



*The Herald and genealogist*

P. 1

THE

# Herald and Genealogist.

EDITED BY

JOHN GOUGH NICHOLS, F.S.A.

HON. MEMBER OF THE SOCIETIES OF ANTIQUARIES OF SCOTLAND AND  
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL  
SOCIETY AND OF THE NEW ENGLAND HISTORIC-GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY.

---

VOLUME THE EIGHTH.

---

LONDON:

R. C. NICHOLS AND J. B. NICHOLS,  
PRINTERS TO THE SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES,  
25, PARLIAMENT STREET, WESTMINSTER.

1874.

## SIR RICHARD PERROTT, A SOI-DISANT BARONET.

“Sir Richard Perrott” was one of the most daring pretenders to title and pedigree in the last century, and his audacity was in several instances attended with extraordinary though transient success. He assumed to be the heir of a Baronetcy created in the year 1716; and in the year 1767 he surreptitiously obtained from one of his Majesty’s Secretaries of State a recognition of such rank and precedence, under the King’s sign manual, which was actually registered in the books of the Office of Arms (I. 32, fo. 58) under the following form :

GEORGE R.

George the Third, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c. To our right trusty and right well-beloved cousin and counsellor, Richard, Earl of Scarborough, Deputy to our right trusty and right entirely beloved cousin Edward, Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshal, and our hereditary Earl Marshal of England, greeting.

Whereas, to avoid all doubts and disputes about the rank and precedency of our trusty and well-beloved subject Sir Richard Perrott, Baronet, we have thought fit hereby to signify our royal pleasure, and to declare, that the said Richard Perrott, and the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten, shall have and enjoy in all places, assemblies, and meetings, the place, rank, precedency, privileges, and immunities, of or belonging to the degree of a Baronet of this our realm, and to take place and commence as from the first day of July, One thousand seven hundred and sixteen. Our will and pleasure is, that you Richard, Earl of Scarborough, Deputy to our said Earl Marshal, do require and command that this our order and declaration be registered in our College of Arms, to the end that our Officers of Arms, and all others, on occasion, may take full notice and have knowledge thereof, for which this shall be your warrant. Given at our Court at St. James’s, the third day of January, 1767, in the seventh year of our reign.

By His Majesty’s command,

H. S. CONWAY.

“Sir Richard” asserted himself to be at once the male heir of the ancient family of Perrott of Haroldstone, co. Hereford, and also to be the representative, through a daughter, of Sir Thomas Perrott, who, as he averred, was about to be created a Baronet in 1611, but had died before the patent had passed for him. He claimed descent from an Owen Perrott, said to be the grandfather of James Perrott of Wellington, and to be the husband of Dorothy, said to be the second daughter of Sir Thomas Perrott. But the Rev. E. L. Barnwell, in his *Notes on the Perrot Family*, 1867, p. 62, informs us that he had searched all the best pedigrees without finding the name of the pre-

tended Owen, or the pretended Dorothy;<sup>1</sup> nor is there any trace of the pretended Baronetcy of 1611. In fact, Sir Thomas Perrott died many years before the institution of the order of Baronets, though the date of his decease is not ascertained by Mr. Barnwell.<sup>2</sup>

Again a similar story is repeated. The dignity of Baronet is asserted to have been conferred on James Perrott, esquire, of Richmond in Surrey, by King George the First, on the 1st of July, 1716. But for fifty years after its presumed creation no recognition of this dignity is to be found. In the *Baronetage of Wotton*, published in 1727, there is no account of the Perrott family; and in the list of all baronetcies, extant or extinct, appended to the *Baronetage of 1741*, the name is not inserted either under 1611 or 1716.<sup>3</sup>

There are some indications, however, of the assumption of the title before the end of the reign of George the Second. In the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1759, this occurs among the deaths:—

*May 29.* Sir Rob. Perrot, bt., at Brussels.

And in the volume for 1769 we find the decease of "Sir Richard Perrot, Dublin." To the latter name "baronet" is not added; but if there was no baronetcy, either of England or of Ireland, who were these persons? Did they actually live and die? Or are these among the *feint* departures of the same extraordinary person who afterwards made himself more conspicuous and notorious? and who, if the anecdotes told of him be true, was much in the habit of imposing upon the credulity of the world by means of the public newspapers.

<sup>1</sup> The only child of Sir Thomas Perrott was named Penelope; she was married first to Sir William Gower, knight, and secondly to Sir Robert Naunton, knight. There is a monument in Letheringham church, Suffolk, to James Naunton, Esq., whereon he is stated to be "sonne of Sir Robert Naunton, knt., and Dame Penelope his wife, daughter and *sole heir* of Sir Thos. Perrott, knt." (See *The Topographer and Genealogist*, ii. 501.)

<sup>2</sup> His father's death took place in September 1592; and "his own death immediately followed that of his father." In or before 1595 his widow (Lady Dorothy *née* Devereux) had become the wife of the Earl of Northumberland. Craik, *Romance of the Peerage*, 1849, ii. 32, 33.

<sup>3</sup> It is equally absent from the similar lists appended to Playfair's *Baronetage*, 1809, and Debrett's *Baronetage*, 1824; but it appears in the lists in Beatson's *Political Index* 1788, and Betham's *Baronetage* 1805, under 1767, "with precedence from July 1st, 1716." The latter writer prints the entry in italics, intending thereby to indicate that it was then extinct. Courthope, in the list given in his *Synopsis of the Extinct Baronetage*, 1835, copied it from that in the *Baronetage of 1771*, under the date of July 1, 1717, but with a caveat that it was "doubtful if a patent ever passed the seal" (p. 245).

“ Sir Richard Perrott,” our hero, was certainly the *soi-disant* Sir Richard from the beginning of the year 1767, if not before; and, that being the case, what other “ Sir Richard Perrott ” could have died, or have pretended to die, in Dublin in 1769 ?

The earliest Baronetage, or list of Baronets, to which the impostor obtained admission, was, so far as we can trace, that published by Almon in 1769 (in 3 vols. 12mo). There is about the article an air of studied incompleteness, framed in order that it might wear the appearance of being the result of imperfect information, and so be open to future correction from “ more competent authority.” This is the whole of it:—

PERROT.

This family is of antient extraction, and has produced many persons of note.

The first of them advanced to the dignity of a Baronet was Sir Robert, by virtue of a sign manuel (*sic*) from his Majesty Geo. I. dated July 1, 1716.

Sir Richard, the present Baronet, married the daughter of ———, and has one son, John.

ARMS : Gules, three pears pendant or, in a chief of the second a demi lion issuant sable.

SEAT : At Richmond in Surry. (Vol. II. p. 374.)

And in the same publication, in a “ Catalogue of all the Persons who have been created Baronets of England,” (copied from former Baronetages) is inserted, under the year 1716,

July 1. Robert Perrot of Richmond

Surry. (Vol. III. p. 257.)

Thus, in two places, the first pretended Baronet of 1716 was distinctly stated to have been named *Robert*, who had been advanced to the dignity of a Baronet merely by virtue of sign manual. And so again in the “ List of all the Baronets from their first institution,” appended to Kimber and Johnson’s Baronetage of 1771 (vol. iii. p. 336):—

998. Robert Perrot, of Richmond, Surry, Esq., now claimed by Sir Richard, who has no patent. July 1, 1717. [no longer 1716.]

Edward Kimber, the actual editor of the Baronetage of 1771, from whose pen the remark just inserted “ who has no patent,” probably proceeded, and who did not insert any article on this family in the body of his work, was dead before its publication; <sup>1</sup> and its com-

<sup>1</sup> Mr. EDWARD KIMBER had compiled a small Peerage, printed in 1766, and again in 1769; he also wrote a History of England, in one volume 8vo. and the novel “ Joe Thomson,” 2 vols. 12mo. (Lowndes, by Bohn, p. 1271.) We have not found the exact date of his death; but Richard Johnson, who completed the

pletion evidently fell into less careful hands. The result was that the agents of "Sir Richard Perrott" found admission for his monstrous genealogy, which is printed in the Appendix to that Baronetage, pp. 458-467. It was thus introduced:—

London, July 18, 1770.

On examination of these volumes, I\* perceive that the family of Perrott is omitted; but wishing to do strict justice to all mankind, I now insert a short account of Sir Richard and his family, from a curious pedigree left by him in the hands of the late Mr. Kimber; which shows that the said Sir Richard descends from a princely line, at the head of which stands Brutus, the first King of Britain; &c., &c.

\* Mr. T. L. who wrote this account of the Perrott family.

It may be concluded that "Mr. T. L. who wrote this account," or at least wrote this introduction to it, was T. Lowndes, one of the booksellers whose names appear on the title-page. Whether he was actually the author of this precious concoction, or whether he merely "wrote it out," is not clearly stated;<sup>1</sup> but it seems unlikely that it could have been composed by any but the great Sir Richard himself. It is pretended that it was chiefly extracted from a pedigree compiled in the seventeenth century by one Owen Griffiths; but there is every

Baronetage of 1771, thus speaks of him: "Mr. Kimber, who fell a victim, in the meridian of his life, to his indefatigable toils in the Republic of Letters—to him I owe the present plan of this Work: He was the Architect, I only the Builder." Kimber is a very uncommon name. It was that of an apothecary at Windsor, William Kimber, who died August 28, 1782, aged 62, having married a niece of Dr. Bland, Dean of Durham, and Provost of Eton. This Mr. Kimber was esteemed as "an excellent wit:" see him commemorated in the Gentleman's Magazine 1783, p. 638.

RICHARD JOHNSON is described in the *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, iii. 604, as "a very useful Corrector of the Press, and Editor for the Booksellers." His tomb in Hendon churchyard was inscribed "To the memory of Mr. RICHARD JOHNSON, Citizen, who died Feb. 25, 1793, aged 53. He possessed a good and generous mind; was much beloved as well as being admired for his moral principles and literature." *Ibid.* p. 760. His son of the same name, who died Feb. 11, 1795, aged 38, having saved some money as clerk to Mr. Curtis, a wholesale stationer, bequeathed in his will, dated 1795 (and printed *Ibid.* p. 605), perpetual annuities for five poor widows of liverymen of the Stationers' Company.

Both Kimber and Johnson, therefore, were what were then called "Booksellers' hacks,"—not genealogists by profession or predilection. The former had twenty guineas for correcting the third edition of Ainsworth's Latin Dictionary. (*Lit. Anecd.* v. 251.)

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently, in p. 466, he says "Thus have I given a fair extract of that curious pedigree, which Sir Richard very obligingly lent Mr. Kimber."

reason to believe that this Owen Griffiths is himself as mythical a personage as those he is supposed to commemorate. His performance is said to have had this absurdly bombastic heading:—

This Pedigree of the most noble and princely House of Perrott, descended from a most numerous race of Kings, monarchs of Britain, was collected from the British annals, which will bear record of the truth, and that it is no fiction, to the latest posterity: it is most humbly dedicated to the most noble and puissant Prince, Sir James Perrott, Marquis of Narbeth, Earl and Viscount Carew, and Baron Perrott, by his Lordship's poor but most faithful servant, Owen Griffiths, who was wounded by his side in Carew Castle, 1650.

Among the lies told in the course of the ensuing pages is this, that Charles the First had that affection towards Sir James Perrott "that he ordered a warrant for a patent creating him Marquis of Narbeth, Earl and Viscount Carew, and Baron Perrott." But a few lines after it is added that Sir James died in 1641,—in charming inconsistency with his defending Carew Castle in 1650!

In other subsequent passages the writer is as self-convicting as he is presumptuous and mendacious. He states (p. 464) that "Sir Thomas Perrott was created a Baronet June 24, 1611, but died before his patent could be made out." Again (p. 465), "Sir James Perrott," having been "employed in many capacities by the government, on his relinquishing a balance due to him for the redemption of British slaves, was on the first of July, 1716, created a Baronet, with limitation to the eldest son of his brother Richard, and his heirs male; but not permitted to take rank from the original grant of this dignity to Sir Francis Perrott, Knight and Baronet, June 29, 1611"—no Sir *Francis* having been before named.

Thus the pretended first Baronet of 1611, and the pretended first Baronet of 1716, have each an *alias* as to their baptismal name: the former is both Sir Thomas and Sir Francis, and the latter both Sir Robert and Sir James! There was probably more of design than mere blundering in this perpetual ambiguity and mystification.

The Baronet of 1716, whatever his own name might have been, was supposed to have been created with a special "limitation to the eldest son of his brother Richard;" and it is this "eldest son of Richard," either already born or *in futuro* in 1716, that "Sir Richard Perrott" assumed to be.

This pretender's biography, which was first fully detailed in print (so far as we can find) less than forty years ago,—for but few particulars of his personal history are given in the Baronetage of 1771, is, like the genealogy which precedes it, such a tissue of monstrous

falsehoods,<sup>1</sup> that no portion of it can be at all relied upon; but it may possibly afford some reflection, though a highly exaggerated one, of the erratic adventures of his actual career, and thus supply a fair estimate of his character.

The Baronetcy, as asserted, was granted to "his uncle Sir James Perrott, in 1716," with limitation to himself. This statement places the date of his birth, supposing he was then born, early in the eighteenth century.

He succeeded (we are told) as second Baronet in 1731. He was present at the battle of Culloden in 1745, "in personal attendance on the Duke of Cumberland;"<sup>2</sup> and he afterwards entered into the service of Frederick the Great of Prussia, who in 1758 conferred upon him so mighty a post,<sup>3</sup> that his acceptance of it was forbidden by the English government. In 1767 he obtained from Mr. Secretary Conway—it would be curious to ascertain how—the extraordinary Fiat, or Warrant, recognizing his assumed title, with precedence from 1716, which has been already inserted at full.

We are next told that Louis the Fifteenth of France created him a Baron, "with the privilege of the *tabouret* to his lady,<sup>4</sup> and the wives of his successors." In 1770, however, he was in England, for in that year he brought up the loyal Flint Address during

<sup>1</sup> It was put forth by another great *humbug*, the late "Sir" Richard Broun, (who made himself a Knight, and his father a Baronet of Nova Scotia: see the particulars in our vol. II. p. 176,) in a little book entitled "*The Baronetage for 1844*." By Sir Richard Broun, Eq. Aur., K.J.J., Hon. Secretary of the Committee of the Baronetage for Privileges." Subsequently, we are sorry to add, it was republished in several editions of Burke's *Peerage and Baronetage*, and in the edition of the latter work for 1846 we observe mentioned certain documents "in the hands of the present Baronet." It is from these papers we presume that the extraordinary account given of Sir Richard's career was derived.

<sup>2</sup> These words are not from Broun, but from Burke, showing that the assuming Baronet of 1844 was admitted as a contributor by the latter author.

<sup>3</sup> This was something equivalent to the office of Lord High Admiral of Prussia, with powers to subjugate all the seas of the world to that new naval power! The commission, dated 24 Oct. 1758, is printed in Johnson and Kimber's *Baronetage*, 1771, "but not the private instructions, which are, with the former, in the hands of the present Baronet." (Burke, edit. 1846.)

<sup>4</sup> To the initiated in court etiquette this statement will appear scarcely less absurdly ridiculous than the appointment to be Lord High Admiral of Prussia. The privilege of the *tabouret*, or to be seated on a stool in the Royal presence, was confined to the Duchesses of France and the wives of Grandees of Spain, and attempts to extend it to titular Princesses were jealously resisted. See the *Mémoires du Duc de Saint Simon*.



the Wilkes riots, whereupon George III., as a special mark of favour, directed his son George Prince of Wales, then only eight years of age, to write him an autograph letter. Thus, for a second time, (if the copy of the letter given below be genuine,) this audacious impostor was successful in cajoling and misleading his sovereign.

Not long after, one of the Wilkes mobs "dismantled" the royal favourite's mansion in Gloucester View, Park Lane, and burned its "costly effects" before it. But, in compensation, he received "a medal," a grant of the "ancient manor of Cheslemere," wherever that may be, and sundry other substantial tokens of his sovereign's sympathy and regard.

On the 3rd of March, 1782, when, in consistency with the previous dates, he must have been approaching his seventieth year, he married Margaret Jemima, the daughter of Captain William Fordyce, "Gentleman of the Bedchamber to George the Third," and "great-grand-niece of John Duke of Argyll;" who two years afterwards gave birth to a son and heir, through whom the family is said to have been perpetuated. But we will not now pursue their history further: for the history of the first "Baronet" is quite sufficient for our present purpose.

The presentation of the Flint Address was the adventure by which our hero rendered himself most famous. It is thus recorded in the historical chronicle of the *Gentleman's Magazine* for the month of January, 1770:—

*Monday 8.* Sir Richard Perrot, Bart. arrived from Wales, with a petition from Flint, addressed to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, expressive of their loyalty, and of their disapprobation of petitions for the dis——n of Parliament.

The concurring accounts that are published in the papers of an infamous adventurer under the above name, involve a mystery, how such a man could procure an Address, and what means he could make use of to obtain countenance at Court to present it; yet that an Address from Flint was presented, and that by one who calls himself Sir Richard Perrot, appears from a letter written by the young Prince, with his own hand, of which the following is a copy:—

"Sir Richard Perrot may assure the baronny of Flint that I have delivered the Petition to the King, and am much pleased with the loyalty and affection to the King and to myself expressed by the Antient Britons on this occasion.

GEORGE, Pr. of Wales."

This political escapade naturally set the newspapers to work to inquire into the pseudo-Baronet's antecedents, and the result was anything but favourable to his reputation. We may hope, in charity, that scandal ran somewhat wild in the ensuing anecdotes; but they

cannot be more unfounded than those advanced on the part of the claimant, and we hear nothing of their being even threatened with any prosecution for libel. They were originally published in the *London Evening Post*, and copied in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for February, 1770 :—

*Particulars of the Noted Perrot, who presented the Flint Petition.*

This pretended baronet is plain D—k P——t, the second son of one P——t, a decayed distiller of Mardol, in Shrewsbury ; his elder brother an apothecary, but now practises as a physician at Tewkesbury, in Gloucestershire, by virtue of a diploma from Leyden.<sup>1</sup>

About nine years ago he was at Worcester, and boarded in the College churchyard, and thought to have carried off the daughter of a gentleman of fortune to Scotland, to have married her. They soon saw through him, and his scheme was frustrated. There he passed for a Knight of the order of the Eagle of Prussia, his Prussian Majesty, he said, having honoured him with that ancient title for his gallant behaviour in several actions, as a volunteer in that monarch's service. That was his travelling title there.

In 1760 he passed, at Beverley, in Yorkshire, for Admiral to his Prussian Majesty, and pretended a commission<sup>2</sup> to purchase shipping for that monarch ; but Lord Rockingham, suspecting the impostor, obliged him to decamp.

At York he succeeded better, and having, by some fraud or other, raised money to equip himself, he paid his addresses to a young woman of fortune, and married her. What became of this unfortunate lady is not publickly known.

Mr. Woodfall, in his list of the *Baronets of Great Britain* for this year, takes notice of him, with a very pompous coat of arms, the arms of England, which he has had the assurance to take upon him.<sup>3</sup>

While at Worcester, he visited one Mrs. G——, of Staffordshire, who was in Worcester Castle for debt, and who is since dead. He got £300 from her,

<sup>1</sup> The father is in the pedigree simply described as Richard Perrott, but his wife as "Rebecca, daughter of Isaac Wyke of Wacton Court in Herefordshire, Esq., paternally descended from Wyke, a knight to whom William the Conqueror granted divers lands on the banks of the Humber, whereon he founded a fair mansion for the reception of weary pilgrims,"—and so on. "They had issue, Sir Richard Perrot, the present baronet, James, M.D., and Eleazer." (Kimber and Johnson, iii. 466.)

<sup>2</sup> This pretended commission, dated at Berlin, 24 October, 1758, and indorsed "Commission pour S<sup>r</sup> Perrott, en qualité de Commandeur de Vaisseaux in Chêf," is printed in the article in Kimber and Johnson, p. 466, with this boastful comment: "A Lord High Admiral of Great Britain could not have been vested with more extensive powers."

<sup>3</sup> The history of this armorial assumption would occupy more than a few lines: and it must therefore be deferred. It is quite of a piece with the pedigree ; and yet, notwithstanding its extravagance, has been repeatedly copied, and handed down, at least in part, to the present day.

under pretence of marrying and releasing her from confinement, but no sooner had he got the money, than he left her to starve, and seduced the daughter of a very honest and reputable tradesman, brought her up [to] town, and when he was tired of her turned her off. Her *dernier resort* was to walk the streets, and in that situation is now in the most deplorable state, with a young infant. The poor unfortunate girl had a grandmother who left her £500 in her will, and when she found what way of life the girl had taken to, cut her off with only fifty; the father took it to heart, as well as the grandmother, which terminated in the death of them both.

After this, he paid his addresses to a young lady, entitled to a fortune of £8,000 at the death of her mother. Finding he could not finger the money immediately, he addressed the mother, got them both with child, and by degrees the whole of their fortunes. The mother broke her heart upon the occasion, and the daughter died raving mad in one of the madhouses of this metropolis.

His next intrigue was at S—d—'s W——s,<sup>1</sup> where, being attracted with the beauty and activity of the celebrated Miss Isabella W——n, Mr. R—s—d's mistress who owns the W——lls, he persuaded the girl to leave her keeper, and to live with him. In a few days she returned to R—s—d, with no other view but to abuse him. Mr. R—s—d upbraided her with incontinency, and gave her to understand that he had behaved with honour to her by settling £300 a-year upon her for her life, which irritated Miss Isabella so far as to make her burn the settlement before his face, which terminated in the ruin of the poor girl's family. Mr. R—s—d turned off her father, brothers, and sisters, from the W——lls, and would never suffer them to perform there any more.

He then took an elegant house looking into Hyde Park, and ordered a tradesman to furnish it in every respect suitable to his pretended rank, which was accordingly done. The poor tradesman durst not presume to demand immediate payment of Sir Rich. Perrot, bart. but was some time after informed that he was an impostor; then he employed the gentlemen of the law to attack him for the debt. He immediately flew to the country with his dear Isabella, gave a bill of sale of the furniture to a broker, and caused the following to be inserted in the daily papers:—"Yesterday Sir Richard Perrot set out on a tour to Italy, by way of Paris." This was done as a blind to preserve him from the talons of the vultures of mankind; the scheme did not take, they found him out at Richmond, where he had served another tradesman the same trick, and found means to make off from both. When he had lived upon poor Isabella as long as she had anything of value left, he deserted her. Her generous keeper redeemed all her valuables from a pawnbroker's shop, which consisted in plate and jewels to the amount of £500, and very humanely allowed her a guinea a week, to keep her from starving.

He then proceeded for Montgomery, and came there the day after the last general election, sent for some of the lowest burgesses, and treated them to the amount of five pounds, and told them he was sorry he came a day too late, or he would

---

<sup>1</sup> This evidently means Sadler's Wells, where a new theatre was erected in 1765, by a builder named Rosoman, whose name is also handed down by Rosoman's Row, Clerkenwell. (Gent. Mag. Dec. 1813, pp. 561, 562.)

have given Mr. Clive a sweat. They laughed in their sleeves at his impudence and ignorance ; they knew him too well, 'twas too near Shrewsbury.

This was the man who was appointed to deliver the Petition, or rather the Address, of the Bailiffs, Corporation, and Borough of Flint.—*London Ev. Post.*

Notwithstanding what has been said above, an evening paper has the copy of a fiat, dated January 3, 1767, as it is said to stand in the Heralds' Office, wherein it is declared, "That Sir Richard Perrot and his heirs male shall have precedence as a Baronet of this Realm, the same to commence as from the first day of July, 1716." This Copy is signed, H. S. CONWAY.

After this exposure had been made, it may be pronounced to have been truly discreditably to Mr. Thomas Lowndes, and the other publishers of the Baronetage of 1771, to have given room in that work to the genealogical romance of the Perrotts. By heralds and genealogists we make no doubt that it was scouted at once : nor do we know that "Sir Richard Perrott" was again recognised in other works on the Baronetage that appeared during the ensuing half-century of the reign of George the Third. On the other hand, we have not ascertained that it immediately received any public criticism—though either in reviews, magazines, or newspapers, such may not improbably have been the case. The next printed notice we have found of it is just forty years later.

With respect to the alleged siege of Carew Castle in 1650, on which occasion the trusty Owen Griffiths was wounded by the side of Sir James Perrott, we learn from Fenton's *Historical Tour through Pembrokeshire*, 1811, that that castle was garrisoned [for the King in 1644, and held out a long siege; but after the ill success of the royalists at Tenby it surrendered on quarter. The mythical Owen Griffiths however informs us that under the conduct of Sir James Perrott, Carew and Laugharn castles were again garrisoned in the year 1650, at his own expense, with 1,130 men—a statement entirely without foundation. Mr. Fenton refers to "Sir Richard Perrott" and his pedigree in the following terms :

The pedigree this charlatan Baronet delivered in is a most curious travesty of the genuine one appertaining to that family ; with which [*i.e.* the travesty] I have treated my readers in No. 13 [20] Appendix, and may throw some light on the history of a man who blazed on the town about thirty-five years ago, and practised his imposture so successfully, that there exists a fiat of his present Majesty, dated 3rd Jan. 1767, and properly authenticated in the Heralds' Office, for his taking title and rank from 1st July, 1716.

Subsequently, in his Appendix (pp. 73-75), Fenton prints part of "A pedigree of the late Sir Richard Perrott, Bart." but with this note :—

This pedigree was left in the hands of the late Mr. Kimber, and is published in the Appendix to his *Baronetage*; but I have transcribed only such parts as are imposture, for the charlatan made use of the real pedigree of the Perrott family of Pembrokeshire as a *fulcrum* to support his fabulous additions.

But it must be added that it is not only those latter portions of the pedigree, which Mr. Fenton has quoted, that are fabricated impostures. The whole of the earlier portions are interlarded with grave mis-statements, like that of the imaginary siege of Carew Castle, several of which are pointed out in *Notes on the Perrot Family*, by Edward Lowry Barnwell, M.A. (printed in the *Archæologia Cambrensis*, and also in royal 8vo. 1867, and noticed in our Vol. V. p. 369.)

“Sir” T. C. Banks, in his *Baronia Anglica Concentrata*, 4to. 1844, gives an account of the family of Perrot (vol. ii. p. 116) among those he styles *Barones Pretermissi*, because Ralph Perot had summons to attend a parliament at Salisbury 25 Edw. I.; and he betrays such want of judgment as to quote the pedigree from Kimber and Johnson, although with the remark that “there is reason to look upon it as neither correct in point of chronology, or identity of persons and marriages.” But in a note below, after copying its title, as pretended to be written by Owen Griffiths, he condemns it more strongly, in these terms: “This pedigree so entitled, and declaratory of honours which were never granted, one would imagine was rather the fruit of a disordered mind, than the produce of a serious research and faithful representation.” Yet afterwards, in p. 118, Banks admits the pretended Baronetcy of 1611!

It is stated in Burke’s *Peerage and Baronetage* (edit. 1847), that “Sir Richard Perrott” died in 1796; and, after the ample and outspoken reproofs we have now quoted, it would naturally be supposed that this flagrant imposture died away with him. Such, however, is not the actual result. We have been able to trace the persevering assumption of the title, though in obscurity, from time to time, until at length, about five-and-twenty years ago, it again crept into our genealogical manuals, into the works of Burke, Debrett, Lodge, and Thom—but never, we believe, into that of Dod, nor into the list of Baronets given in *The Royal Kalendar* or Red Book. The identity of the assumed dignity is shown by the date of the 1st of May, 1716.