

and Mr. Henry Grattan, M.P., had a hostile meeting here, when the latter, after receiving his opponent's fire, discharged his pistol in the air, and so the affair ended.

A memorable meeting which took place here was one between the Prince (afterwards Emperor) Louis Napoleon and Count Léon. It was happily bloodless. They met at seven a.m. on the 3rd of March, 1840. "When on the ground, the count refused to fight with swords," says Mr. B. Jerrold, in his *Life of the Emperor*, "but he found the prince as ready to give him satisfaction with pistols. The delay caused by this change of weapons, however, gave the authorities time to scent the impending breach of the peace, and before the seconds could put their men in position the police came up." The affair ended at Bow Street, when all four were bound over to keep the peace. Count D'Orsay was the prince's "second" on this occasion.

Among the latest duels fought here, or indeed anywhere in England, was one between the Earl of Cardigan and Captain Harvey Tuckett. It took place on the 21st of September, 1840, when the captain was severely wounded by a shot beneath the ribs. The earl was "tried by his peers" in the House of Lords in February, 1841, when, in consequence of the singular tactics of his counsel, who had "discovered a deficiency of proof as to the identity of the wounded man with the Captain Tuckett named in the indictment," a verdict of Not Guilty was returned, although, of course, actually speaking, there could be no doubt of the fact. Another duel about the same time was interrupted by the sudden rise of a cock-pheasant at the moment when the principals were about to fire, and the affair of honour was turned into a jest; and one of the principals in a third duel being a linen-draper's assistant, duelling was voted low and vulgar, and ceased to be fashionable. Even the greatest reforms, however, have their drawbacks, and it may be doubted whether the abolition of duelling has not tended to make men less regardful of the feelings of their neighbours, and encouraged in cowards a tendency to gratuitous insult.

In a previous chapter\* we have spoken of the ancient stronghold, or earthwork, on the south-western side of the common, generally known as Caesar's Camp. "This circular entrenchment," remarks the author of "*Pilgrimages in London*," "is not only a romantic and curious object, but derives additional interest from the mystery hanging over the traditions of its origin, occupants, and purposes. It remains a monument, perhaps a

tomb, not of individuals merely, but of nations long since passed away; and all that antiquaries or topographers can do is to surmise by whom when, and why it was shovelled up from the bosom of Mother Earth."

It has been ascribed by different authors to British, Roman, Saxon, and Danish hands; indeed, seeing that the plough has passed over it, and destroyed many of those features upon which a fair conclusion might be built, it would, no doubt, be a hopeless task to endeavour to settle definitely the period to which these remains may be referred. The final syllable of Wimbledon, as we have already shown, will at once suggest a British origin for the name, if not for the camp itself. Brayley, in his "*History of Surrey*," gives it as his opinion that probably it was originally a British stronghold, subsequently occupied by other nations in succession. Mr. W. D. Saull, in a paper read before the Ethnological Society in March, 1848, speaks very decidedly in favour of the British origin of this earthwork, and even goes so far as to distinctly refer it to the "Fourth, or Pastoral Period" of British history, "when our rude forefathers kept their herds in enclosures of small extent—but numerous—upon the highlands." But there appears to be no reason why this writer might not, with equal propriety, have referred it to his "Fifth Period," when, as he describes it, large and strong encampments were formed on the downs, superseding the small hill camps. Mr. Saull, on the supposition that it belongs to his "Fourth Period," refers Wimbledon to the same date as the enclosures at Edge Hill, in Warwickshire, at Brailes, at Hooknorton Heath, and at Madmarston and Nadbury Camps. As examples of the "Fifth Period," to which Wimbledon would seem more properly to belong, Mr. Saull cites the earthworks on St. Catherine's Hill, near Winchester, the camp on the downs near Folkestone, and a very fine example at Danesfield, near Stockbridge.

Mr. Saull is not alone in his decided opinions on this subject. The Rev. Thomas Hugo, at a meeting of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, in February, 1856, stated that "a large collection of hut circles was distinctly visible on Wimbledon Common a short time ago;" and suggested that Wimbledon was "the fortified fastness to which the Romans pursued Cassivelaunus."

Mr. Walter H. Tregellas, in an interesting paper on this subject in the "*Journal of the Archaeological Institute*," No. 67, says:—"In a letter to myself, Mr. Hugo writes that the hut circles to which he referred were numerous and conspicuous some

\* See ante, p. 470.