

a theoretical control of it – but their control is of the design, not of the motto per se. And even then, there is nothing which would prevent another armiger (or indeed any non-armigerous individual) from adopting the same motto: the Prince of Wales, as heir-apparent, traditionally takes the motto *Ich Dien* but so does Norfolk County Council.

I rather agree with FitzHugh's next point, which seems to suggest that it may never be possible to obtain permission to use some arms. My point about cadency marks was that from the point when mention of them was made in the hearing (p. 54) Goddard must have become (i) aware that under the law of arms there was no difference between 'use' of arms separate from their 'display' and (ii) reminded of his act of providing a shield for display. If Goddard had remained ignorant of having a conflict of interest before this point in proceedings I suggest such ignorance could have not been sustained from this point in proceedings. (I do not argue that Goddard was wrong in not providing a cadency mark – usual practice in England has for some time not to take such trouble.)

Should Goddard have bothered to confirm his personal entitlement to the arms? The answer, of course, is that he probably would not have felt any need to do so. FitzHugh further argues that "Lord Goddard allowed mere display for decoration and the like which ... was not [a] change in the ... Law of Arms" but ends his letter by stating that "Lord Goddard was justifiably not satisfied that 'a Grantee of arms can himself authorise and permit another to bear them.'" However, FitzHugh does not tell us how this distinction – 'display', 'bear', 'use' – is to be made following *Manchester*.

I suggest that as a result of the *Manchester* case, anyone can display another person's armorial bearings with impunity because it would have to be proven that the use was not for mere display, but rather that the display or use was 'improper'. In *Manchester* Goddard suggested that 'mere display' was acceptable – if it was just a matter of display in the auditorium, Goddard indicated, then he would have been inclined to dismiss the case; it was the 'use' of the arms on a seal that did it for the theatre company as its use implied "the act and deed of the person entitled to bear the arms" (p. 60).

An Engraver's late-seventeenth-century Heraldic Sketchbook,

CoA no.237 (2020) pp. 23–53.

Dirk FitzHugh writes: The section dealing with the Hoare family (p. 29) requires some clarification: Dorcas, Lady Ashfield, is described as kinswoman of the banker, Sir Richard Hoare (1649–1719) – whilst she is the daughter of the Comptroller of the Mint, James Hoare, (died 1696), these two Hoare families are not related according to current published evidence. The author of the article quotes, as his source, Capt. Edward Hoare's *Account of the Families Hore and Hoare* (1883), which shows James and Sir Richard Hoare as descendants of a common Devon ancestor. Anthony Wagner, in his *English Genealogy* (Oxford, 1960, p. 375 Addenda) states 'the common ancestry with the Hoares of Hoare's Bank, attributed to this family in Edward Hoare's *Family of Hore and Hoare* 1883 was disproved by a pedigree recorded in the College of Arms in 1923, which takes its ancestry back to 1526 at Green's Norton, Northamptonshire. Since Burke has shown the two families having separate descents: the Irish Baronets of Annabella, Co Cork, (created 1784) descended from the Hoares of Green's Norton and the English Baronets (created 1786) descended from the Banker. The author's reference to the armorial seal

THE COAT OF ARMS

owned by Capt. Edward Hoare in 1883 as evidence that these arms were used by this Hoare family back to the year 1517 must now be suspect. The author states that the arms were 'ascribed to James Hoare's barrister's son. in the fourth addition (sic) of Guillim (1679) with the colours accidentally reversed, corrected in the next edition'. His note 20 refers to the source 'John Guillim, Display of Heraldry 5th edition (London, 1724) p. 211'. The fourth edition was published in 1660. So these references should be to the fifth and sixth editions respectively. *DBA* Vol II p. 161 gives some earlier examples of these arms. Thus in the Sketchbook of Benjamin Rhodes we find two distinct families of the same name, using the same arms, one actually coming from Northants, the other long claiming descent from Devon. It seems a mere coincidence that they both settled in London at about the same time and became involved in similar affairs, and may have assumed a common ancestry. Richard Hoare's name appears in the 'Visitation of London begun in 1687' (Harl. Soc. 2004 p. 608) in a list of persons using armorial bearings which was to be delivered to Sir Henry St George for his Visitations Summons, which were never completed. Sir Richard Hoare's family continued to claim descent from Devon until WWII. Subsequent Burke (PB) and Burke LG now commence the descent with Henry Hoare, yeoman, farmer of Walton, Bucks, son of Henry Hoare by his wife Catherine Nott. According to Fox Davies the Hoares of Green's Norton received 'confirmation' of their arms on 20 Nov. 1923, when their pedigree was accepted by the College of Arms.

Another minor point to note: the author describes the Houblon arms as 'presumably a rather feeble attempt at canting' (p. 50). Wagner's English Genealogy (p. 225) mentions Jean Houblon, the ancestor for of the first Governor of the Bank of England, as one of the French speaking Walloons, who settled (c.1586) in England. Since the French word 'Houblon' means hop plant, this would appear to be a perfect example of canting arms. M.P Siddons' 'Heraldry of Foreigners in England 1400-1700' (Harl. Soc. 2016 p. 177) notes that the Houblons were using arms in England by 1682 but without authority. They were certified by Pierre Hozier in 1638 (Paris) for the family of Jorion. Hozier was genealogist, Herald and Armorialist to King Louis XIII of France, being Toulouse Herald. It was only in 1819 that Susannah, widow of Jacob Houblon of Hallinbury Place, Ex, was granted arms and crest for Houblon, to be used by his son John.

Stephen Humphreys responds: I am grateful to Mr FitzHugh for informing me of a revised understanding of the origins of the banking Hoare families of London, and for his observations on the Houblon coat. This information does not detract from the evident affinity between James Hoare (d.1696) controller of the Mint and Sir Richard Hoare (d.1718) of Hoare's Bank which is confirmed by the sketchbook. The fact that both men bore versions of the same arms provides powerful confirmation that they believed themselves to be kinsmen, and there is no reason to suppose that that Sir Richard linked himself to Devon. That link was based on faulty research almost two centuries later. Since modern scholarship has traced Sir Richard's ancestors back to his grandfather Henry Hoare of Walton in Buckinghamshire, now part of Milton Keynes, while James Hoare was born at Green's Norton in Buckinghamshire, which lies approximately fourteen miles away, a common ancestry is distinctly plausible, even if Edward Hoare, writing in 1883, was wrong to link the two men via the Hoare family of Risford in Devon.

CORRESPONDENCE



Figure 1. See page 212.

THE COAT OF ARMS

That the sketchbook still offers rich material which can aid our understandings of the past can be further evidenced by the following development which I take the opportunity to now report. Shortly after the article was published I was able to contact a curator at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts about an item in its collection. I submitted a photograph of Rhodes' sketch of the Jolly arms (f.27v) and asked that it be compared to the engraving on the item (accession number 62.979a-b) [Figure 1] I am pleased to report that the attribution of Rhodes as the engraver has been accepted as probable, and the museum's records are to be updated accordingly; this despite the covered bowl not carrying the crest, but because of the coincidence of the engraver's style and the dates involved. Previously, only three extant items of Rhodes' work as commissioned through his sketchbook had been found.

Previous page: *Figure 1*

Top: Rhodes sketch of the Jolly arms from Hoare's Bank HB/1/3 f.27v courtesy of the Directors of Hoare's Bank.

Middle: engraving of the Jolly arms courtesy of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, accession number 62.979a-b, now attributed to Benjamin Rhodes.

Bottom: crest of Crawford from Benjamin Rhodes' sketchbook HB/1/3 f.27r, showing very similar decorative elements to those which surround the Jolly arms on the piece from the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Courtesy of the Directors of Hoare's Bank.

The arms of Jolly of Hatton Garden, (*Azure*) a lion passant guardant (*or*) and in chief three sinister hands (*argent*). Crest: a demi-eagle displayed (*or*) holding in its beak a sinister hand (*argent*), granted to Robert Jolly of Hatton Garden on 7th October 1692 (Harl. Soc. vol 66 p. 140). He was presumably the son of George Jolly (d.c.1683) who was a Restoration actor and theatre manager with a training school in Hatton Garden (DNB). If this is the case it might not be too much of a flight of fancy to envisage the lion is parading on a stage, looking out on, and waving back at, his audience; the sinister hands represent both the audience's applause and – just possibly too – the theatre curtain's pelmet.