

A N  
A N S W E R

To a Printed Paper, Entituled

T H E

CASE of *Mary Dutcheſs of Norfolk.*

**I**F notorious Untruths and falſe Inferences deſerve the Name of a ſcandalous Libel, the ſaid Printed Caſe is one.

The Caſe ſets forth, That her Father, the late Earl of *Peterborough*, paid 10000*l.* in Money, and ſettled near 1000*l.* *per Ann.* in Lands, the remainder thereof to the Duke and his Heirs; and a Personal Eſtate of 10000*l.* (after the Deceafe of the ſaid Earl and Counteſs) and alſo 1000*l.* *per Ann.* for twenty Years: Beſides very rich Jewels, Plate, and other things of great value, which the ſaid Dutcheſs brought into the Duke's Family. And it's pretended, that her Grace hath, ſince her Separation, paid great Debts that had been contracted for the ſupport of the Duke's Honour and his Service.

*Answer.* Neither the Duke, nor his Father, received from his Grace's Family any more than 10000*l.* to evidence which, if the Duke pays back the 10000*l.* as the Bill directs, then her Eſtate is as entire and free to all intents, as if he had never married her.

As to his having 1000*l.* *per Ann.* for twenty Years to his Uſe, as is pretended, the Duke abſolutely denys it; or that he has Jewels, Plate, or any thing of Five Pounds value from her or her Family: But ſoon after they married, he was obliged to borrow 1500*l.* to buy Linnen and Houſhold Goods.

That within three Years, which happened between the late Duke's Death, and the parting of the now Duke and Dutcheſs, ſhe ran him out by extravagant expenſes, near 30000*l.* above his Income; to pay which obliged him to ſell his Life in 2400*l.* *per Ann.* out of his Eſtate in *Suſſex* and *Yorkſhire*.

That ſhe has been ſo far from paying any debts for his Honour and Service, that he has been ſued, and forced to pay ſeveral conſiderable Sums to Trades-men (contracted by her without his Privacy) tho' ſhe had a 1000*l.* a Year Pin-money all the while.

That upon her refusal to go into the Country, and her Father's refusing to receive her in any Houſe of his, ſhe at her own requeſt choſe to go into *France*. But the Duke did not concern himſelf whether ſhe came back, or not, nor ever heard of her change of Religion, till he felt it (as well as heard it) by her ſueing him before the then High Commiſſioned Court for Alimony, which forced him to retire beyond Sea, from whence he returned about two Months before the King's Landing.

It is a great aſſurance that the Dutcheſs's Agents have, to mention what was Sworn by her Servants, as diſproving *Hauſeur* and *Vanefs*, when it appeared ſo plainly that they were taught a Leſſon which they greatly miſtook, and inſtead of diſproving, confirmed the chief part of the others Evidence.

And its pleaſant, that inſtead of *Suſannah Barrington*, who has been charged with the Privacy of the whole intrigue, and appears to have been in the Dutcheſs's Service all along, and likewise ſince the bringing in this Bill, they ſhould advance that Infamous Witneſs *Frances Knight* to be the Dutcheſs's Woman.

What they ſay of *Bayly*'s contradicting *Hauſeur*, is upon a miſtake, which *Bayly* himſelf ſoon Corrected: And the Dutcheſs's Servants were ſo far from proving the *Dutch*-Woman *Vanefs* turned away before the rejecting the laſt Bill; that one of the Dutcheſs's Witneſſes proves her to have been the Dutcheſs's Servant while that Bill was depending.