, would allow us some insight into Lucy's personality—the biographer's primary objective. Setting aside the quarrels with her creditors, the notarial acts are remarkably devoid of allusions to, let alone indictments of, Lucy's “scandalous behaviour” as a mistress and neglectful mother (Smith 114). One recent writer is probably close to the mark in observing that Lucy was “ambitious, headstrong and overconfident, and relentlessly combative” (Linda Porter 26). Possibly, as another commentator has put it, “she had a strong, indeed a violent personality”, with an instinct “to assert and parade herself, while granting her favours to any man who took her fancy” (Chapman 109). From the documents examined here, one might be inclined to draw the contradictory conclusion that she was pleasure-loving, calculating and gullible as well as provident and carelessly precipitate. But it must be remembered that she was also at the mercy of historical circumstances over which she had little control, more particularly the contingencies of exile. Barring the discovery of evidence revealing more about the motives prompting Lucy Walter's life choices and movements, all we can do for the time being is to fall back on the factual record, which cannot provide more than a superficial glimpse of her elusive, true self.

Works Cited

- AD1. Archief Delft. Oud Notarieel archief 1574-1842, inventory 161.2112 (4 November 1653).
- AD2. Archief Delft. Oud Notarieel archief 1574-1842, inventory 161.2113 (26 May 1654).
- AD3. Archief Delft. Oud Notarieel archief 1574-1842, inventory 161.2114 (3 April 1657).
- AD4. Archief Delft. Inventory 445.468: Hervormde Gemeente Delft 1566-1976. Registers met namen van aangenomen en van met attestatie ingekomen lidmaten, 1657-1937 (6 June 1659).
- AR541. Oud Archief Rijswijk, 12 May 1656.
- AR541. Oud Archief Rijswijk, 3 May 1657.
- AR541. Oud Archief Rijswijk, 24 January 1658.
- AR707.1 Doop-, trouw- en begraafregisters van Rijswijk, 1596-1812. Nederduitsch-Gereformeerde Gemeente, 28 July 1657.
- Arthur, Frank. *The Abandoned Woman. The Story of Lucy Walter (1630-1658)*. London: Heinemann, 1964.
- Aulnoy, Marie Catherine Baronne d'. *Memoirs of the Court of England in 1675*. Translated from the French by William Henry Arthur. Edited and revised with notes by George David Gilbert. London: John Lane, 1913.
- Birch, Thomas, ed. *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq; Secretary, First, to the Council of State, And afterwards to The Two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell. In Seven Volumes. Volume V. Containing Papers of the Year MDCLVI*. London, 1742.
- Bottema, J. C. "Kroniek van een verdwenen huis". *Kroniek: Orgaan van de Historische Vereniging Rijswijk* 4 (1993): 79-83.
- Brown, Christopher and Hans Vlieghe (eds). *Van Dyck 1599-1641*. Antwerp: Antwerpen Open, 1999.
- Chapman, Hester W. *The Tragedy of Charles II in the years 1630-1660*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1964.
- Clifton, Robin. "Walter, Lucy (1630?-1658)". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Crist, Timothy, ed. *Charles II to Lord Taaffe. Letters in Exile*. Cambridge: Rampant Lions Press, 1974.
- Fea, Allan. "Portraits of Lucy Walter". *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 87 (1945): 192, 194-96.
- Frijhoff, Willem and Marijke Spies. *Dutch Culture in a European Perspective. Volume 1. 1650: Hard-Won Unity*. Translated from the Dutch by Myra Heerspink Scholz. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- GAH18 (15 November 1630).
- GAH37 (18 April 1639).
- GAH56 (15 January 1646).
- GAH180 (31 January 1648).
- GAH189 (19 April 1649).
- GAH214 (19 July 1651).
- GAH336 (1 April 1654).
- GAH336 (20 December 1654).

GAH142 (27 April 1655).

GAH294 (24 March 1657).

GAH162 (7 April 1657).

GAH110 (27 April 1657).

GAH162 (23 May 1657).

GAH410 (23 May 1657).

GAH479 (26 May 1657).

GAH307 (1 June 1657).

GAH162 (8 June 1657).

GAH175 (11 June 1657).

GAH307 (12 June 1657).

GAH175 (13 June 1657).

GAH162 (13 June 1657).

GAH376 (7 July 1657).

GAH337 (24 July 1657).

GAH410 (7 September 1657).

GAH307 (8 September 1657).

GAH376 (8 October 1657).

GAH189 (24 October 1657).

GAH376 (20 November 1657).

GAH175 (29 December 1657).

GAH410 (29 April 1658).

GAH488 (29 May 1658).

GAH177 (8 February 1659).

GAH177 (11 August 1659).

GAH178 (24 November 1661).

GAH605 (26 September 1663).

GAH402 (13 February 1669).

Graswinckel, D. P. M. *Graswinckel. Geschiedenis van een Delfts Brouwers- en Regenten-Geslacht*. 's Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956.

Greenspan, Nicole. "Charles II, Lucy Walter, and the Stuart Courts in Exile". *English Historical Review* cxxxi (2016): 1386-1414.

Harbage, Alfred. *Thomas Killigrew. Cavalier Dramatist 1612-83*. Philadelphia: UPennsylvania Press, 1930. Reprint New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967.

Hartog, Elizabeth den. "Delft, een stad met een gering aantal buitens". In Elizabeth den Hartog and R. M. Deuling (eds), *Buitenplaatsen in de omgeving van Delft*. Haarlem: Kastelenstichting Holland en Zeeland, 2008: 7-44.

- Hughes, Ann and Julie Sanders. "Gender, geography and exile: Royalists and the Low Countries in the 1650s". In: Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (eds). *Royalists and royalism during the Interregnum*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2010: 128-148.
- Hutton, Ronald. *Charles the Second King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Keay, Anna. *The Last Royal Rebel. The Life and Death of James, Duke of Monmouth*. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
- Kemblusek, Marika. "Een zwarte doos op een buiten bij Delft: Engelse royalisten op 'De Ruit' (1656-1660)". In Elizabeth den Hartog and R. M. Deuling (eds). *Buitenplaatsen in de omgeving van Delft*. Haarlem: Kastelenstichting Holland en Zeeland, 2008: 154-165.
- Le Bailly, M. C., P. J. M. van den Heuvel, et al. *Inventaris van het archief van het Hof van Holland, 1428-1811*. Den Haag: Nationaal Archief, 2008.
- Masters, Brian. *The Mistresses of Charles II*. London: Constable, 1979.
- McGee, C. E. "'The Visit of the Nine Goddesses': A Masque at Sir John Crofts's House". *English Literary Renaissance* 21 (1991): 371-384.
- Porter, Linda. *Mistresses. Sex and Scandal at the Court of Charles II*. London: Picador, 2020.
- Porter, Stephen. "Crofts, William, Baron Crofts (d. 1677)". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Schama, Simon. *The Embarrassment of Riches. An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*. London: Fontana, 1988.
- Scott, Eva. *The King in Exile. The Wanderings of Charles II from June 1646 to July 1654*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1905.
- Scott, Eva. *The Travels of the King. Charles II in Germany and Flanders 1654-1660*. London: Archibald Constable, 1907.
- Scott, George. *Lucy Walter. Wife or Mistress*. London: Harrap, 1947.
- Smith, Geoffrey. "Royalists in exile: the experience of Daniel O'Neill". In: Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (eds), *Royalists and royalism during the Interregnum*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2010: 106-127.
- Thornton, Peter. *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France and Holland*. 3d ed. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981.
- Vander Motten, J.P. *Sir William Killigrew (1606-1695): His Life and Dramatic Works*. Wetteren: Universa, 1980.
- Vander Motten, J.P. "Unpublished Letters of Charles II". *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 18 (1994): 17-26.
- Vander Motten, J.P. "Thomas Killigrew's 'Lost Years', 1655-1660". *Neophilologus* 82 (1998): 311-34.
- Vander Motten, J. P. and Katrien Daemen-De Gelder. "'Les Plus Rudes Chocs de la Fortune': Willem Frederik, Stadholder of Friesland (1613-1664), Thomas Killigrew (1612-1683) and Patronage in Exile." *Anglia. Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie* 127 (2009): 65-91.
- Van der Wijck, H. W. M. "Country-Houses in the Northern Netherlands". *Apollo. The Magazine of the Arts* 96 (1972): 406-415.
- Willemijn Fock, C. "De buitenplaats Pasgeld bij Delft ten tijde van Pieter Teding van Berkhout". In: Elizabeth den Hartog and R. M. Deuling (eds). *Buitenplaatsen in de omgeving van Delft*. Haarlem: Kastelenstichting Holland en Zeeland, 2008: 107-153.

2. GAH110 (27 April 1657) folio 119v.

t'felvendes vlecht synde naer de ent-
 solacien: Adont gedaet der propositie
 van Willen, Gelyc W. met selacien
 Evert Jans W. Cimmerning jay
 Lull
 Jib Willens hote
 gort Gay se gort
 De overvond
 Joh: Horsting Not. D.
 1657.

