



**Royal Restoration: Estates of the Duke of Monmouth**  
**Professor Simon Thurley CBE**

17 March 2021

In June 1685 one of the most unlikely invasion forces in English history landed at Lyme Regis in Dorset. Only eighty-three strong, the band of loyal Protestants, were led by Charles II's eldest, and favourite, illegitimate son, James Scott, Duke of Monmouth. Their aim was to unseat King James II who had acceded to the throne that year on the death of King Charles. James II was, of course, a Roman Catholic, and his accession had been steadily opposed by a section of the English Political elite for a Decade or more.

Within a week some 4,000 had joined Monmouth under his blue banners emblazoned with 'For God, Freedom and Religion' and he was declared King in the Market Place at Taunton on Midsummer's day. At this point, his luck ran out. He had hoped to advance much further into England before meeting James II's forces, amassing supporters as he marched but, outside Bridgewater, in Somerset, his poorly trained badly armed force was wiped out at Sedgemoor by the professionally trained royal army. It was the last set piece battle fought on English soil. Monmouth himself was captured and nine days later beheaded on Tower Hill.

If, in one of the 'what if's' of English history, Monmouth had bided his time he would have certainly been at William III's side in 1688 and, in the reign of William and Mary, would have been the leading aristocrat of his age. But that isn't how things played out. Events, as they happened, have obscured the significant achievements of the Duke and in particular the subject of tonight's lecture his family's patronage of architecture.

My lectures this year have been taking a look at four great aristocratic families and their estates. In my first lecture I told the remarkable story of the Boleyns, a dynasty that rose in four generations from Norfolk gentry to produce an, albeit short-lived, queen of England. Their rise was founded on money from the city of London but consolidated through a series of spectacular aristocratic marriages that brought huge wealth, and influence.

What is interesting about the Boleyns is that, until Anne became queen, none of them were great architectural patrons and, although they all extended, modified and improved the houses that they bought, or inherited, architecture was never one of the driving forces in their rise to power. The case of the Cecils, covered in my second lecture in this series is entirely different. Without the blood to marry into great wealth two brilliant men, father and son, systematically invested the fruits of royal service in land. They bought, built, amassed and consolidated. On the strength of their many offices, reinforced by palpable royal favour, they borrowed to buy still more. Both William and Robert Cecil looked to the future - they were dynasty building, creating houses and estates that have endured for 400 years.

The approach to building was different too. The Boleyns were eager to stress their ancient lineage, their aristocratic descent. Owing property was dynastic affirmation. They wanted their houses to look old, any modernisation was carefully judged to bring modern comforts within a pre-existing structure. The Cecils came from much more humble stock - a fact that their opponents and detractors were keen to point out. The family was out to establish itself, not only through architecture

but through the totality of an estate with a capital mansion at its heart. Those mansions made references to the ancient feudal obligations of a landowner, but were essentially modern houses built by new men.

What ties the Boleyns and the Cecils together is their faith in the value of landed estates and property to secure long-term security and achieve upward social mobility. What separates them is the methods they used to achieve it. Today we look at our third family the Scotts, Dukes of Monmouth and Beccleuch. The Duke of Monmouth's rise and fall took place against an architectural background of great importance. As we will see, in the 1670s and 80s, as the notion of political parties was born, so was a new way of deploying building in the service of family and politics.

James, Duke of Monmouth was, until recently, regarded as a flimsy Restoration fop whose life was given over to gambling, sex and fighting but Dr Anna Keay's brilliant 2016 biography has demolished the picture of the dilettante and rake and replaced it with that of an engaged and principled politician and a capable and original administrator. What I am going to say this evening only reinforces that picture.

He was born in April 1649 in Rotterdam to one of Charles II mistresses, Lucy Walter. After an adventurous childhood in the company of his unreliable mother Charles II kidnapped the boy in 1657 and had him sent to Paris where he took the surname of his guardian Lord Crofts. In 1662, secure on his throne, the Restored king ordered James Crofts, as he then was, to London. **One of Charles II's** most admirable traits was the strong affection he had for his children and, although he had not seen much of his 13-year-old son, he fell for his charm, good looks and quick wit. Very soon James was moved into **Whitehall Palace** and given an apartment on the Thames-side at the foot of the king's back stairs – the private staircase that led directly to the king's bedchamber.

The high favour in which James was held quickly came to the notice of Margaret Leslie Countess of Wemyss. **Her daughter Anne**, countess of Buccleuch, was the heir to the richest family in Scotland and Margaret needed to see her married to a man who would protect her from the designs of the rapacious earls of Tweeddale to whom the family estates would fall if her daughter were to die without issue. She hit on the brilliant idea of offering Anne to Charles II as a bride for James Crofts.

Anne was only eleven, but heir to an annual income of soe £10,000 a year. The marriage was agreed in principle and in February 1663 James became the duke of Monmouth and earl of Doncaster, being given precedence over all non-royal dukes and, on 23 April, he was installed a Knight of the Garter. Three days earlier he had married Anne, taking her family name of Scott, and had become duke of Buccleuch, earl of Dalkeith, and Lord Scott of Whitchester and Eskdale. Given that Anne was too young to marry, for the time being, they were to live apart. Lady Wemyss and Charles II must have been mutually delighted, one secured the finances of his son forever without investing a single penny and the other married into the royal family.

Whitehall was no place for a twelve-year-old girl and in March 1664, at the cost of £7,000, Charles II bought Anne and James a house in Chiswick, a safe ten miles distance from Whitehall. Chiswick House is famous today for its surviving fragment, the Italianate villa built by Lord Burlington in the late 1720s and now in the care of English Heritage. But what you see today is the surviving wing of a house built in the 1620s for one of James I's grooms of the Bedchamber, John Ashburnham. The house was considerable, it had 33 hearths, and was described as 'a large great house and large faire garden'. From March 1664 until February 1665 when her marriage was consummated it was Anne Buccleuch's official home.

While Chiswick House was being prepared for Anne the King turned his attention to his son. In the space of three months James had acquired two Dukedoms, married the richest woman in Scotland, and had been declared the country's leading aristocrat. While his lodgings at Whitehall put him in

an immensely privileged location, they were not now reflective of his status. The Surveyor of the king's Works Sir John Denham was ordered to set up suitable lodgings at the Cockpit.

This was the west side of Whitehall Palace, the area that Henry VIII had created as a vast recreation centre containing four tennis courts a bowling alley and an elaborate cockpit from which, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century the area took its name. Denham turned to the largest building in the complex the great close tennis play built by Henry VIII in the early 1530s. We know exactly what it was like because Henry VIII built an almost identical court at **Hampton court**, which itself was converted into lavish lodgings for the Duke of York in 1670. In both cases the court was divided by two floors into a three-story building given large casement windows and furnished with chimney stacks.

Monmouth's lodgings in the Cockpit grew during his lifetime eventually absorbing neighbouring buildings. The rooms remained into the early nineteenth century and Sir John Soane recorded the ceilings of two of them. These record drawings show just how lavish the apartments were; from the inside there was no hint of their Tudor origins, they were done up in the finest taste and furnished with items from the royal wardrobe to match.,

Monmouth's tally of privileges was notched up further in February 1665 when he was granted an annual pension of £6,000 and, in 1667, an additional allowance of £4,000 a year to cover the cost of entertaining the king to suppers at his lodgings. And the gold kept coming - the royal allowance was raised by £2,000 a year in 1672 and, in 1677 to cover the cost of their three children, another £1,600 a year. Other one-off gifts such as the £5,000 given to celebrate the duchess's lying in in 1672 mounted up to a staggering £43,000 in 1672-3 alone.

So what do we know of this incredibly rich, well-connected, glamorous couple? A selection of their account books survive, and make it clear that they did not stint in their enjoyment of their position. They were hugely extravagant, in 1666 their servants cost them £3,500 and their stables £1,135, their clothes budget was meant to be £1,200 a year but in 1671 Anne spent that whole sum on a single pair of diamond earrings.

But what about architecture? The young couple had Chiswick but in 1665 Anne, who we must remember was only 14, was invited to visit Moor Park, Rickmansworth, in Hertfordshire. This country house belonged to the earl of Ormond, one of Charles II closest allies who had been given lodgings in the Cockpit at Whitehall and were in another converted tennis court neighbouring the Monmouths. Anne loved Moor Park and immediately started coveting it. By today's standards this was incredibly precocious, and it must be wondered what drew this teenager to the property.

The house there was very similar to Chiswick, it had been built in 1614-20 by the Earl and countess of Bedford and there was not much advantage in exchanging one 70 year old house for another. So it must have been Moor Park's position and in particular its gardens that attracted her. The Bedfords had laid out a famous garden described by Sir William temple in 1685 as 'the sweetest Place [...] I have ever seen in my Life, either before or since, at Home or Abroad'. And in 1663 when the Ormonds bought it Lord Clarendon said 'the beauty of this place depends upon the gardens'. The house had doors that led straight out into terraces with summer houses and steps leading down to further terraces with parterres, fountains and statues.

Charles II, ever indulgent to his son, bought the house from the Earl of Ormond furniture and all, for the enormous sum of £13,200 in 1670. The house at Chiswick had been sold two years before as the couple, now glued to the side of the king at Whitehall, and elsewhere, rarely used it. Soon they added another property to their portfolio. In 1674 Monmouth had been appointed to one of the three great court offices, the master of the horse. In this role he had the major responsibility of overseeing the king's stables and the transport logistics of the court. The headquarters was at Charing Cross in the Royal Mews, a vast complex of yards, stables and coach houses on the site of modern Trafalgar

Square. With the job, and a major administrative burden, came a fine house on Hedge Lane, modern Whitcombe Street.

The house had been built in 1660 and was purchased by the king in 1661 becoming the official residence of the Master of the Horse. No image of it survives but this plan shows that it had 11 rooms on the ground floor as well as its own stables. The new residence soon got a make-over, was furnished with the finest money could buy. Here the duke kept 30 horses, his coaches and his yellow-liveried footmen who ran alongside the coach wherever it went.

The news that James, Duke of York, had converted to Catholicism, that broke in 1673, was a turning point in Charles II reign triggering huge controversy in a vehemently anti-Catholic country not long out of religious revolution. Disquiet turned into hysteria by the discovery of a Catholic plot against the king – the so called Popish Plot. the Duke of York was implicated in this entirely fictional conspiracy by the discovery of incriminating letters held by one of his chaplains. This ‘made as much noise in and about London, and indeed all over the nation, as if the very cabinet of hell had been laid open.’ A movement to have the Duke of York removed from the succession, which had already begun, now began to gather momentum, the streets of London filled with angry crowds, there were Pope burning processions and the call amongst the populace was for Monmouth to be made his father’s successor.

London, and in particular Whitehall, had been the domain of the court, the primary residence of the King since the Restoration. But the ‘Exclusion Crisis’, as it was called, changed that. The strength of feeling about the prospect of a Catholic sovereign was enormous and gave birth to Political parties - the Whigs who were for changing the succession to keep a Catholic out, the Tories – first among them the King – for standing up for the hereditary principle come what may. The Whigs, as you may imagine, chose the Duke of Monmouth, the Protestant duke, as their figurehead, he alone was a credible alternative heir to Charles II. Monmouth never publicly put himself forward as a potential king, but did want to exclude the Duke of York and supported the idea of the Crown going to William and Mary.

We have to remember that it was Charles I inability to hold and control London that was one of the triggers of the Civil War. Charles knew that he had to diffuse the febrile atmosphere on the streets that was being stoked by the Whig opposition and, in 1674, when he realised he would never persuade his brother to abandon Catholicism, the king had made a sudden and dramatic change to the way the court operated.

For several months every summer, he announced, his entire court would decamp from London to Windsor Castle (which it had never before done), and massive rebuilding works were set in train to modernise the castle to make it suitable. In the early 1680s the king went one stage further and started construction of a huge new palace built from scratch in the loyal Hampshire town of Winchester.

In order to calm things down politically Charles was also forced to invite Whigs to his privy council. But in the autumn of 1679 the King lost patience, abandoned the coalition council, and expelled Monmouth and other opposition leaders from court.

Up until this point the Duke of Monmouth had been a creature of the court, principally residing in his lavish apartment in Whitehall. Now Monmouth was banned from entering its precincts and while Duchess Anne and their children remained in the Cockpit, Monmouth had to live in his official residence in Hedge Lane. Meanwhile they commissioned Hugh May, the Comptroller of the Royal Office of Works to rebuild the Jacobean house at Moor Park. May was then in charge of the spectacular renovation of Windsor Castle creating the most impressive suite of state and private apartments of the whole seventeenth century. The Monmouths not only secured the services of the

king's Architect, but the whole royal team from Windsor, from the joiners to Antonio Verrio the king's painter and Grinling Gibbons his carver.

As far as we can now work out the core of the old house was kept; I say this because, as I shall explain, the new house was of rather an unusual plan. The whole was of brick – 1.4m of them were made in kilns in the park and Paul Drury, Sally Jeffery and Paul Wrightson have managed to reconstruct its appearance. It may look rather plain to our eyes, not at all what we would expect from this celebrity couple and leaders of court fashion. But this was the fashion. These neat brick houses, beautifully proportioned but austere were what everyone of taste from the king downwards wanted. At Hampton Court Charles II built exactly such a building, probably also by Hugh May. In fact Moor Park was described by one contemporary as 'one of the best pieces of brickwork in England'.

It was entered from the side up some steps into the hall which led up more steps to the great stairs. May was a master of spatial composition and staircases, top lit, like this one were a speciality. At the top of the stairs was a dining room that led to two apartments one on either side and both preceded by a drawing room. The plan was not symmetrical or sophisticated, but practical, serving the couple's needs. Below on the ground floor there was a state suited leading from the hall – an ante room, what was called the great dining room, the principal state room of the house, leading to a bedchamber and closets by a back stair. This surely was built in anticipation of a reconciliation with the king when he could come and stay.

The most significant surviving room in this fine mansion is the great dining room that connected via a door to the terrace overlooking the famous gardens. The painted walls were done after Monmouth's time but the ceiling, by Verrio with Apollo crossing the sky viewed by other gods. The original joinery also survives beautifully and richly carved and this would have set off the tapestries originally hung on the walls. Something of the original effect can still be seen at Windsor in the king's great eating room, an exact equivalent for Monmouth's chamber.

Now we come to the most important part of this story, for although in 1679 Monmouth started building what was unquestionably one of the most fashionable houses of its age, he never wanted to live in it. His life was in London and that is where he wanted to be and so while worked progressed at Moor Park he continued to live in Hedge Lane which became an unofficial headquarters for the Whig opposition to the Crown.

As you will know, and one of my previous lectures has covered this in detail, one of the most dramatic effects of the Restoration on London was the birth of what we now call the West End, in particular the building of the streets and squares south of Piccadilly and north of St. James's park. This area was developed quite rapidly in the years after 1660 and during the 1670s and 80s development spread further covering the whole of what is now Soho. The first new square was St. James's which was, of course, built at the gates of St James's palace, the seat of the Duke of York and the Roman Catholic chapel maintained there for public worship. It should be no surprise that with only one significant exception all the early inhabitants of the square were supporters of the Duke of York and the king, in other words they were Tories. The square was, in political terms the epicentre of loyalty to the succession.

In 1677 a successful London bricklayer, Richard Frith, leased part of Soho fields, the open ground north of Charing Cross. He began to build 42 handsome brick houses, following the model of St James's Square, and in January 1680 the first property was sold. By 1683 fourteen houses in the square had been completed and were occupied. The design was highly uniform: most houses were three storeys high and three bays wide, with sashes in flush frames and broken scrolled pedimented doorcases.

Frith had hit on a brilliant bit of salesmanship for he had acquired as principal resident, for the colossal single house that defined the southern side of the square the glamorous figurehead of the opposition party, the Duke of Monmouth himself. The lease was granted in February 1682, when Monmouth was at the height of his fame. It was an enormous plot measuring 76 feet on the square and going back 280 feet to the rear, with, crucially, large stables with their own frontage on Frith Street. The deal was an advantageous one for Monmouth. He acquired the property from Frith at the cost of only £400, the house was to be built by Firth and his associates at their cost over the following year, and several years later the Duke was to reimburse them the £6,600 that the building was to cost. The deal was secured on Monmouth's promise to transfer to the developers what remained of his lease on his stables in Hedge Lane. A crack team of royal craftsmen was taken on, the master joiner Alexander Fort, the interior painter Robert Streeter both of whom were also working at Moor Park.

The square was christened Kings Square and a statue of Charles II was erected at its centre. Monmouth was resident in the house, probably not yet fully completed, just over a year later, in the Spring of 1683. What was remarkable, however, was who else had bought houses in King's Square. Of the 14 inhabited houses on the new development, seven were owned by prominent and influential members of the Whig party. Among them Colonel Rumsey and Lord Grey of Wark, both of whom would sail with Monmouth on his fateful invasion, plus Thomas Grey, 2nd Earl of Stamford, Thomas Thynne, Lord Weymouth and a fistful of others. Just as St James's square was a bastion of the Tories now the new ultra-fashionable King's Square became the headquarters of the Whigs.

The contract to build Monmouth's new house was signed on 17 February 1682 and a few years ago David Adshead identified in the Bodleian Library, Oxford the plans and elevations that formed part of that contract. They show the house Monmouth commissioned to be a very large brick built seven bay, five story house with a roof terrace and a lantern.

On the ground floor were two large reception rooms and some closets. A staircase rose to the principal floor where there was a magnificent gallery entered by a door flanked by two fireplaces. This led to two great rooms overlooking the square. These were not suites of state rooms culminating in a bedroom, but suites of reception rooms. They were decorated much as those at Moor Park. In the great room on the ground floor there were the Duke's initials in plaster on the ceiling and his arms prominently carved over the fireplace. In the great room above there was a limewood carving over the chimney by Grinling Gibbons.

Looking at the plan of this house, it was specifically ordered to be a place of informal assembly rather than formal ceremony. Socially and functionally it was the seminal town house of the Restoration, the one that epitomised aristocratic fashions for nearly two centuries the followed. From the 1680s the West End of London was built by Whig aristocrats, the Bedfords in Russell and Tavistock Squares, the Cavendishes in Cavendish and Manchester Squares, the Grosvenors in Belgravia. For them, as for the Duke of Monmouth, the West End was not only a financial investment it was a social and political one, the very basis of their lives. The richest aristocrats still maintained at least three houses, a principal country house, a town house and a suburban villa. But their town houses were above all political houses, places for the politics of the day to be thrashed out.

In the three successive parliaments which met between 1679 and 1681 where the exclusion of the Duke of York was the dominating issue Anthony Ashley Cooper the first earl of Salisbury was the leading opposition figure. We can't really call him the leader of the Whig Party as it is too early for that, but he was certainly the most powerful opposition politician and, on-and-off, in alliance with Monmouth who, at one stage, he had proposed to the king as an alternative successor to James. John Dryden's 1,000 line poem *Absalom and Achitophel*, described the way it was believed that Shaftesbury had turned Monmouth's head and made him 'drunk with honour and debauched with praise half loath and half consenting to the ill'.

With a fine country house in Dorset the Coopers had been lucky in 1666 as their town house, in Aldersgate Street in the City of London was not burnt down. Built in 1644 it was one of the last generation of aristocratic houses to be built in the city. Thanet House, as it was known, was where Shaftesbury marshalled his opposition confederates and Monmouth was a regular visitor. The City of London was a Whig bastion, the Corporation, mayor, sheriffs and all the leading figures were opponents of the Duke of York's succession.

Both Shaftesbury and Monmouth wanted to use the City to pressurise the King to agree to their demands. Shaftesbury became a member of the Skinner's company to participate in City governance. Monmouth meanwhile took a house in the city, just off Bishopsgate. It was a brand new house built by the wealthy merchant and MP for Old Sarum, Eliab Harvey. Harvey was another exclusionist and may have given the house to Monmouth at a discount, for the only purpose of this new residence was to give him more leverage with the Corporation, entertaining senior figures in the City rather than the West End. Although the house appears on a map of 1682 we don't know what it looked like.

The circumstances of the years 1670 to 1685 saw the political establishment fracture into two disagreeing on what to do over the prospect of a Catholic heir to the throne. The Tories were based at court but the Whigs in opposition had to meet in coffee houses, taverns, clubs and private houses. Both Shaftesbury's house in the City and Monmouth's houses in Hedge Lane and King's Square became centres of opposition and I would argue that Monmouth House was designed to facilitate large assemblies of Whigs.

In this way the early 1680s prefigured what was to become commonplace in the eighteenth century when the sons of the Georgian Kings were expelled from court and created centres of political opposition in the great mansions of the West End. Leicester House was used by two generations of Princes of Wales to oppose their fathers, so much so that the opposition became known as the 'Leicester House faction'. These town houses were created by the new power of parliament and the necessity for aristocrats and the crown to influence its composition to support their policies. Great estates in the country were all very well, but without an effective working base in the West End political ambitions would be still-born.

But to return to the Monmouths. While Monmouth House in Kings square was briefly the first great Whig town house and epicentre of the opposition, its moment of glory was very short. In 1685 when the Duke was executed he left two major houses incomplete. Neither his house in King's square or Moor Park were finished. The duchess was still staying in Hedge Lane rather than King's Square and the Duke's execution left an almost impenetrable tangle of legal tenures on his London property. It was never re-occupied by the duchess and she eventually sold it in 1717.

Moor Park, however remained the principal suburban residence of Anne as Duchess of Buccleuch and she brought the works there to a conclusion. In 1688 she remarried Charles Cornwallis, 3<sup>rd</sup> Baron Cornwallis. She was still in her mid-thirties and had three more children with her second husband, all girls. Moor Park was extensively remodelled and extended in the eighteenth century and so its final appearance under the Monmouths is not clear. After the death of Lord Cornwallis in 1698 she began to think of returning to her native Scotland and made her way to her northern estates in 1701 – for the first time since 1662. She was now 54 and in Scotland carried herself as a member of the Royal family, a status that in England, was now hard to carry off.

Although her second marriage had been as ruinously expensive as the first, and though she remained personally extravagant, her income was such that she could afford to set out to build herself a house that befitted her perceived status as royalty. Her family had acquired Dalkeith Castle just south of Edinburgh in the 1640s and, being close to Edinburgh, had been used by James I and

Charles I reinforcing its royal connotations. She decided not to tear down the medieval castle but to adapt and modify it, rather as she did at Moor Park.

Her architect was James Smith, the former overseer or surveyor of the royal works in Scotland. James Smith had travelled through Europe and lived in Rome where he had begun to train as a priest. Returning to Scotland he married the daughter of Scotland's leading mason, Robert Mylne and was engaged to work on Holyroodhouse. He was summoned to London to receive architectural instructions under James II, but fell out of royal favour thereafter. Yet in 1701 he was still acknowledged Scotland's leading architect.

Dalkeith Palace, remains externally little altered since the duchess's time. It is possible that it owes its inspiration to Anne's friendship with Queen Mary II. Between 1688 and Mary's death in 1694 the two women were close, and Anne saw first-hand the rebuilding of Kensington Palace and must have known about the modernisation of Het Loo, William and Mary's new country house in Holland. Both were built with pavilions attached to a central block and it seems as if Smith was asked to take his inspiration from these houses. The similarity to Het Loo, in particular is striking.

The fine masonry was executed by Scots masons but all the internal fittings and furniture came from London or the Netherlands. In fact, both Monmouth House and Moor Park were stripped of panelling, marble, and all their furnishings to decorate Dalkeith. The rooms were magnificent with a lavish use of marble. Looking at the plan the duchess's intentions become clear, for the ground floor contains a large state apartment of regal proportions and splendour. This was no ordinary country house, it was a royal palace.

I made the point in my first lecture that it was to women that the Boleyns owed their wealth. Their characters are anonymous today but we should not doubt their formidable influence in the family. The Cecils were also blessed with remarkable women, one heiress, but crucially Mildred, William Cecil's second wife, who was one of the most brilliant women of her age and who played a crucial role in partnership with William and in the education of Robert. Once again in the story of the Monmouths, although the marriage with the Duke was not a success in conventional terms, Anne's income and taste was crucial to their lives. With the Duke away from home undertaking his military and other duties Anne must have supervised much of the building work at Monmouth House and Moor Park. Her subsequent activities at Dalkeith certainly show her in control of the design and furnishing of the house.

But we don't end at Dalkeith tonight. We end with the crucial observation that for a couple as wealthy and well-connected at the Monmouths it was London that was important not the country. Until rebuilding began at Moor Park in 1679 it was principally important for supplying hay for their London stables and fruit for their table. The life of the Monmouths was urban and the Duke's engagement in politics made their London residence into a model of a political house. That is not to say that the houses of the aristocrats were not centres of political discourse before 1670, but afterwards with organised political opposition to the crown in parliament the political house became central to the mechanics of national power. Monmouth House was the blueprint for those that came after.

Next time on Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> June 2021 we turn to the Marlborough and we will see what became of the political house both in town and in the country. I hope you will join me then.