Phillips Glover and the Duchess of Kingston’s French Estates

C. P. C. Johnson

The fortuitous survival of some correspondence among the late Canon Foster’s manuscript collections has provided a most interesting glimpse at an adventure in France at the time of the Revolution. This correspondence, among other records of the Glover family who inherited the Phillips family estate at Wispington and the surrounding area, shows in some detail the various attempts made by Phillips Glover, and, after his death, by his executors, to recover the French estates and possessions left by Elizabeth, duchess of Kingston, at her death in the summer of 1788.

Phillips Glover was the only son and eldest child of Phillips Glover F.R.S. who had been High Sheriff of Lincolnshire in 1727, and Mary his wife. The family had not been long resident in the county; in fact the Golvers had their origin in Kent, in particular at Goudham, and one branch had moved to London at some point during the seventeenth century, where success as ironmongers and merchants brought the family some measure of financial gain. John Glover, the grandfather of the subject of this article married, in 1696 Mary Phillips, third daughter and youngest child of Robert Phillips of Wispington, gent., and Mary his wife. The Glover family inherited the Phillips estate in 1720 on the death of John Phillips, last male survivor of the family. Although most of the estate lay in Wispington and the neighbouring parishes of Hemingby, Baumber, Horsington, Thimbleby and Waddingworth, a significant proportion consisted of marshland pasture in Huttoft, Fulstow, Burgh le Marsh, Thorpe, Addelthorpe, Ingoldmells and Winthorpe: on these pastures were grazed the sheep which had earned the Phillips family its wealth and position. The elder Phillips Glover was more of an academic than a typical squire of his day, but we have little evidence other than his Fellowship of the Royal Society, granted at an early age (he was probably no more than twenty six at the time) and a treatise, mentioned in his will entitled ‘An Inquiry after Virtue and Happiness in a Letter to a friend 1728’.9

By way of contrast, his son Phillips appears from all accounts to have been rather an extrovert character, forthright and self-opinionated, who was easily moved to hasty action; his record in the North Lincolnshire Militia (Southern Battalion) in which he enlisted as a major in 1759, would appear to bear this out to a great extent.

We know of a duel he fought in a Manchester coffee house in the summer of 1760 (from an account in the Gentleman’s Magazine of that year), which resulted in the death of Glover’s opponent, a Manchester apothecary named Jackson. It arose, apparently, from a somewhat boisterous greeting exchanged at the local Playhouse, which degenerated into a heated argument and finally, a duel. However, it must be said that the unfortunate victim was just as much, if not more, to blame. The Lancaster Assizes, held on 20 August 1760 discharged Glover from custody on the grounds of insufficient evidence.

A further incident marred his career in the militia in 1762. By this time he was lieut. colonel of the battalion, second in rank to Sir John Cust, and found himself court martialed, for behoving to a Capt. Gardner of the Royal Musketeers ‘in a manner unbecoming an officer and a gentleman’. This disagreement was over a deserter from the regular army, which was not on the best of terms with the militia. The court martial, held in March of that year, found him guilty only of having used language contrary to good order and discipline, and ordered him to be publicly reprimanded in the presence of the officers and men of his regiment.6 While this did not hasten his departure from the militia, it must have had some bearing on his subsequent resignation, which occurred sometime during 1763.

In politics, he supported his Whig friends, particularly his near neighbours the Vyners of Gartby. However, he did not appear willing to enter politics himself: at a meeting in December 1779 for the county by-election, caused by the elevation of Brownlow Bertie to the house of lords (on the death of the fourth duke of Ancaster), his name was put forward, but he declined, and instead proposed Robert Vynor. Glover, sarcastically described as ‘that hero’ by Ayscuough Bouchercett, roundly condemned the nomination of Charles Monson, the brother of Lord Monson, on the grounds that he did not possess the requisite qualification, as well as being too young. His speech on this occasion was interestingly, if not effectively answered in a letter from a Monson supporter, who preferred to remain anonymous; of the speech he remarked ‘...I cannot help thinking it a pity, when you re-heard it in the Reindeer kitchen, where a roasting goose so often spluttered its applause, but that the cook, or some other of your learned audience had, with submission, proposed amendments, I am informed indeed, that one of the waiters did at one time whisper to me the impropriety of saying this here speech...’. In the end, neither Vynor nor Monson contested the seat, and Sir John Thorold, later with Vynor to be one of the executors of Glover’s will, was returned unopposed.

From these episodes in his life, albeit briefly described, it may be seen that Glover’s career, although affected by the precipitate nature of his character, did not incline to the notorious, whereas that of his second cousin Elizabeth, duchess of Kingston, tended to an amazing degree.

Born Elizabeth Chudleigh, the only daughter of Colonel Thomas Chudleigh, Lieutenant-Governor of the Chelsea Hospital, in 1720, she was a familiar figure in the scandal sheets of the time. She was secretly married in 1744 to the Hon. Augustus Hervey, brother to the Earl of Bristol; by way of coincidence, the Bristol estate included the manor of Seaford and other land in Quarrington. Leasingham, Anwick, Askby and Raucybe. This marriage, kept secret because Elizabeth wished to retain her job as a maid of honour in the court of Augusta, Princess of Wales, broke down within a few years, and from about this time she became well known for her immodest style of dress and coarseness of language. In 1759 began her affair with Evelyn Pierrepont, second duke of Kingston, but she was not in a position to marry him until 1769, if indeed she ever technically was in a position to do so. Both Elizabeth and Hervey wished to obtain a divorce in order to remarry (although the latter does not appear to have remarried), but Elizabeth did not wish their marriage to be recognized, although she had in 1759, in view of the precarious health of Augustus’ brother, taken care to put aside enough evidence of the marriage to prove it, if Augustus should succeed to the earldom. This problem was surmounted by a (probably collusive) action in the consistory court, which resulted in a divorce ‘a mensa et thoro’; this Elizabeth considered adequate proof of annulment, and she proceeded to marry Kingston, at St. George’s, Hanover Square, on 8 March 1769.

The duke died in 1773 at Bath, leaving his estate to Elizabeth on condition that she remained a widow, and she took advantage of her new wealth by going on a European tour over the following two years. Meanwhile Hervey, as yet unsatisfied as to the divorce granted in 1769 was still pressing for a more beneficial settlement, but no action had yet been brought, when in 1773 his father died, and Augustus succeeded to the earldom. At this point, Evelyn Philip Meadows (b.1736) appeared on the scene. He was the eldest son of Kingston’s sister, although it is disputed whether the sister had in fact married before; this
dispute was to have a great bearing on the matter of the duchess' estate after her death. Meadows took pains to find out the details of Elizabeth's marriages, and on the basis of information obtained from a certain Ann Cradock, a former servant of Elizabeth, caused an action for bigamy to be brought against her. This hastened her return, and in April of the following year, 1776, the case came before the house of lords. All the 119 peers present found her guilty of bigamy, but she escaped the process of the law by pleading her privilege as a peeress, producing the very evidence of the marriage to Hervey which she had previously sought to conceal.

The aftermath of this famous trial was yet another departure by the duchess, this time for the duration of her life. For a few months she lived at Calais, where she had property, and where a proportion of her wealth was plundered by a certain hotel proprietary named Desseme; here she came into contact with Andrea Charles Lewis Becquet de Mouy, lord of Moyenne, president of the town of Calais, who was to play an important part in the events after her death, as indeed was Meadows. After a brief sojourn in Calais, she went to St. Petersburg where she purchased an estate, later christened Chudleigh. Later, she returned to France, and bought further estates at Montmatre and at St. Assise near Fontainebleau, which had belonged to Monsieur the King's brother. After further short excursions to other European capitals, she returned to Paris where she died on 26 August 1788. 10

Glover's link with the duchess was only that of second cousin (see Appendix); this tenuous connection was the result of the marriage in 1674 of Sir George Chudleigh, the third baronet of Ashton, and Mary Lee of Winslade, a poetess whose nephew, Mary, married the elder Phillips Glover in 1726. 11 The younger Phillips would not have become involved in the duchess' affairs in the normal course of events, but the duchess' debtors saw in the younger Glover's title to the presbytery of Chudleigh and the pursuit of Thomas Chudleigh, the duchess' cousin, who had been made a presbytery in 1779, to take action in regard to that part of her estate which was in France, created a situation which certain unscrupulous persons who had been in the duchess' confidence were eager to exploit. Her natural generosity and lack of money sense had led to her having amassed by the time of her death several unpaid accounts, some quite substantial debts, and even undischargeable mortgages (such as the one for £6000 on the St. Assise property).

The nearer heirs, Sir Henry Oxenden of Wingham, Kent, and his wife Margaret, née Chudleigh, a daughter of the third baronet, the Revd. Samuel Strong and his wife Anne, daughter of the second baronet, and three other spinster ladies of the Chudleigh family, Elizabeth, Elizabeth and Diana, were most reluctant to pay off the duchess' debts, as they feared that these might add up to a considerable amount; instead they employed an agent, William Throckmorton, to oversee the collection of the duchess' effects, employing French lawyers under the system of 'Benefice d'Inventaire'. This practice was the equivalent of the Roman law 'beneficium inventarii' which ensured that the 'heres' (in Roman law the 'heres' was executor as well as heir) would be held responsible for debts and other expenses not exceeding the sum total of the assets of the estate. In French law this system gave similar protection. The duchess' will meanwhile, thought by some to be a forgery, was brought back from France by a Mr. Payne, sometime H.M. Consul at Algiers, one of her executors; due to many odd features of it, the document was the subject of a case in Doctors Commons.

In October of that year, Glover's involvement in the case began. M. de Cocove, who had shared the duchess' house in Calais, together with his family, and a Dr. Jackson, a clergyman who was no advertisement for his calling, and who had been for a number of years one of the duchess' closest 'ministers', came over to England to contact the heirs, no doubt with a view to collecting a share in the proceeds of her estate, by way of commission. As Sir Henry and the others were so reluctant to pay off the duchess' debts, an approach was made to Glover; they moreover persuaded him that if he went personally to France, and proved himself a second cousin of the duchess, he would by the law of France have an equal, if not greater share in the estate, to the nearer heirs. The prospect of acquiring the sort of money which de Cocove and his ally said would come his way, naturally appealed to Glover, and override any consideration of the difficulties which might, and did, befall him. Thus, on the twenty-sixth of October he arrived in Paris, together with his daughter Laura, then nearly seven years old, and her chaperone, Rebecca Shoulders, a widow, daughter of William Jepson of Lincoln who was a proctor (an official with legal functions at the ecclesiastical courts) at Lincoln cathedral. Her position in the Glover household was not just that of a companion; it is known that she was Laura's mother, as Phillips had been courting her since 1778, but was not able to marry her until 1795, after the death in 1795 of William Shoulders. The first Mrs. Glover, Mary, daughter of Charles Gore of Horkstow, whom Phillips married in February 1751, 12 may well have died some years previously.

Glover's first objective, now installed in the Hotel Royal, was to clarify the situation regarding the rights of second cousins to an equal share in the inheritance; to this end, he and his party had stopped over in Calais on the way, in order to acquire information, but was unable, it appears, to make headway. Richard Carr Glyn, the London banker, writing to him on the twenty-eighth of October, was sceptical as to his chances: '... from what I have heard both here and from Paris I fear you will be taught the truth, that by the custom of Paris, second cousins do not share equally ... and in that case we shall again have the pleasure of seeing you in London ...'. 13 Glyn was another interested party; his wife Mary (née Plumptre) was Glover's niece.

A few days after his arrival in Paris, a meeting was called, of all the agents, lawyers and others involved in the case, including Throckmorton. Glover was under the impression that if he paid the duchess' debts, the duchess' effects at law would be obliged to repay him; unfortunately they did not feel in a position to comply. However, still under the delusion that his position as second cousin would be more comfortable if he undertook to pay the debts, as de Cocovse and Jackson were anxious to 'assure' him, he repaid certain large debts, notably £600 at Paris and £2000 at Calais, or rather, gave the money to pay them, to de Cocove; he later had reason to believe that these were fictitious and that de Cocove had pocketed the money. At this early stage, the full extent of the duchess' liabilities was not yet known, and de Cocovse and Jackson, if they had more information, were not letting Glover know of it. However, it soon emerged that a great deal of the duchess' movable goods were being plundered by Evelyn Meadows, the duchess' nephew, and in November a process was taken out, to bring him to court. At the same time an arrêt was obtained to open the seals on the duchess' effects, such as had been located, and letters de bénéficium issued to Glover and the heirs at law, but with priority, to his own and Glyn's satisfaction, to Glover. 14

The following month, Meadows was brought before the criminal court of the Châtellé, and the plundered property, of which we have an inventory, drawn up in court, deposited there for safety. He admitted to defacing items of silver plate by erasing the arms of Kingston and Bristol and substituting his own cipher, and distributing the duchess' clothes among her domestic staff, but denied that he was about to send the stolen goods to London. After ordering them to be deposited, the court gave Glover carte blanche to claim and seize any other of the duchess' effects which might have been taken from her residences either before or after her decease. 15

Sir Henry Oxenden and the other heirs at law were by no means pleased to see Glover apparently acquiring the major portion of the duchess' property, and, suspecting the deception wrought by de Cocove, refused to let the Frenchman have a power of attorney to act jointly with Glover. The latter, indignant at this, and very conscious of the fact that Sir Henry and the others had only worked through agents, a slow and expensive method, while he
himself, with de Cocco, had taken direct action, wrote, in February 1789, a very stiff letter to John Forster, Sir Henry's agent in England, justifying his actions and attempting to persuade him that de Cocco was worthy of their confidence: "I then, being told by Mr. Cocco that all the property would be lost if we delayed, set off from Engholm, and hurled myself on the creditors. It was found on my arrival that the very next day after, the creditors would have been in possession of everything, had I not, by Mr. Cocco's assistance, prevented it. I should have thought, Sir, that the heirs would have been sensible of the great service I had rendered them, and thanked me for the active part I took..."18 His hope was that £60,000 could be raised from the sale of St. Anne's, a gross over-estimation in view of the effect the events of the year had had. However, they considered, the situation, the heirs at law could only offer him one equal share of the effects (Glyn suggested that they ought to have two equal shares: he was thinking of his wife and John Plumptre), and they were persistent in their refusal to have any negotiation with de Cocco (at least for the present).

During the summer months of that year de Cocco's villainous character revealed itself once more. He had, he said, been secretly negotiating with Throckmorton, for Glover to purchase, for £47,25, the rights of the succession; knowing that Glover was eager to shake off the opposition of Sir Henry, he persuaded him to make out a bond for £47,25 (inclusive of interest) to Sir Henry and the others, and also a draft for £1275 payable to self or bearer, on Messrs Child's bank in London (Glover's contact there was John Keyes: "...you shall find us to be the Honestest Jews you ever dealt with..."

The bond to Sir Henry was never executed, and the draft to Throckmorton was returned, but after questioning the advisability of this draft, he was accused of impugning de Cocco's integrity, so he let the matter drop. De Cocco endorsed the draft which was forwarded to a M. Carpenter at Calais; he further endorsed it and sent it back to Paris, to Messieurs Termin de Tastet and Co.

The result of course was that Throckmorton never received one farthing of this money.21 The bond to Sir Henry went through in the correct fashion, but Glover was astounded to find that this effectively constituted him heir at law to all the whole of the French estate, the Duchess' debts included, whereas he thought that he would only be acting on behalf of the heirs, but with an equal share, and that he need not pay any debts to greater value than the extent of the effects. De Cocco also 'borrowed' £300 from him for a legal case which he said was pending (this money too, was never returned), and persuaded him to discharge Chenuix's mortgage for £600.

Glover's readiness to believe de Cocco's every word in relation to this affair was remarkable. Whether it was because he was in a foreign country and dependent upon interpreters, being unable to conduct his own research, or because of advancing age (he would have been 62 or thereabouts in 1789), or just the persuasiveness of the Frenchman, he appears to have been very gullible and susceptible, but his headstrong nature would not allow him to take stock of his position until the matter was critical, by which time it was too late to alter matters.

In November 1789, Glover again found himself involved in litigation, this time of his own volition against Sir Henry Oxenden and the other heirs, who were now contesting his sole right to the succession. Where Glover would have done better to withdraw this case, he pursued it in the defendants' absence (they were legally represented however), and was upheld by the court: the others could do no more than acquiesce in his late advocate returning to England in mid-January 1790. By this time, it was estimated by his French bankers, J. F. Perregaux and Co., who often acted for English people in France, that he had already lost up to £13,500, quite apart from the bond to Sir Henry. One of the reasons for his departure may have been the turbulent situation in Paris, caused by the Revolution; although at this stage, usually called the Liberal Revolution, there was not the same degree of violence as existed during the 'Terror' of 1793, the position for foreigners in France at this time could not have been totally secure.

His return to England in no way lessened the strain. This would have been borne out to a much greater extent had we possessed his letters to Perregaux. However from the banker's replies to him we can gather that his confidence was indeed low: in a letter dated 21 January 1790 Perregaux wrote: "The bustle which is generally one of the consequences of our misfortunes often assists in enabling us to bear them. We hope you will prove this and that your own attention to the business you have before you will render your loss much more supportable than you thought it when here. But in any case keep up your spirits." It may perhaps be mentioned in passing that Glover's health began to suffer from this time, and although he may not have been confined to a sickbed for any length of time, there is ample evidence of illness.

Perregaux and his partner Peter Desbrosses, a subsequent émigré, were kept busy for some considerable time in acting on Glover's behalf. Indeed, until the beginning of 1793 there were still a number of outstanding claims on the duchess' estate, many of which had previously been uncontested; on the other hand there were still various assets which had not been converted into currency. One such asset was a certain amount of jewellery, including diamonds which, it turned out, was in pawn at the Mont de Piété. The recognizances for these jewels were in the hands of a certain Mr. du Fouleur, and it was hoped that a generous value could be placed on them with a view to sale or auction. Desbrosses in February 1790 suggested that Glover should send a jeweller across from London to appraise them. In March, therefore, a Mr. Simms, of Goldsmith's Field, was asked to see them. However, when he was repeatedly refused access until they had been redeemed. Thus Perregaux was placed under the necessity of paying out 110,000 livres. [£4230]. The subsequent appraisal took three days.

It was a matter of no small concern for both Perregaux and Glover when the fruits of Mr. Simms' labour were made known. The valuation of £4,600 was considered very low: "...surprised and concerned to observe the small value. Mr. Simms has put on the Diamonds. Nothing can be more arbitrary than the price of such things, and from the single stone earrings, the single stone ring and the immense quantity, I cannot yet persuade myself that they will at length fetch considerably more than the sum you mention - £4,600."

Nothing further was done about the gems until early July, when Mr. F. C. Virgin, Peter's father and M. Boyer valued them at 193,470 livres. [£7300]. Perregaux said this punctured two alternatives: either Glover could have them auctioned, or he could make an offer of the whole to James Christie. By August however, it had transpired that to auction them would be impracticable, and Perregaux urged Glover to strike a bargain with Christie; by September Glover had agreed a price of £5500 and the banker was able to have the jewels shipped over.25 There is no doubt that these jewels would have fetched a higher price but for the lack of a private purchaser. Paris and Boyer's valuation was based on market value and the political situation undoubtedly had a deleterious effect.

During the same period of March - September 1790 Perregaux had other matters to see to on Glover's behalf apart from the diamonds; one of the largest single demands on the duchess' estate was from the Chevalier La Crosse who was owed 102,500 livres. [£5,750]. Owing to that gentleman's financial straits, he consented to a reduction of the amount of 90,500 livres; once the 8 April. To placate La Crosse, Perregaux paid him 2,500 livres on account, and urged Glover to raise the necessary balance. Unfortunately the stipulated date came and went, leaving Glover still with 100,000 livres to find. By May La Crosse, still very anxious for his money offered a bargain: if Glover could pay 65,000 livres he would accept the house at Montmartre which was also part of the duchess' estate, in lieu of the remainder. Before the end of
the same month, the offer had improved to 60,000 liv. in money and 40,000 for the house, but having received no favourable reply from Glover, this improved deal was called off. At length however a deal was concluded in mid September, Glover paying 66,300 liv. in currency and 36,600 liv. being allowed on the Montmartre property. 27

Meanwhile, Glover was attempting to extricate himself from the bond he had entered into with Sir Henry Oxenden and the Marquess of Chudleigh for the discharge of their rights in the succession. He had approached them to this purpose as far back as March, and Oxenden's agent John Forster had politely given him their reaction ‘...although they cannot help lamenting that you have been cheated and pillaged as you appear to have been, yet they do not perceive that you have any just ground to require them to discharge you from your Bond for the sum you stipulated to pay them for the purchase of their interests in the Duchess's effects.’ 28

Glover’s financial position was such that he was forced to sell some land to raise money. On 25 March he sold to Wastel Brisco the Theddeltheorpe, Burgh le Marsh, Calcethorpe and Walmgate property, a total of approximately 1150 acres, which had a combined rental of over £670 per annum; the amount raised was so far unknown, but may have been anywhere between £10,700 and £22,800 (between 16 and 54 years’ rental). 29 By September 1790, Glover appears to have been in a position to discharge his obligations to the Marquess of Chudleigh, although the interest paid on the bond was not enough to satisfy it. 30

From the autumn of 1790 until the end of the following year, most of the correspondence is taken up with settlement of the smaller claims and actions which were obstructing a final settlement of the duchess’ affairs. Outstanding amongst these was a claim from Evelyn Meadows for 17,000 liv. (£5,650) which, it was alleged, had been laid out by him on behalf of the duchess for travelling expenses; his claim appeared worthless as he had no bills to prove it. This particular claim had been hanging since the previous February, and Glover had been obliged to deposit 22,000 liv. with the public notary as a deposit pending settlement, whether in or out of court. The case had not been heard before October 1790, due to much of the lack of evidence in opposition to the claim as to the backlog of judicial work caused by the political trouble. In the event the case did not need to be heard, as there was a settlement with Meadows’ attorney; 5,000 liv., the balance of the deposit, was subsequently returned to Perregaux and would no doubt have been welcomed. For Glover, any inflow of money was better than none; he had tried to recover the trunk of jewellery etc. (of which a list survives) 31 deposited in the Chateléf as far back as December 1788 at the time of the previous legal battle with Meadows. The result was that the trunk was deposited with du Pouleur, and could not now be recovered until other claims had been settled. 32

Difficulties had similarly arisen with regard to a debt owed by the Calais hotelier Dessein, and the sale of property in Calais. Dessein was all but bankrupt; according to the reports Perregaux had of him he could not make his hotel pay despite the large numbers of foreigners situated in and around Calais. It was with great difficulty that he was persuaded to pay anything, but at length, commencing on July 1791, he was cajoled into paying by instalments. Even so, he never discharged the whole of his debt, something like £25,000 liv. remained unpaid. The Calais property moreover, although valuable enough in itself, was so crippled with debts that the revenue from the sale, to Madame de Carondilot was not expected to cover them. 33

There was even an impediment to the sale of the much larger St. Assise estate to M. Destilliers. This particular deal should have been completed before the autumn of 1790, but was held up by three claims; however a court case in September 1790 overrode these. Even then it was delayed by a claim by the neighbouring villages of St. Port and Boissise le Bertrand against the estate, alleging usurpation of common land; an indemnity had to be provided, and in the end, the parties agreed to arbitration. The net result of the various debts which had accrued was, that out of the net value of the estate, 930,000 liv. [£385,800], the paltry sum of 10,070 liv. [£380] was left to Glover. 34

The major part of his task over, however unsatisfactorily the outcome, Glover was at last able to devote most of his own and Perregaux’s energy to the task of tracking down de Cocove. In July 1792 he had inserted in various English and French newspapers, a notice offering a £40 reward for information leading to de Cocove’s arrest and conviction. 35 It was for Glover a matter of some urgency that the post of this bond be tracked down in his lifetime, for it was valid at law until proved otherwise; moreover Glover was anxious to regain the other sums of which he had been defrauded by the Frenchman. These advertisements did no more than produce a number of false claims on the duchess’ estate, two of which, it was surmised, were in de Cocove’s own handwriting. The elusive Frenchman, however, could not be tracked down; the only avenue to success appeared to be that afforded by a M. de Gesne, but this did not, in the event, lead to any such result. Right until the last months of his life, Glover was still attempting to discover the bond, but with little hope of success. Peter Desbrosses, now an emigre living in London, wrote to Glover in January 1796, two months or so after his marriage to Rebecca Shoulters, suggesting that further advertisement might unearth the bond ‘...as a caution against its being purchased. Or, if it has already been sold, it may bring it to light and step forward be taken even in your lifetime to invalidate it and to punish the author’. 36

No such discovery was made, however, and Glover died (probably in London, as there is no burial entry in the Westminster register), on 16 July 1796. His daughter Laura inherited the Wispington estate, and Rebecca was to have an annuity, and the use of the house in Upper Fitzroy St., London.

Robert Vyner of Graftby and Sir John Thorold of Sysonby, as Glover’s executors, had naturally been forewarned of the likelihood that de Cocove would attempt to pursue his fraudulent claim on the estate, and had accordingly appointed an attorney, who, among other duties, would make sure that any such attempt would be countered. The attorney was Robert Vyner who had been born in June 1765 and educated at Rugby School before entering Lincoln’s Inn. He was a member of the older, Eathorre (Warwickshire) branch of the family, and consequently a distant relation of the Vyners of Graftby. However it was plain from the beginning that he would be called upon to rebuff de Cocove’s claim; in July 1797 a Richard Marnell was briefed to approach the executors with a view to collecting the £5,000. The elder Vyner issued these instructions to his namesake on the thirteenth of July: ‘Having received the enclosed letter from Richard Marnell, I send it enclosed to your desire you will attend him upon the business, and as you know the objections Mrs. Glover makes to the deed, you will state them to him in such manner as you may think right and prudent, and let me know what steps are likely to be taken ... Inform Mrs. and Miss Glover of all transactions in this business’. 37

Some nine days later, Vyner reported back the substance of his meeting with Marnell: ‘...the Bond as written down was either a forgery or obtained by the grossest fraud. Mr. Marnell seems undetermined whether he should proceed or not. I fear if de Cocove is able to find money he will have but little difficulty in picking up an attorney’. 38

Early in the following year, 1798, it appeared that de Cocove was willing to make the gamble, by engaging the firm of Winter Kay and Maynard to act for him. Although we do not hear further of this action, owing to a gap in the correspondence, we may presume that there was no adverse result, as a surviving sheet of the executors’ account at Messrs. Child, covering the years 1797-99 shows no payment to have been made on the bond.

A number of family events marked the year 1799. Not the least of these was that Laura Glover, at the somewhat tender age of seventeen was married on the nineteenth of February to the young Robert Vyner, who was then aged thirty-four. We have no prior information of this in the correspondence beyond a chance remark by the elder
Vyner in December 1797 to the effect that he '. . . has heard nothing concerning the wedding'. Whether this in fact refers to Robert's intended marriage however, is not clear. It was evidently a fruitful match, as they raised seven sons and three daughters at their Eathorpe home. In July of the same year came the death, at the age of eighty two, of Robert Vyner, leaving Sir John Thorold as sole executor of his will. This event came near the beginning of what seems to have been a dispute of some vehemence (at the time) between the newly married Vyangens on the one hand, and the executors on the other. The immediate cause was that ever since Glover's death, Vyner and Thorold had hesitated to dispose of fifty shares in the Chesterfield canal scheme, which Glover had invested in some twenty five years previously; their motive was to provide security for payment should the younger Vyner could see no point in keeping them just for that reason. He was also anxious to obtain a higher standard of living for his wife; under the terms of Glover's will, Laura was to receive £200 per annum, paid quarterly, from the income of the Wispington estate, but Robert was keen to ascertain whether he was entitled, on her behalf, to the whole. The main drawback was that she was a young age, and it appeared that the extra income would not come to them until her majority. However a compromise seems to have been reached on this account, by which Laura was to receive another £100 p.a. and the remainder of the Wispington income was to be put into a trust. A post-nuptial settlement was accordingly drawn up in October 1800. The affair of the shares, however, took a little longer to determine, and eventually, in November 1800, the parties resorted to Chancery proceedings. There are very few records of the case still extant, so we have but a sketchy account of the result, but it appears that one of the Masters in Chancery was to draw up an account of all Glovers personal goods and debts, and deposit any surplus in the bank: no specific mention of the shares survives.

The correspondence recommences in 1802, when it seems that a fresh attempt was made to tidy up Glover's affairs in France. Bouvallet, the attorney employed by Perregaux in the place of Usquin, had, during the last three years brought most of the outstanding problems to a conclusion. However, the one outstanding piece of unfinished business was the matter of the trunks containing the diamonds and other items which had originally been at the Chatellet, and to which Evelyn Meadows was still laying claim. Bouvallet was insistent that action should be taken lest Meadows win by default. Perregaux was still evidently happy to take much of the business upon himself, even after so many years. Vyner, writing to him in August of the same year said: 'It is impossible for me to do justice to the feelings of Mr. Glover's family, and the sense which they have not only of your great kindness heretofore shown to Mr. Glover, but at the fresh instance of your condensation in offering to them your assistance to recover such part of his property which may have escaped the wreck of the Revolution and the rapacity of the villains to whom unfortunately contrary to your good advice he entrusted his concerns'.

A little confusion is also evident as to how far matters had progressed at the time of Glover's death: many of the papers were with Perregaux, but others were said still to be in the hands of M. de Gesse. In order that better liaison might lead to a swift conclusion, William Throckmorton was induced, at a rate of three guineas per day, to go to Paris in October 1802. His first report covers a meeting with de Gesse who said that he had passed the papers to a man at St. Omer. It eventually transpired that the man at St. Omer knew nothing of these papers. However much progress was made in the matter of the trunks of diamonds and other valuables which, it was established, were in the hands of du Fouleur's widow (her husband having fallen foul of the Comité du Salut Public). Mme. du Fouleur had in her hands an unpaid bill for 22,940 liv. [c.£880], but was willing to hand over the trunk on payment of the bill; it appears that by this time (November) Meadow's opposition had been swept aside. A search for a valuation revealed that the gems (mostly necklaces and other items composed of false stones) were only worth some 7,000 liv., but Throckmorton suggested that they go to arbitration in an attempt to get Mme. du Fouleur's bill reduced. This does not appear to have happened however, and Throckmorton returned to England in early December, leaving instructions with Perregaux to pay the bill only on receipt of the trunk. This is the last we hear either of the affair of the diamonds or of de Cocove's bond, although in the case of the latter we may perhaps assume that it was not paid. It is most unfortunate that the correspondence should peter out at this point, leaving these questions unanswered. But what were the results of Phillips Glover's endeavours? A financial loss of over £18,000, entailing the sale of nearly half of his estate, and endless trouble both to himself and to his family, not to mention the extra work which remained for his executors. But in one account of the life of the duchess of Kingston, it is hinted that Glover actually made money from the French estate, perhaps as much as £500,000 from the sale of the Calais property alone. There is no evidence in the foregoing account to corroborate such a statement; Perregaux himself said in a letter dated 22 December 1791: 'The demands of the Creditors at Calais of the late duchess of Kingston being superior to the produce of the houses sold there . . . Again, in the case of St. Asise, although the revenue was over 900,000 liv., the net profit was but 10,000 liv.

These letters, then, may serve to put the record straight, by showing that Glover's somewhat reckless adventure, initiated by the criminal deceit of a villainous Frenchman, brought him not the modest profits he had hoped for originally, but instead a substantial financial loss and worries which attended him for the remaining years of his life.
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## APPENDIX

Table showing the link between the Glover family and the duchess of Kingston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOVER</th>
<th>LEE</th>
<th>CHUDLEIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard, of St. Nicholas</td>
<td>Richard, of Clyst St. George, Devon, Esq. (c. 1630-1701)</td>
<td>George, of Ashton, Devon, 2nd. Bt. (d. 1691)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Mary Sydenham</td>
<td>m. Elizabeth Fortescue</td>
<td>m. Mary Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN (c. 1660-1706)</td>
<td>Richard, of Winslade (1676-1701)</td>
<td>George, 3rd. Bt. (d. 1719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 2nd Mary Phillips of Wispington (1668-1700)</td>
<td>Mary (1656-1718)</td>
<td>m. Mary Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipps, of Wispington (F.R.S.) (c. 1698-1745)</td>
<td>m. Agnes</td>
<td>Thomas (b. 1687)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Mary Lee</td>
<td>Maria (1602-67)</td>
<td>m. Harriet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipps, of Wispington (c. 1727-96)</td>
<td>Richard (b. 1699)</td>
<td>George, 4th. Bt. (1683-1758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 2nd Rebecca Shoulters</td>
<td>Nottingham (c. 1710-c. 1790)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura (1781-1856)</td>
<td>Mary (c. 1765-1832)</td>
<td>Elizabeth (1720-88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Robert Vyner of Eathorpe, Warw.</td>
<td>John (1766-1862)</td>
<td>m. 1st Augustus Hervey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary (c. 1755-1838)</td>
<td>(1724-79), third Earl of Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd. Evelyn Pearepoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c. 1711-75), second Duke of Kingston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>