

years ago, and above a century before Arundel or even Courtenay succeeded to the primacy. It is probable that the need of a guard-chamber was more fully realised by the soldier-minded Courtenay when he was appointed custodian of no less distinguished a prisoner than the young Duke of Rothesay, afterwards James I., who had been captured at sea when flying to France, to seek asylum from his unscrupulous uncle, the Regent Duke of Albany. From the rigours of his first imprisonment in Pevensey Castle he was transferred to the milder guardianship of the chivalrous Primate at Croydon, where he lived for some years.¹⁹

The guard-chamber is about fifty feet long by twenty-two feet wide, with a stone-ribbed roof springing from corbels on which the arms of Arundel are conspicuous, while in the south-east corner there projects a small oriel, the gem of the whole building, clearly belonging to Arundel's time, and in which formerly were the royal arms, in the form in which that half-royal primate delighted to blend them with those of his own family.

To the south of the guard-chamber, and running parallel to it, formerly lay the cloisters and the long gallery. Of the former some interesting traces may still be detected in the lower range of the buildings, but the gallery has wholly disappeared or lost its original character in its more recent adaptation to domestic apartments. The only historic interest of this gallery lay in the recorded fact that in it the handsome Sir Christopher Hatton received the seals as Lord Chancellor in 1587, at the hands of Elizabeth, when Archbishop Whitgift himself had declined the office.

From the brighter and more attractive stonework of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as seen in the hall and guard-room, we pass to the sombre brick of the fifteenth century, as it appears in the chapel. This material and the debased Tudor arch of the west window at once mark the approximate date of the present building, though no record has been found to throw any light on the exact period of its erection. As a brick building it could hardly have been earlier than the year 1400; and as Wilkins, in his "Concilia," notes the absence of any Archiepiscopal Act dated from Croydon between 1454 and 1541, the natural inference is that the chapel was the work of Archbishop Bourchier, or at any rate was raised in its present form in the first half of the fifteenth century.

The existence of an earlier chapel is clear. "Peckham's Register" expressly states that his reception of the pall took place *in camera principali*, and its confirmation two days after *in capella*

sui manerii de Croydon in the year 1382; and the learned, but persecuted, Reginald Peacock was consecrated in the chapel at Croydon in 1414.

But it is with Laud that the present building is especially associated; for, according to his custom, and more fully than even in Lambeth itself, he has recorded here in heraldic characters the history of his rise. On the carved poppy-heads of the western block of stalls appear his arms in connection with those of every preferment he held, impaling the Principalship of St. John's, Oxford, the Deanery of Gloucester, and the sees of St. Asaph, Bath and Wells, London, and Canterbury; while on the eastern block are those of Juxon. During the sad interval between these two Primates piety had given place to puritanic fanaticism, and this chapel was turned into a kitchen, to gratify the tastes of its new owner, Sir William Breton, of whom a pamphleteer of the day says, "he had terrible long teeth and a prodigious stomach." Archbishop Juxon rescued the chapel from its state of desecration; but since his time it has received scant care and attention, as its windows testify, where in too many places stucco has supplied the place of stonework. The altar itself was removed in 1810, when the building was utilised as an armoury for the militia. At a still more recent period the beautifully carved oak poppy-heads of the stalls, which had escaped the hatchets of the Parliamentarians, and had become enriched with the darkened hues of age, were doomed, in deplorable ignorance or utter lack of art appreciation, to be daubed over with dull brown paint! Happily its more recent use as a Sunday-school, and now as a day-school, has been for girls, for it is to be feared that its exquisite carving would have suffered cruel mutilation under the pen-knives of the same number of boys.

It has often been suggested that the old palace should be repaired and again turned to ecclesiastical, or, at least, educational purposes; and in 1883 an effort was made to effect its restoration as a monument to Archbishop Tai's memory. But the proposal was not taken up in the highest quarters, and there seems little hope of the place being rescued from further decay.

Of the Primates who are known to have lived at Croydon Palace a short sketch may be interesting, inasmuch as they form a majority of the men who have occupied the see of Canterbury since the time of the Conquest.

Lanfranc is interesting to us as being the first archbishop on record who owned the Manor of Croydon, as appears by Domesday Survey.²⁰ He was a Milanese by birth; it was he who asserted and