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Abstract of thesis

This thesis is a study of some of the social, economic and political conditions of a number of gentry families of Elizabethan Sussex.

The families selected for investigation were those which were represented among the holders of important official positions in the county during the reign, i.e. among the Lord or Deputy Lieutenants, the sheriffs, the county members of Parliament for Sussex and the J.P's. In addition, each family selected had to have had a representative living in 1580 and then resident primarily in Sussex.

An enquiry was made as to how long the selected families had resided in Sussex, as to where the newcomers had arrived from and what brought them thither; also as to whether or not there were any tendency for important county positions to be monopolised by the long-established families. An examination was also made as to whereabouts the selected families resided and how office-holders at any given time were distributed over the county.

The composition and size of the families were discussed and questions raised as to how many of their members remained single, how many married persons residing mainly in the same county and belonging to the same group of administrative county families, and how many went farther afield or married
into different social levels.

The relative proportion of gentry during two generations who attended places of higher education was considered and some attempt made to discover how many obtained degrees or were called to the Bar.

A survey of the relative economic position of the families was constructed and this was compared with an analysis of the occupations of heads of families in 1580.

Finally, the chief political developments in Sussex during the reign, and the part played in them by the selected families were described.
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Introduction

The rôle of "the gentry" in the life of Elizabethan England, and indeed throughout the period between the Reformation Parliament and the outbreak of the Civil War has been a popular subject of historical discussion for some years. The publication in 1941 of Professor Tawney's article entitled "The Rise of the Gentry" set a pattern readily followed by the social and economic historians of the period for some time afterwards. His theme, which might be described as the success-story of a social class, - a class able, acquisitive and astute, climbing first to prominence and later to power upon the rungs of the Church's ravished wealth, the incompetence and extravagance of an effete nobility, the bankruptcy of the Crown and the vulnerability of copyholders and tenants-at-will, - is too familiar to require detailed repetition. It is a recurrent 'leitmotif' in most historical writing on the period and it certainly harmonises well with the related themes of the 'winning of the initiative by the House of Commons' and with the rise of Puritanism.

A variation was provided more recently, in 1948, by Mr. Lawrence Stone in his article, "The Anatomy of the Elizabethan Aristocracy", which was intended to develop the story of the headlong downfall of a rashly spendthrift

nobility whose plunge to doom paved the way for a more canny class. This article however, provoked a reply from Mr. Trevor-Roper which laid bare some of the false premises and inaccuracies on which Mr. Stone had founded his argument, and which was followed by a rejoinder from Mr. Stone still on the subject of the fortunes of the aristocracy.

However, in a later article on the subject, "The Gentry, 1540-1640", Mr. Trevor-Roper allowed the nobility to slip into second place and concentrated his attention primarily on the gentry themselves. He reverted to Professor Tawney's 1941 publication and produced what might be summarised as a two-fold criticism of it; first, that a clear demarcation between the gentry as one class and the aristocracy as another is impossible, and that to describe them as though they were at the opposite ends of an economic see-saw is misleading since some nobles, for example, the Russells,

Earls of Bedford, were indubitably 'rising' and some gentry were as certainly on the decline; secondly, that such wealth as was amassed by the more successful members of both gentry and nobility came primarily not from meticulous land-management and juggling with leases but rather from the tenure of lucrative offices under the Crown, or possibly from the law or from trade.

This argument, like Professor Tawney's was based only on the investigation of the fortunes of certain particular families and on the criticism of contemporary literary evidence. No serious attempt has been made by either historian to study a group of country gentry in their own local setting and to see what light their family histories can shed upon these questions.

Indeed, not only the economic and social, but also the religious and political history of "the gentry" can be told accurately only when they are examined patiently, county by county, against their own local background. The same individual who is known to the Parliamentary historian as a strong supporter of the status quo, for example, and apparently a man of great influence in his own country, may be found when examined in the light of county history to have been engaged in an uphill struggle against entrenched recusancy in his own class and the powerful influence of a disaffected nobility. The puzzling Justice of the Peace who

6. Such a man, perhaps, was Sir Walter Covert of Slaugham who/contd.
appears, disappears and re-appears as a member of the Commission, and concerning whom the recusancy records give uncertain and conflicting reports, may emerge as a personality more clearly from legal records where he is shown as an astute individual with a fancy for trickery and for browbeating his less powerful neighbours and for currying favour with the authorities whenever it suited him to do so. It is only by studying a group of Elizabethan country gentlemen in the life of their own counties that their activities whether as parliamentarians, lawyers, university men, military or naval

6. contd.

is described as "During the reigns of Elizabeth, James and Charles, the active and trusted representative of the government in Sussex". (S.A.C., xlvii, 137). He was a J.P. from 1581 on (P.R.O. Assize Rolls 35 S.E. Circuit, Sussex); county member for Sussex in 1581 (bye election), 1597, 1614 and 1626 (Official Returns); Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in 1583-4 and 1592-3 (P.R.O. Sheriffs); and Deputy Lieutenant from 1569 (S.P. Dom. Eliz. 59, no. 61).

7. This seems a fair description of Sir Edward Caryll of Shipley, later of Harting, who was a J.P. in 1585, (P.R.O. Assize Rolls 35. S.E. Circuit. Sussex), but not subsequently until 1591 though thereafter he remained on the Commission at least until the end of the reign (ibid). He was described in the Certificate concerning the J.P.'s of Sussex of 1587 as having been dropped from the Commission because he was "an active swyssman, my Lord of Arondell his stward and doer in thys contre." (S.A.C., ii.60) For his attitude to the ecclesiastical settlement, see Part III, ch. 2; of this thesis, and for his part in numerous lawsuits in the Court of Star Chamber, see for example P.R.O., Star Ch. 5. Eliz., C. 29/33; C. 6/12; G. 3/6; W. 79/1; C. 19/9; B. 69/3.
adventurers, as economic men or as men of faith, can be rightly understood. The life of the county was still a very real thing in the late sixteenth century. It was from the country house that the great bulk of the Commons men came at the beginning of each session and to it that they returned when it was over; lawyers too and university men had their vacations when they returned to their respective counties, and even the Court had its strong county connections. All six peers who had country residences in Sussex in the Elizabethan period spent a certain amount of time there, though perhaps Lord Buckhurst rather less than the rest since Withiam was somewhat inaccessible from London.

Moreover, it is self-evident that the history of Elizabethan England will be only partially written until the circumference of the wheel is examined as well as the hub. The Statute Book, the Patent Rolls, the Privy Council Registers, the State Papers, can all throw light on what Parliament and the central administration were trying to do. How far they were successful or represented popular opinion

8. These six peers were the Earl of Arundel at Arundel; the Earl of Northumberland at Petworth; Viscount Montague at Cowdray in Midhurst; Baron Lumley at Stansted; Baron De la Warr at Offington; Baron Buckhurst at Withiam. For the inaccessibility of Withiam, see S.A.C. xix, 162; a lso V. Sackville-West; Knole and the Sackvilles, (1923), 39. On 20 August, 1602, Buckhurst wrote to Sir Robert Cecil that he had not been in Sussex, "but on two days these five or six years". (H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, xii, 309)
in the country at large is another matter. Even the most cursory examination of the legal records of the time, for example of the Court of Star Chamber, shows how tenuous often was the link between local and central authorities and how frequently local feuds and factions followed their own course in defiance of the Queen's writ or the rulings of her Courts at Westminster. Moreover, those who were most vociferous in the House of Commons, most prominent in the professions, most spectacular at Court or in the field, were not always the most firmly entrenched in their counties.

In Sussex, for example, there was a strong under-current of recusancy, both in the East and in the West, and some of the wealthiest and most influential gentry families in the county, for instance the Gages, the Shelleys and the Carylls, were Catholics and a constant source of anxiety to the authorities both ecclesiastical and secular. Sussex had a long coastline from which France could easily be reached and vice versa; and the county was still rendered comparatively inaccessible from London by the Forest of the Weald whose rutted and pot-holed roads were clay quagmires in winter and baked obstacles in summer. Moreover, a glance at the map

---

9. E.g. See the series of lawsuits between John Wilgoose Esq. of Sussex and Egremond Ragland Esq., of co. Glamorgan, concerning the title to certain manors in co. Glamorgan. See/St. Ch. 5 Elizi- W. 7/8; F.2/21; F.17/4; W. 62/28; F.8/38; F. 28/39; F. 8/4.

10. infra., Part III. chs. 1 and 2.

11. See references in the State Papers to the departure overseas, probably from Sussex, of suspected persons without licences, e.g. Lord Paget and Charles Arundel in 1583. (Ca 1.S.P. Dom., 1581-90, 136,137,139) For the attempted /contd.
will show how closely adjacent were Arundel, Petworth, Midhurst and Stansted, the country seats respectively of the Earls of Arundel, the Earls of Northumberland, the Viscounts Montague and Baron Lumley, many of whom were Catholics or Catholic sympathisers. Clearly, in such a county, much must have happened which was not intended to come to the Queen's ears or to those of her local minions, and the true picture of the county's history can be built up only by piecing together scraps of casual evidence and by studying people rather than policies.

11. contd.

escape from England in 1585 of Philip, Earl of Arundel and his arrest as he sailed from Littlehampton, see S.A.C., xlvi, 136; also The Lives of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel and of Anne Dacres his wife, from a MS at Arundel, ed. Duke of Norfolk, (1857), chs. 7 & 8. For the suspicions of the government concerning the presence of "massing priests" in Sussex in the 1580's see, e.g. Cal.S.P. Dom. 1581-90, 137-8, 171 et passim.

12. The proverbial foulness of the Sussex roads had its uses when the government was over-watchful or when the Queen threatened a visit, as for example in June 1583, when the Earl of Northumberland was deep in political intrigue and Elizabeth proposed to honour him with a visit to Petworth. One of the regrettable obstacles to the plan referred to by the Earl's secretary in his letter to Sir Francis Walsingham was that the "wyses by which she must come to them", are, "up the hill and down the hill, so as she shall not be able to use ether coche or litter with ease, and those wises also so full of louse stones, as it is carefull and painfull riding for any body, nether can ther be in this cuntrey any wises devised to avoyd those ould wises." (S.A.C., v, 193-4).

13. It is significant too, that some of these peers were closely related, Baron Lumley being son-in-law to Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel and therefore uncle by marriage to Philip Howard who succeeded his maternal grandfather in the Arundel title in 1580. (G.E.C., Complete Peerage (1932) viii, 278; ibid., i, 254.)
Briefly then, the purpose of this thesis is to analyse the structure, habits and activities of "the gentry" as a class in one particular county of Elizabethan England. That is to say, by taking a group of specific families in a given county, in this case Sussex, within the Elizabethan period, and raising a number of leading questions about them, it should be possible first, to draw some conclusions that may perhaps be applicable to the class as a whole; secondly, to throw some fresh light on the life of the county itself at that time; and thirdly, perhaps, to illuminate a number of national issues whether social, economic, political or religious, by examining them, as it were, in miniature.

A further justification of such an undertaking may be found in an article of Professor Neale's where he outlines the results which might reasonably be expected from research on these lines applied to numerous shires up and down the country. "In the Elizabethan period", he there remarks, "the social and administrative unit par excellence was the county, and the politically significant class the country gentry." It is upon the degree of truth of these two assumptions that the value of this study depends.

15. Studies of "the gentry" in other counties have been undertaken by various research students, (see Bull. I.H.R., xxv. Theses Supplement, 13), but few have so far been completed. See however, Peter Laslett: "The Gentry of Kent in 1640" (Camb. Hist. Journal, 1948, ix, No.2, 148, et seqq, see also A.L. Rowse: Tudor Cornwall (1941).
Sussex is a county which has much to recommend it to a student of the Elizabethan period. Being within reasonable proximity to London, it was likely to have been in touch with both Court and City, yet it was not so close as to have been swamped by the metropolis. Unlike the gentry of the far North and West for whom a journey to London was a matter of several days and who had in the last resort to choose between Court and county, between either local allegiances and time-honoured tradition or conformity to 'autres moeurs', - those of Sussex could venture forth and carve out careers for themselves in the City or in the law for example, without completely abandoning their role as country gentlemen and local administrators.

Sir Richard Lewkenor of I-lest Dean, for instance, though a prominent lawyer and later a serjeant-at-law and Chief Justice of Chester, found time to take some part in the recurrent scramble for one of the parliamentary seats for the City of Chichester in 1572, 1584, 1593 and 1597. He was also sometime Recorder of that City.

The Shirleys of Wiston are outstanding as a family which played a part both in the life of their own county and in a wider sphere.

16. For the similar relationship of Kent to the capital, see Laslett, op.cit. 152,154.
17. e.g. see Rowse, op.cit., 86-7.
18. See Prof. J.E. Neale: The Elizabethan House of Commons, (1949) 263 et seqq; see also (Official Returns).
19. See relevant family history. For their financial debacle, see Part II, ch.3.
Sir Thomas Shirley the elder, who died in 1612, was for years one of the government’s few right-hand men in Sussex and he seems, like Sir Walter Covert, to have held at one time or another most of the significant county offices. He was at various times J.P., Sheriff, Deputy Lieutenant, and sat on Commissions for Recusancy, and was three times county M.P. for Sussex, - in 1572, 1584 and 1593. Yet he was also appointed in February 1587 to the very responsible post of Treasurer at War to the English army serving in Leicester’s expedition to the Low Countries, - an office which he discharged with great discredit to himself and ultimately with great financial loss to his family. His three remarkable sons, Thomas, Anthony and Robert, can also be referred to as examples of the spirit of enterprise and adventure among the county families, who were not content merely to rusticate and manage their estates. But they necessarily played a much smaller part in the administration of Sussex in their day than their father had done before them.

Conversely, Sussex was situated close enough to London for the City and the professions to contribute to the ranks of its gentry families without their abandoning all earlier commercial or professional connections. An example is provided by the family of Bowyer of North Mundham near Chichester. Originally of a Staffordshire family, one of the

20. See relevant family history.
Bowyers had come to settle in Sussex towards the beginning of the fifteenth century, and his grandson who resided in Petworth became steward to the Earl of Northumberland. It was the eldest great-grandson however, Thomas Bowyer, who died in 1558, who became a leading citizen and grocer of London, and who, after having married the niece of a fellow grocer of the City and made and lost a fortune in his business, bought the manor and rectory of Roughton in North Mundham, part of the spoils of the Dissolution, where he retired and founded what was to be a prominent Sussex family, the Bowyers of Leythorne in North Mundham. His eldest son, also Thomas, who became a J.P. in 1593, he had encouraged to enter the legal profession which he himself had intended to follow but which he finally avoided "having some lack of the latyn tongue"; the grandson, Sir Thomas Bowyer, became an M.P. for Midhurst in 1614, for Bramber between 1621 and 1642, and was sheriff in 1626-7. It was he who was created a Baronet in July 1627 and who re-built and enlarged the family residence of Leythorne. Such were the achievements possible for a county family which had taken the trouble to forge links with the City and the Bar. Yet, despite their success, the Bowyers were by no means indifferent to the management of their Sussex property as is shown by the lengthy and

21. S.A.C., lxiv. 106.
formidable lawsuit maintained in the Court of Star Chamber and elsewhere by Thomas Bowyer, the lawyer, against John Caryll of Warnham and his confederates concerning a piece of disputed common land in the neighbourhood of North Mundham.

Sussex was indeed the home of many active and progressive families. Yet, as has already been indicated, it was no mere back-garden of London and must have presented to the administration some of the problems of more distant counties. Apart from the natural obstacles of the Weald's clay bottoms and wooded thickets, - though these were more sparse than formerly owing to the long continued ravaging of timber which the government was now trying to check, - and of the humps and hollows of the South Downs which, except in the extreme East, isolated the seaboard from the rest of the county - there were other administrative inconveniences. For one thing, Sussex is nearly eighty miles long, though only between twenty and thirty miles wide, so that contact with the whole was not easily maintained and there was a tendency for the administration of the county to fall into two sections, one centred at Chichester and the other at Lewes. This decentralisation may have given the individual J.P. in the outlying districts rather more power than he

22. P.R.O., St. Ch. 5 Eliz., B.105/7; B.32/9; B.41/26 C.48/3; C.14/16; C. 52/21; C. 10/11; C. 56/15.
23. See e.g. B.M. Stowe MS. 570., f.103. "Thushing Iron Furnaces".
24. The statement in the Bishop of Chichester's letter to the Privy Council in 1564 that Sussex was "about lx myles in length", is an underestimate. See Camden Misc. (1893) ix, 9.
would have enjoyed in a small, compact county whose county
town lay fairly near the geographical centre. Certainly there
were complaints against the abuse of authority by one J.P.
who lived at Salehurst at the extreme Eastern end of the county,
though how much spite and how much truth lies behind them we
shall probably never know.

From the ecclesiastical point of view, Sussex was also
something of a problem since, being practically co-terminous
with the diocese of Chichester, its administrative centre
was at one extreme end of the county. This made the Bishop
far more dependent on his subordinates and on Commissioners
for Recusancy, for East Sussex particularly, than he would
otherwise have been, and may partly account for the panic-
stricken blunderings of Bishop Curtis in 1576-7 in his efforts
to weed out recusancy,—efforts which stirred up much wrath
and indignation among a group of conformable J.P.'s whose views
had been called in question. No doubt the proximity of
Arundel, Petworth and Midhurst had also something to do with
it.

is devided into two partes East and West." See also
B.M. Harl. MS. 703, f. 16; and P.R.O., S.P. 12/185, f. 43.
26. See the two Star Chamber cases of Robert Walsh Esq.,
of Etchingham, Sussex v. John Wilgoose Esq., of
Salehurst, both in 28 Eliz.:—P.R.O., St. Ch. 5 Eliz.
W 2/1; F. 26/14; W. 67/13; and P.R.O., St. Ch. 5 Eliz.
W 45/17.
27. S.A.C., iii. 90; see also Part III, ch. 2.
28. v. supra, n. 8.
Economically too, Elizabethan Sussex had certain interesting characteristics of its own. "Sussex," says Esther Meynell in her popular work on the county, "is a succession of strips running from east to west. First against the sea is the rich alluvial land, early cultivated, which lies to the southward of the Downs, wider in the western end of the county and fading away towards Brighton and on to Beachy Head, where the chalk cliffs step down to the seashore. Behind this lies the long sweep of the Downs themselves, falling in gentle though often steep curves to the level clays of the Weald. In early times and indeed up to the period of Elizabeth and the Sussex iron-forges, the Weald was largely covered by dense forests. The Wealden clay and the Wealden forests together made a tolerably impenetrable barrier to the north. Beyond the Weald comes what is known as the Forest Ridge, a lighter and more barren land, home of gorse and heather and pine trees, the least authentically Sussex of all the strips. Then, just to stop any "foreigner" getting into Sussex at either end, at the east and at the west, to keep out the Kentish men and those from Hampshire, there was a vast area of marsh, still the most difficult of obstacles to movement when it is undrained. So it is small wonder that Sussex remained a "secret kingdom." The only way to enter the county in the early days was by sea."

30. See also W. Camden: Britania, (1806), 2nd ed., 1, 267.
Elizabethan Sussex was therefore capable of supporting an arable economy on the coastal strip, especially in the West round Chichester and narrowing in the East towards Beachy Head where the Downs meet the sea; a pastoral economy on the Downs themselves; and a sylvan economy to the North where the iron and glass industries flourished.

Apart from the foregoing characteristics of Elizabethan Sussex, all of which give it a peculiar interest to the local historian, it is a county which offers considerable practical advantages to the research student in the way of material. To begin with, the long series of publications of the Sussex Archaeological Society which was founded over a hundred years ago are invaluable as an introduction to many family histories and for information on country houses; the Sussex Record Society too has printed much valuable source material, for example, abstracts of Inquisitions Post Mortem, and of Feet of Fines, and so saved the researcher many valuable hours; and in addition there are a number of local histories of varying degrees of accuracy, as for example Horsfield's "History of Sussex", and Elwes' "Castles and Mansions", all of which are useful in the early stages of research.

31. For a summary of an inventory of the goods and livestock of Sir John Gage of West Firle near Lewes, taken on 12 September, 1556, after his death, see S.A.C., xc, 67-8.
32. T.W. Horsfield: The history, antiquities and topography of the County of Sussex, (London and Lewes, 1835.)
The three volumes extant of the Sussex V.C.H., namely for the Rapes of Hastings, Lewes and Chichester are also very useful. But perhaps the most helpful contribution of all is the arduous spadework already done by Sussex genealogists, chiefly the Rev. John Comber and Mr. Challen. Apart from the former's three published volumes of genealogies for the Horsham, Ardingly and Lewes districts, much of his work survives in MS form in the Chichester County Record Office and has proved invaluable. Again, the painstaking investigations of Mr. Comber into the records of those families which appear in Berry's "Sussex Genealogies" and his careful corrections and amplifications of Berry's work which appear in his own personal copy of it now deposited at Chichester Record Office, have been indispensable. Without his meticulous checking and comparison of wills, inquisitions post mortem and parish registers, the task undertaken in this thesis might well have proved impossible. In the case of such families as the Lewkenors, or of the Pelhams for example, which had multifarious branches whose contemporary members often had identical Christian names, the problem of establishing identity might very often have been left unsolved but for Mr. Comber's extraordinarily accurate


35. W. Berry: County Genealogies, Sussex, 1830 Comber's annotated copy is referred to henceforth as "Berry & Comber", or B and C.
and painstaking notes. These have been further supplemented by the genealogical notes of Mr. Challen.

... ...

The choice of a suitable county for a study such as this is a simpler matter than the selection of "gentry" families within it. Indeed at the outset the researcher is faced with the time-honoured question as to who the "gentry" were in sixteenth century England, or for that matter in any period, and as to whether any clear meaning at all can be attached to so ambiguous a term as "gentleman".

Contemporary opinion on the subject spoke with confused voices. What may perhaps be taken as the official view of the matter appears in a commission issued to Norroy, King of Arms, dated 27 June, 1561: "No sheriffs, commissaries, archdeacons, officials, scriveners, clerks, writers or others shall call or write in courts and open places or use in writing the addition of esquire or gentleman unless they can justify the same by the law of arms and the laws of the realm, or ascertain the same in writing from Norroy or his deputies." This commission should be read in the light of a Statute of Henry V which had required that in future whenever a person's name appeared on any legal document, it should be followed by an "addition" descriptive of his

"Estate, Degree or Mystery". Clearly, by the mid-sixteenth century the title of "gentleman" was becoming cheapened, and contemporary literature is full of expressions of offended conservative sentiment and of disgust at the pushfulness of social climbers. As Prof. Campbell remarks, "Defenders of the status quo in society frowned upon the ambition of the lower classes to move up the social scale."

And as Professor Tawney points out with reference to the Puritan Revolution, "There were voices from the past which, when the crash came, hailed the fall of the monarchy as the inevitable nemesis of a general downward slide towards the abyss of social "parity", and reproached the professional custodians of traditional proprieties with opening to fees doors which a prudent rigour would have locked."

Briefly, despite the flexibility of the class structure of sixteenth century England, despite the rise to prominence of many hitherto obscure names and despite the power of wealth, the prevailing Elizabethan sentiment seems to have been voiced by Shakespeare:

"The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre
Observe degree, priority and place,
Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
Office, and custom, in all line of order:

37. M. Campbell: The English Yeoman: (Yale Univ. Press, 1942) 42. This generalisation she bears out with quotations from various 16th & 17th cent. writers, e.g. Robt. Crowley, Sir Fr. Bacon, Barnabie Rich etc. op. cit. 42-4.
But when the planets
In evil mixture to disorder wander,
What plagues, and what portents, what mutiny,
What raging of the sea, shaking of earth,
Commotion in the winds, frights, changes, horrors,
Divert and crack, rend and deracinate
The unity and married calm of states
Quite from their fixture! O! when degree is shak'd
Which is the ladder to all high designs,
The enterprise is sick. How could communities,
Degrees in schools, and brotherhoods in cities,
Peaceful commerce from dividable shores,
The primogenitive and due of birth,
Prerogative of age, crowns, sceptres, laurels,
But by degree stand in authentic place?
Take but degree away, untune that string,
And, hark! what discord follows." (40)

This respect for "degree, priority and place" led from
time to time to fruitless attempts to buttress up the social
barriers against the 'new gentry' who were swarming into the
law, commerce, the universities and parliament. For example,
an effort was made in 1559 to impose a restriction on legal
training and to confine it to the sons of established
41. gentlemen. An attempt was even made, Canute-like, to fix
a legal maximum to the amount of real property which vulgar
persons like mere merchants might buy.

Yet all this literary comment and half-hearted
administrative action amounts to little more than the
expression of sentiment and is indicative to the historian of
social change rather than of social stability. It points to
an illusion, apparently widely held in the sixteenth and

40. Shakespeare: Troilus & Cressida, Act I. Sc.3.
41. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS i, 163.
42. Ibid. See also Prof. Tawney, op. cit., 17-18.
seventeenth centuries, that in former days English society was a neat and ordered affair, a nicely-balanced class structure in which everyone had his or her own appointed rank and station and concerning which no legislation had been necessary since the whole combined naturally and harmoniously together, - but that more recently conceit and vanity had undone all this. "But with us" wrote Sir William Vaughan in 1626, "Joane is as good as my Lady, Citizens' wives of late grown Gallants. The Yeoman doth gentilize it. The Gentleman scornes to be behind Nobleman ..."

The social historian however, who, unlike the litterateur, is in search of the facts of the situation rather than the feelings of contemporaries about it, will be content with a more balanced comment.

In the absence of a precise definition of the term "gentleman", he will accept the somewhat vague description of him by Sir Walter Raleigh as "Situated neither in the lowest grounds . . . nor in the highest mountains . . . but in the valleys between both."

Perhaps the last word in the matter rests with Sir Thomas Smith in his well-known passage in the "De Republica",

43. Quoted by Prof. Campbell, op.cit, 43.
44. Sir W. Raleigh: Concerning the Causes of the Magnificency and opulence of Cities. Quoted by Prof. Tawney, op.cit., 2.
entitled "Of Gentlemen":-

"But ordinarily the King doth only make knights and create barons or higher degrees: for as for gentlemen, they be made good cheap in England. For whosoever studieth the lawes of the realme, who studieth in the universities, who professeth liberall sciences, and to be shorste, who can live idly and without manuall labour, and will beare the port, charge and countenaunce of a gentleman, he shall be... taken for a gentleman." 45.

On this passage Professor Tawney comments, "Sir Thomas Smith had said that a gentleman is a man who spends his money like a gentleman. Of the theorists rash enough to attempt a definition, few succeeded in improving on that wise tautology."

Yet, Professor Tawney continues:-

"In spite, nevertheless, of ambiguities, the group concerned was not difficult to identify. Its members varied widely in wealth; but, though ragged at its edges, it had a solid core. That core consisted of the landed proprietors, above the yeomanry, and below the peerage, together with a growing body of well-to-do farmers, sometimes tenants of their relativos, who had succeeded the humble peasants of the past as lessees of desmesne farms; professional men, also rapidly increasing in number, such as the more eminent lawyers, divines, and an occasional medical practitioner; and the wealthier merchants... It was this upper layer of commoners, heterogeneous, but compact, whose rapid rise in wealth and power most impressed contemporaries." 47.

In another passage he describes them as:-

"Holding a position determined, not by legal distinctions, but by common estimation; kept few and tough by the ruthlessness of the English family system, ... pouring the martyrs of that prudent egotism, their younger sons, not only into the learned professions, but into armies, English and foreign, exploration and colonisation, and every branch of business enterprise." 48.

46. Prof. Tawney, op. cit., 4.
47. ibid.
For the purposes of such a study as this, then, the problem of differentiating precisely between gentry and nongentry might seem well-nigh insuperable. To begin with, it is clear, as Mr. Trevor-Roper has pointed out, that there was no hard and fast distinction in Elizabethan England between nobility and greater gentry, and to ignore titled families would be to blot out part of the picture of a homogeneous social structure. Of the six peers who had their main country residences in Sussex under Elizabeth, namely the Earls of Arundel and Northumberland, Viscount Montague, and Barons Lumley, Buckhurst and De la Warr, two were of very recent creation, — Viscount Montague having received his title in 1554, and Lord Buckhurst his in 1567. Moreover, the younger branches, for example, of the Sackville family, namely the Sackvilles of Chiddingly and of Seddlescombe, were indubitably 'gentry', and contributed to the ranks of Sussex J.P.'s. Peers who may be said to have had their chief country residences in Sussex are therefore included in this study.

At the other end of the scale, the difficulties are very much greater, and have been touched on by Miss Campbell in

---

49. Mr. H.R. Trevor-Roper, / Supp., 4 et seqq.
50. G.E.C., Complete Peerage, ix, 98.
51. ibid, iv, 422.
52. See notes on the Sackville family, Section III of this thesis.
her book, The English Yeoman. She shows, that, while there was a considerable social gulf between the yeoman and the wealthy knight or large landed gentleman, due to differences of wealth, birth and the length of settlement in a community, to the possession of a coat of arms, to county connections and so on, it is not so easy to determine the distinction existing between the yeoman and the lesser gentry. Clearly "blood" was no satisfactory basis of distinction since the younger sons of gentry were frequently classed as yeomen. Conversely, many of the gentry were not 'gentlemen of the blood' but had 'acquired' their gentility at the hands of the heralds, a matter which, as Sir Thomas Smith points out, could be discreetly arranged for a consideration.

Thomas Fuller's well-worn remark is also relevant: "A Yeoman is a Gentleman in Oure whom the next age may see refined."

It might seem from these contemporary comments that the student of the 'gentry' could reasonably expect some guidance as to who they were from the Heralds' Visitations. Whether coats of arms were inherited or purchased by parvenus, they seem to have been regarded as, in some way, a hall-mark of gentility, and to have been prized as such. Undoubtedly some families which had recently risen to wealth and

54. ibid., 34-5, and 45 et seqq.
influence in their counties, would not immediately have sought patents of arms from the heralds and would not therefore appear in the Visitations. But a ny family which did appear there as armigerous could surely be accepted as of the 'gentry', even though its earlier origins might have been obscure.

Such was the reasoning which led to a thorough investigation as a prelude to this present study of the three relevant Sussex Visitations, namely those of 1530, 1570 and 1634, and of the pedigrees contained in them, but unfortunately they proved useless as a criterion of distinction between gentry and non-gentry families.

To begin with, the number of families dealt with in each of these Visitations varies widely. The 1530 Visitation of Sussex is recorded in at least two manuscripts, B.M. Harleian: MS., 1562, and MS.D. 13 in the College of Arms. The first is useless as a guide to which Sussex families were considered armigerous in 1530 since it includes also, without differentiation, families recognised in the Visitation of 1633-4, and also "many additional Descents not registered in the above Visitations." The College of Arms MS., D.13,

lists 25 families as armigerous in Sussex in 1530. The 1570
Visitation, according to the College of Arms MS. G. 18, f. 68
et seqq., perhaps the most reliable version, recognised 57
families, and the 1633-4 Visitation, according to the College
of Arms MS. C. 27, recognised 211 families.

Not only so, but the lists of families vary in length
and composition in the different MS versions of each single
Visitation. For example, there are four MS versions of
the 1570 Visitation; BM Add. MS. 17, 065, B.M. Harl. MS. 1484,
f. 60-70, College of Arms MS. D.11 and College of Arms MS.
G. 18, f. 68 et seqq.

B.M. Add. MS 17, 065 is described in the B.M. Class
Catalogue, Volume 63, as a "Visitation of Sussex in A.D.
1570 in the handwriting of R. Turpeyn, Windsor Herald".
Richard Turpeyn's name also appears at the head of the MS
itself. This version gives the genealogies of 23 families.

B.M. Harl. MS. 1484 is of no use as a guide to the
Sussex gentry of the 1570 Visitation since it deals also with
those of Kent. As the Class Catalogue in the B.M. points
out, "The Descents of these Counties are jumbled together
and there are some few additions by the hand of . . . ."

59. Noted in error as the 1574 Visitation in Preface to
Harl. Soc. Pubns., liii, d. vi., cf. B.M. Class Catalogue
Vol. 63, Visitations of Sussex, as 1570 Visitation.
60. B.M. Add. MS. 17, 065, f. 1.
MS D.11 in the College of Arms, gives the genealogies of 62 Sussex families, and MS G. 18, of 57 families.

For the 1633-4 Visitation there are many different MS versions in the B.M. which are listed in Sim's Manual and a MS in the College of Arms, namely C. 27, which lists 211 families.

Obviously the most significant of these three Visitations for a study of Elizabethan Sussex, should be that of 1570, but since there are several different MS versions of it, each of which includes some families not found in the others and all of which omit some families which it is clear from other sources were of outstanding importance in Elizabethan Sussex, for example the family of Covert of Slaugham, this Visitation appears to have little value as a catalogue of resident Sussex gentry at that time. Some important Elizabethan families make their debut on the heralds' books in 1634, for example these same Coverts, but there were others mentioned in that Visitation who were not apparently resident in Sussex in the sixteenth century, so that this later Visitation is also worthless as a guide to the Elizabethan gentry.

62. H.C. MS. G. 18, f. 68 et seqq is an original draft on which H.C. MS D.11 is based. The former is more complete than the latter and contains more pedigrees, but H.C. MS D.11 contains those of 2 families not mentioned in the earlier version, namely those of Trayton and of Shurley of Isfield.


64. See H.C. MS., C.27.
Indeed, a careful study of this material led to the conclusion that it was of very little value as a foundation for a social survey of the Sussex gentry. The Richmond Herald, Mr. Wagner, has explained to me verbally that the earlier the Visitation the more defective it is likely to be, and that the lists of families in MS versions of sixteenth century Visitations are nothing like comprehensive. Some MSS in the College of Arms are clearly no more than rough drafts made out hastily at the time the Visitation was carried out, and others are elaborated copies of these which do not contain all the families mentioned in the drafts.

Moreover, he has pointed out that sometimes families of ancient standing in their county whose gentility would never be disputed were simply not included in certain of the Visitations.

Finally, younger branches of families whose elder line was seated in another county and would probably appear in that county's Visitations, would not, as a rule, appear in those of the county where they themselves resided.

In fact, if anything, the Visitations seem to deal more

---

65. See n. 62.
66. This point is also made by Sir George Sitwell: "The English Gentleman", (The Ancestor, i, 58 et seq.) Among Sussex families, the Pelhams, for example, are not listed in either H.C. MS., D.11 or H.C. MS, G.18.
67. E.g. the Blounts of Dedisham near Slinfold, Sussex, were a younger branch of the Blounts of Mapledurham, co. Oxon.
extensively with the lesser gentry whose gentility might be questioned at some time or other, than with the more powerful families and their branches, - and they certainly give no guide to a man's relative importance in his county. Miss Campbell seems to have arrived at the same conclusion; she writes, "The reports of the heralds' Visitations are notoriously inaccurate in giving a complete list of the resident gentry in various counties; there are almost always additional lists of 'disclaimers'. But there is, I think, no disposition to question the right of those who are recorded there to their place in the list."

As additional information about the status of families already under review, the Visitations are indeed an interesting source. But as a criterion of distinction between gentry and non-gentry families in a given county at a given time, they are useless. Indeed, the inclusion by them of many families of extreme obscurity in their county's annals is in itself a warning to the social historian who would study "the gentry" as a whole. They remind him that, beyond the core of influential county families who won for themselves places on the Commission or who entered Parliament as county members, or became sheriffs and Deputy Lieutenants, there was a large and indeterminate body of lesser gentry who have left few records of their doings and who played

68. op. cit., 37.
only a minor part in the administrative history of their county. At the periphery, these shaded off imperceptibly into the yeoman and non-gentry classes.

Unfortunately, these "lesser gentry", interesting as they no doubt are, do not figure in this thesis. To achieve any concrete results, certain families had to be selected from the indeterminate mass, and as a principle of selection, some criterion other than the right to bear arms seemed necessary if the most influential families were to provide the main subject-matter.

Influence is no doubt an ambiguous concept and exists in a variety of forms so that the problem of selecting the more influential among the gentry families of Elizabethan Sussex could be approached from a number of different angles. The economic historian would, no doubt, begin by attempting to assess the number of manors held, or the annual income enjoyed by the heads of respective families, and would then proceed to pick out the more prosperous for further study. But the concept which has been adopted as the starting point of this thesis is that of political or administrative influence within the county. That is to say, the families which have been chosen for detailed study are those which were represented among the holders of leading county offices within the Elizabethan period. Lists were therefore compiled of the names of all those who were county members of
Parliament for Sussex during the reign, likewise lists of Deputy Lieutenants, sheriffs and Justices of the Peace for Sussex during those years.

Naturally, the longest of these lists was that of the Justices of the Peace. This was put together from the invaluable source of the Assize Rolls for the S.E. Circuit. These exist in the P.R.O. in almost a complete series for the entire reign, and attached to them, as a rule, are two annual lists of J.P's for each county within the circuit, one of which is Sussex, one list apparently having been customarily drawn up in the Hilary and the other in the Trinity Law term. These lists are far more numerous and therefore far more valuable than the 'Libri Pacis' or than the entries on the Patent Rolls which Miss Putnam lists in her article since these latter, taken together, amount in all to lists for only nineteen various years during the reign, while there are lists of Elizabethan J.P's attached to the Assize Rolls for Sussex almost throughout the reign.

From the complete catalogue of names of all those individuals appointed to the Commission of the Peace for

69. P.R.O. Assize Rolls, S.E. Circuit. A. 35. (Sussex).
70. B. Putnam: "Justices of the Peace, 1558-1688" (I.H.R.Bull. 1926-7,iv,144).
71. For some years only one of the 2 lists survives, but there are only six years for which there are no lists for Sussex, i.e. 1563, 1567, 1574, 1584, 1586, 1603.
Sussex at any time during the Elizabethan period, certain ones had clearly to be omitted in the final derivative list of J.P.'s who were representative of the Elizabethan Sussex gentry.

To begin with, it was necessary to ignore the names of all those who, like the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Treasurer, were named at the head of each Commission in a purely honorary or official capacity, and who were not resident Sussex gentry; also omitted were those who were on the Commission merely as lawyers, usually attached to the S.E. Circuit, and who were non-resident in the county; also all who were clergy, since these were really a distinct social entity; and finally, all individuals whose families, whether forbears or descendants, were not living in Sussex in 1580. The reason for the omission of this last group is that a number of names appear among the lists of J.P.'s for the first or for the last years of the reign, names of individuals who either died or quitted the county early in that period, leaving no descendants, or who were newcomers towards the end of it. Since this study is concerned primarily with families settled in Sussex during the reign of Elizabeth, these individual J.P.'s are not really relevant to it. The choice of 1580 as a test year for qualification as a resident Sussex family, might appear somewhat arbitrary at first sight, but as it is roughly half-way through the reign, it might be said that
families which had disappeared before then or which did not appear until afterwards, can have played only a minor part in the history of Elizabethan Sussex. In fact, this surmise does appear to be justified since all the families which were really prominent during this period had representatives living only in Sussex in 1580. Sir John Jefferay, the judge, who died in 1578 without male heirs, is included by a special concession. In any case, to study the families of all the J.P.'s who were resident in Sussex at any time during the reign would be a formidable task.

The lists of county M.P.'s for Sussex, and of sheriffs, and Deputy Lieutenants during the reign, add nothing to the family names derived from the Commissions of the Peace. Of the County M.P.'s for Sussex between 1558 and 1603, all but two came from families which were resident mainly in Sussex in 1580. Of the list of sheriffs, only one was excluded from the final list of gentry, Sir William Gresham of Mayfield, who died in 1579. In his family there was a failure of male

73. P.R.O. Sheriffs.
75. These two were Charles Howard Esq., 2nd son of Charles Howard, 2nd Baron Howard of Effingham, M.P. for Sussex in 1601; and Henry Neville Esq., descended from a younger branch of the family of Neville, Lords Abergavenny, and son of Sir Henry Neville of Billingbear, Berks. He was M.P. for Sussex in 1588. For Charles Howard see M. Mort;...
heirs, for his cousin, Sir Thomas Gresham, also died in 1579. All those who were Deputy Lieutenants for Sussex between 1558 and 1603 were of families resident there in 1580, and represented on the Commission of the Peace during the reign.

From these sources the resulting list of names prove to have belonged to seventy different Sussex families, fortunately not an unmanageable number for a study of this sort. Obviously there are dangers in describing these as "the gentry" of Sussex without qualification, partly since, as has already been explained, many "lesser gentry" are excluded, and partly because one would not expect to find many recusant families among them even though they may have been important. Yet, surprisingly, the most prominent

---

75. contd. “The Personnel of the House of Commons in 1601” (Univ. of London M.A. thesis), Section iii, 156; J.E. Neale: Elizabethan House of Commons, 47; G.E.C., ix, 788; S.R.S. xix 51. For Henry Neville, see Harl.Soc. Pubns. Visitations of Berks., 11, 181; 1, 249-50; Horsfield, op.cit.; 1, 417; S.A.C., 11, 187, 210, 245; xxi, 8; H. Matthews: Personnel of the House of Commons in 1584, (Univ. of London M.A. thesis), Section iii, 166. Both of these had property in Sussex at the time they represented the county in Parliament, but neither appears to have been mainly resident there in 1580, the former being of Surrey, the latter of Berkshire.


77. There was at this stage much arduous genealogical research to be done to establish to which family each individual belonged, and who his relatives were. For lists of county M.P.'s, sheriffs, Deputy and Lords Lieutenants as well as for the list of 70 families and their subsidiary branches selected for study, see Section II, Appendices 1-5. For the inclusion of Sir John Jefferay, see relevant family history, n.11.
recusant families are found among the seventy referred to, either because they had representatives on the Commission early in the reign, or because they had non-recusant branches.

In conclusion, it may be said that the seventy families selected are not unrepresentative of the more prominent gentry, including of course the nobility, of Elizabethan Sussex.

Once having determined on the families to be studied in detail, the next step was to decide precisely what questions were to be pursued with regard to them, and how the resulting material could best be arranged.

It seemed that a necessary preliminary was a general inquiry on broad lines into their respective origins and the approximate antiquity of each family's connection with the county. From such an investigation it was hoped that some conclusions might be drawn as to what proportion of the "office-holding" gentry were newcomers to the county, and, if possible, why they came; what relation, if any, had a long connection with the county to the tenure of important county offices; and whether county offices were concentrated in the hands of a few families of long standing and influence or whether newcomers were able to push their way to the top. An attempt was also made early in the course of this study to discover precisely where the selected families
were settled in the county so that their mutual proximity or otherwise could be established, and the possibility of local groupings be made apparent. The structure and composition of each family as it was in 1580 was also studied so that certain questions of interest to the social historian could be investigated, - for example, as to the average number of children, or the extent to which marriages in this class were determined by proximity of residence, social status or religious persuasion. A brief survey was also made of higher education. Other questions relate to the relative wealth of these families, the occupations of their members, and the possible connection between these; and finally to the political and religious alignments among them so far as these are discernible.

The thesis falls into three main sections; the text, a series of statistical tables, and a collection of family histories.
PART I

THE ANTECEDENTS AND SOCIAL SETTING

OF THE SUSSEX GENTRY

CHAPTER I

Origins: the weight of tradition

Sussex is proverbially a conservative county in its social habits and loyalties. Even to-day in the more rural and unsophisticated districts, many years must pass before a settler ceases to be regarded as a "foreigner" by the local inhabitants, and, in this, Sussex resembles counties far more remote from the capital. In the hamlets and villages, memories are long, and there is some pride among the country folk in the "old" families of their neighbourhood, families such as the Ashburnhams whose part in the history of the county was, until recently, unbroken since well before modern times. Even those names which have now died out, like that of Caryll of West Grinstead, are cherished in the districts they were once associated with and their houses, portraits and furniture, and in this case even their secret chapel and

1. The Ashburnhams appear to have been connected with the manor of that name in Foxearle Hundred, Hastings Rape, from the 12th century. (V.C.H. Sussex, ix, 127) The last survivor of this ancient family, Lady Catherine Ashburnham, died in 1953.
missals, are preserved as a memorial to them. The survival of many historic country houses, such as Parham near Pulborough, once the home of some of the Palmers, has certainly helped to commemorate names now extinct.

One might suppose that in the 16th century, the forces that have produced this conservatism would have operated still more powerfully; geographical factors making for the comparative isolation of the county in those days would be likely to have had a marked influence on its social life. Yet in an age of rapid and incisive social transition Sussex cannot have remained entirely unaffected by the changes of the period. Indeed, the organisation of the county in the Elizabethan period is likely to present an interesting study in the conflict of reactionary and progressive forces, and the social class most likely to be affected by the action and counter-action of these forces was, surely, the gentry. They have so often been described as both the vehicles and the products of the social, economic and political changes of the period; yet it may well be asked whether they, like the Crown itself, did not owe much to the weight of tradition and, in many cases, to a long association with the counties where

2. The Priest House in West Grinstead, property of the Carylls in a later period, and which contains a chapel hidden in the roof, is now the property of the West Grinstead Roman Catholic Church, and houses many of the former possessions of this family.
they flourished.

In order to assess, even approximately, the extent to which the "office-holding" families among the Sussex gentry of the Elizabethan period owed their influence to a long connection with the county and to the social standing of their ancestors, a rough estimate has been made of the length of time during which each family had been resident in the shire.

It appears that, of the 70 families selected for study, 18 were certainly resident in the county before 1400; 16 were certainly resident between 1400 and 1500; and that 36 are known to have been resident only after 1500. It should be pointed out that not all the 16 families in the second group, nor all the 36 families in the third, were necessarily newcomers to Sussex within the periods indicated. In some cases genealogical information is scanty and a pedigree can be traced back only one or two generations with any degree of accuracy; yet the existence of the family name in the county many generations earlier or the existence of heraldic evidence may suggest that the family in question was indigenous even if its origins were obscure. In such cases families are classified as resident in Sussex only from such times as there is reliable genealogical evidence for it, but where it seems likely that they had lived in Sussex much earlier the fact is noted 'en passant'.

3. See Section II, Appendix 6
On distinguishing between those families of the second group who seem definitely to have "immigrated" to Sussex between 1400 and 1500 and those whose pedigrees have not been traced back beyond this period but who were probably indigenous, it appears that there were 9 of the former and 7 of the latter. Of the 36 families of the third group there were 28 "immigrant" families, some of whom, however, had property in Sussex before the 16th century, and 8 families of obscure origins who were probably indigenous.

To sum up, 18 families or more than a quarter of the total selected for investigation, were resident in the county at least before the beginning of the 15th century; there were 7 more families residing in the county in the 15th century who were probably of native origin, and 8 more, resident in the 16th century who were probably also not newcomers. So that, altogether, of the "office-holding" families studied for the Elizabethan period, 33 out of 70, or nearly half were either long-established in the county, that is to say, for at least a century and a half, or else were very likely of local, if obscure, and possibly humble origins. This does suggest that length of residence had, at any rate in Elizabethan Sussex, a great deal to do with a family's political influence in the county.

For the present, attention will be concentrated on some of the 18 "office-holding" families known to have been settled
in Sussex before 1400. Naturally, these were not all among the most influential of gentry families in the Elizabethan period, but certainly a very large proportion were. Three of these long-established Sussex families belonged to the peerage by the later 16th century, namely the Fitzalans, Earls of Arundel, the Wests, Lords De la Warr and the Sackvilles, one of whom became Baron Buckhurst under Elizabeth and eventually Earl of Dorset.

That of these, the Fitzalans who had originally been feudal lords of Clun and Oswestry in county Salop, migrated to Sussex in the thirteenth century. The marriage of one of them to a coheirress of Hugh d'Aubigny, the last of the Earls of Arundel of that name, brought their son the Castle, and Honour of Arundel which had been part of the Aubigny inheritance, and to his descendants, the title itself. Like all great landowners of the 16th century, the Fitzalans, Earls of Arundel, had, by that time, property scattered through numerous counties. Miss Miller has shown that at some time or other between 1485 and 1547, they held property in 13 counties apart from Sussex. But even so, the bulk of it lay in Sussex itself; of 131 manors, and 3 religious houses held by them at some time within that period, 58 manors and 3 religious houses were in Sussex. Moreover, Arundel was the

The Wests, Barons De la Warr, seem to have owed their rapid rise to nobility and fortune in the late 14th and early 15th centuries to a series of highly profitable marriages. E.P. Shirley says that "the Wests are remarkable not so much for the antiquity of the family as for the early period at which they attained the honour of the peerage". Considering that their first recorded ancestor, Sir Thomas West, who married Eleanor, daughter and heiress of Sir John de Cantilupe of Hempston Cantilupe in Devon and of Snitterfield, Warwickshire, lived in the mid 14th century, it might seem surprising that his great-grandson, Reginald, should, in 1426, have held two baronies and very considerable property in Sussex, if it were not for the fact that Reginald's father, grandfather and great grandfather had all married wealthy heiresses. The first of these marriages brought the Wests property in Devon and Warwickshire; the second brought them both the Fitzherbert and Peverel inheritances, much of which lay in Sussex, including the two important houses of Ewhurst in Shermanbury and Offington in Broadwater, the latter becoming the Wests' main family residence in the Elizabethan period; and the third

7. For the early West pedigree, see A. Collins: Peerage of England, (1812), W.1.; and B and C., 2 a.
   This first Sir Thomas West is sometimes described as the first Baron West, (Collins, loc. cit., & S.A.C. lxxxii, 61)
eventually brought them in 1426, in addition to their own recently acquired Barony of West, the De la Warr Barony and property.

This run of profitable marriages did not end even there, for the great-grandson of Reginald, the first West who, from 1426, was also Baron De la Warr, – namely Thomas, 9th Baron De la Warr, – married Elizabeth, daughter and coheiress of Sir Richard Bonville of Halnaker, or Halfnaked as it was sometimes called, an ancient fortified house adjacent to Boxgrove priory. This ancient house and the patronage of the priory, a Benedictine foundation established in the early 12th century, were brought to Sir Thomas by his marriage, he having already the two Sussex residences of Offington and Ewhurst, and other lands within and without the county. While Sir Thomas' father had apparently resided principally at Offington, it was evidently Halnaker which won first place in the 9th Baron's affection, for there is evidence that he spent considerable time and money on the improvement and beautifying of the place. He was also, apparently, much

7. contd.

though other genealogies give his grandson, also Sir Thomas West, husband of Joanna De la Warr, as the first Lord West. (G.E.C. 1898 ed. viii.102; B and C. loc. cit.).

8. Reginald's great-grandfather, the first Sir Thomas West, married Eleanor de Cantilupe (v. supra.); his grandfather, the second Sir Thomas West, married Alice, daughter and heiress of Sir Edmund Fitzherbert, (S.A.C. lxxxii.59); his father, Thomas, 1st Lord West, married Joanna, the De la Warr heiress (Collins loc. cit; B and C. loc. cit).

9. B & C loc. cit; cf. S.A.C., lxxxii.61; and G.M. C.; iv.156 which give "Sir John Bonville".

10. S.A.C., lxxxii 63 et seqq.
attached to Boxgrove priory, for when it was about to be
dissolved he sent a petition to Cromwell begging him to hold
his hand, or, if the dissolution must be carried through, to
grant the site to him, Lord De la Warr, since he was the
patron and many of his wife's ancestors were buried there.

When the priory was dissolved in 1535, the site was, in fact,
granted to Lord De la Warr for the sum of £126.13.4. Unlike
some of his contemporaries, Sir Thomas seems to have desired to
possess this property for sentimental rather than acquisitive
reasons. From 1536 onwards he consistently opposed the
Dissolution, and he disliked the new service-books, and was
even imprisoned for a month in 1538 as a suspected malcontent.
It was in the chancel of Boxgrove priory that he had built him-
self a lavishly decorated tomb-chapel though it was not his
fate to rest there. His wife who predeceased him was buried
at Boxgrove where there is a monumental inscription to her.

Perhaps it was to prevent his taking steps at any time
to restore the monks at Boxgrove, or at least because his
affection for the place and his obvious regrets about the
change it had recently suffered might influence others, that
Lord De la Warr was compelled to exchange it with the Crown
for the dissolved Nunnery of Wherwell in Hampshire in 1540.

11. S.A.C., xv, 103 et seqq.
12. ibid.
13. D.N.B.
15. S.A.C. vii, 218-219; lxxxii. 64; and xv. 83.
As a part of his side of the exchange, Lord De la Warr was required to surrender his estate and mansion of Halnaker, adjacent to Boxgrove priory, which he had acquired through his wife and on which he had lavished care and money. He, not unnaturally, made some difficulty about this, but Henry VIII was adamant, perhaps remembering his visit there in August 1526, when Lord De la Warr had been his host, and coveting it. Elizabeth, Lord De la Warr's wife, added her protests to her husband's but unavailingly, so that he was compelled to retire to his house at Offington, "with a reluctance that can be imagined after all he had done to beautify Halnaker". Yet, Halnaker once in the King's hands, was allowed to go to ruin and remained unoccupied until Sir John Morley acquired it in Elizabeth's reign.

The Wests, indeed, who had risen so rapidly to prosperity, appear to have suffered a turn of fortune's wheel in the mid 16th century. Not only did they experience Henry VIII's rapacity and high-handedness but the family became divided against itself, and if it did not fall, came close to doing so. The 9th Baron who died in 1554, left no children, and all his four full brothers had died without issue. However, his eldest brother of the half blood,

16. D.N.B.
17. S.A.C., lxxvii, 64.
18. ibid.; and D.N.B.
the eldest son of the 8th Baron's second marriage, Sir George West of Warbleton, who had died in 1538, had left two sons, William and Thomas. The elder of these, William, had been adopted by the 9th Baron sometime after 1540, as his heir, but this peer seems subsequently to have regretted his action since, in 1549, he accused his nephew of attempting to poison him in his impatience for his inheritance. On this charge, William West was disabled in February 1548/9 from inheriting his title, but he was later forgiven by his uncle who gave him a pension, a house in London, and the manors of Offington and Ewhurst in Sussex; he was not, however, restored in blood until 1563 and not given his title of Baron De la Warr until February 1569/70.

The Sackvilles were more fortunate. Whereas the Wests were sufficiently wealthy and influential by the early 16th century to attract some of the penalties attached to those circumstances under Henry VIII's regime, the Sackvilles had their way still to make. They were sufficiently shrewd to realise that this must be done in co-operation with and under the wing of the Tudor monarchy, and this appears to have been the secret of their rise to outstanding worldly success in the 16th century. Among the gentry and nobility of

20. ibid; and P.C.C. 10 Crumwell, pr. 1538.
21. D.N.B. sub "Sir Thomas West, 9th Baron Delawarr"
22. B. & C., loc. cit; and D.N.B., loc. cit.
Elizabethan Sussex, there seems to have been no family which could rival them in influence at Court or in the county as a whole; for of the other titled families mainly resident in Sussex, all but the Wests fell foul of the government at one time or another during the reign and they, as has been shown, were, until February 1569/70, overshadowed by the recent scandal attached to their name. Examination of the histories of the other titled Sussex families, for example those of Fitzalan, Howard, Lumley and Percy, shows that all of them were more or less suspect at intervals during the reign, and even Anthony Browne, 1st Viscount Montague, that curious Henrician, whose family owed its title and influence to the Tudors, and who appears to have been able to combine devotion to the traditional faith with loyalty to the Crown on most occasions, swerved momentarily after the Bull of Excommunication, for he was numbered in 1571 among the well-wishers of the Ridolfi Conspiracy.

Compared with these the Sackvilles were indeed the tools of the Tudors, and to them they owed both their title and much of their wealth. Yet, they were undoubtedly one of the "old" gentry families of Sussex, and they may have owed their influence there in the Elizabethan period partly to their long connection with the county. As Miss Sackville-West has

23. See notes on the family of Browne, Viscount Montague, Section III of this thesis. Also H. M. C. Hatfield MSS, i, 526-8, and Cal. S. P. D. 1547-80, 438, (no. 64).
written, "Sussex, in fact, was their cradle long before they came to Kent. Buckhurst, which they had owned since the 12th century, was at one time an even larger house than Knole, and to their own vault in the parish Church of Withiam they were invariably brought to rest."

By Queen Elizabeth's accession, the Sackvilles, though still outside the ranks of the peerage, were very well established both socially and materially. Concerning their early history, the family historian, Miss Sackville-West, has written that the first Sackville of whom any "authentic" record exists was a contemporary of William I. Whatever the degree of accuracy of this statement, it is certain that a Sackville was three times county member for Sussex in Richard II's reign, and that the name appears frequently on the list of early sheriffs for the county. They appear in the list of Sussex gentry of 1411 and may have derived their arms chiefly from the De Veres, since one Sir Jordan de Sackville who had died in King John's reign had married a daughter of the Earl of Oxford.

24. V. Sackville-West: Knole and the Sackvilles, (1923) 18. But S.A.C., xxxix, 178 says that Bayham Abbey, Sussex, was formerly the burial place of the Sackvilles.
25. ibid., 29 et seqq.
26. S.A.C., xxxi, 110; P.R.O. Sheriffs.
27. S.A.C., xxxix, 101; S.A.C., vi. 76.
The Sir Richard Sackville who is described by Miss Sackville-West as "the founder of the family fortune" was first cousin to Anne Boleyn, a fact that was to acquire significance in Elizabeth's reign. Perhaps the most memorable thing about Sir Richard "Fill-sack" as he was sometimes called, was the way in which he established the wealth of his family, acquiring monastic lands and ready money for himself and his descendants, and even for his distant relatives. It is notable that the beginning of his public career can be dated from the opening of the Reformation Parliament in which he sat as M.P. for Arundel, being at that time steward to the Earl of Arundel. From 1529 his public responsibilities multiplied and with them the opportunities for the enrichment and advancement of himself and his family. In about 1539 he was appointed under treasurer of the exchequer and treasurer of the army and in 1542 he became Escheator of Surrey and Sussex. Under Edward VI, he took a still more prominent part in public life, being appointed on the 24th August 1548, Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations, and in 1552, three years after he had been knighted, he was made Commissioner for the sale of

28. D.N.B. sub "Sir Richard Sackville"
29. e.g. grant to William Sackville of Dorking, Surrey. S.A.C., xxv, 41. For his relationship to Sir Richard Sackville, see B.& C., loc.cit.
30. D.N.B.
31. Ibid.
Chantry lands. In 1554 he became a Privy Councillor. Among the various duties allotted to him after Elizabeth's accession were the supervision of the recall of the old coinage and the issue of the new in 1560, - and those attached to the Stewardship of the Duchy of Lancaster in Sussex.

The economic side of the life of the gentry will be examined in another section of this thesis. It is sufficient here to remark that at the beginning of the Elizabethan period the Sackvilles had property scattered fairly widely through the Eastern part of the county, while in the course of the reign they acquired still more. They had also town houses in Lewes and London. From such a family came Thomas Sackville who was raised to the peerage in June, 1567 as Baron Buckhurst, and in June, 1582 created a Privy Councillor.

All three of these "old" and now titled Sussex families, the Fitzalans, the Wests and the Sackvilles, exercised considerable influence in Sussex at one time or another under Elizabeth, more particularly the Fitzalans and the Sackvilles. It is relevant to the theme of this chapter that during the first half of the reign at least, the position of leadership in the county was disputed by two of the "old" Sussex families, the Fitzalans and the Sackvilles. One was settled in the West, the other in East Sussex; one had belonged to the

32. ibid; and Cal.S.P.D. 1547-180, 160 et seqg.
34. G.E.C., ii, 384; iv, 422.
35. For their part in the pain political developments in Elizabethan Sussex, see Part III of this thesis.
SIR WALTER COVERT from the painting at Longleat, Wilts.
peerage since the 13th century, the other was ennobled only in 1567; one was strongly conservative both politically and religiously, the other more progressive in both spheres. Yet both had been settled in the county since at least the 13th century.

Other families of the group of 18 who are known to have been settled in Sussex before 1400 and which were particularly prominent in the later 16th century, though not of noble status, were the Coverts, the Palmers, the Pelhams and the Gorings.

Outstanding even among these for influence was the family of Covert, which, although remarkably prosperous and well established in the county even before the accession of Elizabeth, appeared to reach the summit of its power in the late 16th century and at the beginning of the 17th century. As one writer has put it, "The glory of the name was at its highest when the most illustrious of his race, Sir Walter Covert, built in about 1600 his house at Slaugham, of which only ruins remain to attest its former grandeur. The decline and fall of the family seems to have coincided with the decay of the mansion." Sir Walter himself was, indeed, in the latter half of Elizabeth's reign and thereafter, a pillar of the commonwealth; and even in her time he had held all the chief county offices, being a J.P. continuously from 1581; one of the three Deputy Lieutenants for the county from

36: See Appendix 6.
37: S.A.C., xlvi, 170.
November, 1569 on to the end of the reign; a county member in 1581 as the result of a bye-election; and again in 1586; and sheriff in 1583-4 and 1592-3. The most casual reference to the Covert Papers will show to what extent he was relied on by the Privy Council, by the Lords Lieutenant of the county, by Walsingham, by peers who wanted to influence an election, or the selection of a jury, or, for example, to settle a local feud which threatened to disrupt the organisation of the musters in the City of Chichester. Covert, it appears, was of the stuff of which Tudor administrators were made, and in the 1580's he and Lord Buckhurst appear virtually to have run the county between them. Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering, it is true, might seem to have rivalled him in influence; he was also a Deputy Lieutenant from November 1569, Sheriff from November 1572-1573 and was returned with Robert Sackville, Lord Buckhurst's eldest son, as one of the two county members in 1588, but he was not county M.P. again during the reign, and he appears to have spent little time in Sussex thereafter. He is noted in a Privy Council letter of May, 1591 to the Lord Chancellor, requesting the appointment of more Deputy Lieutenants for Sussex because so few resided there, - as "living at Blackwall". Sir Thomas Shirley too, also a Deputy

38. See Appendices 2-5 & Section III, notes on the Covert family.
39. B.M. Harl. MS. 703, passim.
40. ibid., ff. 18b, 19b.
41. ibid., ff. 18b.
42. ibid., ff. 39, 39b, 40b, 42b, 47b, 48. /contd.
Lieutenant from 1569, was in 1591 still in the Low Countries, and although he sat for the county in 1593, the crash in his fortunes came only three years later when his financial speculations during his Treasurership at War on Leicester's expedition ended in disaster. So serious was his plight that he was dropped from the Deputy Lieutenantship and from the Commission of the Peace in 1601. Nicholas Parker Esquire too, as he then was, certainly was named an additional Deputy Lieutenant in 1591 and was returned as county member with Robert Sackville in 1597. He had, moreover, been a J.P. continuously from 1580 and was sheriff in 1586-7 and 1593-4. Yet he was not, from the government's point of view, one hundred per cent reliable as Covert seems to have been, for in the 1587 report on the Justices of the Peace of Sussex he is described as having his wife's mother, "a recusant", in his house, and therefore as fit to be dropped

43. See Appendices 3 & 4.
44. A.P.C., 1591, 5 May, 91.
45. Ibid.
46. Official Returns.
47. See relevant family history.
49. A.P.C., 1591, 91.
from the Commission. He was, moreover, a trustee for some of the lands of the Gages, one of the leading recusant families in Sussex, and his father before him was described in the Bishop's letter of 1564 as a "misliker of religion and godly proceedings", - probably a sound estimate from the bishop's point of view since one of his missals survives to-day among the Arundel MSS in the British Museum.

The chief explanation of Walter Covert's predominance in county affairs in the second half of the reign seems then to have been his utter reliability from the government standpoint. It is true that his father, Richard Covert, was dubbed a "misliker of religion and godly proceedings" by the Bishop in 1564, but he apparently took the Oath of Uniformity in 1569, the year, incidentally, in which his son became Deputy Lieutenant, and the year before the Bull of Excommunication.

Yet the Coverts, like the Sackvilles, were an old Sussex family and must have owed their great influence in the county at least partly to this fact. They are known to have been established at Broadbridge near Horsham, at least as early as 1230 and from then on there are fairly numerous authentic references to members of the family. In time they

51. S.A.C., 11, 59.
52. Ibid., Iviii, 155.
54. B.M. Arundel MS., 203. Sir Nicholas Parkes probably spent little time in Sussex after his appointment in 1598 as Deputy Lieutenant of Cornwall. (See relevant family
acquired numerous properties in Sussex including lands in Slinfold, Washington, Ashington, Sullington, Burpham and Itchingfield, and they had property in Surrey as well, including the manor of Hascombe near Guildford, which they held for about 300 years. Slaugham, where Walter Covert eventually built himself a residence, was purchased by the Coverts in the late 15th century, and in 1583 he purchased the 1/4 part of the manor of Cuckfield from the Duke of Arundel for £500, the Duke being in straightened circumstances owing to heavy recusancy fines, and a further portion was acquired from Lord Abergavenny in 1615.

According to Horsfield, it was said of the 16th century Coverts that they had manors stretching without interruption from Southwark in Surrey to the sea, meaning the south coast, and though this was undoubtedly a popular exaggeration, they did indeed hold lands scattered between Crawley and the sea in Sussex.

The power, possessions and influence of Walter Covert may well have become a byword in Elizabethan Sussex, and seem

---

59. The exact date is not known but it was held by the Coverts at the beginning of the reign of Henry VII (Horsfield op. cit. 256), and William Covert died seised of it in 1494. (V.C.H., Sussex, vii, 183)
60. Cooper, loc. cit.
61. S.A.C., xlvii, 136.
to have been resented by one at least of the lesser gentry, Roger Gratwick of Slinfold, who brought a case against him and Edward Caryll in the Court of Star Chamber concerning certain property including ironworks in St. Leonard's Forest. In his bill of complaint, Gratwick describes Walter Covert as "a man of great liveing, aliance and poore [power] in the said county of Sussex, who shortelie after presuming upon his welthe, power and frends and thinkeing to oppose and overbeare youre said subiecte or that youre said subiecte was to meane a man to be partner with him in the said forest, challenged the whole Intereste in the same, and therof wrongfullie expelled and eieected your said subiecte, and not therewith contente by most forcyble and riotous meanes disturbed your said subiecte to digge stone and Iron ore in the said foreste..." Covert denied that he had attempted to oust the plaintiff from his title, but it is clear that Gratwick was resentful of Covert's overwhelming influence in the neighbourhood.

Certainly Covert had many influential connections in the county, - one result of the long residence of his family there: in the past they had intermarried with such well-known local houses as the de Braoses, the Pelhams, the Culpeppers, the Bartellots and the Gorings, and the great extent of the

63. P.R.O., St.Ch. 5 Eliz., G 3/6. (16 Eliz.).
64. ibid., G 43/32.
65. Cooper, op.cit.,72.
Covert lands must have meant a large tenant retinue. Such a man must have found it no strange thing to count even peers among those who sought his favour.

To sum up, it seems that some, at least, of the most prominent among the office-holding gentry and nobility of Elizabethan Sussex came from families of very long standing in the county, and while the Sackvilles and the Coverts, for example, were assisted to the heights of prestige and influence there by the Tudor monarchy which they so scrupulously served, - their long residence in those parts also contributed much to their position. Competition for predominance in the county, at any rate early in the reign, appears to have been carried on mainly between two families long settled in Sussex, - namely the Fitzalans and the Sackvilles, - one Catholic, conservative and belonging to the pre-Tudor peerage, the other Anglican and committed altogether to the Tudor regime to which it owed its title and most of its wealth. When one of them died out in 1580 with the passing of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, there was no other family to take its place as a serious rival to the Sackvilles. Certainly there was no lack of noble families in Sussex after 1580, since the Percies, Earls of Northumberland, Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, Baron Lumley, the Brownes, Viscounts

66. B.M., Harl. MS. 703, f. 18b.
Text cut off in original
Montague, and the Wests, Lords De la Warr continued, at least nominally, to reside there. Of these all except the Wests were, in varying degrees, sympathetic to the Catholic cause. But, again with the exception of the Wests, all were comparatively newcomers to the county as residents. This fact may go some way towards explaining the speedy collapse of resistance among these Catholic peers early in the 1580's with the arrest of the Earls of Arundel and Northumberland. Strongly recusant and conservative as Sussex was, particularly in the West, Lord Buckhurst was able, at the price of ceaseless vigilance, to hold his own in the 1580's and 1590's, albeit with the re-inforcement of Lord Howard of Effingham who was apparently sole Lord Lieutenant in 1585 and joint Lord Lieutenant with Buckhurst from 1586. As for Viscount Montague who died in October, 1592, and Baron Lumley, uncle by marriage to Philip, Earl of Arundel, neither came of a family deeply rooted in Sussex and either could not or would not carry on the struggle.

67. Philip, Earl of Arundel, was in the Tower from 1585 on. See relevant family history.
68. See Appendix 6.
69. See Part III, chs. 1 & 2.
70. See Appendix I.
72. See Part III, chs 1 & 2.
The thesis that Sussex was socially a conservative county might be approached from another angle, that of the distribution of county offices among families of long or recent standing there. Clearly however, some distinction must be made to begin with between the various types of county offices under consideration.

It might be said that the prestige attached to the office of Deputy Lieutenant was greater than that associated with tenure of a county seat in the House of Commons, and that next in the scale came the office of sheriff, and finally a place on the Commission of the Peace, a J.P. nevertheless ranking as an important office-holder in his county and marked out as socially superior to his fellow-gentry who could not boast the title. The families however that counted for most, would very likely have been those whose members occupied the positions of Deputy Lieutenant, county M.P. or sheriff. A J.P. when all was said, was a lesser man when there were as many as 45 names on the Commission of the Peace in 1559, and as many as 52 for 1602, even though some of these appeared in a purely honorary or "ex officio" capacity or were resident outside the county boundaries.

It is therefore most important to ascertain whether the chief offices were distributed impartially among old and new families alike and among a considerable number of them, or

---

73. For a suggestion along these lines, see J.E. Neale: The Elizabethan House of Commons, (1949), 21-23.
74. See P.R.O., Ass.R., S.E. Circuit, A. 35, for these years.
whether they were enjoyed by only a few families and those of long standing locally.

These questions may be more conveniently dealt with in a separate chapter.
CHAPTER II

Origins: the forces of change.

It has been pointed out that of the 70 families selected for study, 16 were certainly resident between 1400 and 1500, and that 36 are known to have been resident only after 1500. Of the 16 families whose pedigrees show that they were resident in Sussex sometime between 1400 and 1500, 9 appear definitely to have "immigrated" from elsewhere while the remainder may have been indigenous though their earlier origins are obscure. Similarly, of the 36 families whose pedigrees give no evidence of residence in Sussex before 1500, 28 appear definitely to have been "immigrant" after that date, the remainder being families whose earlier histories are apparently unrecorded but who were probably native to Sussex.

In the last chapter, some of the more outstanding Elizabethan Sussex families of the group of 18 who are known to have been resident in the county at least before 1400 were examined. In this chapter, attention will be concentrated on some of those families which are known to have settled in the county after that date, that is to say, some of the 9 families which immigrated during the 15th century and of the 28 which immigrated after 1500.

1. See Appendix 6.
2. Ibid.
To begin with, it should perhaps be emphasised that while of the 70 Elizabethan office-holding families under review, only 9 appear to have been newcomers to the county during the 15th century, - that is to say approximately 13% of the total, - as many as 28 settled after the beginning of the 16th century, a figure representing approximately 39% of the whole.

This last fact, that nearly 40% of the office-holding families investigated took up residence in the county only in the 16th century, appears to be significant. It suggests considerable mobility among the gentry as a class and raises numerous questions as to when, within that period, they came to settle, where they came from, and what brought them to Sussex.

For the moment however, attention will be turned to the relationship between these newer gentry families and tenure of county offices in the reign of Elizabeth. Prima facie, it would seem that the influx during the 16th century of large numbers of new gentry families some of whose members succeeded in securing county offices for themselves before the end of Elizabeth's reign, would destroy the contention that Sussex was a remarkably conservative county. If indeed, as many as 39% of the Elizabethan office-holding gentry under consideration were not resident in the county before the 16th century, length of association with the district would seem to have had little to do with tenure of county
offices, or, for that matter, with social prestige.

However, closer investigation indicates a different conclusion, and one that is complementary to the theme of the previous chapter. There it was suggested that some, at least, of the leading Elizabethan office-holding families owed much of their prestige to their very long standing in the county. Here it will be shown that a very high proportion of those who held the leading positions in the county, namely the posts of Deputy Lieutenant, county member or sheriff, for example, - belonged to families long connected with Sussex. Indeed, study of the lists of Deputy Lieutenants, county members and sheriffs shows a marked tendency for these offices to be monopolised by a few families which were strongly rooted in the county - and that it was apparently very exceptional for an "outsider" or a "newcomer" to acquire such positions for himself.

To be more precise, six individuals held office as Deputy Lieutenants at one time or another under Elizabeth, all of them Sussex men whose families were well-established in the county before 1500. Of these, the families of Covert, Palmer, Parker, Pelham and Sackville were settled in Sussex as early as the fourteenth century, and the family of Shirley

3. See Appendix 2 and Appendix 6.
of Wiston had property in the county at that time even though they do not appear to have resided there until the late 15th century.

Of those who represented Sussex as county members of Parliament under Elizabeth it is true that two were "outsiders" - namely Henry Neville Esquire of Billingbear in Berkshire who sat in 1588, and Charles Howard, 2nd son of Baron Howard of Effingham who sat in 1601. But these had powerful connections: Henry Neville was distantly related to Lord Abegavenny and owned the important Sussex house of Mayfield between 1579 and 1597 by virtue of his marriage to Sir Thomas Gresham's niece; Charles Howard's father, although a Surrey man, was Lord Lieutenant of Sussex from 1585 on, and Charles Howard himself was knighted in May, 1603 as "of Sheffield, Sussex".

Apart from these two individuals, Sussex was represented in the various Parliaments of Elizabeth's reign by eleven different persons. These eleven persons were drawn from only nine different families since Sir Richard Sackville sat in 1559 and 1563 and his grandson Robert in 1584, 1593, 1597 and 1601; also John Pelham sat in 1571 and his brother Thomas in 1586.

4. See Appendix 3.
7. See Appendix 1.
8. D.N.B.
9. See Appendix 3.
All of these 9 families appear to have been resident in Sussex before 1500, including the Shirleys of Wiston, the Jefferays of Chiddingly, and the Carylls of Warnham, while the majority are known to have been settled in the county even before 1400, namely the families of Covert, Dawtrey, Palmer, Parker, Pelham and Sackville.

Similarly, even the office of sheriff, though onerous and financially exacting, was not often held by newcomers to the county. It should, perhaps, be pointed out at this juncture that down to November, 1567, one sheriff was chosen for the counties of Surrey and Sussex jointly, and again from November, 1571 to the end of the reign, but that during the interval each county had its own sheriff. So that before November, 1567, and after November, 1571, a Surrey man was sometimes appointed, as for example in November, 1561, John Stydolff esquire, or in 1579, Sir William Moore.

Altogether, 18 Sussex families contributed one or more sheriffs during the reign, and sometimes even the same individual held this office twice. For instance, Thomas Bishop of Parham Esquire was appointed in November, 1584, and again in December, 1601; Walter Covert was appointed in November, 1583, and November, 1592, and his father had held the office from November, 1514; Henry Goring was sheriff in

10. See Appendix 4; also Statutes of the Realm, iv, 499 + 557
11. The years when a Surrey man was appointed sheriff were Nov., 1561, John Stydolff; Nov., 1574, John Read; Nov., 1575, Richard Polsted; Nov., 1579, Sir William Moore;
November, 1562, and November, 1569, and his brother George in November, 1578; Nicholas Parker was sheriff in November, 1586, and November, 1593; poor Herbert Pelham who seems to have had a most unfortunate career and who eventually went bankrupt, was twice charged with this office - in April 1576, and again in November, 1590. Moreover, he had run into serious trouble with the Privy Council early in 1582 and was even imprisoned in the Marshalsea for a month and two days for having refused the office a few months previously, and his cousin, Edmund Pelham the Lawyer, also fell foul of the Council for defending him with "boldness and offence". Herbert Pelham's father, Anthony, had, incidentally, also been sheriff in the last year of his life from November 1565 to 1566. The senior branch of the family, the Pelhams of Laughton, also twice held this office during Elizabeth's reign, - John Pelham from November, 1571, and his brother, Thomas who eventually succeeded him, in November, 1589.

11. contd.


12. See S.A.C., viii, 209 and W. Murdin: State Papers, (1755) 371-2; H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, ii. 502; See also Section III for notes on the Pelham family.

13. See Appendix 4, and Section III for notes on the Pelham family.
These facts suggest that although the office of sheriff was by no means universally coveted and that evidently individual gentlemen sometimes had this greatness thrust upon them, none the less, it was not readily disposed of among insignificant persons who might have enjoyed its prestige without being able to discharge its responsibilities. Indeed, a study of the list of sheriffs of Sussex, and of Surrey and Sussex jointly under Elizabeth shows that while, during the reign, there were 33 appointments of Sussex residents to the shrievalty either of Sussex or of Surrey and Sussex, and these appointments were distributed between 27 different persons, nevertheless only 18 families were involved.

Of these 18, one family is outside the scope of this study as being extinct in Sussex by 1580. Of the 17 remaining, 9 families were resident in Sussex before 1400, 5 more at least before 1500, leaving only 3 who seem to have been newcomers since the beginning of the 16th century.

Evidently the length of residence of his family in Sussex had at least something to do with a man's chances of occupying high office in the Elizabethan period. In exceptional cases, wealth and contacts might enable a newcomer

14. See Appendix 4. The Pelhams held office on 5 occasions and the Coverts and Gorings on 3, while the Bishopps, Carylls, Culpeppers, Greshams, Parkers, Palmers and Shirleys each did so twice. In fact it appears that those families which bore the burden of the shrievalty only once during this period, were in a minority.

15. i.e. Gresham of Mayfield. See note attached to Appendix 4.

to become a sheriff and very occasionally a county seat might go to an outsider, but as a rule Deputy Lieutenants, knights of the shire, and even sheriffs, were drawn from families long associated with and resident in the county. Newcomers might obtain a place on the Commission of the Peace if they achieved sufficient weight, but only time and steady success could raise them higher.

The fact that nearly 40% of the 70 office-holding families under review were new to Sussex in the 16th century, is quite compatible with the view that the county was still a stronghold of conservatism under Elizabeth. By the early 17th century indeed, as will be shown, some of the "new" families were beginning to enter high county offices and to profit by the Crown's prodigality in creating titles, but under Elizabeth, hardly any were able to enter the charmed circle of important office-holders, that is to say of Deputy Lieutenants, county member's of Parliament & sheriffs. That circle was a remarkably small one. Examination of the lists of Deputy Lieutenants, county members and sheriffs under Elizabeth, shows a marked tendency for all these offices to be monopolised by the same few families. In fact, leaving aside the two "alien" county members, Henry Neville and Charles Howard, and also William Gresham of Mayfield who was sheriff in 1563 and 1576 but who had no male heir resident in Sussex in 1580, together with all the

17. e.g. see section III for notes on families of Bowyer of N. Mundham; & Bishopp.
18. see Appendix 3.
sheriffs who were Surrey men, - altogether there were only 19 families between whom all these offices were shared out during the whole of the Elizabethan period.

For example, the families of Covert, Palmer, Parker, Pelham and Shirley of Wiston, were represented among the occupants of all these offices as well as on the Commission of the Peace; others such as the Carylls, the Dawtreys and the Sackvilles held at least two of the more senior offices in addition to that of J.P. at some time during the reign.

It would seem then, that either a small proportion of the Sussex gentry families stood head and shoulders above their fellows in social prestige and were able to secure for themselves something approaching a monopoly of the more honourable county offices, or else, at least in the case of the Deputy Lieutenantship and the office of sheriff, only a few families were considered by the government to be capable of the responsibilities involved and sufficiently reliable to bear them. There is indeed, evidence that existing authority, whether in affairs ecclesiastical or secular, was sometimes hard put to it to find sufficient staunch and thoroughly reliable supporters in Sussex among the gentry to entrust them with the execution of its policy.

19. See note on Gresham attached to Appendix 4; also supra, note 11 on Surrey men who were Sheriffs for both counties.
20. Appendix 5.
21. ibid.
22. e.g. see P.R.O. S.P. 12/165, no.22.
It is, of course, a truism that a long association with and residence in the county was not, in itself, enough to ensure that a family would hold important office there in the Elizabethan period. The Ernleys, for example, appear to have been connected with the manor of that name, near Chichester, since at least the 13th century, and in 1519 one of their number became Chief Justice of Common Pleas. Yet this family was not represented among the office-holders of any rank higher than that of J.P. under Elizabeth. Similarly, the family of Lunsford, though described by Horsfield as "one of the oldest in the county", having been settled in the parish of Etchingham, according to some authorities, since before the Conquest, reached no higher dignity in the Elizabethan period. Other examples are provided by the families of Selwyn, Bartellot, Lewkenor and Shelley, some of which had enjoyed considerable prestige and wielded much influence in earlier times, and all of which, like the Ernleys and the Lunsfords were settled in Sussex before the beginning of the 15th century. The Bartellots, for instance, had occupied county seats in Parliament several times between the mid 14th century and Elizabeth's accession; and more illustrious than they in the later middle ages, were the great Sussex family of Lewkenor. If wealth, long

23. B.&C., 46.
24. Horsfield, op. cit., 1359; S.A.C., 111, 222; vi, 77; xxiv, 19.
25. See Appendix 6.
residence in the county, alliances with most of the other great Sussex families, the multiplication of family branches and a long record of public service were anything to go by, a prophet living in about 1500 might well have been forgiven for presaging a dazzling future for the family in the course of the next century. But for one reason or another, the Lewkenors did not scale the heights of power in the county during Elizabeth's reign. During that period, not one of them was numbered among the knights of the shire, the Deputy Lieutenants or even among the sheriffs.

Clearly, while some Sussex families had a brilliant past to recommend them for high county office, certain other qualities were necessary, one of which apparently was the sacrifice of time and probably also of money. Sir Richard Lewkenor, for example, the successful lawyer who was also the head of the most prominent branch of his family under Elizabeth, seems to have found it difficult enough to combine his London practice with the retention of his seat at Chichester, let alone attempting the capture of, for instance, a county seat. He and his brother Thomas were said in the report on the J.P.'s in 1587 to execute between them practically all the duties of the Commission of the Peace in Chichester Rape. Yet this fact was recorded with regret because it was said that they both had leanings towards recusancy. This remark may have been an exaggeration but

27. See notes on the Lewkenor family, ibid. Section III.
perhaps it contained a grain of truth. In Elizabethan Sussex, particularly in West Sussex, it was not only the staunch Catholics who were suspect, but their friends and ostensibly conforming relatives as well.

Religion was naturally one of the great barriers excluding from high county office some of the oldest and hitherto most influential Sussex families, as for example, the Ashburnhams and the Shelleys. Yet the local prestige of these recusant families slowly built up over the centuries was not destroyed in a moment by the Tudors. Although excluded from county office, financially bled and relentlessly harried by the authorities in Church and State, the persistency of the attacks upon them is a measure of their continuing influence and of the anxiety that they caused.

Further reference to recusancy among the Sussex gentry under Elizabeth must be reserved for a later section of this thesis, but for the moment it may be observed that its strength, which cannot possibly be measured, may help to account for the apparently extreme shortage of suitable

29. S.A.C., ii., 58.
30. ibid.
31. B.M. Harl. MS, 703, f. 69.
32. See Section III for notes on these families.
candidates among the old families for first class county office. Many of the old gentry families were suspect, if not proscribed, by the central government and its agents on religious grounds, and while they might be tolerated as J.P.'s were trusted no further. At the same time, local tradition had not yet been sufficiently broken down for the really new "immigrant" families to be accepted as more than J.P.'s except in unusual circumstances.

Of those 37 families which have been described as "immigrant" after 1400, a very large proportion seem to have settled in Sussex in the later 16th century. It has already been estimated that 9 families were newcomers to the county in the 15th century and some 28 in the 16th century. Of the latter group, only about 10 appear to have taken up residence in Sussex much before the mid-century though many families had property in the county long before they came to live there. This does, as one would expect, suggest that during the 16th century the gentry were tending to become increasingly mobile as a class, though naturally an allowance must be made for the fact that it is with Elizabethan families only that this study is concerned so that those who had immigrated in, for example, the 15th century or early 16th century and had died out, would not be accounted for in this analysis.

33. e.g. Browne, Viscount Montague; Ford; Gage; Garton; Gounter; Marvin; Onley; Scott; Sharpe; Spelman. See Appendix 6 and Section III on these families.
It is perhaps of some interest to discover where these new families hailed from and, as far as possible, to show what brought them to Sussex.

Of those 9 families which settled in Sussex sometime during the 15th century, 3 came from Kent, namely the Culpeppers, the Darrells and the Mays, but some of the others were from counties much further afield. For example, the ancestor of the Bowyers who were settled at North Mundham came in Elizabeth's reign, to Sussex in the early 15th century from Staffordshire; the Morley family came from Lancashire; the Wiston Shirleys came from Warwickshire, and the Porters from Nottinghamshire. Of the Carylls, it is suggested by their family historian, M. Tranqualeon, that they were descended from the ancient and powerful landed family of O'Carroll of Ireland, who had been great magnates there for centuries, and that their first ancestor to settle in England was one Nicholas Caryll who resided at Benton nr West Grinstead in the mid 15th century.

Most of these families, which settled in Sussex in the 15th century, seem to have done so as the result of a marriage to a Sussex heiress. The property which these marriages brought, sometimes furnished an estate for a younger son of a family already well established.

and continuing to flourish elsewhere, as for example in the case of the Morleys of Glynde, the Darrells of Scotney, or the Culpeppers of Wakehurst.

The Morleys were originally a Lancashire family whose pedigree has been traced back to one Richard Morley of Morley in Lancashire, who was living in Edward III, and who married Margaret, daughter and heiress of Gilbert Winnington of Lancashire. It was by the marriage of a younger son of this family in the 15th century, Nicholas Morley, that the Morleys became established in Sussex. He married Joane, 2nd daughter and heiress of Sir John Walleys, knight, of Glynde, which manor Nicholas acquired from his father-in-law by fine in 1461. The Walleys, incidentally, were an old Sussex family who had been settled in the county, according to Berry and Comber, some six generations before this.

The Darrells of Scotney in Sussex were a younger branch of the Kentish Darrells, both lines having been founded by John Darrell who came, according to Berry and Comber, from Yorkshire, and settled at Calehill in Kent in the early 15th century, dying in October, 1438. From his first marriage descended the Darrells of Calehill, Kent, while from his second, to Florence, daughter of William

35. See notes on these families, Section III.
36. B.&C., 173.
37. See also S.A.C., vi, 81.
38. B.&C., loc.cit.; see also S.A.C., xviii, 13-14.
40. B.&C., 165.
Chichele of Higham-Ferrers in Northamptonshire, and niece of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, descend the Darrells of Scotney, Sussex. On her marriage to John Darrell, Henry Chichele, the Archbishop, gave his niece the manor of Scotney in the parish of Lamberhurst, which he had acquired in the early 15th century from the Ashburnhams. The manor of Scotney, which is partly in Kent, thus came into the Darrell family and remained in their possession until the 18th century.

Similarly, the family of Culpepper of Wakehurst, a fairly prominent family in Elizabethan Sussex, was founded by the younger son of an important Kentish family who succeeded in making away with a Sussex heiress. Sir John Culpepper of Bayhall, Kent, of Hardreshull, Warwickshire and of Bedgbury in Goudhurst, Kent, who died in 1480, had two younger brothers, Richard and Nicholas. These two found a spectacular solution to the perennial problem of younger sons by abducting the two heiresses of the Wakehurst family who had been placed in the care of their elder brother and of Agnes his wife. The two young ladies were seized and carried off to London, but their dowers were less easily captured for their grandmother, Elizabeth Wakehurst, would not surrender the title deeds of their estates which she held in safe custody.

41. ibid; also Horsfield, op.cit., i, 411.
42. Horsfield, loc.cit.
It was only after much litigation that a peaceable settlement was eventually made. Richard Culpepper who married Margaret, daughter of Richard and Agnes Wakehurst of Ardingly, died in 1516 without heirs. But Nicholas who married Elizabeth, her sister, had ten sons and eight daughters, and became ancestor of the Culpeppers of Wakehurst. It was his great-great-grandson, Sir Edward Culpepper who held the Wakehurst estates in 1580 as a youth of 18.  

Sometimes this sort of migration did not take place immediately after a fortunate marriage had brought property to a family. For instance, Sir Hugh Shirley of Eatington in Warwickshire, had married a Sussex heiress in the early 15th century, Beatrix de Braose. In this way he acquired the Sussex manors of Wiston, Ashhurst, West Chiltington, Heene, Slaughters and Erringham. Their grandson, Ralph, who died in 1466, married three times, first, Margaret, daughter and heiress of Thomas Staunton of Staunton-Harold, from whom descended the elder line, the Shirleys of Eatington and Shirley; secondly Elizabeth Blount, daughter of Sir John Blount and sister of Walter, Lord Mountjoy, from whom descended the Shirleys of Wiston; and thirdly Lucy, daughter of Sir John Ashton. The Shirleys had now for several years

43. S.A.C., xlvi, 47 et seqq; x. 152.
44. B.&C., 172; S.A.C., v, 8 et seqq.
generations been lords of Wiston, but they had not resided there. After the death of Ralph Shirley however, in 1466, his estates were partitioned, the Sussex and Buckinghamshire manors being allotted to the son of the second marriage, namely another Ralph, who then settled at Wiston.

Sometimes marriage to a Sussex heiress caused not merely the foundation of a cadet branch to a family continuing to flourish elsewhere, but the migration of the family itself. This happened in the 15th century, for example, in the case of the family of May. John May of Kennington, Kent, married a Sussex woman, Alice, daughter of one Shoyswell of the parish of Etchingham. Their son, Richard, settled at Wadhurst, a few miles North West of Etchingham and his son, Thomas, left a will dated at Wadhurst, 14th August, 1500. It was in the next generation that the Mays acquired the property of Pashley in Ticehurst parish, approximately between Etchingham and Wadhurst, where they were resident in Elizabeth's reign.

The 28 families which migrated to Sussex in the 16th century are, perhaps, of more immediate interest to the Elizabethan historian. These prove to have come from many

45. S.A.C., v, 8 et seqq.
46. B. & C., 36.
47. ibid., and PCC. 16 Moone.
48. V.C.H. Sussex., ix, 255.
different counties, some of them quite remote. There were, for instance, migrants from the far North like the family of Bishopp, originally from Yorkshire, or of Stanley, originally from Cumberland, — in addition to the noble families of Percy, Earls of Northumberland who, until the later 16th century, resided mainly at Alnwick; and the Lumleys who came south from Durham. From the West country came the families of Gage and of Poole of Gloucestershire, of Gounter from Wales, and Henry Barkeley of Bolney who apparently had migrated from Herefordshire. Some came from East Anglia, namely the family of Fortescue from Essex and the Spelmans of Norfolk; and Philip, Earl of Arundel moved to Sussex from Kenninghall, the Norfolk home of the Howards, only when he inherited his title from Henry Fitzalan in 1580. Naturally however, the majority of the newcomers were from other southern counties, particularly from Surrey, whence six of them came and Kent whence four migrated. Two came from London,

49. See notes on family of Percy, Appendix Section III.
53. See notes, Section III, on Barkeley.
54. See notes, Section III, on Howard family.
55. From Surrey, families of Agmondsham; Browne, Viscounts Montague; Churcher; Eversfield; Ford; Stoughton. From Kent, families of Leech; Roberts; Scott; Sharpe.
namely the founders of the Sussex families of Garton and Casie, both of whom were merchants, two from Oxfordshire, one from Hampshire, and one from Wiltshire.

An analysis of the motives which seem to have brought these families to settle in the county during the 16th century shows that they were considerably varied. Naturally the marriages of outsiders to Sussex heiresses continued to bring in fresh blood, and this was happening simultaneously at all levels among the gentry. At the top, it might be observed that it was his marriage to one of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel's daughters and coheiresses that brought John, Baron Lumley, south and influenced him to make his main residence at Stanstead in West Sussex, not far from Arundel.

Again, it was by marriage that the Howards established a connection with the Fitzalans which ultimately brought Philip Howard the Castle and Earldom of Arundel. It was his marriage to one of the two daughters and coheirresses of Edmund Ford of Harting, Sussex, which brought Francis Fortescue of Fawkesborne, Essex, to settle there for a few years. Similarly, Richard Sharpe of Northiam, father of the Elizabethan J.P., had originally lived at Benenden, Kent,

56. See notes on their families in Section III.
57. From Co.Oxon; Barentyne and Blount; from Hants., Onley; from Wilts., Marvin.
58. See notes on family of Lumley in Section III.
59. See notes on Howard family, Section III.
60. See notes on Fortescue family, Section III.
but he moved to Sussex soon after his marriage with Alice, daughter of Nicholas Tufton Esquire of Northiam; Henry Barkeley, the legal scholar of New College, Oxford, and Fellow of that College from 1554 to 1568 had originally resided in Hereford, but he somehow became acquainted with a Sussex widow, a woman of property, one Anne, daughter of John Ashburnham, already twice married, and on 27th August 1572 he became her 3rd husband. She had married as the first, John Bolney of Bolney Esquire, and it was through her life claim on the manor of Bolney that the supposedly poor scholar had a temporary interest in this Sussex property.

Others who might be cited as having been brought to Sussex by the acquisition of property there through marriage, are the family of Agmondesham of Petworth, a younger branch of a Surrey family; Drew Barentyne, whose father, Sir William Barentyne of Oxfordshire, married, as his third wife, a daughter and coheirress of Sir Roger Lewkenor of Dedisham and Bodiam, Sussex; George Casie, citizen and grocer of London, who married Jane Bowyer, one of the Bowyers of North Mundham near Chichester; the family of Drew who acquired their property of Densworth in Funtingdon in West

61. See notes on Sharpe family, Section III.
62. " " " Barkeley family, " "
63. ibid.
64. ibid.
65. See notes on the Agmondesham family, Section III.
66. See notes on family of Casie, Section III.
Sussex by the marriage of Roger Drew to Dorothy, daughter and heiress of Elias Bradshaw who had come by it in 1542; and that of Poole of Ditchling, Henry Poole, a younger son of a Gloucestershire family having married Margaret, daughter of George, 3rd Lord Abergavenny, who probably had property there.

But there were other ways of acquiring lands in Sussex in the 16th century, notably by Crown grants, - sometimes, but not necessarily, of monastic property following the Dissolution; by outright purchase; by the munificence of a noble patron, or simply by inheritance.

Examples of 'new' families which owed their main Sussex properties to Crown grants were those of Blount of Dedisham, Browne, later Viscounts Montague, Marvin of Rogate and Stoughton of West Stoke. Neither the manor of Dedisham nor that of West Stoke appears to have been monastic, and the Crown 'grant' may have been other than outright purchase, - but Sir Edmund Marvin, father of the Sussex J.P., Henry Marvin, and himself a younger son of a leading Wiltshire family, obtained from Henry VIII in 1544/5 the grant of the site of Durford Abbey, near Rogate, which became the family seat of the Marvins. The Brownes, eventually Viscounts Montague, also seem to have owed their

67. See notes on family of Drew, Section III.
68. See notes on family of Poole, Section III.
69. See notes on family of Blount, Section III.
70. See notes on family of Marvin, Section III.
first connections with Sussex to the grant by Henry VIII of former monastic property there, most notably of Battle Abbey in 30 Henry VIII though their subsequent residence at Cowdray, Midhurst, came to them by inheritance from the Fitzwilliam family.

Among the families which acquired Sussex lands by outright purchase, sometimes for a younger son who was to be established with an estate of his own, were those of Churcher of Stoke-juxta-Guildford, — of whom a younger branch, settled at Chiddingly, Sussex, — of Ford of Kingston, Surrey, who bought property in Harting, or of Spelman who bought property at Hartfield, or Onley.

It is not always clear why such purchases were made, but sometimes they seem to have been the result of a connection with a noble patron who either resided or had property in Sussex and who may have rewarded his client or member of his household by making such an acquisition in the neighbourhood possible. This seems the obvious explanation of Thomas Stanley's purchase of the manor of Lee in Fittleworth, near Petworth, in 1589, a few months before he

71. See notes on the Browne family, Section III.
72. ibid.
73. See notes on family of Churcher, Section III.
74. " " " " " Ford, " "
75. " " " " " Spelman, " "
76. " " " " " Onley, " "
77. S.R.S., xix, 265.
retired from the stewardship of the household of the Earl of Northumberland; and also of Stanley's migration from Cumberland, his original home. Indeed, noble patrons seem to have accounted for the immigration of more than one gentry family during the 15th and 16th centuries, others being the families of Gounter, of Leech, of Stoughton, and of Poole. The ancestor of the Bowyers of North Mundham too, originally of Staffordshire, was a steward to one of the Earls of Northumberland who had extensive lands in Sussex, and seems to have come south by reason of his employment.

Finally, there were families which had had property in the county for generations but did not take up residence there until the 16th century, and then apparently for a variety of reasons. The Percies, for example, had held property in Sussex for centuries, but until Elizabeth's reign appear to have resided primarily at Alnwick. By the later 16th century however, the situation of Petworth seems to have made it preferable to them as their main country residence. The families, too, of Roberts and of Scott held property in Sussex.

---
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from the early 15th century, but it was not until the 16th century that younger sons of these families settled there.

... ...

It has already been noted that in spite of the settlement in Sussex in the 16th century of a considerable number of gentry families from elsewhere, nevertheless only very few of them attained positions of primary importance among the local county office-holders. Leaving aside the two noble families of Browne, Viscounts Montague, and Lumley, whose representatives in the Elizabethan period were each at sometime Lords Lieutenant of the county, there were only three 'new' families who were newcomers since the beginning of the 16th century and who also secured county office under Elizabeth of a higher rank than that of J.P. These were the families of Bishopp, Eversfield and Leech, - each of which supplied a sheriff at some time during the reign. All three individuals concerned were apparently men of some means, an undoubted qualification for an Elizabethan sheriff, and this may go some way towards explaining their recruitment.

Thomas Bishopp Esquire, later a knight and eventually a baronet, who was sheriff of Surrey and Sussex from 1584 to 1585 and from 1601 to 1602, was apparently of Yorkshire stock. His grandfather had come south and died leaving a son, Thomas, who settled first at Ayott in Hertfordshire, and

86. See notes on families of Roberts and Scott, Section III.
87. V. Supra., 67-8.
later at Henfield in Sussex, where he was buried on the 6th January, 1559/60. This son is listed among the Sussex J.P.'s for 1559. His wife was Elizabeth, supposedly the natural daughter of Sir Edward Belknap, Privy Councillor to Henry VII, by one Elizabeth Barclay. It was this Thomas Bishopp's son, also Thomas, apparently his only child, who became a Sussex J.P. in 1578, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in November 1584 and December 1601, and who was knighted in 1603, and made a baronet in 1624. It was he too who bought Parham, one of the leading Elizabethan country houses in Sussex, from the Palmers. The sources of Thomas Bishopp's wealth and influence are somewhat mysterious. His father seems to have had no prominent family connections in Sussex and neither of Thomas' own two marriages was into a Sussex family. But it is perhaps significant that Thomas himself had been a minor at his father's death and that he became a ward of Sir Richard Sackville, father of the future Lord Buckhurst, and one of the wealthiest and most influential men in Sussex. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and at the Inner Temple and it is just possible that he subsequently made a fortune as a "money-lender." He remains an interesting exception to the rule that parvenus seldom rose to the heights of influence in Elizabethan Sussex. In the

89. B. & C. 213. For references concerning the following paragraph, see notes on family of Bishopp, Section III.
next generation his second son and heir, Edward, also a minor at his father's death, became sheriff in 1635, governor of Arundel Castle in 1643, and married a daughter of Nicholas Tufton, Earl of Thanet.

Richard Leech Esquire of Fletching, who was sheriff in 1595-'6, and had been a J.P. from 1589 onwards, was of obscure origins. He appears to have been born in the parish of Smeth, Kent, but of unknown parents. He may have been a descendant of the family of Leech of Derbyshire. He is described in the Wilson MSS by a contemporary as "a Sussex gentleman of good fortune, having large estates in Kent, Hampshire, Surrey and Sussex, and whose town house was in Coleman Street." It seems likely that he, like Thomas Bishopp, owed his wealth and standing in Sussex, partly at least, to the Sackville family, for in his will he referred to "the right honourable, my very good lord, the Lord Buckhurst and the Lady Buckhurst, his wife", acknowledging his gratitude to them for all they had done for him and his, and referring to his own gifts to Lord Buckhurst's sons.

In February, 1574, he was listed among the iron founders of Sussex as the manager of a forge belonging to Lord Buckhurst in Fletching; he was also questioned about the consumption of timber for ironworks in the manor of Framfield.

90. See notes on family of Leech, Section III.
He appears to have resided at Sheffield in Fletching, and in the late 1580's and 1590's to have been busy purchasing property for himself in Sussex. He appears to have married twice and to have had only one child, Elizabeth, who predeceased him. But, had he left a male heir, it seems likely that the name of Leech would have been of some consequence in 17th century Sussex.

Thomas Eversfield Esquire, later a knight, of Denne in Horsham, who became sheriff in December, 1599, is one more example, certainly exceptional in Sussex, of the successful Elizabethan capitalist entrepreneur whose wealth opened for him the doors to political and social influence closed to many older and better established families. His grandfather, Nicholas Eversfield of Poyle, Surrey, whose will was proved in July, 1552, is the first of his forbears of whom anything certain is known, and he was a man owning considerable properties in Sussex as well as in Surrey. By his wife, Joanna, of unknown family, he left a son and heir, John, who settled at Worth in North Sussex, not far from Horsham, and married one, Bridget, also of unknown family, by whom he had two sons, the elder being the future Sir Thomas Eversfield of Denne, Horsham. This John Eversfield of Worth was an ironmaster and was named among the owners of ironworks in Sussex, Surrey and Kent of February, 1574. He was

91. For all references connected with this paragraph - see notes on the family of Eversfield, Section III.
apparently a man of means since, for example, he was among the 15 contributors out of the 108 in Sussex who subscribed £100 towards the loan for Defence in 1588. This was the highest rate of assessment adopted in Sussex. In 1604, his son bought the Denne property in Horsham from Stephen Barnham of London and his sons for £5,500. The mansion, which is on the south side of Horsham, stands in a deer park, and was probably erected by the Eversfields shortly after their acquisition of the property. In the early 17th century the Eversfields were marrying into some of the leading county families and occupying the shirealty and seats in Parliament.

In conclusion, it might be said that while a considerable number of families migrated to or sprang up in Sussex during the 16th century, being brought there by the acquisition of property through marriage, or through a Crown grant, or following in the wake of a noble family which took up residence in that county, - or perhaps even simply by investing money made in the City in a country estate, - few of the newcomers had won for themselves any outstanding political influence in Sussex before the end of Elizabeth's reign, and those who did, appear to have owed that influence either to their connection with the Sackvilles, or to their worldly wealth, if not to both. The meteoric rise of Sir Thomas Bishopp from obscurity and the less spectacular but equally interesting career of Richard Leech of Fletching
are both indicative of the power of the Sackvilles in Elizabethan Sussex, and at the same time suggest one reason for the unpopularity of the Sackvilles among some of the old Sussex families of whatever political or religious complexion.

But, generally speaking, it was not until the 17th century that even the most prosperous newcomers were able thoroughly to establish themselves. It was under the early Stuarts that the Bishopps of Parham, the Bowyers of Leythorne in North Mundham, the Eversfields of Dehne, the Gartons of Billingshurst and Woollavington, and the Mays of Burwash and of Ticehurst reached the heights of their influence in the county. All of these new families owed their rise primarily to their economic success. In the 16th century they were still laying the foundations of their prosperity. In the 17th century they reaped some of its rewards.

92. See notes on these families, Section III.
CHAPTER III

The homes of the gentry.

In the first two chapters an attempt was made to consider the 70 selected families against their earlier historical background so that some tentative conclusions might be drawn as to how representative they were of the older and newer types of gentry respectively. It is perhaps also both interesting and relevant to study their geographical distribution over the county as a whole during the reign of Elizabeth, so that some estimates may be formed as to how representative these office-holding families were of their county on a geographical basis. Further, to obtain more precise results, lists of office-holders, whether Deputy Lieutenants, county members, sheriffs or J.P's, for particular years have also been tabulated according to the Rapes where they resided. From these investigations certain facts emerge.

To begin with, of the 70 selected families, 11 of which had one subsidiary office-holding branch and 3 of which had two subsidiary branches thus totalling 87 families or

1. I.e. families of Apsley; Ashburnham; Caryll; Culpepper; Gage; Goring; May; Palmer; Shelley; Shirley; Shurley.
2. I.e. families of Lewkenor; Pelham; Sackville.
branches of families in all, 17 are classified as having resided in Chichester Rape, 14 in Arundel Rape, 9 in Bramber Rape, 14 in Lewes Rape, 16 in Pevensey Rape and 17 in Hastings Rape. Seven of these 87 families or family branches however, moved from one Rape to another in the course of the Elizabethan period or early in James I's reign, but even allowing for these changes it is true to say that the greatest number of office-holding gentry families of the group selected resided either in Chichester Rape or Hastings Rape; that nearly as many resided in Pevensey, Arundel and Lewes Rapes respectively; while Bramber Rape contained rather fewer.

Generally speaking however, the distribution of the 70

3. See Appendix 7.

4. Bishopp, from Henfield, Bramber Rape, to Parham, Arundel Rape; Caryll from Shipley, Bramber Rape to Harting, Chichester, Rape; Colbrand from Worminghurst, Bramber Rape to Chichester; Eversfield from Worth, Lewes Rape, to Horsham, Bramber Rape; Churcher from Chiddingly, Pevensey Rape to Slinfold, Arundel Rape; Porter from Battle, Hastings Rape to Cuckfield, Lewes Rape; Pelham from Buckstepe, Hastings Rape to Hellingly, Pevensey Rape.

5. See Appx. 7: - 17 in Chichester Rape & 19 when Caryll of Shipley had moved to Harting, and Colbrand of Worminghurst had moved to Chichester; 17 in Hastings Rape until the Porter family of Battle moved away to Cuckfield in Lewes Rape, & the Pelhams of Buckstepe moved to Hellingly, Pevensey Rape.

6. See Appx. 7: - 16 in Pevensey Rape until the Churchers moved from Chiddingly to Slinfold in Arundel Rape. However, the Pelhams of Buckstepe, Hastings Rape moved to Hellingly, Pevensey Rape. 14 in Arundel Rape & 16 when the Bishopps of Henfield, Bramber Rape moved to Parham, Arundel Rape, and when the Churchers moved from Chiddingly, Pevensey Rape, to Slinfold, Arundel Rape. Lewes Rape contained 14 families as a fairly constant figure, for while the Eversfield moved away from Worth in that Rape, the Porters, originally of Battle, Hastings Rape, had come to settle in Cuckfield.
office-holding families and their relevant branches over the six Rapes was not markedly uneven and one may presume that a gentleman's place of residence in the county had a good deal to do with determining his selection or rejection as a candidate for the Commission of the Peace if he were a borderline case.

This supposition is supported by a comment in the report on the Sussex J.P's which was compiled in 1587, apparently by the Justices of Assize for the South Eastern Circuit. In this, the reason given for the exclusion of Mr. Anthony Shirley from the Commission of the Peace at the previous assize was "because his brother is in" and that there were sufficient J.P's in that Rape, i.e. Bramber Rape, already.

The distribution of the 70 selected families and their subsidiary lines over the six Rapes has been considered; but

7. See Appx. 7:— Bramber Rape contained 9 families before the Bishopps moved from Henfield in that Rape to Parham, Arundel Rape; before the Carylls of Shipley, Bramber Rape moved to Harting, Chichester Rape; before Colbrand of Worminghurst, Bramber Rape moved to Chichester; and also before the Eversfields of Worth in Lewes Rape came to settle in Horsham, Bramber Rape.

8. B.M. Lansd. MS. 53, art. 80., f. 165. But see my note on this in the relevant family history, section III, sub "Sir Anthony Shirley".
a more exact picture of the extent to which geography dictated the incidence of office will be obtained by an examination of the lists of office-holders for particular years, accompanied by an investigation into their places of residence.

Of the Deputy Lieutenants, Sir Walter Covert, who held office from 1569 to at least the end of the reign, resided in Lewes Rape; his colleague, Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston, who held office until 1601, resided in Bramber Rape; and Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham, Deputy Lieutenant from 1569 until his death in 1582, and Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering, Deputy Lieutenant from 1585 on, were both of Arundel Rape, though the latter of these two is noted as having resided at Blackwall from 1591 at least, so that he was by then no longer very effective in Sussex. The two additional Deputy Lieutenants who were appointed towards the end of the reign, Nicholas Parker of Ratton from 1591 on and Thomas Pelham of Laughton from 1601 on, were both of Pevensey Rape. 9.

It is reasonable to assume that this disposition of the various Elizabethan Deputy Lieutenants of Sussex over the four central Rapes of Arundel, Bramber, Lewes and Pevensey, 9. For all references concerning Deputy Lieutenants, see Appendix 2. For their distribution over the county, see Appendix 8.
was not entirely fortuitous. For the greater part of the reign, that is to say from 1569 on, the effective Deputy Lieutenants seem to have lived in different though adjacent Rapes, Sir Walter Covert in Lewes Rape, Sir Thomas Shirley, in office until 1601, in Bramber Rape, and Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham until 1582 followed by Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering until approximately 1591 in Arundel Rape, while Nicholas Parker who was appointed in 1591 was of Pevensey Rape. The chief of these Deputy Lieutenants, it would seem from perusal of the Covert Papers, was Sir Walter Covert, and his residence at Slaugham was conveniently central to the whole county.

For the county members for Sussex during the reign, the general custom seems to have been that one should be a resident of East and the other of West Sussex, though this arrangement was not invariably adhered to. Examples are found for the Parliaments of 1559, 1563, 1571, 1572, 1584 and 1593; but in 1586 the county was represented by Walter Covert of Slaugham in Lewes Rape and Thomas Pelham of Laughton in Pevensey Rape, both in East Sussex. In 1588 the two

---

10. B.M. Harl. MS., 703.
11. See Appendix 3.
12. See Appendix 9: 1559, John Caryll of Warnham, Bramber Rape & Richard Sackville of Buckhurst, Pevensey Rape; 1563, William Dawtrey of Petworth, Arundel Rape & Sir Richard Sackville of the same; 1571, Thomas Palmer, perhaps of Angmering, Arundel Rape, & John Pelham of Laughton, Pevensey Rape; 1572, Thomas Shirley of Wiston, Bramber Rape & John Jefferay of Chiddingly, Pevensey
county members were Henry Neville, a Berkshire man, who however, at that time, owned Mayfield in Pevensey Rape, and Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering in Arundel Rape. But in 1597 and again in 1601 the preponderance of influence seems to have veered Eastwards again; both the 1597 county members, Robert Sackville of Buckhurst and Sir Nicholas Parker of Ratton, were residents of Pevensey Rape, while in 1601 Robert Sackville was seconded by Charles Howard, a Surrey man, who seems however to have owned property at that time in Sheffield, Pevensey Rape.

A study of those Elizabethan sheriffs for Sussex or for Surrey and Sussex jointly who were resident in Sussex suggests that they also were selected partly with a view to locality. For instance, of this long list of 33 appointments, only two were of residents of the most Easterly and Westerly Rapes of Chichester and Hastings,—namely James Colbrand of Chichester who became sheriff in 1598 and John Ashburnham of Ashburnham in Hastings Rape who became sheriff in 1602. Obviously it was inconvenient for a sheriff to be too remotely situated. For

12. cont. Rape followed in 1581 by Walter Covert of Slaugham, Lewes Rape; 1584, Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston, Bramber Rape & Robert Sackville of Buckhurst, Pevensey Rape; 1593, the same as in 1584.
13. See Appendix 3.
14. Ibid.
15. See Appendix 4.
the rest, the burden of this office seems to have been distributed fairly evenly among residents of the four remaining Rapes, with a tendency, at least until the end of the 1580's, for office-holders of Eastern and Western Rapes to alternate. Thereafter, the great majority of Sussex sheriffs came from the Eastern end of the county.

It remains to consider a few representative lists of J.P.'s for Sussex for selected years throughout the reign, and to discover how the duties of the Commission were shared out among the residents of the various Rapes.

Of the 37 lay Sussex residents on the Commission of the Peace for 1560 who had descendants living in Sussex in 1580 or were alive themselves, 6 lived in Chichester Rape, 6 in Arundel Rape, 3 in Bramber Rape, 5 in Lewes Rape, 10 in Pevensey Rape and 7 in Hastings Rape, so that 22 were of East and 15 of West Sussex.

In 1570 of the 23 lay Sussex residents on the Commission of the Peace, 4 resided in Chichester Rape, 4 in Arundel Rape, 2 in Bramber Rape, 4 in Lewes Rape, 7 in Pevensey Rape and 2 in Hastings Rape, so that 13 were of East Sussex and 10 of West Sussex.

---

16. See Appendix 10.
In the Hilary Term of 1580, of the 29 lay Sussex residents on the Commission of the Peace, 6 were of Chichester Rape, 5 of Arundel Rape, 4 of Bramber Rape, 4 of Lewes Rape, 7 of Pevensey Rape and 3 of Hastings Rape, — so that 15 were of West and 14 of East Sussex.

This approximate balance of numbers between East and West Sussex J.P.'s was maintained in 1590 since 13 were then resident in West Sussex and 16 in East Sussex, 6 being of Chichester Rape, 3 of Arundel Rape, 4 of Bramber Rape, and 6 of Lewes Rape, 7 of Pevensey Rape and 3 of Hastings Rape.

By the Hilary Term of 1600, the preponderant number of Sussex J.P.'s were drawn from the Western half of the county, the proportion being 19 to 14; 7 were of Chichester Rape, 7 of Arundel Rape, 5 of Bramber Rape, 4 of Lewes Rape, 5 of Pevensey Rape and 5 of Hastings Rape.

Nevertheless, it appears from the lists of sheriffs, of county members and even of new Deputy Lieutenants in the last decade of the reign, that the preponderance of political influence in the county was in the East. Some attempt will be made to account for this phenomenon in a subsequent part of

19. See Appx. 11, and P.R.O. Assize Rolls 35.22.1.S.E. Circuit.
20. " " " " " " " " 35.32 S.E. Circuit.
21. " " " " " " " " 35.42.1." " "

There are some divergences in the list on the 1600 Patent Roll P.R.O. C. 66/1523 but these are ignored here as the latter was compiled in May, 1600, several months later. (Edward Culpepper & James Colbrand are not on the Patent Roll though they are on the Assize Roll for Hilary 1600;
this thesis.

So far no attempt has been made to analyse the distribution of the office-holding gentry in Sussex except by Rapes. Obviously, however, something may be learned from an enquiry into the precise location of these families and their exact disposition in relation to one another.

If the 70 selected families and their relevant subsidiary branches alone are considered, numbering in all 87 family units, and their places of residence are plotted on a map of the county, it appears that, though fairly evenly disposed between the Eastern and Western extremities, few of them were situated in the strip of country running along the northern border. In fact, if a line were drawn parallel with this border and running from Rogate in the extreme West, through Petworth, Cuckfield, Fletching, Burwash, Salehurst and Northiam, the merest handful of these families would be found to have lived to the North of it. There were, it is true, the families of Blount of Dedisham, Churcher, later of Slinfold, Caryll of Warnham, Covert of Slaugham, Fenner of Crawley, Eversfield of Worth and later of Horsham, Sackville of Buckhurst in Withiam, Darrell of Wadhurst, May and Roberts of

contd.
Richard Lewknor junior, Stephen Barnham, Thomas May & Thomas Churcher, on the Patent Roll but not the Assize Roll.) are

22. V. infra, Part IV.
Ticehurst, and the two individual J.P.'s, Francis Spelman of Hartfield, and Drew Barentyne of Horsted Keynes; but these were scattered over a wide area, and wide tracts of country appear to have contained no administrative families according to the terms of selection used in this study. For example, the Hundreds of Rotherfield and East Grinstead in Pevensey Rape, contained none, neither did the area running East of Slinfold and on to the Hampshire border.

Prima facie it might seem that this northern borderline, an impoverished and wooded tract of country, probably visited by few except those occupied in forestry or the iron industry unless when travelling into or out of the county, would naturally have required less administrative attention than the more populous areas. But there are indications that the contrary was the case. It was, indeed, the more sparsely populated regions which were most likely to suffer from lawlessness and lack of governance, and the northern borderline seems to have been one of the most troublesome parts of the county. In a letter dated the 21st October, 1593, and addressed "To our very loving friends, the High Sheriff and the rest of the Justices of the Peace in the county of Sussex and to every of them, but especially those that border upon

23. See map.
the confines of the County of Surrey," the Privy Council complained:

"... whereas we are informed that there are divers lewd people, some of them being Horsemen and other vagrant persons and Rogues, that are gathered together in the Confines where the two Counties of Surrey and Sussex do meet and keeping in the woods do sett upon her Majesty's subjects and such as pass that way, and break also into houses committing also foul disorders, Burglaries and Robberies and gather more disordered people unto them, we canot but marvel yf this information be true, that you the Justices bordering upon the Confines do not take present order to suppress these wicked and lewd persons and therefore we require you without delay to enform yourselves of the truth hereof and that some of yourselves with such forces as you shall think convenient do repair to those places and take such order as they may all or the most part of them be apprehended, committed to prison and so proceeded withall as their most lewd disorders do deserve, least further mischief should ensue of this lewd beginning, wherein praying you to place some extraordinary care we bid you heartily farewell." 25.  

The truth seems to be that in some Rapes or districts it must have been very much harder than in others to find gentlemen of the right calibre to be entrusted with the reins of office. Study of the disposition of the selected office-holding families does suggest the very natural fact that they were frequently clustered together in groups of two and three, often in or near a small township. For example, Petworth was the home not only of the Earls of Northumberland but also of the Agmondeshams and the Dawtreys,
while Thomas Stanley, the retired steward of the 8th and 9th Earls of Northumberland, settled at Fittleworth nearby. Pulborough was the home of one branch of the Apsley family and also of the Onleys, while the Palmers and later the Bishopps resided at Parham only a few miles to the South. Cuckfield was the centre of another cluster including the Bowyer family, the Hussey family of Pain's Place and the Michell family of Cuckfield Park. The family of Porter, originally of Battle in Hastings Rape, also migrated to Cuckfield in the reign of Elizabeth. Chiddingly was the home of Sir John Jefferay, the Judge, also of one branch of the Sackville family, and of the family of Churcher, before they moved to Slinfold in Arundel Rape. Only a few miles away and in the same Hundred of Shiplake in Pevensey Rape, were the Lunsfords of East Hoathly and the Pelhams of Laughton.

But there are indications that over the county as a whole there was a real dearth of gentry suitable for the responsibilities of a J.P. or of higher county office. Indeed, the Justices of Assize concluded their report of 8th October, 1587 on the Sussex J.P's with the remark that there should be more J.P's in Sussex than in other counties, "for that it bordereth south on the sea and north on the wyld; in which towne places comminly the people begeuen mutch to rwednes: and wyllfulnes:"

26. For notes concerning all these, see Section III. 27. B.M. Lansd. MS. 53., art 80., f. 165.
The difficulty of finding satisfactory candidates for office seems to have been particularly acute in some districts and to have led sometimes to the appointment as J.P.'s of comparatively insignificant gentry. The task of selecting J.P.'s from among a handful of gentry of approximately equal merit must sometimes have been very perplexing and the results have aroused much feeling, thus increasing, if anything, the problems of administration.

An example of this is found in the protracted feud between the families of Walsh of Etchingham and Wilgoose of Salehurst, both resident in the Henhurst Hundred of Hastings. A feud conducted partly locally and partly in the guise of sundry lawsuits in the Star Chamber.

In one of these dated 28 Elizabeth, Robert Walsh Esquire of Etchingham complained against John Wilgoose Esquire of Salehurst, a Sussex J.P., that the latter had, at sundry times since he had been a J.P., of his own authority, dismissed a number of persons brought before him by the various county officers and constables, - they being strongly suspected of burglaries, robberies or even worse offences, - without even examining them or taking any surety; and the plaintiff reported that the constables and other officers concerned had complained of this, fearing Wilgoose's leniency should even more heinous offences crop up. Further, it was objected

that Wilgoose had openly maintained in his service and work one Robert Gutson and a Thomas Chatterton, - "two very bad and lewd persons", who, between them, kept a "very notorious and infamous woman" in a room of a house of John Wilgoose's, on the pretext that she was the wife of Robert Gutson, though in fact it was widely known, by John Wilgoose as well as by others, that she was married to neither. Since John Wilgoose countenanced this, no one dared to do anything about it, though a few of the inhabitants of Salehurst approached Mr. Hopkinson, the Minister of Salehurst, to request his intervention and Mr. Hopkinson, while openly trying to uphold the credit of Wilgoose in the neighbourhood, made private intreaties to Wilgoose which were fruitless, so that he was eventually obliged to denounce the matter publicly in Church. However, Wilgoose, riding high and making much of his being a J.P., continued to uphold the parties concerned for the space of at least four months afterwards.

John Wilgoose then attempted to cover up the matter by procuring a marriage between the woman and either Gutson or Chatterton, though she was by then with child by Chatterton, - but in this he failed. He then, according to the plaintiff, began trying to hide his part in condoning the matter by distracting his neighbours' attention, bringing against them sundry lewd and frivolous actions and suits of law, including at least one against the plaintiff at the Sussex Assizes, with a view to discrediting him publicly. This point was hammered
home in an interrogatory made on behalf of the plaintiff and
dated 29 Elizabeth, which said:-

"Then do ye not knowe or have herde the sayde
Wildgoose the father to be a trobbelsome man, and greatlye
given to vexe and disquiet his poore neyghbores with
suts uppon verye smale causes and howe knowe you ye same,
ore what have you herde towchinge this matter?" 29.

Wilgoose also, allegedly, persuaded others to proceed
against Walsh, including one John Gibbs who had had a lawsuit
against him in the Court of Star Chamber.

Wilgoose's reply to this bill of complaint was that the
case had been brought maliciously and because Walsh hoped to
have Wilgoose turned off the Commission of the Peace, he
being a near neighbour, so that he, Walsh, a notoriously
tyrrannical and cruel person, would not be under close
observation since all the other J.P.'s lived at some distance
from him.

He also maintained that he had never summarily dismissed
persons accused of serious offences, without a trial. At the
most he had somewhat relaxed the punishments due to those
who had been apprehended and found guilty, if their help was
required in laying hands on their accomplices. Wilgoose
said that this complaint was brought to discredit him, Walsh
being envious of his authority and position and treating him
even with open disrespect when they had met recently in a
neighbouring town.

Concerning the second part of the bill, John Wilgoose
said that he had kept Robert Gutson since the 1st April, 27
Elizabeth, to run his ironworks for him but that he had not maintained Thomas Chatterton at all. He denied that any such lewd or notorious woman had been kept in any house of his but he added that at about Whitsuntide of the 26th year of Elizabeth, Thomas Chatterton had approached him for work, offering himself as an iron founder. Wilgoose already had someone but Chatterton insisted on being set to work to carry coals to the "heap" because he was unemployed and had spent all his money. Wilgoose therefore agreed out of pity. When Wilgoose's iron-founder fell sick, Chatterton again offered his services, saying he had already had experience as an iron founder with one Mr. Thomas May, neighbour to Wilgoose and "a very honest gentleman". Wilgoose therefore referred to May who gave Chatterton a good report, so the latter was taken on until Bartholomewtide or thereabouts when he, Chatterton, saying that his wife was living in the parish of Ticehurst where Mr. May dwelt, and because this was rather far off, asked Wilgoose for houseroom. As Wilgoose did not want the work hindered, he found a room for them near the furnace, not suspecting that Chatterton was not married. Chatterton then recommended that Gutson be brought along to fill the furnace, and the latter therefore came to inhabit the same house. Wilgoose then became increasingly suspicious that this woman was married to neither although she was with child, so he tried to get her married to one or the other of his two employees. He had not condoned anything, having
ordered Chatterton and the woman to be publicly whipped.

Furthermore, the defendant alleged that it was the plaintiff who had been bringing frivolous actions, and of these he gave details.

Another lawsuit between the same parties was also conducted in the Star Chamber in 28 Elizabeth, this time concerning a corn watermill in Salehurst, belonging to the plaintiff, Robert Walsh of Etchingham. He objected that John Wilgoose Esquire, John Wilgoose gentleman, his son, Thomas Chatterton, Robert Gutson, Abraham Ingleton and Thomas Brabourne, - and "divers other malicious and ill disposed persons", . . . "of malice and of hatred of longe tyme borne unto your said Subject by the said John Wilgoose the father and by the procurements and Instigation of the said John Wylgoose the father" - without any "pretence or color of Tytle", and at about the time when they knew the plaintiff would be occupied about his most necessary "Affayres and business", that is to say on the 26th January last, in the 27th year of Elizabeth, at about nine or ten o'clock at night, - assembled at the said mill, being armed, arrayed and weaponed, - and to the great terror of divers local inhabitants, broke into the house of the said mill by the roof and

30. P.R.O., St. Ch. 5 Eliz. W. 45.17.
came down and entered into the said house and mill and took various tools and implements they found there. Also, with spades and mattocks, some of which they found in the mill, they . . . broke open the banks in and about the mill and let out most of the water and fish in the said 'Baye or pounde', carrying away with them the said fish and the said tools.

Furthermore, the same persons or some of them and others, being similarly instigated by John Wilgoose, the father, had, it was objected, at various times since the 1st November, 26 Elizabeth, in the night time, committed similar riots, assembling at the said mill and breaking down the banks of the 'Pounde' or 'Baye' and letting the water out. The plaintiff said that he had been greatly inconvenienced by the loss of water, and that he was also 'like to suffer' further losses, not only in his mill, but in his other lands, goods and chattels, unless some speedy redress were provided. Also John Wilgoose had done all he could to vex the plaintiff by maintaining against him divers suits and quarrels in the law, despite the laws against maintenance of suits, against "champters", and such as should buy the pretended interests and titled of others. "The said John Wylgoose the father beinge one of your Majesty's Justices for the conservacon of your highnes' peace in the said Counteye and thereby the rather Imboldened and Incorraged, much abusinge your highnes' said Authoritye and countenance to him
comytted" - had connived at one Thomas Brabourne and others of the said malefactors - and encouraged the said Thomas to pretend and make title to some of the lands of the plaintiff, and contrary to the laws against maintenance of suits and against champerty had bought of the said Thomas Brabourne his said pretended right and interest, and then commenced a lawsuit against the plaintiff at his own cost, in Thomas Brabourne's name, for one acre of land or meadow of the ancient inheritance of the plaintiff in Salehurst, being of the value of £20 at least, and intended to continue the same at his own costs and charges.

In his answer, John Wilgoose, the father, used some very strong language against Robert Walsh and brought to light a feud between them, saying that this bill was brought of malice and because of Walsh's insubordination to Wilgoose's authority as J.P., Wilgoose having had occasion to deal with Walsh both concerning the latter's treatment of certain poor persons and in searching Walsh's house for slanderous literature, as well as for other vulgar offences. Walsh had brought this suit primarily to divert attention from his own misbehaviour. John Wilgoose, the father, alleged that before dealing with Robert Walsh himself, he had appealed to his neighbour, George May, gentleman, father-in-law of Robert Walsh, to deal with the latter, but George May said he wished he were able to but that he could do nothing with Walsh who was a very headstrong person.
The younger Wilgoose added to his father's evidence by reporting, concerning the mill incident, that his father had determined to build an ironmill on some land of his below the said mill of Robert Walsh, and that it was on the banks of a stream which should pass that way but that Robert Walsh had dammed up the water. Wilgoose had asked for the water to be released and some was, but not enough, so he went and removed the turfs and rubbish blocking the water-supply on several occasions. He denied altogether, however, that there had been any riotous assembly as alleged in the bill of indictment.

Whatever the outcome of these Star Chamber cases may have been, it is clear that Walsh was extremely jealous of Wilgoose's place on the Commission of the Peace. However, Walsh had other enemies in his neighbourhood besides Wilgoose. For example, in 35 Elizabeth a suit was preferred against him and Thomas May by one John Upton of Salehurst who complained that he had been debarred from the inheritance of some lands in Salehurst which by right should have come to him from one Thomas Walsh. He alleged that Robert, the brother of Thomas Walsh, had taken advantage of the fact that Thomas May, his special friend, was then undersheriff of the county and had had a jury impanelled when the case was tried locally which gave a verdict in his, Robert Walsh's, favour.

30. P.R.O. St. Ch. 5 Eliz., U. 1.7.
Another aspect of the subject of this chapter, "The Homes of the Gentry", is that which concerns the buildings themselves. A discussion of these leads away from administrative problems on to the economic survey which is attempted in a later part of this thesis.

Increasing attention has been given in recent years to the value of architecture as historical evidence. With regard to the Elizabethan period, the controversy as to the precise significance of what is sometimes very abundant evidence, remains open. To Mr. Stone, the building mania of the period was evidence of the financially suicidal tendencies among the aristocracy; to Mr. Trevor-Roper it is the deposit left by a high tide of wealth among certain particular classes of the gentry and peerage. How far expenditure represents mere consumption and how far it constitutes a mere boost to credit will always be an open question in borderline cases where the scales are even and there is no accompanying evidence of a marked increase or diminution of wealth. Taken by itself, the fact that the head of one particular gentry family undertook what must have been an expensive building project during this period proves nothing of economic significance. He may have been comfortably

investing a fortune whether inherited or acquired, or, in a
desperate attempt to keep up with his neighbours and rivals for
influence, he may have been spending his last nest-egg or even
running into debt. Only further economic evidence can suggest
which is the likelier explanation. Consequently, the remainder
of this chapter will be confined to an account of the building
of country houses actually undertaken among the families under
review and to an attempt to discover any common characteristics
among those families. The economic significance of these
projects in particular cases will emerge more clearly in a
later section of this thesis.

From references in such authorities as Horsfield, Elwes,
the Victoria County History, and the Sussex Archaeological
Collections, it appears likely that at least some 32 out of
the 87 families or subsidiary branches of families under
review, that is to say over a third, built or altered houses
in Sussex either during Elizabeth's reign or early in James
I's. Examination of Grimm's and Lambert's sketches of
Sussex country houses in the Burrell MSS in the British
Museum, suggests that, judging by architectural style since
there is no other means of dating these buildings, a further
7 families may also have constructed or re-constructed their
homes in Sussex approximately during the Elizabethan period.

That at least a third of the prominent office-holding
gentry families of Elizabethan Sussex should have undertaken

33. See Appendix 12.
34. ibid. But this evidence is too conjectural to be of
much value - and is not made use of.
the building or re-building of their country residences does seem a startling fact. Its most credible economic interpretation will be looked for at a later stage; for the present it may be of some interest to consider briefly whether older and newer gentry alike took part in this hobby or whether it was carried out mainly by new settlers in the county.

Comparison of Appendices 6 and 12 suggests that almost invariably it was the old Sussex families who had been settled in the county since at least before the beginning of the sixteenth century who were undertaking these building projects. Of all the 32 families or branches of families which are noted in Appendix 12 as having been engaged in building in Sussex at this period, only seven had settled in the county after the beginning of the sixteenth century, and of these, two were peers, the Browne's, Viscounts Montague, and the Percies, Earls of Northumberland. Among the rest were the Bowyers of Cuckfield who made a rapid fortune in the iron industry so that Henry Bowyer was able to build himself Cuckfield Place in approximately the year 1580, and the Gartons of Woollavington, also iron founders and a younger branch of a London mercantile family which settled in Sussex early in the sixteenth century. Also Thomas Eversfield, originally of Worth and the eldest son of a signally successful ironmaster and of a family new to Sussex, appears to have been the builder of Denne Place in Horsham, having
bought the site in 1604 from Stephen Barnham, merchant, of London and his sons for the handsome sum of £5,500.

Apart, however, from these exceptions, there is little evidence that families which settled in the county during the sixteenth century took a very prominent part in building activities there. Some, in all probability, had not the means and, just as they would have to wait a generation or two before they could hope to rise higher in the administrative scale than the rank of a Justice of the Peace, so it would be some time before they could feel sufficiently securely established in their new setting to build mansions for themselves. Perhaps too, the more cautious newcomer to the county, even though a man of means, would have thought it wiser not to flaunt his wealth too ostentatiously among his new neighbours by building lavishly under their very noses before he had been accepted by them, though on the whole such a consideration seems to belong to a later age. Possibly also, from the newcomer’s point of view, it was more convenient to buy a mansion ready-built than to construct one for himself, especially if he wished for a large house which would take some years to erect. Such a purchase cannot always have been easy, for while it was the newer houses which would have been most desirable, they would have been least readily

35. The other 2 families were those of Marvin and Gounter.
parted with by their owners who had so recently built them. But there is at least one example in Sussex of this.

Thomas Bishopp, formerly of Henfield, one of the wealthiest of the new Sussex gentry, whose father had come South from Yorkshire, succeeded in buying himself Parham in 1597, one of the finest Elizabethan houses in the county, and only recently built by the younger branch of the ancient family of Palmer. This purchase must have inflated Thomas Bishopp's local prestige enormously. He was one of the few of the 'new' gentry to become sheriff under Elizabeth, which office he held a second time in 1601, soon after this transaction, and in 1603 he was knighted as "of Parham", and his eldest son eventually became a baronet.

Apart from these few examples, it was, in the main, the older families which built the many Elizabethan houses up and down the county or reconstructed earlier buildings. Whether they could all afford to do so, or whether the early history of Parham is symptomatic, is a question that may be pursued in a later section of this thesis. The old adage that fools build houses for wise men to live in may have been as applicable to the later sixteenth century as to other ages.

36. S.A.C., xxiii, 164; also Elwes op.cit., 164-5, and S.A.C., xxv, 1 et seqq.
37. See Section III for notes on family of Bishopp.
CHAPTER 4

The Structure and Composition of the families.

In this chapter a study will be made of the size, composition and structure of the 87 families or family branches under consideration.

Of the 87 Heads of families who were living in 1580, only four were unmarried, namely Drew Barentyne, Robert Casie, Lawrence Levett and Robert Threele. Of the remaining 83, 49 married once, 33 married twice, and one, Edward Caryll of Harting, married three times.

Of the 118 marriages therefore contracted by these gentlemen, 44 were to the daughters of Sussex residents and 49 to daughters of men whose main residence was outside the county. (There are 25 marriages by heads of families of the 1580 generation which have not been classified in this manner as too little is known of the wife or her family.) Of the seven peers included in this study, Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague, Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, John, Lord Lumley, Henry Percy, 8th Earl of Northumberland, Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, and William West, Lord De la Warr, all married every time outside the county except Lord Lumley whose first marriage was to Jane, the elder daughter of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel.

1. See Appendix 13, Part A.
2. See Appendix 13, Part B.
It is, perhaps, surprising, that of those marriages which have been classified, the majority, even if only a slight one, were to women of other counties. Most of these marriages, however, were to women who lived not far beyond the county boundary, in Kent, Surrey or Hampshire. Yet, a few, and not all of them marriages of peers, were to daughters of families farther afield. Francis Agmonedesham, for example, married into a Hertfordshire family; Sir John Pelham married the daughter of a Baron who was resident mainly in Bedfordshire; Walter Roberts married a young lady from Buckinghamshire, and Thomas Stoughton, one from Wiltshire. Several marriages were to London women; for example, the second marriage of Thomas Bowyer, the lawyer, of North Mundham was to a daughter of John Birch, Baron of the Exchequer; both marriages of Giles Garton were to London women, one the daughter of an 'iron-monger', the other the daughter of a Londoner and the widow of an alderman of the City. Garton, however, was a newcomer to Sussex and apparently married before he settled there.

Yet, if there were evidently some flourishing social contacts with families outside Sussex, nevertheless the striking feature about the marriages of the heads of the selected families of the 1580 generation is that they were so frequently to women belonging to one or other of the same

3. See Section III and Appendix 13, Part B.
group of families. Of the 44 marriages by heads of families of the 1580 generation to daughters of Sussex families, 32 were to members of another of the families under review in this study. That is to say, 32 out of 118 marriages contracted by the heads of families who were living in 1580, were to daughters of other families of the same group; the proportion is more than one in four.

Turning from the wives of the gentry of the 1580 generation to the children, it will be found that of the 83 heads of families who married, only 6 appear to have been childless. The average number of children born into each family was 5.3, but naturally, the numbers of children born into individual families varied considerably. They varied from 15 in the case of the Bellingham's, 14 in the cases of the Apsley's of Thackham and the Selwyns, and 13 in the case of the Culpeppers of Wakehurst, downwards. The greatest number of girls born into any family was nine, found in those of Culpepper of Wakehurst and Sackville of Chiddingly. The greatest number of boys was eight, found in the families of Bellingham, Percy, Earl of Northumberland, and Selwyn.

4. See Appendix 13, Part C.
5. See Appendix 14, Part A.
6. The total number of boys born into these 84 families was 223, of girls, 214. See Appendix 14.
Naturally, not all of these 223 boys or 214 girls survived for long. Figures for infant mortality are, however, difficult to arrive at. The genealogical sources, consisting of records of the Heralds' Visitations, Inquisitions Post Mortem, Wills and parish registers, frequently mention by name children about whom there is no further information, and there is no means of knowing whether they died young and intestate or not. However, there is clear evidence that 38 sons and 16 daughters either died in infancy or predeceased their fathers even if they survived childhood. There may have been considerably more. Also, one boy, William, only son and heir to the Onley family inheritance, was found a lunatic by Inquisition in May, 1610, at the age of twenty-three. He was a minor at his father's death and continued to remain a ward as an adult, being in the care of Henry Bartellot in 1630.

It has been seen that of the 87 families or family branches, apart from the four heads who did not marry, only six appear to have been childless. Four more who had a daughter or daughters, had no sons. These were the heads of the families of Jefferay and Leech who had one daughter each, of Sackville of Chiddingly who had nine daughters and Shirley of West Grinstead who had two. It seems then, that

7. See Appendix 14, Part B.
8. See Section III, relevant family history.
in most families there should have been a direct male
descendant to succeed the father of the 1580 generation as
head of the family and heir to its estates. Usually there
was, but, owing to premature death, the succession did not
always go to the eldest son. Quite frequently it descended to
the grandson, eldest son of the eldest son, or to a younger
son, though sometimes, as in the case of the Fitzalans and
the Lumleys, the premature death of a son and heir ended the
male line of descent. Altogether there were 15 families in
which the eldest son died but, in all except these two, the
gap was filled by his son, or a younger brother, or even, as
in the single case of the Shurleys of Isfield, by a nephew
who was the son of a younger brother.

Altogether, in only 16 of the 87 families was there a
failure of male heirs, counting the four whose heads were
unmarried, the six whose heads were married but childless, the
four which had daughters only and the Fitzalans and the
Lumleys.

It remains to examine the marriages of the children of
the gentry living in 1580. Again, it is necessary to
emphasise how incomplete is our genealogical information about
many of the families. Parish registers are frequently missing
and in any case many are too inaccessible for thorough
examination for all the families. Obviously they would throw
no light on the marriages or dates of burial of sons who

9. See Appendix 14, Part C; and B. & C., 204.
migrated from home to an unknown destination. However, it is clear that of the 223 sons born, 84 married once, 28 married twice or more, 5 of them three times and 1 of them four times, 66 appear not to have married, while concerning 45 there is too little information to classify them. Of the 214 daughters, 138 married once, 14 married twice or more, - two of them three times and two of them four times -, and concerning 62 there is no evidence that they married at all; some of these are definitely known to have died single.

That is to say, approximately 29% appear to have remained unmarried. Naturally, some of these 29% are among those who died in infancy or in girlhood, like, for example, Elizabeth Howard, daughter of the unfortunate Philip, Earl of Arundel. She died of consumption at the age of sixteen. Some perhaps, may have made marriages which are unrecorded. But, of those who definitely never married, practically nothing is known.

Some of the unmarried daughters of Catholic families are recorded as having become nuns, for example, Mary, daughter of Sir Edward Caryll of Harting, and two great-grand-daughters of Sir Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague who died in 1592.

10. See Appendix 15, Part A.
11. See Appendix 15, Part A.
13. M. de Trenqualeon: West Grinstead et les Caryll, i, 373 & 375, i:"qui se consacra a Dieu".
Some apparently lived with other members of the family, as is shown by a few wills and by certain recusancy records in the West Sussex County Record Office. But for the most part the lives of these single women in the sixteenth century remain a closed book.

The Diocesan records just referred to as being in the West Sussex County Record Office and relating to recusancy in the reign of Elizabeth, appear to be returns made in response to letters from the bishop of Chichester to his subordinates in the various rural deaneries of the diocese asking for details about Church attendance in those areas. Some of the folios are dated 26th July, 1580, and all refer to letters from the High Commission dated the previous 24th July, requiring such an inquest to be made. Some of the returns are a clear guide as to where individual members of families resided and with whom.

15. E.g. P.C.C., 121, Skynner, - will of Elizabeth Bellingham, spinster, sister of Henry Bellingham Esq. of Chichester with whom she apparently lived.
17. ibid; f. 61 Arundel; f. 62 Midhurst; f. 64 Boxgrove.
For example, the return for the parish of Worminghurst in Storrington rural deanery tells that on the 16th August, Mr. Richard Shelley, a cousin of the Shelleys of Michelgrove and of the Shelleys of Patcham who are included in this study, - "doth not com to church nor receyve the coion." The same was said of Mr. Edward Shelley, his younger brother, and of "Mistress Eliabeth and Mistress Mary, his systers". It should be stated that the father of all of these, Edward Shelley of Worminghurst, had died in 1554, and his eldest son, Henry, apparently soon after, so that a grandson, another Henry, became the heir to Worminghurst but was too young to be the administrator of his father's estate in 1561, this duty being carried out by his uncle, Richard. Indeed, the young Henry must have been surrounded by uncles and aunts during his childhood if this diocesan return is any guide, mentioning as it does his uncles, Richard and Edward, and his aunts, Mary and Elizabeth. It is these two last who are of interest here. Both eventually married, it is true, Whether they would have stayed on at Worminghurst

18. ibid., f. 56.
20. ibid.
21. ibid.
indefinitely if they had not is an open question. 22.

The return for the rural deanery of Pevensey of "the names of such as refuse to come to Churche" includes, for the parish of Alciston, "the Ladye Gage", the widow of Sir Edward 23. Gage of Firle who died in 1567, her son, George, and her daughter, Margaret. The eldest son, John, had succeeded to the family residence at Firle. Now, Margaret was born only 24. in June, 1559, so that she was only 21 years old at the time this return was made in 1580. According to it she had been 25. absent from Church 13 years "as she . . cannot be persuaded in conscience to come". She is clearly stated to be resident with her mother. Eventually she married Henry Darrell Esq. but it is a speculative matter whether she would have continued otherwise to have lived with her mother and what her eventual fate would have been.

Also in the rural deanery of Pevensey, but in the parish of West Ham, Mr. James Thatcher, his wife, and daughters Anne and Margerie (Mary?) 27. were returned. Both Anne and Mary, however, eventually married.

In the rural deanery of Dallington and the parish of Iden, Mistress Scott, Mr. Scott, her husband, and their children, William, Elizabeth and Elea nor, were all named as

23. Ibid.; see also f.1, and B. & C., 295 et seqq.
absentees from church. The two daughters, Eleanor and Elizabeth are mentioned in their father's will, dated 23rd January, 1583, as then unmarried and under 24, so it was natural enough for them still to have been at home in 1580 in any case. But neither appears to have married and again it is uncertain whether they stayed on at Iden after their father's death.

These records throw no more than a faint glimmer on the big question as to what sort of lives were led by the unmarried women of Elizabethan gentry families. To begin with, they relate only to recusant families, and, dealing as they do with one point of time, cannot give a consecutive story. Subsidy Rolls are useful evidence for the places of residence of widows and sometimes of sons of existing heads of families. But they seem to shed no light on the whereabouts of daughters, let alone unmarried ones.

Having determined approximately how many of the sons and daughters of the gentry living in 1580 are known to have married, and how many times, it is perhaps worth assessing how many of these marriages were to members of other Sussex families and how many to individuals residing mainly elsewhere. Of the 147 marriages contracted by the sons, at least 40 appear to have been to Sussex women. Of the 172 marriages contracted by the daughters, 84 married once, 22 twice, 5 three times, 1 four times. See Appendix 15, Parts A & B.
contracted by the daughters, 64 appear to have been to Sussex men. The proportion of marriages within the county was apparently a little higher in the case of women, being among them rather more than one in three, and in the case of the men, rather less.

Comparing the men of this generation with their fathers among whom it was seen that 44 out of 118 marriages were to Sussex women, the proportion of the younger generation marrying outside the county was evidently nearly 10% higher.

It has been shown that among the generation living in 1580, more than one marriage in four was to a member of another family of the group under consideration in this thesis. In the next generation the proportion is lower. Twenty-five out of the 40 marriages of men of this later generation which were to Sussex women, were to women belonging to one of the families under review in this thesis. Twenty-eight of the 64 marriages of women of the later generation, that is to say of daughters of the gentry living in 1580, to Sussex men, were to members of one or other of this same group of families. Thus, of the marriages contracted both by the sons and by the daughters of the 1580 gentry, about one in six of the total was, in each case, to

30. 138 married once, 10 twice, 2 three times, 2 four times. ibid.
31. V. supra, 115
32. V. supra, 117.
33. See Appendix 15, Part C.
another member of the same very limited number of families selected for study. Allowing for the fact that many younger sons must have moved away from home to seek a livelihood and would therefore probably marry elsewhere, if at all, the degree of intermarriage among the office-holding families of the county is still remarkably high.

It remains to indicate the extent to which these marriages between the office-holding gentry families reflected political alliances and groupings among them.

If the marriages of the heads of families alive in 1580 be examined, it is striking how closely the recusant families hung together. For instance, John Apsley of Pulborough married a daughter of Edward Shelley of Worminghurst; Sir Edward Caryll of Harting married Philippa, daughter of James Gage of Bentley in Framfield; Edward Gage of Bentley married Margaret, daughter of John Shelley of Michelgrove; and James Thatcher married Mary, daughter of Sir Edward Gage of Firle. Lord Lumley's first marriage was to Jane, the elder daughter of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel. The part of these families in the political developments of the period in Sussex will be discussed later.

Similarly, there seems to have been a series of alliances between leading families more favourable to the Elizabethan regime. For instance, Walter Covert married Jane, a daughter of Sir John Shurley of Isfield who had himself married first, a daughter of Sir Thomas Shirley of 34. See Section III for these marriages.
Wiston, and secondly, a daughter of George Goring of Ovingdean. Another daughter of George Goring married the Judge, Sir John Jefferay of Chiddingly. All of these families played an important part in the administration of the county under Elizabeth. Walter Covert and Sir Thomas Shirley were particularly prominent members of them. Among the nobility, too, one of the daughters of Lord Buckhurst married, in February, 1591, Anthony Browne, eventually Viscount Montague, grandson of the old Viscount who was at one time suspected of complicity in the Ridolfi conspiracy and who later became a staunch loyalist and supporter of the status quo. Cecily, youngest daughter of Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston married, in November, 1602, Thomas West, who became 12th Baron De la Warr. William West, the 10th Baron, had been one of the few politically reliable peers of Elizabethan Sussex. Another important relationship was between the Pelhams and the Sackvilles since these families became rivals for power in East Sussex towards the middle of the reign. Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst's aunt, Ann Sackville, had married Sir Nicholas Pelham whose eldest son and heir was Sir John Pelham of Laughton, who died in 1580. The rivalry between these two families will be discussed later. Lord Buckhurst

35. For these marriages, see Section III.
was, of course, himself, a cousin of the Queen, - his paternal grandmother, Margaret, daughter of Sir William Boleyn of Blickling, Norfolk, having been aunt of Anne Boleyn. The feud between the Sackvilles and the Pelhams should remind the social historian that family ties may intensify differences between parties as well as fostering friendship between them.

Apart from the political significance of the marriages of the families being studied, they have their value as pointers to social and economic trends. Sometimes, as with the Gartons or the Culpeppers of Wigsell, they suggest a close and continuous connection with the City of London. Sometimes, with the humbler families, they reflect a somewhat limited social environment. With a few of the more prominent untitled families they are proof of an association with the peerage and may perhaps, in one or two cases, be a token of social and political ambition. James Colbrand Esq. of Chichester, who fought avidly for one of the borough seats there in 1584 and who was determined to enforce his rights as captain of the trained bands of the City when there was danger of his losing them, was also husband of Martha, daughter of Oliver St. John of Bletsoe. Sir John Pelham of Laughton and Herbert Pelham of Buckstepe who both attempted

38. B.&C. 300.
39. See Section III.
41. B.M. Harl. MS. 703, ff. 39, 39b, 40b, 42b, 47b, and 48.
to resist the domination of the county towards the middle of the reign by Lord Buckhurst, were also both married to daughters of peers. Sir Edward Bishopp, bart., son of Sir Thomas Bishopp who bought Parham, and grandson of Thomas Bishopp Esq., of Henfield, sealed the rise of his family in the social scale by marrying a daughter of Nicholas Tufton, Earl of Thanet. Two daughters of the spectacular family of Shirley of Wiston married into the peerage. Even a marriage tie with the cadet branch of a noble family must have been highly valued. John Porter of Cuckfield, gent., who married, as his first wife, Winifred, daughter and coheiress of John Sackville of Chiddingly Esq., had their eldest son and heir christened Sackville Porter. Sir John Pelham of Laughton who married Judith, daughter of Oliver, Lord St. John of Bletsoe, had their only son christened Oliver.

The seven peers themselves who were mainly resident in Sussex and alive in 1580 married almost exclusively into other noble families. Exceptions were Lord Buckhurst who married Cicely, daughter of Sir John Baker of Sissinghurst, Kent, and William West, Lord De la Warr, who married first Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Strange Esq., and secondly Ann, daughter of Henry Swift of Andover, Hants.

42. V. infra, Part III.
43. See Appendix 16 for a summary of the marriages of the untitled heads of the selected families living in 1580, and of their children, into the peerage.
44. See Section III.
But, of the eldest sons of these seven peers, those of Sir Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague, Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, and William West, Lord De la Warr, married daughters of commoners; also Robert Sackville, 2nd Earl of Dorset, married as his second wife the daughter of a commoner who had, however, married into the peerage twice before.

Marriage connections between the gentry and humbler folk are more difficult to trace, and the familiar problem of the meaning of the term 'gentleman' again presents itself. Some of the marriages of such families as the Sharpes of Northiam, the Roberts of Ticehurst, the Nevells of Chichester and the Onleys of Pulborough, illustrate the vagueness of the boundaries of the social class, known as "the gentry", at its lower levels.

45. *ibid*.
46. See Section III.
CHAPTER 5

Education.

In the Elizabethan period, higher education was becoming increasingly popular among the gentry and, indeed, the aristocracy. The Universities and the Inns of Court were, however, more than seats of learning; they were also thriving social centres and, as such, attracted many young gentlemen who had no ambition to become scholars or lawyers but who, in time, would take their place in the life of their counties or perhaps make their way further afield.

Comparison on a percentage basis shows that 21.8% of those who were heads of the 87 selected families or family branches in 1580 attended either Oxford or Cambridge or both, whereas 28.7% of their sons did so. The percentage figure for the younger generation would, no doubt, be much higher were it possible to isolate and ignore all those sons born into the families studied who died before reaching University age. As it is, it has been possible to estimate infant mortality only in conjunction with deaths of sons during their fathers' lives. Allowance must also be made for the fact that some of the earlier generation, living in 1580, were themselves comparatively young men at that time and therefore were themselves affected by the growing habit of attending a University.

1. See Appendix 17.
2. See Appendix 14, Part B.
In the earlier generation, Cambridge was the more popular of the two Universities. Of the 19 gentlemen of that generation who received a University education, 13 went to Cambridge, 3 to Oxford, and 3 to both places. But among their sons, Oxford was the more frequented. Of the 64 younger gentlemen who attended the Universities, 41 went to Oxford, 21 to Cambridge and 2 to both.

Brothers generally attended the same University. Sometimes if they were much of an age, several were admitted simultaneously. The 11th January, 1594 must have been a significant day for the Percy family when Alan, aged 15, Joscelin, aged 14 and George, aged 13, the fifth, sixth and seventh sons respectively of the 8th Earl of Northumberland, were admitted to Gloucester Hall, Oxford. In the same way, on 22nd June, 1582, Henry, aged 14, William aged 12 and Thomas, aged 11, the second, third and fourth sons respectively of Lord Buckhurst, were all admitted to Hart Hall, Oxford.

Among the earlier generation, the most popular colleges at Cambridge, the most popular University, were St. John's and Queens', each attended by six of the selected Sussex gentry. The few relevant Sussex gentry of this generation who went to Oxford attended various colleges, showing no marked preferences. Among the younger generation, the most

3. Al Ox., iii, 1146.
4. Al Ox., iv, 1298.
popular college at Oxford, by then the more popular University, appears to have been Hart Hall, attended by as many as 13 of these gentlemen. St. Alban Hall, Gloucester Hall, and Balliol College were each attended by 4, and Brasenose College by 3. At Cambridge, more of this generation went to Clare than to any other college, though St. John's was, apparently still popular.

Of the 19 gentlemen of the earlier generation who attended a University, five are known to have taken degrees; in the younger generation, the proportion was considerably higher, being as many as 25 out of 64. In each generation a few of these degrees may have been practically honorary, for instance the M.A. degree conferred on Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, in 1576 at Cambridge, but it is difficult to distinguish these. There is no reason for thinking the increase in the number of those taking degrees was due to a growing practice of conferring honorary ones.

Turning from the Universities, it seems that there was a decrease between the earlier and the later generations in the numbers attending the four main Inns of Court, since 45.9% of the former went to them and only 33.6% of the latter did so. The Inns may have suffered a little as a result of the increasing popularity of Oxford and Cambridge, yet many gentry of both generations went first to a University and

---

1. See Appendix 17.
2. See Appendix 17.
3. See Appendix 17.
4. See Appendix 17.
5. See Appendix 18.
then on to an Inn where they might acquire a nodding acquaintance with the law they would help to administer as J.P's. Of the earlier generation, 27 went to Inns of Court only, 13 to a University and an Inn, and 6 to a University only. In the later generation, 45 went to a University and an Inn, 30 to an Inn only and 19 to a University only.

The most frequented Inn in both generations was Gray's Inn. Of the earlier gentry recorded as having attended the four Inns, 17 went to Gray's Inn, 12 to the Middle Temple, 9 to the Inner Temple and 2 to Lincoln's Inn. Of their sons, 25 went to Gray's Inn, 21 to the Middle Temple, 21 to the Inner Temple and 7 to Lincoln's Inn. One went to both Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple.

Not very many of those who attended the Inns appear ever to have become barristers. Figures are not easily arrived at since the records of the Inns do not always specifically mention calls to the Bar even of those who ultimately became Serjeants-at-law or Judges, and there are, conceivably, other omissions too. It seems, however, that of the 39 Sussex gentlemen of the earlier generation who attended the Inns, only some 10 or 11 became barristers. Of the 75 gentlemen of the younger generation who attended the Inns, only 6 appear to have been called to the Bar, and one more is

9. See Appendix 19 which shows that 51.7% of the earlier generation and 42.1% of the later were therefore educated at Universities or Inns of Court or both. The figure for the later generation does not allow for infant mortality and is therefore lower than might be expected.
10. See Appendix 18.
11. See Appendix 18.
known to have practised as an Attorney at Guildford.

While, as has been shown, Gray's Inn attracted more Sussex gentlemen than the other Inns, there was a tendency for those who intended to follow the legal profession to go to the Middle Temple. Five, and perhaps six, of the barristers of the earlier generation went there. In the later generation, two went there, two to the Inner Temple and one to each of the other Inns. It has, of course, to be remembered that some of the young gentlemen under consideration in this thesis attended the Inns of Chancery whose records are not available. Where they proceeded from them to one of the four main Inns of Court, the fact is recorded in the admissions registers of the latter. But where they did not, their names are lost.

There were those families which appear not to have sent their sons to either University or to any of the Inns of Court. The Catholic families of Gage and Shelley, for instance, naturally abstained. In such cases, a resident schoolmaster appears to have been one solution.

Francis Fortescue Esq., of Harting in West Sussex, employed such a man. He appears to have fallen foul of the ecclesiastical authorities while staying at Harting for absenting himself from Church. He is mentioned in the recusancy records for the Deanery of Midhurst, in an entry dated 16th August, (1587), as "Mr. Smyth, scholemaster to the

12. Inner Temple Admission Register, 77.
13. See Appendix 18.
14. Two of the younger Shelleys of Patcham were, however, admitted to the Inner Temple, see Section III.
children of Mr. Fortescue, gent.," and it is noted that he "hath absented himself from divine service by the space of one whole yere and for the same standeth excommunicat." 15.

Elsewhere, it is noted that "One Smyth, a scoller of the parish of Harting, is a fugitive from place to place . . . and a great seducer of others; could not be found."

Some sons of Catholic families appear to have been sent abroad to be educated. John, the eldest son and heir of Sir John Caryll of Warnham who died in 1613, and who was then about twentys-x years old, was probably brought up in Rome under the supervision of Cardinal Bellarmine whose friend he became. He subsequently spent some time at the French Court. He was admitted to Gray's Inn in March, 1601. 17.

Despite the educational facilities of Elizabethan England, some of the younger generation remained untamed.

16. ibid., f.2.
17. See Section III, and Trenqualeon, op.cit., 395-7. See also Section III, notes on John Thatcher, brought up at Rome and sometime page to Cardinal Allen.
For instance, John Palmer of Angmering, eldest surviving son and heir to the great Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering, who was Deputy Lieutenant and twice a county member of Parliament, preferred vagrancy to civilisation and "got acquaintance with the Gipsies and other wandering beggars, which way of living he liked so well that he could never be persuaded to leave them but died at length among them." The family inheritance therefore descended to Thomas, his brother next in age.


19. For further evidence relating to schools and schoolmasters in Elizabethan Sussex, see B.M. Add MS 39,356, ff.16, 29,30,39,44,45,78,90 & 91. See also B.M. Add. MS, 33,142,ff.1,14b,20b,27 and 89b; and B.M. Add MS 2,074,f.95.
PART II

THE ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE GENTRY.

CHAPTER I

Landownership: the evidence of Feodary Surveys and Inquisitions Post Mortem.

The economic history of the English gentry and aristocracy between 1540 and 1640 has become a somewhat specialised and an extremely controversial subject of recent years and is therefore one which the mere social historian approaches with some diffidence. Though he is not concerned exclusively, nor even perhaps primarily with economic developments, these must, however, form the background of his picture, and until he has them in some satisfactory sort of perspective his foreground is liable to be out of focus. It is therefore part of his task to paint in this background so far as he sees it, but always as subsidiary to the main scene. Its tones determine the key colours but should not dominate the subject-matter.

A comprehensive and detailed study of the economic life of the Sussex gentry, or even of 70 families of them, in the Elizabethan period, could, in itself, provide material for a full thesis. It has therefore been necessary to work within strict limits on this aspect of the subject, using a somewhat rigid discipline of selection both as to
sources and as to the period covered. Obviously it was not possible to study the economic history of all 70 families in any detail; in any case, not all are of sufficient interest, nor is there the necessary material. A general survey of the relative economic position of all these families has, however, been attempted, and some tentative conclusions as to the trends in their fortunes have been put forward. But it should be emphasised that such conclusions are necessarily provisional in the absence of further and more detailed investigation.

The general framework of the economic position of the 70 chosen families has been built up from a variety of official sources. The most obvious primary material would seem to be the Inquisitions Post Mortem, Feodaries' Surveys, Subsidy Rolls, Wills and Inventories of Wills. Wills, however, and their Inventories, have not been used systematically for all the families; the amount of detail provided by the former varies too widely from case to case to provide material for comparison, and such detail as there is can best be used to supplement faulty Inquisitions or Feodaries' Surveys, while such Inventories for all Wills proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury as have survived are in so chaotic a state at Somerset House as to be useless at present to the researcher. Only Inventories of those Wills which were proved in the Consistory Court at Chichester or the Archdeaconry Court at Lewes, are of any value, and of these too
few are relevant to be significant for a general study.

It is, therefore, from Inquisitions Post Mortem, Feodaries' Surveys, and certain Subsidy Rolls, that the contours of the economic landscape have been sketched in; the evidence of the first two types of sources only is dealt with in this chapter. But before presenting the results of investigation into these sources, a brief evaluation of each should perhaps be made.

Much has been written about Inquisitions Post Mortem and their defects as source material, yet, defective as they are, they appear to be indispensable. It has been shown that although they were intended to embody a comprehensive survey, county by county, of all real estate, held by whatever tenure, whereof every deceased tenant-in-chief of the Crown died seized, in fact, many Inquisitions Post Mortem that should exist appear either to have been lost, or never to have been taken at all. Moreover, sometimes an individual is known from other sources to have held lands in several counties, yet an Inquisition for only one of these has survived. Thus one can never be sure that any single Inquisition even pretended to catalogue all the lands of the


2. E.g. The will of Anthony Pelham Esq. of Buckstepe who died 2nd Nov. 9 Eliz. (P.R.O. C. 142.145.12), refers generally to his lands in Kent, Sussex, Surrey, Dorset,
individual concerned, though among smaller landowners, this would probably have been the case since property in other counties or in London would have been sufficiently small to have been noted in the Inquisition for the county where the deceased had been resident. It is in dealing with the larger landowners who held extensive property in numerous counties that this fact must be remembered.

Apart from this absence of Inquisitions, either total as for some individuals, or for certain counties in the case of others, those that do survive are not invariably comprehensive as inventories of lands held by the deceased, even for the counties where they were taken. Comparison with the Feodaries' Surveys sometimes shows the escheator to have been

contd.

Lincoln, Northumberland, York, "and elsewhere within the realm of England". His Inquisition, (see S.R.S., xxxiii,7) refers only to lands in Sussex.

3. E.g. I.P.M. of William Shirley Esq. of Wiston, dt. at Lewes, 5th Oct. 5 Ed. VI, (P.R.O. C. 142.94.76), mentions his manor of Wodensill, co. Bucks as well as his lands in Sussex: also, I.P.M. of Sir Richard Lewkenor, sometime C.J. Chester, dt. at Petworth 20 Sept. 14 James, (P.R.O. C. 142.355. 45) mentions his capital messuage at Clun, co. Salop. called "Baggatshey", as well as his lands in Sussex.

4. E.g. There are I.P.M's for Sir Thomas West, Lord De la Warr who d.s.p. 25 Sept. 1 & 2 P. & M., for the counties of Sussex (P.R.O. C. 142.104. 73 & 74); Hants (P.R.O.C142. 104. 75), & Wilts. (P.R.O. C. 142.104.110). But for Thomas West, Lord De la Warr, his great-nephew, there is only one I.P.M. dt. at Winchester, 12 August 44 Eliz. (P.R.O. C. 142.273.85) This lists his lands in Hampshire only.
either less thorough or more lenient than the feodary in compiling his complete list of lands, though it must be admitted that where Feodaries' Surveys and Inquisitions Post Mortem overlap, agreement between them as to the number of manors or messuages is overwhelmingly the rule.

The really significant divergence between Inquisitions Post Mortem and Feodaries' Surveys taken for the same persons within a short space of time, is rather in their respective rates of valuation of such property as they do account for. This fact has been pointed out by Mr. Bell, who shows moreover that these discrepancies became more marked as time went on, so that in the early seventeenth century when Robert Cecil was attempting to wring the utmost possible from wardships and liveries, a feodary's valuation might be as many as twelve times that of the escheator.

5. Cf. for example the I.P.M. of Thomas Churcher Esq., who ob. 28 Nov. 1616 at Slindon, (P.R.O. C. 142.375.57) which mentions only one capital messuage there, - & his Feodary Survey (P.R.O. Wards 5.43.Pt.2) which mentions two; also cf. the I.P.M. (P.R.O. C. 142.312.128) and the Feodary Surveys for the lands in Sussex, Kent, Essex, London & Middlesex (P.R.O. Wards 5.43.Pt.2), - of Robert Sackville, 2nd Earl of Dorset. The latter mention in addition to the lands listed in the I.P.M., 5 priories in Sussex, (apart from Lewes Priory which appears in the I.P.M.); a manor of Houndean, Middx.; the manor of Foyle, Surrey;- of Risingden in Gloucs.; and in Sussex, Ringmere Park, and the Boroughs of Seaford & East Grinstead.


7. H.E. Bell; op.cit., 56.n.1.

8. ibid. Bell compares the I.P.M. & F.S. values for the lands of John Hawkins of Essex. Both valuations are dated 10 Charles I, the former amounting to £248.8., the latter to £300.13.4.
It seems safe to assume that the valuations of both officials were definitely on the conservative side, yet there is no doubt but that the feodary's estimate was the more reliable of the two. Accordingly, the valuations given in the relevant Inquisitions have not been utilised, even where no comparable Feodary Survey exists. The Inquisition valuations are, incidentally, far more difficult to use on a large scale since, unlike the Feodaries' Surveys, they often omit a sum total, so that all the individual items have to be added up.

The importance of Inquisitions Post Mortem however, for a study of this sort, cannot be overlooked. They do, where they exist, and in spite of possible errors and omissions, give some kind of picture of the scale and extent of landownership among the gentry within a broadly conceived period, and they do, again with necessary precautions duly taken, give some clue as to whether individual families were acquiring or parting with land. Thus, it has been found convenient to look for the Inquisition of the head of each family who was living in 1580, and also those of his predecessor, whether his grandfather, father or elder brother - and of his successor, if any, whether son, grandson or younger brother, provided the latter died not later than 1625. At the best,

9. The chief disadvantage in using Feodaries' Surveys as a source is their rarity. V. infra, 150.
therefore, a record should in this way be established of the land held by the heads of the family over three generations, stretching backwards and forwards from the year 1580. In fact, for many of the 70 families, only one or two of the three requisite Inquisitions Post Mortem have survived; for 17 families, no relevant Inquisitions whatever are available.

It should, perhaps, be pointed out at this stage, that not all the lands mentioned in the Inquisitions, have been tabulated in forming this schedule of gentry landownership. The task of adopting and utilising, in every case, all the information given as to tofts, crofts, hereditaments, tenements, orchards, gardens, petty messuages and so on, would, very likely, end in shipwreck, so that it has been thought sufficient to note what is said therein as to manors and capital messuages, and, for greater landowners who possessed them, as to hundreds and rapes, boroughs, baronies, parks, London houses and dissolved religious houses. Naturally, Mr. Trevor Roper's criticism that manors vary widely in value, and that one manor is not comparable with another, is one that must be borne constantly in mind. But since Tudor surveyors based their computations on the manor as the unit of landownership, we can ourselves hardly do otherwise. There is, after all, no means of checking acreages where manors are named but

10. See Appendices 20 and 21.
not described and estimation by the escheators' valuations is misleading since they were often wildly inaccurate.

It is quite conceivable, of course, that a landowning family may have been disposing of its manorial property at the same time as it was acquiring non-manorial acres on an extensive scale, or vice versa, so that to take account of manors and capital messuages alone, might well result in a false impression. Such a possibility might, at first sight, explain the curious fact that, according to the Feodaries' Surveys of Thomas Bishopp Esq., dated 6 January, 2 Eliz. and 18 April 2 Eliz., he had held land valued at £161.19.9 p.a. above reprize, - lands including four manors, - while the Feodary Survey of his son and heir, Sir Thomas Bishopp, knight and baronet, dated 14 November 1631, valued the latter's lands at only £105.16.4. p.a. above reprize, though these apparently included as many as ten manors. Thus, it seems that the total value of Sir Thomas Bishopp's landed property was considerably less than that of his father, although he owned six manors more than he. However, comparison of individual items in these Surveys suggests that this situation was due not so much to the sale of valuable non-manorial acres by the son, but rather either to a depreciation in the value of the whole estate, or else to the indulgence

12. P.R.O. Wards 5.43.Pt.1.; P.R.O. Wards 9.138ff.: 159-161
13. P.R.O. Wards 5.43,Pt.2.
Conversely, the Feodary Survey dated 18 January, 1620, of John Cowper of Dicham Park near Harting, apparently the grandson of the John Cowper living in 1580, values his property as a whole at as much as £150.0.0. p.a. above reprize, — an astonishing sum for a man who had apparently held no manors at all, placing him in the same category, according to Feodary Survey valuations, as men like Sir Thomas Caryll of Harting who owned ten manors, and far above that of, for example, James Thatcher, who owned two, or of Edward Gage of Bentley who had four. John Cowper's own Feodary Survey itself states that his capital messuage of Dicham Park, was worth as much as £120 p.a., a figure exceeding by far those given for the whole estates of many very substantial landowners with several manors to their name. Naturally, the personal prejudices of the feodary may have had some part in determining his valuations, but these cannot have been altogether capricious, and the cases of John Cowper and Thomas Bishopp merely illustrate the relevance to certain cases of Mr. Trevor Roper's warning against measurement of landed wealth by manors alone.

14. P.R.O. Wards 5.43.Pt.1. See also the I.P.M. of this John Cowper, P.R.O. C. 142. 378.126.
15. Feodary Survey (P.R.O. Wards 5.43.Pt.2) dt. 6 Feb. 1618, values his lands in Sussex at £150.p.a. above reprize, and that dated 16 Sept. 1618, values his lands in Worcs. at £3.6.8d. p.a. above reprize.
16. Feodary Survey (P.R.O. Wards, 5.43.Pt.1.) dt. 1619, values his lands at £71.3.4.p.a. above reprize.
17. Feodary Surveys (P.R.O. Wards. 5.43.Pt.2) dt. 7 June 1619 (Sussex); 1 June 1619 (Kent); 9 Oct.1619 (Wilts),
However, such a warning and such illustrations need not deter the historian altogether from attempting a rough estimate of the relative position of the landowning gentry by the means already indicated. For, as the statistics show where Feodaries' Surveys exist as a means of checking Inquisitions Post Mortem, the valuations of the former for the whole estates of the individuals concerned are very approximately proportionate to the number of manors held. A comparison of Appendices 21 and 22 will show that no landowner, with the single and accountable exception of George Goring of Ovingdean, who had an estate valued by the feodary at less than £100, or indeed than £80 p.a., had more than five manors according either to his Feodary Survey or his Inquisition Post Mortem. Similarly, all those whose lands were valued in their Feodary Surveys at £100 or over, were seized at their deaths of at least five manors, except

---

contd.

value his lands in those counties respectively at £47.14.8; £5.10.0; and £4.13.4. p.a. above reprize.  
18. E.g. cf. Feodary Surveys of Sir Richard Lewkenor, C.J. Chester, both dt. 1 May, 1619, for Sussex & Salop. Total valuation for 5 manors in Sussex & 1 Capital Messuage in Salop is £22.13.4 (P.R.O. Wards 5.43. Pt.2), with Feodary Surveys of James Colbrand (P.R.O. Wards. 5.43. Pts. 1 & 2), dt 21 Oct. 42 Eliz. and 17 April 4 James. Total valuation £34, though he apparently had no manors.  
19. For the results of such a comparison, see Appendix 23.
in the cases of John Cowper and of Thomas Bishopp, senior which have already been discussed. So that it does seem legitimate to assume that the number of manors a man possessed can, in the majority of instances, be taken as approximately indicative of his total landed wealth, - and that whether, through the generations, a family was buying them up or disposing of them, is therefore likely to be indicative of the increase or diminution of its whole estate.

The detailed investigation of some 130 Inquisitions Post Mortem - which is the approximate number of relevant ones that have survived for the 70 families and their significant subsidiary branches, - suggests that the overwhelming majority of even the leading country gentry of Sussex in the later sixteenth century, owned lands on a very modest scale. Of the 53 families for which at least one relevant Inquisition Post Mortem has survived, as many as 32 owned less than 5 manors in any of the three selected generations for which there is evidence. Only 11 families held at least 5 and less than 10 manors in any generation for which there is evidence; 6 held between 10 and 20 manors; and not more than 4 held 20 manors or over.

20. See Appx. 21.

21. For purposes of classification the greatest number of manors held in any generation is adopted; where two or more branches of a family are under consideration, the greatest number of manors held by any single individual in any branch is adopted as representative of the family as a whole; the numbers of manors held by the different branches at any one time, are not added together, nor are they considered separately.
It is, perhaps, significant, that all the families in the last category were noble, they being the Brownes, Viscounts Montague, the Percies, Earls of Northumberland, the Sackvilles, eventually Earls of Dorset, and the Wests, Lords De la Warr. Among the six families owning between 10 and 20 manors, one was that of Baron Lumley.

It seems, therefore, that the bulk, certainly more than half the families under review, were no more than four manor men. However, four manors, possibly with various appurtenances and other non-manorial property, were not to be despised, and not everyone within the lowest rank of gentry landowners could boast such wealth. In fact, the heads of only 3 of the 32 families of this group are recorded in their relevant Inquisitions Post Mortem as having held 4 manors; while the remaining 29 families - or more than half of the 53 for which there is evidence - subdivide very evenly into four groups, seven of them apparently holding no whole manors at all during this period, another seven holding at most one manor, eight holding two, and seven more, three.

These figures suggest that more than half the gentry whose families supplied the county's J.P.'s, sheriffs, county members or Deputy Lieutenants, - and therefore very likely more than half of the gentry as a whole in Sussex at this period, were holders of no more than three manors at most.

22. See Appendix 21.
What these manors signified in pounds per annum is a much more difficult problem to solve. It has been shown that, with one exception already noted, landowners assessed by the feodary at less than £100, held fewer than 5 manors and that those assessed by him at more than £100 were, with the exception of Thomas Bishopp and John Cowper, 5 manor men or more. However, owing to the paucity of Feodaries' Surveys which appear to have been taken, until James' II's reign at any rate, only when the deceased tenant-in-chief was succeeded by a minor, the cases where an individual Inquisition Post Mortem may be compared with an individual Feodary Survey for the same deceased person, are only very few. Even in these instances, the relationship between the scale of valuations of estates and the numbers of manors contained in them appears to have been only an approximate one.

Some of the difficulties which prevent the historian from estimating the income of the landed gentry of Devonshire under Charles I with any degree of accuracy, are outlined by Messrs Hoskins and Finberg in one of their "Devonshire Studies". They show, for example, that among the smaller

23. V. supra & Appendix 23.
24. See references to minorities in Appendix 22.
25. See Appendix 22.
26. ibid.
gentry, the "home farm" was usually kept in the hands of its owner and was often valued in the Feodary Surveys at half or more of the whole estate, but that it did not, unless by chance it were let out on short lease, produce any corresponding income in cash, since most of its fruits were consumed by its occupiers. The remaining properties were nearly always let on leases for three lives or 99 years, with a heavy fine on entry and a nominal rent thereafter. The rents of such lands therefore obviously did not represent anything like the true value of the property. Further, sales of farm produce, stock and timber, about which the more accessible records say nothing, and which represent a fluctuating proportion of the annual income of an estate, must be borne in mind.

Land titles have not formed any part of this present study so that the relevance of Hoskins' and Finberg's observations is hypothetical. But they do show that even Feodaries' Surveys must be used with considerable reservations.

But, in spite of the obstacles to any decisive conclusions, these writers do feel justified in dividing the Caroline gentry of Devonshire into two main groups, - the smaller or "typical backwoods gentry" who were usually very

28. E.g. Feodaries' Surveys and the records of the Committee for Compounding. Individual collections of estate papers might contain information about this.
long established, often taking their names from their
dwelling-places, but generally not lords of any manors though
they had usually an ancient home-farm which they kept in
their own hands and farmed for themselves as well as about
six to ten farms in parishes round about; and the lesser
squires, usually with one or two manors and a number of farms
in parishes all round. The incomes of the first group are
estimated at between £50 and £100 per annum; and of the latter
at between £100 and £200 per annum or more, most of which
derived from the home farm which these lesser squires occupied
and farmed for themselves.

It seems then, that the Caroline gentry of Devonshire
were rather better off than the Elizabethan gentry of Sussex
if the figures given by Hoskins & Finberg and those found in
the Feodaries' Surveys of the Elizabethan Sussex gentry are
at all comparable; for it has been shown that apart from
John Cowper of Dicham, and the elder Thomas Bishoppe, in none
of the Surveys for Sussex which have been examined were those
holding less than five manors assessed at above £80. Yet
the majority of gentry under review appear to have been less
than 5 manor men. However Hoskins' and Finberg's reminders
that farming was still partly on a subsistence basis, and

29. op. cit., 336 et seqq., and 346 et seqq.
30. See Appendix 23.
that profits from the sale of estate produce as well as intermittent windfalls in the shape of entry fines should be allowed for, suggest that the real income of this class may have been somewhat higher than the feodaries' estimated.

Before considering what light, if any, is shed by the Inquisitions Post Mortem, and other sources, on trends among the gentry towards poverty or affluence, it may be convenient to examine another set of facts. It has been shown that the majority of gentry families appear to have been only modest landowners. If so, how widely were their lands scattered? Evidence from the Inquisitions suggests that few owned much property outside the boundaries of the county where they resided. Of the 53 families for which the Inquisitions provide any information, 32 appear to have held manors in Sussex only; of the remaining 21, only 12 appear to have held manors outside Sussex in any but the immediately neighbouring counties of Hampshire, Kent or Surrey, and five of these 12 were peers. Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague, for instance, owned a manor in Cambridgeshire; Lord Lumley owned manors in county Durham, originally his family's native county; Henry Percy, the 9th Earl of Northumberland, had manors in Yorkshire, Northumberland, Cumberland, Durham, Dorset, Somerset, Carmarthen, Pembrokeshire and London; Thomas

31. V. supra, 148-9
West, Lord De la Warr, had them in Dorset, Wiltshire, Gloucestershire, Somerset, Devon, Warwickshire, Lancashire, Lincolnshire and London.

Altogether, apart from the peerage, only seven families during this period are known to have owned manors outside Sussex or its three contiguous counties. It is true that individuals may have owned non-manorial lands elsewhere. Robert Sheppard of Peasmarsh, for example, is shown by his Feodary Survey, to have owned certain lands and tenements in Kent, though he apparently held no manors outside Sussex. Non-manorial parcels of land are not, however, accounted for in this study, unless, indeed, they were capital messuages or, in the case of large landowners, parks, baronies and so on as already indicated. But it does seem legitimate to conclude both that the great majority of Sussex gentry at this period were essentially landowners on a modest scale, and that they had little property far outside their county boundaries.

32. See Appendix 24.
33. The families of Gage, Pelham, Scott, Shelley, Shirley, Stapley, and Wilgoose. (See Appx. 24.)
34. P.R.O. Wards 9.140, ff. 520-525 (b). See also Sect. III on Thomas Stanley whose will refers to property outside Sussex, some of which was in Herts. No manors outside Sussex were mentioned.
35. For these and their situation, see Appendix 20.
CHAPTER 2

Economic trends: the evidence of Inquisitions Post Mortem and Subsidy Rolls.

It remains to consider the economic currents which flowed beneath this surface and the directions in which they were moving, sometimes sluggishly, sometimes more speedily, bearing some family fortunes on to affluence, and others to the rapids. First, an attempt will be made to discover as nearly as possible which families were rising and which declining in prosperity through this period.

Unfortunately, neither Feodary Surveys, Inquisitions Post Mortem nor Subsidy Rolls can provide a ready-made answer to this problem.

To begin with, as has already been shown, too few Feodary Surveys are available to be of much value in this investigation. Until James I's reign, these Surveys appear to have been taken only when the deceased tenant-in-chief was succeeded by a minor, and these cases were too rare to have produced very much material.

Again, too many Inquisitions Post Mortem are missing to permit a very satisfactory table to be compiled even as to the relative numbers of manors, let alone other property, held by the heads of each family through the three generations.

1. V. supra, 159 & Appendix 22.
2. See Appendix 22, Bell, ob. cit, 40 & 55.
under review. So often only an isolated Inquisition for one
generation has survived, or, as for example in the case of
the Wests, Lords De la Warr, there are gaps in the evidence
for certain counties in a particular generation. 3. So
fragmentary indeed, is the material, that even if the
existence of Inquisitions for the heads of families in only
two generations be considered sufficient for purposes of
comparison, and the establishment of a trend in landownership,-
only 37 families or single branches of families out of the
87 are affected.

Of these 37 families or branches of families, 12 show
an increase in the number of manors held over the generations
under review; 10 show a decrease; 4 show an increase in one
generation followed by a decrease in the next; and for 11
others the number of manors listed remains constant.

Such figures are, perhaps, too partial and too incon-
clusive to be of much value, but, set alongside the verdicts
of other sources, may prove helpful. It should perhaps be
emphasised that, until a careful investigation of alienation
fines for these families has been made, any conclusions as
to trends in gentry landownership drawn from the Inquisitions
alone must remain extremely tentative. Research into
alienations fines should prove rewarding, but it lies beyond

4. See Appx. 25. Family branches are there treated
individually, hence the figure 87.
the scope of this study. In the meantime it is interesting
to note which families appear in the various groups already
mentioned.

Prominent among those 10 whose manors decreased in
numbers were the Catholic families of Caryll of Harting who
dropped 2 manors; the Gages both of Firle, who dropped 4 and
of Bentley who dropped 3 manors; the Thatchers who dropped 2,
and the Brownes, eventually Viscounts Montague, who appear
to have dropped 5, though the later Inquisition for which
there is only one copy, is very imperfect. The Apsleys of
Pulborough too, if not recusants, were connected by marriage
with the prominent Catholic family of Shelley of Worminghurst,
and with the Dawtreys of Petworth who were also no enthusiasts
for the Elizabethan Settlement.

Of the remaining families who appear to have been
shedding manors, the Ernleys at this period were in process
of selling up and leaving the county; the Levett family and
the Shirleys of West Grinstead suffered a failure of male
heirs, and the Onleys a minority and the lunacy of the male
heir simultaneously.

Among the families whose manorial property, according
to the evidence of the Inquisitions Post Mortem, increased
and subsequently decreased, were the Morleys of Glynde who,

5. P.R.O. C. 142. 235. 110.
6. The connection, if any, between recusancy and economic
decline has not yet been satisfactorily worked out. For
a comment on this see H.R. Trevor Roper: "The Gentry,1540-
1640 (Econ. Hist. Rev. Supp., 1.20-21), For the financial
despite their profits from the iron industry, may have been embarrassed by their bankrupt relatives. William Morley was the eldest son and heir of Thomas Morley of Glynde who died in January, 1559, and who had been a prosperous Sussex gentleman with an iron mill, furnace and forge at Hawksden in Mayfield, as well as his landed property which included 5 manors. William, however, left 6 manors as against his father's 5, but his grandson, Herbert, left only 3 manors.

Now this family appears to have supported the Elizabethan Settlement, William Morley being described in the Bishop's letter of 1564 as "no Justice but a favourer of godly proceedings", and in the 1587 report on the J.P's, as "a good Justice as well in respect of religion as of the commyn wealth". In 1588, he with two others

footnote contd.

7. For these families see Section III.
8. V. infra, 223.
10. P.R.O. C. 142, 253, 98.
was assessed at £60 for the Armada loan, the second highest rate of assessment for the county, less only than the rate for such families as the Gorings of Burton or of Ovingdean, the Carylls of Warnham and of Harting; or for Covert of Slaugham, Culpepper of Wakehurst, or Pelham of Laughton - from all of whom £100 was levied. Moreover, it appears to have been William Morley who either added to or restored the mansion of Glynde in the 1560’s.

Yet it does seem that the Morleys were unable to retain the modest fortune they had made. Perhaps the unsuccessful venture of William Morley’s younger brother, Anthony, in the iron industry in Glamorganshire where he had migrated, brought misfortune on others than himself and his own wife and children. William Morley’s brother-in-law too, Herbert Pelham of Buckstepe and Michaelham, stumbled into serious pecuniary difficulties and had to forfeit his estates. Whether the Morleys of Glynde were dragged downwards by Anthony Morley’s and Herbert Pelham’s losses is a matter for speculation, but it may help to explain the family’s apparent decline.

The evidence of the Inquisitions Post Mortem concerning those families who seem neither to have increased nor

14. S.A.C., i, 32 et seq.
15. See notes on the Pelhams in Section III.
16. Also, cf. valuations in Feodary Surveys of Herbert Morley, Esq., dt. 1 Apr. 1611 & 6 Apr. 1622 (both in P.R.O. Wards 5.43. Pt.1) totalling £69.18.10, and of Feodary Survey of his brother, Robert Morley Esq., who eventually succeeded him, dt.17 Jan. 8 Charles, amounting to £28.18.8 (P.R.O. Wards, 5.43. Pt.2).
reduced their number of manors is not by itself of much value. Such families could well have been making fortunes without increasing their lands, or, alternatively, they might have been falling on evil days but clinging desperately to such manors as they had.

More important are the indications given by the Inquisitions as to which families were definitely collecting manors during this period. These ten families were obviously on the upward path, and, in view of the present discussion among economic historians as to the causes of prosperity among the gentry where it is found, they deserve special attention.

One of the most interesting of these "rising" families was that of the Bishopps, since they were mere newcomers to a strongly conservative county - yet through sheer weight of influence, coupled no doubt with some ability, they made their name and fortune in Sussex within two generations. It has already been shown that, according to the Feodary Surveys of Thomas Bishopp Esquire the elder, dated 2 Elizabeth, he died seized of four manors, while the Feodary Survey of his son and heir, Sir Thomas Bishopp, knight and baronet, dated 1631, shows that he held ten manors at his death. The Inquisitions

17. See Appx. 25.
18. V. supra, §4 et seqq & 1147.
Post Mortem of these two people endorse these figures.
A further indication of the increasing affluence of the Bishopp family is the fact that they were among the few whose subsidy assessments rose steadily from 38 Henry VIII to 1/2 Charles I.

Other families which appear from the evidence of the Inquisitions Post Mortem to have been adding to their manors were the Coverts, the Culpeppers of Wakehurst, the Eversfields of Worth and later of Horsham, the Gunters, the Palmers of Parham, the Pelhams of Laughton who became baronets in 1611, the Scotts of Iden, the Selwyns of Friston, the Stoughtons, and the Sackvilles of Withiam - who during this period entered the peerage, Thomas Sackville becoming Baron Buckhurst in 1567 and Earl of Dorset in 1604. The Colbrand family too acquired a manor in Sussex during this period. Finally, the Lewkenors of West Dean should perhaps also be mentioned here, although only one relevant Inquisition Post Mortem survives, namely for Sir Richard Lewkenor, Chief Justice of Chester; he was a second son, being the younger brother of Thomas Lewkenor of Selsey who inherited the family estates, and it was therefore no small achievement for him to have left 4 1/2 manors at his death.

20. P.R.O., C.142. 127.50; P.R.O., C. 142. 453. 98.
21. See Appendix 26, and for Subsidy assessments see relevant family history in Section III.
22. G.E.C., iv, 422.
23. P.R.O. C. 142. 355. 45.
The possible causes of the prosperity of these families will be considered in a subsequent chapter relating to the occupations of the gentry. Meanwhile, the evidence of sources other than Inquisitions Post Mortem will be briefly reviewed so as to check and supplement their verdict on tendencies in individual family fortunes. It has already been observed that only for 37 out of the 87 families or family branches do Inquisitions Post Mortem give any information as to trends in landownership. For a more general picture however, some attempt has been made to use the information contained in the Sussex Subsidy Rolls.

It is, of course, common knowledge that the Tudor Subsidy assessment was very far from being an accurate valuation of a man's substance either in lands or goods, and that as time went on it became increasingly nominal. The very system of assessment and collection employed was sufficient to guarantee this since the Commissioners were, as a rule, themselves the leading gentry of the county who should have borne the main burden of taxation. By the end of Elizabeth's reign, according to Dowell, a subsidy had become virtually a grant of £80,000 as against one of about £100,000 at her accession, to be defrayed by the local fiscal unit, nominally at the rate of 4/- in the £ on lands, or 2/8 in the £ on goods, but in fact according to custom

except where death, removal or a serious diminution of estate necessitated a revision of the previous rates of assessment.

In the later years of Elizabeth's reign, the unproductiveness of subsidies was frequently deplored by statesmen. For example, in 1575 Sir Walter Mildmay, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, said in the House of Commons, "It could not be unknown to any how favourable was the taxation of subsidies, whereby far less cometh to her majesty's coffers than by the law is granted, a matter now drawn to be so usual that it is hard to be reformed." Robert Cecil too, protested at the inadequacy of the Parliamentary grants after the unaccustomed liberality of the Armada year; while Sir Walter Raleigh, in a famous speech in the Parliament of 1601, remarked that, "Our estates that be £30 or £40 in the queen's books are not the hundredth part of our wealth."

The detailed study of a particular Subsidy Roll for a particular Hundred has suggested to Dr. Tait that it was the failure of Subsidy assessments to keep pace with the growing wealth of the country and not their actual reduction that must have provoked criticism, since Salford Hundred as a whole paid more in 1599 and 1600 than, for example, in 1563. But perhaps it is dangerous to generalise from evidence relating

25. Dowell, op. cit. i, 145 & 150. Also 155.
26. Quoted in Dowell, op. cit. i, 146.
27. ibid. i, 149.
28. ibid. i, 150.
merely to one Hundred. So marked is the tendency of assessments for many Sussex families to decline between 38 Henry VIII and 1 Charles I, or even within the Elizabethan period, that it may be doubted whether the Commissioners were as a rule, as conservative as Dr. Tait imagines. They seem not merely to have ignored many rising fortunes, but even, on an average, to have reduced the general liability for taxation; and while their assessments may sometimes reflect genuine distress and economic hardship, it is certain that in other cases they are quite misleading.

Richard Covert Esquire of Slaugham, for example, who was assessed at £100 in lands in 38 Henry VIII, 2 Elizabeth and 5 Elizabeth, was taxed only at the rate of 100 marks in 14 Elizabeth, and of £60 in 18 Elizabeth, and his son, Sir Walter was rated at a mere £50 in 1-2 Charles I. But, Sir Walter left more than 11 manors to his father's 7, and he found the means to build an imposing mansion for himself in about the year 1600 at Slaugham.

Striking too is the contradiction between the evidence of the Subsidy Rolls and other sources, for the fortunes of the Pelhams of Laughton. This family, according to the Inquisitions Post Mortem, increased its manors from 5 to 12

30. See Appendix 26.
31. ibid.
32. For references, see relevant family history, Section III; notes on Subsidy assessments.
in two generations; its representative in 1580, Sir Thomas Pelham, was assessed eight years later at £100 for the Armada loan, the highest rate of assessment then used in Sussex, and his continuous prominence in the county, whether as J.P., as sheriff, as Deputy Lieutenant or County Member of Parliament, suggests that his prestige was by no means on the wane. In fact, he was able to afford to build a new mansion for himself, Halland Place, which was completed in 1595, although the Pelhams had built themselves the magnificent residence of Laughton Place only some 60 years earlier. He was also able to purchase himself a baronetcy in 1611; to purchase the Rape of Hastings from the Earl of Huntingdon; and to build and endow a grammar school in Cuckfield, and even to take over the management of the estates of his cousin, Herbert Pelham of Michaelham, who had fallen into serious financial difficulties. Yet, the subsidy assessment of Sir Nicholas Pelham in 1538, Henry VIII, then head of this family, was £80 in lands, while those of his successors in 1580 Elizabeth, 18 Elizabeth and 1-2 Charles I, were all at £40 in lands. During the course of writing this particular paper, to these instances could be added those of the families of Culpepper of Wakehurst, Gunter of Racton and Selwyn of

33. See Appendix 20.
34. S.A.C. i, 32 et seqq.
35. See Section III: Pelham family history.
36. See Appendix 26 and relevant family history.
of Friston, all of whose subsidy assessments declined over the years, though they were increasing their manorial property according to the Inquisitions Post Mortem.

Apart from this tendency of subsidy assessments to decline, - perhaps the most obvious defect of Subsidy Rolls as source material for the economic historian, - there are other difficulties in making use of them.

To begin with, while in all a considerable number of sixteenth century Subsidy Rolls for the various Rapes of Sussex survive, there are very few subsidy years for which complete Rolls are extant, for the entire county. From the end of Henry VIII's reign and to the beginning of Charles I's there are only four complete or nearly complete Rolls with subsidy assessments and names for the whole county, namely those for the years 38 Henry VIII, 2 Elizabeth, 14 Elizabeth and 1 Charles. It is fortunate that these four are so well spaced out chronologically. Individual Subsidy Rolls for individual Rapes or for the City of Chichester for other Subsidy years have been examined and might be of considerable value in tracing the economic history of certain particular families which lived in those places, but they are of little use in a general study of this kind except in confirming trends in assessments.

37. See notes on subsidy assessments attached to relevant family histories, Section III.
38. For a list of Sussex Subsidy Rolls, see P.R.O. Catalogue, Press 7, vol.34. Exchث. K.R. 'Subsidy' Rolls.
Another problem which arises early in using these Rolls is whether the only assessments to be noted are those for the head of each family or family branch in the Subsidy year in question, or whether the assessments of relatives are also to be taken into account, and if so to what degree of kinship. The solution adopted here has been to note the ratings of heads of families and of their wives if these are separately assessed, or of their sons. Also assessments of widows of sometime heads of families are noted. When, as occasionally happened, a relative, apparently also a guardian, appears on the Subsidy Roll in the place of his ward during the latter's minority, his assessment is taken to represent that of the family.

Further, in dealing with some of the more obscure families, the usual genealogical problem of identification arises, particularly when the family in question was not well established in one district and its place of residence is uncertain. In such cases and where there is any reasonable doubt as to identity, the subsidy assessments which may possibly have related to members of any families here under review, are not used as evidence but merely noted in the family histories in Section III with a query beside them.

40. e.g. See notes on Subsidy assessments attached to family history of Caryll of Warham, Section III.
There is the difficulty too that, while normally, individuals were assessed according either to the estimated value of their lands, or of their goods, whichever were the greater, though occasionally also of both simultaneously, sometimes assessments for particular families are for goods in one year and lands in another, or sometimes for goods throughout, although the family in question undoubtedly owned some lands. No attempt has been made here to adopt two scales of values for lands or goods, and only assessments on lands are noted in Appendix 26, so that families whose chief wealth was in the form of moveables do not appear in this survey of Subsidy assessments in a very favourable light. But there are other clues to their wealth which will be discussed later.

Again, quite apart from the known obstacle that subsidy assessments tended to decline during the later sixteenth century and early seventeenth century, the rates of assessment, even for a group of gentry families in one county in any single subsidy year, were not strictly comparable. For one thing, there was the obvious likelihood that subsidy Commissioners for the individual Rapes or major divisions of the county in question, and perhaps also the Sessors for

41. e.g. See notes on Subsidy assessments of Shelley of Michelgrove, Section III.
42. e.g. See notes on Subsidy assessments of Bartellot, Bowyer of Cuckfield, Cowper & Shelley of Patcham, Section III.
43. But assessments on goods appear in family histories in Section III.
individual Hundreds, would under-assess themselves. Further, there is every possibility that recusants or suspected Catholics were over-assessed. Finally, there is the difficulty of the separate assessment of the peers.

In view of all these difficulties it is obvious that Subsidy Rolls are only of very limited, if of any use, to the historian as a means of discovering either the absolute contemporary value of the lands held by the head of a family in any one subsidy year, or their value relative to those of the heads of other families in any one subsidy year, or even the trend in the value of a family's lands over a period of time covering a number of subsidy years.

Nevertheless, there appears to be no other source within this period which covers anything like the same number of families in all, or which has the same continuity over several generations, and it may be that, if used with extreme caution and compared with that of other sources, the evidence of Subsidy Rolls is not entirely worthless.

44. V. infra/et seqq.
45. It might have been thought that a simple way of using the Subsidy Rolls to discover approximately whether the Elizabethan office-holding gentry were on the upward or downward grade economically between the end of Henry VIII's reign and the beginning of Charles I's, would have been to have estimated the total sum levied from all the relevant families in each subsidy year between those dates for which all the Rolls are available, and to have compared it with the total sum paid by the whole county. In this way, the liability of this class relative to the liability of the county as a whole could have been seen and would surely have had some bearing on the facts of the economic situation. But, unfortunately, the number of families for which assessments exist varies from year to year. Some families, e.g. Churcher, settled in Sussex after 38 /contd.
In the first place, they can at least be used to establish what were the assessments for the lands of each family, as distinct from their absolute value, relative to the assessments for those of others for individual subsidy years.

This has been attempted in the four charts which form Appendix 27 and which represent the known assessments on lands for all the relevant families for each of the four subsidy years, 38 Henry VIII, 2 Elizabeth, 14 Elizabeth and 1 Charles I. These charts speak for themselves and show how the assessments of each family varied relatively to those of the others through these years. But it is perhaps worth pointing out that in 38 Henry VIII the highest assessment, that of Shelley of Michelgrove, was at £400, whereas in 2 Elizabeth the highest assessment was one of £200 on the Gages of Firle, and in 14 Elizabeth one of £100, again on the Shelleys of Michelgrove, while in 1 Charles I the highest assessment was on Covert of Slaugham at the rate of £50.

The lowering in the scale of assessments of such families as the Shelleys of Michelgrove, the Dawtreys and the Gages of Firle, leaps to the eye, - but in view of the general decline in the rate of subsidy assessments and the absence of reference continued.

Henry VIII. Others, e.g. Jefferay, had a failure of direct male heirs before 1 Charles I. So that such a calculation could have very little value.
figures for certain families in individual years, this Appendix does not give the clearest possible interpretation of the Subsidy Rolls.

Therefore, secondly, and perhaps much more significantly, these Rolls may be used to establish the relationship between the assessment on the lands of each individual family and the average assessment on lands for all the relevant families assessed for each subsidy year over a period of subsidy years. That is to say, since subsidy assessments tended to decline, the only way to establish which families were being assessed at relatively higher or lower rates than the others over a period of time, is to strike an average rate of assessment for each subsidy year for all the relevant families assessed in that year, and then to compare individual assessments with it. In this way it can be seen over a period of years whether a family's assessments were relatively higher or lower from time to time. The results of this method of computation appear in Appendix 26 and are indicated by plus and minus signs according to whether the assessments for each family were above or below average for the years in question.

One of the features of this Appendix which calls for comment is the steady decline in the figure for the average subsidy assessment from 38 Henry VIII to 1 Charles I. Although the number of families, excluding peers, for which assessments exist varies only from 36 in 38 Henry VIII to 37 in 2 Elizabeth, 46 in 14 Elizabeth and 37 in 1 Charles I, -
figures which, after all, do not fluctuate to extremes, - the average rate of assessment fell from £61, to the nearest pound, in 38 Henry VIII, to £46, in 2 Elizabeth, £33, in 14 Elizabeth, and £14 in 1 Charles I, - a drop of more than 75%

Hence the decline in the rates of assessment for individual families is not to be taken at face value, as for example in the case of the family of Covert whose assessments dropped from £100 in lands in 38 Henry VIII to £50 in lands in 1 Charles I, - assessments however which remained, as was fitting in their case, above the average throughout.

In interpreting the facts shown by this Appendix, an attempt has been made, first, to work out how many families or family branches among those studied and for which assessments on lands exist in the four selected subsidy years, - were assessed at rates above the average or at rates below it, and how many were assessed at rates rising from below average to above it over the years, or declining from above to below. Such a method of analysis renders the following results: that, of the 87 families or family branches under consideration, seven should be treated separately as peers, namely those of Browne, Viscount Montague, Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, and Howard, Earl of Arundel, of Lord Lumley, of Percy, Earl of

46. See Appendix 26. Supplement.
47. V. infra, 147 et seqq.
Northumberland and West, Lord De la Warr;—also finally the
Sackville family of Withiam, though not its related branches,
as it was ennobled in 1567 and there is only one subsidy
assessment for it along with those of other commoners, that of
38 Henry VIII. Apparently there was no similar assessment in
2 Elizabeth. Therefore there are, at this stage, 80 families
in all to be considered. Of these, 12 have no assessments on
lands for any of the four subsidy years here in question; so
that there are only 68 families for which there are assessments.
Of these, 37 or more than half, were assessed at rates
consistently below average, and 16 or nearly a quarter, were
assessed at rates consistently above; of the remainder,
9 families were assessed to begin with at rates below average
and later at rates above, though sometimes they slipped back
again, and 6 at rates starting above average and later
falling below it, though some recovered again.

These figures are not surprising: the base of the
economic pyramid is bound to be broader than its apex. But
it should be noted that, in the absence of further figures,
the classification of some of these families rests on no more

48. See P.R.O. E. 179/190/225.
49. See P.R.O. E. 179/190/265 & 266.
50. E.g. See assessments for Lunsford, also for Bellingham
of Hangleton & Ford of Harting though the rates for
the two last recovered a 2nd time.
51. E.g. Parker of Ratton & Morley of Glynde, though the
latter's assessment fell below average again a 2nd
time in 1 Charles I.
than two or even one subsidy assessment, even though all the
Rolls for the relevant years have been carefully examined.
Sometimes the gaps can be explained by non-residence in the
county, for example in the case of the family of Churcher for
which there is no assessment on any of these Rolls before 1
Charles I and which appears to have settled in Sussex only in
the latter half of the reign of Elizabeth; sometimes the
assessments for certain families were on goods in some years,
as, for example, in the case of the Cowper family; or
almost throughout, as in the case of the family of Shelley of
Patcham and Lewes. But at other times it is difficult
to understand why particular names did not appear on the
Rolls.

It might, perhaps, be objected at this point, that
such a rough-and-ready approximation makes no distinction
between families assessed at just above or below average and
those well above or below; that it places too much weight on
one or two assessments in some cases and that it does not
throw any light on the trend of subsidy assessments among
those families whose rates did not cross the line of average

52. See Section III on family of Churcher.
53. e.g. John Cooper of Dycham in West Harting, Hundred of
Domford, Chichester Rape (sic) was assessed at £70 in
goods in 38 Henry VIII. P.R.O. (E. 179/190/225). His
son was assessed at £12 in lands in 14 Elizabeth., as of
the same address. (P.R.O. 179/190/283).
54. Richard Shelley of Patcham, Whalesbone Hundred (sic),
Lewes Rape, was assessed at £100 in goods in 38 Henry VII
(P.R.O. E. 179/190/225); his son, John Shelley, as of
(contd.)
assessments in either direction.

It is true that no attempt is made in the Supplement to Appendix 26 to show how near the assessments of some families were to the average over the years in question, but a comparison can easily be made by reference to the Appendix itself and to the table of average assessments.

As for the objection that too much emphasis is laid on one or two isolated assessments in classifying families, the bracketted figure beside each name entered in the Supplement to Appendix 26 shows on how many assessments each particular classification is based.

Finally, a more detailed study of the subsidy assessments within the Elizabethan period would certainly be possible for some of the 87 families or family branches since additional Subsidy Rolls for individual Rapes in individual subsidy years have survived. They are helpful in confirming suspected trends in assessments for particular families between the years selected for study, and have been consulted, but they are too fragmentary to be used systematically. The conclusions drawn from the Subsidy Rolls

footnote continued

the same, was assessed at £50 in goods in 2 Elizabeth and again in 14 Elizabeth (P.R.O. E. 179/190/267 and P.R.O. E. 179/190/283); his grandson, Henry Shelley as of the same, at £4 in goods in 1 Charles I (P.R.O. E.179/190/377a). However, John Shelley of Whalesbone Hundred, Lewes Rape, was assessed at £6 in lands in 38. H.VIII. (P.R.O. E. 179/190/225).

are summarised in a general Appendix on economic trends among the families under review. Where the evidence of these Rolls seems of little value, this is indicated. But sometimes a piece of fragmentary information from one source acquires some value when placed alongside other types of evidence.

However, before attempting to interpret the facts described in this chapter, perhaps a brief summary should be given of the evidence contained in the Subsidy Rolls with regard to the peers whose principal residence under Elizabeth was in Sussex.

For nearly all of these, the assessments declined over the period covered by the four selected subsidy years, some gradually, others precipitously.

Between the assessment for the first payment of the subsidy granted by Parliament in 37 Henry VIII, an assessment dated 1st March, 37 Henry VIII, and the assessment for the second payment of the subsidy granted by Parliament in 13 Elizabeth, an assessment dated October, 14 Elizabeth, the estimated income from lands of the head of the family of Fitzalan, Earls of Arundel, had fallen from £1,966.13.4 to £500. Again, between the assessment for the first payment of

56. See Appendix 28.
57. Statutes of the Realm, (1817), iii, 1019.
58. P.R.O., E. 179/69/54.
60. P.R.O., E. 179/69/87.
the subsidy granted by Parliament in 13 Elizabeth, an assessment whose date is unfortunately illegible on the Roll, and that for the first payment of the subsidy granted by Parliament in 3 Charles I, an assessment dated 5th July, 4 Charles I, the estimated income from lands of the head of the family of Sackville who was at first Lord Buckhurst and later Earl of Dorset, fell from £500 to £100. The assessment for the head of the family of Browne, Viscounts Montague, fell from £700 in August, 1 Elizabeth, to £150 in July, 4 Charles I. For the head of the family of West, Lords De la Warr, it fell from £600 for the first payment of the subsidy on 1st March, 37 Henry VIII, to £50 on 20th March, 5 Charles I. For the head of the family of Howard, then Duke of Norfolk and not primarily resident in Sussex, it was, in March, 37 Henry VIII, £3,000, but in July, 4 Charles I, when the head of the family was Earl of Arundel and Earl Marshal of England, it was only £300. The rate of decline in the assessments for the family of Percy whose head

---

63. P.R.O. E. 178/5941.
64. " E. 179/69/78.
67. " E. 179/70/143.
68. " E. 179/69/54.
69. " E. 178/5941.
was the Earl of Northumberland, was less startling. For him, the assessment in August, 1 Elizabeth was £666.13.4. and for the Countess of Northumberland, £300. In April, 2 Elizabeth, the date of the assessment for the second payment of the same subsidy, which had been granted in 1 Elizabeth, the assessment for the Earl of Northumberland was only £350. But in July, 4 Charles I and March, 5 Charles I, the assessments for the Earl of Northumberland were as high as £600.

For Baron Lumley, the assessments actually rose during this period since his income from lands at the time of both the first and second payments of the subsidy granted in 1 Elizabeth was said to be £66.13.4., but in 1581, and at all subsequent assessments throughout the reign, it was said to be £100.

No attempt has been made to correlate these subsidy assessments of the Sussex peerage with those of the commoners, since the methods by which the respective figures were arrived at were totally different. Neither has any attempt been made to evaluate these figures as evidence for the economic condition of the peerage since they should obviously be compared with some average scale of assessment among the peers as a whole for the subsidy years in question. The

---

70. P.R.O. E. 179/69/78.
73. " E. 179/69/78 & 79. The income of his wife from lands was said to be £100 at that date.
74. P.R.O. E. 179/69/94. I am grateful to Miss H. Miller for all of these figures and for the P.R.O. references except /contd
figures, for what they are worth, must speak for themselves.

... ...

It is now time to attempt to summarise the results already achieved in studying the economic trends among the gentry of Elizabethan Sussex. 76.

A chart has been drawn up tabulating the evidence of the Inquisitions Post Mortem and the selected Subsidy Rolls as to which families appear to have been rising and which declining in the scale of landownership during this period. The Inquisitions Post Mortem, as has already been shown, have been used mainly for their evidence as to the ownership of manors and capital mesuages, and an increase or diminution in the number of those held by the successive heads of families is taken as evidence of the gain or loss by those families of lands in general. The Subsidy Rolls have been used, as has also been shown, for the light they throw on the relationship between the actual assessments on the lands held by each family and the average assessment on the lands of all the selected families in the county in each relevant subsidy year; it is the ratio between these that is taken as evidence of a family's status as landowners.

footnote continued

for those relating to the assessments for 4 and 5 Charles I.

75. Dietz, op. cit., 384.
76. See Appendix 28.
Examination of the first two columns of the table forming Appendix 28, shows that seven families were definitely increasing their landed property during the period under review since the evidence of Inquisitions Post Mortem and of Subsidy Rolls agrees on this point. They were acquiring manors through the generations studied and their subsidy assessments were either above the average or rising in relation to it. They were the families of Bishopp, Covert, Culpepper of Wakehurst, Goring of Burton, Lewkenor of West Dean, Pelham of Laughton and Selwyn. To these might be added the names of Colbrand, Gounter, Palmer of Parham, Scott and Stoughton since, although they were all at sometime assessed at Subsidy rates below average, in the case of all but the Colbrands and the Gounters this was only on one occasion. In any case, that a family should have been assessed at a rate below the average is not in itself proof that it was not acquiring lands. The evidence of the Inquisitions Post Mortem is also quite clear that the family of Sackville of Withiam was adding to its lands through this period but, as its head was ennobled in 1567 the evidence of the Subsidy Rolls has not been used.

Similarly, the same two columns of Appendix 28 agree that the families of Apsley of Pulborough, Caryll of Harting, Ernley, Levett, Morley, Onley, Shirley of West Grinstead, Thatcher and Wilgoose were losing lands during this period.
In view of the startling evidence of the Inquisitions Post Mortem as to the loss of manors by the Gages of Firle and of Bentley, it seems obvious that the upward trend in the assessments of the Gages of Bentley and the consistently high level of those of the Gages of Firle signify something other than a marked increase in the value of their lands. The fact that they were, along with the Shelleys and the Carylls, among the leading Catholic families of the county, may help to explain these facts. In fact, where the Inquisitions Post Mortem give definite evidence of a trend in landownership, it seems that they should be trusted rather than the Subsidy Rolls.

However, for the main bulk of the selected families, one or other of these two columns shows a blank owing to lack of material, or else the evidence is equivocal.

However, there are other sources to be considered, namely the material already examined as to the building of town or country residences during this period, and the figures for sums levied in 1588 or 1589 as contributions.

77. V. supra, 110 et seqq.

78. See T.C. Noble: The names of those persons who subscribed towards the Defence of this Country at the time of the Spanish Armada, 1588, and the amounts each contributed, (1886) See p. xxx of Introduction for a discussion of the date of payment.
towards the Armada Loan. Taken by themselves, neither of 
these two sources is of much value, but set alongside the 
evidence of Inquisitions Post Mortem and of Subsidy Rolls as 
to trends in landownership, they can be helpful. There is 
also much incidental material as to the fortunes of these 
families which is to be found outside the more formal economic 
Sources, for example the material in the Hatfield MSS and in 
the Star Chamber relating to the Ashburnham family. In fact, 
all the material examined has been taken into account in 
attempting to establish the trend in the fortune of any 
particular family.

The results of such a method of comparison are tabulated 
in the Supplement attached to Appendix 28. There it is 
shown that while both the Inquisitions Post Mortem and the 
subsidy assessments of seven families agree that the amount 
and value of their lands increased during the three gener-
atations under review, if other evidence is taken into 
25 consideration, families and families branches, with the 
Sackvilles of Withiam who entered the peerage in 1567, seem 
to have been prospering during the reign of Elizabeth. Again,

79. V. supra, 140 et seq., for a discussion of the value of 
Elizabethan architecture as evidence for economic 
trends. The figures for the Armada Loan contributions 
are relevant for only one year; also the levy was by 
the Lord Lieutenant of each county and the valuation 
was according not to lands or goods but mone\textsuperscript{ly} to 
what each Lord Lieutenant considered each gentleman 
could be make to pay.

80. V. infra., 221 -'5
while the Inquisitions Post Mortem and the Subsidy Rolls suggest that nine families were, on the aggregate, losing lands over this period, if other evidence be adduced, perhaps 23 were economically on the downgrade during this period. The evidence on which these conclusions are based is admittedly fragmentary and difficult to interpret, and in some cases appearances are misleading. For instance, the Shirleys of Wiston were assessed at a consistently high level for two of the subsidies under consideration, they built Wiston House in the 1570's and contributed £100 to the Armada Loan. Yet they met financial disaster during the Elizabethan period. Similarly, the Pelhams of Buckstepe who were assessed at rates well above the average in 2 Elizabeth and 14 Elizabeth, and perhaps built or altered Hendall House in Buckstepe in Elizabeth's reign, fell seriously into debt in Herbert Pelham's time.

There are many families about whom there is insufficient material available to classify them either way; among them are those whose wealth was chiefly in goods rather than in lands. Moreover, some families must have remained at relatively much the same economic level throughout the period, keeping pace with the times but no more. Indeed, not all

81. V. infra, 208 et seqq.
82. See Section III.
the families classified as "rising", were rising throughout the three generations under review. Their fortunes must have fluctuated from time to time as did those of families which were, on the whole, falling in the economic scale. Only general trends can be examined here.

It remains to consider what characteristics, if any, the rising and declining families had in common with others of the same condition, and what factors may have contributed to their prosperity or decay.

83. V. supra, 156-158 & 173, n.50.
CHAPTER 3

Occupations and their bearing on the prosperity of the gentry.

In the last chapter, an attempt was made to estimate which of the families under review appear to have been, on the whole, on the upward and which on the downward grade economically during the reign of Elizabeth. In doing this, it was found impossible, owing to the limitations imposed by the sources being used, to deal adequately with the seven noble families which otherwise come within the scope of this study as being holders of important offices in the county under Elizabeth, primarily resident in Sussex, and with a representative alive in 1580.

In this chapter it is proposed to make use of the conclusions reached in the last as to which gentry families appear definitely to have been rising economically and which declining, and to inquire how many of the more fortunate appear to have been gaining their wealth from sources other than and in addition to landownership.

It was Mr. Trevor-Roper's thesis \(^1\) that between 1540 and 1640 fortunes were both made and lost by families belonging both to the nobility and to the untitled gentry, irrespective of rank, but that the more successful members of both the

---

nobility and the "gentry", from the economic point of view, were those who made their fortunes not so much from land management and the manipulation of leases, as from other sources, - for instance, from the tenure of lucrative offices under the Crown, or from the practise of the law, or from trade.

To broaden and adapt his argument, - the sources from which it appears likely that the Sussex gentry would have derived their income under Elizabeth, apart from and in addition to the land itself, seem to have been industry, trade, the professions and the tenure of remunerative offices. Accordingly, an attempt will be made to find out which families appear to have been gaining income from these origins and this can best be done by dealing as nearly as possible with one generation only, namely with the individuals who were heads of their families in 1580. An enquiry will then be made as to which of these gentry families obviously engaging in activities other than and in addition to agriculture and estate management were among those which were apparently building up fortunes, and as to whether any of them were among those which seem to have been declining economically.

Unfortunately however, the enquiry will not be able to be taken that far in the case of the seven noble families under review since, as has been seen, the trend in their

2. v. supra, 170.
individual economic fortunes has not yet been established.
But it may be of some interest all the same to know which of
the peers concerned who were alive in 1580, appear to have been
drawing funds at some stage in their careers from sources
other than landownership.

3.

Apart from farming and estate management, many of the
Elizabethan gentry in Sussex were engaged directly or
indirectly in industry. It has been shown that many of the
families here under review were landowners on a very modest
scale if the evidence of Inquisitions Post Mortem may be
relied on, yet some of these families were by no means
economically insignificant. For, as Miss Kaye-Smith reminds
us in her popular topographical study of the Weald, this
district was, during a considerable period, "the industrial
area, the Black Country of England", if such an epithet may
be applied to the sixteenth century. Camden, in his general
description of Sussex, says:—

3. For the importance and some of the particular character-
istics of agriculture in Sussex between 1560 and 1640, see
S.A.C. X&ii, 48 et seqq; also J. Cornwall, 'The Agrarian
History of Sussex, 1560-1640', (Univ. of London, M.A.
thesis).

4. V. supra, 148-9

5. E.g. John Bowyer of Hartfield, ironmaster according to
his I.P.M., held some lands but no manors at his death
(P.R.O.C.42.225.60; S.R.S. xiv.35). His son, Henry Bowyer of
Cuckfield, one of the leading ironmasters of Elizabethan
Sussex, according to his I.P.M., held one manor and a
quarter at his death (P.R.O.C.42.143.79; S.R.S. xiv.35).

/contd.
"It [Sussex] has several veins of iron, and many furnaces for melting it, which consumes great quantities of wood every year. Many streams unite in one in several places, and a great deal of meadow ground is converted into lakes and pools to turn mills which move hammers to work iron, whose incessant noise night and day echoes all over the neighbourhood. But the iron melted here, either from the natural quality or management of the metal, is not of the same goodness, and in general more brittle than the Spanish iron. It yields however no small profit to the proprietors of the mines, who cast cannon and other articles in it. How far it will be of public utility time must shew." 7.

Of the local industries of Elizabethan Sussex, the most prominent was indubitably the iron industry. It was, except for farming, the oldest and most continuous in the Weald, going back at least as far as Roman times, though the peak centuries were the sixteenth and seventeenth. During the middle ages the industry had apparently declined and was conducted on a somewhat limited and really a domestic scale by a few landowners, but towards the close of the fifteenth century a new process of iron smelting was introduced from the continent involving the use of blast furnaces - a process best adapted for the production of cast iron whose chief use at that time was in the manufacture of shot or cannon. 9.

---

reference continued

9. ibid., ch.5.
In view of the frequent threats if not of the reality of war in Tudor times, such a development was bound to be very important. The first casting of iron cannon in England took place in Buxsted in Sussex in 1543, though shot had been produced on a limited scale in Sussex before. Undoubtedly a great impetus to the manufacture of cannon and shot in Sussex in the sixteenth century was the loss of Calais in 1558, the main arsenal of England in continental wars in the early Tudor period. After that, the casting of cannon in Sussex became of first rate importance both industrially and militarily.

Mr. Straker surmises that it was owing to his fears that the products of this industry might be falling into unfriendly hands that Walsingham, who was appointed Secretary of State on 20th December, 1573, caused the most complete record of the Wealden iron industry that we have to be compiled. Straker suggests that it was he who caused complaints to be made to the Privy Council about the existing


11. *ibid.*, loc.cit. August, 1513, John Bowyer of "Hatfield" (sic, i.e. Hartfield) was producing "gunstones". He was the father of the great Elizabethan ironmaster, Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield.


conduct of the Wealden iron industry so that the Council might order an investigation into the matter, and summon individual ironmasters and owners of forges and furnaces before it. Whether such complaints were indeed engineered we do not know, but the Council could have intervened without them and in any case one at least of the protests referred to by Straker is apparently dated after the Privy Council had taken action.

The situation was as follows; in January, 1574, one Ralph Hogge, to whom the Queen had granted a patent to provide her with cannon and shot at a specially low rate, apparently on condition that he sold no ordnance to "any stranger" without special permission of the Queen's Master of Ordnance, wrote a letter of complaint to the Privy Council saying that his patent had been and was being infringed. His monopoly, in fact, was breaking down, for "ther is so maynie furnesses that nowe of late yeares have ther owne trade of casting Sowes for ma iking of yron and caryd them to the seay syd to divers and sundry places .. and when they are in the sey they go into France and into Flanders with them without any lycence at all."

14. S.P. Dom. Eliz. Vol. 95, no. 20. Complaint of Christopher Baker about the conduct of the Wealden iron industry, dated in Cal. S.P.D. 1547-'60, 474, as Feb (15), 1574. Also, S.P. Dom. Eliz. Vol. 95, no. 21, a list of the offending ironworks, signed by Baker, is dated 15 Feb., 1574. The Privy Council's summons to individuals connected with the industry to appear before it was dated 3 Feb., 1573/4 (See A.P.C. 1571-5, 186)
He pointed out that, under pretence of carrying ordnance by sea from one English port to another, ships were sailing regularly for foreign ports carrying cannon and shot without any licences, and that this illegal traffic was on the increase. "There is above 4,000 tonnes cast yearly, and all thes will not be sold nor bought to remaine within the Realme, and yf ther be not order taiken, ther is mor about to sett up workes to cast gonnes both here and Wayelles and they being cast will maybe saill one way or other, ether by lawfull meanes or by stelth." 

A further series of criticisms came from one Christopher Baker who deplored the great consumption of timber caused by the industry, also the decay of tillage and ruin of the

16. ibid.
17. ibid.
18. The danger to the local supplies of timber which were used for charcoal, the form of fuel used in the Wealden iron industry in the sixteenth century, was recognised at an early date. A Statute of Henry VIII's reign, (33H.VIII,c.6), had ordered that in the felling of underwood of 24 years' growth and under, there should be left in every acre "twelve standels or stores of oak"; also that no wood of larger than two acres was to be grubbed up for tillage. Again, a Statute of 1 Elizabeth, (1 Eliz. c.15, 1558/9), forbade the felling of timber "to make coals for the making of iron". But both of these Acts specially excepted "places known to be within the Wilds of Kent, Surrey or Sussex" so that they carried little weight. (See Straker, op.cit., ch.14). The life of any particular furnace was limited by the surrounding fuel as it was uneconomic to bring wood and charcoal from afar and the industry as a whole was therefore very dependent on local supplies of timber.
highways for which he likewise held it responsible, and who, like Hogge, emphasised the dangers of allowing the sale of ordnance to foreigners. He concluded:

"I do think that this commoditie of Ordinance that is made within this realm and already sold will turn to a discommoditie when time of service shall require them. That it may please your lordships to consider that this Ordinance making is a commodity to a few and a discommodity to the whole commonwealth. And no merchandise for only private subject to deal withal but more meeter for the prince only. The premisses considered of your lordships I have thought it my duty to signify you the same that unless speedy remedy be provided in these respect ther shall not be timber sufficient to be had within these few years for her majesty to build any ships or otherwise."

It may have been as the result of such complaints, which Straker suspects were inspired, that at a Council held at Hampton Court on 3rd February, 1574, a "placard" was issued to "Richard Pedley, one of the messengers of the Chamber, to warne and commaunde certein whose names are underwritten, with convenient hast, to repaire hither, being soche as were makers of iron pieces to be transported over the seas."

Apart from the list of individual ironmasters or owners of ironworks summoned before the Council by Pedley, which will be referred to again presently, a number of copies have also survived of a list drawn up, apparently in February 1574, of

19. B.M. Stowe MS. 570, f. 103; See also S.P.Dom.Eliz.vol.95. no.20. (Dt.in Cal.S.P.D. 1574-180,474, Feb. (15) 1574).
20. A.P.C. 1571-5,186; also for the list of those summoned before the Council, see S.P.Dom.Eliz., vol.95. no.61, (Dt.in Cal.S.P.D., 1547-180,475,16 March, 1574).
the various forges and furnaces then existing in the Weald whether in Kent, Surrey or Sussex, and of their owners and operators. These copies, while varying slightly as to the spelling of proper names, together form an invaluable source showing which Sussex families in 1574 were operating or leasing out forges and furnaces. According to Mr. Straker who examined them minutely and collated them, they include between them practically every establishment then in existence in the Weald, whether great or small. In all, he finds some 98 or 100 works mentioned. Pedley summoned the owners of 77 of these to appear before the Council, in all 58 persons. The great noblemen, and Sir Thomas Gresham apparently took no notice of the summons, and some of the persons warned were unable to appear and are noted as being "very sick". But in any case we do know that bonds were taken of a number of ironmasters in February and March, 1574, that they would not found or sell iron ordnance without a licence from the Queen on pain of a fine of £2,000.

Precisely how the various 1574 lists of Wealden ironmasters were compiled we do not know but, as Straker says,


"It may be surmised that he had amongst his records full information as to the Wealden ironworks and the importance of preventing the falling into Spanish hands of the cannon produced." Unfortunately no sources have been discovered which show precisely how much individual Sussex ironmasters were making out of this industry, but it is evident that both Hogge and Baker considered that many ironmasters were doing themselves well. Camden seems to have been of the same opinion.

An Appendix has been drawn up showing which of the heads of families under review appear to have either owned or operated forges or furnaces in the Weald in or about 1574. The sources that have been used for this are the 1574 lists already described, supplemented by information compiled by Straker in Part II of his study, and by information found in the Sussex Archaeological Collections. From this it will be seen that as many as 19 heads of families out of a total of 87 under review, or nearly a quarter of the total, owned forges or furnaces at that time in the Weald, and as many as 7 operated them for others, two of these individuals apparently not owning ironworks themselves. Whether or not

27. V.supra, 188.
all of these ironworks were owned or operated by families which seem to have been making their fortunes at this period will be considered later. For the present however, it is clear that a considerable number of gentry families of Elizabethan Sussex had interests in the iron industry, including the noble families of Browne, Viscounts Montague, Howard, Dukes of Norfolk, Percy, Earls of Northumberland, and Sackville, eventually Earls of Dorset.

Another industry which was carried on in Elizabethan Sussex and which the local gentry might have been expected to have busied themselves in was that of glassmaking. As Camden says:

"Nor are glass houses wanting here; but the glass which they make, either from the quality or method of melting it, is less pure and transparent, and fit only for common use." 31.

From the beginning of the thirteenth century to the end of the sixteenth, the forest region of North West Sussex and South West Surrey was the leading glass making centre of the kingdom. After the end of the Roman occupation, the art of glass making seems to have been forgotten in Britain and the various attempts to re-introduce it in Anglo-Saxon times to have had no permanent results. So that it was virtually a new

30. Anthony Morley, the ironmaster, is included in this figure though his father was alive until 1597. John Caryll of Warnham is not included as he does not appear to have managed any ironworks before 1601.(V.App.29).
32. S.E. Winbolt: Wealden Glass (1933), 1-2.
art which was introduced by the French glass-makers who came to settle in Surrey and Sussex at the beginning of the thirteenth century.

However, by the middle of the sixteenth century, the industry was in a state of decline, partly because of the competition of the Wealden iron industry for wood fuel supplies and for water power, and partly because of the increasing competition of foreign glass from Germany, the Netherlands and Venice.  A temporary revival of the industry took place when civil war broke out in the Netherlands and refugees with a knowledge of the craft came to settle in this country. Their leader, one Jean Carré, a Fleming from Antwerp which, after Venice, was the most important glass making centre in Europe, obtained a monopoly in 1567 for the manufacture of glass for glazing on condition that certain royalties were paid and that the craft was to be taught to a certain number of Englishmen. But this last condition does not seem to have suited Carré; in fact he seems to have aimed at establishing a complete monopoly of the English glass industry. For the manufacture of finer glass used for drinking vessels he imported Venetians who specialised in this branch of the industry and whom he employed at his works

at the Crutched Friars in London. One of these, Verzelini, in 1575, three years after Carre's death, obtained a monopoly for the making of finer glass for drinking and other vessels, a monopoly which hit the Sussex manufacturers very hard. Meanwhile, the Surrey-Sussex branch of the industry continued to decline. The alien manufacturers steadfastly refused to teach their art to Englishmen and became increasingly unpopular. Despite what must have been a tremendous demand for window glass at that time in view of all the building then under way, the glass makers of Sussex were fighting a losing battle with the ironmasters for access to local fuel supplies. "Glass was a luxury, iron a necessity; for, with the Spanish trouble in the offing, the cry was for guns and more guns for the navy. Iron was a better paying proposition and influential English ironmasters were jealous of, and indignant against the 'foreigners' who put their fuel supply in jeopardy." Consequently the glass makers trekked westwards into Hampshire, and later to the Forest of Dean where the manufacture of glass by means of coal-power was eventually developed.

It appears therefore that the glass industry can have had little bearing on the fortunes of the Elizabethan gentry

37. See op.cit., 18, for the 1574 "Petworth plot" to rob and murder a number of French glass makers and burn down their houses.
of Sussex one way or the other. The industry was virtually a monopoly in the hands of foreigners though it is possible that there may have been unrecorded instances of gentry embarking on this enterprise after the departure of the aliens. An example of this is found in Kent, for it is known that glass was made at Knole in Sevenoaks in about 1585-17 by one John Lennard, a gentleman and lessee of Knole which was the property of Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst. Again, the site of a glass house probably dating between 1550 and 1610 was found in Petworth Park, but no written records of it have been discovered. Whether the Percies, Earls of Northumberland, had an interest in the industry is not known. It is perhaps significant that in his petition of 1589, one George Longe estimated the total number of glasshouses in all England at no more than fifteen.

With regard to other lesser local industries conducted on a small scale such as the cloth industry or the making of pottery, little is known and no sources have been found to indicate that they had any important bearing on the prosperity of the Elizabethan gentry in Sussex.

42. B.M. Lansd.MS.59.f.72.
As regards trade, casual evidence has not suggested that any of the selected Sussex gentry who were alive and heads of families in 1580 were making regular incomes from it, at least after they had settled in the county. There are examples of Sussex gentlemen, of the first generation as it were, whose fathers had been citizens of London and had carried on business there. For instance, Thomas Bowyer Esquire of Leythorne in North Mundham was the son of Thomas Bowyer, citizen and "grocer" of London, who had made and lost a fortune in his business before his death in 1558, and who urged his son to enter the legal profession since "grocery" was too hazardous an occupation. Again, Robert Casie of Runcton in North Mundham, another lawyer, was also the son of a citizen and "grocer" of London, one George Casie, who had married Jane Bowyer, daughter of Thomas Bowyer, the "grocer". Thus Robert Casie was the nephew of Thomas Bowyer Esquire of Leythorne. But though both of these gentlemen-lawyers were of mercantile families, there is no evidence that either of them had any regular commercial dealings after they settled in the county.

Giles Garton of Woollavington was also descended from a

43. V. Section III; also S.A.C. lxiv, 105.
44. V. Section III.
commercial family. His grandfather was Thomas Garton of London, merchant, and Giles himself, the younger son of a younger son, had sometime been a resident of the parish of St. Margaret's, New Fish Street in London, and was an "ironmonger" and citizen of London. In 1578, Giles, with his elder brother Francis, who was already settled at Billingshurst in Sussex, bought the manor of Woollavington from Lord Lumley for £4,000, and shortly afterwards began to build a large mansion-house there. There is no clear evidence that Giles carried on his "ironmongery" business after he had bought Woollavington manor, though his family seems, on the whole, to have remained connected with the City rather than to have forged new links with other Sussex gentry. Giles Garton's first wife, Catherine, was the daughter of William Pennyfather, a London ironmonger, and his second, Margaret, was the widow of one Richard Goddard, alderman of London. Of Giles' children, his eldest son, Peter, it is true, settled down as a country gentleman at Woollavington, became a J.P. in 1601, and was knighted in 1604. He married into the Sussex family of Shurley of Isfield which no doubt strengthened his position in the county. The second son, William, however, became a citizen of London and several of his sisters and his younger

45. V. Section III.
half-brother, Giles, married into London mercantile families. Elizabeth Garton, for instance, married Francis Dent, a Nsalter" of London, in 1601, and Beatrice married John Poole, alderman of London in the same year. Ann had married Andrew Boome, an "ironmonger" in 1584, and Katherine, another "ironmonger" of London, James Atkins, in 1583.

So far as foreign or other sea-borne trade is concerned, to make sure that none of the gentry here under consideration was regularly exporting or importing merchandise would involve a thorough examination of all the port books for the reign, at least for the port of Chichester and its subsidiary ports, and perhaps also for the ports of London and Southampton. This has not been attempted but the casual investigation of individual port books for Chichester for a number of years has not brought to light the names of any relevant Sussex gentry as exporters or importers of merchandise.

... ... ...

Of the relevant Sussex gentry who were alive in 1580 and then heads of families, it cannot with certainty be said precisely how many were ever practising lawyers since the

46. See Section III, relevant family history.
records are imperfect. The Inns of Court Admission Registers, while giving ample information as to the names of gentlemen admitted there for study, do not, for this period, give full particulars even as to which of these were called to the Bar. For the reign of Elizabeth, the Admission Register of Gray's Inn is silent on the subject, and in the case of the Inner Temple, the earliest calls to the Bar which are noted are for the year 1568. In the Admission Register of the Middle Temple, no calls to the Bar are recorded before 26th June, 1574, and in that of Lincoln's Inn, the first specific mention of a member having been a barrister concerns James Carye of Devon who was admitted 7th November, 1573. The Calendar of Inner Temple Records, the Pension Book of Gray's Inn, the Black Books of Lincoln's Inn and the Minutes of Parliament of the Middle Temple give some information as to calls, but in several instances omit any reference to them for members who later became prominent lawyers. Thus, for those who began their careers early in the reign, it is, as a rule, only the more prominent members of the Inns, for instance, those who became Benchers, Serjeants-at-law or Judges, - and are noted as such, who can safely be described as having been practising lawyers. Lesser men may have been called and

47. Students admitted to the Inner Temple, 1547-1660, (1877), 29 & 30.
48. Middle Temple Admission Register, 1,1501-1781, ed. H.A.C. Sturgess, (1949), Foreword; Lincoln's Inn Admissions, 1,1420-1799, (1896), 80.
49. See Appendices 18 and 30.
THE JEFFERAY MONUMENT in Chiddingly parish church, 1612.
perhaps even practised in the courts but they are not necessarily specified in the records of the Inns.

Of the Sussex gentry here under consideration, several became Judges, namely Sir Edward Fenner of the Middle Temple, who, after building up a large practice, was appointed Judge of Queen's Bench on 26th May, 1590; Sir Richard Lewkenor, also of the Middle Temple, who, after becoming Recorder of Chichester in 1588, was appointed Chief Justice of Chester in 1600; Sir John Jefferay of Gray's Inn who was appointed Judge of Queen's Bench on 15th May, 1576; and Sir Edmund Pelham who was appointed Chief Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland in 1602. Henry Barkeley, perhaps of the Middle Temple and a D.C.L. of Oxford University, became a Master in Chancery in 1575.

In addition to these, at least four and possibly six other gentry of the 1580 generation appear to have been practising lawyers of some standing: Adrian Stoughton of the Inner Temple who became Recorder of Chichester, Thomas Bowyer and Robert Casie of the Middle Temple, and John Shurley of Lewes of the same Inn, who became a serjeant-at-law, and perhaps Sir Edward Culpepper of Wakehurst, as well as John Porter of Cuckfield who may have been a lawyer of Lincoln's Inn. 50.

50. See Appendix 30.
Thus, of a total of 87 heads of families or branches of families living in 1580, seven of whom were peers, at least nine were lawyers of some note.

With regard to other professions, nothing can be said here for lack of information. Perhaps there is nothing to say because none of the Sussex gentry concerned belonged to them. In their article, "An Occupational Census of the Seventeenth Century," A.J. and R.H. Tawney, following the reprint of a manuscript which had been compiled under the direction of John Smith of Nibley in the early seventeenth century, and which was really an edition of the Muster Roll for Gloucestershire for 1608 with the occupations of those listed noted beside their names, placed the 430 knights, esquires and gentlemen of the county, the 38 professional men and the 21 officials, in separate categories. The 38 professional men consisted of 5 chi rurgeons or surgeons, 2 physicians, 1 toothdrawer, 6 schoolmasters, 1 usher, 1 scholar, 2 barristers, 1 attorney-at-law, 3 clergymen, 5 scriveners, 9 musicians, 1 drummer and 1 harper. It has been seen that the Elizabethan gentry of Sussex contributed liberally to the legal profession but it is doubtful whether, had a counterpart to John Smith of Nibley edited a similar

52. ibid., 61, & 63, n.30 & n.31.
Muster Roll for Sussex for 1580, he would have shown many of them, sons and brothers excluded, represented in these other interesting walks of life.

The 21 officials who are also listed as distinct from the gentry of Gloucestershire in 1608, range from 2 mayors down to 1 bellman. No important Crown offices are mentioned. But it is with these that we are mainly concerned here because they tended to be shared out among the nobility and gentry and because it has been maintained that they were one of the main economic pillars supporting this class.

... ... ...

To what precise extent the gentry of Elizabethan Sussex derived their livelihood from the tenure of offices under the Crown it would be a hazardous matter to estimate. The nominal salary attached to an office was very often so much less than the profits and perquisites pertaining to it that even official Exchequer records of salaries disbursed, where they exist, are of questionable value. Again, information as to the names of office-holders under the Crown is very scattered and has to be culled from a variety of sources. New sources are continually being found.

53. Concerning the possible activities of the 430 knights, esquires and gentlemen, this article says practically nothing. It says that it is not even known what proportion of these were directly engaged in farming. Op. cit. 50.

The main sources, apart from such secondary authorities as the Dictionary of National Biography and G.E.C's Complete Peerage, which have been used to discover which of the gentry who were alive in 1580 and heads of the families under review held offices under the Crown during the reign of Elizabeth, are described in Appendix 31. This Appendix also gives the resulting list of names and of positions held.

The overwhelming impression given by the information there collected is that the more valuable Crown offices, as well as many of lesser value, tended to be monopolised by the leading men in the county, more especially the peers. All of the peers under consideration, with the exception of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, the son of the Duke of Norfolk who was attainted and executed in 1572, who became a Catholic, were granted an office of some kind with an emolument attached, sometimes the Keepership of a park or of a castle, sometimes the bailiwick of a Hundred or the stewardship of an Honour or even of a number of royal manors, and such appointments were very frequently made for life.


56. For instance, I am grateful to Mr. R. Gabriel for his reference, P.R.O., E. 315/309, a book containing names of holders of stewardships of royal manors, bailiwicks of Hundreds etc. in the reign of Elizabeth, and describing in detail, county by county and year by year from 2 Eliz. onwards, the grants of these offices and the fees attached to them.
Just how much was meant by that term when the political weather became stormy for the office-holder in question is open to enquiry. The issue was raised with regard to the 8th Earl of Northumberland's tenure of the Keepership of Tynemouth and Norham Castles, offices which were granted to him during pleasure in December, 1560, and for life in May, 1571, but which the Queen subsequently required him to relinquish. In a rather pathetic letter, probably dated 1584, the year of his second arrest and imprisonment, the Earl explained why he had refused to give up the keys of Tynemouth Castle to the newly appointed office-holder. It was, he said, because of the great importance of the office to him as his main source of income. He reminded the Queen that he had resigned Norham Castle to Lord Hunsdon at her bidding, the Keepership of which was worth £400 a year, and which had cost him a great deal not long before. Apparently his protest had some effect since his son held the office in November, 1591.

Evidently the tenure of valuable offices was closely connected with, if not entirely conditional on the enjoyment of the Queen's favour. When Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel,
fell from grace in 1564 he felt it incumbent on him to resign his stewardship of the Royal Household to which he had been appointed only four years earlier, much as he must have prized this position. And, as one would expect, the man out of all Sussex who seems to have reaped the richest harvest for himself in this field was Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, the Queen's cousin. From the day when he, with his father Sir Richard Sackville, was appointed Master Forester of Ashdown Forest for life on 12th February, 1561, until May 15th, 1599, when he was granted the office of Lord Treasurer in succession to Burghley, he climbed steadily up the ladder of administrative advancement, collecting stewardships, bailiwicks and lordships as he went.

The only two untitled Sussex gentry here under review to obtain important public office during the reign were George Goring of Ovingdean who, in July, 1584, was appointed Receiver General of the Court of Wards, and Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston who was appointed in February, 1587, to be Treasurer at War to the English army serving in the Netherlands. Both of these gentlemen came financially to grief.
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Sir Thomas Shirley who had accompanied the Earl of Leicester to the Low Countries with troops of his own raising in 1585, and who probably obtained his position on 27 February, 1587, through Leicester's influence, began soon afterwards to amass a fortune by speculation with the money granted for the payment of the armed forces. According to Cruickshank, Shirley was reported at one time to be making £16,000 a year over and above his salary by speculating with the soldiers' pay or selling concessions to victuallers or in general using the Queen's money to carry on the business of a money-lender.

In 1591, the Queen appointed a commission to enquire into his pecuniary position, but he continued to hold the office and was also Treasurer of the forces serving in France from 1591 on. But there were many complaints about his discharge of his duties, some of which he replied to in a letter of 23 May, 1595. He denied that he was making £3,000 a year out of his job, saying his allowance from the
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Queen was only £1 a day; and in reply to the criticism that he had purchased much land since he had held the office he said that he had always been a great buyer and seller of land and was merely continuing his usual practice and in quite a regular fashion. And as for the observation that he was always in England instead of abroad attending to his duties, he replied that he could discharge them better at home, being in closer touch with the Council.

It is true that Shirley was busy purchasing property early in the 1590's. For example, in 1591 we find him buying a manor of about 1,100 acres in Leicestershire from the Earl of Essex, and in 1593 he bought property from the Pellatt family in Sussex. And, in 1592, he attempted, unsuccessfully, to purchase the office of Comptroller of the Household through Burghley for £500, perhaps a sign that by then he needed to supplement his income.

His debts steadily mounted. The sums he was handling were enormous and his own involvement became ever more inescapable. His position became impossible. By March, 1596 it was reported that he owed the Queen more than he was worth, and on 21st March, 1597, Shirley went bankrupt. His liabilities consisted chiefly of heavy debts to the Crown.
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represented by the wages and diets of the troops for which he had received the money but which he had not paid, and also of huge balances in his hands which he could not account for. Altogether, during his Treasureship, there was issued to him £1,399,540 for military purposes on the Continent, and the defalcations which were debited against him amounted to £120,000.

The catastrophe was followed by charges of peculation early in 1597, and in the course of the subsequent enquiries, others were implicated besides Shirley himself. Finally, in March, 1604, Shirley was arrested for debt and imprisoned in the Fleet though he was then M.P. for Steyning, a fact which caused the House of Commons to raise the question of privilege and champion it with such zeal that eventually Shirley was released and took his seat.

However, he was obliged to sell much ancient family property both in Sussex and elsewhere in a forlorn attempt to meet his debts, retaining only Wiston itself which he settled on his wife. In October, 1612, he died heavily in debt. His family never recovered from the disaster. His eldest son, Thomas, having been involved in his father's pecuniary difficulties, took to privateering as a way out, but
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did not escape his problems that way. In August, 1611, he was confirmed an insolvent debtor in the court of King's Bench, and after his father's death in 1612 his difficulties were, if anything, increased. It was probably in 1624 that, "overwhelmed in debt and broken in spirit", he sold Wiston and retired to the Isle of Wight to pass the last few years of his life. Anthony, the second son, another adventurer, ended his days in dire poverty in Madrid, while Robert, the youngest of the trio, after working himself into the position of an envoy from the Shah to the Court of James I, eventually died in Persia in July, 1628, having been informed that his services were no longer required. The line ended two generations later with the death of Dr. Thomas Shirley, physician to Charles II and great grandson of the Treasurer at War, who attempted vainly to recover Wiston House and who died in 1678 a grief-stricken man.

George Goring, the other defaulter, came of one of the wealthiest and oldest-established families in Sussex. His father, Sir William Goring who was head of the family from
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1520 on, had been one of the Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber to Edward VI and had steadily added to his lands both in Sussex and elsewhere, acquiring a certain amount of monastic property. He was succeeded in 1554 at Burton, the main family residence, by his eldest son, eventually Sir Henry Goring who, in 1583, was assessed at £100 for his contribution to the Armada Loan. The second son was George Goring of Ovingdean and Lewes, himself a wealthy man even early in his career since he was able in 1582 to purchase Danny Park at Hurstpierpoint together with the manor there and other lands from Gregory Fiennes, Lord Dacre, for £10,000.

On the 3rd July, 1584, he was appointed Receiver-General of the Court of Wards and in September, 1590 this appointment was made for life. In this capacity he handled large amounts of Crown revenue which he made a practice of holding on to as long as possible, meanwhile employing the money to his own gain. In March, 1594 he defaulted and died, heavily in debt to the Crown. A letter in the State Papers of July 1595 refers to this debt as amounting to £19,777.2.3d.
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The only way in which part of this sum could be recovered immediately was by the sale of Goring's lands and goods, a procedure which his son and heir tried hard to thwart, offering Robert Cecil £1,000 if he would secure him his father's office and offering to handle his father's debts. These surprising suggestions were not taken up, and, as the younger Goring said in a letter to Burghley, the sheriff entered to value his property in April, 1594, and most of the revenue was appropriated to the Queen's use throughout his life.

Clearly it is not possible to prove from the information here collected that the tenure or lack of Crown offices was the decisive factor in determining the fortunes of the gentry at this period. For one thing it was the peers who seem to have enjoyed most of what must have been the more lucrative offices and no attempt has been made to estimate the trend in their economic status.

It is clear from casual evidence that some of the Sussex peers were passing through hard times financially; for instance the 8th Earl of Northumberland, if he is to be believed, felt severely the deprivation of his office of the Keepership of Norham Castle and was determined to fight to the bitter end to keep the Keepership of Tynemouth Castle.
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Lord Lumley, we know, apparently through no fault of his own, got into financial difficulties through having taken responsibility, along with his father-in-law, Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, for a debt owed by the Duke of Florence to the Queen, which debt he was later unable to collect, so that he himself became liable to her for over £11,000, though, fortunately for him, this liability was, in 1587, transferred to other shoulders. Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, was estimated at about the time of his arrest in 1585 to be heavily in debt. A summary of the state of his affairs which appears to be of that date concludes, "And so wanteth to Answer and Satisfie ye debts of ye said Erle iiiim\textsuperscript{li} dcccxxxiiii\textsuperscript{li},xviii\textsuperscript{s}. ix\textsuperscript{d}. There be other debts yt I can not iustly sett downe as to a Jeweler to Victuelars & fro other grosse provicion of housholde besides servants wags wh ye officers of ye house are to make declaracon of."\textsuperscript{99} Lord De la Warr appears also to have been borrowing money from 1596 onwards.

On the other hand, Lord Buckhurst was evidently
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propping greatly towards the end of his life when he undertook in 1603 the rebuilding of part of Knole House. As early as 29 March, 1576, he had been well enough off to buy the Barony of Lewes from the Earl of Derby for £4,000. It may be that a great deal of his wealth was produced by the offices he held. His less fortunate fellow-peers in the county held far fewer and Philip, Earl of Arundel, apparently none at all.

Yet it would not be wise to conclude that the occupation of public positions, however enviable, was always the high road to prosperity under Elizabeth or that its rewards were more certain than those of, for example, the legal profession, industry, or the farming or leasing of the land itself. The fate of George Goring and of Sir Thomas Shirley should teach us otherwise. Office-holding tended to be a highly speculative affair and, like other forms of business, must have required experience and business acumen if the pitfalls were to be avoided.

Generally speaking however, it would be true to say that those lesser men in the county who appear, for example, on the list of escheators for the reign, like George May of Burwash, or John Selwyn of Friston, or who, like Thomas
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Bishopp or Thomas Lewknor of West Dean, held stewardships of royal manors or a bailiwick of some kind came from families that seem to have been prospering economically. More cannot be said. It may be that many more of the gentry held remunerative offices of some kind than have yet come to light and that these will prove to have had considerable influence on their fortunes. But at present it seems truer to say that office-holding was not an important source of income to most of them and that it was mainly the greater folk who derived profit from this source.

It should perhaps be mentioned before leaving this topic that some, at least, of the gentry were in the employment, not of the Crown itself, but of the peerage.

Sir Edward Caryll of Harting, for instance, an important man in West Sussex, is known to have been Steward to the Earl of Arundel in the 1580's. He was named as the Earl's official Receiver for all his estates in Surrey and Sussex in the statement of that peer's accounts, probably dated about 1585, and this office carried a fee of £300. He was noted by Walsingham in his memorandum of 1585 concerning the proceedings against the Earl, as one of the latter's servants.
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and in 1587 in the report concerning the J.P.'s of Sussex he was described as having been dropped from the Commission of the Peace because he was "an active Wysman, my lord of Arondell his stward and doer in thys contre".

Similarly, Thomas Stanley was Steward to the Earls of Northumberland from 1575-'90 and was also between 1585 and Jan., 1587, Clerk of the Works and between 1585 and 1590, Payer of Foreign Payments in the same lord's household.

Of the earlier generation, Thomas Stoughton of West Stoke, near Chichester, who died in 1576 and was father of Adrian, had been Controller to Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel as we know from references for February, 1564 and for October, 1569. Also Arthur Gounter of Racton, on the Western border of the county, who died in 1576 and was father of George, may have been in the same Earl's household since he refers to him in 1560 as "my Lord, my master".

On the whole, the service of the peerage could be a profitable, even if sometimes a precarious undertaking. Sir Edward Caryll's £300 a year as Receiver to the Earl of Arundel was a good income while it lasted, but in 1585, when his master was arrested, he too was imprisoned in the Tower and subsequently disappeared from the Commission of the Peace.
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until his re-instatement in 1591. In 1588, it is true, he was assessed, along with 14 others, for a contribution of £100 for the Armada Loan, the highest rate then levied in the county. On the other hand, he does not appear to have undertaken any building projects, and comparison of his Inquisition Post Mortem dated 1610 with that of his heir, Sir Thomas Caryll dated 1618, shows that the latter left two manors fewer than his father had done at his death.

Thomas Stanley, the Steward to the Earls of Northumberland between 1575 and 1590 who came South from his native Cumberland, seems to have been comfortably off at the end of his life. He is mentioned in the 9th Earl's accounts for 25th February, 1588 as having received £35.16.8d. for his annuity issuing out of the profits of the Great Park at Petworth, the Hammer and the furnace there for half a year to Michaelmas, 1587. A few months before he retired in 1590, Stanley acquired the manor of Lee in Fittleworth, near Petworth, with certain tenements. In his will dated 26th February, 1604, and proved 3rd May, 1607, he mentions in addition to his lands "in Sussex or elsewhere . . . my house without Temple Bar near London", and it is possible that he may have had property in Hertfordshire as well, where he was living when his will was

110. S.A.C., i, 36. 142.
112. Alnwick MSS U.i, l.
114. P.C.C. 40 Huddlestone.
made.

In the Supplement to Appendix 28, both the Stoughtons and the Gounters appear as families which were thriving economically, though Thomas Stoughton, who died in about 1580, apparently had to convey some of his lands in Surrey to Richard Lewkenor, John Onley and William Devenish to discharge a debt he owed them. He cannot have paid it off fully as his son, Lawrence, was still attempting to meet it in November, 1592.

It has been shown that the tenure of Crown offices does not appear to have brought much profit to those below the peerage but sometimes rather the reverse, and that, on the other hand, an important position on the staff of a noble household could produce a very good salary though this would depend on the fortunes of the nobleman concerned, and sometimes had its perils.

It is now time to examine whether the other occupations already shown to have been pursued by the gentry seem to have been mainly profitable or otherwise.

It is clear that not all the gentry who had interests in the Wealden iron industry made fortunes out of it. The costs of running forges and furnaces were heavy, entailing
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not only their upkeep, but also the maintenance of the ponds and water-courses used to provide the necessary water-power. In fact, as Mr. Straker has pointed out, men of small capital who embarked on iron-founding frequently went bankrupt during periods of bad trade, particularly if they themselves were only the leaseholders of their forges or furnaces and were expected to bear the full cost of maintenance without assistance from the owners themselves.

Several of the Sussex owners or managers of ironworks listed in Appendix 29, belong to families which appear, if anything, to have been economically on the downgrade, for example the families of Ashburnham of Ashburnham, Darrell, Gage, Porter and Pelham of Buckstepe. This, of course, does not imply that their participation in the iron industry was, in each case, mainly responsible for the trend in the fortunes of their families.

It is interesting however that John Ashburnham of Ashburnham who is known to have owned a furnace and two forges in 1574 and perhaps to have worked another furnace on behalf of its owner, should have fallen seriously into debt a few years later, so that in 1582 his lands including the manor of Ashburnham should have been extended by his creditors.
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and that in 1583 Walsingham should have had to write to the Sheriff and Justices of the Peace with orders from the Council to stay these proceedings. The treatment of John Ashburnham by his creditor Edward Catesby of Lambeth, Surrey who had, in 1581, foreclosed on his manor of Ashburnham and his forges and iron mill nearby, apparently provoked the intervention of the debtor's brother, Thomas, and "sordrie lewd wicked and evill disposed persons" who broke into a house called the Hammer, a forge for the making of iron, and dispossessed Catesby's men by main force. This led to a case in the Star Chamber in 24 Elizabeth between George Ognell, Catesby's representative, and Thomas Ashburnham and his friends in the course of which it appeared that John Ashburnham had been a debtor to the Queen to the extent of £350 as early as 16 Elizabeth, and that the bailiff of Hastings Rape had already valued his lands on the Queen's behalf on that earlier occasion. The sequel appears from the fact that John Ashburnham's fourth son, Walter, was baptised on 20th June, 1585, in the Fleet prison and buried on 3rd July of the same year. John Ashburnham himself was buried at Ashburnham on the 14th October, 1592.
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The Gatehouse, Cuckfield Park, the home of the Bowyers of Cuckfield.
In one instance, participation in the iron industry does appear to have been directly responsible for a bankruptcy. This was in the case of Anthony Morley, younger brother of William Morley of Glynde. Their father, Thomas Morley of Glynde, who died on the 9th January, 1559, is known to have had interests in the iron industry, and it was Anthony, the second of his six sons, who had most to do with it. Finding himself hampered, like many other ironmasters in Sussex, by fuel shortages and restrictions, Anthony Morley finally migrated into Glamorganshire where there was plenty of fuel, water-power and iron ore. Here, however, he fell heavily into debt, apparently borrowing capital to launch his enterprise which he was then unable to repay, and died leaving his widow and family in a sorry plight and at the mercy of his numerous creditors.

Not all ironmasters however, were so unfortunate as these. Among the more successful might be named Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield, Richard and later his son Walter Covert of Slaugham, John Eversfield of Worth, Richard Leech of Fletching, Thomas May of Ticehurst and George May of Burwash.
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Their ventures in the industry, particularly in the cases of the Bowyer, Eversfield and May families, seem to have had much to do with their economic prosperity.

With regard to the lawyers listed in Appendix 30, none of them appears to have belonged to a family for which there is evidence of economic decay at this period. Several of them, namely Sir Edward Culpepper of Wakehurst, Sir John Jefferay of Chiddingly and Sir Richard Lewkenor of West Dean, belonged to families which were clearly prospering, and, in the case of Thomas Bowyer of North Mundham, to a family whose head was to be raised to the baronetage in the following generation. Evidently the practice of the law was as secure a means of livelihood among the gentry as any.

In conclusion, it may be said that while a number of Sussex gentry who derived some income from minor offices under the Crown during the reign and a number of ironmasters appear to have been prospering, there were some gentry holding more important Crown offices and some iron-founders who ended in financial ruin. Such evidence as there is suggests that the practising lawyers among the Sussex gentry usually fared well. Further generalisation as to the
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relationship between occupations and economic trends does not appear to be possible.

But, if the families that were apparently rising economically and those that were declining be considered as groups and it be asked whether each of these groups tended to have anything more in common than their increasing or decaying fortunes, it will be found that there was often a striking conjunction between economic trends and politico-religious affiliations.

Among the gentry who appear to have been declining economically throughout the Elizabethan period were a considerable number of recusant or crypto-Catholic families, for instance the Apsleys of Pulborough, the Carylls of Harting, the Darrells of Scotney, the Dauvelys of Petworth, the Gages of Firle and of Bentley, the Roberts, the Shelleys of Michelgrove and the Thatchers of Westham. How far the economic deterioration of these families was due to recusancy fines and other impositions such as, for example, the demand made on 17th August, 1584 that certain J.P.'s should, as proof of their loyalty, furnish a horse or horses, as many as they were scheduled for, to be used for service in Ireland, it is beyond the scope of this study to assess. But there may have been some such factors at work.
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Similarly, it is interesting that among those families which seem from the evidence collected to have been progressing economically at this period, few seem to have been suspect on religious grounds. Of these, Edward Bellingham was classified in 1564 as "a misliker of religion and godly proceedings", but was left on the Commission of the Peace in 1565 and 1566. William Scott of Iden, it is true, who was a J.P. in 1559 and 1560, was described in the Bishop's letters of 1564 as "No Justice, a Misliker of godly orders," and, although he died between January, 1583 and April, 1586, he did not re-appear on the Commission before his death. Yet, his was apparently one of the modestly prosperous families of Elizabethan Sussex. Again, the Stoughton family acquired two manors in Sussex between the death of Thomas Stoughton in about 1580 and of his son, Adrian, the lawyer, in 1614. But Thomas Stoughton,
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described in 1564 as "a stout scorners of godliness", and
steward to the Earl of Arundel, was obliged to part with some
of his lands in Surrey to his creditors and left some
undischarged debts behind him.

Religion may have had not a little to do with the
economic as well as with the political fortunes of the gentry
families of Elizabethan Sussex.
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PART III.

POLITICS AND RELIGION IN ELIZABETHAN SUSSEX.

CHAPTER I.

Trends among the peerage.

There is a manuscript in the State Papers Domestic which is undated but which appears to belong to about the year 1583 and which is endorsed, "Information of ye presente stat of Sussex touching religion." It is apparently both a description of the religious condition of the county and also a series of recommendations drawn up for the consideration of the Lords of the Privy Council, and it begins with a brief survey of "The General State of Sussex". This survey consists of a comment in turn first on the 'noblemen', secondly on the 'gentlemen' and thirdly on 'the people' of the county.

Of the noblemen, the writer remarks, "Five in number, more than one shire can well bear specially if ill affected or doubted and agreeing all together and having often meetings". It is not quite clear which peers he has in mind since there were, in fact, more than five peers resident in Sussex at that time if Henry Percy, the 8th Earl of Northumberland, whose southern residence lay at Petworth, be included along with Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague, Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, John, Baron Lumley, Thomas, Lord Buckhurst and William West, Lord Dela Warr. However, his main point may

be conceded, namely that Sussex in the Elizabethan period did contain a remarkable number of noblemen for one, not very large, county. Whether he was justified in lumping them all together on a level as political trouble-makers is very much open to question, but certainly with regard to some of them there were good reasons for suspicion and caution.

It might be pointed out, for instance, that 1583 was the year before Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel declared himself a Catholic convert and two years before his attempted escape from England, while in December, 1583, Henry Percy, 8th Earl of Northumberland, was arrested for suspected complicity in the Throgmorton conspiracy.

The writer, passing on to the 'gentlemen', remarks that "most of the greatest revenue" are "ill affected ... divers week and indifferent that follow the noblemen being of the Commission for the Peace". Clearly then, he sees the peerage in Sussex as, on the whole, a bad influence, and the remedy he suggests is as follows: "If it might be to remove soom of them into other shires whear they are not native nor landed and should have less authoritie. Otherwise if they be in Commissions for honours sake, always to joign
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with them soon other contrary of the chief gentlemen that are sure to the state and religion as Mr Goringes, Mr Govert, Mr Morley etc."

There is little doubt but that the peerage in Elizabethan Sussex dominated its politics to a very great extent, and to understand the ebb and flow of its currents one must bear in mind the careers of these, the county's leading personalities, for it was upon them very largely that the political fortunes of the untitled families depended.

... ... ... ...

The most prominent nobleman in Sussex in the early years of the reign appears to have been Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel. He was of a family which came originally from Shropshire but had, through a marriage to a d'Aubigny coheiress as long ago as the thirteenth century, acquired the Castle, Honour and eventually the Earldom of Arundel itself. He was one of the greatest landowners of the county and the bulk of his property was in Sussex. Of the other Elizabethan peers whose main residences were in Sussex, only the Sackvilles, still commoners at Elizabeth's accession, and the Wests, could make any comparable claim to a long and close family connection with the county.

Fitzalan had been a staunch supporter of Mary Tudor, having captured the traitor Northumberland at the beginning of her reign, and he had been rewarded with the grant of various offices by her including the Lord Stewardship of the Household. In June, 1560 he was re-appointed to this position. He had also, soon after Elizabeth's accession, been appointed one of her Privy Councillors.

The office however that gave Arundel his pre-eminence in the county was that of Lord Lieutenant, which was bestowed on him on 26th May, 1559, the appointment being renewed on 18th April, 1560, and the duties of which he apparently discharged approximately down to November, 1569 when other Lords Lieutenant were named in his place.

At the beginning of the reign, when there was much speculation on the subject of the Queen's marriage, the Earl's chances were fairly widely favoured on the grounds of his rank and family and notwithstanding his being more than twenty years older than she and having two married daughters of his own. The possibility must have given him considerable
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prestige in the county and raised high hopes among his friends and supporters, just as the danger of her marrying Dudley constituted a threat to these.

The extent to which passions were aroused in West Sussex over this issue, is illustrated by the story of Arthur Gounter of Racton who was apparently in the Earl of Arundel's service. Gounter got himself into trouble in 1560 by expressing surmises as to the possible outcome of a marriage between the Queen and Dudley. He seems to have fallen into conversation one day while out hunting, with a certain Mr. George Cotton, apparently one of Dudley's followers, and talk turned to the topic of the Queen's marriage. As Gounter said in his "Declaration":

"concerning Lord Robert Dudley", Cotton had told him that:-

"Hyt chaunced the Quene's Hynes to be at Supper on a Tyme at my Lorde Robert's Howse, wheare hyt chaunced hyr Hyghness to be nyghted homward; and as hyr Grasce whas goynge homward by Torche lyght, hyr Hyness fell in Taulcke with them that caryed the Torches, and seyde, that hyr Grasce wolde make ther Lord the best that ever whas of hys Name; whereupon I Gounter seyde, that hyr Grasce most macke hyme then a Dewcke: And he said that the Reporte Whas, that hyrHyghness shoolde marry hym: And I aunswered I praye God all be for the best; and I praye God all Men may tacke hyt well that there myght ryssse no troble therof; and so have I seyde to dyvers others synye that Tyme. And I most humbly beseche your Honors all to be good unto me and to pardon me herin, yf I have offended." (12)

Somehow Gounter's rather rash remarks made later in the same conversation subsequently reached the ears of the Council and he was summoned before them and, after being

12. S.Haynes; State Papers, (1740), 364-5.
imprisoned for a while, obliged to make a humble submission
and apology for his "lewde and unfytttyng Wardes". What
those remarks were emerged in the course of his "Confession"
in which Gounter explained that Mr Cotton had said:--

"That hyt was remored hertofore, that my Lorde my
Master[ the Earl of Arundel] shoold have maryed the
Quene's Hyghnes; And I seyde that yf hyt pleased hyr
Hynges, I thought hym as mette a Man as any in Inglande.
And farther he asked me, yf I herde of eny Parlemente
towarde; and I seyde no, byt yf ther were eny, I thynke
every Nobleman wyll geve his Opynyon; and then they that
be my Lords Frends wyll seye, that he ys a mette Man, and
the other that be more my Lord Robert's Frends wyll seye,
that he ys a mette Man; and so hyt maye fortune there
wyll rysse troble amonge the Noblemen, which God forbede.
And then he asked me who was my Lords Frends; And I seyde
my Lorde Markes of Northampton, my Lord of Pembroke, Mr
Treasurer, Mr Sackfelde with many other. Farther I seyd,
I trust the whyght Horsse [ the Earl of Arundel] wylbe in
quyet, and so shall we be owtte of troble; hyt ys well
Knowen hys Blode, as yette, whas never attaynte, nor he
was ever Man of Warr, wherfor ys hyt lycly, that we shall
syttote styll; but yf he shouled stomackehyt, he were able
to macke a great Powre .... Farther, as towchyng my Lord
Robert, I have seyde to Mr Cottone, that I thowght hym tD
be the Causse, that my Lorde my Master myght not marry
the Quene's Hyghness; wherfor I woolde that he had bene
put to dethe with his Father, or that some Roffen woude
have dyspached hym by the Way as he hath gone, with some
Dagge or Gonno." (13)

By 1564, the hopes of Gounter and his kind for his
master were quite clearly doomed to disappointment. Quite
apart from Dudley, the Queen had obviously no serious
intentions of marrying Arundel and during that year he
resigned from the Privy Council and from his Stewardship of
the Household. From then on he seems to have been little

14. G.E.C., i,251; R. Somerville The Duchy of Lancaster,i,
1266-1603, 617.
at Court but was kept in touch with the news there to some extent by Cecil. For instance, on 13th October, 1565, he wrote to Cecil thanking him for his letter and saying he wished he could serve the Queen as she needed and declaring himself ready to serve her to the best of his ability whenever he was wanted, and adding that he would be at Court but for the physic given him by his doctors. Two years later, on 26th December, 1567, he wrote again to Cecil thanking him for his news including that of Lord Cobham's journey to make negotiations for a marriage between the Queen and the Archduke Charles, but hinting that he, Arundel, had little interest in such matters now that he was "further off".

By 25th September, 1569, when the Queen summoned the Earl of Arundel to her to answer some interrogatories drawn up by Cecil, it is clear that he was no longer considered a reliable supporter of the status quo.

1569 was, in fact, in the nature of a landmark in the political history of Elizabethan Sussex. Down to the autumn of that year, the Earl of Arundel might justifiably have been regarded as the chief man in the county. He had so far been the sole Lord Lieutenant, and it is striking that in the two county elections held before that date, the members returned

15. H.M.C., Hatfield MSS, 1,323.
16. H.M.C., Hatfield MSS, 1,349.
17. H.M.C., Hatfield MSS, 1,423 & 428.
may all be calculated to have been friendly to him. Sir Richard Sackville who was returned on both occasions, had been given the office of Steward of the lands of the Duchy of Lancaster in Sussex by the Earl of Arundel, who had hitherto enjoyed it, sometime before 5th March, 1559, when Arundel wrote to tell Cecil of this. John Caryll Esq., who was returned in 1559 and was himself Attorney of the Duchy of Lancaster was father to Edward Caryll of Harting who was to be Receiver to Philip Howard, eventually Henry Fitzalan's heir as Earl of Arundel. And William Dawtrey of Petworth who was a county member for Sussex in 1563 was dubbed in the bishop's letter of 1564 as "a misliker of religion and godly proceedings; very superstitious", and he was friendly with the Stoughton family one of whom was in the Earl's household.

By 1569 however, a new pattern was emerging. From then on a group among the Sussex peers, including the Earl of Arundel, might be described as definitely of "the opposition", while there were others who more or less actively supported the status quo.

The exploits of the Duke of Norfolk, the Earls of Northumberland and Arundel, of Baron Lumley, and their

18. Cal.S.P.D., 1547-80, 123. Sir Richard Sackville had been Steward to the Earl of Arundel himself in Henry VIII's reign (D.N.B.)
19. Camden Miscellany, 1x, 11.
collaborators in 1569 and the years immediately afterwards, belong perhaps more to national than to mere county history. Nevertheless, the two cannot be arbitrarily separated, and the extent to which the Sussex peers as a body became involved, first in the rising of the Northern Earls, and then in the Ridolfi conspiracy, should help to explain why it was that political authority in the county devolved so exclusively in after years on one titled family which had been above suspicion.

The ringleaders of the 1569 conspiracy among the older nobility which was directed primarily towards the displacement of Cecil, the settlement of the succession in favour of Mary, Queen of Scots who was, in the meantime, to be restored to the throne of Scotland and perhaps to be married to the Duke of Norfolk, the smoothing over of Anglo-Spanish relations, and the return to Catholicism in England, - were the Duke of Norfolk and the Earl of Arundel himself. At this early stage, Lord Lumley, who, like the Duke of Norfolk, was son-in-law to the Earl of Arundel, also became involved. But on 25th September, 1569, before anything had been achieved, the Earl of Arundel was arraigned for questioning and so was Lumley, and in October the Duke of Norfolk was arrested. In November these murmurings were drowned by the explosion of

23. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 429-30.
the Northern Rebellion, one of the leaders of which, the 7th Earl of Northumberland, was closely connected with Sussex. It was, however, virtually crushed by the end of the following February and already, in December, 1569, the Earl of Arundel had disclaimed any connection with the rising.

But in 1571 the embers of discontent began to smoulder again and were industriously fanned by Roberto Ridolfi who hoped for nothing less than a coup d'état which would place Mary Stuart on the throne of a Catholic England. The chief instruments of such a reversal were to be the Duke of Norfolk who had been released from the Tower in 1570 and his fellow malcontents among the nobility. These, backed by an army of discontented Catholics at home and an invading Spanish expeditionary force, would seize or assassinate the Queen and quickly take over the state. Such were Ridolfi's ideas.

But, in May 1571, the Bishop of Ross, one of the conspirators, was arrested and, when the evidence had accumulated overwhelmingly against him, he eventually made confessions implicating the Earl of Arundel, Lord Lumley, Viscount Montague and Sir Henry Percy, brother of the 7th Earl of Northumberland, but above all damning the Duke of

24. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 445.
25. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 449.
26. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 475-6 & 479.
27. Lumley and Arundel were also released in that year. See D.N.B. sub "Lumley" and "Fitzalan".
28. D.N.B. sub "John Leslie".
Norfolk. Arundel was consequently placed under guard in September, 1571, Lumley was arrested in October and put in the Marshalsea, and in November Sir Henry Percy was sent to the Tower. In January, 1572, a process was begun against Norfolk for treason and he was executed after trial by his peers. The 7th Earl of Northumberland who had taken refuge with the Scots after the suppression of the Northern Rebellion but was handed over by them to Elizabeth, was also executed in August of that year.

Viscount Montague had been less deeply implicated in this plot than the others and it was reported by several of the examinees who were questioned in the matter in October, 1571 that he "did not like the enterprise", or that he "liked not the device", or "did not like of the manner" and "would not meddle in that matter". Also, despite the evidence of the Bishop of Ross, there were those who said that Montague was not fully informed. Perhaps this explains the fact that, unlike the others, he was not arrested. Also, relations
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33. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, i, 539-40, & 541
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between him and Henry, Earl of Arundel, were apparently not always smooth and, in February, 1565, had led to a rebuke by the Privy Council to one, Thomas Stoughton, Controller to the Earl, for his "unfyttinge language of the Lord Montague", and an injunction that the peace should be kept between the servants of the two households. It is not likely that relations between the two peers would have been improved by the Earl of Arundel's deposition from the office of Lord Lieutenant of the county in 1569, and the substitution of three other peers, one of whom was Viscount Montague. Perhaps it was for these reasons as well as out of loyalty to the Crown that Montague was reluctant to give full support to the schemes of the Earl and of his two sons-in-law.

It was not until after Norfolk's execution that the Earl of Arundel was released from his arrest, and not until 1573, in April, that Lumley was set free, or Sir Henry Percy, now 8th Earl of Northumberland, either. He was released in July, 1573, having been under arrest since November, 1571, the year before his brother's execution.

The execution of the Duke of Norfolk and of the 7th Earl of Northumberland in 1572, and the confinement of...

37. See Appendix 1.
38. D.N.E.
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Arundel, and the arrest of Lumley and of Sir Henry Percy in the autumn of the previous year, had put an end to conspiracies for a time.

After the debacle of 1571 and 1572, the Earl of Arundel seems to have taken no further active part in political intrigue before his death in 1580, and Lord Lumley seems to have learned a lesson which lasted him the rest of the reign. He is even found subsequently serving as a Commissioner, or being present, at all sorts of treason trials, for instance that of William Shelley in February, 1586, of Mary, Queen of Scots in October, 1586, of Davison in March, 1587, and of the Earl of Essex in 1601.

However, trouble was not at an end. Early in the 1580's, it reared its head again and this time the arch-suspect was Henry Percy, the 8th Earl of Northumberland. On 20th December, 1583, he was confined to his house in London, and in February, 1584, he was arrested on the suspicion that he was connected with the Throgmorton conspiracy, and was sent to the Tower. There he was found dead on 21st June, 1585. A verdict of suicide was returned.

On 20th December, 1583, the young Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, grandson and heir of Henry Fitzalan, the previous Earl, and son of the executed Duke of Norfolk, who was also

41. D.N.B.
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44. D.N.B. See also E.A. Latham, MS. 45, f. 175
under suspicion in connection with the Throgmorton plot, was
46
confined to his house in London; four days later, articles
were drawn up on which he was to be cross-examined, relating
to his alleged intrigues with Lord Paget and Charles Arundel,
the conspirators, before they had left England, and his
transactions with the Earl of Northumberland and Mary, Queen
of Scots. In September, 1584, partly under the influence
of his wife, Anne, daughter of Lord Dacre of the North, he
became a Catholic. In April, 1585, Philip Howard attempted,
at last, to escape from the country but was quickly
recaptured and was committed to the Tower where he was
subsequently sentenced to imprisonment during the Queen's
pleasure. In 1589, he was attainted and condemned to death,
one of the charges against him being that he had said mass
the previous year for the success of the Armada. His lands
were also declared forfeit. But he was allowed to linger
on, and finally died in the Tower in October, 1595, without
being allowed to see his wife or family, even on his deathbed.

46. Cal. S. P. D., 1581-90, 133, no. 47; see also Lives of Philip
Howard, Earl of Arundel & of Anne Dacres, his wife, ed.
Duke of Norfolk, (1857), Pt. 1, ch. 5.
Cal. S. P. D., 1581-90, 139, nos. 52 & 53.
48. D. N. B.; see also Lives of Philip Howard... etc., Pt. 1, ch. 6.
She too, had been a prisoner in 1583-4, but at Wiston
House in Sussex, under the surveillance of Sir Thomas
Shirley, and it was there that her daughter, Elizabeth,
was born. (Ibid., Pt. 2, ch. 5; see also S. A. C., v, 15-16). In
April, 1584, she was subjected to cross-examination
regard to her religion, her alleged habit of harbouring
Jesuits and her correspondence with Charles Paget. (Cal.
S. P. D., 1581-90, 171, nos. 20, 22 & 23). For her subsequent
history, see Lives of Philip Howard... etc., Pt. 2.
49. D. N. B.; Lives of Philip Howard... etc., Pt. 1, chs. 8 & 9.
50. D. N. B.; Lives of Philip Howard... etc., Pt. 1, chs. 12, 13 & 14.
51. D. N. E.; Lives of Philip Howard... etc., Pt. 1, ch. 17.
By late 1585 however, it might be said that the most dangerous conspiracies and intrigues among the Sussex peers were at an end. The two dangerous members of the Percy family, the 7th and 8th Earls, were dead, and the young 9th Earl was politically harmless. Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, was a prisoner in the Tower.

Lord Lumley too was no longer dangerous; neither was Viscount Montague who even made a point of being the first nobleman to be present when the Queen's troops assembled in 1588 at Tilbury to meet the Armada threat. Both of these peers entertained the Queen on her state progress through Sussex in the summer of 1591, Lumley at Stanstead, and Montague at Cowdray where she stayed a whole week in August of that year.

In fact, but for his brief lapse in 1571, Viscount Montague might be classed as one of the few 'loyal' peers of

52. S.A.C., vii, 1801, though by then he was apparently no longer a Lord Lieutenant of Sussex, (see Appendix 1). When Lord Howard of Effingham and Lord Buckhurst, the joint Lord Lieutenants of the county, wrote to their deputies on 18th October, 1587, giving them directions about preparations for the expected invasion, they remarked, "Touchinge your proceeding with my Lord Montague we wishe the same to be forborne as well in respecte of his degree as for that we are assured and soo allwayes hath his Lord mad good demonstracon therof that not onlie in his most readie goodwill but allsoe in all sufficient furniture he is supplyed with the most." (B.M. Harl.MS., 703, f.47).
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Elizabethan Sussex, in spite of his staunch support for the Catholic religion. It is notable that he and Lord Shrewsbury were the only two peers to vote against the Queen's Supremacy in 1559, yet the following year he was employed as an Ambassador in Spain. He also made a bold speech in 1562 against the oath of supremacy, yet he did not forfeit the Queen's favour.

In 1586 he was a Commissioner at the trial of Mary, Queen of Scots. At his death, a contemporary wrote, "This year died Anthony Brown, Viscount Montacute; who, though he were a great Roman Catholic, yet the Queen, finding him faithful, always loved him, and in his sickness went to visit him." She had intended to visit him, among others, in 1577, at either Battle Abbey or Cowdray. But the project was stopped by the plague.

This Viscount Montague died in October, 1592, and was succeeded by his grandson, Anthony Maria Browne, his son, the Hon. Anthony Browne having died the previous June. When the reliability of this young man, who, incidentally, was the godchild of Queen Elizabeth, was called in question in May, 1594, because of his faith, he was given an excellent reference by Lord Buckhurst who, writing to the Lord Keeper, said of him, "I do think in my conscience he deleth most truly with you, for I take him to be in his sainings most just and honorable and yt for al the world he wil not affirme an untruth."

55. D.N.B.; G.E.C., ix, 97; S.A.C., v, 188.
56. D.N.B. 57. Ibid.
58. S.A.C., v, 189, quoting Baker's Chronicles (sir).
59. S.A.C., v, 192. 60. D.N.B; GEC.loc.cit
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The chief supporter of the Queen's government throughout the reign, was however, Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst. Raised to the peerage in 1567, he bore the newest title among all the Sussex peers, and this perhaps was the key to his unwavering support of the Queen and Cecil. He belonged not to the old peerage but to a new one which owed its power and very existence to the Tudors themselves.

In November, 1569, Buckhurst, along with Viscount Montague and William West Esq., who was created Baron De la Warr early in the following year, was named joint Lord Lieutenant of Sussex. These three names are re-iterated in a Commission of November, 1570. No further references naming Lords Lieutenant of Sussex appear before the 3rd July, 1585, when Charles, Baron Howard of Effingham, was created one, and on the 2nd August, 1586, he and Lord Buckhurst are referred to in the Acts of the Privy Council as joint Lords Lieutenant of the county. It appears from the numerous references in the Acts of the Privy Council from then on that Lord Howard of Effingham and Lord Buckhurst remained joint Lords Lieutenant of Sussex until the end of the reign.

Now, of all these peers who became Lords Lieutenant from 1569 on, Lord Buckhurst was certainly the most prominent in Sussex. Viscount Montague, as a Catholic, could hardly be relied on to the same extent; William West, who became Baron
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De la Warr in 1570, had been attainted in his early career on a charge of the attempted poisoning of his uncle, the previous holder of the title, and disinherited, and had only been restored in blood in 1563. He was reliable politically, but not powerful. Baron Howard of Effingham was not a Sussex man.

Consequently, to a very great extent, from 1569 on, Lord Buckhurst was the government's right-hand man in Sussex. He was the Queen's cousin and a friend of Burghley to whom he even wrote in August, 1573, suggesting a marriage between his own son, Robert Sackville, and Burghley's daughter, Elizabeth, negotiations which, however, came to nothing.

Only once during the reign was the political firmament overclouded for Buckhurst. That was when the Queen adopted a highly critical attitude towards his conduct of peace negotiations with Spain after Leicester's return from the Low Countries in 1586. Buckhurst and Leicester were members of rival factions on the Privy Council at this time, Buckhurst being a supporter of Burghley through whose influence he had been admitted, so that during Buckhurst's absence, his influence with the Queen was probably undermined by his

---
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political opponents. She recalled him abruptly in June, 1587, and he was placed under house arrest for several months before being restored to liberty and the Queen's favour.

On the 15th September, 1587, he wrote a pathetic letter to the Queen, begging to be restored to favour. He said:

"Most gracious Sovereign, although the burden of my sorrows so heavily oppressing my poor heart, in respect of my restraint from your Majesty's presence, hath oft times moved me, by some mean of suit to your Highness, to have sought release thereof long ere this; yet have I hitherto, to my exceeding grief, even willingly forborne to attempt the same, being informed that my Lord of Leicester hath advertised that he meant to charge me with matters of no small moment concerning your Majesty. And therefore did resolve with myself first to answer all accusations that should be brought against me, and then to humble myself a suitor, and not before. Now therefore his Lordship, after so long a time of delay, having sent over his objections against me, and understanding that your Highness hath most graciously vouchsafed to read mine answers to the same, whereby it is made manifest unto you that this my 10 weeks' banishment from your royal presence hath not had his foundation from any fail of duty to your Highness (whom God doth know that I do honour, love and reverence even in the highest degree of all loyal faith and duty) but only for particular mislikes and mistakings of his Lordship against me; and those also set down altogether in generalities and uncertainties and utterly without proof at all; being matters merely misinformed unto his Lordship; I trust it may seem abundantly sufficient... that for the cause and quarrels of a private man, and but a subject as myself, I should be thus long time disgraced and deprived from your princely face and presence; the desired sight whereof, I protest to God, is even the chiefest joy and comfort that this world can give me. So as in this sort to be so long time banished from the same must surely have brought even an utter wrack and ruin to my afflicted mind had not the consolation of a guiltless conscience greatly comforted me; having withal a settled and resolute heart, and such as in all humility both of love and fear, and that even (cont'd.)
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with dread and trembling to displease, doth stand in awe of God and of your Majesty, but not of any subject whatsoever; most Humbly beseeching your Majesty not to suffer this disgrace any longer to oppress my grieved mind, who have with all fidelity, care and duty, sought to further your best service without particular regard to any; and that I may behold that rare and royal face, the only sight whereof hath power to raise up and recomfort my woeful heart, which hath so long time mourned and languished for the lack thereof. And so, expecting this grace and comfort from your Majesty, I beseech the Almighty God to bless and preserve your Highness with as long and prosperous a reign as ever prince in earth did yet enjoy. - From my poor house at London, this 15th day of September, 1587."

(Unsigned, but endorsed- A petition to her Majesty to be restored in favour from Lord Buckhurst).

Eight days later, in a letter to Burghley, enclosing a copy of his petition to the Queen, Buckhurst described the reception it received at her hands. She was, "at the first, most graciously bent for mine access unto her presence. But within a while after, falling into a new rehearsal of mislikes and, that which most of all doth grieve me, making the quarrels of my Lord of Leicester now the challengers of her Majesty, she became quite altered from her first intention, and thereby left me unto a new suit and means for mine access unto her presence. Thus rolleth my fortune upon the wheel of sorrows and uncertainties, and my comfort still upon protractons, which is a most strange thing unto me, when I consider what herein I have merited, what heretofore my former service hath deserved, what I have always been and will be to her Majesty, and what withal even her Highness' self hath pleased to be evermore to me, yea, and I am sure, still is in her most gracious heart towards me; and, last of all, both what his lordship is, and what I am myself; and that all this notwithstanding, I should be thus disgraced for a private man's respect. Much better had it been for me that I had never found favour in her royal sight, which now doth but renew grief unto my heart by remembrance of that wonted grace and goodness which it hath pleased her Majesty heretofore so oft and benignly to bestow on me, whereby so many of my friends, which now have quite forsaken me, did then esteem me for so happy a man, and I myself did think I stood upon so great a surety. But lo! what is the faith and fortune of this world, where neither state nor friends are certain, (contd.)
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nor Prince's favours may be made freehold: "Sola
salus servire Deo, sunt cetera fraudes."

Wherefore I beseech your lordship, by whose
friendly dealing for me I confess I have received
chiefest consolation in this my trouble, that once
more you will please to move her Majesty on my
behalf, and that these protractions of mine access
to her presence may not thus still strain my heart
upon the rack and torment of mine inward sorrows,
but that they may have their end, and my poor heart
the comfort he so much desireth ..." (72)

By the beginning of 1588, it was thought by the Earl
of Leicester's best friends at Court that he would be wise
to seek reconciliation with Buckhurst if he wanted to
continue to enjoy the Queen's good opinion. It was clearly
well known that the Queen's displeasure would not last long.
In February, 1588, Buckhurst was still negotiating for
permission to return to Court. But on the 4th September,
1588, Leicester died. In December, 1590, Buckhurst was
so far in favour once more as to be granted the office of
Chief Butler of England and Wales for life, and from then

72. H.M.C.Hatfield MSS, iii,283-4. For further correspondence
during this period and the causes of Leicester's enmity -
see H.M.C. 2nd Report, 44 and 45, and B.M.Add,MS,48078,
passim; B.M.Add,MS. 48116, ff.51-79b, and 81-84a;
and B.M.Add,MS. 48127, ff.2-19b.
74. Ibid., 462,no.59.
75. D.N.B., sub "Dudley".
76. Cal.S.P.D.,1581-90. 702,no.51. See also Appendix 31.
on his political career was assured. In May, 1599 he became Lord Treasurer in succession to Burghley.

Such were the peers of Sussex during Elizabeth's reign, and their attitudes towards the existing regime.

It remains to examine how far their political groupings were reflected among the lesser families of the county.

77. But even after this he had some bitter enemies who attempted unsuccessfully to ruin his reputation with charges of gross corruption and political intrigue. See H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, xii, 565-7; and the libel case in the Star Chamber in 44 Eliz., Attorney-General v. Anthony Atkinson et al. (P.R.O. St.Ch. 5 Eliz., A.39/40 and A.38/38); and Cal.S.P.D., 1601-3 and Addenda., 144,209,220. See also H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, x, 295,305,406, for the embarrassment caused to Buckhurst by his son-in-law, Sir Henry Glemham's interview with Father Parsons in Rome in 1600.
CHAPTER II.

Trends among the untitled gentry.

In the manuscript referred to at the beginning of the previous chapter, the writer seems to have had nearly as poor an opinion of the gentry of Sussex as he did of its noblemen. Of the "gentlemen" he wrote,

"Most of the greatest revenue ill affected as Gages, Carrels, Shellyes etc., divers week and indifferent that follow the noblemen being of the Commission for the Peace."

The remedy he proposes for such a state of affairs is,

"To remove such of them from the Commission as are suspect or week and followers only of those noble men as Mr Carrel late put in being a knowen papist . . . and to place other more suer beeing religious and wise and for wealth as able in their stead or at least with them as Mr Lunsford, Mr May, Mr Pellam and Mr Boyer Counsellers at lawe, Mr Boyer gent. and to call Mr Morley and other out of the ports to serve the countrey."

There seems little reason to doubt but that there was a strong under-current of recusancy in Elizabethan Sussex, that many of the gentry were sympathetic to the old, discontented peerage and that these elements of unrest were to be found even on the Commission of the Peace.

At the accession of Elizabeth, it is probable that there were no radical changes in the composition of the Commission of the Peace for Sussex, though, in the absence of

lists of J.P's for the years immediately beforehand, there is no complete proof of this. The ecclesiastical settlement of 1559 did not immediately divide the country into clearly defined groups of protagonists and antagonists. It was not even clear that a reconciliation with Rome was beyond the bounds of the possible. Thus, the roles adopted by some characters at the beginning of the reign seem sometimes a little incongruous in the light of later events. For instance, in 1564, we find Thomas Sackville acting as an envoy from Rome to Queen Elizabeth in an effort on the Pope's behalf to restore the Supremacy of the Holy See. Yet he was, in after years, one of the few apparently anti-papal peers among the Sussex nobility. It was, in fact, only gradually that political and religious groupings among the Sussex gentry emerged.

The first systematic attempt to investigate the attitude of the J.P's to the Elizabethan Settlement came in 1564 when the Privy Council wrote to the archbishops and bishops on the 17th October, asking them to classify those who were J.P's according as they were favourable, indifferent or hostile to the proceedings of the Government in matters of

2. Comparison of the lists of J.P's for July, 1559, and June, 1560 (P.R.O. A.35/1 & A.35/2) with that for Feb., 1554, (Cal.Pat.Rolls,1553-4,24), the only complete list extant for Sussex in Mary's reign, suggests this.


religion, and to name those who, in their opinion, were fit to be put into office and those who should be removed. The result was the bishops' letters of 1564 to the Privy Council, classifying the local J.P's, and other gentry besides, according as they supported or opposed the Settlement of 1559 and, presumably, the Thirty-Nine Articles, passed by Convocation in 1563, though not yet given legal sanction.

In the letter of the Bishop of Chichester to the Privy Council, an analysis is given of the gentry of the diocese, which was virtually co-terminous with the county, in two divisions, East and West. In each of these divisions, the gentry are subdivided into "Justices of the Peace which be favourers of religion and godly orders", "Justices of the Peace which be mislikers of religion and godly proceedings", "Gentlemen being no Justices, favourers of godly proceedings", and "Gentlemen being no Justices, mislikers of godly orders".

Nearly all of those who were described as J.P's who were "mislikers of religion and godly proceedings" were put off the Commission in 1564, – namely, in West Sussex, Mr. William Shelley of Michelgrove, Mr. William Dawtrey of Petworth and Mr. Edmund Ford of Harting; and in East Sussex, Sir Edward Gage of Firle, Mr. John Thatcher, Mr. Richard Covert, Mr. William Culpepper, Mr. Henry Poole of Ditchling, Mr. Thomas Parker of Willingdon, Mr. Thomas Darrell of

5. Ibid.
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Scotney and Mr. Roberts. Mr. Edward Bellingham of Newtimber in East Sussex, though described in the same terms, was, for some reason, left on the Commission. Some of the others were re-appointed within a few years, Mr. Richard Covert in 1566, Mr. Dawtrey in 1568, and Mr. Parker of Willingdon in 1569. Mr. Dawtrey, who had been labelled "superstitious" in 1564, apparently continued to give trouble, refusing to subscribe to the enforcement of the Act of Uniformity as demanded of all the J.P's in December, 1569. He does not appear on the list of J.P's after 1570. Mr. Covert, however, submitted and continued to be a J.P. from 1566 continuously until his death in 1579.

Without delving deeply into the enormous and complex subject of recusancy in Sussex under Elizabeth, it is clear that there were several influential families among the gentry who were a constant source of suspicion and alarm to the authorities and who were more or less closely identified with the aristocratic intrigues which were going on until the middle of the 1580's. Bishop Curtis of Chichester who was consecrated in May, 1570, was seriously alarmed at the state of affairs in his diocese, and on 24th March, 1577, he reported to Walsingham that those who were backward in religion were growing more stubborn since hearing the report of the

---

7. P.R.O. A.35/8/3; A.35/10/1; A.35/11/1.
9. "Letters from the bishops, etc." (Camden Misc. ix), 10n.
10. D.N.B., sub "Richard Curteys".
advent of Don John of Austria to the Netherlands. He recommended that the oath of supremacy should be administered at the next quarter sessions, but apparently took action himself, citing all the J.P's and many of the gentlemen of the county publicly to appear and subscribe to certain articles in Chichester Cathedral. His action was deeply resented by many of the gentry who considered themselves above suspicion, and, in a letter of 13th April, 1577, Sir Thomas Palmer and others bitterly complained of the affair to the Earl of Arundel. In a letter to the Council dated 17th April, 1577, the Bishop defended his action, but it was clear that he had made a blunder, having proceeded against a number of gentlemen who were really quite sound. However, there were influential recusant families in Sussex which might well have caused uneasiness, and prominent among them were the Gages, the Carylls and the Shelleys.

The recusancy records are full of reports of them and of others. Members of each of these three families fell foul of the law at one time or another during the reign, Edward Gage of Bentley being imprisoned in the Marshalsea in August, 1580 for "obstinacy in Popery", and John Gage of
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15. See W.S.C.R.O., D.R.O., 90/1/37, and the Covert papers in the B.M., Harl. MS, 703.
Firle being simultaneously imprisoned in the Fleet and being released the following year after entering into bonds for £1,000. Edward Gage was apparently less fortunate, since his wife was still petitioning for his release early in 1583. Both of them were at liberty on the 22nd October, 1585, being then required to furnish light horses for the Low Countries as a token of their goodwill to the government. However, in September, 1586, Walsingham ordered that one should be sent to the Clink and the other to the Counter in Wood Street, and in January, 1590, John Gage was committed to the Tower; in March, 1591 he was deep in trouble with Topcliffe.

By August, 1591, John Gage was apparently living still in close confinement, at his house at Leighton in Essex whence he was given permission to leave on a visit to Sussex "for the dispatch of your necessary business" and on account of the death during that month of his brother Thomas. This concession was, however, made only on condition he gave "sureties" for his return to Leighton. In May, 1593, permission was given by the Council for him to return to his house at Firle in Sussex on the grounds of ill-health, since he could more conveniently be cared for there than where he
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was, by that time in the custody of Mr. Thomas Culpepper. The price of this concession was the payment by Gage of a bond of £500 "to her Majesty's use" and an undertaking by him "that he depart not anie time above [Blank in MS] miles from his said house at Firlow til he be further licenzed to the contrary". In February, 1595, he was summoned to appear before the Council, but he pleaded severe illness, so that in March, the Council wrote to the President of the College of Physicians asking him "to make choice of some doctor of phisicke about London that is knowne to be well affected in religion to be sent to the said yr Gage to see in what state he is, and to ceretfy the same unto us upon his othe". The expenses of this medical examination were to be borne by Mr Gage. John Gage died in October, 1598.

His cousin, Edward Gage of Bentley, was, in the autumn of 1592, under the surveillance of Mr. Richard Shelley and, in November the Privy Council gave permission for him to be released for a month to attend to business connected with the funeral of the late Viscount Montague by whom he had been nominated an executor. This relaxation of restrictions on his movements had to be renewed from time to time during the disposal of the late Viscount's estate.

27. See Section III.
28. A.P.C.,1592, 329. This Richard Shelley was of the Patcham branch of the family and not a recusant (see Comber, (Lewes centre), 247 et seqq; A.P.C.1598-11,150; and Assize Rolls for S.E.Circuit, lists of Sussex J.P's, 1575-1594 (P.R.O. A.35/17-36); see also H.M.C.Hatfield MSS, iv,264.
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Edward Caryll, Receiver to Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, was, almost inevitably, involved in his master's intrigues in the early 1580's. He was mentioned by the Earl as being present at his last meeting with Charles Arundel and Lord Paget before the flight of these two conspirators overseas, and was accordingly examined on the subject. Apparently, Caryll was, for a time, imprisoned in the Tower, but was subsequently released and restored to the Commission of the Peace.

But, the Sussex gentleman who became most deeply involved in political intrigue was William Shelley of Michelgrove; he was implicated, together with the 8th Earl of Northumberland in the Throgmorton conspiracy and, in February, 1585, was put on trial before the Court of King's Bench, with several others, for high treason. A full account of the trial is contained in the Lansdowne MSS.

The accusation was that he,

"Beinge moved thereunto by the instigacon of the devill the xvth daye of September in the 25th yere of her Majes Raigne at Clapham aforesaid and at divers other dayes and tymes before and after as well at Clapham aforesaid as in other places within that Countie of Sussex did maliciously and traierously Conspire Imagin and Compas not only the deprivacon and deposinge of her Majic, but also her death and destruccon, and to stirre and raise up sedicon Rebellion and Insurreccon within this Realme and the government thereof, and the Religion therein rightly and (Contd.)
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godly established, to alter and to procure and move straungers and enemyes unto her matie in Warlyke manner to invade the Realme and to make warr against her Matie in the same Realme."

The indictment went on to rehearse how Charles Paget Esq., "a traiter and publique enemye to her Matie", having the same ends in view came from abroad to Petworth to treat in this matter with Henry, Earl of Northumberland, "and others of qualetie in those parties", and how William Shelley, shortly afterwards, set out from his mansion house called Michelgrove and had an assignment with Paget "in a certain wood in Patchinge .. called Patchinge Copes". There the traitors were accused of conferring together as to "howe and in what place this Realme might most aptly be invaded by straungers and enemyes to her matie and by what meanes Marye late Queen of Scotts might be set at libertie and the Religion nowe established within this Realme at their pleasures altered and the state of the Comon weale of this Realme wholye overthrovine and destroyed."

In reply Shelley "humbled himself verie lowly and dewtifully to the commissioners and sayd that he perceaved the substance of the indictment" ... but he protested "verie vehemently that he was drawne into those accons only by the Erle of Northumberland." He said he had not been aware of the purpose of Paget's coming to England or to Petworth and indeed at the time of his arrival was himself first in Herefordshire and then in London. However, passing into Sussex to see his house and family about five days
after the arrival of the said Paget, he received from the latter a scroll of paper intimating that he had arrived and would like to see Shelley before his departure, and using a pseudonym. Shortly after, Shelley received an invitation from the Earl of Northumberland to come hunting with him at Petworth, which he, Shelley, accepted. When he arrived at Petworth on the morning of the 11th September, 25 Elizabeth, he was informed by the Earl that there was a gentleman anxious to speak with him and, after dinner, a secret meeting was arranged between them. The gentleman turned out to be Paget. After some conversation on the subject of religion they arranged to meet again at a house belonging to one William Davies at Patching. Subsequently Shelley and Paget had a series of meetings, discussing "the invasion of the Realme then intended by the Duke of Guise and assisted by the pope and Spanish kings for the advancement of the Scottish Queen and setting her at libertie, and for alteration of the State and religion nowe professed within the Realme and restitucion of the Romishe". Paget advised Shelley that the Earl would do all he could for the Scottish Queen and that if there were any stir, particularly in the North parts, he, Shelley, should follow the Earl in all things and do as he did, "for he was, as Paget sayd, the only noble man of England for force and conduct and had greate strength in the North partes, sayenge withall that Sussex was noe good place to land the forces in for that the havens there were barred and the people most protestants, and for that it was see
nere London where the harte of her Ma ... strength was ...

The indictment was then resumed and the substance and details of the plot laid bare. In this figured many notables including the Duke of Lennox, the Duke of Guise, the Pope, Philip II, Mendoza, Francis and Thomas Throgmorton, Paget, the Earls of Northumberland and Arundel, Shelley himself and a number of Catholic sympathisers among the J.P's who "sholde after the landings of those foreign forcs, upon pretence to levye people to joyne in defence of her matie, torne them beinge levyed wholly against her and to the ayde of her enemyes."

It appeared that the Duke of Guise, unlike Paget, favoured a landing in Sussex "in respecte of the Conveniencye of the passage and the nearnes to Depe [Dieppe] in Normandy about which place he laye all that somer. But to have resolucon of such doubts and impediments as might be objected, abowte the beginninge of September that yere Charles Paget was sent over into Sussex to vdiwe the sea coaste and havens there for the Comedetie of those places in landinge of forcs And to sownd the Erles of Arundell and Northumberland and other principall men in these parties for their opinions therein and what aydes and relief woulde be geven that waie. . "

It appears that Shelley subsequently consented to be an intermediary between Charles Paget and the Earl, but when, in November, Francis Throgmorton was arrested, Northumberland became afraid and asked Shelley to get passages to convey away Paget and Charles Arundel, which Shelley duly did. All those
persons who had been connected with the incident of their visit were also removed from the district. Northumberland adjured Shelley "yf he were brought in question" to "conceale hym the same Erle as much as he coulde ... and confesse of him noe more than he sholde be driven unto". However, the departure of Paget and Arundel leaked out and the Earl of Northumberland and Shelley were both committed to the Tower, but there managed to keep in touch for some time so that "eche by means of some messengers that passed between them understood what the other had confessed". But after "Easter last past" they were more closely restrained and "eftsoones comytted to close prison" so that they lost touch. The Earl however, managed to convey a message to Shelley by means of a chamber maid, advising him to stand by his first confessions and go no further. Shelley replied that their cases were no longer alike, "for he was to be dealt with in other sorte than the Erle colde be", and that it was time for him, Shelley, to tell the truth. When Shelley then sent the Earl a list of his confessions in writing, the latter grew very melancholy, saying Shelley had "undone" him. The Earl also managed at about this time to procure himself a dagger and a pistol which he hid in the mattress of his bed, by means of which, on Monday the 21st of June, 1585, at about one o'Clock in the morning, he destroyed himself, realising that the full revelation of his part in the conspiracy would be the overthrow and ruin of his house.
When asked by the Clerk of the Crown what reason he could give why judgment should not be given against him, Shelley answered only that he had been drawn into the affair by the Earl of Northumberland, "and otherwyse had not dealt therein and was nowe only to sybwytt hym self to her maties mercye."

He was found guilty and a sentence of death passed, but it was not carried out, though his estates were confiscated and he was still a prisoner in February, 1593. He died on the 15th April, 39 Elizabeth.

Such was the fate of a Sussex gentleman who followed too closely the lead given by the older aristocracy in the county.

Turning now from those who were hostile to those who supported the status quo, it was shown in the last chapter that, down to 1569, the county was virtually dominated by Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel. He was sole Lord Lieutenant of the county down to November, 1569, and the county M.P's of 1559 and 1563 were probably friends of his.

In November, 1569, however, Lord Buckhurst, Viscount Montague and William West became joint Lords Lieutenant of Sussex in his place. There were too, appointed as their deputies, three of the outstanding gentlemen of the county.
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namely, Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston, Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham and Walter Covert of Slaugham. As a comment on the stability of the administrative machinery of the county, in spite of the undercurrent of political intrigue within it, it might be pointed out that Walter Covert remained a Deputy Lieutenant until after the end of the reign, and Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham until his death in 1582 when he was apparently succeeded by Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering who continued in office to the end of the reign; Sir Thomas Shirley was later deprived of his duties in 1601 when he had got himself hopelessly involved in financial difficulties.

By May, 1591, Nicholas Parker of Ratton had, it is true, been appointed an additional Deputy Lieutenant since Sir Thomas Palmer and Sir Thomas Shirley were in Sussex so little, and in June, 1601, Robert Sackville and Thomas Pelham were also added to the existing quota of Deputy Lieutenants. But the continuity was remarkable.

If the list of names of county members for Sussex for the reign be studied too, continuity will again be found to be the dominant note. It was shown in the previous chapter that the county members for 1559 and 1563 were very probably friendly to the Earl of Arundel, the leading peer in Sussex down to 1569. After 1569, the county seats were frequently occupied by friends or supporters of Buckhurst, whose own son, Robert, represented the county as many as four times before the end of the reign, - in 1584, 1593, 1597 and 1601.
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On only one occasion does there appear to have been any very definite effort on the part of candidates independent of, or hostile to, his influence to capture the county seats. That was in 1584 when Herbert Pelham and George Goring stood for election, challenging Robert Sackville, Buckhurst's son, and Sir Thomas Shirley. Their effrontery provoked two letters still to be found among the Covert papers in the British Museum and written, one by Viscount Montague on the 3rd November, 1584, and the other by Lord Buckhurst himself on the 30th October, 1584, to Walter Covert, then sheriff of Surrey and Sussex. The text of Buckhurst's letter is as follows:

"Cosyn Covert, I here that Mr Herbert Pelham and Mr G. Goringe do stand to be the knights of the shyre and as you frendle offred me your furtherance if nede were so now though I doubt not of anie great need yet wold I be glad to use the help of my frends in this cause for Sir Thomas Sherlie and my sonne. And so leavinge it to your selfe to write to such as you shall thincke good I comitt you to god this 30 of october 1584. Al your assured.

T. Buckhurst". (41)

That of Viscount Montague reads thus:

"With my right hartie comendacons the choice of the knights for this parliament beinge in this sher on thursday next I have thought good to signifie unto you that both sondrie noble men and gentlemen with my selfe have thought Mr Robert Sackfilde and Sir Thomas Sherley most fit for the same, yf the countrie shall like so to make choice And albeit I knowe not neyther heard of anie mention or request made otherwise, yet do I praise you to make my wishe and desire to be knowne to the freholders there as for two suche as I thinck most fitt and to whom I have given my consent and earnestlie request my frends to do the dame. In much hast I comitt yo, to god Cowdrie my howse the iii of November 1584.

Your loving frend,

Anthonie Montague". (42)
Robert Sackville and Sir Thomas Shirley were, in fact, returned.

Yet, more lies behind this incident than meets the eye. There were members of both the Goring and the Pelham families who were persistently hostile to Lord Buckhurst and would no doubt have given much to break his monopoly of power in the county. The Gorings, the Pelhams and the Sackvilles were among the oldest families in the county and it was only to be expected that members of the first two of these would show signs of resentment at the success of the Sackvilles and the elevation of one of them to the peerage. This irritation was never far below the surface and from time to time during the reign petty incidents occurred which brought it to life.

There was, for example, a dispute in 1570 between Lord Buckhurst and Henry Goring of Burton, then sheriff of Surrey and Sussex, over the appointment of a bailiff to the Hundred of Loxfield of which Buckhurst was himself steward. In a letter of the 28th April, 1570, Lord Buckhurst wrote to the inhabitants of the Hundred of Loxfield telling them he had been informed that the sheriff of the county had appointed a bailiff to their Hundred, quite disregarding the rights of the Steward of the Hundred [himself] in the matter, and that he had overridden the traditional liberties of the people of the Hundred themselves. This had happened at the last sessions with the support of one or two justices, "all the rest being silent removed from the exercise of his office"
Buckhurst said he had examined the various ancient charters of the Hundred and consulted elderly persons in the matter but found that there was no precedent for such high-handed action. He therefore charged all the inhabitants of Loxfield Hundred to support him and his nominee to the post of bailiff of the Hundred, and not to accept any other, and, if any intruder were to appear, then they were to notify Buckhurst in writing so that he might take legal proceedings.

Again, in 1572 there was a serious quarrel, this time between Buckhurst and both Henry and George Goring over the rights of felling timber on the manor of Balneth near Lewes. Buckhurst explained the whole story in a letter of 23rd April, 1572 to John Pelham of Laughton, then sheriff of the county. It seems that there was a skirmish and George Goring had summoned John Pelham to his aid on the pretext that he required the sheriff's help in keeping the peace; he also called in Mr. Edward Bellingham and his own brother, Henry. Buckhurst expressed surprise that Pelham should have allowed himself to be drawn into this matter by Goring, even if he were sheriff. However, in his reply, Pelham took Goring's part and said that Buckhurst had far more men on the scene than Goring and that he had only intervened by virtue of his office and to prevent a breach of the peace.

43. B.M. Add.MS., 33,084, f.8.
44. B.M. Add.MS., 33,084, f.12.
45. Ibid., f.14.
In this same year, while Pelham was sheriff, the unfriendly relations that existed between him and his cousin, Lord Buckhurst, are further illustrated in the tone of two letters, one of them from Buckhurst, rather curtly requesting Pelham to send on an enclosed letter to Viscount Montague "and that you fail not thereof for that the service may thereby be much ympeached whereunto I wishe you to have due consideracon." In reply, John Pelham, "not mynding to be any messenger of yours", returned Buckhurst's letter to Viscount Montague with a very rude comment about Buckhurst's parsimony in enclosing a letter "to spare s shilling two in your purse, for to what other end you shold do it I cannot devise. This letter of yours to my Lord Montague was as nere him being in your hands as in myne. And in sending it fortie myles aboute and more to me I cannot perceave yt you have such care of the spedie serving of her majestie as by your letter you wold seem to have."

In September, 1575, a further letter was written by Buckhurst to Pelham, this time apologising for the rough behaviour of his keeper towards the latter when he entered his park, and saying that the keeper had pleaded that he had not known that there had been a reconciliation between these two gentlemen after a poaching incident that had taken place two years previously. Buckhurst begged Pelham's forgiveness
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and invited him to hunt in his park with his friends as soon as he wished.

It is clear, however, from a further letter from Pelham to Buckhurst written in January, 1579, that all was not well between them. Pelham asked whether the price of friendship between them was that he should himself always have to admit having committed grievous wrongs against Buckhurst though he felt that he himself was far behind Buckhurst in this and that Buckhurst was the real source of the dispute. Pelham suggested in conclusion that Buckhurst should choose two or three or more noblemen to act as judges between them, "to be indifferente judges whether that you have iniured me or I you and whether of us hath geven the greatest caus of thys myslike betweene us ... for that I do knowe that the unkindnes betweene us is knowen and spoken of both in courte and shire in bothe wyche places I would gladlye kepe my credite or els be condemned as I have deserved."

Within two years John Pelham was dead. Perhaps it is significant that it was in 1586 that his brother and eventual heir, Thomas, became a county member for Sussex, the year when Buckhurst was in the Low Countries, and soon before the latter's temporary disgrace. Herbert Pelham of Buckstepes,
who stood as a candidate for one of the county seats in 1584 and was set aside at the behest of Buckhurst, was the cousin of John and Thomas Pelham.

Herbert Pelham, himself, seems to have had a somewhat uphill career, perhaps partly owing to the feud between his family and Lord Buckhurst who might, otherwise, have smoothed the way for him a little. On the 25th April, 1582, he was summoned before the Council and questioned as to why he had refused the office of sheriff. Pelham replied it was because he was living in Winchelsey, within the liberty of the Cinque Ports, and therefore thought he was exempted by charter from all offices outside that liberty. This he now confessed to be an error. He was accordingly dismissed without punishment, having already been committed to the Marshalsea by the Lord Treasurer for one month and two days. His cousin, Edmund Pelham, the lawyer of Hastings, was, however, committed to the Fleet for "boldness and offence" in defending him before the Council.

In October, 1587, Herbert Pelham purchased from John Morley of Halnaker Esq. and his wife, Elizabeth, the site of Michaelham priory, together with 787 acres of land, and its manor and messuages. But he soon fell into serious financial difficulties, and in 1590 had to borrow money at a huge interest from John Mitchell of Cuckfield. In 1599, Herbert
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Pelham's whole interest in this property was made over to Thomas Pelham of Laughton and two others who held it in trust with a view to sale, from the proceeds of which an annuity of £400 was to be reserved to Herbert Pelham and his family for life, the residue being kept back to discharge his debts, and the surplus, if any, being reserved for his heirs. This arrangement was made "because by reason of his great debts he was not able to travel about the sale of his lands for the satisfaction of his said debts yet intended they should be paid as soon as they conveniently might." On the 6th April, 1601, the trustees sold the property to Lord Treasurer, Buckhurst, his wife and heirs, for £4,700. This apparently did not end Herbert Pelham's troubles because he was later forced to sell two manors to his cousin, Sir Thomas Pelham.

Apart from his financial problems, Herbert Pelham had other difficulties. In the 1587 Certificate concerning the J.P's, he was described as having been dropped from the Commission of the Peace though he was sound politically and religiously, because "he would be carried with the first report and devise." He did not re-appear on the Commission during the reign, though he was saddled with the office of sheriff in 1590-91.
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In James I's reign, he got himself into trouble, first for harbouring popish recusants, secondly for not receiving communion once over a long period, and thirdly, for interrupting the sermon of the minister at Catsfield in the Archdeaconry of Lewes where Pelham then resided, and using irreverent and defamatory speeches against him. Pelham is said to have reported that Mr. Large, this minister, had been heard to say "that he had as leefe see a sowe weare a saddell as see a minister weare a surplice." He died in July, 1625, without having achieved any great distinction in the county.

It is notable that Sir William Pelham, Master of the Ordnance and brother of Sir Edmund Pelham of Hastings, the lawyer, was a protege of the Earl of Leicester, rival to Buckhurst. However, it is misleading to suggest a clear-cut rift in the county politics of Sussex between a Leicester faction and a Burghley faction, represented by the Pelhams and the Sackvilles respectively. Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston, for example, was the client of Leicester as is shown by Shirley’s efforts on his behalf in 1585 when Leicester was in disgrace for his acceptance of the governorship of the Low Countries. Yet, only a year before, Buckhurst had used his influence to obtain one of the county seats in Parliament for Shirley, and Shirley even wrote to Leicester on the 7th March.
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1585 that he was using Buckhurst's good offices on his, 62
Leicester's behalf.

Naturally, there were many feuds among the gentry
families which come into this survey, and there is ample
evidence of these in the proceedings of the Star Chamber
during the reign. There were disputes about boundaries,
for example, that between John Caryll and Thomas Bowyer of
North Mundham as to their respective rights to some marsh
land extending into the parishes of Oving, Merston and North
63
Mundham; about the rights to certain iron works, for example,
that between Roger Gratwick of Slinfold of the one part and
64
Walter Covert and Edward Caryll of the other; about armed
trespass, for example, that between Lord Lumley and Richard
65
Stanney; and about many other causes. Most prolonged and
involved, perhaps, of all local disputes which reached the
High Courts, was that concerning the Dicker Common which lay
east of Laughton and south of Chiddingly, - land leased by
the Crown to one Anthony Smyth. Apparently the Queen's claim
to this land was very unpopular, and a series of lawsuits
and counter suits beginning in the year 7 Elizabeth was
conducted between Smyth and his supporter, William Fleetwood,
Chancellor of the Court of the Duchy of Lancaster, within
whose jurisdiction the disputed land lay, and various

62. B.M. Cotton MS., Galba, C.9, f.120.
63. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5 Eliz., C.10/11; C.48/3; B.32/9; B.41/26;
B.105/7; B.99/34 and St.Ch. Addenda 7, bundle 10, no.32;
also C.14/16; C.52/21 and C.56/15.
64. P.R.O. St.Ch. 5 Eliz., G.3/6; G.9/23; G.3/28; G.6/6; G.10/
39; G.43/32; and St.Ch. Addenda 7, bundle 22, no.15.
so-called trespassers on the common. Altogether, the litigation was to last some twenty-five years and to be taken not only before the Duchy Court, but also into the Court of Star Chamber, the Court of Wards and the Court of Queen's Bench.

In 10 Elizabeth, John Pelham, as lord of the manor of Laughton, entered the fray, but his case against Smyth was quashed in the Duchy Court. This led to various riots and misdemeanours by Pelham's adherents, the burning down of barns and woodpiles, the pursuit of Smyth and his servants by armed men - all done with the connivance of the constable at Hailsham; and, by some coincidence, whenever these riots were about to occur, John Pelham was away from the district. Smyth, a stranger in the county and unable to obtain redress, therefore besought the Queen for a subpoena for John Pelham to be brought before the Court of Star Chamber. As a result of all this, Pelham was committed to the Fleet, but subsequently released on the entreaty of his friends.

However, Pelham, nothing daunted, revived the issue, pinning railing letters denouncing the Queen and the Privy Council on Church doors, beating up the local feodary, breaking down the pound and having Smyth up in the Court of Queen's Bench "for vexacion's sake". A further bill was therefore exhibited by

66. S.A.C., xiv, 234-5.
Smyth in the Star Chamber and John Pelham was again committed to the Fleet and fined £200 into the bargain. Several of Pelham's tenants were also sent there. On the intervention of Pelham's friends, however, Smyth made up the quarrel as best he could and stated in open court that all was quiet between them and Pelham was again released.

The next act of the drama began when Pelham obtained the support of his neighbour, John Jefferay, serjeant-at-law, who placed his legal knowledge at Pelham's disposal and himself entered into the quarrel by felling trees on the Dicker Common. Smyth complained that he and Pelham were "lyncked in a confederacy". In the year 17 Elizabeth, Jefferay began a suit against Smyth who replied with a counter-suit.

After John Pelham's death in 1580, the cause of the party hostile to Smyth was maintained by his widow, Dame Judith Pelham and her "mighty frends". A case was therefore brought by the Attorney-General, ex parte Smyth, in the Court of Wards against Oliver Pelham, John Pelham's heir, but before it could be settled, Oliver died, in 1585.

Proceedings were, however, revived against Thomas Pelham, brother of the late John Pelham, and eventually the case came before the Court of Queen's Bench with a special

70. Ibid, ff. 177-8; also S. A. C., xiv, 235.
71. Ibid, f. 179; and f. 167 et seq.
Jury out of Sussex, who found for the defendant, Pelham. It was adjudged that the 450 acres claimed by the Queen were really part of and belonged to the manor of Laughton, and that all trees growing there belonged to the said manor. It was held that the Queen's title and therefore Smyth's lease also, were void. The matter was not settled until 31 and 32 Elizabeth.

Buckhurst, it should be noted, would take no part in the issue; he had heard both sides and would not meddle himself in the matter, but he said that, in the early stages of the dispute, he felt that it was John Pelham's fault that the wrangle continued and he knew that Pelham and Jefferay were in league.

Many of these local quarrels had little more than local significance. Yet they sometimes throw valuable light on the characters taking part. Judging from the persistence of the Felhams in the Dicker dispute, and their local influence it is small wonder that even Lord Buckhurst sometimes regarded them as potential rivals for power in the county.

In conclusion it may be said that, apart from local disputes, the politics of Elizabethan Sussex seem to have been dominated to a great extent by the peerage. Down to 1569 the county was largely overshadowed by Henry Fitzalan,

73. B.M. Add. MS., 33,058, f. 62b; see also S.A.C., xiv, 235.
Earl of Arundel, but thereafter he and his supporters passed, as it were, into opposition to the existing regime. He and his two sons-in-law, Baron Lumley and the Duke of Norfolk, and the 7th Earl of Northumberland and his brother, were all involved in the intrigue and insurrection of the years immediately after 1569. And, even after the execution of the Duke of Norfolk and of the 7th Earl of Northumberland in 1572, and after the death of Henry Fitzalan himself in 1580 had changed the political scene considerably, the story of conspiracy and hostility to the government was carried on by the 8th Earl of Northumberland and Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel and their supporters among the gentry such as Edward Caryll, the Gages and William Shelley.

On the other hand, from 1569 on, Lord Buckhurst, who was the staunchest and most powerful bulwark of the government in the county, had numerous valuable supporters among the gentry, such as Walter Covert, the Palmers of Parham and Angmering and the Shirleys of Wiston, even if he had sometimes to face the jealous antagonism of those who, like the Pelhams and the Gorings, resented the powerful influence of the Sackvilles in the county.

The anxiety of the writer who commented on the general state of Sussex in 1583 is perhaps understandable. But by 1591 when Queen Elizabeth came south to visit the county and enjoy the hospitality of Cowdray and of Stanstead, those who had been its most dangerous and hostile figures were either dead, imprisoned or otherwise politically tamed.
SECTION II

Appendices
Appendix 1. The Lords Lieutenant of Sussex in the reign of Elizabeth.

May 26, 1559

Henry, Earl of Arundel, Lord Steward of the Queen's Household. (On a list of Lords Lieut. in various shires)
(S.P.Dom.Eliz.4, nos.29 & 30)

Oct. 15, 1559

End of Earl of Arundel's Commission of Lieutency for Sussex. His Commission "not to be continued this winter time" but he is to keep forces in readiness as though he were still Lieutenant.
(S.P.Dom.Eliz.7, no.9)

April 18, 1560

The Earl of Arundel. On a list of Lieutenants and Muster Masters in several English counties. (S.P.Dom.Eliz.12, nos.7,8 & 9)
(But on no.7 the name of the Earl of Arundel is deleted and that of Lord Lumley is substituted). No.10 loc.cit. is "Instructions by the Queen to the Earl of Arundel (Steward of the Household), Lieut. of the Counties of Surrey & Sussex to have the forces of those counties in readiness.

July (?), 1561

Lord Lumley. On a list of Lieuts. of counties attached to a letter from the Queen to the sheriffs and J.P's, saying she does not intend to issue a Commission of Lieutency this summer but to leave the govt. of the counties to their charge. (S.P.Dom.Eliz.18, no.36)

August 12, 1567

Queen to sheriffs and J.P's (not to Lords Lieutenants as stated in Calendar) of the S. & W. counties to aid in the musters and appointment of captains in their respective counties. (These to act on the advice of the Earl of Arundel and others. Other names added later in a different hand).
(S.P.Dom.Eliz.43, no.49)

Nov., 1569

Viscount Montague; Sir Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst; William West Esq. On a list of names of the Lieuts. of counties with their styles and titles as they were rehearsed in the Commissions issued at Windsor, November, 12 Eliz. (S.P.Dom.Eliz.59, nos.57-60).
(No. 58,59,60 are complete or incomplete copies of 57. But one gives the Lord (Contd.)
Chamberlain, i.e. William, Lord Howard of Effingham as Lord Lieut.)

Nov. 15, 1570
Viscount Montague; Lord Buckhurst; Lord De la Warr. (On a list of Lords Lieutenant and their Deputies - no Deputies given for Sussex - to whom notices of discharge from all duties under their Commissions of Lieutenancy were issued, notices which also directed them to exercise vigilant care as ordinary magistrates.)
(S.P.Dom.Eliz.74,no.36)

(1572 ?)
(Among the Burghley papers in the Lansdowne Collection in the B.M. is a list headed "Persons to be considered for Her Majesty to train soldiers". On the back is written, "Names of Lieutenants". It is catalogued as "A list of Lieutenants of counties to be recommended to the Queen for training soldiers". There is no indication that they were appointed. The list is undated but inserted between a paper dated 1569 and another dated 1572. Names for Sussex and Surrey (Bracketted): - Earl of Lincoln [only created Earl in 1572], and Lord Admiral (B.M.Lansd.MS.104,no.10))

July 3, 1585
Charles Howard, Baron Howard of Effingham, later Earl of Nottingham, created Lord Lieut. of Sussex. (G.E.C.,ix,783).
(See also S.P.Dom.Eliz.179,nos.52,53,54; and B.M.Harl.MS.703,f.32)

August 2, 1586
Lord Howard of Effingham & Lord Buckhurst referred to as Joint Lords Lieutenant of Sussex. (A.P.C.,1586, 199)

(Over this Joint Lieutenancy, G.E.C. goes slightly astray twice:--
a) G.E.C.ix,783, says Lord Buckhurst became Joint Lord Lieut. in Sept.1586 instead of by August, 1586
b) G.E.C.iv,423, says he became Joint Lord Lieut. in 1587.

These two remained Joint Lords Lieutenant to the end of the reign and beyond. See almost annual references in the Acts of the Privy Council, indexed under "Sussex".
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Appendix 2.  The Deputy Lieutenants of Sussex in the reign of Elizabeth.

Nov. 1569  Sir Thomas Shirley
Sir Thomas Palmer  Walter Covert Esq.  (S.P.Dom. Eliz. 59, no. 61)

June 30, 1585  Sir Thomas Shirley
Sir Thomas Palmer  Walter Covert Esq.  (S.P.Dom. Eliz. 179, nos. 52 & 53)

(These names are attached to a warrant to the Chancellor to issue Commissions of Lieutenant to various nobles etc. empowering them to levy forces and appoint Deputy Lieutenants.)

July 23, 1585  Sir Thomas Shirley
Sir Thomas Palmer  Walter Covert Esq.  (H.M.C. Hatfield MSS. iiii, 297)

(Copy of the appointment of these as Deputies of Lord Howard of Effingham who was made Lieut. of the counties of Surrey & Sussex by the Queen's Letters Patent dated 3 July, 27 Eliz. This copy is attached to a copy of a form of appointment of a Lord Lieutenant's Deputies with the names not filled in, dated 14 Nov., 1587)

(See also B.M. Harl. MS. 703, f. 33)

Dec. 21, 1587  Letter from Lord Buckhurst mentions Nicholas Parker Esq., as recently appointed as a new Deputy Lieutenant for Sussex.
(B.M. Harl. MS. 703, f. 49)

May 5, 1591  Letter to Lord Chancellor from Privy Council requiring more Deputy Lieutenants for Sussex since there are so few residing there, e.g.: Sir Thomas Shirley - is in the Low Countries. Sir Thomas Palmer - resides at Blackwall.

So that the only two remaining are:
Walter Covert Esq.
Nicholas Parker Esq.

It is therefore suggested that Henry Neville Esq. of Mayfield be appointed also.
(A.P.C. 1591, 91)

(Contd.)
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June 3, 1601

Robert Sackville Esq) and Thomas Pelham Esq. are added to the existing Deputy L's.

Sir Thomas Shirley is now left off the Commission.

(Note. Robert Sackville Esq. was the son of Lord Buckhurst, one of the two joint Lords Lieutenant).

(A.P.C., 1601, 400).

(See also Crown Office Docquet Book, July 1595-March 1603, P.R.O. 4208, f.220:

"A Commission of Lieutenancy in the county of Sussex for adding of Robert Sackville Esq. and Thomas Pelham Esq. to the former Deputies unto the Lord Treasurer and the Earl of Nottingham, Lieutenants for the said county and also for leaving of Sir Thomas Sherley out of the same Commission. Witnessed at Westminster, 6th day of June, Anno 43 Eliz."

*NOTE:* Sir Nicholas Parker, (Knighted 1588), became Deputy Lieutenant of Cornwall in 1598. (See relevant family history in Section III).
Appendix 3. County Members of Parliament for Sussex during the reign of Elizabeth who were resident mainly in Sussex.

The following list of names has been compiled after consulting the Return of Members of Parliament, 1: England, 1213-1702 for all the Parliaments during the reign, supplemented by the Crown Office lists, and, where both are silent, by Browne Willis': Notitia Parliamentaria (1730), and, for the 1571 returns, the De Tabley MSS.

No attempt is made to enumerate families which were resident in Sussex or connected with that county by ties of property but whose members sat in the Elizabethan House of Commons as representatives of other counties, e.g. William Gresham "of Mayfield, Sussex", who sat for Norfolk in 1586, or Richard Mill "of Greatham, Sussex", who sat for Hampshire in 1597. (The seat of this family was the Greatham near Arundel, Sussex, not the Greatham near Petersfield, Hampshire. S.A.C., xvii, 108)

There are two cases of gentlemen representing Sussex although they appear to have belong primarily to other counties, i.e. Charles Howard Esq., 2nd son of Charles Howard, 2nd Baron Howard of Effingham, and Henry Neville Esq., son of Sir Henry Neville of Billingbear, Berks. Charles Howard sat for Sussex in the 1601 Parliament. Although he was described when he was knighted, 11th May, 1603, as "of Sheffield, Sussex" (G.E.C., ix, 788), and appears on the Commission of the Peace for Sussex in 1602 (Dorse of Pat. Roll, 44 Eliz., pt. 25, F.R.O., G.66/1594), yet he came originally from Surrey and during the greater part of his life, and particularly when he succeeded to his father's title, was connected primarily with that county. Charles Howard Esq. is therefore omitted from the following list.

The other gentleman, Henry Neville Esq., was the son of Sir Henry Neville of Billingbear, Berks, who had inherited the property called Mayfield in Sussex from Sir Thomas Gresham who died in 1579 and whose niece he had married. (Horsfield, i, 417; Visitations of Berkshire, Harl. Soc. Pubns., ii, 181; i, 249-50). Sir Henry Neville died in 1593 (H. Matthews: Personnel of the House of Commons in 1584, Univ. of Lond. M.A. thesis, Sect. III, 165), and his son sold the manor and park of Mayfield in 1597 (S.A.C., ii, 245). He had begun to alienate his Sussex property before this, (S.A.C., xxi, 3) and probably did not make his main residence in that county, but in Berkshire.

| Caryll, John, Esq. | 1559 | (Bye-election vice Sir John Jefferys, deceased) |
| Covert, Walter, Esq. | 1581 |
| Dawtrey, William, Esq. | 1563 |
| Jefferys, Sir John | 1572 |

(Contd)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date (Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Sir Thomas</td>
<td>1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Sir Nicholas</td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham, John Esq.,</td>
<td>1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville, Sir Richard</td>
<td>1559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Robert, Esq.,</td>
<td>1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley, Sir Thomas</td>
<td>1572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4. The Sheriffs of Sussex and of Surrey & Sussex in the reign of Elizabeth.

These names are taken from the List of Sheriffs, (P.R.O. Lists and Indexes, ix), supplemented by Horsfield, t. 86, though the latter is sometimes inaccurate as to the places of residence of these gentlemen. (See Appendix 10).

They include only those individuals who were alive or had a direct descendant alive and mainly resident in Sussex in 1580. For a complete list of names for the reign, see Appendix 10.

Normally one Sheriff was responsible for both Surrey and Sussex so that individuals from either county might be appointed, but from November, 1567 to November, 1571, Surrey and Sussex were divided for the purpose of this office. Those who were appointed Sheriffs of Sussex only are indicated thus, (S). Naturally, Surrey men do not appear in this list.

(S) Apsley, John, "the elder", i.e. of Pulborough, Esq.
   Ashburnham, John, Esq.
(S) Bellingham, Edward, Esq.
   Bishopp, Thomas, Esq.
   " " "
(S) Caryll, Edward, Esq.
   " John, Esq.
   Colbrand, James, Esq.
   Covert, Richard, Esq.
   " Walter, Esq.
   " Sir Walter,
   Culpepper, John, Esq.
   " Edward, Esq.
(S) Dawtrey, William, Esq.
   Eversfield, Thomas, Esq.
   " " "
(S) Goring, Henry, Esq.
   " " "
   " George, Esq.
   Leech, Richard, Esq.
   Morley, William, Esq.
   Palmer, Sir Thomas, [of Parham, since Sir T.P. of Angmering was knighted in August, 1573, See P.R.O. list]
   " Sir Thomas, of Angmering.
   Parker, Nicholas, Esq.
   " Sir "
(S) Pelham, Anthony, Esq.
   John, Esq.

(Contd.)
(Appendix 4 Contd.)

Pelham, Herbert, Esq. (Apr. 1576-Nov. 1576)

" " " (Nov. 1590-91)

" Thomas, Esq. Nov. 1589-90

Shirley, Francis, Esq. Nov. 1573-74

" Sir Thomas, Nov. 1577-78

Note: William Gresham Esq., "of Mayfield" was Sheriff, Nov. 1563-64 and Nov. 1576-77, but his family is not selected for study because he died in 1579 without a male heir, his cousin, Thomas Gresham dying in the same year. (B. & C. 238-19).

From the above list it may be noted that while, during the reign, there were 33 appointments of Sussex residents to the shrievalty of Sussex, or of Surrey and Sussex, and that these appointments were distributed among 27 individuals, only 18 families were involved. The Pelhams held office on 5 occasions, and the Coverts and Gorings on 3, while the families of Bishopp, Caryll, Culppepper, Gresham, Palmer, Parker and Shirley each did so twice. In fact, it appears that those families which bore the burden of the shrievalty only once during this period, were in a minority.
Appendix 5. Complete list of families represented among J.P.'s, Sheriffs, Deputy Lieutenants and M.P.'s for Sussex in the reign of Elizabeth, and selected for study.

Note: This list does not include: (a) Families of office-holders who were mainly resident in another county. Many of these non-resident county 'office-holders' were J.P.'s listed on the Commission in a purely honorary or 'ex officio' capacity, e.g. the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Treasurer etc. There were usually also two professional lawyers at the head of the list, not necessarily Sussex men though sometimes attached to the South-Eastern Circuit. (b) Families apparently not represented in Sussex in 1580 by a resident member, i.e. extinct of departed by 1580, or coming into residence after that date. (c) Families of office-holders who were clergy, even when Sussex men.

Initials beside family names indicate offices held by members of the family concerned T.R.Eliz. Not all offices indicated were necessarily held by one individual in any family since father and son, or grandfather and grandson etc. may have been office-holders in the one reign. But it is the family which is taken as the unit here, - "family" being understood in its broadest sense, so that subsidiary or cadet branches, though treated independently in Section III, (provided they were both resident and office-holding), are not separately noted in the following list. (E.g. The Pelhams of Laughton and those of Hastings and of Buckstepe are considered separately in Section III and for some purposes in this thesis are treated as independent units, but here they are simply noted as "Pelhams"). However, the Bowyers of Leythorne in North Mundham and the Bowyers of Cuckfield, appear to have belonged to quite different families, and are therefore listed separately below.

(Note: 'L.L.' means Lord Lieutenant.)

Agmondesham J.P. Colbrand Sh., J.P.
Apsley Sh., J.P. Covert D.L., M.P., Sx., Sh., J.P.
Ashburnham J.P. Cowper J.P.
Barentyne J.P. Culpepper Sh., J.P.
Barkeley J.P. Darrell J.P.
Bartellot J.P. Dawtrey M.P., Sx., Sh., J.P.
Bellingham Sh., J.P. Drew J.P.
Bishopp Sh., J.P. Ernley J.P.
Blount J.P. Eversfield Sh., J.P.
Bowyer (of Cuckfield) J.P. Fenner J.P.
Bowyer (of N. Mundham) J.P. of Arundel L.L., J.P.
Browne, Visc. Montague L.L., J.P. Ford J.P.
Caryll M.P., Sx., Sh., J.P. (Contd.)
Casi J.P. Fitzalan, E.,
Churcher J.P.
(Appendix 5 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring</td>
<td>Sh., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, E., of Arundel</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferey</td>
<td>M.P.; Sx., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td>Sh., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levett</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley, Baron Lumley</td>
<td>L.L., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunsford</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michell</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>Sh., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>D.L., M.P., Sx., Sh., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>D.L., M.P., Sx., Sh., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polham</td>
<td>D.L., M.P., Sx., Sh., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, E. of Northumberland</td>
<td>L.L., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>L.L., D.L., M.P., Sx., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley (of Wiston)</td>
<td>D.L., M.P., Sx., Sh., J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley (of Isfield)</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threle</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Baron De la Warr</td>
<td>L.L.; J.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td>J.P.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total: 70 families. For cadet branches, see Appendix 7.)
Appendix 6. The approximate length of residence in Sussex of the selected families.

Note: Pedigrees based on tradition only may give longer periods of residence in Sussex but the following is based on evidence of deeds, wills, Inquisitions Post Mortem, according to Berry & Comber, Comber and other authorities described in the family histories in Section III of this thesis. Consequently, this Appendix may place in Columns 2 & 3 families which were really resident in Sussex much earlier, for want of reliable evidence. This possibility is noted wherever it occurs. When a family is known to have 'immigrated' from another county, this too is indicated thus: (Im.). Families placed in Columns 2 or 3 may, e.g. the Culpeppers, Percies, etc., have held extensive property in Sussex before they became primarily resident there. This too is indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAINLY</th>
<th>RESIDENT IN SUSSEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Before 1400.</td>
<td>II: Before 1500.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apsley. Apparently established in Thackham in 20 Ed. III by marriage to an heiress. The Pulborough branch established themselves there in the mid.15th cent. by marriage to an heiress. Ashburnham. Established from the 12th. cent. Younger branch at Broomham established themselves there in mid.15th cent. by marriage to an heiress.

Acmondeham, Cadet branch of a Surrey family. Acquired Sussex property in late 15th cent. through marriage to a Sussex heiress but probably came to reside only in 1560's. (IM.)

Barentyne. Son & heir of an Oxfordshire gent. Sir William Barentyne who married a Lowkenor coheiress and so acquired Dedisham, Sussex. His son apparently resided at Horsted Keynes and left no issue. (Im.) (contd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot. Established at Stopham from towards end of 14th cent., when a Bartellot married a Stopham co-heiress. (See S.A.C., lv. 20)</td>
<td>Bellingham. Apparently not newcomers to Sussex. Perhaps connected with Eringham near Shoreham from an early date but genealogical evidence scanty before the later 15th cent.</td>
<td>Berkeley. Apparently from Herefordshire. Married a widow with a claim on property in Bolney during her life. Settled in Sussex about 1570. No children. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caryll.</strong> According to Trenqualeon (see Sect. III, family history), resident near West Grinstead by mid 15th cent., and later Warnham and Harting. (Im.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>successful ironmaster. Son built Cuckfield Place and was 'Esquire'. Grandson was knighted, became a J.P. and married a Goring. Browne, Viscount Montague Cadet branch of the Brownes of Bechworth Castle, Surrey. Perhaps resident from c.1539, date of the Dissolution of Battle Abbey. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand. Apparently were settled at Boreham in East Sussex in mid 14th cent. with lands in Laughton Covert. Connected with West Sussex from early 13th cent. at least. Had property in Surrey from an early date and gradually increased their Sussex lands. Married into many distinguished Sussex families. Acquired Slaugham in late 15th cent. and much Cuckfield property in late 16th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Casie. From London; father a citizen and grocer. Married into family of Bowyer of North Mundham and died 1568. Son a lawyer. No issue. (Im.) Churcher. From Surrey. Apparently settled in Chiddingly c.1570. Another line continued in Surrey. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey. Were living in West Sussex from at least the 13th cent., possibly earlier.</td>
<td>Cowper. Had lands in Harting and in Hampshire from late 15th cent. Perhaps settled in Sussex before the 15th cent. Apparently connected with the Cowpers of Somerset.</td>
<td>Culpepper. Younger branches of an old Kentish family owning Sussex property including Wigsell held from the 14th cent. One branch settled there probably at the beginning of the 15th cent.; the Culpeppers of Wakehurst acquired that property by marriage to a Sussex coheiress in the late 15th cent. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley. Apparently connected with the manor of that name from the 13th cent. In the 15th cent. they acquired property in Wilts., which went to a younger but eventually more notable branch of the family.</td>
<td>Darrell. Younger branch of the Darrells of Kent, originally of Yorks. Acquired property in Sussex by marriage to Henry Chichele's niece and probably settled in the county in the early 15th cent. (Im.)</td>
<td>Darrell. Younger branch of the Darrells of Kent, originally of Yorks. Acquired property in Sussex by marriage to Henry Chichele's niece and probably settled in the county in the early 15th cent. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drew. A newcomer. Parentage unknown. Connection with Sussex appears to date from marriage to a Sussex heiress whose father had acquired Densworth manor in 1542. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Appendix 6 contd.)

Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel. Held the Castle and Honour of Arundel since the 13th cent.

Goring. Probably connected with Goring, Sussex, though not lords of the manor, from the 13th cent. Were settled at Lancing in the 14th cent. and Burton in the 15th cent. There were two branches of the family in the 16th cent. (contd.)

II

Eversfield. From Surrey. Probably settled in Sussex soon after 1551, at North, near Horsham. (Im.)

Fenner. Living at Crawley, Sussex in the early 16th cent., probably earlier.

Ford. From Surrey. Settled in c. 1540's. A coheiress married one of the Devonshire branch of the family who then settled in Sussex. (Im.)

Fortescue. From Essex. Settled in Sussex, c. 1580. (Im.)

III

Gage. From the Forest of Dean and Gloucecs. Married into the St. Clare Family in the 15th cent. so acquiring lands in Sussex. Also married a Bolney heiress, so acquiring Firle in the 15th cent. The Gages were apparently resident in Sussex from the early 16th cent., having been in Surrey immediately before that. (Im.)

Garton. A merchant family from London. Settled at Billingshurst in the early 16th cent. A younger branch settled at Woolavington, Sussex in the later 16th cent. (Im.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the Gorings of Burton, and those of Danny Park</td>
<td>Gounter. From Wales. Had property there into the 16th cent., also in Berks, Wilts, Hants, and were connected with Sussex from the early 15th cent., but probably resident there only from the early 16th cent. (Im.)</td>
<td>Howard, Earl of Arundel. From Norfolk. After inheriting the Castle and Honour of Arundel in 1580, Philip Howard probably spent considerable time in Sussex. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hussey. Pedigree traced back only to early 16th cent. when living at Slinfold, but probably connected with the Husseys who had been resident in West Sussex since the 12th cent. Settled in Cuckfield in 1540, having acquired property there by marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leech. Settled in Sussex in late 16th cent. Apparently from Kent. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levett. Pedigree traced only to early 16th cent., but probably resident in Sussex earlier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | Lumley, Baron Lumley. From Durham, Probably settled in Sussex in mid 16th cent. due to a marriage to a daughter of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel. (Im.)
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## (Appendix 6 contd.)

### I
- **Lunsford.** A very old Sussex family, perhaps even pre-Conquest. Had lived at Etchingham and later Battle, and in the 16th cent. at East Hoathly.

### II
- **May.** From Kent. Settled in Sussex in the 15th cent. owing to marriage to a Sussex heiress. (Im.)
- **Morley.** From Lancashire. Married a Sussex heiress in the 15th cent. (Im.)

### III
- **Marvin.** A younger branch of its Wilts. family. Settled in Sussex c.1545. Moved to Petersfield, Hants. late in Elizabeth's reign. (Im.)
- **Michell.** Pedigree traced back only to early 16th cent. in Cuckfield, but probably connected with Cuckfield from the late 13th cent. at least, since Michells were living there then.
- **Nevell.** Origins unknown. Perhaps a native of Sussex.
- **Onley.** Originally of Hants. Perhaps connected with the Northants. family. Acquired property in Warnham and Rudgwick, Sussex, in the late 15th cent. and in Pulborough in the early 16th cent. Apparently settled in Pulborough between 1501 and 1511. (Im.)

### Palmer
- Resident in Sussex at least from the early 14th cent.

### Parker
- Apparently resident in Sussex from the late 13th cent. and at Ratton from the early 15th.

### Pelham
- Resident in Sussex at least from the late 14th cent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Porter.</strong> From Nottinghamshire. Settled in Sussex T.R.Henry VI. (Im.)</td>
<td><strong>Sackville.</strong> Resident in Sussex from at least the 12th cent., - at Buckhurst in Withiam.</td>
<td><strong>Percy, Earls of Northumberland.</strong> Owned the Petworth estate from the mid 12th cent., though were apparently mainly resident at Alnwick until about the 1570's or perhaps a little earlier. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selwyn.</strong> A long-established Sussex family, known in the county from at least the 14th cent. Living at Friston from the early 16th cent.</td>
<td><strong>ShelleX.</strong> Resident in Sussex from the late 14th cent. at least, possibly much earlier. At Michelgrove from the late 15th or early 16th cent.</td>
<td><strong>Poole.</strong> From Gloucestershire. A younger son. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roberts.</strong> Apparently settled at Ticehurst, Sussex about the mid 16th cent. A younger branch of a Kentish family which had property in Ticehurst, Sussex in the later 15th cent. (Im.)</td>
<td><strong>Scott.</strong> Younger branch of a Kentish family. Settled at Iden in the early 16th cent. though they had this property from the mid 15th cent. (Im.)</td>
<td><strong>Sharpe.</strong> Migrated from Kent in the early 16th cent. owing to marriage to a Sussex heiress. (Im.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheppard.</strong> Genealogy traced back only to early 16th cent. but probably native to Sussex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shirley. From Warwickshire. Acquired Wiston in the late 14th cent. by marriage but resided there only from the late 15th cent. when a younger branch came to settle in the county. (Im.)

Shurley. Origins obscure but apparently settled in Sussex just before the end of the 15th cent. (Im.)

Spelman. Perhaps came to Sussex from Norfolk in the early 16th cent. (Im.)

Stanley. From Cumberland. Settled in Sussex in the later 16th cent., serving in the Earl of Northumberland's household. (Im.)

Stannye. Living in Sussex in the late 15th cent. but possibly earlier. Apparently native to Sussex but of obscure origins.

Stapley. Resident in Sussex from the late 15th cent. and probably native to it. The Stapleys of Framfield, a younger branch, were established there from the late 15th cent., the elder branch settled at Twineham in the 1540's.

Stoughton. Came to Sussex from Surrey in the mid 16th cent. (Im.)

Thatcher. Settled in Ringmer in the late 15th cent. Probably native to Sussex and of humble origins.

Thre le. Origin unknown, but perhaps connected with the Threles of Wiborough Green who lived there in the 15th cent. Settled at Bexhill in the mid 16th cent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West, Lord De la Warr. Resident in Sussex from late 13th cent. at least. Had acquired a considerable amount of property in Sussex by the 15th cent.</td>
<td>Wilgoose. Resided at Tredge, near Burwash from the late 15th cent. Probably native to Sussex.</td>
<td>Total: 18 families, of whom 9 are thought to have &quot;immigrated&quot; during the 15th cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 16 families, of whom 28 are thought to have &quot;immigrated&quot; during the 15th cent.</td>
<td>Total: 36 families, of whom 28 are thought to have &quot;immigrated&quot; during the 16th cent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 7. Main seats of residence of the Sussex gentry, selected for study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Rape.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agmondeham</td>
<td>Petworth</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley</td>
<td>a) Thackham</td>
<td>Bramber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Fulborough</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham</td>
<td>a) Ashburnham</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Guestling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td>Horsted Keynes</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley</td>
<td>Bolney</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td>Stopham, nr. Fulborough</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>Hangleton</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp</td>
<td>Henfield</td>
<td>Bramber, Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Later of Parham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B lount</td>
<td>Dedisham, nr. Slinfold</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer (i)</td>
<td>North Mundham</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer (ii)</td>
<td>Cuckfield</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Viscount</td>
<td>Cowdray in Midhurst</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll</td>
<td>a) Warnham, nr. Horsham</td>
<td>Bramber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Shipley, nr. West Grinstead</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Later of Harting)</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casie</td>
<td>North Mundham</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
<td>Chiddingly, nr. E. Hoathly</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Later of Slinfold)</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td>Worminghurst</td>
<td>Bramber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Later of Chichester)</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
<td>Slaugham, nr. Horsham</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td>Harting</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper</td>
<td>a) Wigsell, nr. Salehurst</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Wakehurst, nr. Ardingly</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>Scothney, in Wadhurst</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td>Petworth</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Rape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Runtington</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>Ernley, nr. Wittering</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td>Worth, nr. Crawley</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Later of Horsham</td>
<td>Bramber)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, Earl of</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Harting</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td>Harting</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>a)West Firle, nr. Lewes</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b)Bentley, in Framfield, nr. Uckfield</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
<td>Woollawington</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(or E. Lavington, S. of Petworth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring</td>
<td>a)Burton, nr. Petworth</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b)Ovingdean, nr. Rotting-dean, and of Lewes</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td>Racton</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Earl of</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td>Cuckfield</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay</td>
<td>Chiddingly, nr. E. Hoathly</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td>Fletching, nr. Uckfield</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levett</td>
<td>Hollington</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor</td>
<td>a)Selsey</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b)West Dean</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c)Trotton</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley, Baron</td>
<td>Stanstead</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumsford</td>
<td>East Hoathly</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Durford</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>a)Burwash</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b)Ticehurst</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Appendix 7 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michell</td>
<td>Cuckfield</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>Glynde</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td>Pulborough</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>a) Angmering, nr. Arundel</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Parham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Ratton, in Willingdon</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>a) Laughton</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Hastings</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Buckstepe, in Warbleton, S.W. of Burwash</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Later of Hellingly Pevensey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, Earls of Northumberland</td>
<td>Petworth</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>Ditchling</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>Cuckfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Originally of Battle Hastings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Ticehurst</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>a) Buckhurst in Withiam</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Seddlescombe, nr. Brede Hastings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) CChiddingly, nr. E. Hoathly Pevensey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Iden</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>Friston</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td>Northiam</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>a) Michelgrove, at Clapham, Bramber nr. Worthing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Patcham, N. of the later town of Brighton</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>Peasmarsh</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>a) Wiston</td>
<td>Bramber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) West Grinstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(Appendix 7 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shurley</td>
<td>a) Isfield, nr. Uckfield</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Lewes</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td>Hartfield, nr. Withiam</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Fittleworth</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
<td>Wittering and Eston</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td>Framfield, nr. Uckfield</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>West Stoke</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>Priest Hawes, in Westham, nr. Pevensey</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threele</td>
<td>Bexhill</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Baron De la Warr</td>
<td>Offington, nr. Broadwater</td>
<td>Bramber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td>Salehurst, nr. Robertsbridge</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chichester Rape</td>
<td>17 families or branches of families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundel Rape</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramber Rape</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes Rape</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey Rape</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings Rape</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 8. Distribution of Deputy Lieutenants in Sussex during the reign of Elizabeth.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering. D.L. 1585 on, but not very active from c. 1591 since he lived at Blackwall.

Nicholas Parker Esq. of Hatton. D.L. 1591 on.

Thomas Pelham Esq. of Laughton. D.L. 1601 on.
Appendix 9. Distribution of County Members of Parliament for Sussex during the reign of Elizabeth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Election</th>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Caryll of Warnham</td>
<td>Richard Sackville of Buckhurst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>William Dawtrey of Petworth</td>
<td>(Ditto.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571</td>
<td>Thomas Palmer, perhaps of Angmering</td>
<td>John Pelham of Laughton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston.</td>
<td>Robert Sackville of Buckhurst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Walter Thomas Covert of Slaugham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering. (Also Henry Neville of Billingbear, Berkshire.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston.</td>
<td>Robert Sackville of Buckhurst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>(Robert Sackville of Buckhurst. Sir Nicholas Parker of Ratton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>(Also Charles Howard of Surrey)</td>
<td>Robert Sackville of Buckhurst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10. Distribution of sheriffs in the county for particular years of the reign of Elizabeth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Appointment</th>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(William Moore, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Culpepper of Wakehurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(John Stydolf, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Goring of Burton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Gresham of Mayfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Covert of Slaugham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Pelham of Buckstepe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Dawtrey of Petworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Bellingham of Hangleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Apsley of Pulborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Goring of Burton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
(Appendix 10 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Appointment</th>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Caryll</td>
<td></td>
<td>(perhaps at this time of Shipley)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Horsfield, i,86 gives him as &quot;of Harting&quot;. Cf. notes in Section III).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Pelham of Laughton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Shirley of West Grinstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1574</td>
<td>(John Read, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1575</td>
<td>(Richard Polsted, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert Pelham of Hellingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Gresham of Mayfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Göring of Ovingdean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1579</td>
<td>(Sir William Moore, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of appointment</th>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Morley of Glynde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Edmund Slifield, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walter Covert of Slaugham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sir Thomas Browne, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Bishop of Henfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Horsfield, 1, 86 gives him as &quot;of Parham&quot;. Cf. notes in Section III.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Falkner of Ratton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Richard Bostock, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Richard Browne, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Caryll of Warnham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Horsfield, 1, 86 gives him as &quot;of Harting&quot;. Cf. notes in Sec. III.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Pelham of Laughton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert Pelham of Hell- ingly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1591</td>
<td>(Robert Levesey, Sy.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Appointment</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>Arundel</td>
<td>Bramber</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>Pevensey</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Walter Covert of Slaugham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Nicholas Parker of Ratton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Leech of Fletching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Culpepper of Wakehurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Moore, Sy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1598</td>
<td>James Colbrand of Chichester</td>
<td>(Horsfield; i, 86, gives him as &quot;of Boreham&quot;. Cf. notes in Section III.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Eversfield as &quot;of Den&quot;. Cf. notes in Section III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund Bowyer, Sy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Bishop of Parham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Ashburnham of Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Lovesey, Sy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11. Distribution of resident J.P.'s in the county for particular years.
(Names taken from the Assize Rolls, P.R.O. A.35, S.E.
Circuit, Sussex)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chichester</th>
<th>Arundel</th>
<th>Bramber</th>
<th>Lewes</th>
<th>Pevensey</th>
<th>Hastings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thos. Stoughton; (W. Stoke)</td>
<td>(Petworth)</td>
<td>groove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edm., Ford: (Harting)</td>
<td>Jno. Palmer: (Angmering)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(Slaugham)</td>
<td>(Westham)</td>
<td>Thos. Darrell: (Scotney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hy., Marvin: (Durford)</td>
<td>Hy. Goring: (Burton)</td>
<td>Geo. Goring: (Ovingdean)</td>
<td>Jno. Hussey: (Cuckfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pelham: (Scotney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geo. Stoughton; (Chich.)</td>
<td>Wm. Barlellot: (Stopham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wm. Scott:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--------- West Sx: 15 ---------

(Total: 37)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hr.Marvin: (Durford)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hr.Marvin: (Durford)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- West Sx. 10: ---

--- East Sx. 13: ---

(Total: 23)
(Appendix 11 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.35/22/1</td>
<td>Hy. E. of Northumberland</td>
<td>De la Warr</td>
<td>(Crawley)</td>
<td>Buckhurst, (Wigsell)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hy. Marvin.</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>(Bolney)</td>
<td>Geo. Goring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ric. Lewkenor; Selsey</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>(Wiston)</td>
<td>Ric. Shelley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ric. Lewkenor; W. Dean</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Sir Thos.</td>
<td>(Wiston)</td>
<td>Ric. Shelley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ric. Ernley</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>(Ovingdean)</td>
<td>Ric. Shelley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>(Farham); Hy. Goring, (Burton)</td>
<td>(Thackham)</td>
<td>Ric. Shelley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Wm. Bartellot</td>
<td>(Henfield)</td>
<td>(Patcham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Wm. Bartellot</td>
<td>(Burton)</td>
<td>(Thackham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Wm. Bartellot</td>
<td>(Burton)</td>
<td>(Thackham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Wm. Bartellot</td>
<td>(Burton)</td>
<td>(Thackham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Wm. Bartellot</td>
<td>(Burton)</td>
<td>(Thackham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Wm. Bartellot</td>
<td>(Burton)</td>
<td>(Thackham)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------------------------ West Sx. 15 ------------------------/-------- East Sx. 14 ------------------------

(Total: 29)
(Appendix 11 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P.R.O. A. 35/32)</td>
<td>Ric. Blount;</td>
<td>De la Warr. (Crawley)</td>
<td>Thos. Shirley; Walter Govert; Buckhurst. Jno. Wil-</td>
<td>Thos. Pelham, goose;</td>
<td>Wm. Morley (Salehurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ld. Lumley (Dedisham)</td>
<td>Thos. Lewkenor; Wm. Bartellot. (Wiston)</td>
<td>(Slaugham)</td>
<td>Thos. Bishop; Geo. Goring. Wm. Morley (Salehurst)</td>
<td>Thos. Pelham, goose;</td>
<td>Wm. Morley (Salehurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Drew; (Funtington)</td>
<td>Shirley; (Wiston)</td>
<td>(Lewes)</td>
<td>Hy. Shelley; Ric. Leech;</td>
<td>(Patcham)</td>
<td>(Fletching)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) (7)

------------------------ West Sx. 13 ------------------------/------------------East Sx. 16 ----------------

(Total: 29)
(Appendix II contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chichester Rape</th>
<th>Arundel Rape</th>
<th>Bramber Rape</th>
<th>Lewes Rape</th>
<th>Pevensey Rape</th>
<th>Hastings Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Chichester) land.</td>
<td>(Wakehurst)</td>
<td>pepper:</td>
<td>ville, Id.</td>
<td>(Wigsell)</td>
<td>(Wigsell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enor; (Dedisham) (Wiston)</td>
<td>Sir Thom.</td>
<td>ert.</td>
<td>ville.</td>
<td>(Wigsell)</td>
<td>(Wigsell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Nevell; Wm. Bartellot; (Chichester)</td>
<td>Thos. Shirley; (Lewes)</td>
<td>(Ratton)</td>
<td>Jno. Shury; Ric. Parker;</td>
<td>Edmund Pelham.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Edw. Caryll; (Harting)</td>
<td>Wm. Goring; (W. Grinstead)</td>
<td>Hy. Shely; Thos. Pelham.</td>
<td>(W. Grinstead)</td>
<td>(Ratton)</td>
<td>(Wigesse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir Edw. Caryll; (Barton)</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Jno. Shury.</td>
<td>(Patcham)</td>
<td>(Isfield)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ric. Ernley; (Wiston)</td>
<td>Sir Thom.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Shley;</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adrian Stough-</td>
<td>Sir Thom.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thos. Bishopp; (Thackham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ton; (W. Stand) (Angmering)</td>
<td>Shirley;</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Parham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thos. Stanley; (Fittleworth)</td>
<td>Thos. Stanley;</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

----------- West Sx. 19 -----------/-------- East Sx. 14 -----------

(Total: 33)
Appendix 12. Families which appear to have built or extensively altered houses in Sussex approximately during the reign of Elizabeth or early in James I's reign.

Apsley (of Pulborough) New Place, altered. (Elwes, 235)
Ashburnham (of Broomham) House said to date from 1580. (V.C.H. Sussex, ix, 179).
Bartellot. The Hall & adjoining chambers of Stopham House, perhaps of this period. (Elwes, 221)
Bellingham. Hangleton, an Elizabethan house, probably built by the Bellinghams. (Horsfield, i, 162)
Bowyer of North Mundham. Leythorne, re-built by Sir Thomas Bowyer, early 17th cent., (Horsfield, ii, 46; Elwes, 154-5)
Bowyer of Cuckfield. Cuckfield Place built by Henry Bowyer as his residence, between 1575 & 1589. (V.C.H. Sussex, vii, 149 et seqq., & 156; Cooper, History of the Parish of Cuckfield, 77)
Browne, Viscount Montague. Possibly altered Cowdray T.R. Eliz. for her visit of 1591. (Elwes, 77; Garner & Stratton, Domestic Architecture of England during the Tudor period, i, 49 et seqq)
Culpepper (of Wakehurst) Wakehurst Place built c. 1590, (V.C.H. Sussex, vii, 129)
Darrell. Scotney House built early 17th cent. (Horsfield, i, 411).
Dawtrey. More House built. Date 1580 over the fireplace. (S.A.C. xiv, 18)
Eversfield. Deene House built probably soon after 1604 by the Eversfields. (Elwes, 120)
Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel. Construction of the Castle perhaps finished at this time. (Elwes, 20)
Garton. Woollavington built T.R. Eliz. (Horsfield, ii, 171)
(Appendix 12 contd.)

Goring (of Burton)
Burton House built T.R. Eliz. (Horsfield, i, 172)

" (of Ovingdean & Lewes)
Part of Ovingdean Grange, late 16th cent. work. (V.C.H. Sussex, vii, 228)

Gounter
Racton Manor built in about this period. (V.C.H. Sussex, iv, 113; B.M. Add. MS. 5675, f. 42a & b)

Jeffery.
Chiddingly Place re-built T.R. Eliz. (S.A.C., xiv, 218)

Marvin.
Durford in Rogate altered. (V.C.H. Sussex, iv, 21; B.M. Add. MS. 5675, f. 28 a & b)

Morley.
Glynde restored or added to c. 1569. (S.A.C., xx, 75 & v, 91; Horsfield, i, 345)

Palmer (of Angmering)
New Place built by Sir Thomas Palmer. (Elwes, 11)

" (of Parham)
Parham enlarged and altered T.R. Eliz. (Elwes, 165)

Pelham (of Laughton)
Halland Place completed 1595. (S.A.C., xxiv, 5 et seqq.)

" (of Hastings)
Pelham House completed 1610. (V.C.H. Sussex, ix, 6).

" (of Buckstepe)
Hendall House perhaps built in this period. (S.A.C., ix, 220)

Percy, Earl of Northumberland.
Petworth House largely repaired, if not wholly reconstructed by Henry Percy, 8th Earl, c. 1576. (Elwes, 171)

Porter.
Court Lodge in Lamberhurst built soon after 1607. (Horsfield, i, 410).

Sackville (of Buckhurst in Withiam)
Lord Buckhurst built a house in Lewes known as "Lord's House". (S.A.C., xliii, 218; Horsfield, i, 215).

Shelley (of Patcham & Lewes)
Perhaps built Patcham too. (B.M. Add. MS. 5672, f. 21)
Appendix 12 contd.

Shirley (of Wiston) Wiston House, re-built c. 1576. (Horsfield, i, 235)

Shurley (of Isfield) Possibly a small house erected there by Thomas Shurley who d. 1579, in place of the larger one found by the family on their arrival. (S.A.C. xviii, 127)

Thatcher. Priesthawes in Westham, nr. Pevensey, perhaps built late in Elizabeth's reign or early in James I's. (S.A.C., xlv, 204)

(Total: 32 families or family branches).

Families which may have built or re-built houses in Sussex approx. during the Elizabathan period, judging from the architectural style shown in Grimms' and Lambert's etchings in the Burrell MSS in the B.M. (B.M. Add. MSS. 5670-5677).

Apsley (of Thackham) (B.M. Add. MS. 5673, f. 36c)
Culpepper (of Wigsell) (B.M. Add. MS. 5670, f. 4)
Gage (of Firle) (B.M. Add. MS. 5671, f. 90b)
Levett (of Grove House, nr. Hollington) (B.M. Add. MS. 5670, f. 30b)
May (of Pashley, nr. Ticehurst) (B.M. Add. MS. 5670, f. 2b)
Roberts (of Bearzell, nr. Ticehurst) (B.M. Add. MS. 5670, f. 2a)
Selwyn (of Friston) (B.M. Add. MS. 5671, f. 80a)

(See also above for Shelley of Patcham)

(Total: 7 families or family branches).
Appendix 13. Marriages of the heads of families living in 1580.

PART A. Numbers of times heads of families living in 1580 married.

Married once.

Agmondesham
Apsley of Pulborough
Ashburnham of Ashburnham
Ashburnham of Broomham
Barkeley
Bartellot
Blount?
Bowyer of Cuckfield
Caryll of Warnham
Churcher?
Culpepper of Wigsell
Culpepper of Wakehurst
Drew
Ernley
Eversfield
Fenner?
Ford
Fortescue
Gage of Bentley
Goring of Burton
Goring of Ovingdean
Howard, Earl of Arundel
Lewkenor of West Dean
Lewkenor of Trotton
Lunsford
May of Ticehurst
May of Burwash
Michell
Onley
Parker
Pelham of Laughton
Pelham of Hastings
Percy, Earl of Northumberland
Poole
Roberts
Sackville, Lord Buckhurst
Sackville of Sedlescombe
Sackville of Chiddingly
Scott
Sharpe
Shelley of Patcham & Lewes

Married twice.

Apsley of Thackham
Bellingham
Bishop
Bowyer of North Mundham
Browne, Viscount Montague
Colbrand
Cowper
Darrell
Dawtrey
Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel
Gage of Firle
Garton
Gounter
Hussey
Jefferay
Leech
Lewkenor of Selsey
Lumley
Marvin
Morley
Nevell
Palmer of Angmering
Palmer of Parham
Pelham of Buckstepe
Porter
Selwyn
Shelley of Michelgrove
Sheppard
Shirley of West Grinstead
Shurley of Isfield
Shurley of Lewes
West, Lord De la Warr

Married three times.

Caryll of Harting.

(Total: 1)

(Total: 33)
(Appendix 13 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married once.</th>
<th>Unmarried.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirley of Wiston</td>
<td>Barentyns (probably)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td>Casse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Levett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
<td>Threele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total: 49)

(Thus the total no. of marriages of these gentry was 118)

PART B. Numbers of marriages of gentry living in 1580 to daughters of Sussex residents and to daughters of families mainly resident elsewhere.

(The figure '2' signifies two marriages).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marriages within Sussex.</th>
<th>Marriages outside Sussex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apsley of Thackham (2)</td>
<td>Agmondesham (Herts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley of Pulborough</td>
<td>Ashburnham of Ashburnham (Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley</td>
<td>Ashburnham of Broomham (Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Warnham</td>
<td>Bartellot (Surrey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Harting (2nd marriage)</td>
<td>Bellingham (Hants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wakehurst</td>
<td>Bishop (2: Kent; Surrey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey (2nd marriage)</td>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield (Surrey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Bowyer of North Mundham (2nd marriage; London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>Browne, Viscount Montague (2: London &amp; Essex; Cumberland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Colbrand (1st marriage; Beds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td>Caryll of Harting (3rd marriage; London, but the widow of Sussex resident)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage of Bentley</td>
<td>Covert (1st marriage; Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring of Burton</td>
<td>Cowper (1st marriage; Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring of Ovingdean</td>
<td>Culpepper of Wigsell (Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey (1st marriage)</td>
<td>Darrell (2: both of Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay (2nd marriage)</td>
<td>Dawtrey (1st marriage; Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of Selsey (1st marriage)</td>
<td>Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel (2: Warwick's; Cornwall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of Trotton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley (1st marriage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunsford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May of Ticehurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd)
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Marriages within Sussex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Marriage Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morley (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell (2nd marriage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer of Angmering</td>
<td>(1st marriage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer of Parham</td>
<td>(1st marriage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Buckstepe</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Hastings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter (1st marriage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Sedlescombe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley of Patcham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard (1st marriage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley of West Grinstead</td>
<td>(2nd marriage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of Isfield</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of Lewes</td>
<td>(1st marriage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total: 44)

Marriages outside Sussex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Marriage Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gage of Firle (2nd marriage; Surrey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton (2; London; London &amp; Warwick)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter (1st marriage; Hants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Earl of Arundel (Cumb.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey (2nd marriage; Middx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay (1st marriage; London)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech (2nd marriage; Hants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley (2nd marriage; Yorks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin (1st marriage; Middx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May of Burwash (Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker (Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Laughton (Beds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, Earl of Northumb (Yorks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole (Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts (Bucks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Witham (Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Chiddingly (Oxon?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Middx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn (2nd marriage; Herts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley of Michelgrove (2; Hants; Herefordshire)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard (2nd marriage; Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley of Wiston (Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of Lewes (2nd marriage; Herts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton (Wilts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Lord De la Warr, (2; Glouce; Hants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total: 49)

Queries. (i.e. Those of whose wives too little is known for their marriages to be classified.)

Bellingham (2nd marriage)
Blount
Bowyer of North Mundham (1st marriage)
Caryll of Harting (1st marriage)
Churcher
Colbrand (2nd marriage)
Cowper (2nd marriage)
Eversfield
Fenner
Gage of Firle (1st marriage)
Gounter (2nd marriage)
Leech (1st marriage)

(contd.)
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Lewkenor of Selsey (2nd marriage)
Lewkenor of West Dean
Marvin (2nd marriage)
Michell
Nevell (1st marriage)
Palmer of Angmering (2nd marriage)
Palmer of Parham (2nd marriage)
Porter (2nd marriage)
Selwyn (1st marriage)
Shirley of West Grinstead (1st marriage)
Spelman
Stanley
Stannye

(Total: 25)

PART C. Numbers of marriages of heads of the 87 selected families, living in 1580, to women who were also members of that group of families.

Apsley of Thackham (2)
Apsley of Pulborough
Barkeley
Caryll of Harting (2nd marriage)
Covert (2nd marriage)
Ernley
Ford
Fortescue
Gage of Bentley
Hussey (1st marriage)
Lewkenor of Trotton
Lumley (1st marriage)
Lunsford
May of Ticehurst
Morley (1st marriage)
Nevell (2nd marriage)
Onley
Palmer of Angmering (1st marriage)
Palmer of Parham (1st marriage)
Pelham of Buckstepe (2)
Pelham of Hastings
Porter (1st marriage)
Sackville of Sedlescombe
Shelley of Patcham
Sheppard (1st marriage)
Shirley of West Grinstead (2nd marriage)

Shurley of Isfield (2)
Thatcher
Wilgoose

(Total: 32)
Appendix 14. Size of families.

PART A. Numbers of children of heads of selected families of the 1580 generation.

Note:— No distinction is made here between the children of first, second or third marriages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agmondesham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Thackham</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Pulborough</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Ashburnham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Broomham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td>(Probably unmarried)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartallot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of North Mundham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Viscount Montague</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Warnham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Harting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casie</td>
<td>(Unmarried)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Wigsell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Wakehurst</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Firle</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Bentley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Burton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Ovingdean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Sons.</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levett</td>
<td>(Unmarried)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Selsey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of West Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) of Trotton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunsford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Ticehurst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Burwash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Angmering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Parham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Laughton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Buckstepe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) of Hastings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, Earl of Northumberland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Withiam</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Sedlescombe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) of Chiddingly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Michelgrove (No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Patcham</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Wiston</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of West Grinstead</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Isfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Lewes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threele (Unmarried)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Lord De la Warr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 223 sons; 214 daughters.

Thus, omitting the 4 unmarried heads of families, among the remaining 83 the average number of children of each was 5.3 to the first decimal place.

PART B. Numbers of children who died either in infancy or during the lifetime of their fathers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apsley of Thackham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham of Ashburnham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of North Mundham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Viscount Montague</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Warnham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Harting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wakehurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of Selsey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of West Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer of Angmering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Laughton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, Earl of Northumberland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of Isfield</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: William Onley, only son and heir to his father, was found a lunatic, May 1610. (See Section III).

PART C. Families in which the father (living in 1580) was not succeeded by his eldest son owing to the latter's premature death.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Heir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td>A grandson in the male line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>A younger son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>A younger son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Viscount Montague</td>
<td>A grandson in the male line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wakehurst.</td>
<td>A younger son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td>A grandson in the male line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>A younger son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalab, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td>A grandson in the female line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td>A grandson in the male line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of West Dean</td>
<td>A grandson in the male line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley</td>
<td>No direct heirs. Title became extinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>A grandson in the male line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer of Angmering</td>
<td>A younger son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>A younger son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of Isfield</td>
<td>A nephew, son of a younger brother.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total: 15)

Note: Sir John Pelham of Laughton's only son, Oliver, was a few months old at his father's death in 1580 and died in 1585, so that he was succeeded by his uncle, Sir Thomas Pelham, younger brother of Sir John.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
<th>Queries: Unknown whether they md. or not.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>once</td>
<td></td>
<td>or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agmondesham</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley of Thackham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley of Pulborough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(one 3 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham of A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; of B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B loint</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of N. Mundham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Visc. of Montague</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(+2 ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Warnham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Harting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casie</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wigsell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wakehurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, E. of Arundel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
<th>Queries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmd.</td>
<td>Md. once</td>
<td>Md. twice or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levett</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of Selsey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of W. Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of Trotton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innsford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May of Ticehurst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May of Burwash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer of Angmering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer of Parham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4 times) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Laughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Buckstepe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Hastings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, E. of Northumberland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 times) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Withiam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Sedlescombe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Chiddingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( contd. )
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
<th>Queries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmd.</td>
<td>Md.</td>
<td>Md. twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley of</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelgrove</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patcham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Grinstead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanye</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (3 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threele</td>
<td>(No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Lord De</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la Warr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, of 223 sons:—

- 84 married once
- 28 married twice or more (5 three times, 1 four times)
- 66 apparently did not marry
- 45 not classified

Total 223

of 214 daughters:—

- 138 married once
- 14 married twice or more (2 three times, 2 four times)
- 62 apparently did not marry

Total 214

N.B. 1) Out of the 147 marriages of the sons, at least 40 appear to have been to Sussex women. (See Part B of Appendix). Out of the 172 marriages of the daughters, at least 64 appear to have been to Sussex men. (ibid.)
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2) Of the 40 marriages of the sons to Sussex women, 25 were to members of one or other of the families under review, i.e. about 1/6th of the total of marriages. (147) (See Part C. of Appendix).

Of the 64 marriages of the daughters to Sussex men, 28 were to members of one or other of the families under review, i.e. about 1/6th of the total of marriages (172). (ibid.)

PART B. Numbers of marriages listed in Part A of the Appendix which were to sons or daughters of Sussex residents.

Among the children of the selected Sussex gentry of the 1580 generation who married, the following sons and daughters married Sussex women and men:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marrying once</td>
<td>Marrying twice or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley of Thackham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley of Pulborough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham of Broomham</td>
<td>1 (one wife of Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td>1 (both wives of Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (md. 3 times; 1 wife of Sx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of N. Mundham</td>
<td>1 (both wives of Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Harting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcker</td>
<td>1 (one wife of Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td>1 (one wife of Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td>1 (one wife of Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wakehurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
## (Appendix 15 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marrying once</td>
<td>Marrying twice or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td>1 (one wife of Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, E. of Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring of Burton</td>
<td>1 (one wife of Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring of Ovingdean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (one wife of each of Sx.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of Selsey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunsford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May of Ticehurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (both wives of Sx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May of Burwash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer of Parham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Buckstepe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (md. 4 times; 3 husbands of Sx.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Buckstepe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (both husbands of Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Withiam, E. of Dorset</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Sedlescombe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Chiddingly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley of Patcham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
(Appendix 15 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Sons</th>
<th>Daughters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marrying</td>
<td>Marrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>once</td>
<td>twice or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley of Wiston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley of W. Grinstead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of Isfield</td>
<td>1 (all three wives of Sx.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Lord De la Warr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 marriages       64 marriages

PART C. Numbers of marriages listed in Part B of the Appendix which were to members of the same group of families.

Of the 40 marriages of the sons of gentry of the 1580 generation to Sussex women, 25 were to members of one or other of the same group of families:

Ashburnham of Broomham 1
Bartellot 2
Blount 1
Bowyer of Cuckfield 1
Bowyer of N. Mundham 1
Cowper 1
Eversfield 1
Ford 1
Garton 1
Gounter 2
Lewkenor of Selsey 1
Lunsford 2
May of Ticehurst 2
Pelham of Buckstepe 1
Poole 1
Selwyn 1
Stannye 1

(contd.)
Stapley 3
Stoughton 1
\[\frac{3}{25}\] i.e. about 1/6th of the total of 147 marriages of the sons of this generation.

Of the 64 marriages of the daughters of gentry of the 1580 generation to Sussex men, 28 were to members of one or other of the same group of families:

- Apsley of Thackham 3
- Apsey of Pulborough 1
- Bowyer of N. Mundham 1
- Caryll of Harting 3
- Ernley 1
- Fitzalan, E. of Arundel 1
- Goring of Burton 2
- Goring of Ovingdean 3
- Gounter 1
- Lawkenor of Selsey 1
- Morley 1
- Parker 1
- Roberts 1
- Sackville of Withiam 1
- Sackville of Chiddingly 1
- Shirley of Wiston 2
- Shirley of Isfield 1
- Stoughton 2
- West, Lord De la Warr 1
\[\frac{28}{172}\] i.e. about 1/6th of the total of 172 marriages of the daughters of this generation.
Appendix 16. Marriages of untitled Sussex gentry of the selected families into the peerage.

Heads of families in 1580.

James Colbrand Esq. md. Martha, d. of Oliver, Lord St. John of Bletsoe.
(Edmund Lewkenor or Trotton Esq. md. Anne, base daughter of Sir Anthony Browne, father of Sir Anthony, 1st Viscount Montague).

Sir John Pelham of Laughton md. Judith, d. of Oliver, Lord St. John of Bletsoe.

Herbert Pelham of Buckstepe Esq. md. Elizabeth, d. of Thomas West, 8th Lord De la Warr.

Henry Poole of Ditchling Esq. md. Margaret, d. of George Neville, Lord Abergavenny.


William Shelley of Michelgrove Esq. md. as his 1st wife Margaret, d. of Thomas Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton.

Children of heads of families in 1580.

Sir Edward Bishopp md. Mary, 4th d. of Nicholas Tufton, Earl of Thanet.

Richard Blount of Dedisham Esq. md. Mary, d. of William West, 10th Lord De la Warr.

John Caryll of Warnham Esq. md. Mary, d. of Robert, Lord Dormer of Winge and of Elizabeth, d. of Sir Anthony, Viscount Montague.

Margaret Caryll of Warnham md. Sir Philip Howard, eld. s. of Lord William Howard of Naworth.

Herbert Pelham of Buckstepe Esq. md. Penelope, d. of Thomas West, 11th Lord De la Warr.

Anne Shirley of Wiston md. John, 1st Viscount Tracy.

Cicely Shirley of Wiston md. Thomas West, 12th Lord De la Warr.

Jane Shurley md. Denzil, Lord Holles.

Note:  'O' and 'C' indicate which University they attended.  'x' indicates a degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>1580 generation</th>
<th>Sons of the 1580 generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agmondesham</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (0;0;0x;0x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Thackham</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Pulborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (0;0;0x;0x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Broomham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td>1 (C &amp; 0x)</td>
<td>2 (0;0x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>1 (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of North Mundham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Visc. Montague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Warnham</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (0;0x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Harting</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td>2 (0;0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Wigsell</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (0;0x;0x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Wakehurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (0x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>1 (C)</td>
<td>1 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
<td>1 (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td>1 (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Firle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Bentley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (0;0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Burton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Ovingdean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>1580 generation</th>
<th>Sons of the 1580 generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td>1 ($C^x$)</td>
<td>1 ($C^x$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) of Selsey</td>
<td>1 ($C^x$ &amp; O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of West Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) of Trotton</td>
<td>1 ($C$ &amp; O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamley</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunsford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) of Ticehurst</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Burwash</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michell</td>
<td>1 ($C^x$)</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>1 ($C^x$)</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) of Angmering</td>
<td>1 ($O$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Parham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>2 ($C^x; O^x$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) of Laughton</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Hastings</td>
<td>1 ($C$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) of Buckstepe</td>
<td>2 ($C; C^x$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, Earl of Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 ($O^x; O; 0; 0; 0; 0$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>2 ($C; O$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) of Withiam</td>
<td>1 ($O$ &amp; $C^x$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Sedlescombe</td>
<td>4 ($O^x; 0^x; O^x; 0^x$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) of Chiddingly</td>
<td>2 ($O; O$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>2 ($C; C^x$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td>1 ($O^x$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) of Michelgrove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Patcham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) of Wistom</td>
<td>1 ($O^x$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of West Grinstead</td>
<td>3 ($O; O^x; C^x$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
(Appendix 17 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>1580 generation</th>
<th>Sons of the 1580 generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shurley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) of Isfield</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Lewes</td>
<td>1 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threlas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Lord De la Warr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total: 19</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3 Oxford; 13 Cambridge; 3 at both)

(19 out of 87 = 21.8% to the first decimal place)

5 of the above took degrees.

Colleges attended by the above.

1580 generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New College</td>
<td>1 (Barkeley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>1 (Barkeley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>1 (Lewkenor of Trotton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart Hall</td>
<td>2 (Sackville of Withiam; Shurley of Isfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriel College</td>
<td>1 (Shirley of Wiston)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cambridge

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>2 (Barkeley; Spelman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's</td>
<td>6 (Bishopp; Fortescue; Howard; Lewkenor; of Trotton; Nevell; Sackville of Withiam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi College</td>
<td>1 (Eversfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's College</td>
<td>6 (Lumley; May of Burwash; Morley; Pelham of Laughton; Pelham of Buckstepe; Shurley of Lewes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterhouse</td>
<td>1 (Michell)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(64 out of 223 = 28.7% to the first decimal place)

25 of the above took degrees.

(41 Oxford; 21 Cambridge; 2 at both)

(64 out of 223 = 28.7% to the first decimal place)
Colleges attended by the above Sons of the 1580 generation.

**Oxford**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Alban Hall</td>
<td>4 (All Ashburnhams of Broomham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter College</td>
<td>1 (Lewkenor of Trotton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New College</td>
<td>1 (Bellingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's College</td>
<td>1 (Palmer of Angmering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester Hall</td>
<td>4 (All Percies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>2 (1 Bishopp; 1 Caryll of Harting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balliol College</td>
<td>4 (1 Browne; 1 Garton; 1 Culpepper of Wakehurst; 1 Goring of Burton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriel College</td>
<td>1 (Caryll of Harting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Hall</td>
<td>1 (Porter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart Hall</td>
<td>13 (2 Wilgoose; 2 Shirley of Wiston; 2 Culpepper of Wigsell; 1 Culpepper of Wakehurst; 1 Drew; 1 Lewkenor of West Dean; 4 Sackville of Withiam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brasenose College</td>
<td>3 (1 Gounter; 2 Stoughton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's College</td>
<td>2 (Both Sackvilles of Sedlescombe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church College</td>
<td>2 (1 Sharpe; 1 Stapley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalen College</td>
<td>1 (Thatcher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cambridge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus College</td>
<td>3 (2 Apsleys; of Thackham; 1 Bellingham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalene College</td>
<td>1 (Michell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare College</td>
<td>6 (1 Bowyer of Cuckfield; 1 Eversfield; 1 Morley; 2 Selwyns; 1 Stannye)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's College</td>
<td>2 (Both Culpeppers of Wakehurst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caius College</td>
<td>2 (Fitzalan; Lunsford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>1 (Howard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's College</td>
<td>4 (Garton; Nevell; Lewkenor of Trotton; Porter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel College</td>
<td>1 (Pelham of Buckstepe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Sussex College</td>
<td>1 (Pelham of Buckstepe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Not all those who are recorded as having been at Oxford and Cambridge Universities are listed above. It is not known to which colleges a few of them went.
Appendix 18. Sussex gentry attending the four main Inns of Court.

**Note:** 'I'; 'M'; 'G'; and 'L' indicate respectively the Inner Temple, Middle Temple, Gray's Inn and Lincoln's Inn.

'x' indicates a call to the Bar. 5 of the names in the 1580 generation are thus marked, although no specific reference to their calls can be found in the records of their respective Inns, because they are known to have become Benchers, Serjeants-at-law, or Judges. In addition, Sir Edward Culpepper of Wakehurst, alive in 1580, is marked 'x' as he appears to have been a serjeant-at-law, (See Section III), but with a query, as there is no record of his admission to or membership of any of the four Inns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>1580 generation</th>
<th>Sons of the 1580 generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agmondesham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Thackham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Pulborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Broomham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td>1 (L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkeley</td>
<td>1 (M?x - but no reference)</td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B owyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B owyer of N. Mundham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Visc. Montague</td>
<td>1 ? (G)</td>
<td>3 (I; G; I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll</td>
<td>1 (G?)</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Warnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Harting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casie</td>
<td>1(Mx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Wigsell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Wakehurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td></td>
<td>x?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>1 (L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>1 (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td>1 (Mx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
<td>1 (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Appendix 18 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>1580 generation</th>
<th>Sons of the 1580 generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>(I) of Firle, (II) of Bentley</td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring</td>
<td>(I) of Burton, (II) of Ovingdean</td>
<td>2 (G;M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garter</td>
<td>1 (M)</td>
<td>1 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay</td>
<td>1 (G^2-but no reference)</td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor</td>
<td>(I) of Selsey, (II) of West Dean, (III) of Trotton</td>
<td>2 (M;M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunsford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>1 (M^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>(I) of Angmering, (II) of Parham</td>
<td>1 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>(I) of Laughton, (II) of Hastings, (III) of Buckstepe</td>
<td>3 (G;M;L^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, Earl of Northumberland</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td>5 (M;G;M;M;M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>1 (L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>1 (L^2)</td>
<td>2 (I;I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>1580 generation</th>
<th>Sons of the 1580 generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Withiam</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
<td>3 (I;I;I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Sedlescombe</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) of Chiddingly</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td>2 (G;G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Michelgrove</td>
<td>1 (I)</td>
<td>2 (I;I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Patcham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td>2 (I;I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Wiston</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of West Grinstead</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Isfield</td>
<td>1 (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Lewes</td>
<td>1 (M* but no reference)</td>
<td>1 (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speelman</td>
<td>1 (M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>1 ? (G)</td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanney</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>1 (I^x)</td>
<td>2 (I;I^x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threele</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Lord De la Warr</td>
<td>1 (G)</td>
<td>2 (G;L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 28/40

(9 Inner Temple; 12 Middle Temple; 17 Gray's Inn; 2 Lincoln's Inn)

45.9% (40 out of 87 = 45.9% to the first decimal place)

10 of the above became barristers, or 11 counting Culpepper of Wakehurst.

Of these barristers, 5, or 6 if Henry Barkeley be included, though his membership of the Inn is doubtful, were of the Middle Temple; 2 of Gray's Inn; 1 of the Inner Temple; 1 of Lincoln's Inn. It is not known to which Inn Sir Edward Culpepper belonged.

Total: 75/47 families

(21 Inner Temple; 21 Middle Temple; 25 Gray's Inn; 7 Lincoln's Inn)

33.6% (75 out of 223 = 33.6% to the first decimal place)

6 of the above became barristers.
## Appendix 19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers attending Universities &amp; Inns of Court.</th>
<th>Numbers attending Universities only.</th>
<th>Numbers attending Inns of Court only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1580 generation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Their sons</strong></td>
<td><strong>1580 generation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley of Thackham (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham of Broomham (2)</td>
<td>Ashburnham of Broomham (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley?</td>
<td>Bellingham (1)</td>
<td>Bellingham (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp</td>
<td>Bowyer of Browne, Visc. (1)</td>
<td>Bowyer of N. Mundham (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Guckfield (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Montague Browne (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne (1)</td>
<td>Caryll of Harting (1)</td>
<td>Caryll of Harting (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Harting (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wigsell (2)</td>
<td>Culpepper of Wigsell (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wakehurst (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goring of Burton (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Appendix 19 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers attending Universities &amp; Inns of Court</th>
<th>Numbers attending Universities only</th>
<th>Numbers attending Inns of Court only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1580 generation Their sons 1580 generation Their sons 1580 generation Their sons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Howard(1) Gounter (1) Goring of Ovingdean (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of Selsey (1) Lewkenor of West Dean(1) Lewkenor of Trotton Lewkenor of West Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May of Burwash Michell(1) Michell Morley(1) Morley Nevell Nevell Palmer of Angmering(1) Pelham of Laughton Pelham of Hastings (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell Palmer of Angmering Parker(2) Pelham of Hastings (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Buckstepe(1) Percy (4) Pelham of Buckstepe (1) Percy (2) Percy (1) Poole(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Withiam(3) Porter(2) Sackville of Withiam(1) Sackville Sackville of Seddles- of Seddles- combe (2) combe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers attending Universities &amp; Inns of Court.</th>
<th>Numbers attending Universities only</th>
<th>Numbers attending Inns of Court only.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1580 generation.</td>
<td>Their sons.</td>
<td>1580 generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn(2)</td>
<td>Sharpe(1)</td>
<td>Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley of Wiston(2)</td>
<td>Shirley of Wiston(1)</td>
<td>Stanley?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of Isfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shurley of Lewes(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley of Lewes</td>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td>Stannye(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stoughton(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals:-

| 13 | 45 | 6 | 19 |

Percentages (of 87 for the earlier generation; of 223 for the later):-

| 14.9% | 20.2% | 6.9% | 8.5% |

Thus, 51.7% of the earlier generation and 42.1% of the later were educated at a University or an Inn of Court or both. The percentage figure for the later generation would be higher were it possible to allow for infant mortalities.
Appendix 20.  Numbers of manors, reversions of manors and of capital messuages held by heads of selected families through three generations according to Inquisitions Post Mortem.

Note: - The Inquisitions Post Mortem here referred to are those of the individual who was head of each selected family, or family branch in 1580, of his predecessor, whether grandfather, father or elder brother, and of his successor, if any, whether son, grandson or younger brother, provided the latter died not later than c. 1625.

Not all the parcels of land referred to in these Inquisitions are listed here, but only manors, reversions of manors and capital messuages, and, in the case of the greater landowners who possessed them, hundreds and rapes, boroughs, baronies, parks, London houses and dissolved religious houses.

The sources are printed in the Publications of the Sussex Record Society, iii, xiv, and xxxii, though xxxiii gives no details, and reference has been made to the originals in the P.R.O. For all references, see end of Appendix.

'Sx' means that the property referred to is in Sussex.
(2) represents the individual living in 1580, (1) and (3) his predecessors and successors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Manors</th>
<th>Reversions of manors</th>
<th>Capital messuages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agmonedesham (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) of Thackham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Wm. Apsley, gent.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Pulborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Nicholas Apsley, gent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Apsley Esq.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Geo. Apsley Esq.</td>
<td>2/3rds of a manor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) of Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Broomham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Lawrence Ashburnham Esq.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Adam Ashburnham Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Sir Wm. Barentyne (I.P.M. for Oxfordshire; apparently no lands in Sussex).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkeley (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Wm. Bartellot Esq.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Richard Bellingham Esq.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Bishopp</td>
<td>4)</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir Thomas Bishopp</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) John Bowyer, yeo.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Henry Bowyer Esq.</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sir Henry Bowyer</td>
<td>1½+: 1½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of North Mundham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Bowyer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Thomas Bowyer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Viscount Montague</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Sir Anthony Browne</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Sy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also: -</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 dissolved relig. houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4 Sx; 4 Sy; 1 Cambs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Parks (Sy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Rape (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(From 4 I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir Anthony Browne</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also: -</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 dissolved relig. houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2 Sx; 2 Sy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Parks (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(From one I.P.M., but very imperfect. No Wards or Exchequer copies.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Son d.v.p. Grandson died after 1626)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Manors</th>
<th>Reversions of manors</th>
<th>Capital messuages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caryll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Warnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) John Caryll Esq. (Grandfather)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir John Caryll (Only one copy, almost entirely illegible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Harting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (See 1 above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir Edward Caryll</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sir Thomas Caryll</td>
<td>10 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casie (No I.P.M.'s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.'s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Thomas Churcher, gent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Colbrand</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) James Colbrand Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Richard Covert Esq.</td>
<td>7 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir Walter Covert</td>
<td>11 + 2/3rds + ¼</td>
<td>3 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8 + 2/3rds + ¼ Sx; 1 Sy; 2 Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Died in 1651, but included here as of the 2nd generation &amp; of such importance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) John Cowper</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(but held lands in Dicham and Harting, Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Cowper, gent.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) John Cowper Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Wigsell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Thomas Culpepper Esq.</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Wakehurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Culpepper</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir Edward Culpepper</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (3 Sx; 3 Sy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Kent. I.P.M. taken in Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Thomas Darrell</td>
<td></td>
<td>(cont'd.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Manors</td>
<td>Reversions</td>
<td>Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of manors</td>
<td>messuages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrey</td>
<td></td>
<td>l (Sx)</td>
<td>l (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Sir John Dautrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) William Dautrey Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Son d.v.p.; grandson died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M. for Roger Drew but one for his widow, Dorothy)</td>
<td>0 (but held lands in Bosham, Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Bradshaw Drew Esq.</td>
<td>1 and the moiety of another 1/3rd (Also lands in Bosham, Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td>1 (Hants but also had non-manorial lands in Sx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Wm. Ernley Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Richard Ernley Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Nicholas Eversfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Eversfield Esq.</td>
<td>$\frac{4}{3} + \frac{1}{2}$ (3 + 1/3 Sx; 1 Sy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sir Thomas Eversfield</td>
<td>$\frac{4}{3} + \frac{1}{2}$ (3 + 1/3 Sx; 1 Sy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No I.P.M.'s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) William, Earl of Arundel (Only I.P.M. gives 3 m's in Sy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No sons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (Irrelevant, - a Devon man. See Section III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Ford Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Son died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (Irrelevant, - an Essex man, no property in Sussex. See Section III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Francis Fortescue Esq</td>
<td>$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{2}{3}$ (Sx)</td>
<td>Also 1 Hundred (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Edmund Fortescue Esq.</td>
<td>0 (but manors in Essex &amp; Cambs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) of Firle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Sir Edward Gage</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (14 Sx; 1 Sy; 1 Norfolk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Gage Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
(Appendix 20 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gage (ii) of Bentley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) James Gage Esq.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6 Sx; 1 Wilts)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Edward Gage Esq.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2 Sx; 1 Wilts; 1 Kent)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No sons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Giles Garton Esq.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sir Peter Garton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring (i) of Burton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Sir William Goring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir Henry Goring</td>
<td>9 4/9 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) William Goring Esq.</td>
<td>8 2/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Ovingdean &amp; Lewes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (See 1 above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) George Goring Esq.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1/3 + 1/3 (Sx)</td>
<td>1 (in Lewes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Arthur Gounter Esq.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) George Gounter Esq.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2 Sx; 1 Hants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) John Gounter Esq.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2 Sx; 1 Hants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk (I.P.M. for Herts. only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel (Apparently no I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel. (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Hussey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Sy)</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) George Hussey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Sy)</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir John Jefferay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 + 3/2 a park (Sx)</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
(Appendix 20 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Manors</th>
<th>Reversions of manors</th>
<th>Capital messuages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (Unknown)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Richard Leech Esq.</td>
<td>3 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No sons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) John Levett</td>
<td>20 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Lawrence Levett</td>
<td>6 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Selsey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Edmund Lewkenor</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Thomas Lewkenor (I.P.M. contains proof of age only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of West Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (See 1 above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir Richard Lewkenor</td>
<td>4+1/2 (Sx)</td>
<td>1 (Salop)</td>
<td>1 (Salop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Son d.v.p. Grandson died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) of Trotton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Edmund Lewkenor, gent.</td>
<td>1/2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) George Lumley (I.P.M. in bad condition and largely illegible. No names of manors appear.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John, Lord Lumley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(8 Sx; 4 Sy; 8 Co. Durham)</td>
<td>(8 Sx; 4 Sy; 8 Co. Durham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also: - 4 Parks (2 Sy; 1 Sx; 1 Durham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Forest (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hundreds (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No surviving children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunsford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No I.P.M.'s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.'s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Edmund Marvin Esq.</td>
<td>2 (1 Hants; 1 Sx)</td>
<td>1 (Hants)</td>
<td>1 (Hants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also: - 1 dissolved priory (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Pashley in Ticehurst.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas May, gent.</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Thomas May, Esq.</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Son died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Burwash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (See 1 above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) George May Esq.</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sir Thomas May</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(contd.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Appendix 20 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Manors</th>
<th>Reversions of manors</th>
<th>Capital messuages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michell (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Morley Esq.</td>
<td>5 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) William Morley Esq.</td>
<td>6 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Herbert Morley Esq.</td>
<td>3 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Owen Onley Esq.</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) William Onley, gent.</td>
<td>3 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Angmering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) John Palmer Esq.</td>
<td>6 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Parham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Robert Palmer Esq.</td>
<td>6 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir Thomas Palmer</td>
<td>9 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) William Palmer Esq.</td>
<td>9 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) John Parker Esq.</td>
<td>7 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sir Nicholas Parker</td>
<td>7 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Laughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Sir Nicholas Pelham</td>
<td>5 (Sx)</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also: 2 Hundreds (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir John Pelham</td>
<td>5 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also: 1 Hundred (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a) (Also became head of the family on the death of his father in 1580, but then a minor) Oliver Pelham Esq.</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td>3 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also: 1 Hundred (Sx) and the reversion of 3 more (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sir Thomas Pelham</td>
<td>12 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also: Castle, Honour, Barony &amp; Rape of Hastings, and 10 Hundreds named (Sx).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Hastings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir Edmund Pelham</td>
<td>2 (1 Sx; 1 Kent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Contd.)
(Appendix 20 contd.)

|-------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|

**Pelham**

(iii) of Buckstepe

1) Anthony Pelham Esq. 4 (Sx, but will in C, 142, 145, 12 refers to lands also in cos. Kent, Sy., Dorset, Lincolnshire, Northumberland and Yorks).

2) (No I.P.M.)

3) (Died after 1625)

**Percy, Earl of Northumberland.**

1) Thomas Percy, Earl of N., ex. 1572. Elder brother of Henry Percy, 8th Earl. (Only one I.P.M. survives for Dorset)

2) Henry Percy, 8th Earl of Northumberland 100 + 1

(16 Yorks; 56 Northd; 8 Yorks; 1 Durham; 24 + 14 Northd; 1 Cumb; 1 Sx; 10 Dorset; 1 Cumb)

Also: 14 Castles (4 Yorks; 3 Northd; 6 Cumb; 1 Cumb & Northd; 3 Sx)

7 Parks (1 Yorks; 3 Northd; 3 Sx)

1 Hundred (Sx)

3) (Died after 1625)

**Poole (No I.P.M's)**

**Porter (No I.P.M's)**

**Roberts**

1) (No I.P.M.)

2) Walter Roberts Esq.

3) (Died after 1625)

**Sackville**

(i) of Withiam

1) Sir Richard Sackville 35 1/2

(35 1/2 Sx; 2 Sy)

2) Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst & subsy.

Earl of Dorset. 65 1/2 + 1

(57 1/2 Sx; 5 Kent; 1 Sx; 1 Gloucs)

2 London)

Also: 3 1/2 boroughs (Sx)

3 Castle (Sx)

5 Parks (2 Kent; 3 Sx)

2 dissolved relig. houses (1 Sx; 1 Ex)

10 & 1/2 Hundreds (Sx)
(Appendix 20 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Manors</th>
<th>Reversions of manors</th>
<th>Capital messuages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Robert Sackville, Earl of Dorset.</td>
<td>(His I.P.M., which has been studied in conjunction with his will, enumerates precisely the same pieces of property as those held by his father and listed in his I.P.M., except that Robert Sackville's I.P.M. includes also a fourth part of the manor of Houndean in Sx.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Sedlescombe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Sackville Esq.</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) of Chiddingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) William Sackville Esq.</td>
<td>1 (Sy)</td>
<td>(But received rent from tenements in Durford, Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No son)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) William Scott Esq.</td>
<td>4 ½</td>
<td>(3 Sx; 1 Ex; ½ Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) William Scott Esq.</td>
<td>6 ½</td>
<td>(3 Sx; 1 Ex; 2½ Kent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Selwyn, gent.</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Selwyn Esq.</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Thomas Selwyn Esq.</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td>[use only]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe (No I.P.M.'s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Michelgrove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) John Shelley Esq.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1 Sx; 1 Ex; 2 Warwicks; 1 Herts; 2 Wilts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M. - only proof of age)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Patcham &amp; Lewes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(No I.P.M.'s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Robert Sheppard</td>
<td>3 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Wiston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) William Shirley Esq.</td>
<td>5 (4 Sx; 1 Bucks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(contd.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Appendix 20 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Manors</th>
<th>Reversions of manors</th>
<th>Capital messuages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of West Grinstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Francis Shirley Esq.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1 Sx; 1 Som)</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Thomas Shirley Esq.</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Isfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Shurley Esq.</td>
<td>3 (Sx)</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Shurley, Sir.</td>
<td>3 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No surviving children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Lewes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sir John Shurley</td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) William Stannye</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(but held some lands in Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Richard Stannye Esq.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(but held some lands in Sx)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) (No I.P.M'S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Anthony Stapley Esq.</td>
<td>2 (1 Sx; 1 Som)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Stoughton</td>
<td>1 (Sy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Adrian Stoughton Esq.</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (Died after 1625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) John Thatcher Esq.</td>
<td>4 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) James Thatcher Esq.</td>
<td>2 (Sx)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Sx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threele (No I.P.M's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Lords De la Warr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas West, 9th Lord De la Warr</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(1 Wilts; 8 Sx; 10 Hants; 1 Dorset; 1 Devon; 1 Gloucs; 2 Som; 1 Lancs; 1 Lincs; 1 Warwicks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also: 2 dissolved relig houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1 Hants; 1 London)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family. | Manors | Reversions | Capital messuages.
--- | --- | --- | ---
2) William West, Lord De la Warr (I.P.M. for Hants only survives. Lists 14 manors, 8 of which are in Hants, 5 in Sussex and 1 in Lincs; also 2 parks in Sussex; and 2 dissolved religious houses, 1 in London, 1 in Hants.)
3) Thomas West, Lord De la Warr (I.P.M. for Hants only survives. Lists 7 manors, all in Hants.)

Wilgoose
1) Thomas Wilgoose 1 (Sx)
2) John Wilgoose Esq. 5 (1 Kent; 1 Sx; 3 Glamorgan)
3) (Died after 1625)

I.P.M. references.

Note: All references given below are to originals in the P.R.O., whether Chancery, Exchequer or Wards Records, except in the case of transcripts from a MS in the Bodleian Library, printed in S.R.S., xxxiii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Manors</th>
<th>Reversions</th>
<th>Capital messuages.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agmondesham - Apsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Thackham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) William Apsley C.142/200/45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Fulborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Nicholas Apsley C.142/85/32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Apsley C.142/236/47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) George Apsley C.142/291/65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) of Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) John Ashburnham C.142/264/131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Broomham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Lawrence Ashburnham C.142/145/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Adam Ashburnham C.142/251/104 (See also, S.R.S.xxxiii, 50-51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Sir Wm. Barentyne C.142/92/73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) William Bartellot C.142/264/151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Richard Bellingham C.142/238/56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Bishopp C.142/127/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Thomas Bishopp C.142/453/98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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I.P.M. references.

Blount
   3) Richard Blount C.142/550/85
Bowyer of Cuckfield
   1) John Bowyer C.142/67/106
   2) Henry Bowyer C.142/225/60
   3) Henry Bowyer C.142/292/173
Bowyer of N. Mundham
   1) Thomas Bowyer C.142/121/160; C.142/187/62
   2) Thomas Bowyer C.142/244/105
Browne, Viscomontague
   1) Sir Anthony Browne C.142/59/132) Hants (also E.150/994/2)
   & Wards 7/5/128) Kent
   & Wards 7/5/30) Sy. (also E.150/1096/7)
   & Wards 7/5/153) Sx. (also E.150/1096/8)
   2) Sir Anthony Browne C.142/235/110
Garyll
   (i) of Warnham
   1) John Caryll C.142/143/28
   2) Sir John Caryll C.142/346/182
   (ii) of Harting
   2) Sir Edward Caryll C.142/315/179 (See also S.R.S.xxxii,59)
   & Wards 7/44/168
   3) Sir Thomas Caryll C.142/372/155
Casie
Churcher
   3) Thomas Churcher C.142/375/57
Colbrand
   1) Thomas Colbrand C.142/101/104
   2) James Colbrand (C.142/264/110
   & (C.142/291/24
Covert
   1) Richard Covert C.142/191/70
   2) Sir Walter Covert C.142/490/187
   & Wards 7/83/147
Cowper
   1) John Cowper C.142/97/103
   2) John Cowper C.142/214/170
   3) John Cowper C.142/181/153

( contd. )
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I.P.M. references.

Culpepper
(i) of Wigsell
3) Thomas Culpepper (C.142/341/53
& (C.142/355/70

(ii) of Wakehurst
1) Thomas Culpepper C.142/159/46
2) Sir Edward Culpepper C.142/456/80

Darrell
2) Thomas Darrell C.142/209/36

Dawtrey
1) Sir John Dawtrey C.142/92/97
& Wards 7/5/106
2) William Dawtrey (C.142/231/78
& (C.142/267/40

Drew
2) (Dorothy, widow of
Roger Drew) C.142/247/1
3) Bradshaw Drew C.142/341/75

Ernley
1) William Ernley C.142/75/64
2) Richard Ernley C.142/300/104

Eversfield
1) Nicholas Eversfield C.142/97/84
2) John Eversfield C.142/244/103
3) Sir Thomas Eversfield C.142/684/15

(Fenner)

Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel.
1) William Fitzalan, etc. E.150/913/1 (Sy.
& C.142/71/117)

Ford
2) John Ford (C.142/232/27 & 76
& C.142/226/124

Fortescue
1) Henry Fortescue C.142/177/55

(Essex)
2) Francis Fortescue C.142/219/83 (See also S.R.S.xxxi11,

3) Edward Fortescue C.142/251/103

Gage
(i) of Firle
1) Sir Edward Gage C.142/152/144
2) John Gage C.142/257/88

(contd.)
I. P. M. references

Gage
(ii) of Bentley
  1) James Gage C.142/165/178
  2) Edward Gage C.142/378/144
Garton
  2) Giles Garton C.142/236/102
  3) Sir Peter Garton (C.142/292/165 & (C.142/507/1
Goring
(i) of Burton
  1) Sir William Goring C.142/104/79
  2) Sir Henry Goring C.142/244/101
  3) William Goring C.142/269/97
(ii) of Ovingdean & Lewes
  3) George Goring C.142/271/156
Gounter
  1) Arthur Gounter C.142/175/79 (Hants)
  2) George Gounter C.142/404/112 (Hants)
  3) John Gounter C.142/419/45
Howard, Earl of Arundel
  1) Thomas Howard, D. of Norfolk; ex-1572 C.142/161/79 (for Herts only)
Hussey
  2) John Hussey C.142/350/61
  3) George Hussey C.142/350/64
Jeffrey
  2) Sir John Jeffrey C.142/191/77 (Sx) C.142/191/106
Leech
  2) Richard Leech C.142/249/71
Levett
  1) John Levett and (Sx)
  2) Lawrence Levett C.142/106/66 C.142/108/105 C.142/211/192
Lewkenor
(i) of Selsey
  1) Edmund Lewkenor C.142/75/54
  2) Thomas Lewkenor (proof of age only)
  2) Edmund Lewkenor C.142/355/45
(ii) of West Dean
  2) Sir Richard Lewkenor C.142/236/66
(iii) of Trotton
  2) Edmund Lewkenor C.142/236/66
Lumley, Lord Lumley
  1) George Lumley E.150/237/24
  2) John, Lord Lumley C.142/311/109 (Sx)
Lunsford
Marvin
  3) Edmund Marvin C.142/683/187 C.142/346/175 (contd.)
I.P.M. references.

May
(i) of Pashley in Ticehurst
  2) Thomas May C.142/97/85
  2) Thomas May C.142/324/174
(ii) of Barwash
  2) George May C.142/236/88
  3) Sir Thomas May C.142/366/180
Michell
Morley
  1) Thomas Morley C.142/124/160
  2) William Morley C.142/253/98
  3) Herbert Morley C.142/325/184
Nevell
Onley
  2) Owen Onley (C.142/226/121
      & (C.142/238/11
  3) William Onley C.142/324/147
Palmer
(i) of Angmering
  1) John Palmer (C.142/137/50
     & (C.142/140/180
(ii) of Parham
  1) Robert Palmer C.142/70/46
  2) Sir Thomas Palmer (C.142/197/60
      & (C.142/295/55
  3) William Palmer C.142/214/234
Parker
  1) John Parker C.142/114/25
  3) Sir Nicholas Parker C.142/380/124
Pelham
(i) of Laughton
  1) Sir Nicholas Pelham C.142/131/169
  2) Sir John Pelham C.142/195/119
  2a) Oliver Pelham C.142/206/24
  3) Sir Thomas Pelham C.142/417/41
(ii) of Hastings
  2) Sir Edmund Pelham C.142/298/104
(iii) of Buckstepe
  1) Anthony Pelham C.142/145/12
Percy, Earl of Northumberland
  1) Thomas Percy, 7th Earl C.142/176/26 (for Dorset only)
  2) Henry Percy, 8th Earl C.142/208/167
Poole
Porter
Roberts
  2) Walter Roberts C.142/720/2
Sackville
(i) of Withiam
  1) Sir Richard Sackville C.142/145/11
( contd.)
I.P.M. references.

2) Sir Thomas Sackville, Earl of Dorset  C.142/311/110
3) Robert Sackville, Earl of Dorset  C.142/312/128

(ii) of Sedgelemome
2) John Sackville  C.142/381/140
1) William Sackville  C.142/110/148

Scott
2) William Scott  C.142/210/68 (See also S.R.S.xxxiii, 21)

Selwyn
1) Thomas Selwyn  C.142/67/128
2) John Selwyn  C.142/242/89
3) Thomas Selwyn  C.142/393/136

Sharpe
Shelley
1) John Shelley  C.142/94/53
2) William Shelley  C.142/124/164
(proof of age only)

(ii) of Patcham & Lewes
Sheppard
1) Robert Sheppard  C.142/175/77 & 78
(See also S.R.S.xxxii, 15)

Shirley
(i) of Wiston
1) William Shirley  C.142/94/76

(ii) of West Grinstead
1) Francis Shirley  C.142/183/55
2) Thomas Shirley  C.142/292/153

Shurley
(i) of Isfield
1) Thomas Shurley  C.142/191/101
2) Sir John Shurley  C.142/471/70

(ii) of Lewes
2) Sir John Shurley  C.142/355/63
3) John Shurley  C.142/471/73

Spelman
Stanley
Stannye
1) William Stannye  C.142/148/16
(C.142/162/182)

2) Richard Stannye  C.142/279/374

Stapley
3) Anthony Stapley  C.142/291/96

Stoughton
1) Thomas Stoughton  C.142/178/81
(C.142/187/84 (Sy)

(contd.)
(Appendix 20 contd.)

I.P.M. references.

2) Adrian Stoughton

Thatcher

1) John Thatcher
2) James Thatcher

Throsle

West, Lord De la Warr.

1) Thomas West, 9th Lord De la Warr
2) William West, Lord De la Warr (nephew)
3) Thomas West, Lord De la Warr

Wilgoose

1) Thomas Wilgoose
2) John Wilgoose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Stoughton</td>
<td>C.142/351/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thatcher</td>
<td>C.142/167/81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Thatcher</td>
<td>C.142/333/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas West, 9th Lord De la Warr</td>
<td>C.142/104/75 (Hants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William West, Lord De la Warr (nephew)</td>
<td>C.142/245/64 (Hants only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas West, Lord De la Warr</td>
<td>C.142/273/85 (Hants only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wilgoose</td>
<td>C.142/67/101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilgoose</td>
<td>C.142/292/162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 21. Maximum numbers of manors held by the selected families according to I.P.M's (where these exist) for the 3 relevant generations and for individuals dying not later than 1625.

Note: Where the number of manors fluctuates from generation to generation the highest figures are taken. In this Appendix the various branches of any one family are not treated separately and where the number of manors held varies from branch to branch, the highest figure is taken, a note being added about the other branches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 5 M's in any generation</th>
<th>5 - 10 m's</th>
<th>10 - 20 m's</th>
<th>Over 20 m's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apsley (Thackham; &amp; Fulborough)</td>
<td>Bishopp</td>
<td>Caryll (Harting)</td>
<td>Browne, Visc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham (Ashburnham &amp; Broom- ham)</td>
<td>Gulpepper (Wakehurst)</td>
<td>Covert</td>
<td>M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td>Goring (Burton) &amp; Ovingdean</td>
<td>Gage (Firle)</td>
<td>Percy, E. of Nid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>Jeffery</td>
<td>Levett</td>
<td>Sackville, E. of Dorset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>Lumley</td>
<td>Pelham (Laugh- ton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of N. Mundham</td>
<td>Palmer (Angmer- ing &amp; Parham)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>West, I. of De la Warr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(contd.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Note: Caryll of Warrham &amp; Gage</td>
<td>Note: Sack- ville of Sedlescombe &amp; of Chidd- ingly both had less than 5 m's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td>Shelley (Michel- grove)</td>
<td>Pelham of Hast- ings &amp; Pelham</td>
<td>had less than 5 m's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>Shirley (Wiston)</td>
<td>both had under 5 m's.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor (Selsey; Trotton &amp; West Dean)</td>
<td>Note: Culpepper of Wigsell &amp; Shirley</td>
<td>Note: Culpepper of Wigsell &amp; Shirley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May (Ticehurst &amp; Burwash)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley (Isfield; &amp; Lewes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(32)
(Appendix 21 contd.)

No sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No. of Manors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agmondesham</td>
<td>Lunsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Michell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td>Nevell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount</td>
<td>Poole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casie</td>
<td>Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penner</td>
<td>Sharpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td>Spelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (17)

Of the 32 families with less than 5 m's, if the highest figure for any generation or branch of a family be taken, and if fractions of manors be ignored, 7 had no manors at all, 7 had 1 manor, 8 had 2 manors, 7 had 3 manors and 3 had 4 manors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No whole Manors</th>
<th>1 manor</th>
<th>2 manors</th>
<th>3 manors</th>
<th>4 manors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
<td>Ashburnham</td>
<td>Apsley (Thackham &amp; Pulbro')</td>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td>Eversfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td>(of A'turnham)</td>
<td>Bowyer of N.</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>Lewkenor (W. Dean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>Garton</td>
<td>Thatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Leech</td>
<td>Sheppard (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue (had 2 half m's)</td>
<td>Cuckfield</td>
<td>May (Ticehurst &amp; Burwash)</td>
<td>Shurley (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannyne</td>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td>(Shurley of Lewes,1 m.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Onley</td>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (7)             |        | | (Lewkenor of Selsey,1 m;)
|                 |         | | Lewkenor of Trotton, 3/4 m) |

(Ashburnhams of Broomham, no m's.)

Thus, of 53 families out of 70 for which at least one relevant I.P.M. exists:

32 or 60.4% held less than 5 manors.
11 or 20.7% held between 5-10 manors.
6 or 11.3% held between 10-20 manors (1 of these a baronet)
4 or 7.5% held over 20 manors (all peers)
### Appendix 22.

Numbers of manors held and total annual value above reprize of lands held by heads of families over 3 generations, (including those living in 1580, their predecessors and successors, provided these died not later than c.1625), taken from Feodary Surveys.

**Note:** The ticks signify that the corresponding Feodary Surveys and Inquisitions Post Mortem agree as to numbers of manors and/or capital messuages held.

'M' means it has been ascertained that a minority ensued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family and P.R.O. reference</th>
<th>No. of manors &amp; Capital messuages held</th>
<th>Total value of estate P.a. above reprize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bishop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Thomas Bishop Esq. (M)</td>
<td>2 copies: Wards 5/43 Pt.1</td>
<td>£161. 19. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6 Jan. 2 Eliz.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wards 9/158 ff.159)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-161 b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18 Apr. 2 Eliz.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(But see Feodary Survey of his son, Sir Thomas Bishop Esq. (M), which shows him as holding 10 manors that his total estate was valued at £105.16.4. p.a. above reprize.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bowyer of N. Mundham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Thomas Bowyer Esq. (M)</td>
<td>Wards 5/43 Pt.2</td>
<td>£ 76. 13. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12 Apr. 37 Eliz.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Also entry of 1596 gives 1 messuage in London)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garyll of Harting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sir Thomas Caryll (M)</td>
<td>Wards 5/43 Pt.2</td>
<td>£153. 6. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6 Feb. &amp; 16 Sept. 1618)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Churcher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Thomas Churcher Esq. (M)</td>
<td>Wards 5/43 Pt.2</td>
<td>£ 9. 5. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13 Oct. 1619)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colbrand</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) James Colbrand Esq. (M)</td>
<td>Wards 5/43 Pt.2</td>
<td>£ 34. 12. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17 Apr. 4 Jas. I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cf. Wards 5/43 Pt.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dt. 21 Oct. 42 Eliz.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Feodary Survey of John Cowper - Wards 5/43 Pt.1 - in 2 sections, one of which is dt. 18 Jan. 1620 appears to be that of the grandson of the John Cowper who was living 1580. See also the I.P.M. (G.142, 378.126) which shows that he d.v.p.. Although he is not mentioned)

(contd.)
Family and P.R.O. reference

as having held any manors, and is given as holding only one capital messuage together with other lands, his total estate is valued at £150. 0. 0. p.a. above reprize.)

Dawtrey
2) William Dawtrey Esq. (M)
   Wards 5/43 Pt. 2
   (20 Sept. 2 Jas. I)
   1 cap. mess.  £58. 5. 4

Drew
3) Bradshaw Drew Esq. (M)
   Wards 5/43 Pt. 1
   (Date not clear)
   1 & moiety of a third of a manor  £4. 2. 6

Ford
2) John Ford Esq. (M)
   Wards 5/43 Pt. 2
   (27 Apr. 32 Eliz.)
   1 m.  £10. 6. 8

Gage of Bentley
2) Edward Gage Esq.
   3 Surveys in Wards 5/43 Pt. 2
   4 m's
   7 June, 1619 (Sx); 1 June, 1 cap. mess.
   1619 (Kent); 9 Oct. 1619 (Wilts)  (Total val.) £57. 8. 0

Goring of Ovingdean
3) George Goring Esq. (M)
   Wards 5/43 Pt. 2
   (7 June, 44 Eliz.)
   6 m's  3½        ( Total value ) £3. 16. 8
   (& 1 cap. mess)
   (See note on F.S. as to reason for very low valuation - his lands, except for a manor bought after his father's death, had formerly been valued for the Queen's use because of the debts of his father.)

Gounter
1) Arthur Gounter Esq. (M)
   Wards 9/140 ff 50lb-503b. & the reversion
   (22 Sept. 18 Eliz.) of another. £46. 19. 4

Lewkenor of West Dean
2) Sir Richard Lewkenor,
   C. J. Chester.
   Wards 5/43 Pt. 2
   (1 May, 1619)
   5 (I.P.M. says 4½)
   1 cap. mess. in co. Salop.
   (Total value) £22. 13. 4

(contd.)
(Appendix 22 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family and P.R.O. reference</th>
<th>No. of manors &amp; capital messuages held</th>
<th>Total value of estate p.a. above reprize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Lewkenor of Trotton**

2) Edmund Lewkenor, gent. (M)
Wards 5/43 Pt. 2.
(14 June, 35 Eliz.)

3/2 £ 4. 16. 8

**May of Burwash**

3) Sir Thomas May (M)
2 Surveys, both Wards 5/43 Pt. 1. (one undt. & torn, other 3 Feb. 13 Jas. I)

2 m's £ 3. 6. 8

**Michell**

2) Thomas Michell Esq. of Cuckfield.
Wards 5/43 Pt. 1
(F.S. dt. 15 June, 1629 tho' he died c. 1625, see Section III)

0 £ 3. 7. 8

**Morley**

3) Herbert Morley Esq. (M)
3 Surveys, all in Wards 5/43 Pt. 1.
(14 Mar., 8 Jas. I; 1 Apr. 1611; 6 Apr. 1622)

3 m's (Total value of estate) £69. 18. 10

**Onley**

2) Owen Onley Esq. (M)
Wards 5/43 Pt. 1
(17 Apr. 36 Eliz.)

1 m. £ 8. 5. 4

**Palmer of Angmering**

1) John Palmer Esq. (M)
Wards 9/138 ff. 381b-382b and 9/139 ff. 137b-138
(25 Feb. 5 Eliz.)

6 m's £282. 13. 1

**Pelham of Laughton**

3) Sir Thomas Pelham
Wards 5/43 Pt. 1
(Oct. 1 Chas. I, died 1624)

12 m's & Castle, Honour, Barony & Rape of Hastings, and 10 Hundreds.

£229. 3. 4

(contd.)
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Family and F.R.O. reference.

Sackville, Earl of Dorset, of Wiltshire.
3) Robert Sackville, E. of Dorset, (M)
Wards 5/43 Pt.2
(Apr. 17, 1610)

Selwyn
3) Thomas Selwyn Esq. (M)
Wards 5/43 Pt.1
(20 Jas. I)

Sheppard
1) Robert Sheppard Esq. (M)
Wards 9/140 ff. 520-523b.
(23 May 18 Eliz.)

Shirley of West Grinstead
2) Thomas Shirley Esq.
Wards 5/43 Pt.1
(27 Jan. 4 Jas. I)

Shurley of Lewes
2) John Shurley, serj. at L. (M)
Wards 5/43 Pt.1.
(22 Feb. 1616)

Stanny
1) William Stannye (M)
Wards 9/140 ff. 375-6
(27 Apr. 10 Eliz. & 26 Nov. 14 Eliz.)

Stapley
3) Anthony Stapley (M)
Wards 5/43 Pt.1
(3 May, 4 Jas. I)

No. of manors & capital messuages held. Total value of estate p.a. above reprize.

Same lands as in his I.P.M. except the F.S. includes 5 priories in Sx. as well as Lewes priory; & omits ½ m. of Houndean, Mdx., 1 m. in Sy; 1 m. in Gloucs., & 1 park & 2 boroughs in Sx. (Total value of 1ds in Sx., Kent, Ex., London, Mdx., Glos.)

£949. 12. 8

1 cap. mess. £ 36. 1. 8

(2 m's mentioned in I.P.M. were, according to it, conveyed to Edw. S., his brother, Thos. retaining the use during his lifetime. Not mentioned in the F.S.)

3 m's £ 29. 19. 4

1 m. 1 cap. mess. £ 9. 0. 0

1 m. 1 cap. mess. £ 10. 13. 4

0 £ 16. 8. 10

2 m's £ 21. 17. 8

(contd.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Adrian Stoughton (M)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>£13. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards 5/43 Pt.1</td>
<td>2 m's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 Sept. 13 Jas. I;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see also 5 Apr. 13 Jas. I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) James Thatcher</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>£71. 3. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards 5/43 Pt.1.</td>
<td>2 m's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1619)</td>
<td>&amp; a cap. mess.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

Thus the Feodary Surveys give the same no. of manors as the I.P.M's in all the above cases except 3, - Richard Lewkenor of West Deab, C.J. Chester; Robert Sackville, Earl of Dorset; and Thomas Selwyn (but this is explained in a note attached to his I.P.M.)
Appendix 23. Chart showing the comparative value of lands of various heads of families according to Feodary Surveys.

NOTE: Cadet branches of families are treated separately. Only the three generations, - those living in 1580, their predecessors, and successors who died not later than 1625, are dealt with. For no family or family branch has more than one relevant Feodary Survey survived. (See Appendix 22.)

Total estate: valued at -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under £10 p.a.</th>
<th>£10 &amp; over;</th>
<th>£50 &amp; over;</th>
<th>£100 &amp; over;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>above reprize.</td>
<td>under £50.</td>
<td>under £100</td>
<td>over; under £150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(All of the below held less than 5 manors except those marked 'X')

(Churcher (S9.5.4.) (Colbrand (434.12.0) (Bowyer of (N. Mundham (76.13.4)
(Drew (£4.2.6) (Ford (£10.6.8) (Dawtrey (£58.5.4)
(Goring of (Angmering (£46.19.4) (Gage of (Bentley (£57.8.0)
(Ovingdean (£3.16.8) (Lewkenor of (£22.13.4) (Morley (£69.13.10)
(Trotton (£4.16.8) (West Dean (£36.1.3) (Thatcher (£71.3.4)
(May of Burwash (£3.6.8) (Sheppard (£29.19.4)
(Michell (£3.7.8) (Shurley of (£10.13.4)
(Onley (Sackville, (£8.5.4) (Earl of (£16.8.10)
(Shirley of (Dorset (£9.0.0) (Lewes (£21.17.8)
(West Grinstead (Stoughton (£13.0.0.

x George Goring of Ovingdean's Feodary Survey (Wards 5/43 Pt.2; (contd.)
Appendix 23 contd.)

dt. 7 June, 44 Eliz.) shows that he held 6 whole manors and more but values his whole estate at £3.16.8. p.a. above reprize. It explains the reason for this low valuation was that his lands had, with the exception of a manor bought after his father's death, formerly been "extended at a greater valewe to the use of the Queen's Majesty" for the payment of the debts of his father.

Thomas Bishop's Feodary Survey (Wards 5/43 Pt. 1; dt. 6 Jan. 2 Eliz., and Wards 9/138 ff. 159-161 b; dt. 18 Apr. 2 Eliz.) shows that although his whole estate was valued at £161.19.9 p.a. above reprize, he held only 4 manors at his death. Perhaps he enjoyed the use of others. His son, Sir Thomas Bishop, according to his Feodary Survey, (Wards 5/43 Pt. 2, dt. 14 Nov. 1631), held 10 manors at his death although his whole estate was valued at £105.16.4 p.a. above reprize which was less than the valuation on his father's estate.

(See also note in Appendix 22 concerning John Cowper who does not, however, belong to any one of the 3 generations here under review.)
Appendix 24. Families holding manors in Sussex only and those holding them in counties other than Sussex during the three generations under review - i.e. heads of families living in 1580, their predecessors and successors who died no later than 1625 - according to I.P.M's.

(Where possible, I.P.M's have been checked with Feodary Surveys.)

Note: Cadet branches are not treated separately. If the head of any branch of any family under review held manors outside Sussex although he was primarily resident there, then that family is taken as having held them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families holding manors in Sussex only according to I.P.M's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of North Mundham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families holding manors in other counties as well as their Sussex property according to I.P.M's.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Visc. Montague.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert (Sy., Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper (Sy.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell (Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley (Hants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield (Sy.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage (Sy., Kent, Norfolk, Wilts.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter (Hants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey (Sy.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley (Sy., Durham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin (Hants.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham (Kent, Sy., Dorset, Lincs., Northumberland, Yorks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, Earl of Northd. (Yorks., Northumberland, Cumb., Durham, Dorset, Som., Carmarthen, Pembrokes., London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville, later Earl of Dorset. (Sy., Kent, Mdx., Ex., Gloucesters.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (Kent, Ex.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley (Wilt., Warwick., Ex., Herts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley (Bucks., Som.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanway (Som.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton (Sy.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Lord De la Warr. (Hants, Dorset, Wilt., Gloucesters., Som., Devon, Warwick., Lincs., Lincs., London.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose (Kent, Glam.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(32)
(For 17 families there are no sources. See Appendix 21.)

Note: -

The Ford family of the first generation resided in Devon and is therefore not accounted for. (See Section III). In the second generation they held manors only in Sussex (see Appendix 20.)

The Fortescue family came originally from Essex where the head of the family of the first generation resided. He held manors there and in Cambs., Beds., and Herts. (See Section III and his I.P.M., C.142/177/55). His son, Francis Fortescue, who resided in Sussex and held property there does not appear to have held any manors outside the county. In the third generation, the family appears to have moved back to Essex. It is not therefore counted among those residing in Sussex and owning manors elsewhere.

The Caryll family may have owned manors in Norfolk and Suffolk (see Feodary Survey of Thomas Caryll, gent. (Wards 9/138 ff. 444b-445b; and Wards 9/139 ff. 59b-60), who d.v.p., father of Sir John Caryll of Warnham who was head of the family in 1580 and who succeeded his grandfather John Caryll. However, as Thomas Caryll does not belong to any of the 3 generations studied, having d.v.p. and not been head of the family this fact is ignored.

The Gage family of Firle held a manor called Crabhouse in Norfolk for a short time. It was granted to Sir John Gage by Letters Patent. On 21 Feb., 1 & 2 P.& M., but sold on 26 July, 12 Eliz. There is no mention of this in Sir Edward Gage's I.P.M. (see B.H., Cal. of Gage Muniments, G.C., nos. 18-21.)

Families classified as having held manors only in Sussex may have held non-manorial lands in other counties, e.g. see Feodary Survey of Robert Shreddard of Peasmarsh (Wards 9/140 ff. 520 - 523, dt. 9 Nov. 17 Eliz.) who held tenements in Kent.
Appendix 25. Increases and losses in numbers of manors held by heads of families during generations studied for which there is sufficient evidence (i.e. for at least two generations), according to I.P.M's.

Note: - Relevant cadet branches of families are here listed separately.

Where I.P.M's appear to have been taken separately for different counties and are missing for certain counties in particular generations, e.g. see Appendix 20 for the I.P.M's of the Percy family, Earls of Northumberland and the West Family, Lords De la Warr, the families in question are omitted.

Increases in nos. of manors held.

Bishopp (4-10)
Colbrand (0-1)
Covert (7-11 & 2/3rds & 4)
Culpepper of Wakehurst (2-6)
Eversfield (1-4 3/4-4 1)
Gounter (1-3-3)
Palmer of Farham (6-9-9)
Pelham of Laughton (5-5-2-12)
Sackville of Withiam (35-65 & 4 65-3 65-4 65-3 4 65-4 65-3 4)
Scott (43-3 3)
Selwyn (1-2-2)
Stoughton (1-2)

Decrease in nos. of manors held.

Apsley of Pulborough (2-2-2/3rds)
Browne, Visc. Montague (52-47)
Garyll of Harting (12-10)
Ernley (2-0)
Gage of Firle (15-11)
Gage of Bentley (7-4)
Levett (20-6)
Onley (1-3)
Shirley of West Grinstead (2-1)
Thatcher (4-2)

Increase in nos. of manors held followed by a decrease.

Bowyer of Cuckfield (0-1 4 & 4 4)
Goring of Burton (5-9 4& 6)
Morley (5-6-3)
Wilgoose (1-5-2)

(10)

Families whose manors remained constant in no.

Ashburnham of Broomham (1-1)
Bowyer of N. Mundham (2-2)
Cowper (0-0)
Dawtrey (0-0)
Garton (2-3)
Hussey (1-1)
May of Pashley in Ticehurst (2-2)
May of Burwash (2-2)
Parker (7-7)
Shurley of Isfield (3-3)
Stannye (0-0)

(11)

Note: - Thus there are 37 families or family branches for which there is sufficient material for comparison.

(There is only one I.P.M. for the Lewkenors of West Dean but they should perhaps be noted as a "rising" family here, since Sir Richard Lewkenor who founded them, and according to his I.P.M., left 43 manors, was himself only a younger son.)
Appendix 26. Subsidy assessments on lands from the Rolls for 38 Henry VIII, 2 Eliz., 14 Eliz., and 1-2 Charles I. (P.R.O. references E.179/190/225; E.179/190/264-269; E.179/190/283; and E.179/191/377a). The Roll for Arundel Rape for 2 Eliz. (E.179/190/269) is a certificate of assessment only, with no names.

Note a:– The assessments noted are those of heads of families, also of their wives or sons if separately assessed, (these are placed between brackets), or of widows of sometime heads of families. Where identity is at all uncertain, e.g. entry for John Agmondesham of Slindon for 38 Henry VIII (P.R.O. E.179/190/225), the assessment is not included in this chart but noted with a query in the relevant family history in Section III.

Note b:– The average rate of assessment for this group of families for each of the four subsidy years has been worked out, taking account of the assessments which are bracketed. The results are as follows (to the nearest pound):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>£61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>£46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>£53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>£14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether the assessments for each family or family branch for each year were above or below the average assessment is indicated by a plus or minus sign in the right-hand margin.

Agmondesham (no assessments)

Apsley

(1) of Thackham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>John Apsley</td>
<td>£60. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£66. 13. 4 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£40. 0. 0 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) of Pulborough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Nicholas Apsley, gent.</td>
<td>£26. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Apsley Esq.</td>
<td>£25. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ashburnham

(1) of Ashburnham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Ashburnham</td>
<td>(£60. 0. 0 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Ashburnham Esq.</td>
<td>(£30. 0. 0 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mistress Ashburnham, widow)</td>
<td>(£10. 0. 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) of Broomham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Tho. Ashburnham, gent</td>
<td>£8. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>Lawrence Ashburnham, gent</td>
<td>£40. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(Mistress Eve Ashburnham, widow)</td>
<td>(£26. 13. 4 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
(Appendix 26 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>lands</td>
<td>£25. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>Drew Barentyne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>Drew Barentyne</td>
<td>£26. 13. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkeley</td>
<td>(no assessment for dates selected)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>William Bartellot, gent.</td>
<td>£40. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>William Bartellot Esq.</td>
<td>£20. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Walter Bartellot Esq.</td>
<td>£ 7. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham of Hangleton &amp; Newtimber</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Edward Bellingham</td>
<td>£25. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>Edward Bellingham, Esq.</td>
<td>£60. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>Edward Bellingham, Esq.</td>
<td>£25. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Sir Edward Bellingham</td>
<td>£20. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Thomas Bishopp, gent</td>
<td>£26. 13. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(Eliz. Bishopp, widow)</td>
<td>(£20. 0. 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Bishopp, bart.</td>
<td>£30. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>? Blount Esq.</td>
<td>£15. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(assessment on goods)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of North Mundham</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(assessment on goods)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Thomas Bowyer Esq.</td>
<td>lands £20. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll (i) of Warnham</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Caryll Esq.</td>
<td>£100. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
Caryll
(ii) of Harting
38 H.VIII (no assessment)
2 Eliz. (" " )
14 Eliz. Edward Caryll Esq. lands £30. 0. 0 -
1 Charles I (no assessment)

Casie
(no assessments)

Churcher
38 H.VIII (no assessment)
2 Eliz. (" " )
14 Eliz. (" " )
1 Charles I George Churcher, gent. " £5. 0. 0 -

Colbrand
38 H.VIII William Colbrand (no assessment)
2 Eliz. (" " )
14 Eliz. James Colbrand, gent. " £20. 0. 0 -
1 Charles I John Colbrand, Bart. " £12. 0. 0 -

Covert
38 H.VIII ? Covert, sen. (assessment in goods)
2 Eliz. Richard Covert, Esq. (no assessment)
14 Eliz. Richard Covert Esq. (" " )
1 Charles I Sir Walter Covert (sic) (sic) " £12. 0. 0 -

Cowper
38 H.VIII (assessment in goods)
2 Eliz. (no assessment)
14 Eliz. John Cowper of Dycham (sic)
1 Charles I (no assessment)

Culpepper
(i) of Wakehurst
38 H.VIII (no assessment)
2 Eliz. John Culpepper Esq. (no assessment)
14 Eliz. (no assessment)
1 Charles I Sir Edward Culpepper (no assessment)

(ii) of Wigsell
38 H.VIII (no assessment)
2 Eliz. (" " )
14 Eliz. John Culpepper Esq. (no assessment)
1 Charles I (no assessment)

Darrell
38 H.VIII Thomas Darrell Esq. (no assessment)
2 Eliz. Thomas Darrell, gent. (no assessment)
14 Eliz. (no assessment)
1 Charles I William Darrell Esq., recusant £5. 0. 0 -

( contd. )
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doughtrey</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Sir John Doughtrey</td>
<td>lands</td>
<td>£120. 0. 0 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 50. 0. 0 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>William Doughtrey, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 5. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Henry Doughtrey Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(assessment on goods)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(Bridget Ernley, widow)</td>
<td>(100 marks i.e. -  £ 66. 13. 4)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>Richard Ernley Esq.</td>
<td>£ 30. 0. 0 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Richard Ernley Esq.</td>
<td>£ 5. 0. 0 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 6. 0. 0 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(apparently no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(apparently no assessment),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Fenner Esq.</td>
<td>£ 20. 0. 0 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Edmund Ford, gent</td>
<td>(£ 60. 0. 0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>Edmund Ford Esq.</td>
<td>(£ 50. 0. 0)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Erasmus Ford, gent)</td>
<td>(£ 4. 0. 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(Joan Ford, widow)</td>
<td>(£ 10. 0. 0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Erasmus Ford)</td>
<td>(£ 5. 0. 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Sir William Ford</td>
<td>(£ 20. 0. 0)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Edmund Ford Esq.)</td>
<td>(£ 2. 0. 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td></td>
<td>(no assessments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>(1) of Firle</td>
<td>Sir Edward Gage</td>
<td>£200. 0. 0 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>John Gage Esq.</td>
<td>£ 66. 13. 4 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Gage Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Sir John Gage, bart,</td>
<td>£ 30. 0. 0 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recusant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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Gage
(ii) of Bentley
38 H.VIII 2 Eliz. (no assessment)
14 Eliz. (" ")
1 Charles I Edward Gage Esq., recusant lands £16. 0. 0+

Garton
38 H.VIII William Garton
2 Eliz. (no assessment)
14 Eliz. (" ")
1 Charles I Robert Garton Esq.

Goring
(i) of Burton
38 H.VIII Sir William Goring
2 Eliz. (no assessment)
14 Eliz. Henry Goring Esq.
1 Charles I Sir Henry Goring

(ii) of Ovingdean & Lewes
38 H.VIII (no separate assessment since a younger son
of the above founded this line)
2 Eliz. George Goring Esq.
14 Eliz. George Goring Esq.
1 Charles I (Mistress Ann Goring
widow)

Gounter
38 H.VIII (assessment on goods)
2 Eliz. Arthur Gounter gent.
14 Eliz. Arthur Gounter gent.
1 Charles I (no assessment)

Hussey
38 H.VIII John Hussey (of Cuckfield)
1 Charles I (Mistress Mary Hussey, widow)

Jeffery
38 H.VIII Richard Jeffery
2 Eliz. (no assessment)
14 Eliz. John Jeffery, serj. at law
1 Charles I (no assessment)

Leech
38 Eliz. (no assessment)
2 Eliz. 
14 Eliz. (assessment on goods)
1 Charles I (no assessment)

(contd.)
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Levett

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 38 H.VIII | John Levett gent. | lands      | £40. 0. 0 |}
| 2 Eliz.  | (no assessment)    |             |       |
| 14 Eliz. | Lawrence Levett, gent. | (no assessment) | £27. 0. 0 |}
| 1 Charles I |                 |             |       |

Lawkenor

(1) of Selsey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Joan Lewkenor, widow</td>
<td></td>
<td>(£28. 0. 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 Eliz. | Thomas Lewkenor Esq. |             | £15. 0. 0 |}
| 1 Charles I |                 |             |       |

(11) of West Dean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 38 H.VIII | Richard Lewkenor, gent |             | £20. 0. 0 |}
| 2 Eliz.  | (no assessment)     |             |       |
| 14 Eliz. | Richard Lewkenor Esq. |             | £20. 0. 0 |}
| 1 Charles I |                 |             |       |

(111) of Trotton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 38 H.VIII | Richard Lewkenor Esq. |             | £58. 0. 0 |}
| 2 Eliz.  | Richard Lewkenor Esq. |             | £30. 0. 0 |}
| 14 Eliz. | (Dame Eliz. Lewkenor, widow) |             | (£20. 0. 0) |}
| 1 Charles I |                 |             |       |

Lunsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 38 H.VIII | John Lunsford, gent. |             | £40. 0. 0 |}
| 2 Eliz.  | John Lunsford, gent. |             | £40. 0. 0 |}
| 14 Eliz. | John Lunsford Esq. |             | £40. 0. 0 |}
| 1 Charles I | Thomas Lunsford Esq. |             | £10. 0. 0 |}

Marvin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 Eliz.  | Henry Marvin Esq.    |             | £30. 0. 0 |}
| 14 Eliz. | Henry Marvin Esq.    |             | £30. 0. 0 |}
| 1 Charles I |                 |             |       |

May

(i) of Pashley in Ticehurst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 38 H.VIII | (no assessment) |             | £25. 0. 0 |}
| 2 Eliz.  | Thomas May, gent.     |             |       |
| 14 Eliz. | (no assessment)     |             |       |
| 1 Charles I | Anthony May Esq. |             | £14. 0. 0 |}
| (Mistress Ann May) | (Henry May, gent) |             | (£ 2. 0. 0) |}
|       |                       |             | (£ 1. 0. 0) |}

(ii) of Burwash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 Eliz.  | George May, gent.    |             | £18. 0. 0 |}
| 14 Eliz. | Mr. George May       |             | £20. 0. 0 |}
| 1 Charles I |                 |             |       |

Michell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 38 H.VIII | John Michell |             | (£26. 0. 0) |}
| (Edmund Michell) |             |             | (£ 5. 0. 0) |}
|       |                       |             |       | (contd.) |
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(Michell contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>Henry Michell</td>
<td>£3.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Thomas Nevell Esq.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>£40.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Onley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Thomas Onley Esq.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>£3.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Palmer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Thomas Palmer Esq.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>£42.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>John Parker Esq.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>£66.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pelham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Nicholas Pelham Esq.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>£80.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(contd.)
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**Pelham (ii) contd.**
- 2 Eliz. Anthony Pelham Esq. lands £100. 0. 0  
- 14 Eliz. Herbert Pelham Esq.  
- 1 Charles I (no assessment)  

(iii) of Hastings  
(no assessments for dates selected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Henry Poole Esq.</td>
<td>lands £20. 0. 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Richard Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td>£22. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(assessment on goods)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Sackville Porter, gent</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Walter Roberts, gent</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3. 10. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>(i) of Withiam</td>
<td>Richard Sackville Esq.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£66. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(John Sackville Esq., father)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(£3. 0. 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Sackville</td>
<td></td>
<td>£7. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Sedlescombe</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Sackville</td>
<td></td>
<td>£7. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) of Chiddingly</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>John Sackville, gent</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) of Chiddingly</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>John Sackville, gent</td>
<td></td>
<td>£30. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(assessment on goods)</td>
<td></td>
<td>£15. 0. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(assessment on the goods of a widow)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Assessment on Goods</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(assessment on goods)</td>
<td>£55.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Selwyn</td>
<td>£40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Selwyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Assessment on Goods</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Richard Sharpe, gent.</td>
<td>£32.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Sharpe</td>
<td>£20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>John Sharpe</td>
<td>£20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>William Sharpe</td>
<td>£2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Assessment on Goods</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>(i) of Michelgrove</td>
<td>Sir William Shelley</td>
<td>£400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(John Shelley Esq.)</td>
<td>(£30.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>William Shelley</td>
<td>£66.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>William Shelley</td>
<td>£100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Sir John Shelley</td>
<td>£25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Assessment on Goods</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>(ii) of Patcham</td>
<td>(assessment on goods)</td>
<td>(£6.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(John Shelley)</td>
<td>(£6.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>Robert Sheppard, gent</td>
<td>£13.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>Robert Sheppard, gent</td>
<td>£45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Assessment on Goods</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>Robert Sheppard</td>
<td>(£3.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>Robert Sheppard, gent</td>
<td>£10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>Robert Sheppard, gent</td>
<td>£25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Assessment on Goods</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>(i) of Wiston</td>
<td>William Shirley, gent.</td>
<td>£50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(Anne Shirley)</td>
<td>(£50.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>£40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>Thomas Shirley Esq.</td>
<td>£25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Assessment on Goods</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>(ii) of West Grinstead</td>
<td>Francis Shirley, gent.</td>
<td>£25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(Eliz. Shirley, widow, his mother)</td>
<td>(£30.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>Francis Shirley, gent.</td>
<td>£10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>Francis Shirley, gent.</td>
<td>£25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Assessment on Goods</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shurley</td>
<td>(1) of Lsfield</td>
<td>Edward Shurley, gent.</td>
<td>£45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 H.VIII</td>
<td>(Joan Shurley, widow)</td>
<td>(£20.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Eliz.</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Charles I</td>
<td>Sir John Shurley</td>
<td>£20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(no separate assessment)</th>
<th>(no assessment)</th>
<th>14 Eliz.</th>
<th>1 Charles I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shurley</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>John Shurley Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(Mistress Shurley, widow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>lands £ 4. 0. 0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>38 H. VIII</th>
<th>2 Eliz.</th>
<th>14 Eliz.</th>
<th>1 Charles I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Francis Spelman, gent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£16. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>38 H. VIII</th>
<th>2 Eliz.</th>
<th>14 Eliz.</th>
<th>1 Charles I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>(no assessments)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Francis Spelman, gent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£20. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>38 H. VIII</th>
<th>2 Eliz.</th>
<th>14 Eliz.</th>
<th>1 Charles I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£50. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>38 H. VIII</th>
<th>2 Eliz.</th>
<th>14 Eliz.</th>
<th>1 Charles I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Thomas Stoughton Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£ 6. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>38 H. VIII</th>
<th>2 Eliz.</th>
<th>14 Eliz.</th>
<th>1 Charles I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>James Thatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>(assessment on goods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£ 4. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>38 H. VIII</th>
<th>2 Eliz.</th>
<th>14 Eliz.</th>
<th>1 Charles I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threale</td>
<td>(assessment on goods)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>John Wilgoose, gent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£15. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>38 H. VIII</th>
<th>2 Eliz.</th>
<th>14 Eliz.</th>
<th>1 Charles I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td>(no assessment)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>John Wilgoose, gent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£20. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Sir John Wilgoose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£ 5. 0. 0 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 26 Supplement.

Relationship between assessments shown in Appendix 26 and the average assessments for each of the four subsidy years, 38 H.VIII, 2 Eliz., 14 Eliz., and 1 Charles I.

Note (a). 7 of the 87 families or family branches under review in this thesis are excluded from the following lists as peers (including the Sackvilles of Withiam, ennobled in 1567), who were separately assessed.

(b). The number of assessments on which this classification is based is indicated in brackets beside each name.

(c). Some of the families which are listed as above or below the average figure for any given year were sometimes assessed at a figure very close to it. (See Appendix itself).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agmondesham</td>
<td>Apsley of Pulborough (2)</td>
<td>Ashburnham of Ashburnham (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Ashburnham of Broomham (3)</td>
<td>Blount (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>Barentyne (2)</td>
<td>Bowyer of North Mundham (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casie</td>
<td>Bartellot (3)</td>
<td>Caryll of Warham (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drow</td>
<td>Caryll (1)</td>
<td>Covert (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td>Churcher (1)</td>
<td>Gulpepper of Wakehurst (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td>Colbrand (2)</td>
<td>Gage of Firle (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td>Cowper (1)</td>
<td>Gage of Bentley (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell</td>
<td>Gulpepper of Wigsell (1)</td>
<td>Goring of Barton (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Hastings</td>
<td>Fenner (1)</td>
<td>Palmer of Angmering (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Garton (2)</td>
<td>Pelham of Laughton (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threetele</td>
<td>Goring of Ovingdean (3)</td>
<td>Pelham of Buckstepe (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gounter (2)</td>
<td>Selwyn (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hussey (4)</td>
<td>Shelley of Michelgrove (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffery (2)</td>
<td>Shirley of Wiston (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levett (2)</td>
<td>Stannye (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawkenor of Selsey (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawkenor of Trotton (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marvin (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May of Burwash (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michell (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onley (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmer of Parham (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poole (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porter (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sackville of Sedlescombe (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sackville of Chiddingly (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharpe (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shelley of Patcham (1) (but most assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shirley of W. Grinstead were on goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelman (2)</td>
<td>Thatcher (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Wilgoose (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shurley of Lewes (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stapley (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoughton (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(12) (16) (18) (37) (contd.)
Assessed at rates rising from below to above average:

Apsley of Thackham (3)
Bellingham (4)
Bishopp (3)
Ford (4)
Lewkenor of West Dean (2)
Lunsford (4)
May of Ticehurst (2)
Sheppard (3)
Shurley of Isfield (3)

(9)

But Bellingham, Ford, Lunsford slipped below average again, though the assessments for Bellingham and Ford recovered a second time. See Appendix.

Assessed at rates falling from above to below average:

Darrell (3)
Dawtrey (3)
Ernley (3)
Morley (4)
Parker (4)
Roberts (2)

(6)

But Morley and Parker recovered slightly, separate assessments for individuals within the family being added together. But the assessment for Morley subsequently declined again. See Appendix.
Appendix 27

Note:-

1) The assessments shown are to the nearest £. (Cf. Appx. 26)

2) Where two figures are shown and connected by a plus sign, assessments for two members of the same family are denoted, as of the wife, eldest son or mother as well as of the head of the family. In one case, however, that of Richard Ernley Esq. in 1 Charles I, both assessments apply to the same person but one is entered on the Roll for the City of Chichester, and the other on that for Manwood Hundred.

3) Where the name of a family is shown in brackets, the main figure quoted is not that of the head of the family, for whom no assessment has been found.

4) The red line on each chart, denotes the average assessment in lands for the year in question, estimated on the basis of the assessments in lands for all the families included in this study, except the peers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidy assessments in lands for 38 Henry VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelley of Michelgrove, assessed at £400 in lands and goods + £30 in lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage of Firle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Warnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wakehurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Bucksteps &amp; Michaelham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll of Warnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper of Wakehurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Bucksteps &amp; Michaelham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley of Thackham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham of Broomham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley of Michelgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham of Broomham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring of Ovingdean &amp; Lewes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of Trotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bishopp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor of West Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May of Ticehurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shurley of Isfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May of Burwash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville of Chiddingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley of West Grinstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assessment notes: £40, but assessed also in goods.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidy assessments in lands for 14 Elizabeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Shelley of Michelgrove, assessed at £100 in lands.

£80

£70  Covert (£67); Gage of Firle (£67); Goring of Burton (£60); Palmer of Angmering (£66)

£60  Dautrey (£50); Pelham of Buckstepe & Michaelham (£50)

£50  Apsley of Thackham (£40); Ashburnham of Ashburnham (£30+£10); Lunsford (£40); Morley (£30+£18); Pelham of Laughton (£40); Selwyn (£40); Sheppard (£45); Shirley of Wiston (£40)

£40  Caryll of Harting (£30); Culpepper of Wigsell (£30); Ernley (£30); Goring of Ovingdean & Lewes (£30); Jefferay (£30); Marvin (£30); Parker (£30); Sackville of Chiddingly (£30)

£33

£30  Apsley of Fulborough (£25); Ashburnham of Broomham (£27); Barentyne (£27); Bartellot (£20); Bellingham (£25); Colbrand (£20); Gunter (£20); Levett (£27); (Lewkenor of Trotton £20); May of Burwash (£20); Poole (£20) Sharpe (£20); Shirley of West Grinstead (£26); Spelman (£20); Wilgoose (£20)

£20  Cowper (£12); Ford (£10+£5); Hussey (£10); Lewkenor of Selsey (£15); Scott (£15); Stapley (£15); Thatcher (£15)

£10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsidy assessments in lands for 1 Charles I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert (£50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham of Laughton (£40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp (£30); Culpepper of Wakehurst (£30); Gage of Firle (£30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham (£20); Bowyer of North Mundham (£20); Ford (£20+£2); Goring of Burton (£20); Lewkenor of West Dean (£20); Shelley of Michelgrove (£25); Shurley of Isfield (£20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount (£15); Colbrad (£12); Ernley (£5+£6); Gage of Bentley (£16); Garton (£10); Lunsford (£10); May of Tichhurst (£14+£2+£1); Morley (£12); Parker (£15+£2); Stapley (£10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot (£7); Churcher (£5); Darrell (£5); Dextrey (£5); Goring of Ovingdean &amp; Lewes (£4); Hussey (£2+£1); Michell (£3); Nevell (£5); Onley (£3); Porter (£3); Roberts (£4); Sackville of Siddlescombe (£7); Sharpe (£2); Shurley of Lewes (£4+£2); Stoughton (£6); Wilgoose (£5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 28. Economic trends among the gentry.

(The evidence of Inquisitions Post Mortem, the Subsidy Rolls of 38 H VIII, 2 Eliz., 14 Eliz., and Charles I, of building activities and of contributions to the Armada Loan.)

Note: (a) In the first column, 'I' means that according to the evidence of the Inquisitions Post Mortem tabulated in Appendix 25, the number of manors held over the generations studied was increasing. Similarly 'D' means that it was decreasing; 'G' means that it remained constant. (See Appendix 25.)

(b) In the second column, '+' means that such subsidy assessments as are available for the selected years were above average, '-' that they were below, and where they fluctuated this is indicated. (See Appendix 26.)

(c) In the third column, families which undertook the building of houses in Sussex during this period are marked 'B', those which altered them extensively are marked 'A', and those who the evidence of Grimm's etchings in the Burrell MSS. (B.M. Add. MSS. 5670-5677) suggests may have built during this period, are marked (G). (See Appendix 12.)

(d) The evidence in column four is taken from S.A.C., i, 32 et seqq. and shows the scale of contributions by members of these families to the Armada Loan of 1588. Where there is any doubt as to identity, the entry is queried. The scale of contributions shown in S.A.C., i, 32 et seqq. rises thus: £25, £30, £40, £50, £60, £100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.P.M's.</th>
<th>Subsidy Rolls</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Armada Loan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agmondeasham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) of Thackham</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Pulborough</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashburnham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) of Ashburnham</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) of Broomham</td>
<td>- (but rising in relation to the average)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barentyne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartellot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopp</td>
<td></td>
<td>- + - +</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Bought Parham)</td>
<td>£25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of Cuckfield</td>
<td>I D</td>
<td>+ (one entry)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowyer of N.Mundham</td>
<td>+ (one entry)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Visc. Montague</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) of Warnham</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ (one entry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Appendix 28 contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.P.M.'s</th>
<th>Subsidy Rolls</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Armada Loan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caryll (ii) of Harting</td>
<td>D - (one entry)</td>
<td></td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casie</td>
<td>- (one entry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churche</td>
<td>I +</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbrand</td>
<td>I +</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>£25?, £30?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert</td>
<td>I +</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpepper (i) of Wigsell (ii) of Wakehurst</td>
<td>I -</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell</td>
<td>I +</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawtrey</td>
<td>I + -</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernley</td>
<td>D + -</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>£30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversfield</td>
<td>I - (one entry)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
<td>- + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortescue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage (i) of Firle (ii) of Bentley</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton</td>
<td>D +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goring (i) of Burton (ii) of Ovingdean</td>
<td>I +</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gounter</td>
<td>I -</td>
<td>(but rising in relation to the average)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Earl of Arundel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferay</td>
<td></td>
<td>(but rising in relation to the average)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levett</td>
<td>D -</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>£40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewkenor (i) of Selsey (ii) of West Dean (iii) of Trotton</td>
<td>I - +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunsford</td>
<td>- + -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May (i) of Ticehurst (ii) of Burwash</td>
<td>C -</td>
<td>(but rising in relation to the average)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>I.P.M's</td>
<td>Subsidy Rolls</td>
<td>Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michell</td>
<td>I D</td>
<td>+ - -</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevell</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ (one entry)</td>
<td>A (but sold Parham)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onley</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>(i) of Angmering</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>+ (one entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Parham</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ - +</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>(i) of Laughton</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Buckstepe</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy, Earl of Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole</td>
<td></td>
<td>- (one entry)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>+ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>(i) of Withiam</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>- (one entry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Seddlescombe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) of Chiddingly</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>- (one entry)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>(i) of Michelgrove</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(nearly all assessments on goods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Patcham</td>
<td></td>
<td>- (nearly all assessments on goods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppard</td>
<td>- +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>(i) of Wiston</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of W. Grinstead</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shurley</td>
<td>(i) of Isfield</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) of Lewes</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stannye</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stapley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>- (one entry)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Lord De la Warr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilgoose</td>
<td>I D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplement to Appendix 28.

Families and family branches augmenting their lands.

(I.e. those which according to Inquisitions Post Mortem were increasing the number of manors they held, and which were assessed at rates above average or rising in relation to it in the subsidy years studied. See Columns 1 & 2 of Appendix.)

Bishop
Covert
Culpepper of Wakehurst
Goring of Burton
Lewkenor of West Dean
Pelham of Laughton
Selwyn

(7)

Families and family branches which, considering the evidence of all 4 columns of Appendix 28 and relevant evidence in Section III, appear to have been prospering economically during the reign of Elizabeth.

Ashburnham of Broomham
Bellingham
Bishop
Bowyer of Cuckfield (See also Section III)
Bowyer of North Mundham
Colbrand
Covert
Culpepper of Wakehurst
Eversfield
Garton
Goring of Burton
Gounter
Jefferay
Leech (See also Section III)
Lewkenor of West Dean
May of Pashley in Ticehurst
May of Burwash
Palmer of Angmering
Palmer of Parham
Pelham of Laughton
Scott
Selwyn
Sheppard
Shurley of Isfield
Stoughton

(25)

(To this list might be added Sackville of Withiam though, as they entered the peerage in 1567, their subsidy assessments are not taken into account.)

(contd.)
Families and family branches losing lands. (I.e., those which according to Inquisitions Post Mortem were losing manors during the generations studied, and which were assessed at rates below average or sinking in relation to it in the subsidy years reviewed. See columns 1 & 2 of Appendix.)

- Apsley of Pulborough
- Caryll of Harting
- Ernley
- Levett
- Morley
- Onley
- Shirley of West Grinstead
- Thatcher
- Wilgoose

(9)

Families and family branches which, considering the evidence of all 4 columns of Appendix 28 and relevant evidence in Section III, appear either not to have been prospering or to have been declining economically during the reign of Elizabeth.

- Apsley of Pulborough
- Ashburnham of Ashburnham
- Caryll of Harting
- Darrell
- Dawtrey
- Ernley
- Gage of Firle
- Gage of Bentley
- Goring of Ovingdean
- Levett
- Lunsford
- Michell
- Morley
- Onley
- Pelham of Buckstepe (See Section III)
- Porter
- Roberts
- Sharpe
- Shelley of Michelgrove (See Section III)
- Shirley of Wiston (See Section III and Part II, ch.3)
- Shirley of West Grinstead
- Thatcher
- Wilgoose

(23)
Appendix 29. Sussex gentry families concerned in the Wealden iron industry in or about the year 1574.

Owners of forges & furnaces.

1. Apsley. 1 forge at Shipley. (Straker, Wealden Iron, 418; S.A.C., ii, 217. M.A. Lower here refers to John Apsley as an eminent iron-master.)

2. Ashburnham (of Ashburnham) 
   "A furnace called Panning Reche, Ashburnham furnace, a forge in Ashburnham and a forge in Penshurst" belonged to John Ashburnham, gent., in 1574. (S.P.D, Eliz. vol. 117, no. 39. See also B.M. Stowe., MS. 570, f. 104, and Straker, 362-3, 364, 365.) 
   Note: 6 March, 1574, a bond was taken of one John Gardyner for John Ashburnham under penalty of £2,000 fine that the latter should not found or sell iron ordnance without a licence from the Queen. (S.P.D, Eliz. vol. 95, no. 52)

3. Barentyne. 1 forge, 1 furnace in Horsted Keynes (given as owned by Mr. Barrington?) B.M. Stowe MS. 570, f. 104.

4. Bowyer (of Cuckfield) 1 forge in Tinsley, a double furnace at Newbridge and a furnace in Moore forest (as owned by Henry Bowyer) B.M. Stowe MS. f. 104; Straker, op. cit. 465) 
   Henry Bowyer mentioned as a "Founder of Ordinance" in Jan., 1576. B.M., Lansd. MS. 683, f. 21 b.)

5. Browne, Viscount Montague. 1 forge, 1 furnace in Haslemere 'and thereabouts', also a furnace called Pophall, and 1 forge in Frank (sic, i.e. Frant) in the hands of John Porter. (B.M. Stowe MS. 570, f. 104 (given as belonging to "Thomas, Lord Montague"); see also f. 103).

6. Caryll (of Harting) By 1586 Edward Caryll held Gosden furnace (Straker, op. cit. 417 & 436) 1 forge & 1 furnace at Burningfold in Dunsfold parish, Surrey, were in about 1580 in the hands of Edward Caryll and Simon Bowyer in partnership. (Straker, 422). 
   Pallinham furnace in the parish of Wisborough Green was erected c. 1586

Managers or lessees of forges and furnaces.

1). 1 furnace in Horsmonden, Kent, worked by Mr. Ashburnham but owned by another. (Straker, op. cit. 280)

2). 1 forge and 1 furnace in Ashdown were managed by Henry Bowyer for the Queen. (B.M. Stowe MS. 570, f. 104)

3). Kneppe furnace in Shipley parish, belonging to the Duke of Norfolk was worked by Edward Caryll, 1588-1604. (Straker, 418)

(contd.)
or 1587 by Edward Caryll. (Straker, 425)

Note:
Sir John Caryll of Warnham was granted the lease of some ironworks at St. Leonards by letters patent for 60 years in 1601 (Straker, 439). There is also a reference to his owing a furnace at Warnham in 1609 (Straker, 441), but it is not known whether he had any ironworks in 1574. (See also S.A.C., vi, 48; xxxiii, 121; lxvi, 90).

7. Covert. 1 forge, 1 furnace at Slaugham, owned jointly with Mr. Challoner (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104)

Later, Walter Covert, whose father died in 1579, owned a furnace at Cuckfield together with the right to cut wood and dig ore in St. Leonard's Forest (Straker, 436).

8. Darrell. 1 furnace in Shringley, in the parish of Goudhurst, Kent, owned by Thomas Darrell of Scotney in 1574 and worked by another. (Straker, 276).

9. Eversfield. 1 furnace, 1 forge at Crotchford in Hartfield parish. (B.M. Stowe MS, 570, f. 104; Straker, 251). 1 forge at Mitchell Park Farm owned jointly by John Eversfield and another (Straker, 429).

Note: 4 March 1574 a bond was taken of John Eversfield under penalty of £2,000 fine not to sell or found iron ordnance without a licence from the Queen. (S.P.D. Eliz., vol. 95, no. 37).

10. Gage. 1 forge, 1 furnace about Copthorne and Lingfield in the hands of one, Thorp. (B.M. Stowe MS, 570, f. 104).

Knapp furnace in the parish of Shipley worked by Carylls July 1568 - April 1604, belonged to the Duke of Norfolk's estate. (Straker, 418). The Duke (ex.1572) had owned certain ironworks in the Forest of St. Leonard's (Straker, 454), and in 1580 and 1582 certain ironworks in the Forest of Worth leased to John Eversfield, formed part of the late Duke's estate. (Straker, 464).
12. May (of Ticehurst, Echingham)  
I furnace in Echingham belonging to Thomas May. (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104).  
Note: 10 March, 1574, bond taken of Thos. May under penalty of £2,000 fine not to found or sell iron ordnance without a licence from the Queen.  
(S.P.D. Eliz., vol. 95, no. 57).

13. May (of Burwash) 1 forge "called Badgell in Burrish (sic., i.e. Burwash) parish". (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104)  
Note: 4 March, 1574, bond taken of George May under penalty of £2,000 fine not to sell or found iron ordnance without a licence from the Queen. (S.P.D. Eliz., vol. 95, no. 40).

14. Michell. 1 furnace in Hoathly.  
(Described as belonging to one Mr. Michell, probably Thos. Michell of Cuckfield). (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104).

15. Morley. 1 forge in Freshfield and 1 furnace in Horstead belonged to Anthony Morley. (His brother William, is not mentioned in the 1574 lists). (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104).

16. Pelham (of Laughton). "2 forges, 1 furnace in Dallington, Netherfield, Waldon and Brightling" owned by Sir John Pelham but "in other mens' hands". (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104).

17. Percy, Earl of Northumberland.  
1 furnace in Petworth "great park" owned by "the late Earle
of Northumberland", (the 8th Earl did not die until 1585 and the date of this document is 1574) and in the hands of a Mr. Blackwell. (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104).

18. Porter. 1 forge in "Bowyham" (sic, i.e. Bayham) owned by John Porter. (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104).

1 furnace in the parish of Rotherfield, Sussex belonging either to Thos. Lord Buckhurst or to one Arthur Milton. (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 103).
1 forge in "Ashfold" in the hands of Mr. Relfe. (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104).
1 forge, 1 furnace in Parrock in the hands of George Buller. (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104).
1 forge in Fletching in the hands of Mr. Leech. (S.P.D. Eliz. vol. 95, no. 21).
1 forge at Sheffield. (S.P.D. Eliz. vol. 95, no. 61).

7). 1 forge in Frant owned by Lord Montague in the hands of John Porter. (B.M. Stowe MS., 570, f. 104).
Appendix 30. Sussex gentry who were heads of families in 1580 and who are known to have been practising lawyers.

1. Henry Berkeley. Scholar of New College, Oxford; Fellow, 1554-1568; from Hereford; B.C.L., Dec., 1561; D.C.L., 19 April, 1567. Perhaps the Henry Berkeley who was admitted to the Middle Temple, 14 Oct. 1565 as son and heir of Maurice Berkeley of Bruton, Somerset, knt. (J. Foster: Alum. Oxoniensis, 1500-1714, i, 113; Middle Temple Admission Register, i, 29). Perhaps had been scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1546, but is more likely that this was a different man (J. & J. J. Venn: Alumni Cantabrigiensis, Pt. 1, i, 89). An advocate, 1567; Master in Chancery, 1575. (Foster, loc. cit.)

2. Thomas Bowyer, (of North Mundham). Admitted to the Middle Temple, 8 Feb., 1558, as son and heir of (Thomas) Bowyer of London. Bencher, 1577. Reader, Autumn, 1577 and Lent, 1585. (Middle Temple Admission Register, 1. 23).

3. Robert Casie, (or Cassey). Admitted to the Middle Temple, 9 Nov., 1580; then late of Clifford's Inn, gent., son and heir of George Casie of Roughton, Sussex. Called, 7 Feb., 1589. (Middle Temple Admission Register, i, 47; Minutes of Parliament of the Middle Temple, i, 304).

4. Sir Edward Culpepper (of Wakehurst)? A serjeant-at-law according to S. A. C., xlviii, 89. [I can find no reference to him in the Admission Registers for any of the four Inns of Court. He is not mentioned in Foss's list of serjeants-at-law for Queen Elizabeth's reign. (Foss: Judges of England, v, 413-5). Neither does he appear in the Calendar of Inner Temple Records, The Pension Book of Gray's Inn, The Black Books of Lincoln's Inn, or the Minutes of Parliament of the Middle Temple.]

5. Sir Edward Fenner. Admitted to the Middle Temple, 16 October, 1557, then late of New Inn. Bencher, 1576. Reader, Autumn, 1576. (Middle Temple Admission Register, i, 23). Serjeant-at-law, November, 1577. Built up a large practice. Appointed Judge of Queen's Bench, 26 May, 1590. (D. N. B.; Foss, op. cit., vi, 152; Minutes of Parliament of the Middle Temple, 1, 171).


1594, Knighted, 1600. Recorder of Chichester as early as May, 1580. (A.P.C., 1580-81, 8), and until 1600. J.P. Pembrokeshire, 13 April, 1603, and Chief Justice of Chester, 11 March, 1600 until his death, 6 April, 1616. (W.R. Williams: The History of the Great Sessions in Wales, 1542-1830, together with the lives of the Welsh Judges, 33).


9. John Porter. Perhaps was he of that name who was admitted to Lincoln's Inn from Clifford's Inn., 20 June, 1576., as "of Kent", and called to the Bar, 11 Oct., 1584. (Lincoln's Inn Admissions, 1,84; Black Book of Lincoln's Inn, 1,435).

10. John Shurley (of Lewes). Admitted to the Middle Temple, 5 August, 1585, as the 2nd son of Edward Shurley of Isfield, Sussex, Esq., deceased. Bencher, 1587. Reader, Lent, 1587 and Lent, 1596. Treasurer, 22 May, 1601. (Middle Temple Admission Register, 1,104, - at admission of his son, John, ref. to the father as a serjeant-at-law, 13 Oct., 1615). John Rowe, the lawyer and antiquary, studied under John Shurley of Lewes, and after he had completed his legal education, became his managing clerk. (S.A.C., xviii, 133).

11. Adrian Stoughton. Admitted to the Inner Temple, Nov. 1578, as the 2nd son of Thomas Stoughton of Stoke, Surrey. Became Recorder (and M.P.) for Chichester. (Students admitted to the Inner Temple, 1547-1660, 89; Calendar of Inner Temple Records, 1,342.)
Appendix 31. Gentry who were alive and heads of families under review in 1580 who are known to have held CROWN OFFICES or remunerative positions under the Crown, during the reign of Elizabeth.

(Apart from the Dict. of Nat. Biolg., and G.E.C's Complete Peerage, the sources used were as follows;)

The Calendar of the Patent Rolls, published to 1563, and the MS Calendar in the P.R.O., thereafter; the Calendar of State Papers Domestic 1547-80, 1581-90, 1591-4, 1595-7, 1598-1601, 1601-3, & Addenda 1580-1625; Acts of the Privy Council for the reign of Elizabeth; the Signet Office Doccquets, P.R.O. ref. Index 6800, for offices granted from 1584 onwards; A.C.Wood, List of Escheators for England, 159 et seqq, for Surrey and Sussex, at the P.R.O.; R.Somerville, The Duchy of Lancaster, 1, 1265-1603, for an index of names of office-holders in the Duchy; the Gentlemen Pensioners' Rolls for the reign of Elizabeth, P.R.O., E.407/1 E-35; the Entry Book in the records of the Exchequer Augmentation Office, P.R.O. E.315/309 recording grants of stewardships of royal manors, castles, boroughs, honours etc., and of the bailiwick of hundreds, made during the reign; the undt. Petyt MS. in the Inner Temple, Petyt MS.538, vol.39, f.154, a list of Elizabethan offices with details of salaries but giving few names of office-holders.)


Granted for life the office of Steward of Hampton Court & numerous other lordships & manors, & the Keepership of the Chase of Hampton Court. Valued in all at £32.7.1d. 12th June, 1554. (G.E.C.,op.cit.,ix,98, & Cal.Pat.Rolls,1553-4, 272).

Granted an annuity of 20 marks to him and his heirs on the occasion of his elevation to the peerage, "to maintain more decently the estate of a Viscount". 2nd September, 1554. (Cal.Pat. Rolls,1554-5, 86).

Special embassy to Madrid, Jan-June, 1560. (G.E.C.,loc.cit.) Missions to Flanders, March 1565 and 1566. (Ibid.)


(It is not clear whether he held the office of Master of the Horse under Queen Elizabeth, a post to which his father had been

(contd.)
appointed in 1539 (D.N.B.) - and which he had held April-Sept., 1554 (G.E.C., ix, 98).


Fitzalan, Henry, Earl of Arundel. Appointed Steward of the Eagle Honour and to the Lordship of Pevensey and of other lands in Sussex belonging to the Duchy of Lancaster, for life, 8th April, 1549. (R. Somerville, op. cit., 617). Granted the office of High Steward for 15th Jan., the date of the Queen's intended Coronation, from sunrise to sunset; also the office of High Constable throughout the 14th Jan., the day before. 13th Jan., 1559. (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1558-60, 63). Appointed Lord Steward of the Household, June 1560. (Cal.S.P.D. 1547-80, 55).

He resigned from this position in November, 1564. (G.E.C., i, 251; Somerville, loc. cit.; A.P.C. 1558-70 Index under "Arundel"). (Though not a Crown Office it might be noted that he was High Steward of Oxford University, 1555-9, and Chancellor of Oxford University, 6th Feb. - 12th June, 1559. (G.E.C., loc. cit.)

Goring, George, (of Ovingdean & Lewes). Appointed Receiver-General of the Court of Wards, 3rd July, 1584. (MS. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 26 Eliz., f. 5) This appointment made for life, Sept. 1590. (Cal.S.P.D. 1581-90, 687). Reference to a debt of £19,777.2.3½d. of George Goring, sen., "late" Receiver of the Court of Wards, and to the means by which this debt was to be discharged by his son; July, 1595. (Cal.S.P.D. 1595-7, 69-70).


Lewkenor, Thomas. Appointed bailiff of the guild or fraternity of (?) in Sussex, 17th May, 1586. Fee, £13.6.8d. (P.R.O. E.315/309, f.60b).

Lumley, John, Baron. Granted for life the office of Keeper of the Great Park of Nonsuch, Surrey. Fee, 4d. per day. (Cal.Pat. Rolls, 1558-60, 20).

Commission to treat with the Duke of Florence about a debt owed by the latter to the Queen, 1564. (G.E.C., viii, 277). The Duke was subsequently released from his obligation to the Queen direct, Lord Lumley & the Earl of Arundel taking responsibility for the debt and he owing them. Subsequently they were unable to collect from the Duke (Ibid.), hence the reference, undated, to Lord Lumley's debt of over £11,000 to the Queen. (Cal.S.P.D. Addenda, 1580-1625, 466). In May, 1597, the Queen released and discharged Lord Lumley of his assurance to her for the payment of
this debt of £11,400, which assurance was taken over by the Earl
of Huntingdon on the security of his lands. (Signet Office
Docquets, i. P.R.O. Index, 6800, f.101).

(Though not a Crown office it might be noted that in February
1559 he was appointed High Steward of Oxford University when the
Earl of Arundel, formerly holding this office, was appointed
Chancellor of the University. Lumley held this office for the
remainder of his life. (G.E.C., vii, 277)).

May, George, (of Burwash). Appointed Escheator of Surrey &
Sussex, 26th January, 1583. (Wood, op. cit., 159 et seqq.)

Percy, Henry, 8th Earl of Northumberland. Commissioner to
negotiate with the Scottish Congregation, 1559. (G.E.C., ix, 730).
April, 1560. At this time he was Captain-General of the Light
Horse. (Ibid). Commissioner to treat with the French, 25th May,
1560. (Ibid). Granted, during pleasure, the offices of Keeper &
Captain of Tynemouth & Norham Castles, February, 1561. (G.E.C.,
ix, 730-1; Cal. of Pat. Rolls, 1560-5, 11; A.P.C., 1558-70, 233).
Also granted the Chief Stewardship of the Crown lands in North-
umberland. (Cal. S.P.D. 1660-3, 11-12. Date given for the grant of
all these offices is 13 December, 1560).
These offices held until his arrest. (G.E.C., loc. cit).
Office of Keeper & Captain of Tynemouth Castle regranted him for
life, 3rd May, 1571. (MS, Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1-16 Eliz., f. 270b; A.P.C.,
1571-5, 51; A.P.C., 1577-8, 407).
In a letter he explains why he has refused to give up the keys of
Tynemouth Castle to the new office-holder, - because of the great
importance of the office to him as his main source of income.
Reminds the Queen that he had resigned Norham Castle to Lord
Hunsdon at her bidding, worth £400 p.a., which not long before had
cost him a great deal. 1584 ?. (Cal. S.P.D. Addenda, 1580-1625, 134-
5).
(His son held the office in November, 1591. (Cal. S.P.D. 1591-4, 128))

Sackville, John, (of either Seddlescombe or Chiddingly). Appointed
Escheator for Surrey & Sussex, 11 November, 1562. (Wood, op. cit.,
159 et seqq).

Sackville, Thomas, Lord Buckhurst. Appointed, with his father Sir
Richard Sackville, Master Forester of Ashdown Forest for life,
12 Feb., 1561. (Somerville, op. cit., 621).
Appointed Feodary in Sussex from Michaelmas, 1560. 20th Feb.,
1561. (Somerville, op. cit., 619).
Mission to France, 1568. (D.N.B.)
 Granted the Stewardship of the capital lordship of Minster, Kent,
and its appurtenances. Fee, £15. 13s. 4d. 7th May, 1570. (P.R.O.
E. 315/309, f. 19).
Granted the bailiwick of the liberty, lordship and Hundred of
Lockfield with its appurtenances. Fee, 20s. (P.R.O. 315/309, f.
25b). 1584.

(contd.)
Ambassador to the Low Countries, 1587. (G.E.C., iv, 422-3; (D.N.B.)
Ambassador to the Low Countries, 1589. (D.N.B.)
Granted the office of Chief Butler of England & Wales with the several fees of 150 marks p.a. for life. Dec., 1590. (Cal.S.P.D., 1581-90, 702). Granted the stewardship & view of frankpledge of the Honour, Castle & borough of Arundel & all manors, lands, & tenements attached to them; also the bailiwicks of the Hundreds of Poling, Estborne, Estwithe & Westwithe, Overford & Roberts-bridge, lately part of the property of Philip, Earl of Arundel, now attainted. Value £6.18s.4d. 1590. (P.R.O. E.315/309,f.72b).
Granted the stewardships of the manors of Lewysham, Sayescourte, Westgreenewich, Le Shrofold & Bankers, value £10.12s.4d. p.a.; also the High Stewardship of the Manor & Town of Oxford & Stroud, value 50s p.a.; & the bailiwick of the manor of Sayescourte, value £3.0s.4d. p.a.; the manor of Pleasaunce in East Greenwich with the fee of 4d per day, of the park of Green- wich with the same fee, the Keepership of the orchard and garden of the said manor, 3d per day etc. May, 1594. (Signet Office Docquets, 1, P.R.O. Index, 6800,f.454).
Commissioner for the Seal of the Duchy of Lancaster, 1595-7. (Somerville, op. cit., 335).
Granted the office of High Treasurer from the 14th inst. during pleasure. May 15, 1599. (Cal.S.P.D.1598-1601, 194).
Commissioner for peace negotiations with Spain, May, 1604. King of Spain granted him a pension of £1,000. (D.N.B.)

(Though not a Crown office, it might be noted that from 1591 to his death he held the office of Chancellor of Oxford University. (G.E.C., iv, 423))

Selwyn, John. Appointed Escheator for Surrey & Sussex, 18 Nov., 1559. (Wood, loc. cit.)

Shirley, Sir Thomas, (of Wiston). Appointed Treasurer at War to the English army serving in the Low Countries, 27 Feb., 1587. (MS.Cal.Pat.Roll. for 30 Eliz.,f.13b; see also Signet Office Docquets i, P.R.O. Index 6800,f.113; Cal.S.P.D.1581-90, 663).
Complaints against his discharge of this office which is worth £3,000 p.a., 1595. (Cal.S.P.D.,1595-7, 44).
Arrested for debt & sent to the Fleet, 15 March, 1603-4. (D.N.B.)

West, William, Baron De la Warr. Appointed Keeper of the Forest & Chases of Ayleshott & Woolmer in the County of Southampton and the reversion of the manor of Wordelsham, Hants, and its appurtenances rent free for life, 3 November, 1577. (MS. Cal. of Pat. (contd.)
(Appendix 31 contd.)

Rolls, 17-30 Eliz., f. 30b; Signet Office Docquets i, P.R.O. Index, 6800, f. 580b.)

Note:
The Book recording grants of stewardships of royal manors etc. (P.R.O. E. 315/309) contains several other entries with names of grantees which are also the names of relevant Sussex gentry, but in each case the manors or properties in question are in counties at some distance from Sussex. It is therefore likely that such entries refer to residents of other counties, e.g. one Thomas Palmer was granted the bailiwicks of manors in Worcestershire in 8 Eliz. and 27 Eliz. (f. 11b & f. 59); in 15 Eliz., one John Hussey was granted the stewardship of a manor in Herts, (f. 29b); in 17 Eliz., one Henry Poole was granted a stewardship in Worcestershire, (f. 42); in 24 Eliz., Henry Berkeley was granted a stewardship in Somerset (f. 52b); in 36, 38 and 45 Eliz., Francis Fortescue was granted stewardships in Gloucestershire (f. 89; f. 99b and f. 146).
SECTION III.

Family Histories.
AGMONDESHAM.

Origins.

The John Agmondesham who was J.P. of Sussex, 1559-1562, is likely to have been the father of Francis Agmondesham Esq., who appears in the 1570 Visitation of Sussex as "Francis Agmondesham of Petworth".

A younger branch of a well-known Surrey family, their connection with Sussex seems to date from the late 15th century when one Ralph Agmondesham married a Sussex heiress named Agnes Cranley who was seized of a messuage and lands in Kirdford named "Baskefald", of another messuage and lands in Kirdford, of two messuages in Petworth, one of them with a garden, and of other lands there. The Inquisition of Ralph Agmondesham says that he married Agnes Cranley and that they had a son, John, who was 23 years old when his father died. This Ralph Agmondesham appears to be the one named in the 1570 Visitation of Sussex as the father of John and grandfather of Francis Agmondesham of Petworth who was living there at that date, having a son aged 19.

The Ralph Agmondesham mentioned in the 1570 Sussex Visitation is there described as the son of Philip Agmondesham, who also appears in the Surrey Visitations as of "Rowebarnes", in that county. The Surrey line was perpetuated by Philip's elder son, William, while the younger son, Ralph, described in the Surrey Visitation as "of East Horsley" seems to have founded the Sussex branch.

Information about the Sussex Agmondeshams is fragmentary. The 1570 Sussex Visitation gives Francis Agmondesham as head of the branch in 1570, but it is not clear when his father died since no will nor I.P.M. appears to have survived. Probably it was between 1562 when he was last on the Commission of the Peace for Sussex, and 1565 when Francis, his son, appeared as the witness to an indenture dated the 8th November for lands in Sulham.

---

5. Ibid.
6. See note 3.
7. Ibid.
8. See note 2.
It is not clear when the Agmondeshams actually came to Sussex to reside but possibly it was not long before 1570 since the Sussex Visitation of that year describes John, father of Francis, as "of Apscourt, co. Surrey."

Whether armigerous.

In the 1570 Visitation of Sussex, College of Arms MS. G.18, and the printed version edited by Sir Thomas Phillips. (See note 2).

Members of family.

Head of family in 1580.

Assumed to be Francis Agmondesham Esq. of Petworth, son of John Agmondesham of Apscourt, Surrey, J.P. Sussex, 1559-1562, and of Alice, daughter of William Vertue of Tinston. Nov., 1565, witness in an indenture for lands in Sulham. Date of death unknown. No will or I.P.M.

Wife.


Children.

John Aged 19 in 1570.
Richard " 15 " "
Robert " 9 " "
Francis " 6 " "

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children.

Subsidy assessments.

10. See note 2.
12. V. supra, note 9.
14. Ibid.
According to Berry and Comber, the Apsley pedigree can be traced back to 20 Edward III when Stephen Apsley resided at Apsley, "a place so called in Sussex in Thackham". Berry's source for this and for the descent of the next four generations of heirs is a deed of 17 Edward IV produced at the 'Office of Arms' (sic.). The Stephen Apsley referred to was married to Mary, daughter and co-heiress of Stephen Le Power, serjeant-at-law, who was owner of Thackham. There is another reference in Berry to this Sir Stephen Le Power where he is described as lord of the manor of Thackham, Sussex, in 3 Edward I. It appears that it was by the marriage of Stephen Apsley to Mary or Margaret Le Power that the Apsleys established themselves in Thackham.

Among their descendants of the fourth generation, the eldest son, John Apsley of Thackham, distinguished himself by becoming Esquire of the Body to Edward IV. He married Beatrix, daughter of a gentleman of Knotsford, Sussex, who was one of the maids of honour to the Queen. His grandson, John, succeeded his father in 1527 and lived until the 14th May, 1587, being head of the family at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. He was a J.P. of Sussex, 1559-1585.

The younger brother of the John Apsley of Thackham who was Esquire of the Body to Edward IV, was William Apsley of Pulborough who married Ann, daughter of Edward Mille of Pulborough and Greatham and eventually heiress of her brother, Richard Mille. From them descended the younger branch of the Apsley family, the Apsleys of Pulborough. Their eldest grandson, John Apsley of Pulborough, was a minor of 13 years, 10 months in July, 1547 when his father died. This John Apsley's will was proved in 1594, he having died on the 30th April, 1593. It appears to have been he who was Sheriff of Sussex, 1568-69.

Apparently then, the Apsleys had been resident and well established in the county for at least 200 years before the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, the Apsleys of Thackham having

1. W. Berry, County Genealogies; Sussex, (1830), copy annotated by Mr. Comber and deposited at West Sx.Co. Rec. Office, (noted henceforth as "B.& C.").
2. B.& C., 150n.
4. B.& C., 150.
5. Ibid., quoting Horsham Par. Register.
7. B.& C., 151.
8. Ibid., & P.C.C. 54 Dixy.
been settled there since the mid 14th century, and the younger branch at Pulborough, not far away, having flourished since the mid 15th century. Each of these branches of the Apsleys appears to have established itself by a marriage with an heiress.

Whether armigerous.

There is some doubt as to whether the family was recognised at the 1570 Visitation. The name does not appear in either MS G,18 or MS D,11 at the College of Arms, nor in Phillips' printed version. But it is found in Richard Turpyn, the Windsor Herald's version.

The family definitely appears in the 1634 Visitation.

(1) Apsley of Thackham.

Members of family.

Head of family in 1580.

John Apsley Esq. of Thackham, eld. son of William Apsley of the same who died 24 December, 1527, and of Jane, d. of William Ashburnham, who married, as her second husband, Richard Covert.

J.P., Sussex, 1559-85, Q. 1562 and 1564.

1564, bishop's letter, a "favourer of religion and godly orders; learned in the law". Perhaps the commissioner for disarming the recusants, c.1585, as Thos. Apsley, c.1585, Commissioner for masters.

Will dt. 1 May, 1587, pr. 27 October, 1587, at Chichester.

Buried at Thackham, 14 May, 1587.

12. H.C., MS., C.27.
13. M.I. at Thackham, see S.A.C., xxiii., 183.
15. Bishop's letters, 1564, (Camden Misc. ix, 9); B.M. Harl. MS., 474, f. 90b.
16. B.M. Harl. MS., 474, f. 81.
17. Chichester wills, 14/50.
18. S.A.C., liii, 113; S.R.S., xx1, 347.
Wives.

1) Jane, d. of John Michell of Cuckfield, Sussex, and widow of Bullockers. 19
2) Mary, d. of Edward Lewkenor of Kingston-Bowsey, Sussex, and widow of John Michell of Stamerham. She was buried at Horsham, 30 Jan., 1604. 20

Children.

By his first wife:

William Received a grant by his father's settlement, 1571. Settled his lands 1 April, 1581 and 20 November, 1582. Will dt. 3 Oct., 1581, pr. 1583. Died 23 Feb., 1583 v.p. and was buried at Thackham. I.P.M., 24 May, 1583.

John Mentioned in deeds of settlement of 1571 and 1582. Sole executor to his brother William.

Henry

Edward Mentioned in his father's will as the "crafty abuser" of his brother William and as one who needed watching.

Thomas

Mary

Dorothy

Elizabeth

Katherine

Alice Mentioned in mother's will.

19. See her will, dt. 27 Oct., 1538, Chichester wills, 2/147.
22. Chichester wills, 13/56b.
23. S.A.C.,xxiii, 183.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
(Apsley contd.)

By his second wife:-

Henry

Anthony
Mentioned in father's will. Eventually of Ticehurst. Living in 1634.

Dorothy

Ann

Education.

Father

Sons
William, perhaps he who was adm. Gray's Inn, 1561.

John, perhaps he who was adm. Gray's Inn, 1562.


29. S.R.S., xxi, 92.
32. Dorse Pat. Rolls, P.R.O., C.66/1421; C.66/1468; C.66/1493; C.66/1523; C.66/1549; C.66/1594.
33. Official returns.
34. B & C., loc. cit.
35. S.R.S., xxi, 89.
37. Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889, ed. J. Foster, 21
40. Gray's Inn Admissions, 53; Inner Temple Admissions, 97.
41. Al.Cant., Pt. 1, 1, 36.
42. Inner Temple Admissions, 113; Cal. Inner Temple Records, 1, 422.
(Apsley contd.)

Marriages of children.

Sons
William md. Elizabeth, d. and heiress of John Lloyd Esq.
John
Henry
Edward
Thomas
Henry
Anthony
Daughters
Mary md. Robert Bartellot of Stopham.
Dorothy md. Thomas Threele.
Elizabeth Unmarried in 1557.
Katherine md. Thomas Hever, gent. of Cuckfield.
Alice
Dorothy
Ann md., as his second wife, Sir John Lunsford of East Hoathly.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of the tithing of Sullington, or sometimes of 'Thakeham' in the Hundred of Estwryth, Bramber Rape.)

38 Henry VIII John Apsley, arm., in lands £60.
(Commissioner of Subsidy)

2 Elizabeth. John Apsley Esq. in lands 100 marks.
(Commissioner of Subsidy)

14 Elizabeth John Apsley Esq. in lands £40.
(Commissioner of Subsidy)

18 Elizabeth John Apsley Esq. in lands £40.
(Commissioner of Subsidy)

43. B & C., 150; S.A.C., xiii, 183.
44. B & C., loc. cit., and 179.
46. B & C., loc. cit.
49. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
51. " E.179/190/283.
52. " E.179/190/297.
(Apsley contd.)

Sons:— (Note: the identification of the gentlemen named below as the sons of John Apsley Esq. of Thackham is uncertain.)

William Apsley. (As of Ponyngs, Hundred of Whalesbone, Lewes Rape.)
2 Eliz. William Apsley, gent. in lands £453
5 Eliz. " " " " " " £454
14 Eliz. " " " " " " £1055
18 Eliz. Mr. William Apsley, " " £1056

Henry Apsley (As of Hundred of Baldslowes, Hastings Rape. Perhaps the elder son of John Apsley Esq.'s 2nd marriage.)
37 Eliz. Mr. Henry Apsley in lands £657

Anthony Apsley. (As of Shewswell Hundred, Hastings Rape.)
1-2 Charles I Anthony Apsley Esq. in lands £558

(ii) Apsley of Pulborough.

Members of family.

Head of family in 1580.

John Apsley Esq. of Pulborough, eld. son and heir of Nicholas Apsley of Pulborough, gent., who died 3 July, 1547, 59 and of Mary, daughter of Sir John Dawtrey of More House, Petworth, who remarried Thomas Onley. 60

---

54. " E.179/190/274.
55. P.R.O., E.179/190/283.
56. " E.179/190/299.
57. " E.179/190/332.
59. I.P.M., 14 Nov., 1547, P.R.O., C.142/85/32. Will pr. at Chichester, 7/35.
60. B & C., 151, 197.
(Apsley contd.)

Aged 13 years, 10 months in 1547.  
1568-69, Sheriff of Sussex.  
Feb., 1578. Summoned before the Privy Council.  
March, 1578. Committed to the Fleet.  
March, 1578. Suspected of having harboured a "massing priest".  
March, 1579. Discharged from the Fleet.  
30 April, 1593, died. I.P.M., 22 Oct., 1593. Will pr. 1594.  
Wife.  
Elizabeth, d. of Edward Shelley of Warminghurst.  
Children.  
George Aged 30 and more in 1593. Died at Southwark,  
12 Feb., 1606. Will dt. 11 Feb., 1606, pr. 6 Nov.  
1618 and 11 July, 1622. I.P.M., 15 April, 1606.  
Charles  
Michael  
Richard  
Nicholas  
? a son  
Allen Later Sir Allen Apsley, youngest son. Lieutenant  
of the Tower of London, Heir to nephew, William  
Alice Will pr. 28 Nov., 1618.  
Susan  
Education. Universities. Inns of Court.  
Father -  
Sons (Sir) Allen, adm. Inner Temple, Nov. 1613.  
61. See father's I.P.M.  
62. P.R.O. Sheriffs. John Apsley of Thackham was a J.P. that  
year so it was not he who was sheriff.  
63. A.P.C., 1578-80, 58.  
64. Ibid., 70.  
65. Ibid., 77.  
66. Ibid., 88.  
67. P.R.O., C.142/236/47.  
68. P.C.C., 54 Dixy.  
69. B & C., 151.  
70. Ibid.  
71. P.C.C., 109 Meade.  
73. B & C., loc. cit.  
74. P.C.C., 55 St. John.  
75. P.C.C., 110 Meade.  
76. Inner Temple Admissions, 206.
Marriages of children.

George

md. twice:— (a) Mary, d. and coheiress of William Goulding of Essex. She was buried at Pulborough, 7 Feb., 1594. They had a son, William, who died without heirs in 1621. 77 (b) Ancilla, d. of — Highgate of Essex. She was buried at St. Andrews, Holborn, 22 Dec., 1624. They had issue, including John Apsley of Pulborough, the eldest. 78

Charles

md. —? They had issue, — 3 daughters. 79

Michael

Richard

In father's will mentioned as contracted to marry Elizabeth James of Climping, Sussex; licenced at Chichester, 12 May, 1593. 80

Nicholas

—a son

Allen

md. three times:— (a) —, d. of Hunikes of — in Stafford, wid. of Henry Cooper. (b) Ann, d. and heiress of Sir Peter Carew and widow of Henry Cooper. (c) Lucy, youngest d. of Sir John St. John of Lydiard Tregozi, Wilts. Md. at St. Anne, Blackfriars, London, 23 October, 1615, she was aged 17. She remarried Sir Leventhorpe Francie of King's Hatfield, Essex. She died 11 October, 1659. There were children of her marriage to Sir Allen Apsley. 81

Alice

md. twice:— (a) Rev. John Drury of Pulborough, D.C.L. He died 9 June, 1614, will pr. 1614. 82 Issue. (b) Francis Nevell of Chichester. 83

Susan

Perhaps md. George Hunt of Houghton, Sussex. M. Lic. at Chichester, 28 May, 1603. 84

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Pulborough in the Hundred of Easewryth, Rape of Arundel).

38 Henry VIII. Nicholas Apsley, gent. in lands £26 85
14 Elizabeth John Apsley Esq. " " £25 86
? Elizabeth (before 1593 when he died). " " " " £15 87

77. B & C., 151 82. P.C.C., 65 Lawe
78. Ibid. 83. B & C., loc. cit.
79. Ibid. 84. Ibid.
80. Ibid. 85. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
81. Ibid. 86. " E.179/190/283.
82. " E.179/190/346.
(Apsley contd.)

Sons. (The identity of those named below is uncertain.)

George Apsley (As of Hundred of Eastnor, Hastings Rape.)

14 Eliz. George Apsley in goods £4 88

Richard Apsley (As of Strete Hundred, Lewes Rape.)

14 Eliz. Richard Apsley in goods £4 89

88. P.R.O., E.179/190/283.
89. Ibid.
ASHEURNHAM.

Origins.

To his description of Battle in Sussex, Camden appended this remark: "Here is nothing else remarkable in this place or neighbourhood except Ashburnham, which gives name to a family the most antient of any in these parts.

His observation as to the antiquity of this family might have been echoed with increasing emphasis by the historians of Sussex right down to the twentieth century since a member of the family was still living at Ashburnham until 1953 and the male line became extinct only in 1924.

The connection of the family of Ashburnham with the manor of the same name in the parish of Ashburnham, in Fexearle Hundred appears to go back to the twelfth century, and to this manor other estates and messuages within the parish were gradually annexed.

In the mid fifteenth century, a younger branch of the family established itself at Broomham in the parish of Guestling in Guestling Hundred, by virtue of the marriage of Richard, second son of Thomas Ashburnham of Ashburnham, to the daughter and heiress of Sir John Stoneleng, or Stonelink, of Broomham, who formerly held that estate. Richard's great grandson, Lawrence died seized of it in 1565 when it was held of Anthony, Viscount Montague as of his manor of Brede. It then passed to Lawrence's son, Adam, who was head of the younger branch of the Ashburnham family in 1580.

The Ashburnhams appear in the sixteenth century as an outstanding example of the survival of the more vigorous of the ancient armigerous families in a new and changing world. An indication of their importance is that members of this family sat as county M.P.'s on six different occasions between 1340 and the beginning of Elizabeth's reign.

Whether armigerous.

The family appears in all the various versions of the 1570 Visitation of Sussex. It is also found in the 1634 Visitation. There is a reference to the arms of this family as early as June, 1300.

2. V.C.H., Sussex,ix,127. Lady Catherine Ashburnham, the last of the family, died in 1953.
3. Ibid.
6. S.R.S.,III,44.
7. S.A.C.,xxx,191.
10. S.A.C.,vi,77. See also 84 et seqq.
(Ashburnham contd.)

(1) Ashburnham of Ashburnham.

Members of family.

Head of family in 1580.

John Ashburnham Esq., eld., son of John Ashburnham Esq., who
was buried 14 Dec., 1562,11 whose will pr., 1563,12 and who
had been J.P. Sussex, 1559 and 1560,13 - and of Isabel,
(Elizabeth ?14), d., of John Sackville of Buckhurst, she
dying 24 May, 1584.15

Born at Northiam, 17 May, 1545 and bap. there 18 May, 1545.16

January, 1581, mentioned in the certificate of recusancy
for the Archdeaconry of Lewes as an absentee from Church.
"He is not to be spoken withal but remaineth at London
where he hath continued since Michaelmas last of late
greatly distracted of his wits." In this certificate his
lands were valued at 200 marks yearly and his goods at
£200 yearly. (Other members of the family are also named
in this certificate as absentees from Church.)17

1581, he and 2 London merchants became indebted to one
Edward Catesby of Lambeth, Surrey, for £240 to be paid
before "the Feast of the Annunciation of Our Lady next
ensuing". Not being able to meet this debt, his lands
were valued or extended, including the manor of Ashburnham,
on behalf of Catesby. One, George Ognell, was duly installed
at Ashburnham on Catesby's behalf.18

October, 1582, Ashburnham's plea to Burghley to intervene19
and Ognell's plea to Burghley to resist him.20

1582, Star Chamber case between George Ognell and Thomas
Ashburnham, the debtor's brother and others who had attempted
forcibly to dispossess Ognell. In the course of this case,
it appeared that John Ashburnham's lands had already been
extended in respect of a debt of £350 to the Queen.21

Nov., 1583, still seriously in debt.22

11. S.A.C., xxxiii, 57.
15. S.A.C., xxxiii, 58.
18. P.R.O., St.Ch., 5 Eliz., D.8, 36.
19. H.M.C.Hatfield MSS., ii, 528.
21. P.R.O., St.Ch., 5 Eliz., D.8, 36.
22. B.M. Harl. M.S., 703, f.2 and f.12b.
20 June, 1585, his son, Walter, baptised in the Fleet Prison. 23

October, 1592, died. 14 October, buried at Ashburnham. 24

Apparently no will. I.P.M., 15 Sept., 1601. 25

Wife.

Mary, d. of George Vane of Baddesly, or Bordeshill, Kent. 26

She was mentioned in certificate of recusancy of January, 1581, when at Ashburnham, as absenting herself from Church. 27

She remarried Mr. George Wentworth of Yorkshire. 28

Children.

John Bap. in parish of Endebie at Bordeshill, Kent, 1571. 29

Aged 20 when his father died. 30 J.P., Sussex, 1597 to end of reign. Q. in 1599 and 1601. 31 1602-03 Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex. 32 1604, knighted. 33

Died 29 June, 1620 and buried at St. Andrew's, Holborn. M.I. 34

Thomas Bap. 16 July, 1573. 35

William Bap. 17 May, 1582, having been born the previous 27 April. 36

Walter Bap. 20 June, 1585 in the Fleet prison. Buried at Ashburnham, 3 July, 1585. 37

Katherine Born and baptised at Endebie, Bordeshill, Kent, 1570. 38

23. S.A.C., xxxiii, 55.
24. S.A.C., xxxiii, 57.
25. P.R.O., C.142/2/64/131.
26. S.A.C., xxxiii, 55; B & C., 185.
28. S.A.C., xxxiii, 55.
29. S.A.C., xxxiii, 55.
32. P.R.O. Sheriffs.
34. B & C., loc. cit.; & D.N.B. sub"John Ashburnham", his son.
35. S.A.C., xxxiii, 55.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid.
(Ashburnham contd.)

**Education.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
<th>Sons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marriages of children.**

John md. Eliza, d. of Sir Thomas Beaumont of Stoughton, co. Leics. She remarried Sir Thomas Richardson, L.C.J., and was created Baroness Cramond. Died in her 75th year and was buried at St. Andrew’s Holborn, 3 April, 1651.

William

Katherine md., 26 Jan., 1607, Mr. George (Admyst ?), gent.

**Subsidy assessments.**

(As of Ashburnham of Foxearle Hundred, Hastings Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Elizabeth</th>
<th>John Ashburnham Esq., in lands</th>
<th>£60.41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Ashburnham Esq., Mistress Ashburnham, widow. in lands</td>
<td>£30.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Elizabeth</td>
<td>Mistress Ashburnham, gent., in lands</td>
<td>£20.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Elizabeth</td>
<td>Mistress Ashburnham, widow of John Ashburnham Esq., in lands</td>
<td>£6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Ashburnham Esq. in lands</td>
<td>£20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. S.A.C., xxxiii, 54.
41. F.R.O., E.179/190/266.
42. " E.179/190/283.
43. " E.179/190/298.
44. " E.179/190/332.
(ii) Ashburnham of Broomham.

Members of family in 1580.

Head of family in 1580.

Adam Ashburnham Esq., son & heir of Lawrence Ashburnham Esq.,
who died 30 October, 1565 and of Eva or Joan, d. of
Richard Adams of Sussex, and widow of John Levett. 47

Escheator of Surrey & Sussex, 1587-88. 47

M.P. Winchelsea, 1593. 48

J.P. Sussex, Jan., 1595, but not in June. 49

5 June, 1596, died at East Peckham, Kent.

Wife.

Elizabeth, d. of Roger Twisden of Roydon Hall, East Peckham,
Kent. 52

Children.

Lawrence  Aged 14 at his father's death, 18 December, 1639.
Wrote to the Mayor, Jurats and Commonalty of Rye,
asking to be elected one of their burgesses to
Parliament. 53

John  Knighted at Titchfield, Hants., 12 Sept., 1625.
Sometime servant to the Queen of Bohemia. 54

Charles

Edward  1617, Vicar of Tonbridge, Kent; 1632, Rectgr of
Guestling; 1642, prebendary of Chichester. 55

45. Comber; (Lewes), 148. I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/145/16.
46. B & C., 28.
47. A.C.Wood; List of Escheators for England, 165.
50. B & C., loc.cit.
51. P.R.O., C.142/251/104; see also S.R.S.,xxxiii., 50-51.
52. B & C., loc.cit.
54. Al., Ox., 1, 34.
55. Ibid.
(Ashburnham contd.)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children.

Lawrence md. twice: (a) Bridget, eld. d. of Sir George Fleetwood of the Vache, Chalfont St. Giles, Bucks., (b) Sibbell, d. of George Goring of Danny, Sussex, Esq. There were children of both these marriages. 62

John
Charles
Edward

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hundred of Guestling, Hastings Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td>Thomas Ashburnham, gent. in lands</td>
<td>£863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Lawrence Ashburnham, gent.</td>
<td>£40.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Mistress Eve Ashburnham, widow</td>
<td>£26.13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>£26.10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Mr. Adam Ashburnham</td>
<td>£20.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. Al. Ox., 1, 34.
57. Gray's Inn Admissions, 104.
58. Al. Ox., loc. cit.
59. Gray's Inn Admissions, loc. cit.
60. Al. Ox., loc. cit.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid.
63. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
64. " E.179/190/266
65. " E.179/190/283.
66. P.R.O., E.179/190/298.
67. E.179/190/332.
The Barentynes were newcomers to Sussex in the sixteenth century and their connection with the county was of short duration. Drew Barentyne Esq., J.P. of Sussex, 1559 to 1560, was the son of Sir William Barentyne of Great Haseley, co. Oxon, by his third wife, Jane, daughter and coheiress of Sir Roger Lewkenor of Dedisham and Bodiam. However, shortly after Sir Roger's death in 1543, Dedisham passed into the hands of the Blount family, and Bodiam and the manor of Trotton in West Sussex later reverted to members of the Lewkenor family.

A question was raised as to the legality of the marriage between Sir William Barentyne and Jane Lewkenor, even though a child had by then already been born to them, since Jane had taken a vow of perpetual chastity after her first husband's death and Sir William Barentyne knew of this. An Inquisition was therefore held in obedience to a Royal Commission dated 26 Feb., 31 Henry VIII. Although the Court held the marriage to be void, this judgment was quashed in a clause of a Statute, 34 and 35 Henry VIII., cap. 46, and the claims of the heirs upheld. The whole affair may have been stirred up by the Poles, one of whom had been Jane's first husband, to fasten on to part of the great possessions of Sir Roger Lewkenor, father of Jane.

In the 1570 Visitation of Sussex; Coll of Arms MSS G.18; D.11; and the printed version edited by Sir Thomas Phillips. (see note 10.)

Members of family.

Head of family in 1580.
Drew Barentyne Esq., only son and heir of Sir William Barentyne of Great Haseley, co. Oxon and of Jane, d. and coh. of Sir Roger Lewkenor of Dedisham and Bodiam and widow of (a) Sir Arthur Pole, (b) Sir Charles Pickering.

Born c. 1539-40.

1. J. Comber: (Horsham), 18; (Lewes); 151.
2. See notes on Blount and Lewkenor families.
3. S.A.C., lxviii, 279.
5. S.A.C., lxviii, 279.
(Barentyne contd.)

Named in father's I.P.M. of October, 1550. 6
J.P. Sussex, 1559 and 1560. 7

1564, bishop's letter, - as "no justice", but a "miser of godly orders" 8

1560 Def. in fine for manor of Iden; 1565, for manor of Tremons; 1567 for manors of Brodhurst and Horsted Keynes. 9

In the 1570 Visitation as of Flompton, (sic), Sussex. 10

At the I.P.M. of Richard Michelborne, 3 Dec., 1585, late of Horsted Keynes, gent., Drew Barentyne said to be seized of manors of Horsted Keynes and Broderst, West Hoathly, East Grinstead and Fletching in Sussex, and "Lyngfelde" and "Cowdene" in the counties of Surrey & Kent. 11

Date of death unknown.

Wife.

Apparently unmarried. I.P.M. of Richard Michelborne, 1585, says that Drew Barentyne vested his manors there listed in himself for life with the remainder as to one half of the manors to Nicholas Lewkenor Esq. and as to the other half to Richard Michelborne and his heirs for ever. 13

Education.  

Universities. 

Inns of Court.

Adm. Lincoln's Inn,  
10 Feb., 1521. 14

Subsidy assessments.  

(As of Horsted or of Myddelham in the Hundred of Loxfeld, Pevensey Rape.)

2 Elizabeth Drew Barentyne in lands £25 15
14 Elizabeth " " Esq., " " 40 marks. 16

6. Comber, loc.cit; father's will pr.1549, P.C.O. 5 Goda.
9. S.R.S., xix, 238; xx, 443; xix, 225.
11. B.M. Stowe MS, 570, f. 104.
13. S.A.C., loc.cit.
14. Lincoln's Inn Admissions, 1, 40.
BARKELEY. (or 'Berkeley', sometimes 'Bartlett'.)

Origins.

Apparently Henry Barkley who was a J.P., Sussex, 1571-85, was a newcomer to the county. He is described by one authority as coming from Hereford, but it is also possible that he belonged to the Somersetshire family of that name.

His connection with Sussex seems to have begun shortly before his marriage when he became a M.P. for East Grinstead in 1571. On 27 August, 1572, he married, as her third husband, Anne, daughter of John Ashburnham who died in 1562, she having previously married first, John Bolney Esq. of Bolney, Sussex, and secondly, Thomas Culpepper of Wakehurst Esq., It was apparently through this marriage that Henry Barkley became connected with Bolney. Bolney manor was held by the Bolney family at least from the 13th century and remained in their hands until the mid 16th century. In 1558 John Bolney, husband of Anne, died, his heir being his nephew, also John Bolney. His own widow, however, Anne, who eventually married Henry Barkley, retained a claim on the manor during her life, though the nephew also had his rights during that time. After Anne's death in 1600, the manor was settled, in 1626, on the wife of William Culpepper, her grandson by her second marriage.

Whether armigerous.

Henry Barkley does not appear in any version of the 1570 Visitation. There is no mention of the name in the 1634 Visitation.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Mr. Henry Barkley. Origins uncertain.

(See under "Education" for his legal career.)

10 November, 1567, was constituted commissary of the 9 deaneries of the Arches, London, Shoreham and Croydon. 1571 M.P. East Grinstead. 10

1571-85, J.P., Sussex. 11 Frequently of the quorum.

1. Al.Ox., i, 113.
2. Middle Temple Admissions, 29. Probably a different person.
5. S.R.S., xl, 52; V.C.H., loc.cit.
7. Horsfield, i, 251.
10. See note 3.
Nov., 1575, Master in Chancery, until shortly before his death. In 18 Elizabeth, whilst he was sitting in the House of Lords, a debate arose about the privileges of certain officers. Without asking leave, Henry Barkeley rose and made a speech asking that the masters in chancery be comprised in the privilege. The Lords resented this. Next day, the queen's serjeant, the attorney and solicitor took their places about the masters in chancery which had never been done before.

Died May, 1587. Apparently no will or I.P.M.

Wife.

Anne, d. of John Ashburnham who died 1562. She had previously married first, John Bolney Esq., and secondly, Thomas Culpepper of Wakehurst.

Children.

Apparently none.

Education.

Universities.


Inns of Court.

Perhaps was he of that name adm. a student of the Middle Temple, Oct., 1565, as the son & h. of Sir Maurice Berkeley of Keynton, Somerset, knt. 18 Admitted as an advocate, 23 Oct., 1567. Nov., 1575, Master in Chancery. (V. supra.)

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Strete Hundred, Lewes Rape.)

18 Elizabeth Mr. Henry Bartlett (sic), in lands £30. 20 "doctor of the law".

15. Horsfield, i, 25; Comber, (Ardingly), 127.
16. Ath. Cant., ii, 14; Al. Ox., i, 113; but Al. Cant., Pt. 1, 1, 89, holds that the Cambridge scholar, given as "Henry Barley", is not the same as Henry Berkeley (sic) of New College, Oxford.
17. Al. Ox., loc. cit.
18. See note 2.
20. P.R.O., E.179/190/299.
BARTELLOT.

Origins.

According to one writer, "The Bartellots of Stopham are unquestionably among the most ancient families not of Sussex only, but of England. They have also been remarkably stationary both in place and condition." So ancient is this family that its early history merges almost imperceptibly into tradition and the margin between fact and legend has often been blurred. The popular belief that the family was of Norman origin and had been settled at Stopham since the Conquest is without any real foundation, and pedigrees which trace the family back to the eleventh century are suspect. However, there is clear evidence that the Bartellot family acquired some property at Stopham, in the fork of the rivers Arun and Rother, a few miles from Petworth, towards the close of the fourteenth century, from the Stopham family. They also acquired the manor of Stopham itself, by purchase, during the reign of Elizabeth. They therefore rank as Sussex gentry in the male line from at least the close of the fourteenth century.

The Bartellots had been prominent in public life for many generations before Elizabeth's accession and had frequently sat in the House of Commons, often representing Canterbury City.

From the sixteenth century to at least the late nineteenth century, the manor of Stopham descended without interruption in the Bartellot family.

In the sixteenth century there was a younger branch of the family settled at Ernley, near Wittering, sometimes known as the "Bartellots of Redlands". This branch was founded by Edmund Bartellot, brother of William Bartellot of Stopham, head of the senior branch of the family at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign.

1. S.A.C., xxvii, 37.
2. S.A.C., xxiv, 14 and 40; cf. S.A.C., lv, 20.
3. S.A.C., xxiv, 40-41.
4. S.A.C., lv, 20; xxvii, 56 et seqq. William Bartellot bought the chief lordship of Stopham from Lord Lumley sometime between 1555 and 1584. Lord Lumley may have acquired it from the Earl of Arundel, lord of Stopham. (Ibid., 57). The manor house itself had been in the hands of the Bartellots as mesne lords since the late 14th century and subsequently became their principal residence. (Ibid., 60 and S.A.C., vi, 87).
5. S.A.C., xxx, 191-2.
6. S.A.C., xxvii, 57.
Whether armigerous.

The Bartellots of Stopham and the Bartellots of Redlands both appear in the 1570 Visitations of Sussex according to the original MSS in the College of Arms and in Sir Thomas Phillips' version. The family does not appear in Richard Turpeyn, the Windsor Herald's version in the British Museum, but this is very incomplete. The family is also found in the College of Arms version of the 1634 Visitations of Sussex. John Bartellot, a follower of the Earl of Arundel at the time of the battle of Agincourt was then an armiger.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

William Bartellot, eld. son of Richard Bartellot who died at Tournay in 1514, and of Elizabeth, d. of John Gates. 1 April, 1525, he succeeded his uncle, John Bartellot of Stopham, Richard's elder brother, who left no children.

Between 1555 and 1584, became lord of the manor of Stopham by purchase. 1559-Jan., 1601, J.P. Sussex.


1586, certificate concerning the J.Ps., - "a man of great age and ever a great favourer of religion". A good justice. 11 June, 1601, died aged 97. 13 June, bur. at Stopham.


---

8. H.C., MS, G, 18 and D. 11; Phillips, 2.
10. H.C., MS, C, 27.
11. S.A.C., xv, 129.
12. S.A.C., xxiv, 52.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
16. Bishops' letters, 1564, (Camden Misc., ix, 9.)
17. S.A.C., 11, 59.
(Bartellot contd.)

Wife.

Ann, d. of William Covert and sister of Giles Covert of Hascombe, Surrey.

Children.


Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of son.

Robert md. twice, (a) Mary, d. of John Apaley of Thackham. She was bur. at Stopham, 15 Jan, 1576;
(b) Barbara, only d. of Thomas Ohley of Pulborough. There were children of both these marriages.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Stopham in Hundred of Rotherbridge, Arundel Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>William Bartellot</td>
<td>gent. in lands</td>
<td>£40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>William Bartellot</td>
<td>Esq.</td>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>William Bartellot</td>
<td>Esq.</td>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Walter Bartellot</td>
<td>Esq.</td>
<td>£7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Bartellot</td>
<td>gent in goods</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Ibid.
23. S.A.C., xxiv, 52.
25. E.179/190/233.
27. E.179/190/346.
BELLINGHAM

Origins.

The Bellinghams are referred to by one authority as an "old and somewhat distinguished family."¹ According to Berry, their pedigree goes back to one, Adam de Bellingham, a contemporary of William I;² some versions trace it back still further.³

The family seems to have been connected from a very early date with a place called Eringham in the parish of Old Shoreham which is in Fishersgate Hundred and Brember Rape. Eringham originally consisted of two manors, those of Eringham Walsted and of Eringham Braose, but later they coalesced. The origin of Eringham Walsted is unknown, and apparently it was "always" connected with the Bellinghams who, in the sixteenth century, acquired Eringham Braose also by purchase from Thomas Shirley in 1564. It remained with the purchaser's descendants for about a century when one, Thomas Bellingham, sold it.⁴

The various branches of the Bellingham family in Sussex in the sixteenth century were all descendants of Thomas Bellingham of Lyminster, near Arundel, who died in 1490. He had three sons, Ralph, Edward and Richard. There was a failure of male heirs in the senior line, the Bellinghams of Lyminster, Ralph's grandsons all dying without issue. The second son, Edward Bellingham of Eringham, had only one grandson, John, who was four years old in 1540 when his father, John, died. This grandson, John, was head of the family at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign but died at Bath on 6 November, 1576. It is, however, the descendants of Richard, the third son of Thomas Bellingham of Lyminster, who come within the scope of this survey, since it was Richard's son, Edward, who was on the Commission of the Peace for Sussex at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, and who became Sheriff in 1567.⁵

In the Elizabethan period, this, the youngest branch of the family, held property at Hangleton in Fishersgate Hundred and at Newtimber in Poynings Hundred, both in Lewes Rape.⁶

---

1. S.A.C., xxxiv, 169.
2. B & C., 190.
3. S.A.C., xxxiv, 170.
4. Elwes, 195.
5. Comber (Lewes), 7 et seqq.; Horsfield, ii, 143; Elwes, 145.
Whether armigerous.

This family does not appear in either MS G.18 or MS.D.11 in the College of Arms for the 1570 Visitation, or in Phillips' version. It does appear in the Windsor Herald's version. It is also found in the College of Arms MS, C.27, for the 1634 Visitation.

Members of Family.

Head of family in 1580.

Edward Bellingham Esq., of Hangleton and Newtimber, son of Richard Bellingham Esq., of the same who had been sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in 1528-9, 1534-5 and 1542-3, and whose will was pr., 1552-9 - also of Parnell, d. of John Cheyney of Cralle, Sussex.

1559-66, J.P. Sussex.

1564, bishop's letter, a "myslyker of religion and godly proceedings".

1567-68, sheriff of Sussex.

1572, M.P. for Lewes.

Will pr. 1590.

Wives.

1) Barbara, d. of Edward Banister of co. Hants.

2) Elizabeth, d. of John a'Wood. Living in 1599.

7. B.M.Add.MS,17,065,f.9b.
8. P.R.O. Sheriffs.
9. P.C.C.,x,All. Taske.
11. P.R.O., Assizes 35, S.E.Circuit,Sussex,1-8,
12. Bishops' letters, 1564. (Camden Misc.,ix,10).
Children.

By his first wife:

Edward Called "the elder" in his father's will. Probably buried at Newtimber, 7 Feb., 1608.
Mary Barbara Elizabeth
Mary Died before 9 Jan., 1589.
Barbara Elizabeth

By his second wife:

Henry Of Chichester. M.P. Chichester, 1627.
Edward Of Chichester. Bur. at St. Peter's the Great, 4 December, 1644.
George Bur. at Newtimber, 5 May, 1568.
George Of Chichester, gent. Bap. at Newtimber, 4 June, 1570. Will pr 1 Dec., 1638.
John Thomas Bap. at Newtimber, 28 Oct., 1576. 30 May, 1579 and bur. there the same day.
Elizabeth Bap. at Harting, 10 March, 1572, of Chichester. Died unmarried. Will pr. 1627.
Dorothy Bap. at Newtimber, 21 Nov., 1574. 5 Jan., 1578.
Anne

Education.

Universities.

Sons Edward, adm. Gray's Inn, Nov. 1584.

Inns of Court.

17. P.R.O. Assizes 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 33 & 34.
18. Comber, (Lewes), 12.
20. Ibid.
22. P.C.C., 121 Skynner.
24. Gray's Inn Admissions, 65, as son of "John Bellingham"
25. Al. Ox., i, 104; Comber (Lewes) 12.
(Bellingham contd.)

Marriages of children.

Of the first marriage:

Edward
Mary md. Thomas Fehner of Shoreham
Elizabeth md. John Gifford of Northall, Middx.

Of the second marriage:

Henry
Edward md. Mary - , d. of - Ward.
George
George
John
Thomas
Mary md. Agmondesham Muschamp
Elizabeth
Dorothy
Anne md. Robert Bold of Petersfield.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Fishersgate Hundred, Lewes Rape.)

38 Henry VIII Edward Bellingham in lands £25
2 Elizabeth " " Esq. " " £60

(As of Newtimber, Hundred of Pownings, (sic), Lewes Rape.)

5 Elizabeth Edward Bellingham Esq. in lands (Commissioner of Subsidy) £50
14 Elizabeth " " " " " " £25
18 Elizabeth " " " " " " £25

27. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
29. " E.179/190/274.
31. " E.179/190/299.
(Bellingham contd.)

(As of City of Chichester, West Street)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 Elizabeth</td>
<td>Edward Bellingham Esq. in lands</td>
<td>£25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(As of Pownings Hundred, Lewes Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Charles I</td>
<td>Sir Edward Bellingham in lands</td>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sons.

(As of Hove & Preston, Lewes Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Elizabeth</td>
<td>Richard Bellingham, gent. in lands</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(As of Fishersgate Hundred, Lewes Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Elizabeth</td>
<td>Richard Bellingham, gent. in lands</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(As of West Street, Chichester.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Charles I</td>
<td>Henry Bellingham, gent in goods</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Charles I</td>
<td>Edward Bellingham, gent in goods</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. P.R.O., E.179/258/11
34. See note 30.
35. See note 31.
36. See note 33.
37. Ibid.
BISHOP. (Bishop; Eyshopp; Bushopp etc.)

Origins.

This family came from Yorkshire. According to Barry, it was the grandfather of the Sussex Elizabethan of that name who came south, though this seems to be all that is known about him. Barry records neither his first name nor the name of his wife. He appears to have left three children, Thomas Bishop, later of Henfield, Sussex, John, who left a son of the same name mentioned in his uncle Thomas' will, and a daughter who married William Stapleton who became executor to his brother-in-law, Thomas Bishop.1

According to the published Visitations of Sussex for 1530 and 1634,2 this same Thomas Bishop, before settling at Henfield "was first (of) Ayott in com. Hertford". He was Attorney to 3 Bishop Sherborne of Chichester and was a J.P. of Sussex in 1559. He was buried in Henfield, 6 Jan., 1560.4

Whether armigerous.

The name does not appear in any version of the 1570 Visitation for Sussex. It does appear in the 1634 Visitation.5

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Thomas Bishop, only son of Thomas Bishop of Henfield, Sussex, J.P. Sussex in 1559, who was buried in Henfield, 6 Jan., 1560, and of Elizabeth, supposedly the natural daughter of Sir Edward Belknap, Privy Councillor to Henry VII, by one Elizabeth Barclay, and widow of Walter Scott of Stapleford Tany in Essex.6

A minor at his father's death, he became the ward of Sir Richard Sackville, the father of the future Lord Buckhurst.7 He was six years old at the time of his father's feodary survey, dated 18 April, 2 Elizabeth.8

5. H.C., MS. C.27.
8. Ibid.
(Bishopp contd.)

J.P. Sussex, 1578-1601. Frequently of the quorum. 1587 certificate concerning the J.P.'s, one of those described as "good justices, - young men". 10

Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex, 1584-5 and 1601-2. 11

M.P. Gatton, 1584: M.P. Steyning, 1586, 1604. 12

24 May, 1594, was said to have a recusant living with him at Henfield, 13 but had been a Commissioner for disarming the recusants c.1585. 14

c. 1597, bought Parham from the Palmer family. 15

1603, knighted. 16

1618, Deputy Lieutenant of Sussex. 17

1620, cr. a baronet. 18

1626, died. 19 Will. 20 I.P.R. 21

(It has been stated 22 that this Sir Thomas Bishopp was sometime Secretary of State under Sir Francis Walsingham. I have found no evidence for this. The same authority states that the manor of Pocklington, Yorks., was granted to him, but the grantee was evidently a different man, since he offered his services against Scotland in March, 1562, 23 when this Thomas Bishopp was eight years old).

He may have some profit by money-lending. 24

10. S.A.C., xi, 59.
11. P.R.O. Sheriff's
14. B.M.Harl. MS, 474, f.90b.
15. S.A.C., xxiii,164.
16. Shaw, ii,104.
17. S.A.C., lix,118. See also S.A.C., xi, 2 et seqq.
18. C.E.C: Complete Baronetage, I,156.
20. P.C.C., 14 Skyner.
22. S.A.C., xxx,1.
23. Cal.S.P.D.,1547-80, 197. See also 199,200,360,368.
(Bishopp contd.)

25

Wives.

1) Ann, d. of William Cromer of Tunstall, Kent.
2) Jane, d. of Sir Richard Weston of Sutton, Surrey.

26

Children.

By his second wife:

Thomas Died unmarried, and v.p.

Edward Eventually Sir Edward Bishopp of Parham, knt.
and bart. M.P. Steyning 1626, Bramber, 1640.
Sheriff of Sussex in 1635. Governor of Arundel
Castle, 1643. Died, 1649.

Henry Unmarried in 1634.

Elizabeth

Frances

Education.

Universities.

Father Matric. pens. from St.
John's Colleg, Camb.,
Michs., 1562.

Sons Edward matric. Trinity
Coll., Oxford, 22 Oct.,
1619, aged 18.

Inns of Court.

Adm. Inner Temple,
Nov., 1573.

Edward adm. Inner
Temple, 1620.

Marriages of children.

31

Thomas

Edward md. Lady Mary, 4th d. of Nicholas Tufton, Earl of
Thanet. She died, 1663.

Henry Unmd. in 1634.

Elizabeth md. Sir John Gresham of Titsey, Surrey. Buried at
Titsey, 10 June, 1664, aged 74.

Frances md. John Alford Esq., of Offington, Sussex.

28. Ibid. for Edward, see also Al. Ox., i, 129.
27. Al. Cant., i, 159.
28. Inner Temple Admissions, 73.
29. Al. Ox., i, 129.
30. Inner Temple Admissions, 228.
Subsidy assessments.

(As of Henfield, Tympne Hundred, Bramber Rape.)

38 Henry VIII Thomas Bishopp, gent. in lands £26.13.4.
32
2 Elizabeth Elizabeth Bishopp, widow " " £20.33
18 Elizabeth Thomas Bishopp, gent. " " £30.34

(As of Parham and Greatham, West Easewryth Hundred, Arundel Rape.)

1-2 Charles I Sir Thomas Bishopp, knt. and bart., in lands £30.

(Commissioner of Subsidy)

32. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
33. E.179/190/258.
34. E.179/190/297.
35. E.179/191/377a.
Origins.

The Blounts of Elizabethan Sussex were a younger branch of an ancient and distinguished family, the Blounts, Barons Mountjoy. They were descended from Richard Blount of Iver, Bucks., who died in 1508 and who was a younger son of Walter Blount, K.G., first Baron Mountjoy. This Richard Blount's son and heir was Sir Richard Blount who became Lieutenant of the Tower and died in 1564 and was buried in a chapel in the Tower. By his wife, Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Richard Lisher, L.C.J., he had two sons and two daughters, his heir, Sir Michael Blount of Mapledurham, co. Oxon., becoming Lieutenant of the Tower after him and founding the line of the Oxfordshire Blounts. The second son, Richard, succeeded to the manor of Dedisham, Sussex.

Dedisham is the chief manor in the parish of Slinfold and is situated partly in Slinfold and partly in Rudgwick. In the early sixteenth century it was in the hands of the Lewkenors, Sir Roger Lewkenor dying seised of it in 1543 and leaving four daughters as coheirnesses. Shortly afterwards it seems to have been in the hands of the Crown since Edward VI granted it in July, 1551, to Sir Richard Blount, Lieutenant of the Tower, father of Richard Blount of Dedisham. The manor remained in the hands of the Blounts until the sister of one Katherine Blount, sold it to the Onslow family in about 1630.

Thus, while of noble and ancient origin, this branch were of only short standing in Sussex, nor did they remain in the county much above two generations since there was, early in the seventeenth century a failure of male heirs. Even before the death of the second Richard Blount of Dedisham on the 30 April, 1628, and possibly before the death of his son and heir, William, between 1623 and 1637, Lodge Farm, part of the family inheritance, was sold in 1623.

1. B & C., 285; B. Burke; Landed Gentry, (1855), 105.
2. Comber, (Horsham), 21.
3. S.A.C., xl, 48-49.
4. See notes on the Lewkenor family.
6. S.A.C., xl, 49; Elwes, 204.
7. Comber, loc.cit.
10. Ibid.
(Blount contd.)

Whether armigerous.

This family does not appear in any version of the Visitation for Sussex for 1570, neither does it in the College of Arms version for 1634.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Richard Blount of Dedisham, Sussex, younger son of Sir Richard Blount, Lieutenant of the Tower, of Mapledurham, co. Oxon., who died 9 August, 1564 and was buried in the chapel of St. Peter in Vinculis in the Tower, and of Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Richard Lister, L.C.J.

Mentioned in father's will, dt. 1560 by which he was bequeathed "my manor and lordship of Dedisham and the park to the same belonging in the county of Sussex".

J.P. Sussex, 1585-1602. Q.1594 onwards.

1587, certificate concerning the Sussex J.P's, a "good justice".

Named in mother's will, dt. 1581. She left him the lease and interest in the Rectory and parsonage of Climping and its appurtenances in Sussex, Sonning mill, Berks. and all money, cattle, plate, household stuff, goods and chattels not already bequeathed in the same will. He was appointed sole executor.

1602, plaintiff in fine for land in West Grinstea.

Date of death unknown, but perhaps between 1602 and date of brother Michael's will, pr.1610, in which he is not mentioned. No will or I.P.M. and no D.I. at Slinfold.

Wife.

Unknown.

12. Ibid; her will pr.1562, P.C.C., 26 Tirwhite.
15. S.A.C.,11,59.
16. See note 12.
17. S.R.S.,xx, 475.
18. P.C.C.,76 Wingfield.
19. Visitation of Shropshire,1623, Pt.1, (Harl.Soc.Pubns.,xxviii, 56) gives her as Elizabeth, d. of Lord De la Warr, and also states that Richard Blount her husband was knighted. There is no confirmation of these points by other authorities.
(Blount contd.)

Children.

Richard Of Dedisham. Sold Lodge Farm, 1623.
Died, 30 April, 1628. I.P.M. 21

Education.

Father

Universities.

Son

Inns of Court.

Marriages of children.

Richard

md. Mary, d. of William West, Baron De la Warr, and of Elizabeth, d. of Thomas Strange of Chesterton, co. Gloucs. She died in 1630. They had two sons and six daughters. 22

Subsidy assessments.

(As of West Easewrith Hundred, Arundel Rape.) 23

1-2 Charles I Blount Esq. in lands £15

BOYNER (of Cuckfield)

Origins.

The connection between this family and the Bowyers of Petworth and of North Mundham does not appear to have been satisfactorily established in spite of the assertions of some authorities, by whom they are said to descend from John Bowyer, the third son of William Bowyer of Petworth whose will was proved in 1528.

It is true that the pedigree of the Bowyers of North Mundham drawn up at the time of the 1570 Visitation shows one, John Bowyer, as William Bowyer of Petworth's third son, but it is not certain that he was the same John Bowyer who founded the Cuckfield family. The evidence of the heralds' Visitations seems to contradict the assumption since they give, as the wife of John Bowyer, the third son of William, one Margaret, daughter of John Dingley of Winchelsea. They are shown, by the same authorities, to have had one son, William, and three daughters, Farnell, Alice and Rose. Yet, the John Bowyer from whom the Cuckfield Bowyers descended left a wife, Dionysia or Dennys, by whom he had eight sons, and one daughter, Ann. In his will, this John Bowyer described himself as a yeoman.

So that although Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield described Thomas Bowyer of Leythorne whom he made an overseer to his will, as "cousin", the term had probably no exact meaning and is not sufficient evidence of any close kinship. Possibly there was some connection between the Bowyers of North Mundham and of Chichester on the one hand, and those of Cuckfield on the other, but if so, it does not appear to have been traced.

The pedigree of the Bowyers of Cuckfield has therefore been taken no further back than John Bowyer of Hartfield, Sussex, yeoman, who died in September, 1536, who was the father of the first Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield Esq., head of the family in 1580, and grandfather of Henry Bowyer, the J.P. of 1593 onwards.

It is not clear whether John Bowyer of Hartfield was the successful ironmaster referred to by Cooper in his "History of the Parish of Cuckfield", since he is there described as not

3. Ibid., Harl. Soc. Pubns., lxxvi, 62. Here Margaret is given as the daughter of John Barkley of Winchelsea.
4. See his will, P.C.C. 13 Coode; and B & C., 363.
5. Cooper, op.cit., 77; See also S.A.C., xlii, 36.
only the father of Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield but also the third son of William Bowyer of Petworth who seems to be a different person. Since, however, the first Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield had interests in the Sussex iron industry, it seems likely that his father was the ironmaster referred to, particularly as this would help to explain the rise of this family to prosperity. 6

Whether armigerous.

This family does not appear in any version of the 1570 Visitation. 7

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield Esq., third son of John Bowyer of Hartfield, Sussex, "Yeoman", who died, 29 Sept., 1536, 3 and of Dionysia or Dennys. 9

Mentioned in father's will. Executor to his eld. brother, William whose will pr. 11 Feb. 1579. 10

1565. Acquired the lease of Bentley Park in Cuckfield from Lord Abergavenny. 11

1575 Bought one fourth part of Cuckfield manor belonging to Henry, Earl of Derby, 12 and subsequently built Cuckfield Place as his residence. 13

He increased his property after settling at Cuckfield, buying land both there and in Crawley. 14

6. There is no mention of his forges in John Bowyer's will, P.C.C., 13 Coode.
7. To confirm the distinction made here between John Bowyer of Cuckfield and John Bowyer, 3rd son of William Bowyer of Petworth, see H.C., MS G.18,f.112b, and MS D.11,f.74. See also B & C., 134 and 363.
10. P.C.C., 10 Bakon.
11. V.C.H., Sussex, vii,157; Cooper, 77.
14. Cooper, 78; S.R.S.,xx,498; S.A.C.,xlii, 36 et seqq.
(Bowyer of Cuckfield contd.)

C. 1574, he owned at least one forge and two iron furnaces and managed another forge in Ashdown forest. His forges and furnaces are mentioned in his will and I.P.M.

1579-1581, took part in a prolonged feud with Edmund Curtis, Vicar of Cuckfield and brother of the Bishop of Chichester. In this, many of the local gentry sided against Henry Bowyer.


Wife.

Elizabeth, d. and h. of Thomas Vaux of Caterham, Surrey, Clerk Comptroller of the Household to Henry VIII. Mentioned in her husband's will. Buried at Cuckfield, 22 Dec., 1601.

Children.

Thomas Died v.p. Mentioned in father's will.
Francis
Henry Later Sir Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield, knight.
Youngest but only surviving son at father's death. J.P. Sussex, 1593-1595, and June, 1602. Q, 1594.
1601, M.P. Bramber. 1603, knighted.
Will dr. 21 May, 1606, pr. 24 Jan., 1607.

Anne
Mary

15. See Appendix 29.
17. P.R.O., C. 142/225/60.
18. P.C.C., 74 Leicester.
19. B & C., loc. cit; and Visitation of Sussex, 1662 (Harl.Soc. Pubns., lxxxix, 60.)
20. S.A.C., xlii, 44; B & C., loc. cit.
26. P.C.C., 2 Huddlestone.
(Bowyer of Cuckfield contd.)

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Henry, matric. fell. com. from Clare College, Camb., Michs., 1576. 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sons</td>
<td>Henry, adm. Middle Temple, Jan., 1579. 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inns of Court.

Marriages of children.

Thomas
Francis
Henry

md. Dorothy, d. of George Goring of Lewes, Sussex.
She re-married at Cuckfield, 17 March, 1607, Sir John Shurley, knt., of Isfield. 29

Anne
md. Thomas Hendley of Cranbrook, Kent, Esq. Mentioned in brother's I.P.M. 30

Mary

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Cuckfield, Lewes Rape.)

| 5 Elizabeth | Henry Bowyer in goods | £10. |
| 14 Elizabeth | " gent. " | £10. |

27. Al.Cant., Pt.1, i, 194.
28. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 43.
29. B & C., loc. cit; see also notes on Shurley family.
31. P.R.O., E.179/190/274.
32. " E.179/190/283.
The Bowyers, described by one authority as "a well-to-do family of some prominence in Sussex local history," came originally from Staffordshire. One, Thomas Bowyer, came to Sussex to settle in about 1410. His son, Richard, resided at Petworth and had a son, William, who was steward to the Earls of Northumberland.

William's eldest son, Thomas, who died on 13 Sept., 1558, became a leading London merchant and founded the family of Bowyer of Leythorne in the parish of North Mundham, near Chichester. It was his eldest surviving son and heir, also Thomas, the lawyer, who was a J.P. from 1593 to his death in March, 1595, and it is therefore this branch of the family which is reviewed in this study.

Another prominent branch of the family descended from William's second son, Robert Bowyer of Chichester, who died in 1552 having been twice Mayor of that city. Among his sons were Francis, Alderman of London, and Sheriff of London in 1577, from whom the Bowyers of Buckinghamshire descended, and William, Keeper of the Records in the Tower of London from June, 1567, and father of the celebrated Robert Bowyer who became Clerk of the House of Lords in 1610, and who was the author of a valuable Parliamentary Diary. Although Robert Bowyer, the future diarist, was a friend of Lord Buckhurst and from 1599 on, his secretary, and was M.P. for Steyning in 1601, this branch of the family does not come within the scope of this survey since none of its members was a Deputy Lieutenant, county M.P., sheriff or J.P. for Sussex during Elizabeth's reign.

The Bowyers of Cuckfield are derived by some authorities from John Bowyer, third son of William Bowyer of Petworth whose will was proved in 1528, and younger brother of Thomas Bowyer,

2. B & G., 154; W. V. Cooper: History of the parish of Cuckfield, 76 et seq.
3. Cooper, loc. cit.; will pr., 1528, P.C.C. 32 Porch.
4. Cooper, loc. cit.; Horsfield, ii., 46.
6. Ibid.; S.A.C., xli., 32 and Table B.
7. B.M. Sloane MS., 541, f. 2.
8. Willson, p. xi.
citizen and merchant of London who died in 1558, and of
Robert Bowyer of Chichester who died in 1552. However,
this relationship is by no means certain. 10

The founder of the North Mundham line, Thomas Bowyer,
citizen and grocer of London, who made and lost a fortune in
his business, had strong Puritan leanings. 11 In 1540, he
was granted the manor and rectory of Runcton or Roughton and
the manor of North Mundham where he was buried 19 Sept.,
1558. 12 Before the Dissolution, Runcton had belonged to the
priory of Bruton, Somerset, hence the reference to it in the
family bible as "in tymes past in the possession of the
nouryshers of superstition and ignorance." 12a The North
Mundham property had been in Lord De la Warr's possession but
was taken from him by the Crown in exchange for lands formerly
the property of Wherwell Nunnery, Hampshire. 13 The Bowyers of
North Mundham therefore profited indirectly from the Dissolution,
though Thomas Bowyer, despite his loses, paid as much as
£650.16s. for the Runcton property. 14

Whether armigerous.

In the 1570 Visitation according to the College of Arms
MSS, G.18 and D.11 and to Sir Thomas Phillips' version.
According to H.C. MS D.11, Thomas Bowyer of Sussex was granted
a coat of arms in 1536.

In the 1634 Visitation according to the College of Arms
MS G.27.

Members of family.

Head of family in 1580.

Thomas Bowyer Esq., of Leythorne in North Mundham, s. and h.
of Thomas Bowyer, citizen and grocer of London and subsequently
of North Mundham, Sussex, who died 13 Sept., 1558, 15 and of
Jane, d. and h. of Robert Merry, and niece of William Merry,
grocer of London. She died 3 August, 1579. 16

10. See notes on the Bowyers of Cuckfield.
11. S.A.C., lxiv,105; and xlii,19.
12. Ibid; I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/121/160.
12a. Horsham,11,46; S.A.C., lxiv,105.
13. Ibid; Elwes,154-5. Leythorne had previously been the
occasional residence of Bishop Sherborne of Chichester.
V.C.H.,Sussex, iv,161,163.
14. S.A.C., loc.cit.
15. E & C., loc.cit.; I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/121/160.
(Bowyer of North Mundham contd.)

At his father's wish, took up the legal profession, "grocery" being too hazardous. 17

(For his legal career, see below, 'Education')

1558, succeeded his father at the age of 21. 18

1583, described as a person suitable for a J.P., being "religious and wise". 19

1586, gave advice in the Chichester election dispute.

1587, mentioned in certificate concerning Sussex J.P.'s as "a lawyer" and "great favorer of religion and the commonwealth". He is not mentioned as a J.P. in any other source until 1593.

1593 - Jan., 1595, J.P. Sussex. Q., 1594. 22

7 March, 1595, died. I.P.M., 9 Apr., 1595. Will dt. 4 Aug.

1590, pr. - 1595 and 8 July, 1602. 22

(For his long dispute with John Caryll of Warnham in the Star Chamber over the boundaries of some marshland, near North Mundham, see reference on p.172)

Wives.

1) Magdalen, d. of Bartholomew Traheron. No children.

2) Jane, d. of John Birch, Baron of the Exchequer.

Children.

By his second wife:

Later Sir Thomas Bowyer of Laythorne, Sussex.

Aged 8 at his father's death. 27 Created a baronet, 23 July, 1627. Re-built and enlarged

17. S.A.C., loc.cit.
18. See father's I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/121/160.
21. S.A.C., ii, 60.
22. P.R.O., Assizes 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 35-37; Dorse Pat.
23. P.R.O., C.142/244/105.
24. P.C.C., 30, Scott.
25. B & C., 134. See also Horsfield, ii, 46; Elwes, 155.
26. Ibid.
27. See father's I.P.M.

John Born and died, 1591, at North Mundham.

Jane Bap. at Mundham, 8 Nov., 1588.

Anne Died, 1661.

Education.

Universities.

Father

-  

Inns of Court.


Sons

Thomas md. three times: (a) Ann, d. and coheiress of Adrian Stoughton of Stoke, Sussex. Issue (b) Jane, d. and h. of Emery Cranley of Surrey and relict of Samuel Austen of Shalford and of Sir George Stoughton. No issue. (c) Anne -- Issue.

John

Jane md. at North Mundham, 8 Dec. 1608, Richard Bellingham, gent.

Anne

Subsidy assessments.

(As of North Mundham, Hundred of Box and Stockbridge, Chichester Rape.)

| 14 Elizabeth | Thomas Bowyer, gent in goods | £10 |
| 39-42 Elizabeth | Thomas Bowyer, Esq. in lands | £20 |
| ? Elizabeth | Joan Bowyer, widow in lands | £8 |
| 1-2 Charles I | Thomas Bowyer Esq. in lands | £20 |

(Coimissioner of Subsidy).

29. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 23.
30. Ibid., 85; See also P.R.O., St. Ch. 5 Eliz. S. 5/7.
32. P.R.O., E.179/190/283.
33. P.R.O., E.179/190/333.
34. P.R.O., E.179/190/327.
BROWNE, Viscount Montague.

Origins.

Sir Anthony Browne of Cowdray in Midhurst who was raised to the peerage in 1554 as Viscount Montague, came of a younger branch of the Brownes of Bechworth (or Beechworth) Castle in Surrey. His grandfather, also Sir Anthony Browne, was a younger son of Sir Thomas Browne of Bechworth Castle, who was Treasurer of the Household to Henry VI and twice sheriff of Kent, in 22 and 38 Henry VI, and of Eleanor, daughter and sole heiress of Sir Thomas Fitzalan of Bechworth Castle, and niece of John Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel.

Although a younger son, this first Sir Anthony achieved considerable success under the first of the Tudors, being appointed Standard Bearer of England in 1485, Esquire of the Body and Governor of Queenborough Castle, Kent subsequently, and Constable of the Castle of Calais in 1503, three years before he died. An important contribution of his to the fortune of the family he founded was his marriage to Lucy, daughter and coheiress of John Neville, Marquis of Montague who was brother of Warwick the Kingmaker and who died with him at Barnet in 1471. This Lucy had previously married Sir Thomas Fitzwilliam of Aldwark, co. York, by whom she had a son, later Sir William Fitzwilliam, K.G., and eventually Earl of Southampton, who, in 1528, bought the greater part of the Cowdray property from Sir David Owen, himself a recent purchaser. In October, 1542, the Earl of Southampton died without issue, having bequeathed his Cowdray estates to his younger half-brother, the second Sir Anthony Browne, only son of the first Sir Anthony who died in 1506, by Lucy, the Earl's mother, and father of the first Viscount Montague.

The Fitzwilliam inheritance, however, was not the first link in the long chain of Sussex estates accumulated by the Browne family. Even before the death of his half-brother brought him Cowdray and other lands in that county, the second Sir Anthony Browne had begun to gather in substantial tokens of Henry VIII's personal affection for him in the shape of former monastic property. He was created Esquire of the Body to the King in 1524, and an intimate friendship sprang up between them whose progress was marked by successive appointments of Sir Anthony to posts of honour and

responsibility. In 1528 and 1533 he was sent on embassies to France, in 1539 was appointed Master of the Horse, in 1540 created a K.G., and in 1547 Standard Bearer of England, a post once held by his father. In the more personal and intimate affairs of the king, Sir Anthony was also a man of influence. It has been stated that he was even sent to the court of the Duke of Cleves in 1540 to act as proxy for Henry VIII in his marriage with Anne of Cleves, but the story appears to be without foundation. He is said to have advised the king in 1541 about Queen Katherine Howard when her conduct came in question, and in the king's last illness it was he who undertook to tell him of his approaching end. The continuation of the king's confidence in him to the end of his reign is shown by his appointment of Sir Anthony as one of the 15 executors of his will, by which he also bequeathed him £300. In addition, Sir Anthony was appointed a guardian to the young Prince Edward and of the Princess Elizabeth, and it was he who carried the news of his accession to the new king at Hertford and who, as Master of the Horse, rode into London beside him.

Such a friendship brought its material rewards. The most notable of Henry VIII's many grants of ecclesiastical property to his favoured servant was that of the site and house of Battle Abbey on 15 August, 30 Henry VIII. Sir Anthony took up residence in the abbot's former lodging and razed the Church, chapter house and cloisters to the ground. Other royal grants included the site and rights of the royal free chapel within the walls of Hastings Castle; the manor of Brede which included a considerable part of the town of Hastings and which had pertained to the monastic house at Syon; the manors of Godstow and Send in Sussex; the site of the Priory of St. Mary Overy in Southwark on which Sir Anthony built what was to be for generations the London residence of his descendants; the manor of Waldron, or

2. B. & C., loc. cit.; D.N.B.
4. S.A.C., lxvi, 205.
5. S.A.C., xlii, 228.
6. D.N.B.
7. B. & C., 354.
9. S.A.C., 11, 166; xiii, 140-11; and 151-12.
10. S.A.C., 11, 167; D.N.B.
11. D.N.B.
(Browne, Viscount Montague continued)

13. the manor of Chinting and other lands of Michaelham Priory in the neighbourhood; and the manor of Saddlescombe. Not all of these properties were handed down to Sir Anthony's heir; some were sold, others exchanged, but Battle Abbey was kept and prized above all as the symbol of a king's favour. When, on 6 May, 1548, Sir Anthony died at the house he had built at Byfleet in Surrey, his body was removed and buried with great pomp at Battle under an altar tomb which he had begun to prepare and which was completed by his son and heir, also Sir Anthony Browne, later first Viscount Montague. 

In addition to the ecclesiastical properties which came to Sir Anthony by direct grant, there were others which came to him indirectly through his half-brother, Sir William Fitzwilliam, Earl of Southampton, to whom they had been granted at the time of the Dissolution. Among these, to mention only religious houses, were the priories of Shulbred and Easebourne in Sussex, and the Abbeys of Durford in Sussex and Chertsey and Waverley in Surrey. Moreover, the harvest was by no means wholly gathered in even at Henry VIII's death. According to the "Monasticon", Elizabeth granted Bayham Abbey to Sir Anthony's son and heir, the first Viscount Montague, and as late as the year 1607, certain lands of the alien priory of Calceto near Arundel, originally seized by Wolsey to help to endow his new college at Oxford but after his fall appropriated by the Crown, were granted to the second Viscount Montague.

The Brownes were a family remarkable for their apparent ability to reconcile loyalties which many others found incompatible. Both Sir Anthony who died in 1548 and his son who became the first Viscount Montague, were apparently strong Catholics. It is in the situation of the first Viscount, more than in that of any other prominent figure of Elizabethan Sussex, that the dilemma of the Catholic man of property appears; his worldly position was founded on

13. S.A.C., xiii, 91.
14. S.A.C., xvii, 163.
15. S.A.C., lxvi, 190-1.
16. D.N.B.
17. S.A.C., vi, 54-6; xlii, 229-31.
18. S.A.C., lxxv, 39.
19. S.A.C., ix, 181.
20. S.A.C., xi, 95.
the ruins of monastic wealth and on the favour of an indulgent secular ruler; his faith bound him to Rome. Yet, in spite of the paradoxes of his position, this enigma was honoured by the royal visits of Edward VI in 1552 and of Queen Elizabeth in 1591 to Cowdray, and was raised to the peerage in 1554 by Mary. He remained almost uninterruptedly on excellent terms with all three rulers. But when disaster overtook the family towards the close of the eighteenth century, rumour had it among simple folk that this was the fulfilment of a long-standing curse on a line of notorious appropriators of Church property.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Anthony Browne of Cowdray, later 1st Viscount Montague, eld. s. and h. of Sir Anthony Browne of Cowdray who died 6 May, 1548, by his first wife, Alice, d. of Sir John Gage, K.G., Constable of the Tower.

M.P. Guildford, 1547; Petersfield, 1553, Surrey, 25. 1547, knighted at the Coronation of Edward VI, 26. 1548, succeeded his father at the age of 27. 1552, entertained Edward VI at Cowdray, 28. Nov. 1552, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex. 1554, Master of the Horse and Steward of Hampton Court. 30. Sept., cr. Viscount Montague at the time of the Queen's marriage. 31. Sent on an embassy to Rome.

1555, K.G. and Privy Councillor. 1557, Lieutenant General of the English forces at St. Quentin. 32. 1558, Lord Lieutenant of Sussex. One of the executors of Queen Mary and chief mourner at her funeral. 33. On the accession of Queen Elizabeth, lost his seat on the Privy Council. 34.

---

1559, one of the only two peers to oppose the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity in the House of Lords.  
1560, special embassy to Madrid.  
1562, speech in the House of Lords against the oath of Supremacy.  
1565, mission to Flanders.  
1569, joint Lord Lieutenant for Sussex.  
June, 1569, Commissioner for Musters for Sussex; June, 1573, Chief Commissioner; 1579, joint Commissioner for Surrey & Sussex.  
1571-2, implicated in plot for marrying the Duke of Norfolk to Mary, Queen of Scots.  
1577, Queen planned to visit him, perhaps at Battle Abbey, but this was prevented by the plague.  
1584, intervened in the county election for Sussex on behalf of Robert Sackville and Sir Thomas Shirley.  
1586, on the commission for the trial of Mary, Queen of Scots.  
1588, took an active part in the preparations for repelling the Armada.  
August, 1591, entertained the Queen sumptuously at Cowdray for six days.  
19 October, 1592, died at Horsley, Surrey. Buried in chapel at Midhurst, 6 Dec., 1592. His tomb was subsequently removed to Easebourne Church, close to the entrance of Cowdray Park.

Note: He had been a J.P. for Sussex, 1559 - 1592, and was usually of the quorum. C. 1585, Commission for the restraint of grain.
(Browne, Viscount Montague continued.)

Wives.

1) Jane, d. of Robert Radcliffe, Earl of Sussex. She died at Cowdray, 22 July, 1552, aged 20, and was buried, Aug., in the chapel at Midhurst. 49.


Children. 51.

By his first wife:

Mary Died 1607.

By his second wife:

George Knighted by the Queen in 1591 at her visit to Cowdray. 52. Ancestor of the Brownes of Wickham.
Anthony Later Sir Anthony Browne of Effingham, d.s.p.
Thomas
Philip D.v.p.
Elizabeth Died, 1631.
Mabel D.v.p.
Jane

45. B. & C., loc. cit., D.N.B.; S.A.C. v, 185 & 189; xlii, 229; lxxv, 179
46. P.C.C., 22 Nevell.
47. P.R.O. C. 142/235/110.
49. B. & C., loc. cit.
50. P.C.C. 28 Windibank, Sent. 72 Dorset.
51. B. & C., 354 et seq.
52. S.A.C., v, 185.
(Browne, Viscount Montague continued.)

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Perhaps the Anthony Browne, adm. Gray's Inn, 1537.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>George, adm. Inner Temple, Nov., 1586.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Henry, adm. Gray's Inn, 13 August, 1588.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William, matric. entry Balliol College, Oxford 2 May, 1581, aged 17.</td>
<td>William, perhaps a student of the Inner Temple, as of Chichester, Sussex and late of Clifford's Inn, gent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William, adm. Gray's Inn, 1585.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marriages of children:

**Of the first marriage:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anthony</th>
<th>md. Mary, d. of Sir William Dormer of Wing, Bucks. She re-married twice. They had 3 sons &amp; 3 daughters. The eld. s., Anthony-Maria Browne, born 1 Feb. 1574, was heir to his grandfather in 1592 and came of age in 1595.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>md three times: (a) Sir Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, (b) Sir Thomas Heneage, knt., Vice-chamberlain to Queen Elizabeth, (c) Sir William Harvey, later Lord Harvey who died, 1642.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Of the second marriage:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>George</th>
<th>? (Had children - v. supra)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>? (&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Died unmd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>md. Robert, Lord Dormer of Wing, Bucks., who died in 1616.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabel</td>
<td>md. Sir Francis Lacon of Willey, Salop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. Inner Temple Admissions, 117.
55. Gray's Inn Admissions, 73.
56. Al. Ox, i, 198.
57. Inner Temple Admissions, 121.
58. B. & C., loc. cit
59. S.A.C. liv, 125. See also v, 187 & vii, 173-212.
CARYLL. (or Carrell).

Origins.

There are considerable discrepancies among the authorities as to the antecedents of this family.

Berry and Comber go no further back than one, Caryll, whose christian name, the name of whose wife and other details about whom are unknown, but who was the father of John Caryll, serjeant-at-law to Henry VIII who died in 1523 and of Thomas Caryll of Ochecote, Northants. 1.

According to another authority, the family apparently came from London and settled in Sussex early in the sixteenth century, at first in Warnham and later at Harting and Shipley. 2.

M. Trenqualéon traces the family back to one, Nicholas Caryll, who resided at Benton, near West Grinstead in the mid 15th century, the first ancestor of his family on English soil and of gentle birth, Trenqualéon says he was probably of the family of O'Carrroll of Ireland who had been great magnates with much influence there for centuries, and gives him as having married in about 1420 a wife whose name is unknown, and leaving as his son and heir, John Caryll, who was in turn father of John Caryll, the serjeant-at-law under Henry VII and Henry VIII, who died in 1523. 3.

2. S.A.C., xxxiii, 170.
Trenquélon's version of a connection with the county from the early 15th century seems more plausible than that which gives them as newcomers from London in the early 16th century. Further it is based on family papers.\(^4\) At least it is clear that the Carylls were associated with Sussex before their purchase of property in Warnham, near Horsham in August, 1513,\(^5\) and there is no definite evidence of their previous residence in London.

From John Caryll who died in 1523 onwards, the descent of the Carylls is less obscure. He was succeeded by John, the elder of his two sons by his second wife, who was to follow his father into the legal profession and to emulate his success there. This John Caryll of Warnham Esq., who was not yet 22 years old on the 25 June, 1523,\(^6\) rose to the status of serjeant-at-law on the 17 October, 1552, and in the same year became both a Bencher of the Inner Temple and the Treasurer of that society. He was also sometime Attorney of the Duchy of Lancaster and Steward of the Barony of Bramber. At Elizabeth's accession, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton recommended him as a candidate for the Lord Chancellorship.\(^7\)

Despite M. Trenquélon's glosses, this John Caryll seems to have been somewhat inconsistent from the religious standpoint. His apparent success in reconciling loyalty to Rome with any necessary subservience to the Royal Supremacy seems to have set a pattern which his son, Sir Edward Caryll of Harting, was to follow with remarkable success under Elizabeth. In January, 1539, John Caryll was nominated Attorney of the Court of First Fruits and Tenths, and in 1549

---

4. Trenquélon, \textit{op.cit.}, Preface, p.ix. But he does not accept responsibility for the genealogy he uses. Where this diverges from that of B.\&C. which is supported by references to wills, l.P.M's etc., the latter has been followed.

5. For this date, see B. \& C., \textit{loc.cit.} See also \textbf{S.A.C.} lxxii 262, and \textbf{S.R.S.} xxiii,111.

6. B. \& C., \textit{loc.cit.;} date of probate of father's will of which he was executor. (P.C.C. 10 Bodfelde).

(Caryll continued.)

he appeared on a Commission, of 32 for revising the liturgy though, according to Trenqualeon, tradition has it that he refused to append his name to the document they produced. 8. However, in 1553 he was appointed a Commissioner for the collection of church plate in the Rape of Bramber. 9. Yet he was sufficiently 'en rapport' with Mary for her to give him the late Sir Thomas More's house at Chelsea 10. He was a county M.P. for Sussex in 1553, 1555 and 1559. 11.

Like Sir John Gage, his contemporary and colleague, 12. John Caryll was the forerunner of one of the outstanding recusant families of Sussex, but, like him, found it possible both to serve and to profit by the Henrician and Edwardian regimes, and yet to emerge creditably into the Marian period. It is perhaps significant that Sir John Gage, a notable beneficiary of the Dissolution, should have appointed John Caryll Esq. one of his two executors. 13. The two must have been on intimate terms.

This John Caryll Esq. died at St. Martin Outwych, London on 10 March, 1566 and was buried at Warnham on the 24 March. 14. He was a J.P. of Sussex at least from 1559 to his death. 15. From him descend the two main lines of Carylls of the Elizabethan period, the elder line, the Carylls of Warnham, and the cadet branch, the Carylls of Shipley and subsequently of Harting. Of the former, Thomas Caryll, eldest son of John Caryll Esq. afore-mentioned, predeceased his father but left a son, John, who succeeded his grandfather in 1566, though he was then a minor. 16. In his will, dated 9 March, 1566, John Caryll, the elder, directed that his younger son, Edward, the future Sir Edward Caryll of Shipley and subsequently of Harting, should assume the guardianship of his nephew, John, until he should reach his majority. 17. This Sir Edward Caryll was the founder of the cadet branch of the family.

8. Trenqualeon, op.cit. 351.
9. S.A.C., liii, 210 & 212. Note: 210n. wrongly identifies him with his grandson, the future Sir John Caryll of Warnham, s. of Thomas Caryll.
11. S.A.C., xxxi, 161, 33, 69; Official Returns
12. Gage was Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. See notes on the Gage family.
13. S.A.C., xlv, 115-16.
17. P.C.C. 34 Stonard.
(Caryll continued.)

Whether armigerous.

The Carylls are not mentioned in any version of the 1570 Visitation of Sussex, but they do appear in those of 1634 and 1662. 18.

(1) Caryll of Warnham.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir John Caryll of Warnham, only son of Thomas Caryll of the same who d.v.p. and was bur. there, 23 Nov., 1564, 19. and of his first wife, Dorothy, d. and eventually heiress of Thomas Bokenham. She was bur. 9 Mch., 1558 at Warnham. 20.

1566, Succeeded his grandfather but was then a minor of 9 years old. Had been placed by his grandfather 21. under the guardianship of his uncle, Edward Caryll.

Apparently never a J.P. under Elizabeth.

26 Oct. 1577, entered on the diocesan recusancy return sent by the Bishop of Chichester to the Privy Council as one who absented himself from church. His lands were valued at 1,000 marks. 22.

15 August, 1580, on recusancy return from the parish of Warnham in the rural deanery of Storrington to the bishop of Chichester it was noted that "Mr John Carryll and his wife do not come to church at such times as they are at Warnham". 23.

17 August, 1580, —"Nichas. Herne his servante comyth not to church nor yet receyved the colon of long time. Nichas. the gardener his servant also — -". 24.

18. S.A.C., xxxix,110.
22. C.R.S., xxii,80-1; or W.S.C.R.O., D.R.O. 90/1/37,f.8.
24. Ibid.
Another return, undt. but entitled "The certificate of such as refuse to come to church within the Archdeaconrye of Chichester", notes - "John Caryll esquier of the parrishe of Warneham in landes a thousand marks in goods 200 pounds could not be found but ys supposed to bee at Warblington in Hampshyre and to be a grete mainteyner of preests scholemasters and assemblies of those that refuse to here divine service." His wife and his servants "Nicholas Herne and Nicholas Gardener" .. "could not be found but are also supposed to be at Warblington aforesayd". 25,

1588-19, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex. 26.
1588, assessed at £100 for the Armada loan, highest rate, with 14 others.27.

Aug.1591, Knighted.28.

14 August,1599, in making his contribution of arms, light horses etc., he "of his own goodwill"brought more to Eltham than he was required to do. 29.

1600, was arraigned for his faith with 7 other gentlemen, his neighbours, before the Earl of Southampton.30:

1602, Leased various properties in the Horsham district, including ironworks in St. Leonard's forest, from the Crown. 31.
At that time held the convent buildings of the dissolved religious house of the Grey Friars, Chichester.32.
He was concerned in the property affairs of Anne, Countess of Arundel, after her husband, Philip Howard's death in 1595. 33

26. See Appendix 4.
27. S.A.C. i, 35.
31. S.A.C.xxiii 121; see also vi, 48; xxiv, 231-2; xxv- 44-53; lxvi, 90.
32. S.A.C. li,33.
33. C.R.S. xx1,380.
(Caryll continued.)


37.

Wife

Mary, d. of George Cotton of Warblington. Bur. at Warnham, 24 June, 1601. M.I.

38.

Children.


Henry Bap. at Warnham, 29 Aug., 1587. Bur. there, 6 May, 1588.

George B. Bur. Warnham, 16 Apr., 1583.


Jeanne Bap. Warnham, 20 June, 1589. - a daughter.

Elizabeth

Margaret.

34. B. & D., 359 & 72.
35. ibid.; P.C.C. Admon.
37. B. & C. 359 & 72; Trenqualeon, op.cit. 387 et seqq.
38. These according to B. & C., loc.cit. Trenqualeon says there were 8 children of whom 6 died in infancy, Catherine died unm., and John was son and heir. But B. & C. are supported with references to the Warnham parish registers etc.
39. Shaw ii, 112.
(Caryll continued.)

Education.

Father
Sons

Universities. (father) Inns of Court.

John, adm. Gray's Inn, 5 Mch, 1601. 41.

Marriages of children 42.

John md. Mary, d. of Robert, Lord Dormer and of Elizabeth, d. of Sir Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague.

Henry
George
Thomas
Mary
Jeanne
Elizabeth

- daughter

md. Sir Garret Kempe of Slindon, knt., royalist and possibly a recusant. 43.

Mary md. Sir Philip Howard, eld. s. of Lord William Howard of Naworth, from whom descended the Earls of Carlisle.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Warnham, Hundred of Shinglecross, Bramber Rape.) 44.

2 Elizabeth John Caryll Esq., in lands £100. (Commissioner)

(As of Chichester City, North Street)

38 Elizabeth Sir John Caryll, knt., in lands £80 45.
40 Elizabeth " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " £80 46.
41 Elizabeth " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " £80 47.

42. B. & C., 359; and 72.
43. S.A.C., xix, 116-120.
44. P.R.O., E. 179/190/268.
45. " ; E. 179/190/333.
46. " ; E. 179/190/335.
47. " ; E. 179/190/336.
(Caryll continued).

(ii) Caryll of Harting.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Edward Caryll of Shipley and later of Harting, younger son of John Caryll of Warnham Esq., who died March, 1566, and of Elizabeth, his wife, d. of Robert Palmer of Parham. (See notes on origins). Mentioned in his father's will. 48.

Sometime of Shipley. 49. 1573, plaintiff in fine for manor of Bentons in Shipley and tenements in Shipley and West Grinstead. 50.

Date? Settled his lands in Washington, West Grinstead and Shipley on his eldest son, Thomas, and established himself at Harting where he bought property from the heirs of Francis Fortescue, and where he passed his last years 51. 1590 and 1592, plaintiff in fine for manor of West Harting, Edmund Fortescue Esq., and Isabel his wife, deforciants. 52. This was originally part of the Ford property in Harting. (See notes on Ford and Fortescue families). The Carylls resided at Ladyholt Park in West Harting. 53.

Feb. - Dec., 1571, Sheriff of Sussex. 54.

1576, one Hare, servant to Edward Caryll, examined for papistry. 55.

26 Oct, 1577, entered on diocesan recusancy return sent by the bishop of Chichester to the Privy Council as absenting himself from church. His property valued at 400 marks in lands and £100 in goods. 56.

48. P.C.C. 34 Stonard.
49. S.A.C., xl, 126; lvi, 155; C.R.S., xxii, 80-1, etc.
50. S.R.S., xix, 33.
51. Trenquille, op. cit., 367.
52. S.R.S., xx, 480.
54. See Appendix 4.
55. S.A.C., iii, 90.
56. C.R.S., xxii, 80-1.
(Caryll continued.)

Undt. but appary. 1580, mentioned in a letter from the bishop of Chichester to the Privy Council, "Mr. Edward Carell came to prayers here in my house amonge dyvers but whether he com to his parrishe churche or no I knowe not yf it please yo to send for him to enquier the certentye thereof I think it well." 15 August, 1580, in recusancy return from the rural deanery of Storrington, parish of Shipley, "Mr. Edward Carell esquier and his wief do absent themselves from divine service and have not receyved the colon."

For the 17th August, entries to the same effect for Robert Hampton, his servant, and Richard Stratford, his servant, "thought a scholemaster". 58.

1580, bishop of Chichester wrote to the minister of the parish of Shipley and to the Constable, tithingman or headborough of the same parish, demanding that they should send to him at his residence at Aldingbourne, Mr Edward Caryll, Robert Hampton and Richard Stratfoule (sic). 59.

8th Jan., 1581, the said minister replied describing how he and the constable of the parish received the bishop's letter on 4th Jan., and how they went to Bentons Place and searched for Robert Hampton and Richard Stratfoud (sic) but could not find them, or on the 7th Jan., and how, on enquiry, they were told "they have not dwelled there this quarter of this year and mor". 60.

1583, mentioned by Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, as having been present at the last meeting between him and Charles Arundel before the latter's flight and that of Lord Page, collaborators in the Throgmorton conspiracy. 61.

1583, Edward Caryll and his servant, John Michell, with others, examined about this. 62.

58. Ibid., f. 56. See also f. 38.
59. Ibid., f. 29.
60. Ibid., f. 10.
61. C.R.S., xxi, 46.
62. S.A.C., xxxviii, 114.
(Caryll continued).

24 June, 1585, entry in Walsingham's notes concerning the proceedings against Philip, Earl of Arundel, "Ther may be also had in consideration what shall be done with the Earl of Arundel's servants committed abroad to divers persons". (The name "Carrell" in the margin.) 63.

1585, J.P. Sussex, but apparently put in the Tower that year. 64.

1587, in certificate concerning the Sussex J.P.'s, described as dropped from the Commission because he was "an active wysman, my lord6ýý Arondell his stward and doer in thys contre".

1588, assessed at £100 for the Armada Loan, highest rate with 14 others, including his nephew, John Caryll of Warnham. 66.

1589-90, in the statements of accounts for the Earl of Arundel's estates, Edward Caryll was named as the official receiver for these estates for Sussex and Surrey. 67. Was perhaps one of the 5 lessees and trustees named in the will of Philip, Earl of Arundel, June-July 1588, to administer his property after his death. 68. (Note: - 1584, he had also been trustee for certain property belonging to the Gage family. 69.

Jan., 1591, restored to the Commission of the Peace. He remained a J.P. until the end of the reign at least. From 1594 at least, he was always of the Quorum. 70.

11 May, 1603, knighted. 71.


63. C.R.S., xxi, 130-11.
64. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 27. "In Turr." added beside his name.
65. S.A.C., 11, 60.
66. S.A.C., 1, 36.
67. C.R.S., xxi, 312 et seqq.
68. C.R.S., xxi, 368-9, but cf. 380.
69. S.A.C., lviii, 155.
71. Shaw, ii, 107.
72. B. & C., 359.
73. Pr. 1610. P.C.C. 55 Wingfield.
74. 20 Aug., 1610. P.R.O. C. 142/315/179.
(Caryll continued.)

Wives. 75.

Md. three times:-
1) Johan Warnecombe, named in father-in-law's will, 1566, then dead.
2) Philippa, d. of James Gage of Bentley in Framfield.

Children 76.

By his first wife:- None.

By his second wife:-


June, 1601 - end of reign at least, J.P. Sussex. 80.
11 May, 1603, knighted on same day as his father:
30 Jan., 1617, died s.p. male. Bur. in Shipley chancel. & M.I. at Shipley, I.P.M. 81. He had succeeded his half brother, Sir Richard Caryll, as owner of West Harting manor but survived him by only a few months. Under a provision of Sir Richard's will and in default of surviving male issue of Sir Thomas Caryll, this property passed to Sir John Caryll of Warnham (q.v.)

Edward D.S.p., and probably in infancy. 82.
Philippa Bap. at Warnham, 31 Mch, 1568.
Elizabeth Mary Became a nun, mentioned in brother Richard's will. 83.
Ann In brother Richard's will. 84.
Ciceley Bap. at Warnham, 4 Jan, 1572.

75. B. & C., loc.cit.
76. Ibid. Where B. & C. differ from Trenqualeon 373 et seqq, the former have been followed.
77. V. supra, note 49.
78. Trenqualeon, op.cit., 368.
79. P.R.O. Assizes, 35. S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 43 & 44.
81. P.R.O. Cl42/372/155. For M.I. see S.A.C.,xxii,1, and lxxii, 222.

/references contd.
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By his third wife:-

Richard later Sir Richard Caryll, Succeeded to manor of West Harting which he bequeathed to his elder brother, Sir Thomas Caryll and in default of surviving male issue of his, to Sir John Caryll of Warnham. 85.

Knighted 26 May, 1615. 86. d.s.p. Sept., 1616, aged 26, and bur. at West Harting, 16 Sept.

M.I. Will pr. at Chichester.

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Adm. Inner Temple,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov., 1556. 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas, Oriel Coll. Oxf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matric. 8 June, 1588, aged 15. 88.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. B.A., 11 May, 1608. 89.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82. See also Trenqualeon op. cit. 373 et seqq.
83. Ibid.
84. Ibid.
85. See also Trenqualeon op. cit., 398.
86. Shaw, 11, 155.
89. Ibid.
90. Inner Temple Admissions, 170.
(Caryll continued).


Of the second marriage:-

Thomas    md. twice:- (a) Mary, d. of Sir John Tufton, knqt. and bart.; (b) Margaret. Will dt. 18 June, 1652, pr. 5 Sept., 1653. 92.
Edward    Philippa    md. Thomas Shirley of West Grinstead.
Elizabeth Mary    unmd.
Ann        md. at Harting, 13 Nov. 1597, William Ford Esq., later knqted.
Ciceley    md. Sir John Morley of Halfnaked, knqt.

Of the third marriage:-

Richard    md. Margery, only d. of John Freelond, lord of manor of Greatham, Hants. She bur. at West Harting, 15 May, 1632. M.I. Will pr. 28 May, 1632. 93.

Subsidy assessments.

(For 2 Elizabeth, see John Caryll Esq., of Warnham, Edward Caryll's father.)

(As of Warnham, Hundred of Shinglecross, Bramber Rape) 14 Elizabeth Edward Caryll Esq., in lands £30. 94.

91. B. & C., 359. Where these differ from Trenqualeon op. cit. 373 et seqq., the former have been followed.
92. P.C.C. 286 Brent.
93. P.C.C. 49 Ardley.
94. P.R.O., E. 179/190/283.
CASIE  (or Cassey, Cassy etc.)

Origins.

The Casies were newcomers to Sussex brought there by their marriage into the family of Bowyer of North Mundham. Their connection with the county was of short duration.

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned as armigerous in any version of the 1570 Visitation.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Robert Casie of Runcton (or Roughton), Sussex, gent., only son and h. of George Casie, citizen and grocer of London who died 20 August, 1568, and of Jane, d. of Thomas Bowyer of London, citizen and grocer, who died 13 Sept., 1558 and was son of William Bowyer of Petworth. George Casie was Jane's first husband; his father-in-law appointed him overseer to his will.

(For his legal career, see 'Education'.)

1584 Succeeded his mother and was sole executor of her will which was dt. 8 August, 1584 and pr. 1 Nov. 1584.

June, 1601, and 1602, J.P. Sussex.

Date of death unknown. Apparently no will or I.P.M.

Wife.


1. But see Harl. Soc. Pubns. liii, 70, where Robert Casie is mentioned as "the lawyer".
3. See notes on the Bowyer family of North Mundham.
4. B. & C., 134; Harl. Soc. Pubns. liii, 70; B.M. Harl MSS, 1084, f. 30 and 1076, f. 132. See also S.A.C., xxiii, 169; xlii, 24-5; lxxiv, 202.
5. P.C.C. 51 Noodes.
7. P.R.O. Assizes 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 43 & 44.
(Casie continued).

**Education.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Casie, late of Clifford's Inn, gent., s. &amp; h. of George Casie of Roughton, Sussex, adm. Middle Temple, 9 Nov., 1580. Called, 7 Feb. 1589.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subsidy assessments:**

---

9. *Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 42; Minutes of Parliament of the Middle Temple, 1, 304.*
CHURCHER.

Origins.

The Churchers appear to have been newcomers to Sussex in the latter half of the sixteenth century. Thomas Churcher who was a J.P. of Sussex in 1600, 1601 and 1602, and M.P. for Midhurst in 1584, 1586, 1588 and 1593, (1) and is described in his will (2) as "of Slinfold, gent." , was the son of one, Thomas Churcher of Guildford, Surrey, and perhaps also of Chiddingly, Sussex and plaintiff in fine for that manor in 1573. (3)

Little evidence seems to be available about the elder Thomas Churcher. It may be he who appears in a deed relating to the appointment of one of that name as Mock Magistrate in Guildford in 30 Henry VIII; (4) he may also have been the plaintiff in fine for certain lands in Stoke-next-Guildford and in Shalford in 1 Mary, (5) and in 1557 plaintiff for lands in West Horsley, Surrey. (6) Whether, after acquiring the manor of Chiddingly from John Jefferay Esq. in 1573, he ever resided there, is uncertain. Nor is it clear whether it was to him or to his son of the same name that a patent of arms was granted on 10 October, 1570 by Robert Cooke, Clarencieux King of Arms, since the recipient is described simply as "Thomas Churcher of Chittingly, Sussex, gent." (7) Even the date of Thomas Churcher senior's death is uncertain as the only will which seems to correspond with his probable dates is not certainly his. It is entered in the Calendar of wills of the Archdeaconry of Surrey prior to 1595, as that of "Thomas Chroucher; Par. West Horslye; pr. 7 Mch., 1581." (8)

2. P.C.C., 14 Weldon.
3. Comber, (Horsham), 60; S.R.S., xix, 98.
6. ibid, no.902.
7. B.M., Harl. MS, 1562, f. 156b; and Grantees of Arms... to the end of the 17th century! (Harl. Soc. Pubns, 1915), 52.
8. Archdeaconry of Surrey Wills, Somerset House.
The identity of Thomas Churcher senior's wife is also a matter of speculation. Neither Comber, nor Berry and Comber, gives any information on the point. Two alternative suggestions might be made. One is that she was Anne, sister of Richard Leech of Fletching, Sussex, since in his will proved in 1595, this Richard refers to one, Thomas Churcher, as his brother-in-law though there is no trace of either of Richard's brothers or of his other sister having been connected with the Churchers. The main objection to this suggestion is that the said Anne is named in another brother, John Leech's will, dated 13 August, 1574 as unmarried, so that any marriage between her and Thomas Churcher, senior, would have had to take place between that date and 1581, assuming that the will proved at that date was this Thomas Churcher's. In such a case, she would have been a second or third wife, since the younger Thomas Churcher is known to have been born in about 1542. In the circumstances it seems more likely that she was the first, and hitherto unidentified wife of the younger Thomas Churcher of Slinfold.

Another suggestion is that Thomas Churcher senior's wife was one of the daughters of Joan, widow of Thomas Culpepper of Crawley, Sussex, Esq., and previously of John Fenner of Crawley, since, in her will, undated but estimated as having been made in about 1540, she mentioned her daughter, "Churcher".

One authority mentions the Churchers as a "family of note connected with Chiddingly", and says, though no proof is given of this, that Thomas Churcher was resident there in 1570 and left issue, Henry and Thomas, founders of the two branches of the family at Guildford and Slinfold. It mentions the grant of arms of 1570 to one, Thomas Churcher, but does not say whether this was the father or the son.

10. P.C.C., 89 Drake.
11. See notes on 'Leech' family.
12. P.C.C., 9 Pyckering.
13. V. infra.
14. S.A.C., x, 155n.; and xxxii, 135.
15. S.A.C., xiv, 233.
Whether armigerous.

Received a grant of arms in 1570. (v. supra.)
Mentioned in 1634 Visitation of Sussex. (16).

Head of the family in 1580.

Thomas Churcher of Guildford and of Chiddingly, Sussex. (17)
Parents unknown.

Possibly the individual mentioned in a deed concerning the appointment of a Mock Magistrate in Guildford in 30 Henry VIII; also mentioned as a plaintiff in fine for lands in Stoke-next-Guildford and in Shalford, Surrey in 1 Mary; and as plaintiff in fine for lands in West Horsley, Surrey in 1557. (v. supra)

1570 Probably the Thomas Churcher who was granted a coat of arms by Robert Cooke, Clarenceux King of Arms. (v. supra)

1573 With John Michell was plaintiff in fine, John Jeffery being the deforciant, for the manor of Chiddingly in West Hoathly, which manor was quitclaimed to the plaintiffs and heirs of Thomas Churcher. (18)

7 March, 1581, Will proved. (v. supra)

Wife or wives. Identity uncertain.

16. H.C. MS, C. 27.

17. It is assumed, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that Thomas Churcher, senior, of Guildford & Chiddingly was living in 1580 and that it was his will which was proved in March, 1581.

18. S.R.S., xix, 98.
(Churcher continued.)

Children.

Thomas Later of Slinfold, gent. Born c. 1542. (20) M.P. Midhurst, 1584, 1586, 1588, and 1593. (21) J.P. Sussex, 1600, 1601, and 1602. (22) 1587, plaintiff in fine for manor of Stedham, Sussex; 1590, " " " " " Woolbeding, Sussex. (23) 1613/4 (As Thomas Churcher Esq.) plaintiff in fine for manor of Endelwykes, Sussex. (24) T.R. James I, and before his death in Nov., 1616, he acquired the estate of "Hill" or "Hillands" in Slinfold. The estate, a little to the north of the village of Slinfold, had been the property of the Hussey family, Sir Henry Hussey dying seized of it in 1557. (25) Although Thomas Churcher the younger was the first of his family to possess it, "the family appears to have been connected with this part of the country before the acquisition of Hill, for a Thomas Churcher was one of the two (26) Parliamentary representatives from 1584 till 1593"


Peter Later the Rev. Peter Churcher. Named in the 2nd codicil to his elder brother's will, 24 August, 1616, as deceased.

James Named in nephew James' will, 1622. (30)

John Died v.p. Buried at Warnham, 26 Nov., 1577

Henry Of Guildford. (31).

(Churcher continued.)

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children.

Thomas may have md. twice. No issue. (33) (a)? Mary, d.of Richard Coldham of Midhurst whose will was pr., 1593. In this will, Mr. Thomas Churcher of Slinfold was made an executor, and Mary, d. of the testator is mentioned as the wife of Thomas Kercher. In 1590, Thomas Churcher and William Coldham were plaintiffs in fine for the manor of Woolbeding. (34) But perhaps Anne, sister of Richard Leech, was Thomas Churcher's first wife, (v. supra). (b) Patience, d. of -, who had married first, Robert Saye of Icklesham and secondly, James Ede of Warnham, gent., who was (35) buried there 20 Feb., 1591 Will pr. 22 Mch., 1591. She was buried at Warnham, 14 Dec., 1635. Will pr. 17 Dec., 1635. (36).

27. B. & C., loc.cit.
28. P.C.C., 14 Weldon.
29. P.R.O. C. 142/375/57.
30. P.C.C. 31 Savile.
31. S.A.C. xdv, 233. Cf. Berry, 48, as "Thomas".
32. Inner Temple Admissions, 77.
33. B. & C., 48. See this also for the marriages of his brothers.
34. S.R.S., xx, 503.
35. P.C.C. 20 Sainberbe.
36. P.C.C. 131 Sadler; B. & C. loc.cit.
(Churcher continued.)

Peter md. Julian -. Named in brother-in-law, Thomas Churcher's will, 1614, then remarried to - Knepp. Peter and Julian had issue.

James

John

Henry (Thomas?)md. Johan, named in son James' will, 1622. (37) Issue, including George, executor and chief beneficiary of his uncle, Thomas Churcher's will. He inherited the Slinfold property. (38)

Subsidy assessments.

Apparently the only relevant entry was:

(As of Billingshurst Tithing, Hundred of West Easewryth, Arundel Rape.)

1-2 Charles I George Churcher, gent., in lands £5. (39)

37. P.C.C. 31 Savile.
38. B. & C., loc.cit. See also P.C.C. 14 Weldon. Thomas Churcher evidently feared a dispute after his death between his nephew, George, and his widow.
The Colbrands were a family of fairly long standing in East Sussex by the mid sixteenth century. They came originally from Laughton, also the seat of the Pelhams, but subsequently resided at Boreham in Wartling, Foxearle Hundred, Hastings Rape. (1) Boreham, or Boreham Street, is described by Horsfield as "a small but neat hamlet in the parish". (2) Of Wartling, about eight miles from Battle on the Battle road. (2) There, he says, the Colbrands resided from the reign of Edward III, and there they built, probably in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century, the family residence which still stood in Horsfield's time. After settling there, they retained their connection with Laughton, where they had held lands since before Henry V's reign, and later John Colbrand of Boreham married into the important family of Pelham of Laughton. (3) The Colbrand arms may still be seen in juxtaposition with the Pelham arms in the spandrels of the doorway in Laughton Church, and for generations the Pelhams held a manor farm bearing the name of Colbrand. (4) It has also been pointed out that "the ancient family of Stopham of Stopham and of Colbrand of Boreham, exhibit arms which clearly denote a family relationship." (5)

Berry and Comber trace the family back to John Colbrand, the father of "John Colbrand of Boreham, 46 Ed. III". From him descended in a direct line Thomas Colbrand of Boreham, who died 2 August, 1552, and who married Alice, daughter of John Michell of Cuckfield. (6)

Whether armigerous.

This family had apparently long been armigerous but, despite a reference to their appearance in the 1570 Visitation, their name is not found in any version consulted. (7) They are found in the College of Arms version of the Visitation of 1634. (8)

1. S.A.C., xxiv, 256n.
2. Horsfield, i, 547.
3. S.A.C., vi, 68; B. & C., 183.
4. S.A.C., loc. cit.; and iii, 222.
5. S.A.C., vi, 87.
7. S.A.C., vi, 87.
8. H.C. MS, C. 27.
(Colbrand and continued.)

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

James Colbrand of Chichester Esq. (9) only son of Thomas Colbrand of Boreham who died 2 August, 1552, (10) and of Alice, d. of John Michell of Cuckfield.

Aged 8 years old and more at his father's death. (11)

1571 and 1572, M.P. for Ludgarshall; 1597 M.P. for Appleby; and 1586 disputed one of the borough seats for Chichester and gained the result of the 1586 election in the Star Chamber (12). 1585, captain of the trained bands of the City of Chichester but a dispute arose over his tenure of this office and in 1587 he was displaced (13).


Wives. (18)

1) Martha, d. of Oliver, Lord St. John of Bletso, Beds., relict of Richard Cheyney. Perhaps she remd. - Palmer.
2) Jane - . Bur. at Subdeanery, 13 June, 1580.

Children.

By his first wife:


10. E.P.M., P.R.O; C. 142/101/104.
13. B.M. Harl MS. 703, ff.39, 39b, 40b, 42b, 47b, 48.
15. See Appendix 4.
18. B. & C., loc.cit.
19. See father's I.P.M.; also P.R.O., Wards 5/43, pts 1 & 2. /references continued.
(Colbrand continued.)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Colbrand, adm. Inner Temple, Nov., 1562, as of Pevensey, Sussex. (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children. (24)

John md. twice:-(a) Ann, d. of - Willson of Ditchling, Sussex. (b) Sarah, d. of - Needham in co. Derby. She re-md. Humphrey Newton.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hundred of Battle, Hastings Rape) 38 Henry VIII
William Colbrand in lands 40s. (25)
(As of Worminghurst, Hundred of Easwryth, Bramber Rape.)
14 Elizabeth James Colbrand, gent. in lands £20. (26)
18 Elizabeth " " " " £20 (27)
(As of East Street, Chichester city)
29 Elizabeth James Colbrand Esq. in lands £25 (28)
38 Elizabeth " " " " £30 (29)
40 Elizabeth " " " " £30 (30)
41 Elizabeth " " " " £30 (31)
(As of Southover, Lewes Rape.)
1 - 2 Charles I, John Colbrand, bart., in lands £12 (32)

23. Inner Temple Admissions, 47.
27. " E. 179/190/297.
29. " E. 179/190/333.
30. " E. 179/190/335.
COVERT.

Origins.

The Coverts were certainly one of the most prominent and influential of Elizabethan Sussex families. According to one writer, "The glory of the name was at its highest when the most illustrious of his race, Sir Walter Covert, built, in about 1600 his house at Slaugham, of which only ruins remain to attest its former grandeur. The decline and fall of the family seems to have coincided with the decay of the mansion."

The writer of this article points out that it was not until the later 16th century that the Coverts became a "Cuckfield family", though they had flourished in West Sussex from time immemorial. Mr. Cooper, in his "History of Cuckfield", says that, while the family is traced in the Heralds' Visitations back to "Sir Bartholomew of Chaldon (in Surrey) who came to England with the Conqueror", there is no real information about the family until 1230 when one, Richard, was established at Broadbridge near Horsham. This Richard le Covert was summoned in 1233 to the King's Court in the matter of the dower of Isabella, widow of Humfrey de Hiden. From then on there are fairly numerous authentic references to members of this family.

Originally, they possessed the manor of Chaldon, Surrey, but parted with it in the mid 15th century and acquired another manor, that of Hascombe and Danehurst, near Guildford, which they held for about 300 years. At an early date, a Covert came into possession of the manor of Bradbrigg, or Broadbridge, near Horsham, and soon afterwards, of Ashington. In time, they had numerous properties in Sussex including lands at Slinfold, Washington, Sullington, Burpham, Itchingfield and so on, and they intermarried with such well known Sussex families as the de Braoses, Pelhams, Culpeppers, Bartellots and Gorings. Slaugham was purchased in the late 15th century and the Coverts flourished at Slaugham Park in the reign of Henry VIII. In 1583, Walter Covert purchased the fourth part of the manor of Cuckfield from Philip Earl of Arundel for £500, the Earl being in straitened circumstances owing to heavy recusancy fines. A further portion was acquired in 1615 from Lord Abergavenny, and also some land in Balcombe.

1. S.A.C., xlvi, 170 et seqq.
2. Ibid., 170.
4. S.A.C., loc. cit.; Comber, (Lewes), 89. (471 et seqq. See als
5. Cooper, op. cit., 71 et seqq.
(Covert continued.)

It was said of the 16th century Coverts that they had manors stretching without interruption from Southwark in Surrey to the sea, meaning the south coast, and though this was undoubtedly a popular exaggeration, they did indeed hold lands scattered between Crawley on the borders of the two counties and Hangleton, near the sea in Sussex.

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in any version of the 1570 Visitation of Sussex. Mentioned in the 1634 Visitation.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Walter Covert of Slaugham, 2nd son and heir of Richard Covert of Slaugham, Esq., who was J.P., Sussex, 1559-1564 and 1566-1579, also Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex, 1564-1579, and was described in the bishop of Chichester's letter of 1564 about the J.P.'s of his diocese as a "myslyker of religion and godly proceedings", and who died 10 Sept., 1579; also of Anne, his first wife, d. and coheir of Sir Walter Henley of Corshorne, Kent. 1569 onwards, Deputy Lieutenant for Sussex.

1581, M.P. Sussex (bye-election); 1584 Newport; 1586, Sussex; 1593, Petersfield; 1614 and 1628, Sussex.

---

7. Cooper, op.cit. 71 and 73.  
8. S.A.C., xlvi, 136.  
10. Ibid., note 1.  
11. H.C. MS, C. 27.  
12. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 1 - 6, and 8 - 22  
13. See Appendix 4.  
14. Bishops' letters, 1564 (Camden Misc., ix, 10.)  
15. B.&C., 18; P.C.C. 14 Arundel; P.R.O., C. 142/191/70.  
16. B.&C., loc.cit.; (M.I. at Slaugham.)  
17. See Appendix 2.  
(Covert continued.)

1583 - '4, and 1592- '3, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex. (19)
1581 - '3, 1585 - '92, 1594 - 1602, J.P. Sussex; (20)

frequently of the Quorum.

1587, described in certificate concerning the J. P.'s of
Sussex as "very well thought of for executing /his/ office
of peace". (21)

C. 1585, Commissioner for disarming the recusants (22)

1591, knighted. (23)


His wives. (26)

1) Timothy, d. of John Lennard of Chevening and Knowle, Kent.
Buried at Slaugham, 10 June, 1610.

2) Jane, d. of Sir John Shurley of Isfield. Executrix to
Sir Walter Covert in 1632. She married secondly, John
Freake, and thirdly, Denzil, Lord Holles. Died April,
1666 at Paris.

Children.

None.

Education.

Universities.

Inns of Court

Walter Covert, adm.
Gray's Inn, 1567. (27)

---

19. See Appendix 4.
20. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 23-25, 27-34,
36-44.
22. B.M. Harl. MS, 474. f. 90b.
23. Shaw, 11, 86.
24. B. & C., loc. cit., H.R. Mosse; Monumental Effigies of
Sussex, 107.
27. Gray’s Inn Admissions, 37.
(Covert continued.)

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Slaugham, Hundred of Buttinghill, Lewes Rape).

38 Henry VIII — Covert, sen. in lands £100 (28)

2 Elizabeth Richard Covert Esq. in lands £100 (29)
     (Commissioner)

5 Elizabeth Richard Covert Esq. " " £100 (30)
     (Commissioner)

14 Elizabeth Richard Covert Esq. " " 100 marks (31)

18 Elizabeth Richard Covert Esq. " " £60. (32)

1-2 Charles I Sir Walter Covert, knt. in lands £50. (33)

30. " E. 179/190/274.
32. " E. 179/190/299.
COWPER, (or Cooper)

Origins.

'Cowper' was a common name in Sussex in the sixteenth century, the best-known family perhaps being the Cowpers of Slinfold.

The John Cowper who was a J.P. of Sussex in 1585 and 1586 seems most likely to have been of the South Harting family; the fact that the residence of the South Harting Cowpers was partly outside the county boundary may account for the remark about "Mr Cooper" in the 1587 report concerning the Sussex J.P's.

Information about the family is meagre. The earliest member of whom there is any certain knowledge was John Cowper, or Cooper, of Harting whose will was dated 16 May, 1495. He had lands in the counties both of Sussex and Southampton and left two sons, John and Richard. According to one genealogist, Richard, the younger, was the ancestor of the Cowpers of Paulett in Somerset, while John, the elder, died without issue. However, it appears that this elder son, John, was the John Cowper of Dicham who died on 20 December, 1550, and whose will shows that he married twice and had numerous children. Of these, it seems that his second son by his second wife, also John, succeeded to the Dicham estate.

Dicham is a hamlet partly in South Harting parish and partly in the parish of Buriton, Hampshire. According to Horsfield, it was held by the Cowpers from the reign of Edward VI until 1762, and the arms of this family are found on certain monumental inscriptions in South Harting church.

Whether a rigorous.

John Cowper of Dicham, Hampshire (sic), was mentioned in the 1634 Visitation of Sussex.

---

1. B. & C., 145. See also 377.
2. S.A.C., 11,60. B. & C., 276.
4. Elwes, 115n; B. Burke: Peerage, Baronetage & Grand Knighthage (1907), 1510.
5. B. & C., loc.cit.; Will P.C.C. 1 Bucke; I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/97/103.
6. B.&C., loc.cit.; but Anthony, his eldest son by his first marriage, was heir to his father according to the latter's I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/97/103.
(Cowper continued.)

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Cowper, gent, of Dicham in the parishes of Buriton, Hants, and of Harting, Sussex, second son by his 2nd marriage, of John Cowper of Dicham who died on the 20 Dec., 1550, and of Margaret. 16.

Mentioned in father's will. 11.

12 Sept., 1586, died. Will at. 5 Sept., pr. 18 Nov., 1586. 12.
I.P.M., 9 Jan., 1587. 13.

Probably not the M.P. for Steyning, 1572, who appears to have been one of the Cowpers of Paulet, Somerset. 14.

Wives. 15.

1) Margaret, d. of Humphrey Leigh of Leigh, nr. Tunbridge, Kent.
2) Mary —, executrix to her husband.

Children. 16.

Later John Cowper of Dicham and of Chichester, Esq.; aged over 30 in father's I.P.M. Executor to his father. J.P., Sussex, 1585; sometime of the Quorum. 17. Mentioned in the report concerning the J.P.'s of Sussex in 1587 as "Mr Cooper, a lawyer" who had been dropped from the Commission because he did not live in Sussex 18, 1588, perhaps one of the two John Cowpers assessed at £25 and £30 respectively for the Armada Loan. 19. Sept., 1594, Constable of the Hundred of West Harting. 20.

8. H.C., MS. C. 27.
9. See note 5.
12. P.C.C., 59 Windsor.
14. H. Matthews; Personnel of the Parliament of 1584 - 5; (Univ. of London M.A. thesis), Sect. iii, 52.
15. B. & C., loc.cit.
16. Ibid.
17. P.R.O., Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 27; B.M., Lansd. MS., 737, f. 158b. He was apparently a J.P. in his
(Cowper continued.)

1 James, settled lands, including Dicham, on his son, John, on tail male, but the latter d.v.p. 21.
Will dt. 26 Oct., pr. 4 Nov., 1620., then of Chichester. 22.
Died, 28 Oct., 1620. I.P.M. at Winchester, 10 Jan. 1621.

4 daughters. Christian names unknown. Known only by the names of their husbands.

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps the John Cowper of co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southampton, adm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln's Inn, 11 May, 1571. 24.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children. 25.

John md. twice, (a) Jane, d. of James Unwin, younger son of Robert Unwin of Horton, Wilts., Esq. Issue (of whom the eldest son, John, was perhaps he who was adm. to the Inner Temple, Nov., 1594) 26.; (b) Elizabeth, d. and coheiress of Robert Palmer, 2nd brother of Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham, Sussex, knt. Issue.

reference continued

father's lifetime, though his father was never on the Commission.

18. *S.A.C.*, ii, 60; B.M., Lansd. MS, 121, f. 65.
(Cowper continued.)

Of the 4 daughters:


Subsidy assessments.

(As of Westhartyng, Hundred of Domford, Chichester Rape.)
38 Henry VIII John Cooper of Dycham in goods £70.27.
14 Elizabeth " " " in lands £12.28.
(Sessor for the Hundred.)

(As of South Street, Chichester city.)
38 Elizabeth John Cooper, gent. in lands £20.29.
40 Elizabeth John Cooper, gent. " " £20.30.
41 Elizabeth " " " (Named as High Collector for Chichester city, but entries for South Street mainly illegible.) 31.
CULPEPPER. (or Colepepper etc.)

Origin.

Apparently no entirely satisfactory explanation of the derivation of this family's name has yet been found. Since the first member of the family of whom any reference has survived is Thomas de Colepeper, "Recognitor Magnae Assisae, temp. Regis Johannis", it has been suggested that the name bore either a local significance, being derived possibly from Gollesbergh in Sandwich, Kent, or Goldspur or Culspore, a Hundred in the Rape of Hastings; or, alternatively, the name might refer to an occupation or calling, Colepepper meaning perhaps 'false pepper', or 'sham grocer', i.e. one who traded outside the fraternity of pepperers, or possibly 'black pepper', or perhaps it indicated some industry in which the culling or picking of pepper played the principal part. 1

From the Sir Thomas Culpepper above-mentioned, descended various branches of the Culpeppers in Kent and Sussex, for, in time the family became very numerous. In the 16th century, the two branches of the Culpeppers which were principally connected with Sussex and which descended from him were the Culpeppers of Wigsell and the Culpeppers of Wakehurst. These branches were founded by two of three brothers, sons of Walter Culpepper of Goudhurst, Kent, who died in 1462, and of Agnes, his wife. The eldest son who became Sir John Culpepper of Bayhall, Kent, of Hardreshull, Warwick and of Bedgbury in Goudhurst, Kent, and who died in 1480, was the forerunner of the Culpeppers of Bedgbury, Wigsell and Hollingbourne. By his wife, Agnes, he had two sons, the elder, Alexander, being the progenitor of the senior line of the Culpeppers of Bedgbury in Goudhurst, Kent, the younger, Walter, being the ancestor of the Wigsell branch, Wigsell being in Salehurst, Sussex. 2 This Walter's eldest grandson was the John Culpepper of Wigsell who succeeded his father in 1559 and who died in 1612 at the age of 82. He was for many years a J.P. in Elizabeth's reign.

1. S.A.C., xlvii, 47 et seqq.
2. The fee of Wigsell was conveyed by Simon de Echingham and Alice, his wife, in 1348 to Sir John Culpepper, son of Sir Thomas Culpepper. From him, the property descended as has been partly described, until, in 1624, it was sold by Sir John Culpepper of Wigsell to his cousin, Cheney Culpepper. (V.C.H. Sussex, ix, 221-2; S.A.C., xlvii, genealogical chart, opp.p.72)
(Culpepper continued)

The two younger brothers of Sir John Culpepper who died in 1480, Richard and Nicholas, found a spectacular solution to the perennial problems of younger sons. They abducted the two heiresses of the Wakehurst family who had been placed in the care of their elder brother, Sir John Culpepper, and of his wife, Sir John having solemnly promised when he undertook the responsibility to discharge it faithfully "as he was a gentleman". The two young ladies were, however, seized and carried off to London; but their dowers were less easily captured, for their grandmother, Elizabeth Wakehurst, would not surrender the title deeds of their estates which she held in safe custody. It was only after much litigation that a peaceable settlement was eventually made. Richard Culpepper who married Margaret, daughter of Richard and Agnes Wakehurst of Ardingly, died in 1516 without heirs. But Nicholas, who married Elizabeth, her sister, had ten sons and eight daughters and became ancestor of the Culpeppers of Wakehurst. It was his great-great-grandson, Sir Edward Culpepper, who held the Wakehurst estates in 1580 as a youth of eighteen years old. This branch of the family were as distinguished, as the Culpeppers of Wigsell in the public affairs of the county, possibly more so. Sir Edward Culpepper of Wakehurst was Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in 1596-97, his grandfather having been the same in 1560-61, and both were on the Commission of the Peace for some years.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation according to Richard Turpeyn, the Windsor Herald. Also in the 1634 Visitation.

(1) Culpepper of Wigsell.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Culpepper of Wigsell Esq., s. and heir of William Culpepper of Wigsell Esq., J.P. Sussex, 1559, who died, 1559, and of Ciceley, perhaps d. of John Barrett of Belhowse in Alvethley, co Essex.

3. S.A.C., lxvi, 59.
4. S.A.C., loc.cit., and x, 152.
5. B.M., Add. MS, 17,065, f. 5b.
6. H.C. MS, C. 27.
7. S.A.C., xlvi, chart opp. p. 72; P.C.C., 61 Chayney.
8. S.A.C., xlvi, 62.
(Culpepper continued)

J.P., Sussex, 1569 - 1602.9 Frequently of the Quorum.

1587, in certificate concerning the Sussex J.P.s, described as a "cold professor of religion". 10

1612, died, aged 82. Buried at Salehurst. 11

Apparently no Will or I.P.M.

Wife.

Elizabeth, d. of William Sedley of Southfleet, Kent. Died, 1618. 12

Children. 13

Thomas Later, of Wigsell, Esq., Buried at Salehurst, 1613. 14


Alexander Later, Sir Alexander Culpepper of Greenway Court, Hollingbourne, Kent. died s.p., 1645. 15

Ciceley.

Education.

Universities. Inns of Court.

Father (As John Colepeper of Wigsell, Sussex), 25 Oct., 1553. 17

1559, B.A., Oxford. 16

Sons Thomas, Hart Hall, Adm. Inner Temple,

Oxford, matric. entry

under date, 1579, aged

18.

Thomas, adm. Middle Temple, 25 April, 1583. 19

William, Hart Hall, Evidently called to the Bar but date

Oxford, matric. entry

unknown 22.

under date, 1579, aged

17. 20

William, adm. Middle Temple, 25 April, 1583 21.


10. S.A.C., 11, 58.


12. Ibid.
(Culpepper continued)

Marriages of children. 24.

Thomas    md. twice; (a) Anne, d. of Sir Stephen Slaney, knt., Lord Mayor of London, 1595. She was bur. at Salehurst, 1601, (b) Mary, d. and heiress of Roger Beeston, citizen of London and widow of Francis Gibbon, gent. Her will pr. 1661.

William John    md. three times; (a) Ursula, d. of Thomas Woodcock, Alderman of London. She was bur. at Feckenham, Worcs., 1612, (b) Elinor, widow of Sir George Blount of Sodington, Worcs., and d. of William Norwood Esq., of Leckhampton, Glos. She died, 1624. (c) Anne, widow of Hugh Goddard, citizen and draper of London. She died, 1646.

Alexander    md. Mary, d. of Sir Thomas Scott and widow of Anthony St. Leger of Ulcombe. Married in 1603. She died, 1636.

Ciceley    md. Sir William Steed of Harrietsham.

14. Probably not the J.P. Sussex, 1592-1602 (P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 34 et seqq.), who was 'of Wilmington in 1601 + 1602 (see P.R.O. C. 66/1549 & 1594), and who was his uncle, (S.A.C., xlvii, chart opp. p. 72).
15. Greenway Court had been in the hands of his uncle, Francis, brother next in age to Alexander's father, John. (S.A.C., xlvii, 71-12.)
17. Inner Temple Admissions, 15.
18. Al.Ox. loc. cit.
19. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 51.
21. Middle Temple Admissions, loc. cit.
22. Middle Temple Records, Minutes of Parliament, 1, 271.
23. Gray's Inn Admissions, 86.
24. S.A.C., xlvii, 65 et seqq. & chart opp. 72.
(Culpepper continued.)

**Subsidy Assessments.**

(as of Hundred of Henhurst, Hastings Rape.)

14 Elizabeth John Culpepper Esq., in lands £30.25.
18 Elizabeth " " " " " " £30.26.
37 Elizabeth " " " " " " £22.27.

(Commissioner)

Son?"

(As of the same.)

37 Elizabeth Thomas Culpepper, gent. in lands £8.27.

(iii) Culpepper of Wakehurst.

**Members of the family.**

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Edward Culpepper of Wakehurst, knt., only s. and heir of Thomas Culpepper of Wakehurst, J.P., Sussex, 1566-1571, who was bur. at Ardingly, 30 Mch., 1571, and of Philipa, his 2nd wife, d. of Sir John Thatcher of Priesthawes.

Aged 9 at his father's death in 1571. 30.

11 Sept., 1589. Appointed captain of 1,000 Sussex men joining an expedition going to France to help the French king against the Catholic League. 31.

c. 1590, built Wakehurst Place. Subsequently greatly enlarged his property there and in Worth forest where, in 1613, he bought lands from Edward Neville, Lord Bergavenny, for £1,700. 32.

1594 - 1600, J.P. Sussex. 33.
(Culpepper continued.)

1596 - '7, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex. 34.

23 July, 1603, knighted. 35.

9 April, 1630, bur. at Ardingly. 36. Administration, 15 May, 1630. 37.

I.P.M., 6 Oct., 1630. 38.

Note: Sir Edward Culpepper is described by one authority as a serjeant-at-law 39 but there are no references to him in the admission registers or printed records of the four main Inns of Court.

Wife.


---

(P.R.O. Assizes, loc. cit., 1, 2, 4-7, B. & C., 341 and Appendix 4.)

29. B. & C., 341; Will, P.C.C. 45 Holney; I.P.M., P.R.O., C. 142/159/46.
30. See father's I.P.M.
31. B.M. Harl. MSS, 703, f. 58.
32. S.A.C., xlviii, 89-90.
34. See Appendix 4.
35. Shaw, 118.
36. B. & C., loc. cit.
39. S.A.C., xlviii, 89.
40. B. & C., loc. cit.
41. Will pr. at Lewes. (Lewes wills, A. 23/56).
(Culpepper continued.)

42.

Children.


Edward  Bap. Ardingly, 24 Feb., 1605. (Twin to Mary). Named in father's I.P.M. and in mother's will, of which he was executor.


Timothea " 8 April, 1588.

Dorothy " 20 May, 1589. Bur. there 28th June, 1596.


Ann    Bap. Ardingly, 6 March, 1596.


42. S.A.C., xlviii, 92 et seqq.
(Culpepper continued.)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Marriages of children.

Edward John William md. at Bolney, 13 July, 1626, Jane, d. of Sir Benjamin Pellatt, at whose death the manor of Bolney came to Sir William Culpepper, according to the terms of the marriage settlement. Issue. md. Mary, d. of Sir Edward Bellingham.

Edward Elizabeth md. 25 May, 1611, John Whitfield Esq., of Mortlake, Surrey, s. and h. of Thomas Whitfield of the same.

Timothea md. twice, (a) on 25 June, 1616, George Phillips of E. Peckham, Kent, (b) Thomas Turner of Surrey.

Dorothy md. on 22 June, 1614, John Theobald of Seale, Kent.

Margery md. at Ardingly, 19 Feb., 1626, Anthony Bickerstaffe

Ann md. at Ardingly, 25 June, 1616, Thomas Wood of West Hoathly.

Catherine md. at Ardingly on 24 Feb., 1620, Richard Infield of Gravety, West Hoathly.

Philippa Eleanor Mary

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Street Hundred, Lewes Rape)

2 Elizabeth John Culpepper Esq. in lands £100. (Commissioner)

5 Elizabeth John Culpepper Esq. £100. (Commissioner)

1-2 Charles I Sir Edward Culpepper, knt., inlands £30. (Commissioner)
(Culpepper continued.)

References continued.

46. *Gray's Inn Admissions*, 181.
47. *S.A.C.*, xlvi, 94 et seqq.
49. "  , E. 179/190/274.
DARRELL.

Origins.

According to Berry and Comber, this family derived from the Darrells of Sesay in Yorkshire where they were settled in the reign of Henry III. One of the Yorkshire Darrells, John Darrell, came to settle at Calehill in Kent, early in the 15th century and died in October, 1438. It was by his second marriage, to Florence, daughter of William Chichele of Higham-Ferrers, Northamptonshire, and niece of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, that the Darrells became connected with Sussex: Henry Chichele, the Archbishop, gave his niece, on her marriage to John Darrell Esq. of Calehill, the manor of Scotney in the parish of Lamberhurst which he had acquired from the Ashburnhams in the early 15th century. The manor of Scotney which is partly in Kent thus came into the Darrell family and remained in their possession until the eighteenth century. The house later built by the Darrells was said to be designed by Inigo Jones.

From this marriage descended the Darrells of Scotney, while the elder line of Calehill, Kent, descended from the eldest son of John Darrell's first marriage. Of the Scotney Darrells, it was the great-grandson of John and Florence, Thomas Darrell Esq., who died shortly before Elizabeth's accession and who was the father of the J.P. whose name appears on the Commission in the early years of the reign. At least two of the Darrells held posts in the Royal Household in the sixteenth century: Stephen, uncle of the Thomas Darrell who was head of the Scotney family in 1580, was Clerk of the Kitchen in Henry VIII's Household, and this Thomas Darrell's brother, Edward, was Clerk of the Catery to Queen Elizabeth.

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in any version of the 1570 Visitation of Sussex. Mentioned in the 1634 Visitation.

1. B. & C., 165.
2. Ibid., Will, Lambeth, Chichele, 1,470.
3. Ibid.; Horsfield, 1,411.
4. B. & C., loc.cit.
5. Ibid.
6. H.C. MS, C. 27.
(Darrell continued.)

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Thomas Darrell of Scotney Esq., eld. son by his 1st marriage of Thomas Darrell of Scotney Esq., who died in 1558, and of Elizabeth, d. of James Horne of Bethersden, Kent. 7.

4 Mch. 1514, born. 8.

Executor to father, 1558, and to brother, George, 1567. 9.

J.P., Sussex, 1560-1564. 10.

1564, described in bishop's letter as "Mr Thomas Dorrell of Stackney" (sic), a J.P. of the East part of the county and a "myslyker of religion and godly proceedings". 11.

22 Sept., 1584, died at Battle. I.P.M., 5 Nov., 1586. 12.

Wives. 13.

1) Anne, d. and coheiress of Thomas Hedd of Maidstone, Kent.
2) Mary, d. of Thomas Roydon of Fortune Hall, East Peckham, Kent.

Children. 14.

By his first wife:-

Mary or Alice.

By his second marriage:-

Henry Later Henry Darrell of Scotney Esq. Became involved in a Star Chamber case for riot, trespass and forcible entry on the lands of one Edward Bathurst of Goudhurst in 39 Elizabeth. 15.

Mary
Margaret
Frances
Ellen

8. B. & C., loc. cit.
11. Bishops' letters, 1564. (Camden Misc., ix, 10)
12. I.P.M., P.R.O., C. 142/209/36.
(Darrell continued)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Son</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Inns of Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Perhaps the Henry Darrell adm. Gray's Inn, 1563. 16.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children. 17.

| Mary     | md. John Brooke. |
| Henry    | md. Margaret, d. of Sir Edward Gage of Firle, Sussex, (q.v.) |
| Mary     | md. Barnaby Gough |
| Margaret | md. - Tyndale |
| Frances  | md. Robert Greene of Bobbing, Kent |
| Ellen    | md. Edmund Pelham of Hastings | 18. |

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Wadhurst, Loxfield Hundred, Pevensey Rape.)

38 Henry VIII Thomas Darrell Esq. in lands £80 19. 2
2 Elizabeth " " ,gent., " " £50 20. 2
(As of Lamberhurst, Loxfield Hundred, Pevensey Rape)

18 Elizabeth Thomas Darrell & his son in lands £20 21. 2
(As of Wadhurst, Loxfield Hundred, Pevensey Rape)

1-2 Charles I William Darrell Esq., recusant, in lands £5 22.
(Also Elizabeth, his wife, and Thomas Darrell, gent. assessed at 8d. per poll)

14. Ibid.
15. P.R.O., Star Chamber 5 Elizabeth, D. 18/22. He may also have been the Darrell held in custody in 1596 for sending his children beyond the seas without licence. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, vi, 561.
17. B. & C., loc. cit.
18. See notes on Pelham family.
19. P.R.O.; E. 179/190/225.
20. " ; E. 179/190/265.
21. " ; E. 179/190/298.
DAWTREY.

Origins.

A comparatively recent writer on this family describes them as having been connected with West Sussex for over eight hundred years and as having, for six hundred of them, "played a leading part in the affairs and destinies of Petworth and its neighbourhood". 1.

These "large landowners in West Sussex"2 were of Norman origin and it is thought that they took their name from Hauertive, near Alençon, where they held land before the Conquest.3 It was thought at one time that their name derived from the 'High Stream' in Hardham, near Amberley, Sussex, where they had much land in the reigns of John and Henry III, and where a priory of Augustinian Black canons is supposed to have been founded by them. Hardham lies approximately 62 miles south-east of Petworth, on a bend of the River Arun which almost encircles it; the priory stands on a precipitous bank sloping steeply to the river which flows by on its south and east sides. Hence, it has been suggested, the name 'de Hault Rey', or later 'Dawtrey', and, in Latin, 'de Alta Ripa'. 4 But it has been pointed out that the Dawtreys were known by that name long before they were connected with Hardham. 5

The earliest member of the family to be mentioned in English records appears to have been William de Alta Ripa, who, between 1090 and 1100 held lands in Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, Shropshire and Sussex. His youngest son, Robert, came to Sussex in the train of Adelaide, widow of Henry I, on her second marriage to the Earl of Arundel. Robert's eldest son, William, acquired a considerable amount of property in the Petworth area, including the Hardham lands and lands at Bignor, Barlavington and Burton, either directly from Adelaide and her husband or, more probably, indirectly from Joscelin de Louvain, her brother who had come to England with her. When this brother, Joscelin de Louvain, married, in 1122, Agnes de Percy, the heiress to the great Percy estates in the North of

1. Lady Maxse: Petworth in Ancient Times, (Chichester, 1952), 10 et seqq.
2. S.A.C. xiv, 18.
3. Lady Maxse, loc.cit; See also S.A.C. vi, 76.
4. S.A.C. xvii, 191; xi, 112; vi, 257.
5. Lady Maxse, loc.cit.
(Dawtrey continued.)

England, Adelaide and the Earl of Arundel conferred on him the Honour of Petworth and other extensive estates in Sussex. Since Robert Dawtrey's son, William, appears to have married another sister of Joscelin de Louvain, it is likely that some of the Dawtrey lands came from him. A close connection between the Dawtreys and the Percies must, in this case, have been established at an early date, since Joscelin de Louvain was the ancestor of the Percies, Earls of Northumberland.

Although the Dawtreys resided in Petworth from an early date, it was not until the late 15th century that they acquired the More property there. This they did when Edmund Dawtrey, Sheriff of Sussex in 1492, married Isabel Wood, daughter of Sir Thomas Wood of River Park, who inherited her father's estate of which the house and lands of "the More", a mile from Petworth town, were a part. She also inherited property from her uncle, Sir John Wood, who was Treasurer of England in the reign of Richard III. From then on, "the More" was the home of the Dawtreys for over 250 years.

Leland, writing of this family in the early sixteenth century, said, "The chiefest house of these Dawtries is in Petworth Paroche callid More, half a mile from Petworth towne". They also had a house in Petworth itself near the church.

Edmund Dawtrey's grandson, John, who fought at Flodden in 1513 and was knighted on the field for his prowess, was one of the Commissioners sent by Thomas Cromwell in 1535 to dissolve the priory at Boxgrove and to take an inventory of its treasures. He was Sheriff in 1547. It was his son, William, who was head of the family in 1580.

7. Joscelin de Louvain undertook, on his marriage, to adopt the surname of Percy but retained his own arms. The old arms of the Percies were adopted and perpetuated by the Dawtrey family. (S.A.C. vi, 76)
8. Lady Maxse, loc. cit.
9. Ibid.; S.A.C., xiv, 18-19; B. & C., 46.
10. S.A.C., xiv, 18.
11. Lady Maxse, loc. cit.
(Dawtrey continued.)

Whether armigerous.

This family is found in all versions of the 1570 Visitation of Sussex which have been consulted. They are also mentioned in the 1634 Visitation.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

William Dawtrey Esq. of More House, Petworth, eld. s. of Sir John Dawtrey of the same who died, Dec. 1549, and of his 2nd wife, Jane, d. and heiress of William Skardeville.

J.P., Sussex, 1559 - 1564 and 1567 or '8 - 1570. Also in 1591.

1563, M.P. for Sussex.

1564, described in bishop's letters as "myslyker of religion and godlye proceedings", and as "verye supersticious." 17

1566 - '7, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex.

1569, refused to subscribe to the Council's order for the uniformity of public worship.

1576, examined for papistry.

15 August, 1580, in report to the bishop on recusancy in the deanery of Midhurst, "Mr. William Dawtrey esquyer doth not, neythr hath of long tyme come to divýie service neythr receyved the holy comm on but hath bene pnt at divers sermons preched in petworth church." 21

12. H.C. MS. G. 18 & MS D. 11; Phillips, 4; B.M. Add. MS.17, 065, f.10.


14. B. & C., 46. William succeeded his elder half-brother Richard Dawtrey Esq., son of Sir John Dawtrey by his 1st wife, on his death on 10 Feb., 1554. (Ibid.) This succession was later disputed by one, Nicholas Dawtrey gent., of Woodcote, co. Hants., a cousin of the whole blood to the late Richard. (P.R.O. St.Ch. 5 Eliz., D.13/23).

15. P.R.O., Assizes 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 1-6, 10-12, 33, and 34.

16. See Appendix 3.

17. Bishops' letters 1564, (Camden Misc., ix, 10)

18. See Appendix 4.


20. S.A.C., iii, 90.
1580, built a fine pannelled room in More House.

1587, in report on the Sussex J. P's, "On Mr William Dautre was put out of commission for that he was a recusant; but now syns his last marryadg he dooth diligently come to the church, and publikly receaveth the sacrament, wherfor yf he was restored to the iustys office, I take it ameans to encourage hym to proced, and to allure other recusants for to do their dwghty to God and their prinse". In 1591 he was restored to the Commission of the Peace (v. supra).

13 June, 1591, died Will. d. 13 June, pr. 23 Nov., 1591. I.P.M., 26 August, 1591.

Wives.


Children.

By his first wife:

John Aged 18 in 1570.
Charles " 8 "
Anthony " 2 " "
Jane

By his second wife:

Richard Bap. 18 Oct., 1582.

Education. Universities. Inns of Court.
Father - William, perhaps he who was adm. Lincoln's Inn, 19 April, 1564.
Sons -

Marriages of children.

John md. Joanna, d. of David Polhill of Otford.
Charles md. Jane Knight of Petworth, Sussex.
Anthony md. Mary Durrant.

22. Lady Maxse, 13.
23. S.A.C. ii, 60.
(Dawtrey continued.)

**Subsidy assessments.**

(As of Petworth, Rotherbridge Hundred, Arundel Rape.)

38 Henry VIII John Dawtrey, knt., in lands £120.31.

(Commissioner for Chichester Rape).

14 Elizabeth William Dawtrey Esq., in lands £50.32.

? Elizabeth — before 1591 — Wm. Dawtrey Esq. in lands £50.33.

38 Elizabeth — Mistress Dorothy Dawtrey, widow, in lands £7.

 Henry Dawtrey, gen., in lands £5.34.

 John Dawtrey, in lands £1.34.

1-2 Charles I, Henry Dawtrey Esq., in lands £5.35.


27. Lady Maxse, 13.


29. Lincoln's Inn Admissions, i, 71.

30. B. & C., loc. cit.


32. " ; E. 179/190/283.

33. " ; E. 179/190/346.

34. " ; E. 179/190/334.

DREW.

Origins.

Roger Drew of Densworth appears on only one list of J.P.'s for the county during the reign, and then is noted as "mort".1 However, he is referred to in the will of his younger son, James, as "sometime one of the Queen's Majesties' Justices of Peace and Quorum", which fact James wished to be recorded in a monumental inscription to his father to be erected in Chichester Cathedral.2 But, since Roger Drew's name does not appear on any of the lists of J.P.'s for Sussex for dates earlier or later than June, 1590,3 it appears that he enjoyed the honour of which his son was so proud for a few months only. He died on 16 December, 1599.4

His parentage is unknown. The family does not appear in the Visitations of 1570 or 1634. He was probably a newcomer to the county whose connection with it is likely to have commenced with his marriage to Dorothy, daughter and heiress of Elias Bradshaw Esq., who had been plaintiff in fine for the manor of Densworth in Funtington, West Sussex, in 1542.5 She is mentioned in the wills both of her husband and of her son, James.6 In his will, Roger Drew refers also to his lands in and about Chichester, some of which he bought "lately . . . of my sister Prynce", and to his lands in Surrey. He also refers to his brother, Edward.

The family of Drew of Densworth died out in 1630 with the demise of Roger Drew's great-grandson, Francis Drew, at the age of about two years.7

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in any version of the 1570 or 1634 Visitations of Sussex.

2. P.C.C. 24 Lewyn.
4. See son, James' will. Note 2.
5. Elwes, 101; S.R.S., xix, 126.
7. S.R.S., xiv, nos. 345 & 346.
(Drew continued.)

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Roger Drew of Densworth in Funtington, and of Chichester.

J.P. Sussex, (and Q? v. supra) according to Assize Roll for June 1590, but "mort" added. Not on list of J.P's attached to Assize Roll for June, 1589.

According to will of son, James, died 16 December, 1585.

Own will dt. 7 Dec. 1585, pr. 23 Jan., 1590. Shows he held lands in Surrey as well as Densworth, and lands in and near Chichester. 8.

Wife.

Dorothy, d. and h. of Elias Bradshaw Esq. who was plaintiff in fine for the manor of Densworth in 1542. (v. supra). Her I.P.M. dt. 14 July 1596, and gives the date of her death as 28 Oct., 1595. 9. Died seized of lands in Bosham which descended to Bradshaw Drew.

Children.

Bradshaw Later Bradshaw Drew Esq. of Densworth. Aged 32 at mother's I.P.M., i.e. born about 1563. Died 1 July, 1614. I.P.M. dt. 17 August, 1614. Then seized of Densworth and lands in Birdham, Bosham and Chichester, Sussex. 10. Will dt. 23 Feb., 1609, pr. 9 Nov., 1614. 11.


Agnes Mentioned in father's will.

Dorothy " " " " "

Sibil " " " " "

8. P.C.C. 2 Drury.
10. Ibid., and P.R.O., C. 142/341/75.
12. See note 2.
(Drew continued.)

**Education.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Bradshaw, adm. Inner Temple Nov., 1584-1594.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>James, adm. Gray's Inn, Nov., 1596.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marriages of children.**

| Bradshaw | md. Ellnor - 16. Issue including Francis, aged 6 at father's death. |
| James | apparently d.s.p. and unmd. No mention of a wife in his will. Made his brother, Bradshaw, his heir. |
| Agnes | |
| Dorothy | Mentioned in their brother, Bradshaw's will as "my sister Shott of Portsmouth", "my sister Ingram!", also a reference to "my brother in-law, Stutt". |

**Subsidy assessments.**

(As of the City of Chichester, Chichester Rape.)

14 Elizabeth Roger Drew in goods £8 19.
29 Elizabeth " " " £8 20.

(As of Funtington, Hundred of Bosham, Chichester Rape.)


13. Inner Temple Admissions, 111.
15. Gray's Inn Admissions, 92; Pension Book of Gray's Inn, 1,89.
16. See her husband's will, P.C.C. 117 Lawe.
18. In 38 Henry VIII, one John Drewe (sic), of Elsted, Hundred of Domforde, Chichester Rape was assessed at 40s. in lands. It is not known whether he was the father of Roger Drew of Densworth. In 2 Elizabeth, one Thomas Drewe, gent. of Buxsted, Alcyston Hundred, Pevensey Rape, was assessed at £16 in lands. It is not known whether he was related to this family. See P.R.O., E.179/190/225 and E. 179/190/265.
20. P.R.O., E.179/258/11.
21. P.R.O.; E.179/190/347.
ERNLEY. (or Erneley, Earnley etc.)

Origins.

There are at least two versions of the origins of this family. According to one, they were originally known as "Erley", and derived their name from the village of Erley or Ernley, so called from 'Er-lege', the eagle's nest, and this manor of Erleges was at Brighton. A fine that passed between Matilda, daughter of Robert de Erlege, deforciant, and John de Erlege, plaintiff, in 1197 in respect of this and other land, is quoted.

Elwes, however, connects the family from its origins with the parish of Earnley in Manhood Hundred, Chichester Rape. There seems no clear reason for questioning his assertion. Richard Ernley Esq., who died in 1577, was J.P. for Chichester Rape. Elwes quotes Sir William Dugdale's researches into the early history of the parish of Ernley and describes how, after Athelstan had granted the manor in 930 to the bishop of Selsey, it was reunited to the crown and "for several centuries was held by a distinguished family which took its name from the place - and bore what we may call the derivative coat - argent on a bend sable, 3 eagles (or earns) sable." 4.

The most distinguished member of the family before the Elizabethan period was Sir John Ernley who became Lord Chief Justice of Common Pleas on 27 January, 1519, on which date he was also knighted. He was married to Margaret, daughter of Edmund Dawtrey Esq. of More House, Petworth. He died in 1520 and was buried in the parish church of Earnley.

"The seat of the Earnleys, a large castellated mansion, surrounded by a moat, stood near the Church". Another notable family residing in this parish in the 16th century was the younger branch of the Bartellots, - the Bartellots of "Redlands".

Unfortunately, Berry and Comber do not give a full pedigree of this family and mention only Sir John Ernley, the Judge, already referred to, by reason of his marriage to a Dawtrey.

1. S.A.C., ix, 314.
2. Elwes, 74.
4. Elwes, 75n. From the terms of King Athelstan's grant it appears that the place at the time contained much woodland and might therefore have been the haunt of eagles - hence "Earn-lege".
5. B. & C., 46.
6. Ibid; his will was pr. 17 Nov. 1520. P.C.C. 3 Maynwaring.
7. Elwes loc. cit.
8. See notes on family of Bartellot.
But a full pedigree is given by Elwes. He traces them back to Richard Ernle, living in the reign of Henry III; his son, John Ernle who was living in 13 Edward I, held lands in North Mundham, Itchenor, Donington, Oving and other parishes in Sussex. In the 15th century began their association with Wiltshire when Robert Ernle, a younger son, in addition to his property at Burpham in Angmering, Sussex, acquired lands in that county. His grandson, John, who succeeded his father in 4 Edward IV, married Joan, (or Agnes), daughter of Simon Best by Agnes, daughter and heiress of one of the Nervins, (or Marvins), a prominent Wiltshire family; she succeeded to the family property at Echilhampton in that county. It was the second of the grandsons of John Ernle and Joan who became the Chief Justice of Common Pleas in 1519, and it was he who came into his grandmother's estate of Echilhampton. The judge's elder brother having died without children, it was his own two sons who divided the Ernley inheritance between them, the elder, William, inheriting the family seat at Ernley in Sussex, and the younger, John, settling at Burton in the parish of Allcanning, Wiltshire, and founding the Wiltshire branch which became very distinguished in the affairs of that county during the next two centuries.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation. Not in the 1634 Visitation.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580

Richard Ernley Esq., of Cackham and Ernley, s. and heir of William Ernley Esq., the M.P. Chichester, 1542, who died 20 Jan., 1546, and of Bridget, d. of - Spring of Lavenham.

1564, in bishop's letter mentioned as "No justice" but a "favorer of godlye proceedings".

10. Elwes chart opp. p. 75.
14. Perhaps he had had an elder brother, Francis, who died a minor in 1 Ed. VI; see I. P. M., P. R. O. C. 142/92/84.
15. Comber, (Horsham), 186.
(Ernley continued)

J.P. Sussex, 1565 - Jan., 1593, and 1597 - 1602, and c. 1585, commissioner for restraint of grain. 18.

1576, was one of those cited by Bishop Curtis of Chichester for examination on suspicion of papistry. Curtis was later, on the petition of several including Richard Ernley, arraigned for over-zealousness. 19.

1587, in report on Sussex J.P.'s was described as not being very satisfactory because he "is dwelling most in Hampshire". 20.

15 Nov., 1607, died. I.P.M.

Wife.

Barbara, d. of Sir Henry Goring of Burton, Sussex. 22.

Children.


Richard Mentioned in father's I.P.M. as his s. and h.

Bridget. 24.

17. Bishops letters, 1564 as "Mr Richard Ernlie of Cackham" (Camden Misc., ix, 10).
19. S.A.C. iii, 90 et seqq.
21. I.P.M. P.R.O. C 142/300/184. Nota Elwes, chart opp. p.75, gives one, Richard Ernley, son of William who died Jan. 1546, as marrying one, Elizabeth, and as dying in 1577 and leaving a son Richard who married Barbara, daughter of Sir Henry Goring, & was himself father of William & Bridget. Elwes seems to have inserted a generation. (cf. Phillips,4). There is no evidence of a Richard Ernley dying in 1577, and the Sussex J.P. held office continuously from 1565-1595. However, Richard Ernley who died in 1607, had a son Richard who was then his heir according to the I.P.M. quoted.
23. Ibid.
24. Elwes, chart opp. p. 75. Elwes, however, omits any reference to Richard, her brother.
(Ernley continued)

Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons</td>
<td>Admin., Middle Temple, 7 Feb., 1561. 25.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children.


Subsidy assessments.

(As of West Wittering, Hundred of Manwood, Chichester Rape.)
38 Henry VIII Bridget Ernley, wid., in lands 100 marks. 27. 14 Elizabeth Richard Ernley Esq., £30. 28.

(As of South Street, Chichester city)
41 Elizabeth Richard Ernley Esq. in lands £20. 29.

(As of Manwood Hundred, Chichester Rape)
3 Elizabeth Richard Ernley Esq. in lands £20. 30.

1-2 Charles I ditto £6.
(And as of West St., Chichester City)
1-2 Charles I ditto £5. 31.

25. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 26.
27. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
EVERSFIELD

Origins

Little is known of the early origins of this family, but it was very likely a branch of the great Kentish family of Hever from which it may have derived both name and coat of arms. The name "Hever" was often spelt "Ever", and it has been suggested that heiresses of this name founded the families of Eversfield and Evershed whose arms, like their names, appear to have had a common origin.

Comber traces the pedigree of this family no farther back than one, "Eversfield", father of Nicholas Eversfield of Foyle, Surrey, who had also considerable properties in Sussex, namely the manor of Torryng Peverell in Fletching, and lands in Buxsted, Rotherfield, Newick, Chailey, Hartfield, Framfield, Maresfield and Kingston-by-Lewes. The will of this Nicholas Eversfield was proved in July, 1552. By his wife, Johane, of unknown family, he had three sons and three daughters. His son and heir, John, aged 19 in September, 1551, when his father made his will, settled at Worth in North Sussex, not far from Horsham, and by his wife, Bridget, of unknown family, had two sons, the future Sir Thomas Eversfield of Denne in Horsham, and John. It was this Sir Thomas Eversfield who was to be Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex, 1599 - 1600, and J.P. in 1601 and 1602.

While the Eversfield are classed as newcomers to the county and they do not appear among the more important county office-holders until the end of the reign, and while little is known of their earlier history when settled in Surrey, yet they appear to have been a striking example of the rapid advancement of certain gentry families at this period.

John Eversfield Esq. of Worth who died 13 June, 1595, father of Sir Thomas Eversfield, the Sheriff, was an ironmaster and is named among the owners of ironworks in Sussex, Surrey and Kent in February, 1574. Some of these had apparently been infringing a patent granted by the Queen to one, Ralph Hogge, for the sole exportation of ordnance, and bonds were now

1. S.A.C., vi, 86.
2. Comber, (Horsham), 89.
5. S.A.C., 111, 243.
(Eversfield continued)

taken from them that this would not continue in future. Apparently John Eversfield was a man of means since, for example, he was among the 15 contributors out of the 108 in Sussex who subscribed £100 towards the loan for Defence in 1588. This was the highest rate of assessment adopted in Sussex. 6.

Thus, despite their possible claim to a distinguished origin, the 16th century Eversfields of Sussex have all the appearances of a family of parvenus. They rose rapidly, and the Elizabethan age and the early years of the 17th century saw them buying up property, marrying into some of the leading county families and occupying the shrievalty and seats in Parliament. 7.

Of this family, the elder branch, the Eversfields of Denne in Horsham, was established by Sir Thomas Eversfield, knight, John Eversfield's son and heir. He was aged 40 or more at his father's death in 1595, 8 and died himself in 1616 after marrying twice and having a large family. It was he who bought the Denne property in 1604 from Stephen Barnham of London and his sons, for the handsome sum of £5,500. 9.

The younger branch of the family, the Eversfields of Hollington, also successfully established themselves in the later 16th century but do not emerge as holders of important county office until early in the 17th century. They descended from Thomas Eversfield, gent., younger brother of John Eversfield Esq. of Worth, and uncle of Sir Thomas Eversfield of Denne. He resided first at Uckfield, and, under his father's will in 1551, he inherited lands in Rotherfield. 10. It was through the second marriage of this Thomas Eversfield that the family acquired their property in Hollington, namely "The Grove", which is described in the Victoria County History as "a capital messuage of Hollington in the Rape of Hastings. 11. "The Grove" had formerly been the property of Lawrence Levett who died without issue on the 16 January, 1585, and from him it passed to his sister, Mary, who, on 26 January, 1586, married Thomas Eversfield Esq. of Uckfield. 12

6. S.A.C., i, 32.
7. For the part played by the family as Parliamentarians during the Civil War, see S.A.C., lxx, 166.
9. Elwes, 120.
11. V.C.H., Sussex, ix, 84.
Nicholas Eversfield, son and heir of Thomas Eversfield of Hollington, who succeeded his father on the latter's death in February, 1612, was Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in 1619 and sat as M.P. for Hastings in 1623-'4 in the teeth of government opposition, the official candidate being Walter Montague Esq., son of the Lord President of the Council. 13.

Whether armigerous.

In no version of the 1570 Visitation, but they do appear in the 1634 Visitation. 14.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Eversfield of Worth Esq., eld. son and heir of Nicholas Eversfield of Poyle, Surrey who died c. 1551-'2, 15.

An ironmaster. Named among owners of ironworks in Sussex, Surrey and Kent, February, 1574. 16.

1588, contributed £100 to the Armada Loan. 17.

13 June, 1595, died. 18. Will and I.P.M.

Wife.

Bridget -. 19.

12. Comber, loc.cit.; S.A.C., xiv, 3. Note: both Horsfield, i, 434, and S.A.C., xx1, 148 et seqq., err in describing the husband of the Levett heiress as "Sir" Thomas Eversfield. Sir Thomas Eversfield was the nephew of the Thomas Eversfield here in question. This latter person was never knighted. (See Comber, loc.cit; and wills, and I.P.M's there quoted).
14. H.C. MS, C.27.
16. S.A.C., iii, 243, and see Appendix 29.
17. S.A.C., i, 32.
18. Comber, (Horsham), 90; I.P.M., P.R.O., C. 142/244/103. Will, P.C.C. 42 Scott, & 17 Drake.
(Eversfield continued)

Children. 20.

Thomas Later Sir Thomas Eversfield of Denne, Horsham. Aged 40 and more at father's death. 1599-1600, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex. 20. J.P. Sussex, Juge, 1601 and 1602. 21. 1603, knighted. 22. 1604, bought the Denne property from Stephen Barnham of London and his sons, for £5,500. The mansion, which is on the south side of Horsham, stands in a deer park and was probably built by the Eversfields soon after they acquired the property. 23. It seems that Sir Thomas Eversfield went into residence there almost at once since all his children born before the purchase are registered as baptised at Worth, whereas from 1605 on, they are all entered in the Horsham Parish registers. 24.

John Dead before August, 1612.

Education. Universities Inns of Court

Father Perhaps - the John Eversfield who matric. sizar from Corpus Christi, Cambridge, Michaelmas, 1548. 25.


20. Ibid.
21. P.R.O. Assiges 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 43 & 44. Described on Dorse of Pat. Rolls, P.R.O. C. 66/1549 and 1594 as "of Tilgaté". He resided at this time at Worth, near Tilgaté Forest.
22. Shaw, ii, 112.
23. Elwes, 120.
26. Ibid.
(Eversfield continued)

Marriages of children. 27.

Thomas md. (a) Anne, d. of William Morley of Glynde.
(b) Elizabeth, d. of Ashton Aylesworth of London.

John

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Buttinghill Hundred, Lewes Rape)

18 Elizabeth Mr Eversfield in goods £28 16s. 28.

(Apparently no other relevant assessments for this branch of the family between 38 Henry VIII and 1-2 Charles I.)

27. Comber, loc. cit.
FENNER

Origins.

Sir Edward Fenner, Justice of King's Bench from 26 May, 1590, who died 23 Jan., 1612, and who was a J.P. of Sussex for some years under Queen Elizabeth, and M.P. for Lewes in 1571 and for Shoreham in 1572, seems to have come from rather an obscure Sussex family. No pedigree is given by either Comber or Berry; there is one compiled by Dallaway, but it does not agree with the evidence of the I.P.M's and wills examined. A pedigree has therefore been constructed from the latter sources, ignoring Dallaway's account.

Sir Edward Fenner is described by Foss as son of John Fenner of Crawley, Surrey, apparently an error for Crawley, Sussex. Dallaway makes the same error in his tabulated pedigree, though elsewhere he refers to the Fenners of Crawley "in this county", speaking of Sussex. The evidence of the Herald's Visitations shows that the family had, in earlier generations, been connected with Sussex, and the evidence of wills and I.P.M's seems conclusive as to the Sussex origin of Sir Edward Fenner.

The first Fenner of Crawley, Sussex, of whom any authentic record appears to be available is one, John Fenner, whose will was proved in 1513 along with that of his son, Thomas. This John Fenner's I.P.M. was dated 5 November, 1513.

It has been suggested that the resemblance between the coats of arms of the Fenners and of the Michelborne's of Sussex may indicate an early connection between the two families. It has also been suggested that the Michelborne family might have been descended from the Fenners of Fenn Place, Worth. The Michelbornes were one of the armigerous Sussex families of the 1570 Visitation. If these suggestions are worth anything, the Fenners must have been one of the older established families of the county.

1. J. Dallaway: History of the Western Division of the county of Sussex, (1815), i, pt.2,16.
3. Dallaway, loc. cit.
4. Dallaway, i,15. See also Horsfield, ii, 398; Elwes, 270.
8. S.A.C., 1,63.
9. S.A.C., xxxvii, 30n.
(Fenner continued).

Thomas, son of John Fenner whose will was proved in 1513, and whose own will is embodied in that of his father, left all his goods to be disposed of by his father and his wife. He is referred to in his father's will as "lately deceased",11 and he is mentioned in his father's I.P.M., though here he is called "John".12 Evidently the same person is referred to since both sources mention him as leaving a widow, Anne and two sons called John; also Anne, his widow, who remarried, called him Thomas in her will.13

It is clear therefore that, by her first husband, Thomas Fenner, Anne had had two sons, both called John. They are referred to in their grandfather's I.P.M., of 1513, as being at that time aged 6 and 4 respectively.14 They are also named in their grandfather's will and in their mother's will.15 In their grandfather's will it was arranged that certain property in Bolney and Ifield including the manor of "Bonewyks" should go to their mother Anne, during her lifetime, and then to John Fenner, her younger son, with remainder to John, the elder son and heir.16 The Crawley property being the main family residence would, in the natural course of things, go to the elder John on his attaining his majority.

It therefore seems likely that the John Fenner of Amberley Esq. whose I.P.M. is dated 26 Sept., 1567, was the younger of these two sons, for, among the lands of which he had been seized, according to his I.P.M., were the manors of Fishbourne, Bonewikes and Rumbalswike, though he had sold them before his death.17 He is not likely to have been the elder of the two brothers to whom the manor was to revert should his younger brother predecease him, since he would then have been possessed of the Crawley property also. Moreover, his heir, aged 6 at his death, was no other than Dudley Fenner, the Puritan divine,18 while the heir to the Crawley property left at the decease of John Fenner of Crawley, was the future Sir Edward Fenner, the Judge.19

These are the grounds for suspecting that Sir Edward Fenner the Judge, was first cousin to Dudley Fenner, the Puritan. He may also have been related somehow to the Thomas Fenner who was M.P. for Shoreham in 1584,20 and perhaps also to the Joan Fenner who married into the Shurley and Morley families and died before 1569.21

13. S.A.C. x, 155
15. S.A.C., xxxi, 135.
17. S.R.S., xiv, 89.
18. D.N.B. "Dudley Fenner".
(Fenner continued.)

Both Horsfield and Elwes say that the Fenners of Crawley acquired extensive property in the parish of West Wittering, "before the time of Queen Elizabeth". 22.

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in any version of the 1570 Visitation of Sussex, but Sir Edward Fenner is named in the MS containing genealogies culled from the Visitations of 1530 and 1633-14 together with a few additions.23.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Edward Fenner of Crawley, Sussex, son of John Fenner of the same whose date of death is unknown,24 and of Elinor, d. of John Goring of Burton who died in 1520 and of Constantia his wife.25.

1557, admitted Middle Temple. Called to the bar (See "Education")

1571 M.P. Lewes,26 1572, M.P. New Shoreham.27

1576, Bencher and Autumn Reader.28

Nov., 1577, serjeant-at-law. Acquired a large practice.29.

26 May, 1590, appointed a Judge of King's Bench and remained one for 21 years.30. Not a prominent member of the court but on the commissions for several state trials.31. In 1603, Cecil said he "would never run mad with learning".32.

23 July, 1603, knighted, as "of Middlesex". 33.

19. D.N.B. "Edward Fenner".
20. The Judge appears to have had two brothers, both also Edward, both of whose wills were pr., 1614:-(a) Edward Fenner of Chichester, gent., P.C.C. 32 Lawe, and (b) Edward Fenner Esq., of Hayes, Middlesex, P.C.C. 78 Lawe. These had also a brother called Thomas (see P.C.C. 32 Lawe) who may have been the M.P. for Shoreham, 1584. See also Harl Soc. Pubs. liii, 108.
24. Probably not the J.P. Sussex of 1565-1568, (P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, 7-10) who was more likely John Fenner of Amberley whose I.P.M. dt. 1567 (S.R.+, xiv, 89) On the 1568 Assize Roll he is noted as dead.
25. B. & C. 139. op. cit.
26. Browne Willis, /iii, 85.
(Fenner continued.)

Jan., 1608, received an annuity of £50 during the time his services on circuit were discontinued. 34.

1578-1595, J.P., Sussex, usually of the Quorum. 35. Not mentioned in the report on the Sussex J.P.'s in 1587. 36.

23 Jan., 1612, died. 37. Will dt. 1611, pr. 1612. By this he left his children and goods to the disposition of his eld. son, Edward Fenner. No mention of his wife. His second son, Richard was a witness to the will. Will describes the testator as of Hayes, Middlesex. 38.

Wife. ?

Children.


Richard Named as second son and a witness in father's will. 41.

George Named in will of uncle, Edward Fenner of Chichester.

Anne 42.
Anne
Frances
Elizabeth
Mary

27. Official returns.
28. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 23.
29. D.N.B.
30. Foss op. cit. vi, 152-3; D.N.B.
31. D.N.B.
33. Shaw, 11, 113.
34. D.N.B.
36. S.A.C. 11, 58 et seqq.
37. D.N.B.
38. P.C.C. 1 Fenner.
39. P.C.C. 78 Lawe
40. P.C.C. 32 Lawe.
41. But as "Robert" in his uncles' wills.
42. See wills, P.C.C. 78 and 32 Lawe.
(Fenner continued.)

**Education.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adm, Middle Temple, from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Inn, 16 Oct., 1557,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barrister by 1570. Bencher 1576.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn Reader, 1576.43.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sons</th>
<th></th>
<th>Edward, matric. fell. Edward, adm. Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comm. from St. John's Temple, 3 July, 1593.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coll., Camb., c.159344.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marriages of children.**

- Edward md. Katherine - Issue. 46.
- Richard
- George
- Anne md. - Saye. 47.
- Anne md. - Shelley 48.
- Frances md. - Waler 49.
- Elizabeth unmarried in uncle Edward's will, pr. 1614.50.
- Mary youngest daughter. 51.

**Subsidy assessments.**

(The identity of the various Fenners mentioned in the Subsidy Rolls for Sussex for this period is too uncertain for the assessments to be noted. The only one which seems likely to have related to the Judge's family is:-

(As of Warnham, Hundred of Shinglecross, Bramber Rape)

2 Elizabeth John Fenner Esq. in lands £20. 52.

43. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 23; Minutes of Parliament, Middle Temple Records, 1, 171.
44. Al.Cant., Pt. 1,11,130.
45. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 65.
46. P.C.C. 78 Lawe.
47. Ibid., and P.C.C. 32 Lawe.
49. P.C.C. 32 Lawe.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. P.R.O., E. 179/190/268. Perhaps the Judge's father.
FITZALAN, Earl of Arundel.

Origins.

Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, who died on the 24 February 1580, was the last heir male of the house of Fitzalan, Earls of Arundel, who had enjoyed that title since the thirteenth century. The Fitzalans had originally been feudal lords of Clun and Oswestry in co. Salop, but the marriage of one of them to a coheiress of Hugh d'Aubigny, the last of the Earls of Arundel of that name, brought their son the Castle and Honour of Arundel which had been part of the d'Aubigny inheritance, and, to his descendants, the title itself.

The connection of the Fitzalans with Sussex was, therefore, by the 16th century, one of fairly long standing. Of the other Elizabethan peers whose main residence was within the county, only the Sackvilles, recently ennobled, and the Wests, Barons De la Warr, could make similar claims. For, although it is true that the Percies, Earls of Northumberland, had held extensive lands in the Honour of Petworth since the 12th century, it was not until the 16th century that they showed signs of preferring to reside there rather than at their native Alnwick.

Like all great landowners of the period, the Fitzalans, Earls of Arundel, had property scattered through numerous counties. Between 1485 and 1547, they held property in 13 counties apart from Sussex. But, even so, the bulk of it lay in that county: of 131 manors and 3 religious houses held by them at some time within that period, 58 manors and the 3 religious houses were in Sussex.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Henry Fitzalan, 12th Earl of Arundel, only s. of William Fitzalan, 11th Earl of that name, who died 23 Jan. 1544, and of Lady Anne Percy, d. of Henry Percy, 4th Earl of Northumberland. She died in 1552.

c. 1511, born. Godson of Henry VIII.

---

1. G.E.C., i, 239 and 237 for pedigree. See also 231, note b, showing that in 1433 it was conceded by the Crown that the Earldom was one of tenure, depending on the tenure of the Lordship of the Castle of Arundel, and, since this ruling was retrospective, the son of Hugh d'Aubigny's coheiress was de jure the first Fitzalan to hold the title. However, neither he nor his son was known by this title during his

/contd.
Fitzalan continued.)

1532, accompanied Henry VIII to France
1540-'3, Lord Deputy of Calais.
4 Feb., 1541, Henry granted the site of the late Priory of
Michaelham to his father, William Fitzalan, Earl of
Arundel, who in turn "bargained and sold" to the king
property in West Sussex. 7.
1544, K.G. Stormed Boulogne. On his return to England, was
created Lord Chamberlain, which office he retained under
Edward VI.
July, 1546. Privy Councilor.
Joined Warwick against Somerset but was removed by
Warwick from the Council. Next allied himself with
Somerset. On Somerset's fall, he was imprisoned and
fined.
A strong supporter of Mary for whom he raised the City
against Northumberland. He captured Northumberland.
Held various offices under Mary including that of Lord
Steward of the Household.
1554-'5, conveyed Michaelham to the Crown in exchange for other
lands. 8.
1558 At the accession of Elizabeth, was Lord Steward of the
Household and Privy Councillor.
1559 Chancellor of Oxford University.
1559-1571 and 1573 - 1579, J.P. for Sussex. Of the Quorum. 9.
5 March, 1559, wrote to Cecil that he had given the office of
Steward of the lands of the Duchy of Lancaster in
Sussex to Sir Richard Sackville. 10.

continued
lifetime, though the grandson was apparently formally
created an Earl, probably of Arundel, not of Sussex
as Glover says, in 1239, and was generally known as
the Earl of Arundel during his lifetime.
2. See notes on the Percy family.
theses) Addit. Appx. sub 'Fitzalan'.
4. Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, died in Feb. 1580 and
is therefore included in this survey as well as his heir,
Philip Howard.
5. G.E.C., i, 250.
6. D.N.B. When no other reference is given in the following
biography, either this authority or G.E.C. i, 250 et
seqq, has been used.
7. S.A.C., vi, 159-'60.
8. Ibid.
(Fitzalan, continued.)

26 May, 1559, on a list of Lords Lieutenant as Lord Lieutenant of Sussex. 11.

20 April, 1560, Lord John Grey wrote to Cecil of the danger to England of "the Philippians" both abroad and on the Queen's Council; among these he numbered the Earl of Arundel. He said that the Queen should take more stringent measures about them for the sake of God's cause, the Commonwealth's safety and her own surety, and either banish them to their own houses or wipe them out of her Council.12.

18 May, 1560, in a letter to Sir Thomas Parry he mentioned that he was expecting one, Thomas Stoughton to come to him shortly. The latter was later Controller to the Earl of Arundel.13.

c. 1560, an arrangement was made for an exchange of lands between the Queen and the Earl of Arundel. Certain of the Queen's lands in Sussex, including the manor of Halfnaked and the parsonage of Boxgrove, were to go to him in exchange for some lands of his in other counties.14.

c. 1560, referred to by Arthur Gounter in a conversation with George Cotton concerning the question of the Queen's marriage, as being very powerful and having many supporters and as being a rival to Dudley.15.

1564, resigned the Lord Stewardship of the Household; resigned from the Council, and went out of favour.

13 October, 1565, wrote to Cecil thanking him for his letter and saying he wished he could serve the Queen as she needed; declaring himself ready to serve her to the best of his ability if he were needed; and saying he would have been at Court but for the physic given him by his doctors.16.

26 Dec., 1567, wrote to Cecil thanking him for news including that of Henry Cobham's journey to negotiate a marriage between the Queen and the Archduke Charles, but he hinted that he was not much interested in this, especially now that he was "further off". 17.

1569, fell under suspicion for participating in schemes for a marriage between Mary Queen of Scots and the Duke of Norfolk, Arundel's former son-in-law.

25 Sept., 1569, summoned by the Queen for interrogation, and, together with Lord Lumley and the Earl of Pembroke, was subjected to examination. Confined to his own house and in October and December was re-examined. 18.

11. For his tenure of the Lord Lieutenancy of Sussex, see Appendix 1.
12. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 212.
14. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 256.
15. S.A.C., xxiii, 5-6, and see notes on Gounter family.
16. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 323.
(Fitzalan, continued)

Oct., Rumoured that Lord De la Warr had charged the Earl of Arundel with treason, but this was denied by Lord De la Warr. 19.

5 Dec., 1569, denied any connivance at the Northern Rebellion. 20. Deco) 1569: restored to the Council by the influence of Leicester. 21. Opposed the Alencon match.

settled the Honour, Castle and town of Arundel and various other lands on himself for life, with the remainder to John, Lord Lumley, his son-in-law, and Jane, his wife, and subsequently to Philip Howard, Earl of Surrey, and Anne, his wife, and their heirs, and to the Duke of Norfolk, Philip's father, and his heirs. 22.

May, 1571, Bishop of Ross arrested. On examination, made confessions concerning the Ridolfi plot, implicating many people, including the Earl of Arundel. 23.


c. Jan., 1572, after the execution of the Duke of Norfolk, was set at liberty. 25.


There are various references in the State Papers to a debt of the Earl's to the Crown, and also one concerning the state of his lands at his death together with a petition about these from Lord Lumley to the Queen. 28.

Wives.

1) Catherine, d. of Thomas Grey, 2nd Marquess of Dorset by his second wife, Margaret, d. of Sir Robert Wootton. Catherine was aunt of Lady Jane Grey. She died, 1 May, 1532. 29.


21. D.N.B.
22. S.R.S., xix, 10; see also 9.
23. D.N.B., sub "John Leslie"; H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 526, 527, 528, 544 et seqq., 546 et seqq., 549.
24. D.N.B., sub "Henry Fitzalan".
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.; for a description of his funeral and the names of the chief mourners, see S.A.C. xii, 261-12; his tomb, S.A.C., iii, 78-85. His portrait at Parham, S.A.C. xxv, 13.
27. D.t. 30 Dec., 1579; pr. 27 Feb., 1580. P.C.C. 1 Arundell.
(Fitzalan, continued)

Children.

**Henry** Styled Lord Maltravers. Only s. and h. app. Born, 1538. 20 Feb., 1547, knighted as a K.B. Was sent as an ambassador to the King of Bohemia; caught a fever and d.s.p. and v.p., 30 June, 1556 at Brussels, aged 18. 31.

**Joan (or Jane) Elder** d. and coh. She was one of the 6 principal ladies who sat in the third chariot of state at the Coronation of Queen Mary; her scholarship made her eminent among the well-educated ladies of the time. Died, 1576. 32.

**Mary** Younger daughter. 1540, born. Died in childbed, 25 Aug., 1557 at Arundel House, Strand in her 17th year. 33.

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(High Steward of Oxf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ., 1555-’9; and Chancellor, 1558-’9.) 34.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Son</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Phil. Matric. from Queen’s Coll., Camb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter 1549. 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children.

**Henry** Lord Maltravers, md. Ann, wid. of Sir High Rich, 3rd d. and coh. of Sir John Wentworth of Gosfield, Essex. She remd. after his death, between 1573 and 1580, William Deane. She was bur. 10 Jan., 1581 at Gosfield as "Ann, Lady Maltravers, uxor William Deane Esq." 36.

**Joan, or Jane** md. John, Lord Lumley as his first wife. No issue. 37.

**Mary** md. on or before 30 Mch., 1555 as his first wife, Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk. Issue, one son, Philip Howard, later Earl of Arundel. Born 28 June, 1557 at Arundel House, Strand. 38.

29. G.E.C., i, 251.
34. AI. Ox., ii, 502.
35. AI. Cant., Pt.1, ii, 145.
36. G.E.C., i, 252.
37. G.E.C., i, 253; viii, 278.
38. G.E.C., i, 254; ix, 623.
FORD, (or Forde).

Origins.

"The Fords who made Up Park their residence and built a mansion therein were a branch of an old Devonshire family, but acquired in Sussex considerable eminence, and were conspicuous for their loyalty," says Elwes.1 Up Park lies on a high northern shoulder of the West Sussex Downs above the village of South Harting, not far from the Hampshire border. From this height and between the beechwoods and hazel copses where deer are still preserved, there is a magnificent view northwards towards the Surrey border and eastwards in the direction of Midhurst. It was here that the Fords came to settle in the mid-16th century2 and it was in the shingle-spired church at the foot of Harting hill that most of them were buried, as a mural brass in the south wall testifies. "Here lyeth the bodyes of these Fords," it says, and below are given their names, with some omissions, down to Catherine, daughter and heiress of Sir Edward Ford who died in 1670. It was she who carried the Ford property into the Grey family by marrying as her second husband, Ralph, 2nd Baron Grey of Werke.2

Although this family was connected with Sussex for less than a century and a half, they achieved within that time a position of some importance there and were among the outstanding Royalist families in the county at the time of the Civil War.3

The forbears of this particular branch of the Fords came from Kingston, Surrey.4 The first of these to come to Sussex was Erasmus Ford who died on the 21st July, 1533 and was buried at Kingston where a brass commemorates him. He is described in the inscription to his eldest son in Harting Church as "of Thames Ditton in Surrey" so that his link with Sussex must have been somewhat tenuous. By his wife, Julia, daughter and coheiress of William Salford of Derbyshire, he had two sons and four daughters. The two sons, Edmund, the elder, and Erasmus, were both resident in Harting.5 Edmund was M.P. for Midhurst in 1547,6 a J.P. early in Elizabeth’s reign,7 and head of the

3. Elwes, loc.cit.; S.A.C., v, 35; xxviii, 110 et seqq.
5. Ibid.
7. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 1-6. In the bishop’s letter of 1564 he was described as a J.P. who was a "myslyker of religion and godlye procedings" and as "extremely perverse" (Camden Misc., ix,10)
(Ford, continued)

family until his death before 1579 when his will was proved. 8. His wife, Joan, daughter and heiress of John Cheeseman of Lewisham, Kent, bore him a son who seems to have predeceased his father, and three daughters. 9. Two of these survived their father as his co-heiresses, Magdalen marrying John Ford, a kinsman, of the Devonshire stem, and Dorothy marrying Francis Fortescue, gent., of Fawkesborne, Essex. The Fortescue couple gradually alienated their share of the Harting property, some of it going to Magdalen and John who continued in residence at Up Park, John being head of the family there in 1580. 10.

Whether armigerous.

Not found on the College of Arms versions of the 1570 Visitation or in Phillips' version. But they are found in Richard Turpeyn, the Windsor Herald's version. 11. They are also found in a version preserved in the library of Queen's College, Oxford. 12. They are found in the College of Arms MS version of the 1634 Visitation. 13. In another MS version of the 1634 Visitation appears a certificate dated 15 Dec., 1615, which describes the family as "Antiqua generis dignitate ffluruisse in Devonia et Sussex." 14.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Ford of Harting and of Wenham in Rogate Esq., son of John Ford by a d. of Apleton and grandson of John Ford of co. Devon by Mary, d. and heiress of Claverton. 15.

1568, plaintiff in fine for Harting, Edmund Ford, his father-in-law, being the deforciant. 16.

1582/3, plaintiff in fine for South Harting manor and moiety of E. Harting and Wenham, Francis Fortescue and Dorothy, his wife, being the deforciants. 17.

1583, deforciants in fine for manor of West Harting, Francis Fortescue and Dorothy, his wife, being plaintiffs. 18.


10. Comber, loc.cit., Elwes, 113-114. See also notes on the Fortescue family.
11. B.M. Harl. MS, 17, 065, f.15.
13. H.C. MS, C. 27.
14. B.M. Harl. MS, 1,084;., f. 41.
15. Comber, loc.cit.
16. Ibid.
17. S.H.S., xx, 408 and 471.
Wife.
Magdalen, d. and coh. of Edmund Ford of Harting; (v. supra). 22. She re-married Henry Knevett of Warwickshire. M.I. at Harting.

Children.

Edmund John Of Harting, gent. Will pr. 1642. 28.

Education.

Father

Sons

Universities.

Inns of Court.


Marriages of children. 30.
William md. at Harting in 1597, Ann, youngest daughter of Sir Edward Caryll, knt., of Harting, by Philippa, his 2nd wife, d. of James Gage of Bentley.

Edmund John

18. S.R.S., xx, 479.
22. Comber, loc. cit.
23. See father's I.P.M.; also P.R.O., Wards 5.43, Pt. 2.
25. P.C.C. 111 Bowyer.
26. S.A.C., lxxv, 184.
27. S.A.C., v, 45.
28. Chichester wills, M. Dean, 1.
29. Middle Temple Admissions, 148.
30. Comber, loc. cit.
(Ford, continued)

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Eseborne, Hundred of Eseborne, Chichester Rape.)
38 Henry VIII Edmund Ford, gent., in lands £60. 31.

(As of Harting, Hundred of Dumpford, Chichester Rape.)
2 Elizabeth Edmund Ford Esq., in lands £50. 32.

(Commissioner)
Erasmus Ford, gent. [his brother] £4

14 Elizabeth Joan Ford, widow, in lands £10
Erasmus Ford, [brother-in-law] in lands £5. 33

(As of E. Harting, Hundred of Dumpford, Chichester Rape.)

(Commissioner)
Edmund Ford [brother] in lands £2. 34.

32. " ; E. 179/190/264.
33. " ; E. 179/190/283.
34. " ; E. 179/191/377a.
FORTESCUE.

Origins.

Francis Fortescue Esq. who was a J.P. of Sussex in 1585 and who was dropped from the Commission in 1587, was an Essex man who had married Dorothy, one of the two daughters and coheiresses of Edmund Ford Esq. of Harting who died in about 1579.\(^1\) By this marriage, he acquired a share in the Harting property of the Fords, but this was soon alienated, much of it to his brother-in-law, John Ford, who married Magdalen, Dorothy's sister, and some to the Carylls of Harting (q.v.)

It seems likely that Francis Fortescue was resident in Harting in about the year 1580 since his father-in-law died only the previous year, and he himself and his wife were engaged in property transactions in Harting until at least 1584. Probably the connection of the Fortescues with Sussex was very brief, and did not long survive Francis Fortescue's omission from the Sussex Commission of the Peace in 1587.\(^2\) His son and heir by Dorothy, his wife, is described in the Essex Visitations as of 'Falborne' (sic, - i.e. Fawkesborne), Essex, Esq., where his father came from.\(^3\)

It may be that Francis Fortescue was excluded from the Commission for reasons additional to that given. The certificate concerning the Sussex J.P.'s in 1587, says he was dropped because he was 'greatly behindhand through suits in law'\(^4\) It appears also that he was a harbourer of at least one recusant, a schoolmaster whom he employed to educate his own children.

Whether armigerous.

Not in the Sussex Visitations, but the family appears in those of Essex.\(^5\)

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Francis Fortescue Esq. of Fawkesborne, Essex, and sometime of Harting, Sussex, Esq., son of Henry Fortescue Esq. of Fawkesborne, and of -, d. of - Stafford of Bradfield.\(^6\)

---

1. See notes on Ford family.
2. But Francis Fortescue was appointed overseer to the will of Erasmus Ford, his father-in-law, dt. 4 July, 1587. P.C.C. 80, Rutland.
4. S.A.C., ii, 60.
5. See note 3.
6. Ibid.
(Fortescue, continued)

16 August, 1580, mentioned in a certificate concerning recusants in the Deanery of Midhurst. "Mr Smyth, schoolmaster to the children of Mr Fortescue, gent., hath absented himself from divine service by the space of one whole yere and for the same standyth excommunicat." Another entry, apparently also belonging to 1580, in "The certificate of such a refuse to come to Church within the Archdeaconry of Chichester", says, "One Smyth, a scoller of the parish of Harting, is a fugitive from place to place - and a great seducer of others; could not be found."

1585, J.P. Sussex, and sometime of the Quorum.

1587, reported as having been dropped from the Commission of the Peace because he was "greatly behindhand through suits in law".

1572, He and his wife were deforciants in fine for a moiety of South Harting manor, E. Harting, W. Harting and Wenham; 1578, deforciants for a moiety of E. Harting manor; and in 1582/3 for S. Harting, E. Harting and Wenham, - the plaintiffs being John Ford and Magdalen his wife, brother-in-law and sister-in-law to Francis Fortescue. 1583, plaintiffs in fine for manor of W. Harting, (John Ford and Magdalen, deforciants), but deforciants in fine for the same in 1584.

8 July, 1588, died. I.P.M.

Wife.

Dorothy, 2nd d. and coheirress of Edmund Ford of Harting Esq. and of Joan, d. and heiress of John Chejjan of Lewisham, Kent. She was mentioned in her father's will.

Children.

Edmund Later of Fawkesborne, Essex, Esq. Deforplant in fine for manor of W. Harting, 1590 & 1592.

Dorothy ) Elizabeth) Mentioned in grandfather's will.

8. Ibid., f. 2.
9. P.R.O. Assizes 35, S.B.Circuit, Sussex, 27; (no. 26 is missing - for 1586); B.M. Lamsd. MS. 737, f. 158b.
10. B.M. Lansd. MS. 121, f. 65; S.A.C. ii, 60.
11. S.R.S., xix, 145; xx, 408, 471, 479. See also Cal. S.P. D. 1527-80, 702.
(Fortescue, continued)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Son

- Edmund, late of New Inn, adm. Middle Temple, 18 Nov., 1583.

Marriages of children.

Subsidy assessments. Apparently not assessed in Sussex.

---

17. See note 14.
20. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 52.
GAGE.

Origins.

According to Horsfield, this was a family of Norman extraction which, to begin with, held lands in the Forest of Dean and Gloucestershire. The name "Gaugy" does appear in Leland's list of companions in arms of William the Conqueror. However, the pedigree of the family of Gage, settled in Sussex in the 16th century, does not appear to have been traced back further than John, son of John Gage who lived in the time of Henry IV, who married Joan, daughter and coheiress of John Sudgrove of Sudgrove in the county of Gloucestershire. Their son, also John, acquired great honour, says Camden, from a marriage with a coheiress of the family of St. Clere, and also, incidentally, a share of the St. Clere estates, including lands in Worth and East Grinstead in Sussex.

The family seat of the Gages in the 16th century, Firle, came to them by the marriage of William Gage, son of Sir John Gage who died in 1486 and the St. Clere heiress, to Agnes, daughter of Bartholomew Bolney of Bolney, Sussex. Bartholomew Bolney had acquired the tenancy of the manor of Firle in about 1440, and his daughter carried this to the Gages. Her husband, William Gage, was of Burstow, Surrey, where his son and heir was born in 1479. This son, the future Sir John Gage, perhaps the first conspicuous member of this important family, appears to have been the one to take up residence at Firle. At any rate, he was the first to be buried there.

This Sir John Gage was eminent as a general and statesman in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI and early in that of Mary. Under Henry VIII he served in the French wars and was, at that time, Controller of the Household, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Constable of the Tower of London, which last office he continued to hold in the two succeeding reigns. Henry VIII caused his portrait to be painted by Holbein. Under Mary he became Lord Chamberlain. He was also, for a time, a Privy Councillor. It has been said that he was, undoubtedly, the most popular "county man" of his time.

1. Horsfield, i, 338.
2. S.A.C., xxiv, 11 et seqq.
3. Ibid.; see also B. & C., 295.
5. B. & C., loc. cit.; S.A.C., xviii, 18n; The ownership of the manor of West Firle was not acquired by the Gage family until 1788. A. Oswald: "Firle Place, Sussex, I", (Country Life, 17 Feb., 1955, 481.)
Gage, continued

He was a county M.P. for Sussex from 1529 to 1536.14.

Sir John Gage did much to build up the family fortunes from the spoils of the Dissolution. In 1542, the site of the house of the Grey Friars at Lewes was leased to him.15. After the Dissolution, Cambwell Abbey in Goudhurst, Kent, which was dedicated to St. Mary Magdalen, was granted to him. Its clear income then was £80.17s.1d.16. Sir John too, was one of the Commissioners for the Dissolution of Battle Abbey and, as such, was partly responsible for the defamatory report on the character of the Abbot and monks sent in to Cromwell. It was said in this report that only worthless stuff was to be found there.17. The bulk of the Abbey property was granted by the King to Sir Anthony Browne, Henry VIII's Master of the Horse, who married Alice, daughter of Sir John Gage.18. But the Abbey's sword of maintenance went to Sir John Gage and remained with his descendants until the 19th century.19. Also, part of the Abbey property was granted to him in 1540, including Alciston manor.20. Further, some of the manors and lands of Bayham Abbey, surrendered voluntarily in 1525, came eventually to Sir John Gage by royal grant. The lands of this house had, at first and immediately after its suppression, been granted, in 1526, to the Dean and canons of Wolsey's college at Oxford. On Wolsey's fall in 1530, the estates reverted to the Crown and some were then granted by the King to Sir John Gage.21.

However, Sir John does not seem to have intended to appropriate all the ecclesiastical property he acquired for his own benefit. He wrote a letter to Cromwell after the Dissolution requesting permission to rent certain lands, lately the property of Lewes priory, "not for covytys to make myself riche", but to help keep the poorhouse which he had established.

8. M.I., see B. & C., loc. cit.; also in 1530 Visitation of Sussex as of Firle, S.A.C., xxxix, 105.
9. Horsfield, loc. cit.; S.A.C., xxiv, 12; B. & C., loc. cit.
10. S.A.C., xxiv, 12.
12. S.A.C., xxiv, 12.
14. S.A.C., xxxi, 158.
15. S.A.C., xiii, 33.
17. S.A.C., xvii, 48n.; vii, 227.
18. S.A.C., xvii, 48n.
19. S.A.C., xvii, 52.
22. S.A.C., x, 99.
Apart from former monastic lands, there were other royal grants to Sir John Gage, including the manor of Haresfield, and the manor of Shovelstrode in East Grinstead which had belonged to John Aske Esq., before the latter's attainder. Sir John also acquired lands by purchase, including some of the West property in Excete, Sussex.

The inventory of Sir John Gage's household goods, annexed to his will, shows him to have been "an extensive farmer for those days" and a man of substance. But apparently he was of a generous disposition for he directed in his will that his gold collar of the Garter was to be sold and that the proceeds were to go to the poor who should attend his funeral, and the inhabitants of 40 parishes in and near where his lands lay.

Sir John Gage died on 18 April, 1556. His two eldest sons by his marriage to Philippa, daughter of Sir Richard Guildford, knt., were Sir Edward Gage who succeeded his father at Firle, and James, who founded a younger branch of the family at Bentley in Framfield, and who was a J.P. in 1560. Bentley originally possessed a large mansion and a very extensive park in the time of the Gages. A farm house is all that now remains of the original mansion. James Gage, like his father, took advantage of the times to amass property. For instance, in 1543, on the attainder of Sir Nicholas Carew, he bought the manor of Wartling from the Crown.

Sir Edward Gage who was aged 53 at his father's death, had been a Commissioner for the collection of Church plate under Henry VIII and Edward VI. Under Mary, he was Sheriff in 1557, and as such took part in measures against Protestants. He was a J.P. in Elizabeth's reign down to 1564, when he was reported in the bishop's letter to be a "myslyker of religion and godlye proceedings". It was his eldest son, John Gage Esq. of Firle, who was head of the senior line of the family in 1580.

In the Elizabethan period, the Gages both of Firle and of Bentley, were among the leading recusant families of the county.

23. S.A.C., xiv, 157; xx, 141.
24. S.A.C., lviii, 149-150.
26. S.A.C., xxiv, 12.
28. S.A.C., iv, 298.
(Gage, continued)

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1530 Visitation of Sussex. 33.
" " " 1570 Visitation, in Richard Turpeyn, the
Windsor Herald's version. 34.
Mentioned in the 1634 Visitation. 35.

(1) Gage of Firle.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Gage Esq. of Firle, eld. s. and h. of Sir Edward Gage,
(v. supra) who died 26 Dec., 1567, and of his wife,
Elizabeth, d. of John Parker Esq. of Ratton. 36.

M.P., Lewes, 1557 -'8. 37.

Aged 30 at father's death in 1567. 38.

Held lands in Sussex, Surrey and Norfolk. Held 1 forge &
1 furnace in Sussex, c. 1574. 39.

A prominent Sussex recusant.

26 Oct., 1577, listed as such in the diocesan return to the
Privy Council. Lands valued at £400 and goods at £500. 40.
In this return were also entered his mother, "The Lady Gage of Alciston", his younger brother, "Mr Thomas Gage", and his cousin, "Mr Edward Gage of Bentley Esq." (q. v.)

1580, he, together with various relatives, entered in
recusancy return for the parish of West Firle, rural deanery
of Pevensey, Archdeaconry of Lewes. 41. In a similar entry,
of the same date, noted that "John Gage of the parish of
West Fyrles Esq. in lands vic marks, in goods, £6 li, was
sent up to the LL. of hir Majesty's Privy Consell and
remayneth at their lordshLpý disposition." Other recusant
relatives also mentioned. 42.

13 August, 1580, committed to the Fleet. 43.
June, 1581, entered into bond to return to the place in
London where he was when committed, after visiting his

29. S.A.C., viii, 122.
31. S.A.C., xxiv, 13; H.M.C. 7th Report, 614a, 665b.
letter, (Camden Misc., ix, 10)
33. S.A.C., xxxix, 105.
34. B.A. Add. MS, 17, 065, f. 15b.
house in the country until the end of July. 44.
2 August, 1581, sent back to the Fleet. 45.
4 August, 1581, after giving a bond to the Privy Council for £1,000 for the fulfilment of certain conditions, was set at liberty. 46.

1585, along with other recusants in Surrey & Sussex, was required to furnish light horses for the Queen's use as a token of goodwill. Objected that he had already been rated in Middlesex for two light horses and had paid £50 composition. 47.

Sept. 1586, sent either to the Clink or the Counter in Wood Street. 48.

Nov., 1587, in a note concerning the annual rents & revenues of Sussex recusants, and the value of their goods, was estimated at £800 for the former, "whereof 200 li is in right of his wife", and at 1000 li for the latter. 49.

Jan., 1590, committed to the Tower. 50.

35. H.C.MS, C.27.
36. B. & C., loc.cit.
38. B. & C., loc.cit.
39. B. & C., loc.cit. and see Appendix 29. For a reference to his manor of Crabhouse in Norfolk, leased to his brother Thomas and another, and sold in 1570, see B.H. Cal. of Gage Muniments. GCj nos. 18-21.
40. C.R.S., xxii, 80; and W.S.C.R.O., D.R.O., 90/1/37, f.8.
41. Ibid., f.4.
42. Ibid., f.1.
43. A.P.C., 1580-11, 152.
44. A.P.C., 1581-12, 94.
45. Ibid., 148-19.
46. Ibid.
47. Cal.S.P.D., 1581-190, 276.
48. B.M. Harl.MS 703, f.23b.
49. B.M. Lansd. MS 53, art.69
50. A.P.C., 1590-11, 207.
(Gage, continued)

Mch., 1591, proceedings against him by Topcliffe referred to in the State Papers. Was removed to the bishop's palace at Ely where he and other Sussex recusants were kept in custody.

August, 1591, was at this time confined to his house at Leighton in Essex whence he was given permission to visit Sussex "for the dispatch of your necessary business" after which he was to return there.

July, 1592, one of the Sussex recusants who were disarmed in that month.

October, 1592, was reported that Henry Collins, a servant of John Gage of Firle, had been committed the previous Easter for seeking to kill the Queen.

May, 1593, was given permission to return to his house at Firle on grounds of ill health on the payment of a bond of £500 and an undertaking not to go beyond a certain distance from the house.

February, 1595, summoned before the Council. Pledged illness. The Council ordered a medical examination to check on this.


Wives.

Mrs. 60.

1) Elizabeth. Bur. at Firle. M.I.
2) Margaret, d. of Sir Roger Copley, knt. of Leigh, Surrey. Mge. settlement, 28 May, 1559. Bur. Firle. M.I. She was sister to the "desperate" Anthony Copley of Roughey, a Catholic who was at Rome in 1592, and with Cardinal Allen in 1596.

52. A.P.C., 1591, 402; H.M.C. Hatfield MSS., iv, 264.
55. A.P.C., 1592-13, 229.
56. A.P.C., 1595-6, 208, 234, 294; Oct., 1597, said to owe £260 for a year's recusancy fines incurred because he had not gone "to any church or chapel or other place of common prayer". (Quoted without a reference by A. Oswald: "Firle Place, Sussex II": Country Life, 24 Feb., 1955, 564, probably from B.H. Cal. of Gage Monument, III, 16, (q.v.)
57. B. & C. loc.cit.
(Gage, continued)

Children. None.

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsidy assessments.

(As of West Firle, Hundred of Totnere, Pevensey Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>In lands</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>John Gage Esq.,</td>
<td>100 marks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sir John Gage, bart.,</td>
<td>100 marks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recusant,</td>
<td>£30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Gage of Bentley in Framfield.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Edward Gage Esq., eld. s. and h. of James Gage Esq. of Bentley, J.P. in 1560, and noted in the bishop's letter of 1564 as "no Justice but a mysliker of godlie orders", who died 12 Jan., 1573, and of his first wife, Joan, d. and coh. of John Delve and relict of John Bellingham of Eringham.

Aged 27 years in 1573. A prominent Sussex recusant.

60. B. & C., loc. cit.
61. S.A.C., lxxi, 151, says she was Elizabeth Shelley.
62. S.A.C., xiv, 264.
63. P.R.O., E. 179/190/265.
64. " , E. 179/190/283.
65. " , E. 179/190/298.
67. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 2; Camden Misc. ix, 11. Also described as "A common harborer of obstinates".
69. See father's I.P.M.
26 Oct., 1577, entered in the diocesan recusancy return to the Privy Council, his lands then valued at £200 and his goods at the same. 70.

1580, in a return for the Archdeaconry of Lewes, noted that, "Edward Gage Esq. of the parisse of Framfield, in lands 11c 11, in goods 11c li, was sent up to the Lords of Her Majesty's Privy Consell and there remayneth at their lordships disposing." Also, "Margaret, his wife, answereth she hath not bene at Church since her Majesty's reign and further sayth that it is against her conscience to come to Church to heare the service now used." Similarly, "Mary Gage and Urith Gage, daughters of the sayd Edward and Margaret of one of them seventeen the other of sixteen and thereabout answereth that they have ever absented themselves from Church, affirming the reason set down before by their mother." 71.

13 August, 1580, Edward Gage of Bentley sent to the Marshalsea 'for obstinacy in Popery'. 72.

16 Dec., 1581, reference to a request of Viscount Montague to the Privy Council that Edward Gage might be set at liberty for 2 months longer than originally allowed before returning to the Marshalsea, so that he could execute the Earl of Southampton's will. 73.

March, 1583, petition of Margaret Gage to Walsingham, that her husband, on account of his long imprisonment and infirmities, might be released from the Marshalsea and placed in the custody of the Sheriff of Sussex. 74.

Oct., 1585, was one of the Sussex recusants required to furnish light horses for the Queen's use in the Low Countries as a token of goodwill. 75.

Sept., 1586, examination of Nicholas Smithel alias Phelps, a popish priest. He had been in Sussex at Edward Gage's house. 76.

Sept., 1586, sent to the Counter in Wood Street. 77.

Nov., 1587, in a note about the Sussex recusants, estimated as having yearly rents and revenues worth £400, and goods worth £100. 78.

Mch, 1588, on a list of Sussex recusants. 79.

70. C.R.S. xxii, 80; W.S.C.R.O., D.R.O. 90/I/37, f. 8.
72. A.P.C. 1580-1, 153.
73. A.P.C., 1581-12, 296; see also 93 and 377.
74. Cal.S.P.D., 1581-90, 104.
75. Ibid., 276.
76. Ibid., 352.
77. B.M. Harl. MS, 703, f. 23b, and Cal.S.P.D., 1591-14, 463.
78. B.M. Lansd. MS, 53, art. 69.
79. B.M. Lansd. MS, 55, art. 58.
July, 1592, one of the Sussex recusants who were disarmed. 80.

Jan.?, 1592, information entered in the State Papers that at Edward Gage's house at Bentley in Sussex, there were three priests always in residence. 81.

Nov., 1592, referred to as having been "lately committed" to the charge of Mr. Richard Shelley. To be released for a month to deal with the business of the late Viscount Montague's funeral and the execution of his will. This permission was renewed from time to time in the following months. 82.

1600 ? On a list of 8 recusants stayed for the Earl of Southampton. 83.

Edward Gage had been appointed executor to the attainted Earl of Southampton. 84.

Aug. 1606, was licensed to go beyond the seas and return without molestation. 85.


Wife. 89.


Children. 91.

Edward? 92.

Mary

Urith

Elizabeth

Anne

Mildred.

Margaret

Philippa

80. B.M. Harl. MS 703, f. 67b.


82. A.P.C., 1592, 329; A.P.C., 1592-13, 17, 149, 452. See also


86. B. & C., loc.cit.

87. P.C.C. 52 & 125 Lawe.

88. P.R.O. C. 142/378/144.

89. B. & C., loc.cit.

90. P.C.C. 84 Drake.

91. B. & C., loc.cit.

92. B. & C., do not mention him, but the subsidy roll for 1-2 Charles I gives an Edward Gage Esq. of Loxfield Hundred, having a wife, Clare, and a daughter, Clare, both of /contd.
(Gage, continued)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children. 93

| Edward       | md. Clare - (see note 92). |
| Mary         | md. John Crispe          |
| Urith        | md. Thomas Alcock       |
| Elizabeth    | md. Anthony Skynner     |
| Anne         |                            |
| Mildred      | md. Augustin Belson     |
| Margaret     | md. George Smith        |
| Philippa     | md. Andrew Bendlowes.   |

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Framfield, Loxfield Hundred, Pevensey Rape)
18 Elizabeth Edward Gage Esq. in lands £20.94.

(As of Peckham borough, Hundred of Loxfield, Pevensey Rape)

Note: For 14 Eliz. and 18 Eliz., "My Lady Gage" of the Hundred of Alciston, Pevensey Rape / presumably widow of Sir Edward Gage of Firle / was assessed at £30 on both occasions. 96. She is not included in Appendix 26 since she had her own establishment independently of both branches of the family.

reference continued

Framfield, and a sister Anne. All were noted as recusants. See ref., note 95 infra.

93. B. & C., loc. cit.
94. P.R.O., E. 179/190/298.
96. " , E. 179/190/283 and E. 179/190/298.
GARTON.

Origins.

Descended from Thomas Garton of London, merchant, this family appears to have settled at Billingshurst in West Sussex early in the 16th century, though they retained their connections with London for several generations. William, younger son of Thomas Garton, himself left two sons, Francis and Giles. While it was the elder of these, Francis Garton of Billingshurst, who figured in the 1570 Visitation as the head of the Sussex Gartons, this study is concerned with the family of his younger brother, Giles. It is Giles' eldest son, Peter, whose appearance on the Commission of the Peace in 1601, brings the family into the category of "leading office-holders" in the county. Since Giles was living in 1580, he is taken as head of the family at that date, "family" being understood in the narrower sense. In any case, it was Giles' descendants who perpetuated the family name until the mid-17th century in Sussex, since all three sons of Francis Garton predeceased him and he himself died in January, 1604.

The younger branch of the family settled at Woollavington, Sussex, Giles having made his fortune in London as an "ironmonger", and Woollavington remained their seat, as distinct from Billingshurst which descended in the elder line, until, owing to a failure of male heirs, the manor and advowson passed by marriage to the Ormes of Peterborough, an old Northamptonshire family.

Whether armigerous.

The Gartons of Billingshurst are named in the 1570 Visitation. The Gartons of Woollavington are named in the 1634 Visitation.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Giles Garton of Woollavington, Sussex, younger son of William Garton of Billingshurst, Sussex, and of Ursula, d. of John Stapley of Framfield.

1. B. & C., 152; Elwes, 272.
2. See note 5.
3. B. & C., loc. cit.
4. Elwes, loc. cit.
6. H.C. MS, C. 27.
7. B. & C., loc. cit.
Sometime of St. Margaret's, New Fish Street, London, ironmonger. A citizen of London. 8.

1578, together with his brother, Francis Garton of Billingshurst, bought the manor of Woollavington from Lord Lumley for £4,000. Shortly afterwards, the advowson was also purchased. 10.

c. 1586, a few years after the purchase of the manor of Woollavington, Giles Garton was building himself a mansion house there, described by Dallaway as "a spacious mansion-house, with towers at the angles, and other appendages in the style prevalent at that day". 11. The builder's contract for this work has survived with detailed building specifications. 12.

Sept. 1592, referred to as being in league with the Earl of Huntingdon, a prominent Puritan. 13.

1 Feb., 1593, died. 14. Will dt. 20 Jan., pr. 10 May, 1593. 15. I.P.M., 7 June, 1593. 16.

Wives. 17.


Children. 19.

By his 1st wife:-


8. Ibid.
9. S.A.C., xxix, 60.
10. Ibid., & Elwes, loc. cit.
11. J. Dallaway: History of the Western Division of the County of Sussex, (1819) ii, pt 1, 245.
12. S.A.C., Ixv, 211.
(Warton, continued)

William 2nd son. Citizen of London. In uncle Francis' I.P.M.
Mabel
Elizabeth
Beatrice
Ann
Katherine
Alice
Judith

By his 2nd wife:-

Giles Eld. s. by 2nd wife. Had lands in Billingshurst under

Simon

Education.

Father
Sons.
Peter, matric. fell. comm. from St. John's, Camb., 1583.

Universitàes.

Inns of Court.

Father
Sons. Peter, adm. Gray's Inn, 21 Oct., 1584, then "as of London".
Giles, adm. Middle Temple, 5 Feb., 1606.

Marriages of children. Of the first marriage:-

William md. Martha, d. of Thomas Astyn of Bishberry, co.
Beatrice md. John Poole of London, alderman.
Ann md. Andrew Boome, ironmonger.
Katherine md. James Atkins of St. Bennet Fink, ironmonger.
Alice
Judith

15. P.C.C. 34 Nevell.
17. B. & C., loc.cit.
18. P.C.C. 3 Scroope.
20. P.R.O., Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 43 & 44.
(Garton continued)

Marriages of children contd.

Of the second marriage:-

Simon md. Mary Jennings of Essex. She was mentioned in his uncle Francis' will.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Billingshurst, Hundred of Esewryth, Arundel Rape)
38 Henry VIII William Garton in lands £21.

(As of Woollavington, Hundred of Rotherbridge, Arundel Rape.)
38 Elizabeth Peter Garton, gent., in lands £20.31.

(As of the same)
1 - 2 Charles I Robert Garton Esq., in lands £10.32.

(As of Wigenholt, West Esewryth Hundred, Arundel Rape)
1 - 2 Charles I Simon Garton, gent., in goods £3 32.

brother of the late Peter Garton.

---

23. P.C.C. 14 Twisse. See also P.R.O. Sheriffs, as 'Giles Barton Esq!.
27. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 85.
29. P.C.C. 54 Campbell.
GORING.

Origins.

The Gorings were certainly among the most wealthy and influential Sussex families at this period. Elwes says, "Throughout the sixteenth and especially during the seventeenth century, the Goring family was steadily rising in wealth and importance, and several of its members achieved distinction in the field and Senate."

Another writer describes them as "One of the oldest of Sussex families, who derived their name from the manor of Goring in the rape of Arundel so early as the reign of Henry III."

While it seems generally agreed among the local historians that the family took its name from Goring near Arundel in the reign of Henry III, it is not certain that they were at that time lords of the manor of Goring. Elwes raises the point and shows that the oft-repeated statement that the Gorings were lords of Goring in Edward I's reign and that it was through a Goring heiress that their rights came to a Henry Tregoz is unsubstantiated. Henry Tregoz had apparently a charter of free warren in his manor of Goring in 41 Henry III, and again one Henry Tregoz subscribed the barons' letter to the Pope in 1300 as "Dominus de Garinges". Elwes is of the opinion that the Gorings did not acquire the manor until it was purchased by Sir William Goring of Burton from the Lewkenors in the mid-sixteenth century. But "although the Gorings, in our opinion, became then lords of the manor for the first time, it is not intended to imply that members of that family had not been tenants in the place at an earlier date."

The first member of this family given in Berry's pedigree is John de Goring, father of John who was living in the reigns of Edward I and Edward II. Berry describes the father as "lord of Goring", but gives no authority for this. The family settled subsequently first at Lancing in the reign of Edward III, and at Burton in the later 15th century. John Goring of Burton who died in 1520 and was buried in Burton Church, married Constantia, daughter and coheiress of Henry Dyke of Sussex who was descended on her mother's side from a Dawtrey heiress. By this marriage, a considerable amount of Dawtrey

1. Elwes, 56.
2. S.A.C., v, 27; see also W. Camden: Brittania, (1806 ed.), 286, 1, 289.
3. S.A.C., v, 27; vi, 79; J. Dallaway: History of the Western Division of the County of Sussex, (1819), 11, Pt. 2, 34.
4. Elwes, loc. cit.
property passed eventually into Goring hands. The estate of Burton itself, which is almost co-extensive with the small parish of that name in the rape of Arundel to the south of Petworth, descended to them from the Dawtreys. At the Dissolution of the monasteries, the Gorings added to their property there by obtaining a grant of the lands held in the parish of Burton by the nunnery of Godstow in Oxfordshire. The manor of Crouch in Barlavington, the parish adjacent to Burton and for long closely connected with it, had been assigned by the Dawtreys to Hardham priory as part of its original endowment. At the Dissolution, Sir William Goring, son of the John Goring who died in 1520, obtained the grant of this manor. (It was he too, who had acquired the Godstow foundation's lands in Burton parish.) The Gorings had already become the lords of Hardham parish by descent from the Dawtreys. So that, however liberal as benefactors before the Reformation, the Gorings were to receive their own again with interest at the Dissolution.

The mansion at Burton which was to be the residence of the Gorings for several generations, was built during Elizabeth's reign and in the Elizabethan style of architecture. While the greater part of it has since been destroyed by a series of fires and reconstructions, the main entrance is a survival of the Elizabethan mansion with the Arms of the Gorings over the doorway. The Church at Burton contains several altar tombs of Sussex marble inlaid with brasses and inscriptions to the memory of various members of the family. Burton Park which was marked on Speed's map of the county and some 210 acres in extent, is said by Dallaway and Horsfield to have been enclosed by Sir William Goring at the time the Tudor house was built. This statement is queried by Elwes.

7. Ibid., S.A.C., v, 27.
8. Will pr. 7 Feb. 1521, P.C.C. 5 Maynwarings.
10. Elwes, 56.
12. Elwes, 23 & 56.
13. Elwes, 111.
15. Elwes, 58; Horsfield, ii, 171.
17. Ibid.
In addition to their lands at Burton and Hardham already mentioned, the Gorings had inherited property at Lancing early in the 15th century. Goring manor was purchased by Sir William Goring of Burton in the mid-sixteenth century, and before it was sold in 1584, Bignor Park, part of the Arundel property, was leased to the Gorings. In the Elizabethan period, the Gorings were certainly among the most extensive landowners in the county.

Apart from their territorial importance, the Gorings had, for some generations, taken an active part in the affairs of Sussex. Their name appears on the list of Sheriffs from the reign of Edward IV onwards and before Elizabeth's accession they had twice represented the county in the House of Commons, in 1467 and 1547.

However, it was in the later 16th and in the 17th centuries that they achieved their greatest wealth and influence. Sir William Goring of Burton, son and heir of the John Goring of Burton who died in 1520, was a gentleman of the Privy Chamber to Edward VI, and after marrying Elizabeth, daughter and coheirress of John Covet of Slaugham and having a family of three sons and a daughter, he died in March, 1554. His two elder sons became, in time, heads of two distinct branches of the family. The eldest, Sir Henry Goring of Burton, knt., who succeeded his father in 1554, was then aged 32 and more. From him descend the Gorings of Burton, the senior line, of whom Sir William was created a baronet in 1622. This line failed on the death of Sir William Goring, bart., in 1723, his sister and heiress carrying the Burton estate to the Biddulphs.

19. B. & C. loc. cit. See also J. Dallaway History of the Western Division of the County of Sussex (1830) ii, Pt 2, 41. and Elwes, 133.
20. Elwes, 102n.
21. Elwes, 32.
25. Ibid.; see also S.A.C., xi, 66. Also S.A.C., v, 27 et seqq.
The second son was George Goring of Ovingdean and Lewes, who was living in the reign of Edward VI and died before 1595. He it was who purchased Danny Park in Hurstpierpoint in 1582, together with the manor of Hurstpierpoint and other lands, from Gregory Fiennes, Lord Dacre, for the sum of £10,000. His grandson, Sir George Goring, was created Baron Goring of Hurstpierpoint in 1620, and Earl of Norwich in 1644. The male line of this branch failed on the death of the second Earl in 1672.

Since each of these two brothers was head of a distinct branch of the family and both held high office in the county, each of them will be studied separately. For the unfriendly relationships between them and Lord Buckhurst, see Part III, ch. 2. of thesis.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation, but not in that of 1634.

(1) Goring of Burton.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Henry Goring, knt., eld. s. of Sir William Goring of Burton, knt., who died, 1554, and of Elizabeth, his wife, d. and coh. of John Covert of Slaugham. She died, 1558.

Aged 32 and more at the death of his father and was executor to him in 1556.

J.P. Sussex, 1560-1594, and frequently of the Quorum in the later years. c. 1585, commissioner for musters and for the restraint of grain.

1564, bishop's letter, - "a favorer of religion and godlye orders" 31.

1587, described in report on Sussex J.P's as a J.P. of Arundel Rape who was "aged" but a "good justic".

---

29. See father's I.P.M.
(Goring continued.)

1562-'3, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex; 1569-'70, of Sussex only. 33.

1588, Assessed for a contribution of £100 for Armada loan, - highest rate of assessment with 14 others. 34.

16 Dec., 1594, died. 35. Will dt. 4 Dec., 1594, pr. 12 May, 1595. 36. I.P.M., 9 April, 1595. 37.

Wife. 38.

Dorothy, 2nd d. and coh. of William Everard of Sussex Esq., by Johan, nee Ernley, his wife, relict of Edward Banister of Idworth.

Children. 39.


Edward Of Wappingthorn and Oakhurst. Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex, 1613. 20 May, 1617, died. Will pr. 20 May, 1617. From him descend the Gorings of Highden, his grandson, Henry becoming a baronet. From Edward's third son, Edward, descended the Gorings of Cobden. 43.

Barbara
Elizabeth
Mary

30. P.R.O. Assizes 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 2-36. He was not J.P. in 1570, when Sheriff, (see no. 12), nor in 1583 (see no. 25). The roll for 1563 (no. 5), is missing. Also see B.M. Harl. MS 474, ff. 81 & 92.

31. Bishop's letter, (Camden Misc., ix, 9)

32. S.A.C., ii, 59.

33. See Appendix 4.

34. S.A.C., i, 32.

35. B. & C., loc.cit.


37. P.R.O., 6. 142/244/101.

38. B. & C., loc.cit.

39. Ibid.

40. P.R.O., Assizes 35, Sx., 33-44.

41. P.R.O., C. 66/1594.

42. P.R.O., C. 142/269/97.

43. B. & C., 140; S.A.C., v, 27 et seqq.
(Goring, continued)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward, Balliol Coll.</td>
<td></td>
<td>William, adm. Middle Temple, 11 Mch, 1565.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matric. entry under dt.</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575, aged 18.</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children. 46.

William md. twice; - (a) Anne, d. of Robert Burbage of Hayes, Middlesex. Issue, - Henry, aged 27 and more at father's death. He was father of William, cr. bart. in 1622. Died, 16 July, 1626. (b) Margaret, d. of Thomas Chaloner of Sussex, and wid. of William Courtopp and of Richard Mill. Issue,- George, from whom descended the Gorings of Barcombe.


Elizabeth md. Thomas Selwyn of Friston. Issue.


Subsidy assessment.

(As of Burton, Hundred of Rotherbridge, Arundel Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td>Sir William Goring, kn., in lands</td>
<td>£140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Henry Goring Esq.</td>
<td>£60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Henry Goring Esq.</td>
<td>£66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>William Goring Esq.</td>
<td>£60.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>Sir Henry Goring, kn.</td>
<td>£20.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 29.
45. Al.0x ii, 588.
46. B. & C., 140.
47. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
48. " ; E. 179/190/283.
49. " ; E. 179/190/346.
50. " ; E. 179/190/334.
(ii) Goring of Ovingdean and Lewes, later of Danny Park.

Head of the family in 1580.

George Goring of Ovingdean and Lewes Esq., 2nd son of Sir William Goring of Burton, knt., who died, 1554, and of Elizabeth, his wife, d. and c. of John Covert of Slaugham. She died, 1558. (v. supra, parents of Sir Henry Goring of Burton, brother to George.)

Living T. R. Edward VI. 52.

J. P., Sussex, 1560 - Feb., 1594. 53.
1564, - bishop's letter, a "favoner of religion and godly order", and "learned in the lawe". 54.
1587, certificate concerning the Sussex J. P.'s, - a J. P. of Lewes Rape, 'very well thought of for executing . . . office of the peace'. 55.

c. 1585, on a commission for disarming the Sussex recusants. Also commissioner for musters & for the restraint of grain. 56

1563, M. P., Lewes. Stood for one of the county seats in 1584 but was not returned. 57.

1578-'9, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex. 58.

1582, purchased Danny Park at Hurstpierpoint and the manor there and other lands from Gregory Fiennes, Lord Dacre, for £10,000. 59.

3 July, 1584, appointed Receiver-General of the Court of Wards. 60. Sept, 1590, this appointment made for life. 61.

In this capacity, handled large sums of Crown money which he made a practice of keeping at his own disposal as long as possible, meanwhile employing the money for his own gain. 62.

52. B. & C., 138. 53. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 2-36. Not on the Commission in 1579 when he was Sheriff (see no. 21) 54. Bishop's letter, 1564, (Camden Misc. ix, 10) 55. S.A.C. 11, 59. 56. B.M. Harl. MS 474, ff. 90b and 81, & 92b. See also for 1592, Commission for the disarming of recusants, B.M. Harl MS 703, f. 67b. (He was also, apparently, a Commissioner for recusancy in 1580. W.S.C.R.O., D.R.O. 90/I/37, ff. 1b, 7, 30.) 57. Official Returns and B.M. Harl. MS, 703, ff. 18b and 19b. 58. See Appendix 4.
1588, assessed at £100 for the Armada Loan. 63.

March, 1594, defaulted and died, in considerable debt to the Crown. In July, 1595, this debt was estimated to be £19,777. 2. 3rd. 64. No will or I.P.M.

Wife. 65.

Maria, eld. d. and coh. of William Everard, (i.e. sister of Dorothy, wife of Sir Henry Goring, Maria's brother-in-law). Maria was the widow of Richard Bellingham. She died at Hurstpierpoint, Dec. 1602.

Children. 66.

George Eld. s. and h. 1578, became a Gentleman Pensioner. Then receiving £11.13.4d per quarter. 67. M.P. Lewes, 1593 and 1601. After his father's death was heavily in debt to the Crown. He offered Robert Cecil £1,000 if he would secure him his father's office and offered to handle his father's debts. 68. But, April, 1594, the sheriff entered to value his property, 69. and most of the revenue was appropriated to the Queen's use throughout his life. 70. 7 Feb., 1602, died. Will, dt. 4 Feb. 1601, pr. 9 June, 1602. 71. I.P.M., 1 June, 1602. 72.

Edward
Mary
Dorothy.

59. S.A.C. xi, 66
60. MS Cal. of Pat. Rolls, 26 Eliz. f.5.
63. S.A.C. i, 32.
64. Cal.S.P.D., 1595-17, 69-70.
65. B. & C., loc.cit.
66. Ibid.
68. H.E. Bell: The Court of Wards & Liveries, 25, 37; H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, iv, 515; also 501, 508, 516, 528.
69. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, iv, 501; and v, and vi, passim.
70. See note in margin of the younger George Goring's Feodary Survey, dt. 7 June, 44 Eliz. P.R.O. Wards 5/43/pt.2.
71. P.C.C. 44 Montague.
72. P.R.O. C. 142/271/156.
(Goring continued.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sons</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inns of Court.

- Probably the George Goring who was adm. Middle Temple between 1524 and 1550.
- George, adm. Lincoln's Inn, 24 Feb., 1592, at special request of George Kingsmill, reader.

Marriages of children.

- George md. Anne, d. of Henry Denny of Waltham Abbey, Essex. Issue including George, later cr. Baron Goring of Hurstpierpoint and Earl of Norwich, eld. son.
- Edward md. as his 2nd wife, John Jeffray Esq., serj.-at-law, the future judge. (q.v.)
- Dorothy md. twice: (a) Sir Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield, D.s.p., May, 1606. (b) Sir John Shurley, knpt. of Isfield.

Subsidy assessments.

(For 38 Henry VIII, see assessment for Goring of Burton)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(As of Eynsmore (sic) Hundred, Lewes Rape)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Elizabeth George Goring Esq. in lands £40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Commissioner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Elizabeth George Goring Esq. &quot; &quot; £40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Commissioner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Elizabeth George Goring Esq. &quot; &quot; £30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Commissioner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Elizabeth George Goring Esq. &quot; &quot; £30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(As of Lewes borough, Lewes Rape)


References:

73. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 15.
74. Lincoln's Inn Admissions, i, 113.
75. B. & C., loc.cit.
76. See D.N.B.
77. B. & C., 156.
78. P.R.O., E. 179/190/267.
79. " E. 179/190/274.
80. " E. 179/190/283.
81. " E. 179/190/299.
GOUNTER. (or Gunter.)

Origins.

The Gounters were descended from an ancient family and reputed by some genealogists to be of Norman origin. They are known to have been settled in Wales from an early period. Representatives of the family also acquired considerable property elsewhere, including lands in Berkshire, Wiltshire and Hampshire, and the first member of the family who appears to have been connected with Sussex was Roger Gounter whose name is found on a list of Sussex men returned to serve in France under the Earl of Arundel in the Agincourt campaign. This Roger Gounter had considerable lands in Wales and it has been suggested that his introduction to Sussex may have been due in some way to the then Earl of Arundel who had estates both in Wales and in Sussex, the latter including the manor of Racton, later to become the seat of the Sussex Gounters.

There is some uncertainty as to when the Gounters may be said to have "settled" in Sussex. Their connection with Wales certainly continued well into the 16th century, John Gounter who died in January, 1558 having been described in his Inquisition Post Mortem as of Racton, Sussex, and Gilleston in Wales, and having held the office of auditor of lands in Wales under Henry VIII. However, there are grounds for thinking that John's father, Hugh, settled at Racton and may even have been buried there, for the external labels of the East window of Racton church bear the arms of GOUNTER impaling HOWELL, Hugh's wife's family.

John Gounter's I.P.M., dated 1 Oct., 1559, shows that he had been seized of 3 messuages and 1,450 acres of land in Racton and elsewhere at his death in 1557. It seems that at this time they held the chief estate in Racton. According to Elwes, the manor of Racton and its manorial right was sold to the Gounter family by Lord Lumley, and according to another authority it passed at John Gounter's death to his son, Arthur. In the later 16th century, the Gounters resided at the ancient manor house.

1. S.A.C., xxviii, 200, et seqq.
2. Ibid; The Gounters had an estate at Tregunter in Wales as early as 1095.
3. Ibid; and S.A.C., xxiii, 4, and xv, 129.
4. S.A.C., xxiii, 4 and n. See also V.C.H. Sussex, iv, 114--'5.
5. Cf. S.A.C., xxviii, 210; S.A.C., xxiii, 4 note; Elwes, 177 note.
7. S.A.C. xxiii, 4 n.; Elwes, 177 n.
8. I.P.M., P.R.O. C. 142/124/163.
10. Elwes, 177.
John Gounter, who was a J.P., became involved in a serious dispute in 1540 with his neighbour, Sir Geoffrey Pole, brother of Cardinal Pole. As a result of this, Pole was committed to the Fleet for a time.\(^\text{13}\)

Arthur, eldest son and heir of John Gounter whom he succeeded in 1558, was in the service of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. He was summoned before the Privy Council, examined, and for a short while imprisoned in September - October, 1560, for his rash words in a private conversation concerning the Queen's rumoured intention of marrying Dudley and the possible effect of this on the Earl of Arundel, Gounter's master. Gounter admitted having said he wished Dudley had been executed along with his father or dispatched in some other way. For his remarks he was made to apologise and humbly submit.\(^\text{14}\)

It was Arthur Gounter's eldest son and heir, George, who was a J.P. of Sussex in 1602.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation\(^\text{15}\) and in the 1634 Visitation\(^\text{16}\).

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1560.

Sir George Gounter, eldest s. and h. of Arthur Gounter of Racton Esq. who died 23 June, 1576,\(^\text{17}\) and of Mary, d. of Stafford, s. of Sir Thomas Stafford of Bradfield, Berks.\(^\text{18}\)

Aged 13 on 25 April, 1576.\(^\text{19}\). Under 21 in father's will.

Wardship sold to Thomas Lewkenor, gent.\(^\text{20}\).

J.P. Sussex and of the Quorum, 1602.\(^\text{21}\).

April, 1604, knighted.\(^\text{22}\).

22 August, 1624, died. M.I. at Racton.\(^\text{23}\).

\(^{11}\) S.A.C. \text{xxiii}, 4. \\
\(^{12}\) Elwes, \text{177}; S.A.C., \text{xxiii}, 16. \\
\(^{13}\) S.A.C. \text{xxi}, 79-80; Elwes, 179. \\
\(^{14}\) H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, \text{1}, 252-'3, 255; Haynes, \text{State Papers}, \text{364-'5}. \\
\(^{15}\) H.C. MS D.\text{11}; G.\text{18}. Phillips, 5. \\
\(^{16}\) H.C. MS, C. 27.
Wives. 24.

Md. twice:
1) Ursula, d. of Richard Bayley of the Isle of Wight.
2) Susan, d. of - Bullen. She remd. Thomas Drury.

Children. 25.

By his first wife:
George
Richard
James Bap. 1599, St. Andrew's ch., Chichester. 27
Margaret
Mary

By his second wife: - None.

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Adm. Middle Temple, 21 Apr., 1583. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons</td>
<td>George, B.N.C., Oxf., matric. 16 June, 1610.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children. 29.

John md. twice: (a) Joand. of - Knight of Chaughton, Hants. Named in husband's I.P.M. but predeceased him. Issue, including George, s. and h., a minor at father's death. (b) Martha, d. of Bradshaw Drew. She md. secondly, Sir Gregory Morton, bart. Executor to her aunt, Dame Dorothy Thornehurst, 1620. Then a widow of her first husband. 30. No issue.

---

18. B. & C., loc.cit.
20. Ibid.
22. Shaw, 11, 131.
23. B.& C., loc.cit. No will or I.P.M. but dt. of death given in son John's I.P.M., P.R.O., C. 142/419/45.
26. See note 23.
27. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 51.
(Gounter continued.)

**Marriages of children (continued)**

George md. twice:— (a) Mary, d. of Adrian Stoughton of West Stoke, Sussex. (q.v.) Issue. (b) Frances French of Essex. Issue.

Richard James

Margaret md. John Poor of Bedfordshire.

Mary md. Francis, s. and h. of Bradshaw Drew of Densworth in Huntingdon (q.v.). He under 21 in will of aunt Dame Dorothy Thornehurst, 1620.

**Subsidy assessments.**

(As of Racton, Hundred of Westbourne & Singleton, Chichester Rape.)

30. Henry VIII John Gounter Esq., in goods £60.32.
2. Elizabeth Arthur Gounter Esq. in lands £20.33.
14. Elizabeth " " " " £20.34.

(Sessor for that Hundred.)

29. B.&C., loc.cit.
32. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
33. " ; E. 179/190/264.
34. " ; E. 179/190/283.
35. " ; E. 179/190/347.
HOWARD, (Earl of Arundel)

Origins.

Philip Howard, the first Earl of Arundel of the Howard family, was the eldest son of Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk who was executed in 1572, by his first wife, Lady Mary Fitzalan, daughter of Henry Fitzalan, last Earl of Arundel of the Fitzalan family, (q.v.). His mother had died in 1557, but it was through her that he inherited the Arundel title in 1580 when his maternal grandfather died. This fact calls for some explanation in that, of Henry Fitzalan's two daughters, it was the younger, Mary, who had married the Duke of Norfolk and was mother of Philip Howard, while the elder, Joan, had married Lord Lumley and had died without issue some four years before her father.1 It was on this elder daughter and on her husband that the Arundel estates had been settled by the late Earl.2 However, on 24 February, 1580, the day that Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, died, Lord Lumley conveyed his life interest in the Castle and Honour of Arundel to Philip Howard, his nephew-in-law, whereby, according to the admission made by the Crown in 1433 that the Earldom went by tenure of the Castle and Honour, Philip became Earl of Arundel.3

The chief residence of the Howards before 1580 was Kenninghall in Norfolk. After 1580, Philip Howard appears to have been regarded as primarily of Sussex; his name appears on the Commission of the Peace for Sussex in that year.4 His wife, the Countess of Arundel, was for a time in the custody of Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston. (v. infra).

1. G.E.C., i, 252 et seqq.
3. G.E.C., i, 254; and see notes on Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel.
4. T.B. Howell: State Trials, (1816), i, 1253; B.M.Add. MS, 38,792, f. 1b; P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 22-27.
(Howard, continued)

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Philip Howard, eld. son of Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, who was executed in 1572, by his first wife, Lady Mary Fitzalan, younger daughter of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel. She died in 1557. (v. supra.)

July, 1557, born. His mother died at his birth. King Philip and the Lord Chancellor were his godfathers. 7.

1572, his father was attainted and executed. 6.

Shortly afterwards, when c. 15 years old, went to Cambridge with his two younger brothers and remained there two years. Then bore the courtesy title of the Earl of Surrey. 7. (See also under 'Education').


Went to Court and led a rather profligate life. Was paid marked attention by the Queen. 9.

Feb., 1580, on the death of his maternal grandfather, Henry Fitzalan, he succeeded to the Earldom of Arundel. (v. supra).

1580 - 1585, J.P. Sussex. 10.

20 Dec., 1583, confined to his house in London on the suspicion that he was connected with the Throgmorton plot. 11.

24 Dec., 1583, articles were drawn up on which he was to be cross-examined, relating to his alleged intrigues with Lord Paget, and Charles Arundel, the conspirators, before they had left England, and his transactions with the Earl of Northumberland, and Mary, Queen of Scots. 12.

Sept., 1584, partly under the influence of his wife, he became a Catholic. 13.

5. S.A.C., xli;83; G.E.C.;1, 254, says he was born 28 June, 1557.
6. D.N.B. sub "Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk".
7. ed. Duke of Norfolk; Lives of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel and of Anne Dacres, his wife, (1857), 9-11. This
(Howard, Earl of Arundel, continued.)

April, 1585, attempted to escape from the country, but was re-captured almost immediately and was committed to the Tower. Subsequently sentenced to imprisonment during the Queen's pleasure, and to the payment of a fine of £10,000. Obliged to sell his share of the manor of Cuckfield and of lands there for £500 to Walter Covert to help to meet this. 14.

1589, attainted and condemned to death, one of the charges being that he had said Mass for the success of the Armada. His lands were declared forfeit. Sentence not carried out. Lingered in the Tower until October, 1595, when he died. Bur. in Tower Chapel. His remains later removed to Arundel. 15.

His wife.

Anne, d. of Thomas, Lord Dacre of the North. She married Philip Howard in his 14th year. 16. 1582, she openly became a Catholic. 17. 1583-'4 was a prisoner in the custody of Sir Thomas Shirley at Wiston House in Sussex. There her daughter, Elizabeth, was born. 18. In April, 1584, she was cross-examined about her religion, her alleged habit of harbouring Jesuits, and her correspondence with Charles Paget. 19. June, 1584, she petitioned Walsingham to use his influence with the Queen to obtain her release. 20. 1585, much of her property was seized on her husband's arrest. 21. Her debts are said by one writer to have amounted at one time to £14,000. 22. April, 1630, died at Shifnal, Shropshire. Buried at Arundel. 23.

ref.7. cont'd.

biography is based on original MSS but these are not directly referred to. The whole is somewhat hagiographic.

8. D.N.B., sub "Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel".
9. Ibid., and Lives of Philip Howard, Pt.1, ch.3
10. P.R.O. Assizes, (See note 4).
12. Cal.S.P.D., 1581-'90, 139,nos.52 and 53.
18. D.N.B., loc.cit; S.A.C., v,16. (The Lives etc. says she was in custody 1582-'3, but this does not agree with her plea of June,1584, or with S.A.C., loc.cit.)
Children.

Thomas Only son. Born, 1586. In 1604, restored in blood and to titles of Earl of Arundel and Surrey, and to the honours his father had enjoyed and to the baronies of the attainted Duke of Norfolk. 1609-10, first continental tour. 1611, K.G. 1615, became a protestant. 1616, Privy Councillor. 1621, presided over committee of peers on Bacon's case. Joint Commissioner of Great Seal; Earl Marshal. 1626-18, imprisoned for hostility to Buckingham. 1628, attempted mediation in debates on the Petition of Right. 1639, general of the army against the Scots. 1641, presided at Strafford's trial. 1642, escorted the Queen to the Continent and subsequently lived at Padua, contributing large sums to the royalist cause. 1644, created Earl of Norfolk. Was a noted art collector. 1646, died.

Elizabeth Only daughter. Born at Wiston, 1584. D. Dip at the age of sixteen, probably of consumption.

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, (School, Westminster), At Trinity College, Camb. M.A., 1605</td>
<td>Thomas, adm. Inner Temple, Nov., 1604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. S.A.C., v. 16.
28. Inner Temple Admissions, 94. Noted that he "withdrew from the frivolities of the Court".
29. D.N.B., but this not noted in the University register.
(Howard, Earl of Arundel continued)

**Marriages of children.**

Thomas md. in Sept., 1606, Alathea, 3rd d. and heiress of Gilbert Talbot, 7th Earl of Shrewsbury.\(^{32}\)

Elizabeth died unmd.\(^{33}\)

---

32. G.E.C., 1,257.
33. See note 26.
Hussey.

Origins.

The Husseys were an ancient family with a pedigree going back to Henry Hosatus, or de Hoese, founder of Durford Abbey in 1165. From his elder son descended the Husseys of Harting, with lands also from time to time in Wiltshire, Kent and Gloucestershire. From his younger son descended the Husseys of Salop. A link between these Husseys and the Husseys of Slinfold and Cuckfield in the 16th century seems very likely, but has not apparently yet been established.

The John Hussey who was a J.P. of Sussex between 1559 and 1572, and perhaps earlier, and is described in the bishop's letter of 1564 as Mr John Hussey of Cuckfield, J.P. of the East part of the county and a "favourer of religion and godlie order", appears to have been the second son of Henry Hussey Esq. of Slinfold who died in about 1541, and who had been a deforciant in fine for Denne in Horsham in 1517 and for the manor of Leigh in Cuckfield in 1540. Nothing is known of the parentage of this Henry Hussey, though he mentions in his will a brother, John Hussey, buried in Slinfold Church. From this John Hussey descended a collateral branch of the family, the Husseys of London.

While the length of the connection of the Husseys with Sussex suggests that this Henry Hussey was no newcomer to the county in the 16th century, it seems that it was by his marriage to Eleanor, daughter and heiress of John Bradbridge, that he established himself in Slinfold, and also perhaps acquired property in Cuckfield. The Bradbridges had been settled in Slinfold since the early 14th century and some indication of the extent of their property there and elsewhere is given in the will of John Bradbridge, father of Eleanor, dated and proved in 1503. Some of the Cuckfield property of the 16th century Husseys may have come from Eleanor's mother, Agnes, daughter and heiress of John Payne of Cuckfield.

1. B.&C., 344.
2. Ibid., 286-17.
3. R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 1-14; He was not on the Commission in 1561 or 1562. (See nos. 3 & 4. Roll for 1563, no. 5, is missing).
4. Bishop's letter, 1564 (Camden Misc., ix, 10)
5. B.&C., 286-17. Will, Chichester, 2/229b.
7. Ibid; Comber, (Horsham), 184.
8. B.&C., 286-17.
(Hussey continued)

Henry Hussey Esq., at his death in about 1541, left three sons; the eldest, Sir Henry Hussey, succeeded to the Slinfold property, while the second, John, inherited the manor of Leigh in Cuckfield which his father had acquired in 1540, the previous year. 10

The Husseys held the manor of Leigh in Cuckfield from 1540 to 1627, and this branch of the family are referred to in Parish Registers and other sources as "of Pain's in Cuckfield". Pain's Place was apparently the original manor house and the estate of Pains formed part of Leigh manor. II. On a chimney piece are carved the initials, "I.H." and "M.H.", probably those of John Hussey who died in 1572 and of his wife, Margaret. It has been suggested that Pains was either built or re-built by this John Hussey before 1557 when Sir Henry Hussey of Slinfold died. 12

The Husseys are described by Cooper as important figures in that district. 13 They were, above all, distinguished for their parliamentary services to Sussex. Their name is found among lists of M.P.'s for Sussex constituencies from the late 13th century onwards. Henry Hussey who died in about 1541, was M.P. for Horsham in 1529. His eldest son, Sir Henry Hussey, sat for the same borough in 1552, and for Lewes in 1553, when he appears to have been among those who opposed the Marian reaction. 14 Anthony Hussey Esq., Sir Henry's first cousin, was a member for Horsham in 1553, and for Shoreham in 1558. 15

Although John Hussey, the J.P., bought the impropriated rectory of Cuckfield with a messuage and garden, in 1560, it seems that soon afterwards the family fortunes began to decline, for in 1564 and 1572, John Hussey sold property to Ninian Ward. 16 Further alienations of property took place after his death.

12. S.N.Q., loc. cit. This article errs in saying this John Hussey died in 1600. It was his son who died in that year. Cf. B.&C., 286-17, and genealogy given below.
16. Cooper, op. cit., 119-120.
Ibid.
Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in the 1570 Visitation, nor in that of 1634, though the ancient family of Hussey whose pedigree is given by Berry, had a coat of arms. 17.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Hussey of Pain's in Cuckfield Esq., eld. son and heir of John Hussey Esq. of the same, who was J.P. of Sussex, 1559-1572 (v. notes on origins), and M.P. Horsham, 1571, 18, and died c. 1572, 19, and of Margaret, d. of William Apsley Esq., of Thackham. 20.

c. 1572, succeeded his father and was his executor.

Between 1579 and 1581, during the quarrel between Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield (q.v.) and Edmund Curtis, Vicar of Cuckfield and brother of the Bishop of Chichester, took the side of Bowyer against Curtis and most of the leading Cuckfield families. 21.

Feb., 1582, plaintiff in a lawsuit about lands in Slinfold. 22.

1585, violent quarrel with a neighbour, Captain Vaughan. 23.

1587, holding manor of Leigh, 24. Evidently sold the manor of Pains to John Porter who died in 1599. 25.

27 May, 1600, buried at Cuckfield. 26.

17. B.&C., 344.
18. Brown\Willis, Notitia Parliamentaria, iii, 85.
19. Will dt. 25 June, 1571; pr. 6 Mch, 1572, P.C.C. 9 Peter.
21. Cooper, op. cit. 119.
22. B.&C., loc.cit.
23. Cooper, op. cit. 120.
25. Ibid.
(Hussey continued.)

Wives. 27.

Md. twice:-
1) Joan, d. of John Michell of Cuckfield, Sussex.
   2) Mary, d. of Thomas Wroth of Druant's in Enfield, Middx.

Had the manor of Leigh under son, Nathaniel's will, 1627.
Will dt. 20 Apr., 1646, pr. 4 June, 1647. 28.

Children. 29.

By his first wife: -

George Eld.s. and h. Later of Peasmarsh Esq. Died 14 Jan.,
   1615. I.P.M. Will. 30.

By his second wife: -

Nathaniel Held part of manor of Pains in Cuckfield, 1615. Will
   dt. 2 June, 1626, pr. by sentence 2 Dec., 1627. 31.
   Bur. All Hallows, Bread St., 30 June, 1626.

Thomas Of Bread Street, London, citizen and grocer. Will
   dt. 11 Jan., 1653, pr. 21 Nov., 1655. 32.

Joseph

John Clerk. Minister of Cincpen.

Robert Citizen and salter. One of the bridge masters of

London, 1666.


Anne or Hannah

Lydia

Martha

Dorcas

Education.

Father

Universities. Inns of Court.

Sons

27. Ibid.


29. B.&C., loc.cit.

30. P.C.C. 49 Rudd.


32. P.C.C. 186 Aylett.

(Hussey continued)

Marriages of children.

Of the first marriage:

George md. Joan, eld. d. of John Derings of Egerton, Kent, gent.: executrix to her husband in 1615.

Of the second marriage:

Nathaniel md. Mary, d. of Richard Catlyn, or Catpyn, of Woolverston, Suffolk. Issue.


Joseph D.s.p.

John Married twice. Identity of wives unknown. 35.

Robert md. Awdrey, d. of Francis Curwen of London. Issue, several of whom settled in Barbadoes.

Stephen

Anne md. - Street.

Lydia md. - Crab.


Dorcas

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Cuckfield, Hundred of Buttinghill, Lewes Rape.)

38 Henry VIII John Hussey in lands £20. 36.

2 Elizabeth John Hussey Esq. " " £40. 37.

5 Elizabeth Mr. John Hussey " " £40. 38.

14 Elizabeth John Hussey " " £10. 39.


L-2 Charles I Mistress Mary Hussey," " £2. 41.

widow,

Nathaniel Hussey, gent." " £1.

34. B. & C., loc. cit.; Comber, (Horsham), 187.

35. See Comber, loc. cit.

36. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.

37. " " E. 179/190/267.

38. " " E. 179/190/274.


40. " " E. 179/190/299.

JEFFERAY, (or Jeffrey).

Origins.

The family of Jefferay, owners of Chiddingly manor in the rape of Pevensey for three generations "and rendered illustrious by the production of Sir John Jefferay, Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer" seem to have been of Sussex origin.¹ Both Berry and Comber and Mr Lower trace their pedigree back to Symon Jefferay whose place of residence is unknown but who was the father of William Jefferay of Bletchington, Sussex.² William died in 9 Edward IV, 1469, and it was his son and heir, John, who purchased Chiddingly manor and died in 1513.³ His three sons, Richard, Thomas and William, founded three distinct branches of the family; Thomas, who was either the second or the third son, founded the Ripe branch; William, also a younger son, founded the branch at Peaks in Chiddingly. The eldest, Richard, succeeded his father as proprietor of Chiddingly Place and in the Subsidy Roll for 1545 he is placed at the head of the list of contributors at Chiddingly manor with the highest assessment, at the rate of 40s. He died in 1554. By his wife, Eliza, daughter of Robert Whitfield of Wadhurst, he had two sons and a daughter. The younger son, Richard, settled at South Malling, and the elder was the distinguished judge, the future Sir John Jefferay.⁴

Mr. Mainwaring Johnston referred to them as "The important and ancient family of the Jefferays who were seated in Sussex as early as the beginning of the fifteenth century and who even then ranked as persons of wealth and consequence".⁵

Their coat of arms, like those of so many families, is more productive of hypotheses than of reliable information as to their earlier origins. Mr Lower considered that the Jefferay coat was a derivation of that of Echingham because the family held an estate in Bletchington of the Barons of that name. Mr W.S. Ellis, however, suggested that "as it more nearly resembles the St. Leger bearings and as Geoffrey was not an uncommon name of their race, it seems more likely that the Jefferays sprang from one of its scions - taking, as was frequently the case, - the Christian name for a surname and charging the chief with a lion as a distinctive bearing".⁶

¹ S.A.C., xiv, 218.
² Ibid., and B.& C., 156. Lower suggests this was Bletchington in Friston, now Friston Place.
³ Will pr. 1515; P.C.C. 24 Fettiplace.
⁴ B.&C., loc.cit.; S.A.C., loc.cit.
⁵ S.A.C., liii, 138.
⁶ S.A.C., vi, 83.
(Jefferay continued.)

The seat of the Jefferays, Chiddingly Place, was re-built by Sir John Jefferay and "must have been one of the finest Elizabethan houses in the county". It was arranged on three sides of a quadrangle, open towards the North, with two projecting wings and a slightly projecting porch making an "E", - an architectural compliment to the Queen. But apparently the house was occupied only for a very short time. "The mortar could scarcely have been dry when its builder departed this life and his heiress soon after took up her chief abode in a distant shire". 8.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in 1570 Visitation9. Also in the 1634 Visitation.10.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.11.


1564, bishop's letter as a "favourer of religion and godlie order" and "learned in the law". 14.

1569, accepted the Act of Uniformity.15.

1563, M.P. Clitheroe; 1571 East Grinstead; 1572, Sussex; 1581, Sussex, vice Walter Covert, deceased.16.

Admitted to Gray's Inn, 1544 (see 'Education'); barrister, 1546; Lent reader, 1561; Serjeant-at-law, 1567; Queen's serjeant, 1572.

7. S. A.C., xiv, 218.
8. S.A.C., xiv, 218; and Horsfield, 1, 354.
11. Strictly, Sir John Jefferay should not be included in this study since, according to his I.P.M. he died 13 May, 1578, leaving no male heirs (v.infra note 21). But in view of his importance in the county and the comparatively long association of his family with it, - the early date of his death was intentionally overlooked.
12. B.&C., 156.
(Jefferay continued.)

Justice of Queen's Bench, 1576; Chief Baron of the Exchequer, 1577. 17.

1577, knighted. 18.

He was Justice of Assize for the S.W. Circuit, 1574. 19.

1575 onwards, took part in the legal dispute over the Dicker common, siding with the Pelhams against Anthony Smyth and the Crown. 20. The Crown eventually gave way.


Wives. 22.

Md. twice:-

1) Alice, d. of John Apsley of London. She died 28 May, 1570.
2) Mary, d. of George Goring Esq. of Ovingdean, Sussex.

Children. 23.


Education.

Universities.

Father

Inns of Court.


(No sons)

14. Bishop's letter, 1564, (Camden Misc. ix,10.)
15. Ibid.
18. Shaw, ii, 78.
19. Fudge, loc.cit.
22. B.&C., loc.cit.
23. Ibid.
(Jefferay continued)

**Marriages of children**

Elizabeth md. as his first wife, Edward Montague of Boughton, co. Northants., 1562-1644, who was crl Baron Montague in 1621.

**Subsidy assessments.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As of Chiddingly, Pevensey Rape</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 Henry VIII</td>
<td>Richard Jefferay in lands £20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Jefferay, serj.£30.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-at-law, (Commissioner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Jefferay Esq. in lands £30.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Commissioner)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


27. "; E. 179/190/283.

28. "; E. 179/190/299.
LEECH.

Origins.

The origins of Richard Leech of Fletching in Sussex, Esq., Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in 1595, M.P. for Camelford in 1593, and a J.P. of Sussex between June, 1589 and 1595, are obscure, although he appears to have been a man of substance and of influential connections in the county.

He does not appear in any relevant Sussex Visitations, nor in the pedigree in Berry and Comber which shows that a certain James Leech "descended out of Chatsworth in the co. of Derby, and lived in Sussex as appears by certificate". His son and heir was one, Thomas Leech of South Bersted in Sussex, and in this pedigree, no other sons are mentioned, although Thomas apparently had two sons, John, living near Chichester in 1634, and William. Although Richard Leech is known to have had two brothers, John and William, they cannot have been the same, since John Leech of Fletching's will is dated 13 August, 1574, and pr. 9 Feb. 1575. The only link appears to be in the coats of arms which are the same in Berry and on the M.I. of Richard Leech of Fletching Esq.

Richard Leech's parentage is unknown, though he was apparently born in the parish of Smeth in Kent. In his will, Richard refers to his uncle, John Baker, and also to "the right honourable, my very good lord, the Lord Buckhurst and the Lady Buckhurst, his wife", acknowledging his gratitude to them for all they have done for him and his, and referring to his own gifts to Lord Buckhurst's sons.

Richard Leech is known to have two brothers, John and William, and at least two sisters, Sybil who married first, Thomas Courthope of Dymchurch, Kent and secondly, Cheesman, and Anne. Richard Leech also had a brother-in-law, Thomas Churcher.

1. B.&C., 7.
2. P.C.C., 9 Pyckering.
4. S.A.C., iv, 232.
5. P.C.C., 89 Drake.
6. Ibid., and P.C.C. 9 Pyckering.
(Leech continued)

**Whether armigerous.**

Not mentioned in the 1570 or 1634 Sussex Visitations. A coat of arms appears on Richard Leech's monumental inscription.7.

**Members of the family.**

**Head of the family in 1580.**

Richard Leech of Fletching, Sussex, Esq. of unknown parentage.

1593, M.P. Camelford.9.

June, 1589 - 1595, J.P. Sussex. 10.

1595-16, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex.11.

Referred to by a contemporary as "Richard Leech Esq., a Sussex gentleman of good fortune, having large estates in Kent, Hampshire, Surrey and Sussex, and whose town house was in Coleman Street."12.

1574, listed as the manager of a forge belonging to Lord Buckhurst in Fletching.13.

1588, assessed at £40 for the Armada Loan.14.

1593, with his wife, Charity, bought the manor and rectory of Plumpton Boscage from Sir Francis Carew.15.

Apparently resided at Sheffield in Fletching, though practically nothing is known of the original mansion where Sheffield Place later stood.16.

23 Dec., 1597, died.17 Bur. at Fletching in accordance with will.18 M.I.

---

7. S.A.C., iv, 232.
8. Assumed that he was living in Sussex in 1580.
11. See Appendix 4.
12. S.A.C., xi, 7-8.
13. S.A.C., ii, 242; see also S.A.C., ii, 209 and B.M. Stowe MS. 570,f.104; also Appendix 29.
14. S.A.C., i, 36.
15. B.R.O., xx, 222; xiv, 140; S.A.C., xxxiv, 20. See also B.R.O., xix, 247, and xx, 316.
Wives.

Md. twice:

1) ? (In his will, Richard Leech referred to his late wife and child, beside whom he wished to be buried in Fletching Church).

2) Charity, or Catherine, d. of Robert White of Christchurch, Hants. 19. She remarried, 19 May, 1597, at Sheffield, Fletching, Charles Howard, 2nd but eld. surviving son of Lord Howard of Effingham, 1st Earl of Nottingham. 20. She died 18, bur. 20 Dec., 1618 at Fletching. Will dt. 16 May, pr. 27 Jan. 1619. 21. It was she who erected the M.I. to Richard Leech at Fletching Church. She was made his sole executrix and was also bequeathed all his lands in Sussex, "having no issue of his body living". 22.

Children.


16. Horsfield, i, 277.
17. I.P.N., see S.R.S., xiv, 140.
18. S.A.C., xi, 10; iv, 232; will P.C.C. 89 Drake.
19. 'Charity' in Richard Leech's will, 'Catherine' in his M.I. (see S.A.C., xi, 10)
21. P.C.C. 5 Parker; S.A.C. ix, 404.
22. S.A.C. xi, 10; & P.C.C. 89 Drake.
23. Visitations of Kent, 1574 and 1592 (Harl. Soc. Pubns., lxxv, 127)
24. See inscription on father's M.I. (S.A.C., xi, 10)
25. P.C.C. 89 Drake.
(Leech continued.)

Education.  Universities.  Inns of Court.

Marriages of children.


Subsidy assessments.

(As of Sheffield, Hundred of Richmonden, Pevensey Rape).

14 Elizabeth Richard Leech in goods £5. 27.

---

27. P.R.O., E. 179/190/283.
LEVETT.

Origins.

The family of Levett does not appear to have been very distinguished but is included in this study by reason of the place held by one of its members on the Commission of the Peace for several years during Elizabeth's reign.

The family here in question was that of the Levetts of Little Horsted and Hollington. Little is known of their origin and there is apparently no known connection between them and the Levetts of Warbleton and Salehurst. Comber compiled pedigrees of both these families but showed no relationship between them. The most that can be said is that a common origin is likely, especially as the two families were settled so near together.

The pedigree of the family here under consideration has been traced no further back than one, John Levett, who was a deforciant in fine for the manor of Allington in 1515, together with Elizabeth, his wife. Their children were John and Richard. John Levett, the elder, of Little Horsted and Hollington, was plaintiff in fine for Allington in 1526, and his will was dated 12 October, 1533, and was proved 11 May, 1535. His Inquisition Post Mortem was dated 30 October, 1536.

John Levett's heir, of the same name, was a minor in 1534, but came of age on 11 September, 1548. He died 13 December, 1554, his I.P.M. being dated 7 November, 1555. He had married Eva, daughter and heiress of Richard Adams, and sister and heiress of Stephen Adams of Harrietsham, Kent. She re-married Lawrence Ashburnham Esq., and survived him also, her will not being proved until 1585. By her first husband, she had four children - a son and three daughters. The son was Lawrence Levett, the Elizabethan J.P.

1. But John Levett, father of Lawrence, held as many as 20 manors at his death according to his I.P.M. dt. 7 Nov., 1554. (P.R.O., C.142/106/66 and C. 142/108/105).
2. Comber, (Lewes), 146 et seqq.; B.&C., 229. His notes at the head of p. 229 of his copy of Berry, deal with the Hollington family, but he apparently found nothing to link them directly with the Warbleton Levetts whose printed pedigree and coat of arms appear below.
3. There are three notes in Comber, (Lewes), 148, which are perhaps intended to show how long the Levetts had been settled in the neighbourhood of Little Horsted & /contd.
(Levett continued.)

The only Sussex families with which these Levetts are known to have been connected were the Challoners, since Mary, sister of the John Levett who died in 1554, married Francis Challoner of Kenwards, and the Eversfields.7

The seat of the Levetts at Hollington was "The Grove". In the 16th century, this, together with a messuage and a windmill called "Swans", came into the hands of the Levett family who already owned the manor of Yielding.8 All of this property descended to the Eversfields by marriage on the death of the last male heir of the Levett family. (v. infra).

During a "good part" of the 16th century, the manor of Hollington was leased to John Levett of the Grove, who died in Dec., 1554, and to his son, Lawrence, who died in 1586.9

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in any version of the 1570 Visitation, though Lawrence Levett was sometimes styled "Esq" 10. The Levetts of Warbleton appear in the 1634 Visitation.11 By then the Levetts of Little Horsted and Hollington had died out.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Lawrence Levett of Hollington, gent., only son of John Levett of Little Horsted and Hollington who died December, 1554, and of Eva his wife. (v. supra).

Aged 11\(\frac{1}{2}\) years in 1554.12

ref. 3 continued.

Hollington, and connected with East Sussex. But the genealogy of the persons mentioned is not indicated. The pedigree of the Levetts of Warbleton & Salehurst goes back to William Levett of Warbleton whose will was pr. 23 May, 1545 (B.&C., loc.cit.; Comber (Lewes), 145; Lewes wills, A.I. 74.)

5. See note 1.
8. V.C.H. Sussex, ix, 84. Cf. p. 81 which says that the Grove was the seat of the Levetts in the 15th century.

/contd.
(Levett continued.)

J.P. Sussex, 1578 - 1585. 13.

1580, plaintiff in fine for manor of Middleham. 14.


Wife.

Unmarried. He had three sisters, Anne, Jane and Mary, all of whom are named in their uncle Stephen Adams' will. Mary was heiress to her brother and aged 30 at his death. She had married Thomas Eversfield, eventually of Uckfield and Hollington gent., and carried the Levett property into the Eversfield family, (q.v.). She d.s.p. at Hollington, 31 Jan., 1608. 16.

Education.  Universities.  Inns of Court.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Baldslow Hundred, Hastings Rape).

38 Henry VIII  John Levett, gent., in lands £40. 17.

14 Elizabeth  Lawrence Levett, gent., in lands £27. 18.

18 Elizabeth  Lawrence Levett, gent., " " £30. 19.

ref. 9 contd.

(See his I.P.M., P.R.O., C. 142/106/66 and C.142/108/105.)


12. See father's I.P.M.


15. Ibid.; and P.R.O., C. 142/303/133.

16. B.&C., loc.cit; I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/303/133.

17. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.

18. " ; E. 179/190/283.

19. " ; E. 179/190/298.
LEWKENOR. (or Lewknor, Leucknor etc.)

Origins.

The Lewkenors are described in the introduction to an article on the "Pedigree of the Lewknor family" as, "From the time of Edward I to the days of Philip and Mary" having "occupied a very high position among the families of Sussex. They were the representatives of the Bodymans, the Warden, the Dallyngrudes, the Bardolphs, the Polyotts, the Loughes, the Husseys and the Camoys, and through these last of the Tregoz and the Radmelles, whilst they have been connected by marriage with the De la Warrs, the Sackvilles, the Pelhams, the Pellatts, the Culpeppers, the Gorings, the Audleys, the Nevilles, the Finches, the Mays, the Stapleys and the Peachys ... and a large number of the olden laded proprietors of Sussex." The attraction which Sussex heiresses held for the Lewkenors has been a subject for comment elsewhere, and it is clear that it was largely to their judicious choice of consorts through succeeding generations that the Lewkenors owed their rise. The article first alluded to continues, "They were many times sheriffs, and various members of the family represented the shire, Chichester, Shoreham, Horsham and East Grinstead in Parliament." One of them, Thomas Lewkenor, armiger, fought at Agincourt. Loyal to the Lancastrian monarchy, they were among the supporters of authority at the time of Cade's rising, and later "fought and bled at Tewkesbury and Bosworth." Sir Thomas Lewkenor, in fact, whose uncle, Sir John, had been killed at Tewkesbury fighting under Prince Edward for the Lancastrian cause, rebelled against Richard III and, having been compelled to surrender after a siege in his castle of Bodiam, was attainted and made to forfeit his estates to the Crown. The attainder was reversed immediately after Henry VII's accession, but the revenues of the Lewkenor estates were too valuable to be relinquished by that thrifty ruler, so that their extensive lands were not restored to the Lewkenors until 1532. In the award restoring the Lewkenor estates to their previous owners, lands are mentioned in Sussex, Middlesex, Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire, Leicestershire, and Huntingdonshire. Few Sussex families", says one writer, "have in any age been more influential than the Lewkenors".

1. S.A.C., iii, 89 et seqq.
2. S.A.C., lxiii, 201.
3. See note 1; also S.A.C., xxx, 161 et seq., xxxi, 95 et seq, xxxii, 141 et seq., xxxiii, 69 et seq., xxxv, 127 et seq.
4. S.A.C., xv, 123, 129.
5. S.A.C., xviii, 21n.
6. S.A.C., iii, 89; xxxix, 103.
7. S.A.C., iii, 95-16; Comber, (Lewes), 150.
(Lewkenor continued)

The pedigree of the Sussex Lewkenors, a family now extinct, has, like those of most other ancient families, more than one version. In their case, one difficulty has been the existence of other families of the same name, so that many errors have crept into the various printed pedigrees which have appeared from time to time. Mr. Cooper, the writer of the article on the "Pedigree of the Lewkenor family" in vol. iii of the S.A.C., gave as what he considered the most credible version, one based on the B.M. Harl. Ms 1562, a version of the pedigree of the 1634 Visitation of Sussex, checked and compared with a number of other sources, and his conclusions are substantially endorsed by Comber.

Both of these genealogists trace the family back to one, Nicholas Lewkenor, Keeper of the Wardrobe, who died possessed of the manor of Rayne Hall, Essex, in 1266, leaving a son and heir, Roger, to whom Henry III confirmed the fee. Yet as Mr. Cooper says, even from this point the descent of the Sussex family is "very doubtful" owing to the problem already mentioned of the existence of Lewkenors other than those of Sussex.

The first reliable evidence of the Sussex Lewkenors appears in the Placita de Quo Warranto in 7 Edward I, where Roger de Lewkenor claimed and had the manor of Herstede in Sussex, which he and his ancestors had owned from time immemorial. From him descended the Sir Thomas Lewkenor who appears in the list of Sussex gentry in 1434, who was M.P. for Lewes in 1468, and whose I.P.M. is dated 1453. This Sir Thomas is notable in the annals of the county for his Lancastrian sentiments, his marriage to the Dallyngrrudge heiress which brought Bodiam Castle to the Lewkenors, and for his six sons, three of whom founded important branches of the family and all of whom had some claim to distinction. It was to this Sir Thomas that all the numerous Lewkenors of 16th century Sussex, whether of Bodiam, West Dean, Selsey, Sheffield, Trotton or Kingston Bowsey traced their origin, and to some extent it was to his astute marriage that they owed their fortunes.

8. V.C.H., Sussex, ix, 293.
9. S.A.C., ix, 293.
10. Ibid., 292n.
11. S.A.C., iii, 90.
12. Ibid., 90-1.
13. S.A.C., iii, 90-91; Comber (Lewes), 148-162.
14. Ibid.; see also B.&C., 130-1, and 343.
15. S.A.C., iii, 91.
(Lewkenor continued.)

It is not clear whether he married twice or three times. Authorities differ. But it seems common ground that he had issue by one wife only, though whether she was his first, second or third is again in dispute. She was Philippa, daughter and heiress of Walter Dallyngridge of Bodiam Castle, and relict of Sir Richard Barnes. By her, it seems, Sir Thomas Lewkenor had six sons and 4 daughters.

Of the six sons, Sir Roger, Sir John, Thomas, Richard, Walter and Nicholas, two died without issue, namely the second, Sir John who was killed at Tewkesbury in 1471, and Richard, the fourth, who was M.P. for Horsham in 1459, Shoreham in 1468, and East Grinstead in 1473 and 1478. The third son, Thomas, who was Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex in 1473, and who married a Goring, founded no line since his two sons, Francis and John died without issue. It was therefore from the eldest, the fifth and the sixth sons, that the 16th century Sussex Lewkenors descended. The branch with which this study is mainly concerned is that it furnished two important J.P.'s of Chichester Rape during Elizabeth's reign, was an offshoot of the elder line founded by Sir Roger. But, before dealing with the said Sir Roger's descendants, it may be as well to describe briefly the other branches of the family whose members while not always qualifying for selection for study according to the standards adopted in this thesis, were nevertheless interesting and probably sometimes influential relatives.

From the fifth son of the Sir Thomas Lewkenor already referred to, Walter Lewkenor of Walberton who married Joan, daughter of Walter Culpepper of Bedgbery, Kent, descend the Lewkenors of Trotton who appear in the Visitation of 1570; their eldest son was Richard, whose son and heir the Richard Lewkenor of Trotton of the 1570 Visitation was a Sussex J.P. at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. (V. infra.) He married Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Meffante and relict of Sir Roger Lewkenor of Bodiam and Dedisham Park, grandson of the Sir Roger above-mentioned. The manor of Trotton in the parish of that name near Rogate, West Sussex, was originally held by

16. S.A.C., iii, 91.
17. S.A.C., iii, 92; Comber (Lewes), 149-50; S.A.C., xxxix, 103.
18. S.A.C., iii, 92; Comber (Lewes), 149-50; cf. Phillips, 7.
22. S.A.C., iii, 100; cf. Comber, (Lewes), 156, says Joyce, d. of Nicholas Culpepper of Bayhall, Kent.
the family of Camoys in the 14th century, but their line terminated in two coheiresses, one of whom, Elinor, married Sir Roger Lewkenor, elder brother of Walter, thus carrying Trotton manor and various appurtenances to the Lewkenors. In 1539, Sir Roger Lewkenor, grandson of the above Sir Roger, transferred the manor of Trotton to Sir William Barentyne, his son-in-law, whose son, Sir Drew Barentyne inherited it. "It is, however, doubtful whether this was any more than a temporary arrangement for we find Trotton soon afterwards in the hands of Richard Lewkenor, grandson of Walter Lewkenor of Walberton, " and it remained with his descendants until 1634". This branch of the family is selected for study in view of Richard Lewkenor's membership of the Sussex Commission of the Peace at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign.

From the sixth son of Sir Thomas Lewkenor, - Nicholas Lewkenor of Kingston Bowsey, or Kingston-by-Sea, descended another interesting, and perhaps more influential branch, known as the Lewkenors of Kingston Bowsey. This manor, in the Fishergate Hundred of Bramber Rape, was situated in the immediate vicinity of what is now called Old Shoreham, on the left bank of the Adur estuary. According to Elwes, it came into the possession of the Lewkenors at the close of the 15th century and was to be held by them for about 250 years. Nicholas distinguished himself in the Lewkenor fashion by marrying Elizabeth, daughter, and eventually coheiress of Ralph Radmylde. In the next four generations, the son and heir was christened Edward, the first of these having his will proved in 1522. The Edward of the second generation, whose will was proved in 1528, was Escheator for Sussex, while his eldest son, again Edward, who was 11 years old in 1528, became Groom Porter to Edward VI and Mary, though he later became hostile to her regime, for which he was tried at the Guildhall in June, 1556. After being condemned to death, he was thrown into the Tower where he died on 7 September, before the sentence could be executed. However, "Elizabeth was not unmindful of his services, and one of the first Acts of Parliament introduced in her time was on 15 March, 1558 (sic) for the restitution in blood of his son, Edward Lewkenor, and three of his brothers and six sisters."
(Lewkenor continued)

But the most notable of all the Kingston Bowsey Lewkenors during this period at least, was this Groom Porter's son and heir, of the same name. He was born in about the year, 1543, and most likely at the manor house of Kingston Bowsey which appears to have been built in Henry VII's or Henry VIII's reign, close to the site of an earlier residence. He distinguished himself as a scholar of Cambridge University, obtaining a Fellowship at St. John's College in 1562. 31. "From 1571 to his death in 1605, he was almost uninterruptedly in Parliament, taking an active part in politics but withal retaining his high position as a man of letters". 32. This branch of the Lewkenor family seems to have sent many men to the Universities and Inns of Court, Edward himself going on to the Middle Temple, his younger brother, Thomas also going there, two of Edward's sons, Edward and Robert, going to Emmanuel College, and Thomas' son going to the Inner Temple. 33. Edward himself, after attaining distinction in the House of Commons and as a litterateur, was eventually knighted, in 1603. His wife brought him property in Suffolk where he seems to have passed his latter days. She was Susan, daughter and coheiress of Thomas Higham of Higham Hall, Suffolk. Sir Edward Lewkenor's residence in later years was Denham Hall, Suffolk, where he died 19 September, 1605. 34. This branch of the Lewkenor family had strong Puritan leanings. 35. Since none of its members was on the Commission of the Peace for Sussex under Elizabeth or was M.P., Sheriff or Deputy Lieutenant for that county during her reign, it is not included among the families selected for study.

29. S.A.C., xvii, 79.
30. S.A.C., iii, 89; xvii, 79-80; Comber, (Lewes), 160.
31. Elwes, 130.
32. Elwes, 131n. He is not to be confused with Edmund Lewkenor of Trotton (see notes on Lewkenors of Trotton).
33. Al Cant. Pt.I.iii, 82; Middle Temple Admissions, 1,27,41; Inner Temple Admissions, 164.
34. Comber, (Lewes), 161.
(Lewkenor continued.)

It is, however, with the descendants of Sir Roger Lewkenor, the eldest son and heir of Sir Thomas Lewkenor above-mentioned, that we are directly concerned. Sir Roger Lewkenor of Dedisham in Slinfold and later of Bodiam Castle and of Trotton, near Rogate, who was sheriff of the county in 1440 and 1468 and died in 1478, married Elinor, daughter and coheirress of Sir Richard Camoys of Broadwater, through whom he acquired the Trotton property. It has been shown how his son and heir, Sir Thomas Lewkenor of Trotton, was attainted in 1483, the year before his death for his rebellion against Richard III, and how his estates were forfeited to the Crown, only being restored, despite the reversal of the said attainder on Henry VII's accession, in 1532 to Sir Thomas' son and heir, Sir Roger Lewkenor, who died in 1543. Sir Roger left no male issue, only a daughter, Jane, by his first wife, and three infant daughters by his third. The Bodiam property, on its restoration, was settled on Jane, in 1532. She was then married to Sir William Barentyne. Subsequently, Bodiam passed to her three half-sisters, Katherine, Mabel, and Constance, and their issue. Thus the elder line of the Lewkenor family failed in male heirs in the early 16th century, and from this period, Bodiam itself began "more from neglect than from the tooth of time" to fall into gradual decay.

However, other descendants of the elder Sir Roger Lewkenor who died in 1478 and was the eldest of the six Lewkenor brothers already described, continued to flourish. Two of this Sir Roger's younger sons, brothers of the Sir Thomas who was attainted, founded fresh branches of the family. One was Sir Roger Lewkenor, knight, of West Dean, whose will was proved in 1502. He founded the Lewkenors of West Dean and Tangmere, the subject of this study. The other, Richard Lewkenor of Sheffield, founded another and much less notable branch of the family.

36. V. supra. See also S.A.C., iii, 94 and 101.
37. V. supra.
38. V.C.H., Sussex, 1x, 263. But this account errs in saying Sir William Barentyne and Jane had no children, when they had a son, Drew Barentyne. (See notes on the Barentyne family). But Bodiam did not descend to him.
40. S.A.C., ix, 293.
41. Comber, (Lewes), 151; S.A.C., iii, 97.
Sir Roger Lewkenor of West Dean and Tangmere, whose will was proved in 1509, married Mary, daughter of Reginald West, Lord De la Warr. It was their fourth son, Edmund, of Tangmere and Fyning, who perpetuated the line. By his wife, Jane, daughter of Tirrell, he had four sons and a daughter, Thomas, Richard, George, Edmond and Anne. The elder Edmund died 11 March, 1544, and his will was proved on 23 June, 1545. It is with the two eldest of his sons, Thomas of Selsey, and Richard of West Dean, that this study is mainly concerned, since both were prominent J.P.'s under Elizabeth.

Whether armigerous.

The Lewkenor coat of three chevronels seems to have been held by them for an indefinite period before Elizabeth's reign. Their name appears in all the available lists of Sussex gentry before this time and in all the relevant Visitations.

The Lewkenors of Trotton appear in the 1570 Visitation of Sussex.

The Lewkenors also appear in the 1634 Visitation. Richard Lewkenor of West Dean is mentioned in Berry as equivalent to an armiger although he is not named in this Visitation.

(1) Lewkenor of Selsey.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Thomas Lewkenor Esq. of Selsey, eld. son and heir of Edmund Lewkenor Esq. of Tangmere, Sussex, who died 11 March, 1544, and of Jane, d. of Tirrell, his wife. (V. supra).

Born at Tangmere, Sussex, and bap. there, 27 Jan., 1538.

Aged 6 at father's death.

1563 and 1572, def. in fine for Fyning.

---

42. S.A.C., iii, 97, and Comber, (Lewes), 150. But this incorrectly states that of these children, Edmond was older than George, and that George was born in 1544. It also omits Anne. (Cf. Tangmere Parish Registers at /cond.
(Lewkenor continued.)

J.P., Sussex, 1575 - 1596. 

1577, was among those gentry cited by Bishop Curtis of Chichester to appear before him and publicly answer to certain articles concerning religion. He was among those who later protested to the Privy Council about this. The bishop was eventually reprimanded for over-zealouness.

1578, acquired the lease of part of the bishop of Chichester's estate at Selsey.

1586; M.P. Midhurst.

1587, in the certificate concerning the Sussex J.P.'s, he is described as a J.P. of Chichester Rape. He and his brother, Richard Lewkenor, "do in effect all the service in this rape". But others should be joined with them on the Commission, it was added. It was noted that they visited their brother, Dr. Lewkenor, in Chichester, a recusant and a lawyer. Also the eldest son "is said to be entertained with the Prince of Parma".

1596, will proved.

ref. 42 contd.

W.S.C.R.O."

43. Comber, loc.cit.

44. S.A.C., xxxix, 101, 103, 105, 107; should read "Richard Lewkenor of Trotton";


46. H.C.MS, C. 27; S.A.C., xxxix, 112.

47. S.A.C., xxxix, 115; B.&C., 130.


49. See father's I.P.M., P.R.O., C. 142/124/163.

50. Comber, (Lewes), 153.

51. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 17-38. (But not in June, 1595. See no. 37. He was apparently restored to the Commission at Lord Buckhurst's request. (B.M. Harl. MS, 6996, f.143.).

52. Cal.S.P.D., 1547-1580, 539 no. 45, 542, 543, 544 nos. 30-44, 49 & 50.

53. Comber (Lewes), 153; S.A.C., 111, 97.

54. Official Returns; but not in 1588 (cf. Comber (Lewes), 153.)
(Lewkenor continued)

Wives. 57.

M. twice:-

1) Bridget, d. of - of Lewes.
2) Anne, d. of - Hill, and relict of John Bellingham of Eringham. Her will as of Appledram, widow, 1597 - 1602. 58.

Children. 59.

By his first wife:-

Lewis, Later Sir Lewis Lewkenor, knt., of Selsey, 1597 M.P. for Midhurst; 1604-11, M.P. Bridgnorth. 22 Apr., 1603, knighted. Master of Ceremonies to James I, from 1605. 1626, died. 60.

Edmund Died in infancy.

Thomas

John

Richard Later of Amberley

Bridget Perhaps also the child of this marriage. Not mentioned by Comber, loc. cit., but appears in uncle, Sir Richard Lewkenor's will, proved in 1616. 61.

By his second wife:- Apparently none.

Education.

Universities. Inns of Court.

Father Adm. Middle Temple, 3 Aug., 1555. 62.

Sons. Lewis, M.A. of Camb., Lewis, adm. Middle Temple, 12 Oct., 1579 as late of Lyons Inn. 64.

incorp. at Oxf., 25 Aug., late of New Temple, as late of New Inn, 28 Nov., 1583. 65.

1624. 63

55. S.A.C., ii, 59. Apparently the brother referred to was George. (See will of Sir Richard Lewkenor of West Dean, P.C.C. 62 Cope.)

56. P.C.C. 55 Drake.

57. Comber, (Lewes), 153.

58. P.C.C. 75 Montague.


60. Official Returns; Shaw, ii, 102; S.A.C., xxiv, 120.


62. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 21.

63. Al.Ox,iii,911;AlCant. Pt.1.,iii,82.
(Lewkenor continued.)

Marriages of children. 66.

Lewis md Mary, d. and coheirress of Richard Blount of Dedisham (q.v.). She living a widow in 1637. Issue. 67.

Edmund
Thomas
John
Richard md. Ann, d. and h. of John Fraye of Lyntehurst in Icklesham. Issue.


Subsidy assessments.

(As of Tangmere, Aldwyke Hundred, Chichester Rape.)

38 Henry VIII Johan Lewkenor, widow, in lands £28. 69.

(As of Selsey, Manwood Hundred, Chichester Rape)
14 Elizabeth Thomas Lewkenor Esq. in lands £15.70. (Commissioner)


(11) Lewkenor of West Dean.

Before tabulating the members of the Elizabethan family of Lewkenor of West Dean it is necessary to dispose of what appears to be a serious error in the accepted genealogy. Several authorities describe Richard, the second son of Edmund Lewkenor Esq. of Tangmere who died in 1544, as of West Dean Esq., and as 'Chief Justice of Wales. 72. None of these authorities gives the name of his wife, but all give him as the father of two sons, the elder, Thomas Lewkenor who died without issue, the younger, Sir Richard Lewkenor who became Chief Justice of Chester and who died in 1616. No further details are given.

64. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 45.
65. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 52.
68. See her uncle, Richard's will, P.C.C. 62 Cope. Reference to their poverty and many children.
69. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
70. " ; E. 179/190/283.
71. " ; E. 179/190/347.
72. S.A.C., Mii, 97; Comber, (Lewes), 154; B.&C., 130.
It appears, after careful study of the available sources, that these authorities interposed a generation which never, in fact, existed, and that Richard Lewkenor, the so-called 'Chief Justice of Wales' was no other than the well-documented figure, Sir Richard Lewkenor, eventually Chief Justice of Chester. The so-called elder son, Thomas, of this said Chief Justice of Wales, who is supposed to have died without issue, is simply named in this genealogy. No details are given about him, and it seems likely that, as the elder brother of the Chief Justice of Chester, he may have been no other than Thomas Lewkenor Esq. of Selsey, since the evidence seems overwhelming that the Chief Justice of Chester was himself Edmund Lewkenor Esq. of Tangmere's second son.

The evidence referred to is as follows: first, there appears to be no record of any such office as that of Chief Justice of Wales. Mr. W.R. Williams in his "History of the Great Sessions in Wales, 1542 -1830, together with the lives of the Welsh Judges" makes no reference to such an office, but in his introduction he does say, "The Chief Justice of Chester was always regarded as the head of the Welsh Bench; he was always a very important member of the Council of the Marches at Ludlow, and the Calendar of State Papers contains many references to his proceedings." The annual fee of the Chief Justice of Chester in 1542 was £100, double that of the other Welsh Judges, and after 1578 when a second Justice was appointed to assist him, his pre-eminence became more definite even than before.

Secondly, there is no record in any of the Inns of Court Admission Registers of any Richard Lewkenor, or indeed of any Lewkenor, earlier than the entry in the Middle Temple Admission Register for 5 October, 1560. This records the admission of one, Richard Leucknor, (sic), second son of Edmund Leucknor of Tangmere, Sussex, Bencher in 1561, Autumn Reader in 1581 and Lent Reader in 1592. (V. infra on Education). Nothing is said of his having become Chief Justice of Wales, but the details given fit in well enough with the career of the future Chief Justice of Chester who, according to Williams, was a serjeant-at-law on 29 Nov., 1594, was knighted in 1600, M.P. for Chichester in 1572, 1584, 1586, 1588, 1593 and 1597, Recorder of Chichester from 1588 - 1600 and Chief Justice of Chester from 1600 until his death in April, 1616 at the age of 36.74.

Thirdly, Sir Richard Lewkenor, Chief Justice of Chester's I.P.M., states that he died on 6 April, 1616, aged 76. The second son of Edmund Lewkenor of Tangmere, Sussex, also Richard, was baptised on 14 March, 1541. Assuming that Old Style dating was used in both cases, these dates certainly do not quite harmonise, for Edmund Lewkenor's son should have reached the age of 74 years old on 15 March, 1615, and the date, 6 April, 1616, was, according to the Old Style, only about three weeks later. But so slight a discrepancy does not appear to dismiss the possibility that both these facts relate to the same person, and that there may have been a slight error of a year or two as to Sir Richard Lewkenor's age at death at the time when his I.P.M. was made. Rather, the close relationship of these dates, appears to confirm the theory that the man who died in 1616 was the second son of Edmund Lewkenor of Tangmere, Sussex, and the younger brother of Thomas Lewkenor Esq. of Selsey.

Finally, there is no record of any will, or I.P.M., or other trace of the death of the so-called Chief Justice of Wales, nor is there any trace of a wife; - both singular facts for a leading member of the Bench.

On the basis of these considerations, it is therefore assumed in this study, that Richard Lewkenor, second son of Edmund Lewkenor of Tangmere who died in 1544, and younger brother of Thomas Lewkenor of Selsey Esq., was the future prominent J.P. of Chichester Rape, M.P. for Chichester in a series of Parliaments, Recorder of Chichester, and eventually knight and Chief Justice of Chester.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Richard Lewkenor, knt., of West Dean, 2nd son of Edmund Lewkenor Esq. of Tangmere, Sussex who died 11 March, 1544 and of Jane, d. of - Tirrell. (V. supra).

14 Mch., 1541, Bap. at Tangmere. (V. supra)

75. P.R.O., C. 142/355/45.
76. W.S.C.R.O., Tangmere Parish Registers.
77. Cf. will of Sir Richard Lewkenor, Chief Justice of Chester which refers to his nephew, Sir Lewis Lewkenor, and mentions that the testator was born in Tangmere, Sussex. (P.C.C. 62 Cope.)
(Lewkenor continued.)

Named in father's will, pr. 23 June, 1545, as under 21. 78.

(For his early legal career, see 'Education').

M.P. Chichester, 1572, 1584, 1586, 1588, 1593, 1597. 79.
The 1584 and 1586 elections were contested by James Colbrand (q.v.) without success and led to a Star Chamber case. 80.

1588 - 1600, Recorder of Chichester. 81.

29 Nov., 1594, Serjeant-at-law. 82.

1600, knighted. 83.

May, 1600, appointed Chief Justice of Chester. Held this post until his death. 84.


1587, in the certificate concerning the Sussex Justices, mentioned that he and his brother, Thomas, did practically all the work in Chichester Rape and that others should be joined with them since they frequently called on their brother, Dr. Lewkenor, a recusant and a lawyer, dwelling in Chichester. 86.

c. 1585, a Commissioner for disarming the recusants. 87.

July, 1592, " " " " " " 88.

(See also his letter to the Privy Council, 27 Jan., 1606, from Worcester, reporting on his dealings with those who harboured Jesuits and priests in Staffs. and Worcs. Here he refers to one "verry subyttl and obstinatt papist". 89.)

1589, plaintiff in fine for manor of West Dean in Sussex. It was quitclaimed to him. 90.

6 April, 1616, died. 91. I.P.K. and Will. 92. M.I. at West Dean. 93.

78. P.C.C. 31 Pynning.
81. Williams, op.cit. 33.
82. Ibid.
83. Shaw, ii, 98.
85. P.R.O., Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 14-44.
86. S.A.C., ii, 59.
87. B. N. Harl. MS, 474, f.90b. Also for musters and for the restraint of grain. Ibid., ff.81 & 92b.
(Lewkenor continued.)

Wife.

Margaret - . Perhaps a widow before he married her since in his will he refers to his wife's daughter and grandchildren. He calls her "Dame Margaret". After Sir Richard's death, she married Sir William Oglander.94.

Children.

(Here again, there appear to be some serious errors in the accepted genealogies.95. These give Sir Richard Lewkenor who died in 1616 as having had 5 sons in addition to his eldest son, and 2 daughters. These statements are not supported by any references, and the assertion that Sir Christopher Lewkenor who became Recorder of Chichester in 1634, and was M.P. for Midhurst in 1628, and for Chichester in 1640, and living in 1649, was the brother next in age of Richard Lewkenor of West Dean, the Judge's eldest son and heir who died in 1602 aged 34, is suspect. This Sir Christopher Lewkenor appears in the 'Alumni Oxonienses' as becoming a D.C.L. in Nov., 1642, a royalist colonel in the Civil War in 1644, and as very likely being the same Christopher Lewkenor who was admitted to the Middle Temple in 1617 and called to the bar in 1625 as the son of Richard Lewkenor of West Dean Esquire deceased.96. If he had been the Judge's son, his father would have been described as a knight. Further, his dates suggest, he was born too late to have been the second of six sons of a man who, like Sir Richard Lewkenor, the Judge, died in 1616 aged about 76, or to have been the brother next in age of one who died in 1602 aged about 34.

The will of Sir Richard Lewkenor, proved in 1616, though abnormally long and detailed, mentions no children except his late son, Richard, whose 6 sons and 2 daughters are all referred to, the sons being specifically named. The christian names of these grandsons are precisely the same as those of the so-called "sons" of the Judge in Comber's genealogy, so that it appears he has confused the two generations.)

88. B.M. Harl. MS, 703, f. 67b.
89. B.M. Add. MS, 6178, f. 697.
90. S.R.S. xx, 473.
91. T.P.M., P.R.O. C.142/355/45; H.M.C. 13th Report, iv, 257
93. S.A.C. xxviii, 161.
(Lewkenor continued.)

Richard

Of West Dean. Died v.p., 9 March, 1602, aged 34, 97
J.P. Sussex, 1600 - Jan., 1602. Of the Quorum. 98

Education.

Father

Richard, matric. Hart Hall, 9 May, 1584, aged 14. 100

Son

Richard, adm. Middle Temple, 28 Jan., 1586, as son of Richard Lewkenor of "Downeley, Sussex". 101

Universities.

Adm. Middle Temple, 9 Oct., 1560. Bencher, 1581;
Autumn Reader, 1581 and Lent Reader, 1582. 99

Inns of Court.

Richard, adm. Middle Temple, 28 Jan., 1586, as son of Richard Lewkenor of "Downeley, Sussex". 101

Marriages of children.

Richard md. Eleanor, d. of Sir Christopher Broome of Halton, co. Oxon. 102 Issue, including Richard, heir to his grandfather in 1616, then aged 24 and more. 103

95. B & C., 130; Comber (Lewes), 154.
96. Al. Ox., iii, 911; Middle Temple Admissions, i, 107.
97. B & C., 130; Comber (Lewes), 154; R.M.C. Hatfield MSS xii, 86.
99. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 25.
100. Al. Ox., iii, 911.
101. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 56; probably Downley in West Dean. See "The Place-Names of Sussex" Pt. 1., (English Place-Name Society Pubns., vi, 49). See also Middle Temple Records. Minutes of Parliament, ii, 183.
103. See their grandfather's will, P.C.C. 62 Cope; and Al. Ox., iii, 911, and Middle Temple Admissions, i, 89.
(Lewkenor continued.)

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Funtington, Hundred of Bosham, Chichester Rape).
2 Elizabeth Richard Lewkenor, gent., in lands £20.104.

(As of The Pallant, City of Chichester)
38 Elizabeth Richard Lewkenor, gent., in lands £1 105. (Commissioner, and Recorder of Chichester)
40 Elizabeth (Not assessed but named as a Commissioner and as Recorder.) 106.
41 Elizabeth (Not assessed but named " " " " as Recorder.) 107.

(As of Westdean, Hundred of Westbourne and Singleton, Chichester Rape.)
? Elizabeth Richard Lewkenor, serjeant-at-law, in lands £30.108


(iii) Lewkenor of Trotton.

(For their relationship with the other branches, see notes on Origins.)

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Edmund Lewkenor Esq., eld. son and heir of Richard Lewkenor of Trotton Esq., who was J.P., Sussex, c. 1558-19, 110 and was referred to in the bishop's letter of 1564 as "No Justice" but a "mislyker of godlie orders".111 and who died 26 June, 1572,112 also of Elizabeth, d. of Thomas Meffant and relct of Sir Roger Lewkenor of Dedisham and Bodiam. 113.

104. P.R.O., E. 179/190/264.
105. " , E. 179/190/333.
106. " , E. 179/190/335.
111. Bishop's letter, 1564 (Camden Misc., ix,10.)
112. Comber (Lewes), 157.
113. Ibid.
(Lewkenor continued)

Mentioned in 1570 Visitation as son and heir.114.

1572, succeeded his father, aged 30.115. The bulk of the property held by his father passed however, to the Mills family, descendants of Elizabeth, Edmund's mother, by her previous husband, Sir Roger Lewkenor who had died in 1543. Sir Roger and Elizabeth had had a daughter, Katherine, who married John Mill of Greatham, and by him had a son, Lewkenor Mill, who died seized of the manors of Trotton, Elsted, Didling etc.116. The Feodary Survey taken at Edmund Lewkenor's death shows that he held merely the reversion of a moiety of the manor of Selmeston after his mother's death.117.

Not on the Commission of the Peace under Elizabeth.

30 April, 1588, died. I.P.M., 7 June, 1593.118.

Wife.119.

Anne, base daughter of Sir Anthony Browne, kn.t.

Children.120.

Herbert Aged 16 on 31 August, 1593. Of Loverhill, near Trotton. Will proved, 1610.121.

Anthony A soldier in the Low Countries where he d.s.p.

A daughter

Constance

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps Matric. pens. from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. John's Coll, Camb.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michs. 1559.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.A., 1562-'3. Incorp. at Oxf.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 July, 1566; Fell. Exeter Coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1566-'77; M.A., 21 April, 1567.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sons

115. Comber (Lewes), 158.
For the genealogical connection, Harl.Soc.Pubns, lxiv, 160.
(Lewkenor continued)

Marriages of children.123.

Herbert md. Mary, d. of William Payntz of Reigate, Surrey.124
   Administratrix to her husband. Her will pr.,1617.124

Anthony
   Constance

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Trotton, Hundred of Westbourne and Singleton, Chichester Rape)

30 Henry VIII Richard Lewkenor Esq. in lands £58.125.

(As of Harting, Hundred of Dumpford, Chichester Rape)

2 Elizabeth Richard Lewkenor Esq. in lands £30.126.

(As of Trotton, etc.)

14 Elizabeth Dame Elizabeth Lewkenor in lands £20.127.

118. P.R.O., C. 142/236/66.
119. Comber, (Lewes), 158.
120. Ibid.
121. P.C.C. 83 Wingfield.
122. Al.Ox., iii, 911; Al.Cant., Pt.I,iii,82.
123. Comber, loc.cit.
125. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
LUMLEY, (Baron Lumley).

Origins.

John, Baron Lumley, who died in 1609 and was the son-in-law of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, was a descendant of the Lumleys of Little Lumley in the bishopric of Durham who acquired a barony by writ towards the close of the 14th century.\(^1\) The main scene of activities of this northern family down to the mid 16th century was Northumberland and Durham, in which counties its members held many prominent official positions and from where they took an active part in the wars against the Scots in the reign of Henry VIII.\(^2\) Down to the middle of the 16th century, the Barons Lumley do not appear to have had any landed property in Sussex; Miss Miller says that of 56 manors held by them sometime between 1485 and 1547, 19 were in Durham, 7 in Northumberland, 5 in Westmoreland and 25 in Yorkshire.\(^3\)

It seems very likely that the first introduction of the Lumleys to Sussex came about through the marriage of John, Baron Lumley, who died in 1609, to Jane, elder daughter and coheiress of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel, sometime before March, 1552.\(^4\) Lumley seems to have been of great assistance to his father-in-law both in reducing his enormous debts and as a general factotum, for, in March, 1566, by way of recompense, the Earl made him a handsome gift; in 1570 he settled the Honour, Castle and town of Arundel and various other lands on himself for life with the remainder to Lord Lumley and his wife, and in his will left him other property. This was in consideration "of his great travaile and paines taken for me and about my busines and affaires during all the time sithens he was first knowne to me, and for the payment of my debtes he hath soulede the most parte of his own landes and patrimony, and hath bound himself and his frendes in divers bonds and great summes of money."\(^5\) When the Earl died in February, 1580, he left Lumley his sole executor and legatee.\(^6\)

1. G.E.C., viii, 266 et seqq.
2. Ibid.
4. D.N.B., sub "John Lumley, Baron Lumley".
On the day that his father-in-law died, 24 February, 1580, John Lumley conveyed his life interest in the Castle and Honour of Arundel to Philip Howard, son of the late Duke of Norfolk and of the late Mary, younger daughter of the late Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel. By so doing, he virtually relinquished to the young Philip Howard, the title of Earl of Arundel which was held to run with the tenure of the Castle and Honour of that name. His chief Sussex residence was at Stanstead on the S.W. border of the county, where he entertained the Queen in 1591.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Lumley, Baron Lumley, only son of George Lumley of Thwing in East Riding, Yorks., who was executed June, 1537, by Jane, 2nd daughter and coheir of Sir Richard Knightley of Fawsley, Northants.

1547, was restored in Hoo and title by Act of Parliament and became Baron Lumley (See note 9).

Attended the Court of Edward VI and was present at his funeral in 1553.

29 Sept., 1553, created a K.B. at the accession of Queen Mary.

1 Oct., 1553, attended her Coronation.

Feb., 1554, was one of the peers who sat as judges on Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk, for treason.

1554, present in Parliament. Attended the Queen's wedding at Winchester in July.

1558, at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, was one of the lords appointed to attend her from Hatfield to London. One of the Commissioners appointed to settle claims in connection with her Coronation.

8. J. Nichols, Progresses of Queen Elizabeth, iii, 97; Elwes, 226.
9. D.N.B. In June, 1537, this George Lumley, for taking part in the second Yorkshire rising in protest against the Dissolution of the Monasteries led by Sir Francis Bigod, was attainted for high treason and executed. (G.E.C., viii, 276); but his only son, John, born /contd.
Feb., 1559, Nominated High Steward of Oxford University by his father-in-law, the Earl of Arundel, when he latter was appointed Lord Chancellor of the University.

1559-1602, (though not 1572 or 1573), J.P. Sussex.

April, 1560, named on one list of Lord Lieutenants and Muster Masters in the various shires of England, as the representative for Sussex, though in several other versions, the Earl of Arundel was named.

c. July, 1561, on a list of Lord Lieutenants, but the Queen announced she did not intend to renew the Commissions that summer.

28 Oct., 1559, appointed Keeper of the Park of Nonsuch for life.

1566, commissioned to treat with the Duke of Florence for recovery of a debt owed by him to the Queen. Lumley took partial responsibility for the debt and became heavily liable to the Queen himself. Lumley was only discharged from this debt in May, 1587.

reference 9 continued

c. 1533, became entitled to the family estates on the death of his grandfather, John, Baron Lumley, in 1544, by virtue of a settlement made after George Lumley's death. (D.N.B. sub "John Lumley"). On the death of Baron Lumley in 1544, the title of baron however, became forfeit owing to his late son's attainder. (G.E.C., viii, 276) But in 1547, John Lumley, his grandson, petitioned for and obtained an Act of Parliament restoring him in blood and title, so that he became Baron Lumley, by which title he was summoned to Parliament from Oct., 1553 to Nov., 1605. (Ibid.)

10. D.N.B.
11. Ibid.; G.E.C., loc.cit.; Shaw, i, 152.
12. D.N.B.; G.E.C., loc.cit. (Unless specific references are given, information hereafter is from one or other of three sources.)
14. See Appendix I. He was one of the commissioners for musters in Sussex c. 1585. (B.M. Harl.MS. 474.f.805.)
15. See Appendix I.
17. See Appendix 31. (Cf. D.N.B.)
(Lumley, Baron Lumley, continued).

14 Mch., 1566, Earl of Arundel settled a considerable amount of property on him.18.

Became involved with the Earl of Arundel in intrigues for the marriage of the Duke of Norfolk and Mary, Queen of Scots, and for the restoration of the Catholic religion.19.

August, 1569, was one of those who intimated to Don Gueran that he was ready to take up arms.20.

25 Sept., 1569, was arraigned for questioning. Interrogatories were prepared by Cecil for him and others.21. These examinations continued until December.22. Eventually he was sent to the Tower.23.

April, 1570, was confined to a Mr. Hampden's house, near Staines. Shortly afterwards was released. He and the Earl of Arundel recommenced negotiations with Gueran.24.

May, 1571, Bishop of Ross, one of the Ridolfi conspirators, was arrested, and in the course of subsequent examinations he and others made confessions implicating Lord Lumley.25.

Oct., 1571, Lumley was arrested and committed to the Marshalsea. Not liberated until April, 1573.26.

Feb., 1580, was left as sole executor and legatee of the Earl of Arundel, but conveyed his life interest in the Castle and Honour of Arundel to Philip Howard, the young Earl of Surrey. (V. supra., on Origins).

Acted as Commissioner in several state trials at about this time 27. - 1 Feb., 1586, named in special Commission of Oyer & Terminer for Sussex under which William Shelley was indicted for high treason.

20. D.N.B.
22. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, i, 432; 456.
23. D.N.B.
24. Ibid.
26. D.N.B.
27. D.N.B.: and Howell, State Trials, (1816); 1236
Oct., 1586, nominated one of the Commissioners at the trial of Mary Queen of Scots.
28 Mch., 1587, attended in the Star Chamber when William Davison was arraigned for misprision.

1587, engaged in a lawsuit in the Star Chamber as plaintiff against one, Clement Darrell, whom he alleged to have trespassed in his park of Stanstead. 28. In 1599, was plaintiff in a similar action in the Star Chamber against George Upcott, alleged to have been poaching deer there; 29. and in 1602, against Richard Stanney and others for similar offences. 30.

1589, for £5, 350, purchased various manors in Durham.

Aug., 1591, entertained the Queen at Stanstead. 31.
From 1593 on, he was very friendly with Sir Robert Cecil. 32.
Feb., 1601, after the return of Essex from Ireland, he had appeared at first adverse with him, but subsequently sat in judgment on him and the Earl of Southampton.

Mch., 1603, on the Queen's death, signed the proclamation of James I as her successor.
April, 1603, Lumley Castle was visited by James I, in his absence.
July, 1603, was on the Commission for settling Coronation claims, and on a Commission for the creation of Knights of the Bath.
Sept., 1603, was visited at his house at Cheam by Prince Henry and Prince Charles.

11 April, 1609, died at his residence on Tower Hill in the parish of St. Olave, Hart St., Bur. in Cheam Church. M.I. Another M.I. at Lumley Castle and in adjacent Church of Chester-le-Street.

28. P.R.O. St. Ch. 5 Eliz. 16/26
29. P.R.O. St. Ch. 5 Eliz. 3/16; L. 36/20.
30. P.R.O. St. Ch. 5 Eliz. L. 25/5.
31. V. Supra, note 8.
32. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS. iv, 356, 490, 618; v, 227, 250; vi, 334; vii 370; ix, 386, 405; x, 372; xi, 312, 384, 430; xii, 111, 198, 509.
(Lumley, Baron Lumley, continued)

He was a notable patron of art and learning and collected many pictures and books. After his death his library was purchased by James I and eventually formed part of the Royal Library. In 1582-3, in conjunction with Richard Caldwell, M.D., he founded a surgery lecture in the Royal College of Physicians and endowed it with £40 p.a. He built the Lumley aisle in Cheam church in Surrey in 1592, and at about that time erected a monument to his late father-in-law in the Collegiate church at Arundel. He added to the buildings of Lumley Castle and built monuments to his ancestors in the neighbouring church of Chester-le-Street.

At his death, the title became extinct since he left no surviving children; in 1547 the title had been specifically confined to heirs male.32

In 1607, he had entailed many of his lands and the castle of Lumley on one of his cousins, Richard Lumley, who, in 1628, was cr. Viscount Lumley of Waterford. Richard Lumley also succeeded to Stanstead in Sussex.33 The Surrey estates went to Splandian Lluyd, eldest son of the late Lord Lumley's sister, Barbara, by her 1st husband, Humphrey Lluyd.34

Will dt. 28 Jan, 1606., pr. 22 Apr., 1609. 35.

Wives.

Md. twice:-

1) Jane, eld. d. and coh. of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel. They were md. before Mch, 1552. She d., 1576. She was a classical scholar.

2) Elizabeth, d. of John Darcy, Baron Darcy, of Chiche in Yorkshire. They were md. in 1582. She died, 1618.

Children.

By his first wife:- 2 sons; 1 daughter. All died in infancy.

By his second wife:- No children.

32. As well as D.N.B., and G.E.C., loc.cit., see S.A.C., v, 66n.
33. S.A.C., xix, 103.
34. D.N.B.
35. P.C.C. 34 Dorset.
(Lumley, Baron Lumley; continued.)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Elizabethan Soc. of Antiquaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For other details of his patronage of learning, v. supra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559-1609, High Steward of Oxford Univ.</td>
<td>36.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sons | |

36. *Al.Cant.*, pt.1,iii,117; *Al.Ox.*, iii,949; *Ath.Ox.*, 1,382.
LUNSFORD.

Origins.

The Lunsford family, now extinct, was "one of the oldest in the county,"¹ rivalling in antiquity even the Ashburnhams.² They were settled at Lunsford in the parish of Etchingham in or before the reign of Edward the Confessor.³ An old cartulary of this family records that one, Godwin, possibly Earl Godwin, made a charter to one, John de Londresford, and that this was in the reign of William I. Mr. Lower considered this dating unsound and that the charter referred to probably belonged to a date shortly before the Conquest.⁴

Subsequently, the family was seated at Battle and appear to have been benefactors of the Abbey there, for, according to the cartulary above-mentioned, "In the window of Battyle Abbey are the Armes of Lunsford/and this Latin verse in Caracter; 'Haec multis annis sunt Arma Johannis'. During the reign of Henry VII they were resident at Whiligh in East Hoathly where they continued to flourish down to the Civil Wars when they distinguished themselves in the king's service.⁵

Apart from their antiquity, they appear to have been a family of some local importance in the later Middle Ages. They were considerable benefactors not only to Battle, but also to Robertsbridge Abbey on the Rother,⁶ and in the later 14th century acquired a manor in Burwash parish, - the manor of Woodmowle and Mottingden, so that, by 1411 John Lunsford's land in that parish was valued at £20 p.a.⁷ Their name appears in lists of Sussex gentry for 1411 and 1434,⁸ and in 1450 they were among the Sussex gentry who supported and led Jack Cade's rising.⁹

From the early 15th century, when Berry's detailed pedigree begins, onwards, the Lunsford heirs made a series of striking matches which must have done much to enhance their prestige. William Lunsford whose will was proved in 1445, and who is the first of the family given in Berry and Comber's genealogy, married as his first wife, Thomazin, daughter and heiress of John Barrington of Rayle in Essex which he therefore acquired 'uxoris jure'. He also held lands at Battle.¹⁰ His

---

1. Horsfield, i, 359.
2. S.A.C., xxiv, 19.
3. S.A.C., iii, 222; xxiv, 18-19; vi, 77.
4. S.A.C., xxiv, 18-19.
5. Ibid.
7. S.A.C., xxi, 130.
8. S.A.C., x, 145.
9. S.A.C., xxxix, 101, 103.
10. S.A.C., xviii, 18.
12. Ibid., Phillips, sub 'Barington of Raile' (sic); Visitation of Essex, 1558 (Harl. Soc. Pubns., xiii, 22-3); Essex Feet of Fines, 1327-1422, iii, 240 and 247.
heir, William, married one of the Pelhams, - Ciceley, second daughter of the third Sir John Pelham. In the third generation, William Lunsford of Hoathly Esq., who died, 3 May, 1551, married Margaret, daughter of Sir Thomas Fiennes, knt., of Cleverham, and their son, John, married into the Sackville family. (V. infra).

There is little trace of them in the parish of East Hoathly where they resided in the sixteenth century, - a parish in the Rape of Pevensey, north-east of Laughton, the seat of the Pelhams, and north-west of Chiddingly. But their arms do appear on the spandrel shields of the West door of the parish church, "a chevron between three bears' heads". 

Between their escapade in Jack Cade's day in support of rebellion, and their military efforts to put down insurrection in the seventeenth century, the Lunsfords took no very active part in political affairs whether national or local. Apart from his duties as a J.P., John Lunsford who died in 1581 bore no county office of first class importance. His heir, Sir John Lunsford, is known to have been a Jurat of Hastings in 1568, and sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in 1610-11. It was three of Sir John's grandsons, Sir Thomas, Henry and Sir Herbert Lunsford who gave the King such distinguished service during the Civil War. Sir Thomas, the eldest, was colonel of a regiment in France, and afterwards served in England against the Scots in 1640. He acquired a reputation among the Parliamentarians for his ferocity in war and was taken prisoner by them at Edghill. In 1649, when the royalist cause seemed irretrievably lost, he went to Virginia, but died in Surrey in 1691. Henry, next in age, was Lieutenant Colonel to his elder brother and was later killed at Bristol in 1643, while Sir Herbert, youngest of the three, served under his eldest brother as a captain, and later received a colonelcy and was knighted in 1644.

Apparently the Lunsfords were a spirited family and, both in the 15th and in the 17th centuries at least, were not reluctant to take up arms. The story of Sir Thomas' attack in 1633 on his kinsman, Sir Thomas Pelham, who had charged him with

15. S.A.C., iii, 222; Horsfield, i, 359.
16. See Appendix 5.
17. B & C., loc.cit; S.A.C., xiv, 100; xix, 106.
18. P.R.O. Sheriffs.
20. S.A.C., xxiv, 18-19; S.A.C., xix, 105; iii, 223; v, 81.
21. D.N.B.
22. B & C., loc.cit; cf. D.N.B.
poaching offences, and of his subsequent outlawry, suggests a family streak of hot-headedness which served better on the battlefield particularly when odds were against, than in civil life. 24

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in 1570 Visitation 25 Also in 1634 Visitation 26 They had been armigerous for generations since their coat appeared in a window of Battle Abbey before the Dissolution. 27 It is thought that the similarity of the names and coats together with the adjacency of their places of residence in East Sussex, suggests a close relationship, if not identity between the Lunsfords and the Luxfords of Windmill Hill, near Battle and Etchingham. 28

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Lunsford of Hoathly Esq., eld. son and heir of William Lunsford Esq. of the same who died 3 May, 1531 29 and of Margaret, d. of Sir Thomas Fiennes, knt., of Claverham. 30

Aged 12 years in 1531. 31

J.P., Sussex, 1560-1581. 32

1564, bishop's letter, as "John Limmesford of East Hoathly", - a "favourer of Religion and godlie order". 33

28 Nov., 1581, bur. at East Hoathly. 34 Will as of Clerkenwell, Middlesex, dt. 19 Oct., pr. 29 Jan., 1581. 35

Wife.

Mary, d. of John Sackville Esq. of Chiddingly, Sussex who died 26 Sept., 1557, and sister of Sir Richard Sackville of Buckhurst who died in 1566. She was bur. at East Hoathly, 30 June, 1571. 36

24. D.N.B.
27. S.A.C., xxiv., 18-19.
28. Ibid. ; S.A.C., vi., 77.
31. Ibid.
33. Bishop's letter, 1564, (Camden Misc., ix, 10).
34. B & C., loc.cit.
35. P.C.C., 5 Tyrwhite.
36. B & C., loc.cit., also 300 for Sackville pedigree. She was aunt of Sir Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst.
(Lunsford continued).

Children.

John


James

Aged 15 in 1570. Will pr. 1584.

Isabel

Mary

Ann

Education.

Universities. Inns of Court.

Father

Sons

James, matric. Fell. Comm. from Queen's Coll., Easter, 1572.

James, perhaps he who was adm. Gray's Inn, 21 Nov., 1576, as of Staple Inn.

Marriages of children.

John

md. twice:-(a) Barbara, d. and heiress of John Lewkenor Esq., of Buckingham, Sussex. Issue, including Thomas, father of Sir Thomas Lunsford, the cavalier; (b) Anne, d. of John Apsley of Thackham, Esq. She was bap. at Horsham, 2 March 1557; md. there 2 Sept., 1577. Bur. East Hoathly, 16 Sept., 1612. Issue, two sons who died in infancy.

James

Isabel

md. at East Hoathly, 3 April, 1570, John Randolph, gent. Issue. He d.v.p., 1583.

Mary

Ann

37. B & C., 312.

38. Ibid., S.A.C., xiv, 100; xix, 106; P.R.0. & Sheriff's Shaw, ii, 149.


40. Al. Cant., Pt.1, 111, 118.

41. Gray's Inn Admissions, 50.

42. B & C., loc. cit.
(Lunsford continued).

**Subsidy assessments.**

(As of Foxearle Hundred, Hastings Rape).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Henry VIII John Lunsford, gent.</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£40.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(As of Hothligh (sic) or East Hoathly, Hundred of Shiplake, Pevensey Rape)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elizabeth John Lunsford, gent.</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£40.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elizabeth John Lunsford, Esq.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£40.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elizabeth John Lunsford Esq.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£30.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Charles I Thomas Lunsford Esq.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£10.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
44. " E.179/190/265.
45. " E.179/190/283.
46. " E.179/190/298.
MARVIN, (or Mervin).

Origins.

The Marvins of Sussex were a younger branch of a leading Wiltshire family. Their connection with Sussex appears to have begun when Sir Edmund Marvingknt., and Justice of the King's Bench from 1540 onwards, obtained from Henry VIII a grant of the site of Durford Abbey in 1544/5.¹ This Sir Edmund was the second son of Walter Marvin of Fountel Giffard in Wiltshire and his is the first name given by Berry and Comber.²

Durford Abbey was situated in Rogate parish in the Chichester Rape of West Sussex, close to the Hampshire border, and had been founded as a house for Prämonstratensian Canons in 1165 and dedicated to Our Lady and to St. John the Baptist.³ In 1537, after the Dissolution, the site of the Abbey was granted by the Crown to Sir William Fitzwilliam, but seven years later another grant of the site was made, this time to Sir Edmund Marvin. It was to be held in fee farm.⁴

Sir Edmund's association with the Abbey appears to have originated in the discharge of certain of his judicial duties. On 10th February, 1541, a writ was issued commissioning him as a Judge of the King's Bench to investigate and report on certain alleged frauds said to have been perpetrated at the time of the suppression of Durford Abbey. It was said that a considerable amount of property had been successfully concealed from Cromwell's agents by the late abbot and others, and that much moveable property had been misappropriated.⁵

It seems to have been as a result of the satisfactory discharge of these enquiries that Sir Edmund Marvin obtained the grant of the Abbey lands above mentioned. This site he made his residence as also did his descendants for several generations.⁶

At the beginning of Philip and Mary's reign, Sir Edmund's heir, "Henry Marvyn holding the late site of the monastery of Dureford and of others in Sussex" was called upon

1. B.&C., 92; Horsfield, ii, 92; Elwes, 182.
2. B.&C., loc.cit.
3. Horsfield, 11, 114.
4. Elwes, 182, S.A.C., viii, 92-3; B.M. Add. MS., 5706, f.213.
5. S.A.C., vii, 223-6; S.A.C., viii, 92-3.
to show by what title he held them. Possibly at this time there was some intention of restoring the monastery, though there is no further evidence of this.

Sir Edmund's will was dated 24 July, 1550 and proved 16 Nov., 1553, and he was succeeded by Henry, his eldest son by his second wife, Elizabeth, third daughter and coheiress of Sir Edmund Pakenham, knt., of Bramshott, Surrey. He was head of the Sussex Marvins in 1580.

Whether armigerous.

The Marvins do not appear in any of the relevant Visitations of Sussex in their own right, but they had a coat of arms shown in Berry and Comber, and the family appears in the Wiltshire Visitations. Sir Edmund Marvin, personally, figures in the 1530 Visitation by reason of his first marriage, to Eleanor, d. of Thomas Welles, and certain of his children by that marriage are also given. A daughter of his first marriage, Eleanor, is also found in the 1570 Visitation of her marriage to Richard Rouse, or Rowe, of Rogate, by virtue of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Henry Marvin of Durford in Rogate, Sussex, and of Heath House, Petersfield, Hampshire, eld. son of Sir Edmund Marvin of Durford, whose will was dt. 24 July, 1550 and pr. 16 Nov., 1553, and of his second wife, Elizabeth, 3rd daughter and coheiress of Sir Edmund Pakenham, knt., of Bramshott, Surrey.

Mentioned in father's will, 1550.

J.P. Sussex, 1560-1585. In later years was of the Quorum.

1564, bishop's letter describes him as a "favourer of religion and godlye orders".

---

7. S.A.C., viii, 92-3.
8. F.C.C. 20 Tashe.
13. See note 8.
c.1565, was a Commissioner for disarming the Recusants in Sussex; also for the restraint of grain.\textsuperscript{17}

1613, deforciant in fine for Durford.\textsuperscript{18}

Will dt. 6 March, 1609, pr. 20 May, 1614.\textsuperscript{19}

Wives.

Md. twice:—

(1) Edith, d. of Sir Anthony Windsor, knt.

(2) Jane, — executrix to her husband, 1614.

Children.\textsuperscript{21}

By his first wife:—

Edmund Of Durford and later of Petersfield, Hants. M.P.

Petersfield, 1584, 1586, 1588. Owned Heath house,

a manor in Petersfield, and other land and

tenements there.\textsuperscript{22} He died 9 Sept., 1604.\textsuperscript{23}

Will dt. 9 Sept., 1604, pr. 20 Feb., 1605.\textsuperscript{24} (I.e., he died v.p.)

By his second wife:— No children.

Education.

Father

Son

Inns of Court.

Universities.

Edmund, late of Clement's Inn, Middle Temple,

23 Feb., 1572. Called

10 Feb., 1581.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{17} B.M., Harl.MS., 474, ff.90b and 92b.

\textsuperscript{18} B & C., loc.cit.

\textsuperscript{19} P.C.C., 48 Lawe.

\textsuperscript{20} B & C., loc.cit.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{22} H.Matthews: Personnel of the Parliament of 1584-85,

(Univ. of London M.A. thesis), Sect.III,151.

\textsuperscript{23} P.R.O., C.142/685/197 and C.142/346/175.

\textsuperscript{24} P.C.C., 11 Hayes.

\textsuperscript{25} Middle Temple Admissions, 1,36; Middle Temple Records,

Marvin continued.

Marriages of children.

Edmund married Anna, d. of William Jephson of Froyle, Hants, and sister of Sir John Jephson, kn.t. Executrix to her husband, 1605. Will dt. 31 May, 1625, pr. 3 July, 1626; Issue, 7 sons and 5 d. The eldest son was later Sir Henry Marvin, vice-admiral of the Narrow Seas; bap. at Rogate, 26 Dec., 1583, M.P. Woottsg Bassett, 1614; will dt. 29 May, pr. 12 June, 1646.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Harting, Hundred of Dumpford, Chichester Rape)

2 Elizabeth Henry Marvyn Esq., in lands £30.

(As of Rogate, Hundred of Easebourne, Chichester Rape)

14 Elizabeth Henry Marvyn Esq., in lands £30.

(Commissioner)

27. P.C.C., 71 Barrington.
28. B & C., loc. cit; Elwes, 182; P.C.C., 80 Twisse.
MAY, (or Maye, Maie, etc.)

Origins.

The first of the Mays to be noted by Berry and Comber is John May of Kennington, Kent. He married a Sussex woman, Alice, daughter of Shoyswell of the parish of Etchingham. Their son, Richard, settled at Wadhurst, Sussex, a few miles north west of Etchingham, and there, according to Berry and Comber, he was buried. 1

So far no dates are given. However, Richard's son, Thomas May of Wadhurst, left a will dated 14 August, 1500, and proved 14 May, 1501, and from that time onwards fuller information is available. This Thomas had, according to Berry and Comber, three sons and three daughters. William, the second son, married a lady from Portugal, and, after founding a branch of the May family at Rawmere, died in Portugal some time before 1543. Richard, the third son, is described as a citizen and Merchant Taylor of London. The eldest son was Thomas May of Pashley in Ticehurst, Sussex, and of Camberwell. He was under twenty one in his father's will. 2

The manor of Pashley in the parish of Ticehurst, Hastings Rape, situated approximately between Etchingham and Wadhurst had formerly been the property of the Pashley family. 3 It was acquired by Thomas May and his son in 1543 by quitclaim. 4 Thomas died seized of it in 1552 and left it to his eldest son, of the same name who was a J.P. of Sussex at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, and who died in 1577. 5

A younger branch of the family, settled at Burwash, also comes within the scope of this survey since one of its members was a J.P. at the close of Elizabeth's reign. The first Thomas May of Pashley, who died in 1552, had married Margaret, daughter of Robert Whitfield of Wadhurst and they had had three sons and two daughters. While the eldest son, Thomas, inherited Pashley from his father, as well as lands in Kent from his uncle, Richard, the Merchant Taylor of London, the second son, George, made his way so well/quite eclipsed the elder line. 6

2. P.C.C. 16 Moone.
4. Horsfield, i, 589.
6. V.C.H., Sussex, loc.cit; B & C., loc.cit.; S.R.S., xv, 697. Note:- The V.C.H. erroneously states that it was this son, Thomas, who died in 1610, leaving Pashley to his son, Anthony. However, this version omits one generation. Anthony's father, Thomas, died in 1610; his grandfather, also Thomas, died in 1577; his great-grandfather, Thomas, died in 1552. See B & C., loc.cit.
Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in Sussex Visitation of 1634, but not before.\(^8\) Coat of arms shown in Berry and Comber\(^9\)

(i) **May of Ticehurst.**

Note: - The Thomas May who was J.P., Sussex, 1560\(^{10}\), was apparently the eldest son of Thomas May of Pashley who died in 1552\(^{11}\) and his wife, Margaret, daughter of Robert Whitfield of Wadhurst. He was the elder brother of George May of Burwash who was living in 1580. This Thomas May died in 1577\(^{12}\). He owned a furnace in Etchingham, c. 1574\(^{13}\). It was therefore his eldest son, also Thomas May of Pashley, who was head of this branch of the family in 1580, though he was apparently not a J.P. under Elizabeth.

Members of the family.

**Head of the family in 1580.**

Thomas May of Pashley, in Ticehurst, gent., eld.s, of Thomas May of the same who died in 1577, (v. supra), and of his first wife, Jane, d. of William Wyborne of Hawkwell, Kent\(^{14}\).

1577, executor to his father, and in 1609, to his brother, Abraham\(^{15}\).

9 July, 1610, died\(^{16}\) Will dt. 23 Feb., 1609, pr. 22 Oct., 1610\(^{17}\).

**Wife.**

Ann, d. of Anthony Stapley of Framfield, Sussex. Executor to her husband, 1610. Named in son Anthony's will, 1635\(^{18}\).

---

12. Will dt. 29 Apr., pr. 15 May, 1577; P.C.C. 20 Daughtry.
13. See Appendix 29.
15. P.C.C. 87 Wingfield.
17. P.C.C., 87 Wingfield.
Children. 19


Henry Of Ticehurst, gent. Under 18 in father's will.

Frances Under 18 in her father's will.

Elizabeth) Under 18 in her father's will.

Ann )

Rebecca ) All under 18 and unmarried in father's will.

Jane )

Education.

Universities.

Inns of Court.

Father -

Sons -

Anthony, adm. to Gray's Inn, 4 Feb., 1607. 23

Marriages of children. 24

Anthony md. twice:-(a) Audrey, d. of Sir John Wilgoose of Iridge, Sussex, knt. Md. 1614 at Ticehurst. No surviving issue. (b) Jane, d. of Walter Roberts of Boresell in Ticehurst, Sussex, (q.v.) Executrix to her husband in 1631, and to her son, Adrian in 1654. She subsequently had three husbands, Richard Alfre of Carsfield, Sussex, John Gyles of Penshurst, and Col. John Busbridge of Haremare in Echingham, Sussex. She died before 10 Feb., 1694. Issue.

22. Horsfield, i, 589 and See Appendix 12.
Herbert
md. Elizabeth, d. of William Newton of Southover, Sussex.
Issue.

Henry
md. Mildred, d. of Robert Ollyffe of Framfield, Sussex.
Issue.

Frances
md. Francis Lyfe of Hastings, gent. Lic. at Lewes,
6 Nov., 1615.

Elizabeth
Ann
Rebecca
Jane

Subsidy assessments.
(As of Hundred of Shoyswell, Hastings Rape).

2 Elizabeth Thomas May, gent., in lands £235
37 Elizabeth Thomas May of Pashley, in lands gent. £20.26

1-2 Charles I Anthony May Esq. in lands £14.
Mistress Ann May in lands £2
Henry May, gent. in lands £1 27

25. P.R.O., E.179/190/266.
(May continued).

(ii) May of Burwash.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

George May of Burwash, gent., second son of Thomas May of Fashley in Ticehurst who died in 1552 (v. supra), and of Margaret, his wife, d. of Robert Whitfield of Wadhurst.

Under 21 in his father's will.

In time he became a "well-known iron-master as his father had probably been before him". Was related through his mother to the Whitfields, then in Wadhurst, a family well-known in the iron industry. He resided at "Frenches" or "The Franchise" in Burwash and was sometimes styled "Esquire". He was apparently never a J.P. under Elizabeth though his only son and heir became one. (v. infra).

c.1574, owned a forge in Burwash.

1587, in the certificate relating to Sussex J.P's, was highly recommended for appointment to the Commission of the Peace in Hastings Rape, being "zealous in religion".

1588, assessed at £50 for the Armada Loan, the third highest rate, with 10 others.

15 Sept., 1593, died. I.P.M., 22 Oct., 1593. Will dt. 24 Oct., 1592; pr. 1 Feb., 1594.64

Wife.

Elizabeth, d. of John Henley of Cranbrook, Kent, and relict of Goddard Walsh.

28. S.A.C., xix, 86.
29. Ibid., but see Subsidy Rolls where he is styled "Mr" and "gent".
30. See Appendix 29.
31. S.A.C., xi, 58.
32. S.A.C., i, 36.
34. P.C.C., 10 Dixy.
35. B & C., loc.cit.
(May continued)

Children: 36

Thomas Later Sir Thomas May of Mayfield. Knighted 23 July, 1603. Exec. to father and aged 30 and more in 1594. Named in will of Richard May of London, 1587, a cousin of a younger branch of the family. Bought the manor and part of Mayfield on 6 May, 1597 from Henry Nevill Esq., he then being styled Thomas May of Burwash Esquire. 37 Sir Henry Nevill had acquired it juxta his wife, Elizabeth, having been the niece and heiress to the Sussex property of Sir Thomas Gresham, the financier, who died in 1579. 38 Sir Thomas May spent the greater part of his fortune on Mayfield, leaving his wife and children with small means. They sold the property on 11 Nov., 1617, to John Baker for £4,100. 39 J.P., Sussex, 1600-1602 at least. 40 23 August, 1615, died. I.P.M., 21 Jan., 1617. 41

Margaret

Jane

Education.

Father

Universities.

Perhaps matric. pens. from Queen's Coll., Camb., Michgs.
1546. Scholar, 1547-50. 42

Son

Inns of Court.

Perhaps adm. Gray's Inn, 1549. 43

Thomas, perhaps adm. Gray's Inn, 1580. 44

36. Ibid., and p.21.
37. S.A.C., ii, 245. Shaw, ii, 117.
38. Horsfield, i, 417.
39. S.A.C., xxi, 8. But in Gresham's time, the contents alone were valued at £7,550. (A.L. Rowe: The England of Elizabeth, 123). See also S.A.C., ii, 233. For a description of May-field, S.A.C., ii, 221 et seqq; xxi, 1 et seqq.
40. P.R.O., Dorset, Pat.Roll, C.68/1523. (for 1600); Assizes 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 43 & 44 (1601 & 2).
42. Al.Cant., Pt.1, iii, 166.
Marriages of children.

Thomas md. twice:— (a) Barbara, d. of Edward Rich of Hordon, Essex. Issue, incl. Thomas, eld. son, the "celebrated poet", died 13 Nov., 1650 and bur. Westminster Abbey, but disinterred. (b) Jane, d. of Sir Michael Sands of Throwly, Kent, knt., and relict of Edward Fluid. Issue, one d.


Jane md. twice:— (a) Richard Farnfolf of Chichester, gent., who died 30 May, 1600. Will. (b) before 28 March, 1602, John Hale.

Subsidy Assessments.

(As of Henhurst Hundred, Hastings Rape)

2 Elizabeth George May, gent. in lands £18.48

(As of Hundred of Shoyswell, Hastings Rape).

14 Elizabeth Mr. George May, in lands £20.49
18 Elizabeth George May, gent. " " £20.50
37 Elizabeth Thomas May of Frenches, gent. " " £26.51
Mistress — wid., " " £9.

45. B & C., loc. cit.
46. Ibid.; Horsfield, 1, 420.
47. P.C.C. 40 Wallopp.
48. P.R.O., E.179/190/266.
49. P.R.O., E.179/190/283.
50. P.R.O., E.179/190/298.
51. P.R.O., E.179/190/332.
MICHELL.

Origins.

Several pedigrees of families of this name are given by Barry and Comber, for example, the Michells of Horsham, the Michells of Harting, and the Michells of Cuckfield. Edmund Michell who was a J.P. c. 1558-59, appears to have been a member of the third of these families.

No direct link between these families is shown by Berry and Comber, but they were all apparently of one stock with the same coat of arms. They are described by one writer as "This widespread indigenous Sussex family" whose original coat was probably that borne by the Michells of Cornwall. It is likely that the Michells of Stamerham in Horsham were a cadet branch of the Cuckfield family and owed their subsequent importance in the county to a marriage with a Stamerham heiress.

The Cuckfield family became important in their neighbourhood in the 16th and 17th centuries. The first person of the name whose connection with Cuckfield is recorded was Richard Michell who, according to two deeds from the Cartulary of Lewes Priory, granted certain lands in Cuckfield in 1279 to the Prior and monks of St. Pancras Priory, Lewes. But there is a gap in the records of the family between this Richard and the John Michell who died on 1 February, 1525 and who erected a brass to his wife, Mylicent, who died in the previous year. It was their grandson, Edmund, who appears to have been a J.P. at Elizabeth's accession, though he died shortly afterwards.

Edmund Michell of Cuckfield Esq, who is mentioned as the eldest son in the will of his father, John Michell "of Cuckfield, gent.", dated 5 Sept., 1546, was aged 38 at his father's death on 15 Oct., 1546. Edmund inherited not only his father's estate, but also that of his uncle, Thomas Michell of Worth, gent., Ranger of Worth Forest, who d.s.p. in 1561.
The family seems to have acquired some standing and permanence in Cuckfield before the mid 16th century, three of its members, Edmund Michell, his father, and his brother next in age, being among those mentioned in the Indenture of 20 Henry VIII of feoffees of certain landed property with which the Grammar School of Cuckfield was to be endowed. 14

Whether armigerous.
Mentioned in the 1634 Visitation. 15 Also in 1662. 16

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Thomas Michell Esq. of Cuckfield and later of Bolney, eld. son and heir of Edmund Michell of Cuckfield Esq., who died c. 1558-9, 17 and was J. P. c. 1558-9, 18 and of Joan, d. of John (?), sister of Edmund Hensley. 19

Executor to father, 1557, then under 24. Administered mother's will in 1566. 20 Named in wills of uncles Richard, 1566, 21 and John, 1573, 22

1568, bought half Cuckfield Park from Henry Nevill, Lord Abergavenny, for £10 p.a. 23

c. 1574, perhaps the owner of a furnace in Hoathly. 24

1581, with Ninian Chaloner was committed to the Marshalsea for their part in the Curtis-Bowyer quarrel, they siding with Curtis. 25

Apparently gradually parted with the large property to which he succeeded because he is a frequent deforciant in fine for lands in Cuckfield under Elizabeth. 26 The old family residence of Ockenden in Cuckfield, mentioned in his father, Edmund's, I.P.M., was apparently occupied in the early 17th

15. H.C. MS., C.27.
16. S.A.C., xxxix, 123; S. N.Q., 11, 205.
20. Lewes wills, A.7/192.
22. P.C.C. 24 Peter.
23. Cooper, op. cit., 81; S.A.C., xli, 91; B & C., loc. cit. (but date given as 30 Sept., 1567).
24. See Appendix 29. (contd. on next page)
century at least, by John Michell, first cousin of Thomas
Michell, and son of the John Michell whose will was proved
in 1573.27 This cousin, John, occupied Ockenden in 1608
when it was burnt down.28

1617, living at Bolney, and on 2 Dec., party to a deed
concerning Cuckfield School.29

Probably the Thomas Michell "of Bolney" who was buried in
Wivelsfield, 27 April, 1625.30 Perhaps staying with his
nephew, Edmund Attree of Theobalds in Wivelsfield.31

Wife.32

Jane, - Living at date of mother-in-law's will, 1569.33
Perhaps buried at Bolney, 14 June, 1618.

Children.34

grandmother's will, 1569. Nov., 1619, knighted.
Master in Chancery. 1617, named in deed concerning
Cuckfield School. Died, 1644.35

Henry Named in deed of 1617. Perhaps the Henry Michell
of Bolney, gent., bur. there 26 May, 1637.

Thomas Attorney for father in 1617.

(Footnotes from previous page)

26. S.A.C.,111,120 et seqq.
27. B & C.,loc.cit; P.C.C.,24 Peter.
29. B & C.,loc.cit; S.A.C.,111, 121.
31. Cooper, op.cit.,113; S.A.C.,111,121.
32. B & C.,loc.cit.
33. Lewes Wills, A7/192.
34. B & C.,loc.cit.
35. Ibid., but S.A.C.,lxv,257 says c.1640. No will or
I.P.M. (See S.A.C.,111,121).
(Michell continued).

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities.</th>
<th>Inns of Court.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Perhaps matric. pens. from Peterhouse, Camb., Michs., 1566.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>md. Elinor, d. and coh. of Sir Anthony Strelley of Strelley, Notts., Issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Cuckfield, Hundred of Buttinghill, Lewes Rape).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>In lands</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmund Michell</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The identity of those Michells assessed in Cuckfield in 2 Eliz. and 14 Eliz. is uncertain).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>In lands</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Elizabeth</td>
<td>Thomas Michell</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Charles I</td>
<td>Henry Michell</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Ibid.
38. Gray's Inn Admissions, 63.
40. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
41. " E.179/190/299.
42. " E.179/191/337a.
The Morleys were originally a Lancashire family. Their pedigree is traced back by Berry and Comber to Richard Morley of Morley in Lancashire, living in Edward III, who married Margaret, daughter and heiress of Gilbert Winington of Lancashire. It has been suggested by one writer, that these Lancashire Morleys may have been a cadet branch of the Cantelupe family who were "of baronial eminence during the reign of John", since their coats of arms were identical.

It was by the marriage of a younger son of this family in the 15th century, Nicholas Morley, that the Morleys became established in Sussex. He married Joane, second daughter and coheiress of Sir John Walleys, knight, of Glynde, which manor Nicholas acquired from his father-in-law by fine in 1461. The Walleys were an old Sussex family, traced back by Berry six generations before this to Sir Richard Walleys of Sussex, knt., who married Dyonise, heiress to the Lord Glynde in Sussex.

There was, apparently, no connection between these Morleys, of Glynde, and the Morleys of Halnaker. Their coats of arms were different, the former showing three leopard's faces where the latter showed only one. The Morleys of Halnaker were granted arms during the reign of Elizabeth, whereas the arms of the Morleys of Glynde had been theirs since at least the fourteenth century, and possibly earlier.

Robert Morley of Glynde Esq., son of the above-mentioned Nicholas, appears to have been a man of property since, in his will dated 10 April, 1513, he ordained that his houses and lands in London should be sold to found a chantry in Glynde. His grand son and heir, Thomas Morley of Glynde, who died on 9 Jan., 1559, is known to have had interests in the iron industry. At Hawksden in the Bibleham quarter of Mayfield, he had an iron mill and furnace from which his daughter's jointure was levied.
and there was a forge there also. Thomas Morley's great-grandson, Herbert Morley, the republican, died possessed of these works which descended to his son.

The Morleys were, in fact, very closely connected with Sussex's leading industry at this period, and it did much in the shaping of their fortunes. Of Thomas Morley's six sons, it was the second, Anthony, who had most to do with this industry. He is a sorry example of the unsuccessful capitalist entrepreneur of the time whose speculations led him into bankruptcy and penury and left his widow and family virtually without means. He, like many other ironmasters of Sussex, finding their activities hampered in their own county by fuel shortages and the many restrictions imposed as to its consumption, migrated into South Wales, to Glamorganshire, still a comparatively well-wooded region, and one where rivers and streams suitable for water wheels were to be found in addition to the primary essential, iron ore. Anthony Morley set up his iron works in the parishes of Llanwyno and Merthyr Tydfil, and so began his long financial nightmare. He died in debt in 1586, leaving his widow and family in a sorry plight, so that she was compelled to petition Sir Christopher Hatton, the Lord Chancellor, complaining of various injustices of which she felt herself the victim. The litigation on the subject was extensive, and the creditors numerous, many of them Sussex people. "It is clear," says one writer, "that poor Anthony Morley had borrowed money from his neighbours and that his enterprise did not succeed." Yet, "The family of Morley has not yet become extinct in Glamorganshire and several of the descendants may yet be found in the district." However, it is with Anthony's elder brother, William, that this study is mainly concerned. He succeeded his father in 1559 at the age of twenty-eight and remained head of the Morley family of Glynde until his death in 1597. He was both a J.P. and a Sheriff for Sussex during the reign of Elizabeth. (v. infra).

The Morleys of Glynde were well connected. They had, since Robert Morley's time, twice married into the influential family of Pelham, William Morley's grandmother and also his own first wife being Pelhams. His second wife was a Roberts of Warbleton, while through his brothers and sisters he was connected with such solid Sussex families as the Fenners, the Michells and the Stapleys. His own children also married well.

9. S.A.C., xi, 214.
10. S.A.C., xviii, 13 et seqq.
11. For Anthony Morley's iron works in Sussex, see S.A.C., iii, 242 and 245.
12. S.A.C., xviii, 13 et seqq; S.A.C., i, 119-120.
The manor of Glynde is situated in the parish of the same name, in the Hundred of Ringmer, in the Rape of Pevensey, though it is very close to the town of Lewes. No record remains of any house at Glynde before 1569, which date appears on the arms in the inner quadrangle, when it is supposed that William Morley restored or added to the mansion, which at that time had but three sides to it. The house is described by Horsfield as a "reverend Elizabethan mansion", looking East, with magnificent views over the Weald. The property continued in the Morley family down to 1683 when it passed by marriage to the Trevors, descendants of Sir John Trevor, Secretary of State to Charles II.

Whether armigerous.

Apparently the Morleys were armigerous from the 14th century or earlier. Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation, and in the 1634.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

William Morley of Glynde Esq., eld. son and heir of Thomas Morley Esq. of the same who died 9 Jan., 1559, and of Elizabeth, d. of Anthony Maycott of Reculver, Kent.

Aged 28 in 1559. Executor to his father.

1564, bishop's letter, - mentionged as no Justice but a favourer of godly proceedings.

1571, M.P. for Lewes.

1571 - Jan., 1598, (then noted as "mort"), J.P. Sussex.

1580, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex.

---

15. S.A.C., xx, 72. S.A.C., v, 91, says that much of Glynde Place remains (1852), as William Morley left it, including the imposing gateway. (Print, p. 92). For a full illustrated description of Glynde Place and a brief account of its owners, see: A. Oswald: "Glynde Place, Sussex, I, II and III" (Country Life, 14 April, 1955, 978 et seqq; 21 April, 1955, 1040 et seqq; 28 April, 1955, 1104 et seqq).

16. Horsfield, i, 345.

17. Ibid., and S.A.C., xxiv, 106.

18. S.A.C., vi, 81.

19. Phillips, 8; H.C. MS, D.11; and G.18.

20. H.C. MS, G.27.


23. Browne Willis, Notitia Parliamentaria, iii, 85.

(contd. on next page)
14 June, 1584, mentioned in a letter from the Privy Council to the Sheriff and Commissioner for Musters for Sussex as being unable to serve, along with George Goring, as Captain of Musters for Pevensey Rape since, dwelling within the liberty of the Cinque Ports he had to serve the musters there. 26

1587, in the certificate concerning the Sussex J.P.'s, was mentioned as "A good justice as well in respect of religion as of the commonwealth". But it was said that others should be appointed with him and his colleagues for Pevensey Rape. Mr. Morley, for example, "abideth about Lewes". (i.e. he was not central for Pevensey Rape). 27

1588, assessed at £60 for the Armada Loan - the second highest rate of assessment, with two others. 28

24 Nov., 1597, died. 29 I.P.M., 6 March, 1598. 30 Will dt. 13 Oct., 1573, pr. 28 Jan., 1598. 31

Wives:

Md. twice:— (a) Ann, d. of Anthony Pelham of Buckstepe in Warbleton Esq. (q.v.); (b) Margaret, d. of William Roberts of Warbleton, Sussex. Md. c. 24 Sept., 1570. She died at Glynde, 1632. 33

(Footnotes contd. from previous page)

24. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 13-40. But not a J.P. in 1583 (no. 25); also erased but re-inserted in list for Jan. 1580 (no. 22).
25. See Appendix 4.

26. B.M. Harl. MS, 703, f. 16b. Also see B.M. Harl. MS, 474, f. 92b, (c. 1585). Commissioner for the restraint of grain.
27. S.A.C., 11, 59.
31. P.C.C., 3 Lewyn.
32. B & C., loc. cit; see also 316 for Ann Pelham.
33. Her will dt. 29 Dec., 1631, pr. 2 Aug., 1632. P.C.C. 90 Audley.
(Morley continued)

Children.

By his first wife:

Herbert

Anthony

Amy
In 1570 Visitation. 40

Mary

Anne
" " " Bur. Worth, 28 Dec., 1595.

Judith

By his second wife:

Robert

Henry
Named in father's will, 1573. 42

Margaret

34. B & C., loc. cit; but according to Comber, (Lewes), 193. Anthony was the second son of William Morley's second marriage, and therefore junior to Robert. Yet, the I.P.M. of Anthony himself shows that he was William Morley's second son, and Robert his third. (S.R.S., xiv, 166).

35. Official Returns.
36. P.R.O., Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit Sussex, 43 & 44.
37. P.R.O. Sheriffs.
38. P.C.C. 82 Wingfield.
40. Phillips, 8.
41. P.R.O., C.142/488/82.
42. P.C.C. 111 Audley.
43. Given by Comber, (Lewes), 193 as of William Morley's 2nd marriage, though appears in B & C., loc. cit., with a query, as of the first.
44. Comber, loc. cit.; in B & C., suggested this might be an error for "Robert". (continued on next page)
(Morley continued)

Education.

Father
Perhaps matric. pens. from Queen's Coll., Camb., Michs., 1545; B.A. 1549. Fellow, 1548-50.

Sons
Herbert, matric. fell-comm. from Clare Coll., Camb., Easter, 1577.

Inns of Court.

Herbert, adm. Middle Temple, late of Furnivall's Inn, 2 Aug., 1579.


Marriages of children.

Of the first marriage:


Anthony
Amy
Mary
Anne
Judith

md. as his first wife, John Hay of Hurstmonceux, gent. Issue.
md. at Worth, 7 Sept., 1585, as his first wife, Sir Thomas Eversfield, knt. of Denne, (q.v.). Issue.
md. as his first wife, Marmaduke Wyvill of Croydon. Issue.

(Footnote from previous page)

45. Mentioned in husband's will, P.C.C. 87 Stafford.

47. Ibid.
48. Middle Temple Admission, i,45.
49. Gray's Inn Admissions, 76.
50. Ibid.,153.
51. B & C.,loc.cit; Comber (Lewes), 192-3.
52. P.C.C., 104, Byrde.
(Morley continued)

(Marriages of children contd.)

Of the second marriage:

Robert md. Susan, d. and heiress of Thomas Hodgson of Framfield. M. sett. 15 May, 1614. She died 1667, aged 72. Will dt. 6 March, 1665, pr. 4 May, 1667. M.I. at Glynde. Issue, of whom the eldest son and heir was Herbert, a colonel in the Parliamentary army in the Civil War, and M.P. Lewes, in the Long Parliament, 1640, and M.P. Sussex, 1659. He took a prominent part in the Civil War in Sussex and became Lieutenant of the Tower during the Commonwealth. He was a staunch republican and retired from public life during the Protectorate and after the Restoration.

Henry Margaret md. twice:—(a) Ninian Boord of Lindfield, (b) Nicholas Jordan of Sussex. Issue.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Glynde, Hundred of Ringmere, Pevensey Rape).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td>Thomas Morley Esq.</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£100.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>William Morley, arm.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>£20.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>William Morley Esq.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>£30.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>William Morley Esq.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>£30.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Charles I</td>
<td>Robert Morley Esq.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>£12.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(As of Hundred of Isfield, Pevensey Rape).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Anthony Morley, gent.</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£18.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(As of Street Hundred, Lewes Rape).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Mr. Anthony Morley</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£4.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
56. " E.179/190/265.
57. " E.179/190/283.
58. " E.179/190/298.
60. " E.179/190/299.
NEVELL. (or Nevill)

Origins.

Unknown. Apparently the Nevell family of Chichester were not directly connected with either the Nevills, Lords Abergavenny, or the Nevilles of Billingbeare, Berks.\(^1\)

Whether armigerous.

They appear in no relevant Sussex Visitations or among Berry's pedigrees of Sussex gentry families.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.\(^2\)

Francis Nevell Esq. of Chichester. Parentage unknown, but was the brother of Richard Nevell, gent., of Sidlesham, nr. Chichester.\(^3\)

J.P. Sussex, 1597 - 1602 at least. Of the Quorum from 1600.\(^4\)

1603, M.P. Midhurst.\(^5\)

Feb., 1621, appears in Subsidy Roll as a Commissioner for Subsidies.\(^6\)

17 June, 1628, bur. at Subdeanery Church, Chichester.\(^7\)

Wives.

Apparently md. twice but identity of first wife unknown:\(^-\)

1) ?

2) Alice, d. of John Apsey of Pulborough, relict of John Drury of Pulborough, Sussex, LL.D. and Master in Chancery, who d. June 1614. She was bap. at Worminghurst in 1570. Md. Francis Nevell at Chichester Subdeanery Church, Nov., 1616.\(^8\) Her will dt. 9 Oct., 1618, pr. 28 Nov., 1618.\(^9\)

---


2. It is not known for certain whether he was resident in Sussex in 1580. No record of his being there before 1597 when he first appeared on the Commission of the Peace, has been found.

3. Chichester Administrations, 142 (Index). E.142, dt.1608. Francis Nevell took out letters of administration on behalf of his deceased brother.


5. Official Returns.

6. S.A.C., xxiv, 75.


(Nevell continued).

Children.

Perhaps by his first wife:—

Francis. 12
Maria. 13

By his second wife:—

Apparently no children. She died 2 years after their marriage. Entries for baptisms between 1607 & 1618 are missing from the Subdeanery Parish Register, but no children by this marriage are specifically mentioned in the will of Alice, Francis Nevell's second wife.

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perhaps he who matric. pens. from St. John's Camb., Michs. 1565. 14</td>
<td>Ad., Gray's Inn, 1564. 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Son

Perhaps the Francis who matric. pens. from St. John's Easter, 1609. 16

Marriages of children.

Francis md. at Aldingbourne, 27 Feb., 1617, Elizabeth Edmunds, also of the parish of Chichester Subdeanery. 17

Maria

Subsidy assessments.

(As of The Close, Chichester City).

| 38 Elizabeth Francis Nevell Esq. in goods | £6. 18 |
| 40 Elizabeth | " " " " " " | £10. 19 |
| 41 Elizabeth | " " " " " " | £10. 20 |
| 1-2 Charles I | " " " " " " | £ 5. 21 |

(Commissioner for City and Chichester Rape).
ONLEY.

Origins.

Thomas Onley Esq., who was a J.P. of Sussex in 1559 and died in the same year, appears to have been the eldest son of one, John Onley, originally of Warnford, Hampshire, who acquired lands in Warnham and Rudgwick in 1488 and a messuage and other lands in Pulborough in 1501. John Onley appears to have settled in Pulborough since he is described in his will, proved in 1511, as of that place, and he directed that he was to be buried in a certain chapel in Pulborough Church. The property which he acquired in Pulborough seems to have been that moiety of the manor of Pulborough which was known as Old Place and which had been vested in the family of Lisle since the marriage of one of their name to one of two coheiresses. This property continued in the possession of the Onley family until 1665 when Edward Onley Esq. and Elizabeth, his wife, and Thomas Onley, gent., were deforciants in fine for it.

Little is known of the earlier history of these Onleys, but perhaps they were connections of the Northamptonshire family of that name who appear in the Northamptonshire Visitations.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1634 Visitation. Also in that of 1662.

1. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, I.
2. B & C., 197; S.A.C., lxxii, 262-3.
3. S.A.C., loc. cit.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid; this shows that, contrary to Horsfield, 11, 163, and other authorities, Old Place was not Apsley property. See also S.R.S., xx, 364.
6. Thomas Onley of Pulborough who died in 1559, mentions in his will (P.C.C. 47 Charney) his cousin, Thomas Onley of London, sometime under sheriff, to whose son the testator left the contingent remainder of his lands in Pulborough. B & C., 197n. suggests that this Thomas Onley of London, an under sheriff of London, who died in 1537, was the son of John Onley of Catesby, Northants., gent., and was younger brother of Edward Onley, also of Catesby, whose will was proved in 1522. (P.C.C. 33 Tirwhite). For the pedigree of the Northants Onleys, see B & C., 196a and 197a. See also Visitations of Northamptonshire, 1564-1618-19. (1887) ed. W.C. Metcalfe, 38 & 121.
8. S.A.C., xxxix, 123.
Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Owen Onley Esq. of Pulborough, Sussex, 2nd but eldest surviving son of Thomas Onley of the same who was J.P. of Sussex in 1559 and who died in that year, and of his first wife, Clemence, daughter of Sir John Earnley of Cakeham, Sussex, Lord Chief Justice of Common Pleas. Named in father's will, 1559.

Executor to sister, Mary, widow of Robert Goring of Burton, gent., in 1590.


Wife.


William Aged 2 on 17 Dec., 1589. Found a lunatic by Inquisition, 11 May, 1610, after 1 year, 5 months, 20 days. Living in 1630, then in ward to Henry Bartellot.

Elizabeth Found heiress to her brother in 1610. Then married.

9. See Note 1; will dt. 20 June, pr. 17 Oct., 1559. (P.C.C., 47 Chaynay).
11. Chichester wills, 14/154 b.
14. Chichester wills, 14/153b.
15. B & C., loc. cit.; see also "Bartellot", 179.
17. P.R.O., C.142/324/147.
(Onley continued).

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children.\(^\text{18}\)

William  Perhaps md. Susan - , who was bur. at Pulborough, 25 Nov., 1609 and was perhaps father of Mary, bur. at Pulborough, 11 Oct., 1608.

Elizabeth  md. Richard Barnard.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Pulborough, Hundred of Esewryth, Arundel Rape).

\(38\) Henry VIII  Thomas Onley Esq.  in lands  £40\(^\text{19}\)

(Commissioner)  

\(?\) Elizabeth  Mary Onley, widow  " "  £10\(^\text{20}\)

1-2 Charles I  William Onley, gent.  " "  £ 3\(^\text{21}\)

\(\text{18.}\) B & C., loc. cit.
\(\text{19.}\) P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
\(\text{20.}\) E.179/190/346.
\(\text{21.}\) E.179/191/377a. Note:- In B & C., 197, immediately below William Onley, lunatic, and Elizabeth, his sister, but not descended from them, is William Onley of Pulborough of the 1634 Visitation. He was perhaps the second son of Edward Onley of Northants, the nephew of Thomas Onley of London who died in 1537, and the great grandson of John Onley of Gatesby, Northants, gent. (B & C., 196a and 197a). It appears that the Pulborough property passed, after the declaration of the lunacy of William Onley and the death of his sister, Elizabeth, to cousins of the Northants line who were resident in Pulborough in 1634, at the time of the Visitation.
Palmers.

Origins.

"The Palmers of Sussex are acknowledged by the whole county one of their most ancient families before the Conquest, though the name came from the Holy War; for Palmer signifies Pilgrim because they carried (as Camden says) a Palme when they returned from Jerusalem." ... "All our adventurers in the Holy War (as Fuller and others have it) were called Pilgrims or Palmers so that there have been about sixty considerable families at a time in England of this very Sirname differing in the Arms and no ways related but by marriage." Thus wrote Mr. Jenyns in his introduction to a genealogical study of the Sussex Palmers.

The pedigree, compiled by Jenyns in 1672, begins in the reign of Edward I, and he says it was "collected about fifty yeares agoe in a Methodicall Roll .. and approved by Sir William Segrar, Garter King of Armes." He gives a copy of the latter's certificate, dated 12 March, 1626. This pedigree, and that of Kimber and Johnson are almost identical with that of Berry and Comber, though there are a few discrepancies as to Christian names. The main difficulty in tracing the family history of the Palmers lies not in contradictory pedigrees but, in the later sixteenth century at least, in the co-existence of a number of members of the family, more or less contemporaries, with the same Christian name, - that of 'Thomas'. Despite the careful study of dates this does leave a certain margin of error.

The earliest individual member of the family mentioned in the above sources, including Berry and Comber, was Ralph Palmer who is said to have possessed considerable estates in Sussex at the beginning of Edward II's reign in 1307. From him descended in direct line, one Robert Palmer of Steyning, Sussex, who, towards the end of the 14th century, married one of the two coheiresses of William Stopham de Stopham, a Bartellot marrying the other, so that both the Palmers and the Bartellots were later entitled to quarter the Stopham coat. It was this marriage that brought the Palmers certain property in Angmering where they subsequently settled and where the senior line of the family resided in the Elizabethan period.

1. R. Jenyns; Pedigree of the Ancient Family of the Palmers of Sussex,1672, (1867). Introduction. See also E. Kimber & R. Johnson; Baronetage, (1771),1,205 et seqq.
2. See note 1.
5. S.A.C.,vi, 87.
6. Jenyns, op.cit.5; and see infra.
The family was rising into prominence from the early 16th century onwards. At the beginning of the century, there were three brothers, Edward Palmer, the eldest, forerunner of the Palmers of Angmering, Robert, the second, founder of the Parham branch of the family, and Sir Thomas, the youngest, who served with distinction in the garrison at Calais but died without issue.

Of the three interesting sons of Edward Palmer who died on 25 July, 1516, John, Sir Henry Palmer and Sir Thomas Palmer, it is the eldest, John, and his descendants, who are of immediate concern for this study. Sir Henry, the second son, who became a distinguished soldier and had an active military career during the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary, was of much greater repute than his elder brother, John, and it was he who founded the branch of the family settled at Wingham in Kent, a branch which was to remain influential well on into Stuart times. It is perhaps worth noting that the seat of this branch, at Wingham, was secured by Sir Henry as a result of the Dissolution of the Monasteries. Sir Thomas Palmer, the youngest of the three remarkable sons of Edward Palmer, who, incidentally, are traditionally held to have been born on three successive Sundays, a story which apparently derives from Fuller's "Worthies", had a still more dazzling career, though one that ended tragically. Courtier and soldier, he rose high in the favour of Henry VIII, and his career was punctuated by grants of lands, annuities and lucrative offices. Locally, he acquired the reputation of an enormous acquirer of church property in many parts of Sussex. Among the most prominent of his acquisitions were the revenues of the recently dissolved College of Benedictine Canons at South Malling, near Lewes. This was "one of the oldest monastic institutions in Sussex." Under Edward VI, he successfully negotiated the transfer of his allegiance from Somerset to Northumberland, and under the latter prospered so far as to undertake to build himself a house in the Strand, but the collapse of the Lady Jane Grey conspiracy implicated him too seriously for his good fortune to continue, and when Northumberland fell, he fell with him.

10. E.Hasted; History of Kent, (Canterbury,1800),ix,234 et seqq.; D.N.B., sub "Sir Henry Palmer".
11. S.A.C.,v,16-17; Kimber & Johnson,i,206; Elwes,10-11.
12. D.N.E.
13. D.N.B.
14. S.A.C.,v,127. On his revenues from this source, see S.A.C., xix,36; S.A.C.,v,127 et seqq.; and 139; S.A.C.,ix,328-19; S.A.C.,xxvi,96,92,72,77,82.
15. D.N.B.
The careers of Sir Henry and Sir Thomas Palmer have this significance for the present study - that the reputation of each rested on important services rendered personally to the Crown, in both cases, as it happened, in the military sphere; in return, each reaped substantial material rewards, largely in the form of monastic property. This appears also to have been the dominant motif in the history of the two branches of the family with which this study is concerned, namely the Palmers of Angmering, descendants of John Palmer, the elder brother of Sir Henry and Sir Thomas, and the Palmers of Parham. Both branches gave outstanding service to the Crown in the Elizabethan period at a time when many families were being drawn into the currents of aristocratic intrigue, and when staunch supporters of sufficient means and influence to be of significant use to the Queen in the shire were all too few. Indeed, perusal of the county offices held during the reign by these two groups of Palmers shows beyond doubt that, judged by the responsibilities vested in them by the Crown, not to mention the tenure by a representative of the family of a county seat in Parliament on two occasions during the reign, they were one of the small number of key families in the social structure of Elizabethan Sussex. Among those below noble status, they may be compared with the Coverts or the Shirleys, and indeed, it was from these three families that the county's Deputy Lieutenants were drawn for the greater part of the reign.

(i) Palmer of Angmering.

Certain lands in Angmering had been acquired by the Palmers by the marriage of Robert Palmer of Steyning to a daughter and coheirress of William de Stopham, which lands were settled on himself and his heirs by an indenture dated 1383. It was apparently Edward Palmer, Robert's direct descendant of the fourth generation, and father of John Palmer, Sir Henry Palmer of Wingham and of Sir Thomas Palmer, who made Angmering his main place of residence before he died in 1516. His eldest son and heir, John Palmer of Angmering Esq., was aged 21 in 1516. At the Dissolution, the manor of West Angmering which had been the property of Syon monastery in Middlesex, was purchased by the Palmers, and Old Place, the manor house of the former bailiff of Syon monastery, appears to have been the residence of John Palmer.

19. Elwes, loc.cit.; S.A.C.,xxiii,132. The manor of East Angmering passed from Henry Fitzalan to the Parham branch of the Palmer family, T.R.,Eliz., and was subsequently disposed of at the same time and to the same purchaser as was Parham. (Elwes, loc.cit.).
John Palmer Esq. was rather less distinguished than his two younger military brothers, but he was twice Sheriff in Henry VIII's reign and, like his brothers, he also took part in the spoliation of the monasteries. It was possibly he who was appointed commissioner for the Dissolution of Boxgrove priory under the name of "William Palmer", since there appears to be no contemporary of that name and this may have some connection with the fact that one, Sir Thomas Palmer, tenant-at-will for 30 acres in Halmaker, had a dovecote at Boxgrove in 12 Elizabeth. Perhaps this was his son.

Contrary to the legend reproduced in the D.N.B. that John Palmer was hanged for beating Henry VIII at cards, he appears to have survived quite comfortably into Elizabeth's reign and to have died a natural death on the 7 January, 1563. He is known to have married twice, and by his first wife, Jane, daughter of John or Thomas Hynde of London, he had a son John, of whom nothing appears to be known, save that he died without issue, though at an uncertain date. It was, however, the future Sir Thomas Palmer, - the son of John Palmer senior's second marriage, to Mary, daughter of William, Lord Sandys, - who succeeded him in 1563 in the Angmering inheritance, and who was head of the senior line of the Palmers in 1580. (For the descent of Palmer of Parham, v. infra.)

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in 1570 Visitation (Palmers of Parham). Also in the 1634 Visitation.
Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Thomas Palmer, knt., of Angmering, Sussex, second son of John Palmer Esq. of Angmering who died 7 Jan., 1563, and only son by his second wife, Mary, d. of William, Lord Sandys.

He succeeded his father as a minor of 20 yrs., 2 m., 27 days. He had been appointed by him to be sole executor and residuary legatee.

1571, M.P., Sussex. Also in 1588.

1572, J.P. Sussex.

1572-'3, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex.

12 August, 1573, knighted.

June, 1585, Deputy Lieutenant of Sussex, in succession to his cousin, Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham who died in 1582. (q.v.).

c.1585, Commissioner for Musters, for disarming the Sussex recusants, and for the restraint of grain.

1585, took charge of the armour of William Shelley who was indicted for treason.

1587, responsible for a survey of the Sussex coast in preparation for invasion.

29. See note 25.
30. See note 24.
32. Brown Willis, op. cit., iii, 84, gives the name as 'John' Palmer. The list of M.P.'s for 1571 in the De Tabley MSS gives 'Thomas'. See also H. Brady: The Personnel of Parliament, 1571, (Univ. of Manchester M.A. thesis), 81.
33. Official Returns.
34. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 14.
35. See Appendix 4.
37. See Appendix 2, and notes on Palmer of Parham.
38. B.M., Harl. MS., 474, ff. 80b, 90b and 92.
39. S.A.C., lv, 298.
40. S.A.C., lviii, 161.
(Palmer continued)

May, 1591, mentioned as a Deputy Lieutenant Sussex, but said to be residing mainly at Blackwall. Not named specifically after this. Only additional names given in lists of D.L's.  

July, 1592, appointed a commissioner for the disarming of the Sussex recusants.

1593, deforciant in fine for Madehurst, and 1601-12 for Wiggenholt.

Date of death unknown. No will or I.P.M.

He built 'New Place' in Angmering during Elizabeth's reign. A considerable part survives. It is thought to have been a very large mansion.

Wives:

Md. twice:-
1) Mary, d. of Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham.
2) Alice -. Deforciant in fine with her husband in 1593 and 1601-12. Bur. at Angmering, 23 August, 1606.

Children:

Of the first marriage:-

John Bap. Angmering 15 Aug., 1566. Def. in fine for Wiggenholt, 1615. According to Jenyns, he "either through the viciousness of his nature or dejected at his Father's misfortunes got acquaintance with the Gipsies and other wandering beggars, which way of living he liked so well that he could never be persuaded to leave them but died at length among them".

41. See Appendix 2.
42. B.N.Harl.MS. 703, f. 67b.
43. B & C., loc.cit.
44. Elwes, II.
45. B & C., loc.cit.
46. Ibid.
47. Jenyns, op.cit., 11n.
(Palmer continued)

(Children contd.)


William Bap. at Angmering 9 Nov., 1572. A captain in the Low Countries. 54

Richard Bap. at Angmering 4 Oct., 1574.


Walter 8 March, 1577.

Dorothy

Of the second marriage: None.

Education.

Father Perhaps adm. Gray's Inn, 1562. 55

Sons Thomas, Queen's Coll., Oxf., adm. Middle Temple, matric. 24 March, 1586, aged 17. 56

Inns of Court.

Universities.

48. Official Returns. He would have been only 17 years old in 1586, perhaps too young. The M.P. could not have been his father, (cf. M.Mort: The Personnel of the House of Commons in 1601, (M.A. thesis, Univ. of London), Sect.III, 234) who was knighted in 1573 (v. supra) while the M.P. was styled "Esq." The future Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham, son of William (q.v.) would have been only 12 years old in 1586. (B & C., loc.cit.)

49. Official Returns.


52. Shaw, II, 141.


54. Jenyns, op.cit., II.


57. Middle Temple Admissions, I, 60.
Palmer continued.

Marriages of children.

Henry  
John  
Thomas  
Died in infancy.

Md. three times: — (a) Margaret, d. of Sir John Parker who was son of Archbishop Parker, 59 (b) —, d. of Sir Miles Sands, kn. No issue of either marriage. 60

William  
Richard  
Henry  
Md. Elizabeth, d. of Sir Thomas Minot. Issue. 61

Md. Elizabeth, d. of Edward Parker, at Angmering, 8 Sept., 1602.

Walter  
Dorothy  
Md. Anthony Bustard Esq., 11 Feb., 1594 at Angmering. 62

Subsidy assessments.

(As of West Angmering, Pōlyng Hundred, Arundel Rape).

38 Henry VIII  
John Palmer Esq.  
(Commissioner)  
in lands  
£140. 63

14 Elizabeth  
Thomas Palmer Esq.  
(Commissioner)  
" "  
£66. 64

? Elizabeth  
John Palmer Esq.  
" "  
£66. 65

Palmer of Parham.

The Parham, or Pulborough, branch of the family was founded by Robert Palmer, younger brother of Edward Palmer of Angmering who died in 1516. (V. supra).

---

58. B & C., loc. cit.
60. Kimber & Johnson, loc. cit.
63. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
64. P.R.O., E.179/190/283.
65. P.R.O., E.179/190/346. Year not given.
The property was held of the Crown by Westminster Abbey since before the Conquest, and, before the Dissolution, the manor and estate were found to form part of the endowments of the Infirmary attached to the Abbey. After the Dissolution, in 1540, the manor was sold for £1,225.6s.5d. to Robert Palmer, citizen and mercer, to hold by the 20th part of a knight's fee and a yearly payment of £6.12.4d.66

Only four years later, on 13 May, 1544, Robert Palmer died, leaving as his heir the future Sir Thomas Palmer who remained head of this branch of the family until his death in 1582.67 He was aged 24 and more in 1544. It was this Sir Thomas Palmer who undertook the enlargement and alteration of Parham, "one of the most important mansions in West Sussex".68 "Parham House", says Elwes, "occupies a site of great beauty at the foot of the South Downs and in the midst of a picturesque park".69 The present house is mainly Elizabethan, the South-West and West fronts having been altered or added to very largely by Sir Thomas Palmer or his successor, Sir Thomas Bishopp. The North and East sides are older. The date 1563 and the arms of the Queen and her motto on the wall at the upper end of the hall have led to the legend that Queen Elizabeth once dined in the new hall sitting beneath this spot. There is no authority for this, though she may possibly have visited Parham House in her progress to Cowdray in 1591.70

According to Elwes, certain lands in East Angmering were sold by Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel to the Palmers of Parham who subsequently re-conveyed them when they sold Parham, to Sir Thomas Bishopp.71

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Thomas Palmer, knt., of Parham, eld. son and heir of Robert Palmer of Parham who died 13 May, 1544 (v. supra), and of his first wife, Bridget, d. and coheirress of John Wesse of Millington, Yorks., and an alderman of London.72

66. Elwes, 164; S.A.C.,xxv,1 et seqq.
67. Robert Palmer's will, P.C.C. l2 Fynning; his I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/70/46. See B & C.,loc.cit.
68. Elwes,164. See also H.M.C. 6th Report, 347-18, saying the foundation of Parham was laid on 28 Jan.,1577. The younger Thomas was there referred to as then 2½ years old, and was evidently the grandson of the Sir Thomas who died in 1582. (V.infra.)
69. Ibid.,165.
70. Elwes, 165.
71. Elwes, 10.
Succeeded his father aged 24 and more in 1544.

1559- Jan., 1582, J.P., Sussex. Of the Quorum.

1559-'60, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex. 1562-'3, reference by the bishop of Chichester and Henry Goring, Sheriff, in a letter to the Privy Council, to a "matter between the Earl of Northumberland and Sir Thomas Palmer".

1564, apparently the "Sir Thomas Palmer of Gadwode, kt", described in the bishop's letter as a J.P. of West Sussex who was a favourer of religion and godly orders, but "a faint furtherer".

Nov., 1569, listed as a Deputy Lieutenant of Sussex, with 2 others.

1576, was cited by Bishop Curtis of Chichester for examination with others for popery. Later the bishop was charged for overzealousness on the petition of various gentlemen including Sir Thomas Palmer. He rebuilt Parham (V. supra).

14 April, 1582, died. Will dt 24 Feb., 1581, pr. 1582. Wives:

1) Griselda, d. of John Caryll, serjeant-at-law. (Also called Bridget).
2) Catherine, d. of Sir Edward Stradling of St. Donat's, knt. Married before 1557. Living in 1582.

73. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 1-24. But not in 1560 or 1561 (nos. 2 & 3).
74. See Appendix 4.
75. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 268, 276.
76. Camden Misc., ix, 9; For the fact of his residence at Goodwood early in the reign, see also H.M.C. 13th Report, iv, 26.
77. See Appendix 2. This could only have been Sir Thomas of Parham. His cousin, Sir Thomas of Angmering, was not knighted until 1573. References to a Sir Thomas Palmer as D.L. after 1585 cannot, however, have applied to Sir Thomas of Parham who died in 1582, but must have meant Sir Thomas of Angmering (q.v.).
78. S.A.C., xvii, 81.
80. I.P.M., dt. 7 June, 1582 (P.R.O. C.142/197/60).
81. B & C., loc. cit.
(Palmer continued)

Children. 82

By his first wife:-

Mary
Elizabeth
Dorothy  
Bap. at Parham, 1 July, 1548.

By his second wife:-


Education.

Universities.  
Father -
Son -

Inns of Court.

Marriages of children. 86

Of the first marriage:-

Mary  
Md. as his 1st wife, Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering, son of John Palmer of Angmering Esq. (q.v.) Issue.

Elizabeth  
Md. John Leeds of Steyning, a recusant 87 Issue.

Dorothy  

Of the second marriage:-

William  
Md. Elizabeth, sole d. and h. of Hugh Verney of Fair- 
field in Stoke Courcy, Somerset. Issue including the future Sir Thomas Palmer, their s. and h., aged 12 in 1586, who sold Parham to Sir Thomas Bighopp in c. 1597. He md. a daughter of John Mallet Esq. 89 "There happened

82. Ibid.
83. Given as "John" by J enyns, 11, and Kimber & Johnson, 1, 206.
84. P.C.C. 2 Spencer.
85. P.R.O., C.142/214/234.
86. B & C., loc. cit.
87. S.A.C., liv, 44-45, though here Elizabeth is mistakenly given as the daughter of Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering.
88. S.A.C., xxiii, 164. For the projected re-marriage of Elizabeth, after William's death, to the Puritan, Sir William Bowes, see H.M.C. 6th Report, 345-6. The marriage did not take place.
89. B & C., loc. cit.
no small difference (which some still remember) between this Sir Thomas and his lady and thereupon he becoming careless sold most part of his Sussex land and at last his House and park of Parham to the family of the Bishops who still dwell there. He went envoye into Spain where he dyed so that from an estate of above £4,000 he left not to his posterity quite £2,000 per annum, but this they at present enjoy, part of it being in Sussex and in Somersetshire the rest. 90 Left a son Peregrine Palmer of Fairfield, Somersetshire, a minor. Feodary Survey dated 3 Nov., 3 James I. 92 I.P.M. 93

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Parham, Hundred of Esewrith, Arundel Rape).

38 Henry VIII Thomas Palmer Esq. in lands £42. 94

(As of Ryvere Tithing, Hundred of Rotherbridge, Arundel Rape).

? Elizabeth Sir Thomas Palmer, knt. in lands £66. 95

91. Ibid.
93. P.R.O., C.142/295/55; and S.R.S., xiv., 176.
94. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
95. P.R.O., E.179/190/346. Evidently before 1563 since John Palmer Esq. of Angmering also appears on this Subsidy Roll. (V. supra). Perhaps Sir Thomas Palmer of Parham was residing at 'Ryvere' while his house at Parham was under construction. In the bishop's letter of 1564, he is 'of Goodwood'. (V. supra).
According to Burke, "The family of Parker was of great antiquity in the county of Sussex, and its progenitor, Geoffrey Parker of Bexley is mentioned in deed of 12 Edward I."

The genealogy of this family is given in Berry and Comber from this Geoffrey onwards, accompanied by a note that, "This pedigree down to Sir Thomas Parker was testified by William Camden, Clarencieux." According to this, the Parker family remained at Bexley in Sussex, until the time of Geoffrey's great grandson, John Parker, who is described as "of Lewes", and possibly the plaintiff for lands in Ringmer in 1433 and 1436. It seems likely that he was the M.P. Lewes in 1417, and the individual who appears in the list of Sussex gentry, dated 1434. It may also have been he, or his son of the same name, who was M.P. for Lewes in 1455. One of the family is known to have fought at Agincourt. In 1456, the Parkers were among the Sussex supporters of Cade's rising.

According to Berry and Comber, John Parker, Geoffrey's great-grandson, married Alice, daughter and heiress of Richard Rakeley of Ratton in the parish of Willingdon, and from then onwards the Parkers are described as "of Ratton". At this period, they became closely connected with the Thatchers of Ringmer. The great-grandson of John and Alice was also a John Parker, of Ratton Esq., who became Deputy and Lieutenant to George Bullen, Lord Rochford, who was Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports early in the 16th century. He died on 9 Nov., 1557. (V. infra).

This John Parker had married twice: first, Jane, daughter of Sir Richard Sackville of Buckhurst, and sister of the future Lord Buckhurst. She died on 6 Nov., 1543. By her he had a son and a daughter, Elizabeth, who married Sir Edward Gage, Knt., of Firle, who died in 1567. The son was the future Thomas Parker Esq. of Ratton who died in 1580. (V. infra).

1. J.B. Burke: Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies, (1838), 400.
2. B & C., 12.
3. S. A. C., xxxi, 119; Official Returns.
4. S. A. C., xxxix, 103.
5. S. A. C., xcvii, 153; Official Returns.
6. S. A. C., xv, 129.
7. S. A. C., xviii, 18.
8. B & C., loc. cit; Comber (Lewes) 286.
10. Ibid., B & C., loc. cit.
(Parker continued)

By his second wife, Jane, daughter of Richard Farnesfold of Wickham, relict of Richard de la Chambre, John Parker had two sons, Edward and Thomas, who is described as "of Willingdon". Through them the Parkers became connected with two well-established Sussex families, the Palmers and the Selwyns, Edward's daughter, Elizabeth, marrying Henry Palmer Esq., younger son of Sir Thomas Palmer of Angmering, (q.v.), and Thomas Parker of Willingdon marrying Elizabeth, daughter and coheirress of Thomas Selwyn of Friston in 1596. 11

Ratton is situated in the parish of Willingdon in the Rape of Pevensey, between Lewes and Eastbourne. While Willingdon village overlooks Pevensey Bay, the house is on a slope of the Downs overlooking the Weald, but practically nothing of the ancient structure remains except the gatehouse. In Willingdon church are numerous monumental inscriptions to members of the Parker family. In 10 Elizabeth, the manor of Willingdon itself was granted by the Queen to Thomas, Lord Buckhurst.12

Whether armigerous.

Their coat of arms appears to have been derived from that of the Etchinghams.13 Mencione in the 1570 Visitation.14 Also in that of 1634.15

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Thomas Parker of Ratton Esq., 1st, son and heir of John Parker Esq., of the same, who died on 9 Nov., 1557,16 and of Jane, d. of Sir Richard Sackville of Buckhurst. Aged 30 or more at his father's death. Mentioned in his father's will.

---

11. Burke, loc. cit; B & C., loc. cit; S.A.C., xiv, 122.
13. S.A.C., vi, 82.
14. Phillips,8; H.C. MSS, G.18 and D.11. (A note in MS D.11 says that John Parker, father of Thomas, was granted a coat of arms by the Garter King of Arms in 2 and 3 Philip and Mary. But the family appears to have been armigerous before that; see S.A.C., xv, 129, fo example.)
15. H.C. MS, C.27.
M.P. for East Grinstead, 1558.\(^\text{17}\)

J.P. Sussex, 1560-1564, and 1569 and 1570.\(^\text{18}\)

1564, in the bishop's letter, described as a J.P. but a misliker of religion and godly proceedings.\(^\text{19}\)

16 April, 1580, died. M.I. at Willingdon.\(^\text{20}\)

Wife.\(^\text{21}\)

Ellenor, d. of William Waller of Groombridge, Kent, Esq. She died 26 Feb., 1598.

Children.\(^\text{22}\)

Nicholas Later Sir Nicholas Parker, knt., of Ratton.

Born, 1547. A notable military commander. Served in the Low Countries and was knighted by Lord Willoughby in 1588.\(^\text{23}\) J.P. Sussex, 1580-1602, except for the years 1587 and 1594.\(^\text{24}\) Usually of the Quorum. Mentioned in an undt. MS in the State Papers, perhaps of 1583, as one of the J.P's of Sussex who were "suspect or week and followers only of those nobleman" who were dangerous in the county."\(^\text{25}\) In the report on the J.P's of Sussex in 1587, was described as normally a J.P. for Pevensey Rape but at that time Sheriff, and as one "who hath his wyff's mother in his hows%, a recusant., and is now come to Lewse to dwell., so that another appointment should be made.\(^\text{26}\) But in July, 1592., was appointed a Commissioner for disarming the recusants in Sussex.\(^\text{27}\) 1586-'7

---

17. Official Returns.

18. P.R.O. Assizes, 35,S.E.Circuit,Sussex, 2-6, and 11 & 12; but the last two references may refer to his half-brother, (v. supra). In view of the uncertainty, the half-brother has not been biographed.


21. Ibid.

22. B & C.,loc.cit; and Burke, loc.cit.

23. D.N.B., sub "Sir Nicholas Parker". For details of his military career, though his brother, John, became captain of Pendennis Castle in 1601.


27. B.M.Add.MS,5,702,f.196; and B.M. Harl.MS, 703,f.67b.
and 1593-14, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex. 28
1597, M.P. for Sussex. 29 1591, known to have 30
been at that time a Deputy Lieutenant for Sussex.
1598, became Deputy Lieutenant for Cornwall, and
Governor of Pendennis Castle. 31 1609, became a
trustee for certain lands of the Gage family who
were recusants. 32 1618, gave a large bell to
Willingdon Church. 33 9 March, 1620, died aged
73. M.I. at Willingdon. I.P.M. 34 Will. 35

John

Later Sir John Parker, knt. Knighted 1603. 36
Had been appointed a Gentleman Pensioner to Queen
Elizabeth. 37 1594, granted the office of filing,
keeping and registering Bills, Answers and
pleadings in Chancery. 38 M.P. Hastings, 1588; 39
Truro, 1593; Launceston, 1601; East Looe, 1604-11.
Colonel of foot in 1 James I and captain of Pen-
dennis Castle, Cornwall by Patent for life. 40
Died 15 Oct., 1617, aged 70.

A daughter

Died in infancy.

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps Nicholas, B.A. Oxon.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Feb, 1575; M.A. 26 June, 1578.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps John, B.A. Oxon.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Feb., 1579.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. See Appendix 4.
29. See Appendix 3.
30. See Appendix 2.
31. P.N.B.; H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, xiii, passim.
32. S.A.C., lviii, 155.
33. S.A.C., xvi, 189.
34. P.R.O., C.142/380/124.
36. Shaw, ii, 102.
37. P.R.O., C.407/20. See E. Trafford; Personnel of the
38. Trafford, loc. cit., ex Pink MSS.
39. Trafford, loc. cit.; M. Mort; Personnel of the House of
Commons in 1601, (Univ. of London M.A. thesis), 236.
40. Burke, loc. cit.
41. Al. Ox, i11, 1115.
42. Al. Ox, i11, 1114.
Marriages of children.

Nicholas md. four times:— (a) Jane, d. of Sir William Courtenay of Powderham, Devon, knt., and relict of Francis, 4th son of Sir Anthony Browne, and brother of Sir Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague. No issue. (b) Elizabeth, d. of John Baker Esq. No issue. (c) Katherine, d. of Sir John Temple of Stow, Bucks., bart., Issue, of whom the eldest son, Sir Thomas Parker, was Deputy Lieutenant for Sussex at the beginning of the Civil War and a strong Parliamentarian, and the 4th son, Henry, was a scholar, writer and notable Parliamentarian. (d) Avis, relict of Erisey, and mother of James Erisey who commanded the White Lion under Drake in 1585 and fought against the Armada in 1588.

John Unmd. daughter Died in infancy.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Willingdon, Hundred of Willingdon, Pevensey Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Henry VIII John Parker Esq.</td>
<td>£66.48 (Commissioner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elizabeth Thomas Parker Esq.</td>
<td>£30.49 (Commissioner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elizabeth Thomas Parker Esq.</td>
<td>£30.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elizabeth Thomas Parker Esq.</td>
<td>£30.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Charles I Sir Thomas Parker, knt.</td>
<td>£15.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(As of Hundred of Eastbourne, Pevensey Rape)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Charles I Thomas Parker, gent.</td>
<td>£2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. B & C., loc. cit; Burke, loc. cit.
44. S.A.C., xiv, 101; v, 35 & 102-13; lix, 118; xl, 2,5,7,22.
45. D.N.B.; Horsfield, i,288 et seqq.
46. S.A.C., lxxv, 183.
47. H.R.Mosse; The Monumental Effigies of Sussex, (Hove, 1928), 161.
49. P.R.O., E.179/190/265.
50. P.R.O., E.179/190/283.
51. P.R.O., E.179/190/298.
The early pedigree of the Sussex Pelhams has been the subject of much learned conjecture and controversy most of which is beyond the scope of this study, but since some legends about the early history of the family are very persistent, it is important to show where present authorities draw the line between what is and is not proven.

Perhaps the most important contribution to the subject in later years was an article by Dr. L.F. Salzman entitled "The Early Heraldry of Pelham". This article was taken by Comber as the basis of his account of the Pelham pedigree in early generations, an account which differs considerably in detail and length from earlier versions, including that of Berry. One of the main sources of confusion on the subject was a work of Mr. M.A. Lower, an otherwise reputable nineteenth-century Sussex antiquary, published in 1873 with the title of "Historical and General Notices of the Family of Pelham". In this, as in his "Notes on Old Sussex Families", and his "The Norman Origin of the Family of Pelham", Mr. Lower indulged in some far-reaching speculations to the effect that the Pelhams were originally a Norman family but, on settling in England at or shortly after the Conquest, adopted their name and acquired lands in Hertfordshire in the neighbourhood of the three adjacent parishes there of Brent-Pelham, Stocking-Pelham and Pelham-Furneaux. From there, he asserted, at the very beginning of the 14th century, a branch of the family moved to Sussex, and from this descended all the later Sussex Pelhams whose history Mr. Lower then proceeded to unfold. It is unnecessary to recapitulate the story here. Dr. Salzman's verdict on Lower's "Historical Notices" as "The worst piece of work he ever did" should suffice. The greater part of it", says Dr. Salzman, is taken bodily from Collins' 'Baronet' and the additions and the earlier history of the family are fantastic, as was pointed out by W. Smith Ellis in the 'Genealogist' (iv, 222-15) though Mr. Ellis himself unfortunately went on to indulge in even wilder guesswork. Some of this guesswork appears in an article in the Sussex Archaeological Collections, and the resulting pedigree is appreciably longer than that of Dr. Salzman's article, based on well authenticated facts.

1. S.A.C., lxix, 53 et seqq.
2. Comber, (Lewes), 205 et seqq; Berry, 313 et seqq.
3. S.A.C., xxiv, 5 et seqq.
4. S.A.C., xxiv, 183 et seqq.
5. S.A.C., lxix, 53.
6. S.A.C., xxxvii, 31 et seqq.
Neither Dr. Salzman, nor Comber who relied on him, traces the pedigree any further back than the parents of the John Pelham, or John de Pelham, who was made Constable of Pevensey Castle by John of Gaunt in 1393, who was knighted by Henry IV at the time of his coronation and appointed by that king as his sword-bearer for life and eventually as one of his executors, and who died in February, 1429. It is in discussing the parentage of this Sir John de Pelham, that Dr. Salzman lays one of the most persistent myths connected with this family, or, as he describes it, "possibly the most famous genealogical tradition in Sussex history". This tradition first appearing in the Herald Philipot's pedigree in the early seventeenth century, later adopted by Collins and subsequently by Lower, relates to a person described by Mr. Lower as "of great eminence in the reign of Edward III", - a Sir John de Pelham, supposed to have been the father of the Sir John who was Constable of Pevensey Castle from 1393, who, with Roger la Warr, captured King John of France at the Battle of Poitiers in 1356. As a forfeit, the King of France is supposed to have given the crampet of his scabbard to la Warr, and the buckle of his belt to Pelham, both of whom were soon afterwards knighted. To this alleged incident Lower traces the origin of the famous Pelham Buckle, a family device which appears alone or with armorial bearings from at least 1408 onwards, on the stonework of ten Sussex churches, at Robertsbridge Abbey, in Laughton Place and on iron fire-backs and other objects scattered about the county. However, as Dr. Salzman has pointed out, not only was this incident not mentioned by Froissart or any other contemporary chronicler, or indeed any writer before Philipot who produced his pedigree in 1632, but there was not, so far as the records go, any Sir John Pelham eminent as a warrior living at that time, unless it were the John de Pelham, "chivaler" accused of assault against John de Grey, clerk, at Balsam, Cambridgeshire, in August, 1356, the month before Poitiers. But this individual, as Dr. Salzman shows, was probably a Cambridgeshire man who served on various commissions in that county from 1350 to 1354 and from 1357 to 1359, and was a surveyor of weights and measures in Cambridge-shire in 1350, - not directly connected with the Sussex Pelhams at all, but at most a collateral ancestor.

The legendary knight having been dismissed as the father of Sir John de Pelham who died in 1429, Dr. Salzman shows that his real parents were Thomas Pelham and Agnes Gensyng, and that he was born in about 1355. Thomas Pelham had lands in Sussex, being deforciant in fine for lands in Hurstmonceux in 1348, Wartling in 1375, and for property in Hoo and elsewhere in 1385.

7. S.A.C., lxix, 55.
8. S.A.C., lxix, 70.
(Pelham continued).

His son, the Constable of Pevensey Castle and Henry IV's sword-bearer, had the lease of the manor of Laughton and of the Hundred of Shiplake from Maud, Countess of Oxford in 1401.10

Laughton has been described as the earliest considerable estate and residence of the family,11 and the estate was practically co-extensive with the parish in the Hundred of Shiplake to the East of Lewes.12 This property descended in the male line to Sir William Pelham who was great-grandson to the Sir John who died in 142913 and who finished the building of Laughton Place in 1534, which mansion he apparently intended to be the principal seat of the Sussex Pelhams.14 Sir William, however, survived the completion of this residence for four years only, and Laughton Place was subsequently abandoned in favour of another residence a few miles away, completed in 1595, Halland Place, on the borders of the parishes of Laughton and East Hoathly.15 Like Laughton Place, the "sumptuous mansion of Halland" survives only in part as a farmhouse.16 Lands called Halland were bought by Sir Nicholas Pelham, eldest son and heir of Sir William Pelham in 4 and 5 Philip and Mary.17

Apart from Laughton, the Pelhams were considerable landowners before the 16th century.18 Some time before he died in February, 1429, Sir John Pelham acquired the Lordship of the Rape of Hastings, for, by deed dated 17 June, 1428, he granted this to his son.19 It appears however, that the Castle and Honour were granted sometime in the reign of Henry VI to a Sir Thomas Hoo, later created Baron Hastings, and that in Edward IV, the Castle and Honour were conveyed by Baron Hastings' feoffees to one, William Hastings, with whose descendants they continued until 1591 when they were purchased by the Pelhams.20

From the time of Sir John Pelham, Henry IV's sword-bearer, onwards, the Pelhams were holders of many offices under the Crown. He himself and his heirs male were Constables of Pevensey Castle, and he was a Privy Councillor in Henry V's

10. Ibid., 204.
11. S.A.C.,xxiv, 6-7.
13. Comber,(Lewes), 203-16; S.A.C.,1xix,63 et seqq.
14. S.A.C.,iii,228; vii,66 et seqq.
15. S.A.C.,vii,70.
17. Horsfield,1,358.
18. Horsfield,1,184,433; S.A.C.,iii,221; Comber,(Lewes), 203 et seqq.
19. Comber, (Lewes), 204.
reign and an ambassador in France. His son was Chamberlain of the Household to Henry V's Queen, Catherine, and his wife was her maid-of-honour. Many members of this family were sheriffs in the 15th century and from 1399 onwards they frequently sat in the House of Commons.21

In the Elizabethan period, there were three main branches of the Sussex Pelhams, each of which contributed to the ranks of the main county office-holders of the time. They were the Pelhams of Halland in Laughton, or simply of Laughton, the Pelhams of Hastings, and the Pelhams of Bucksted and later of Michaelham. All of these were descended from Thomas Pelham who died in 1516, and who was the third son of Sir John Pelham, Chamberlain of the Household to Queen Catherine, consort of Henry V, who had died c.1471. Thomas, though the third son, was the only one with male issue, and it was therefore through his line that the bulk of the Pelham property descended. He was succeeded by his third son, Sir William Pelham, who was responsible for the building of Laughton Place and whose will was proved in 1538.24 This Sir William married twice, and from these two marriages descended two different lines of the Sussex Pelhams, those of Laughton, and those of Hastings. By his first wife, Mary, daughter of Sir Richard Carew, Sir William had two sons, the elder of whom, the future Sir Nicholas Pelham, succeeded him and was the owner of Laughton Park and of the Halland property at the accession of Elizabeth. He died on 15 September, 1560.25

Sir Nicholas had distinguished himself in 1545 when he led a force which repelled an invading French detachment at Seaford, and the incident is commemorated in verse on his monumental inscription at St. Michael's in Lewes.26 He was Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in 3 Edward VI,27 M.P. for Arundel between 1547 and 155228 and for the county in January, 1558.29 He was a J.P. for Sussex, 1559 - 1561.30 It was he who owned Laughton Park at the time of the unfortunate poaching escapade of a party of high-spirited young men including Thomas Fiennes, Lord Dacre, which led

22. Comber, (Lewes), 205 et seqq.
23. V.C.H., Sussex, ix, 79.
25. I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/131/169, or S.R.S., xiv, 181.
27. P.R.O., Sheriffs.
28. S.A.C., xxxii, 159; Official Returns.
29. S.A.C., xxxii, 165; Official Returns.
(Pelham continued.)

to the death of a game-keeper on the Laughton property, and so to the arrest, trial and execution of that young peer. 31 By his wife, Anne, daughter of John Sackville of Buckhurst and aunt of the future Lord Buckhurst, the son of Sir Richard Sackville, (q.v.), Sir Nicholas Pelham had six sons and two daughters. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Sir John Pelham who died in 1580 and who therefore counts as the head of the family at that date. (V. infra). Sir John's heir, Oliver, a minor, died in 1585, and the Pelham estates passed to Sir John's next brother, Sir Thomas Pelham, who held many important county offices under Elizabeth. Sir Thomas' family is therefore also examined here but is not made use of for statistical tables relating to the size and composition of the 1580 families, or their education. - His I.P.M. and the subsidy assessment for 1-2 Charles I are, however, brought into the tables on economic trends, and matters of county significance relating to his family are referred to. 32

The Pelhams of Hastings descended from Sir William Pelham of Laughton who died c. 1538, by his second wife, Mary, daughter of William, Lord Sands of Hampshire, K.G., Lord Chamberlain to Henry VIII. There were three sons of this marriage, two of whom, Sir William, the eldest, and Sir Edmund, the third, became prominent lawyers. Sir William became Justiciar of Ireland and held other important offices as Master of the Ordnance, Field Marshal and Privy Councillor, and died at Flushing in 1587. 33 Sir Edmund, or sometimes Edward, the third son, who resided at Hastings and was for some years during Elizabeth's reign a J.P. of the Quorum, appears in this study as the head of an office-holding branch of the family in 1580 (V. infra).

The third group of Sussex Pelhams in the Elizabethan period were those of Bucksted, or Buckstepe, and later of Michaelham. They were descended from Anthony, fourth son of Thomas Pelham who died in 1516, and younger brother of Sir William Pelham of Laughton. This Anthony Pelham Esq. is described as of Bucksted or Buckstepe in Warbleton. 34 Warbleton village lies about six miles to the North East of Laughton. The manor of Hendall in

31. S.A.C., ix, 170-19.
32. See Appendices 20 & 26.
33. Comber, (Lewes), 206-17.
34. S.A.C., ix, 220-71; Comber, (Lewes), 210.; S.N.Q., iv, 79.
Bucksted there had come into the possession of the Pelhams, perhaps by marriage with an heiress of the Wiston family who had formerly owned it, and was the residence of a branch of the Pelham family early in the 16th century. Thomas Pelham who died in 1516, before he inherited the Laughton estate from his brother was of Hendall, and after his death the Bucksted property went to his youngest son, Anthony. In 1857 it was said that the old mansion of Hendall still retained some of its Elizabethan characteristics and that there were at that time still traces of underground passages from the house.

Anthony Pelham was Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in the last year of his life, from November, 1565 on, his account as Sheriff being rendered after his death by his executor. He died on 22 November, 1566, leaving as his son and heir, Herbert, then aged 20 years old. This Herbert, later of Michaelham, was to be a J.P. and twice Sheriff of the county during Elizabeth's reign, and was head of this branch of the Pelham family in 1580.

Whether armigerous.

The Pelhams were an armigerous family from an early date. Named in the 1411 list of Sussex gentry. Named in the 1570 Visitation of Sussex. Also in that of 1634 Visitation of Sussex. Also in that of 1662.

35. S.A.C., loc.cit.
36. Ibid; and S.A.C.,xxiv,200n.
37. S.A.C.,ix,220-71.
38. P.R.O. Sheriffs.
40. S.A.C.,lxix, 53 et seqq.
41. S.A.C.,xxxix, 101.
42. E.M. Add. MS, 17,065. f.6.
43. H.C. MS, C.27.
44. S.A.C.,xxxix, 124.
(Pelham continued.)

(1) Pelham of Laughton.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir John Pelham, eld. son and heir of Sir Nicholas Pelham, knt., of Halland in Laughton who was J.P. Sussex, 1559-1561, and who died 15 Sept., 1560, and of Anne, d. of Sir John Sackville of Buckhurst.

1564, in bishop's letter as no Justice but a favourer of godly proceedings.47

1565 – Jan., 1581, J.P. Sussex.48 Lately of the Quorum.

c. 1569, as lord of Laughton manor, took part in the Dicker dispute against Anthony Smyth, the Crown's tenant; prolonged litigation followed which continued until John Pelham's death, beginning in the Court of the Duchy of Lancaster and subsequently being twice brought before the Star Chamber. As a result, Pelham was committed to the Fleet at least twice, possibly four times, and the struggle continued after his death, ending in a withdrawal of the Queen's claim. Many local people were involved, including the Judge, Sir John Jefferys, who took the part of Pelham.49

1571, M.P. Sussex.50

1571-12, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex.51

A pril., 1572, became involved in the dispute between Lord Buckhurst and George and Henry Goring, (q.v.), concerning the right to fell timber on Balneth manor near Lewes. Pelham, then Sheriff, took the part of George Goring against Buckhurst.52

---

45. See note 30.
46. See note 25.
47. Camden Misc., ix, 10-11.
48. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 7-23. ("Mort" in 1581, - no.23; missing from 1572 list, no.14).
49. S.A.C., xliv, 234-15; B.M.Add., MS., 33, 187, ff.134 et seqq. Ref. to his having been in the Fleet 4 times, f.279-180. (See Pt.iii, ch.2 of this thesis.)
50. Browne Willis, op.cit., iii, 84.
51. See Appendix 4.
52. B.M.Add., MS., 33, 084, ff.12 & 14. (See also Pt.iii, ch.2 of this thesis.)
(Pelham continued.)

1573, knighted.  
1574, owned 2 forges & a furnace in Sussex.  
1579, took part in the attack on Edmund Curtis, Vicar of Cuckfield, joining up in this dispute with Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield. (q.v.).

12 Nov., 1580, died. I.P.M. Will.

Wife.

Judith, d. of Oliver, Lord St. John of Bletso. Her will pr., 1607.

Children.

Oliver  A few months old at father's death. Died, 1585  
Succeeded by his uncle, Sir Thomas Pelham, though his own mother had a life interest in certain Pelham lands.

Heir to the Laughton estates therefore was:—

Sir Thomas Pelham, later bart., 2nd s. of Sir Nicholas Pelham of Laughton and younger brother of Sir John Pelham of the same who died, Nov., 1580. (V. supra). Succeeded his nephew, Oliver, in 1585.

J.P. Sussex, 1585 - 1590 and 1595 - end of reign at least.

1587, in the certificate concerning the Sussex J.P's, was described as a J.P. of Pevensey Rape who was a "good justice as well in respect of religion as of the Commonwealth". But, "Mr. Pellam is full of infirmyty", so that it was thought new appointments should be made.

1586, M.P. for Sussex.

53. Shaw, ii, 75.  
54. See Appendix 29.  
55. S.A.C., xliv, 16.  
57. F.C.C. Arundell; S.N.C., i11,90.  
58. Comber, (Lewes), 207; V.C.H., Sussex, ix,79.  
59. V.C.H., loc.cit.  
(Pelham continued.)

1588, assessed at £100 for the Armada Loan, the highest rate with 14 others.65

1589, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex.66

3 June, 1601, added to the existing number of Deputy Lieutenants for Sussex, with Sir Robert Sackville, Sir Thomas Shirley being dropped.67

1611, cr. a baronet.68

He left Laughton for Halland Place which he completed in 1595.69 He purchased the Rape of Hastings from Henry, Earl of Huntingdon in 1591;70 bought the manor of Foxhunt;71 built and endowed Cuckfield School in 1589;72 became trustee in 1599 for the Michaelham property of his cousin, Herbert Pelham Esq., because of the latter's financial difficulties. In 1601, this property was sold to liquidate Herbert Pelham's debts.73 Sir Thomas appears to have acquired some of these lands himself.74

2 Dec., 1624, died. I.P.M.75

(Footnotes contd. from previous page.)

62. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 27-32, and 37-44. Perhaps was also the commissioner for musters and for the restraint of grain, c.1585, under the name of 'John'. B.M.Harl. MS., 474, ff.51 and 92.
63. S.A.C., ii,59.
64. Official Returns.
65. S.A.C., i,37.
66. See Appendix 4.
67. See Appendix 2.
68. G.E.C., Complete Baronetage, 1,8.
69. S.A.C., xlii,44; iii,228.
70. S.A.C., xxxvii,44 et seqq.
71. S.A.C., xiii,69.
72. S.A.C., xlii,44; xliii,7; B.H.Calendar, A.523.
73. S.A.C., vi, 160-1.
74. S.A.C., xxxvii, 47.
75. S.A.C., i,i,124; S.R.S., xiv,182; P.R.O., C.142/417/41. For his will, see B.H.Calendar, A.106.
(Pelham continued.)

Wife.

Mary, d. of Sir Thomas Walsingham of Chislehurst, Kent, cousin of Sir Francis Walsingham.76

Children.

Thomas Later Sir Thomas Pelham, 2nd bart. Bap., 1597. M.P. for E. Grinstead, 1620-11; M.P. Sussex, 1625, 1640 (Short Parliament), 1640 (Long Parliament), 1654. Strong Parliamentarian.78 1633, involved in a fray with Sir Thomas Lunsford of Hoathly, (q.v.).79 Named in Walter Covert's will and appointed his executor.80 Alienated some of his late father's lands, 1625.81

Judith.82

Education. (1580 family).

Universities.

Father John, perhaps matric. pens. From Queens' Coll., Camb., Easter, 1549.82a

Son (Oliver) -

(The future Sir Thomas Pelham, uncle and heir to Oliver, matric. fell. comm. from Queens' Coll., Camb., Michs., 1561;83 and was probably admitted to Gray's Inn, 1566.84

Marriages of children. (1580 family.)

Oliver died in infancy.

76. Comber, (Lewes), 207; D.N.B., sub. "Sir Francis Walsingham" and "Sir Edmund Walsingham".
77. Comber, loc. cit; and father's I.P.M.
78. S.A.C., lxx, 156; Official Returns.
79. D.N.B. sub "Sir Thomas Lunsford".
80. S.A.C., xlvii, 145.
81. S.A.C., xxxvii, 47.
82. Comber, loc. cit.
83. Ibid.
84. Gray's Inn Admissions, 35.
(Pelham continued.)

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Laughton, Shiplake Hundred, Pevensey Rape).

38 Henry VIII Nicholas Pelham Esq. in lands £80.85
   (Commissioner)
14 Elizabeth John Pelham Esq. " " £40.86
18 Elizabeth Sir John Pelham, knt., " " £40.87
   (Commissioner)

(As of East Hoathly, Shiplake Hundred, Pevensey Rape).

1-2 Charles I Sir Thomas Pelham, bart. in lands £40.88
   (Commissioner)

(ii) Pelham of Hastings.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.


(Sometimes called "Edward Pelham") Resided in Hastings. 90

1550, received a legacy from Thomas Jefferay. 91

24 Nov., 1575, called to the Bar. 92

85. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
86. " E.179/190/283.
87. " E.179/190/298.
89. Comber, (Lewes), 207.
90. S.A.C., xiv, sketch opp.107.
91. S.A.C., xiv, 221.
92. Pension Book of Gray's Inn, 1,19.
April, 1582, committed to the Fleet for "boldness and offence" in his defence of Herbert Pelham, his cousin, before the Privy Council when Herbert was questioned as to why he refused to take the office of Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex. 93

1585-1602 at least, J.P. Sussex. 94 Of the Quorum.

1587, mentioned in the certificate concerning the Sussex J.P.'s as a "cold professor in religion" and as "a lawyer, much at London." 95

1588, Assistant Autumn Reader at Gray's Inn. 1601, 2nd Lent Reader. 96

1592, with Herbert Pelham and 2 others, commissioned to survey Pevensey Castle. 97

1597, M.P. for Hastings. 98

1602, appointed Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland, but in May it was reported that he "makes no haste to go." 99

July, 1604, knighted. 100

4 July, 1606, died. I.P.M. 101

Wife.

Ellen, d. of Thomas Darrell of Scotney, Sussex (q.v.). She appears in an entry in an Act Book of the Archdeaconry Court of Lewes, 12 Sept., 1609, as Dame Ellen Pelham, presented with her daughter and her servant "for being popish recusants". Also, on 16 Sept., Herbert Pelham ar. was presented "for entertaining and harbouring within his house Dame Ellen Pelham, Ellen Pelham and George Tindall being popish recusants". 102

93. S.A.C., vii, 209; H.M.C.Hatfield MSS, 11,502.
94. P.R.O. Assizes, i, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 27-44.
95. S.A.C., ii, 58.
96. Pension Book of Gray's Inn, i, 82, 151.
97. S.A.C., xlix, 30.
98. Official Returns.
99. F.E.Ball, The Judges in Ireland, i, 226; Cal.S.P.D., 1601-13, 183; H.M.C.Hatfield MSS, xl, 437.
100. Shaw, ii, 133.
101. S.A.C., xiv, 107 n.; P.R.O., C.142/298/104.
102. S.A.C., xlix, 56. The Herbert here referred to was probably Herbert Pelham of Michaelham in Catsfield. The entry is for Catsfield.
Children.

Herbert  Only son. Aged 19 in 1606.

Ellen  (See note on her mother).

Education.

Father  Universities.

Son  Inns of Court.  

Adm. Gray's Inn, 1563.  

Nov., 1575, called to the Bar,  

(see note 92., supra; and  

general notes for his legal  

career).

Marriages of children.

Herbert  ?  

Ellen  md. Tristram Woodward of the Middle Temple.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hundred of Nendfield (sic), Hastings Rape).

37 Elizabeth  Edmond Pelham Esq.  in lands  £10.

(iii) Pelham of Bucksted and later of Michaelham.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Herbert Pelham Esq., only son of Anthony Pelham Esq. of  

Bucksted or Buckstepe, who was no Justice but a "favourer  

of godly proceedings" in the bishop's letter of 1564, and a J.P. in 1565 and 1566, and who died 22 Nov., 1566,  

and of Margaret, d. of .

£

103. Comber, (Leuws), 207.
104. Gray's Inn Admissions, 32.
105. Gray's Inn Admissions, 98.
107. P.R.O., B.179/190/332.
108. Camden Misc., ix, 10.
110. S.A.C., ix, 220-1.
Aged 20 at his father's death. 111.

1576-17, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex. 112.

April, 1582, questioned by the Privy Council for refusing to be Sheriff. He replied that, living in Winchelsea, within the liberty of the Cinque Ports, he thought he was exempt by charter from all offices outside that liberty, but now confessed that this was an error. Was dismissed without punishment, having already been committed to the Marshalsea by the Lord Treasurer for 1 month, 2 days. His cousin Edmund Pelham defended him before the Privy Council, (v. supra). 113.

1584, with George Goring, unsuccessfully contested the county seats for Sussex. Robert Sackville and Sir Thomas Shirley, the successful candidates, were supported by Lord Buckhurst and Viscount Montague. 114.

1584, M. P. for Winchelsea. 115.

1590-1, Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex. 116.

1604, M. P. for Reigate. 117.

1582-15, J. P. Sussex. 118.

1587, in certificate concerning Sussex J. P's, mentioned as having been dropped from the Commission, though sound politically and religiously because "he wold styfly be carried with the first report and devise". 119. Did not re-appear on the Commission T.R. Eliz.

1592, appointed to survey Pevensey Castle with his cousin Edmund. 120.

c. 1580, with another, was exporting iron from Pevensey. 121.

31 Oct., 1587, purchased from John Morley of Halnaker Esq., and his wife, Elizabeth, the site of Michaelham priory together with 787 acres of land and its manor and messuages. (Herbert Pelham was then described as "of Hellingly"). But he apparently soon fell into pecuniary difficulties.

III. I.F.M., P.R.O., C. 142/145/12.
112. See Appendix 4.
113. S.A.C., viii, 209; H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 11,502.
114. B.M. Harl MS., 703, f. 18b and f. 19b.
116. See Appendix 4.
117. H. Matthews, loc. cit.
119. S.A.C., iii, 60.
120. S.A.C., xliii, 30.
121. S.A.C., lIII, 59.
1590, granted to John Michell of Cuckfield an annuity of 100 marks for 15 years "to be paid at the manor house of Michaelham" in consideration of £400 advanced.

1599, Herbert Pelham's whole interest in this property was made over to Thomas Pelham of Laughton and 2 others, in trust, with a view to sale from the proceeds of which an annuity was to be reserved for Herbert Pelham and his family for life, (£400 p.a.), the residue going to discharge his debts and the surplus, if any, being reserved for Herbert Pelham's heirs. This was "because by reason of his great debts he was not able to travel about the sale of his lands for the satisfaction of his said debts yet intended they should be paid as soon as they conveniently might."

6 April, 1601, the trustees sold the property to the Lord Treasurer Buckhurst, and Cecily his wife, and heirs, for £4,700.122

16 Sept., 1609, entry in the Act Book of the Archdeaconry Court of Lewes, under "Catsfield" concerns the presentation of Herbert Pelham, ar., "for entertaining and harbouring within his house Dame Ellen Pelham, Ellen Pelham and George Tindall, being popish recusants - and further he hath common resorters to his house who are popish recusants and for not receiving communion this twelve month". 123

2 March, 1611, entry in the same under "Catsfield" : Herbert Pelham, ar., presented "for not receiving the Communion at Easter last nor since, and for this his church mark is not sufficient; And also for disturbing Mr. Large in his preaching he being an excommunicated person and refusing to go out of the Church; and for using irreverent speeches, as the Churchwardens were informed to the diffamation of Mr. Large their minister there, viz. "That Mr Large should say that hee had as leefe see a sowe ware a saddell as see a minister ware a surplice". 124

30 July, 1624, died. 125

Wives: 126

Md. twice:-
1) Katherine, d. of John Thatcher of Priesthawes.
2) Elizabeth, d. of Thomas West, Lord De la Warr.

122. S.A.C., vi, 160-1. Herbert Pelham alienated much property during his lifetime, e.g. the manor of Ewhurst which he obtained soon after his second marriage. This passed shortly afterwards to William Comber. (S.A.C., lxii, 152; S.R.S., xx, 404-"Sompting"). He sold the manors of (contd. on next page).
Pelham continued.)

Children.\(^{127}\) By his first wife:-

Herbert Eld. s. and heir apparent. Ancestor of the Pelhams of Swinshe\(d\), Lincs.\(^{128}\)

John

Anthony

Margaret

By his second wife:-

Thomas Ancestor of the Pelhams of Compton, Valence, Dorset.

Hester Bur. at Ashburnham, 15 Aug., 1625.\(^{130}\)

Education.

|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|

(Note: Some of Herbert Pelham's sons may have been partly educated in Italy. Some were travelling there, 1596.)\(^{139}\)

(Footnotes contd. from previous page)

122. Whatlington and Poplesham to Sir Thomas Pelham, bart., for £5,730. (S.A.C., xxxvii, 47; Horsfield, i, 527).

123. S.A.C., xlix, 56. 125. Comber, (Lewes), 211.

124. Ibid. 58. 126. Ibid.

128. Ibid.; Comber is clearly mistaken about his age, confusing this Herbert with his son of the same name, the colonist. (See D.N.B. sub "Herbert Pelham", 1600-1673\(^{\text{a}}\); S.A.C., ix, 221.

129. S.A.C., ix, 220-1; Comber, loc. cit.

130. S.A.C., xxxiii, 59. (contd. on next page)
(Pelham continued.)

Marriages of children.

Of the first marriage:

Herbert md. Penelope, d. of Thomas West, Lord De la Warr.
John
Anthony
Margaret

Of the second marriage:

Thomas md. - (Their ancestors were of Compton Valence, Dorset. V. supra.)
Hester

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hundred of Foxearle, Hastings Rape).

2 Elizabeth Anthony Pelham Esq., in lands £100
(As of Hellingly, Hundred of Dyll, Pevensey Rape).

14 Elizabeth Herbert Pelham Esq. in lands £50.

18 Elizabeth Herbert Pelham Esq. " " £30.

(Footnotes contd. from previous page).

132. Gray's Inn Admissions, 73.
133. Ibid., 95.
135. Middle Temple Admissions, 1,82.
137. Lincoln's Inn Admissions,1,188.
139. Cal.S.P.D.,1595-'7', 328.

140. Comber, (Lewes),211; D.N.B., sub "Herbert Pelham, 1600-'73" for their son.
141. P.R.O., E.179/190/286.
142. " E.179/190/283.
143. " E.179/190/298
PERCY, Earl of Northumberland.

Origins.

The early history of the family of Percy is largely irrelevant to this study; for, although they acquired extensive estates in and about Petworth and elsewhere in Sussex as early as the twelfth century, their main residence and scene of activities down to the sixteenth century seems always to have been in the North.

An attempt to trace the descent of the Honour of Petworth from the time of Domesday until it became vested in the Percies has been made by Dr. Salzman. It appears from his investigations that the feoffees who held it at the accession of Stephen simply disappeared in the course of his reign and that "in some way the Honour escheated to the overlord, Adeliz, widow of Henry I, . . . She bestowed it upon her brother, Joscelin, who married Agnes heir of William de Percy, from whom his descendants took their name, and it remained for centuries in the hands of the Percies."

It seems probable that the descendants of Joscelin and Agnes who were known as Barons of Petworth until in 1377 they were created Earls of Northumberland, had a house of some sort at Petworth from the time of their coming into possession of the estate. The earliest positive evidence for this, however, is a licence dated 1309, permitting Henry de Percy, 1st Baron of Alnwick, to embattle his residence at Petworth. It is not known at what date this early residence was allowed to fall into disrepair, but "as the principal residences of the Earls of Northumberland were in the North of England, it is not very likely they should have cared to reside much at Petworth, and in consequence they would not feel sufficient interest in the original manor house to induce them to keep it up." Moreover, as the writer of this article suggests, the dimensions of so modest a residence were probably quite inadequate for the Earls and even the minimum number of retainers.

It was apparently not until some time in the sixteenth century that the Earls of Northumberland turned their attention to the provision of a house at Petworth which would be suitable as a residence for themselves. A remark of Leland's in his "Itinerary", made after he had visited Petworth, suggests that

1. Dr. L.F. Salzman: "On the Early History of the Honour of Petworth", (S.A.C., lxviii, 60 et seqq.) See also notes on origins of the Dawtrey family.
2. S.A.C., xiv, 1 et seqq.; G.E.C., ix, 708.
3. S.A.C., xiv, 5.
4. ibid.
5. ibid., 6.
the Earls were spending more time there even in Henry VII's reign: "The market town of Petworth yn the wald of Southsax ys right well encreasid syns the Yerles of Northumberland usid little to ly there. For now the men there make good cloth. .. One Parson Acon builid the spire of the faire steple there in the towne and also made the fayre bridge of stone, caullid Rotherbridge, scant a mile from Petworth, upon the water that commith downe from Cowdray." During the twenty years too, from 1537 to 1557, when the Petworth estates were vested in the Crown as a result of the death without issue of Henry Percy, the 6th Earl, and the attainder and execution of Sir Thomas Percy, his younger brother in the same year, 1537, - Edward VI was entertained at Petworth for five days, in 1552, probably by Henry, Earl of Arundel, who held the Crown Office of "Master of the Game." This fact does suggest that there was some sort of residence at Petworth by 1552 at least.

It is not known by whom the first house was built at Petworth after the embattled building had been abandoned, but it was the 8th Earl who undertook to enlarge and repair it between 1576 and 1582; an entry in the Burwell MSS says that in 1576, the first year of this undertaking, £2,829.16s. was spent on it, and that thereafter, until the completion of the work in 1582, a further £4,126. 9s. 8d. was also spent. Evidently it was an enterprise of some magnitude. Indeed, if the accommodation provided for people was on as generous a scale as the stabling, it must have approached the sumptuous. For, as Fuller said in his "Worthies", "Petworth, the house of the Earls of Northumberland, is most famous for a stately stable, the best of any subjects in Christendom as it affords 9 stabling for threescore horses with all necessary accommodation" Even assuming that the Earl was an ardent horse-fancier and kept something like that number of mounts for the use of himself and his household so that there need have been no corresponding house-room for guests, the figure suggests the need for a considerable number of grooms and stable-boys who must have been lodged on the premises.

A memorandum in the Petworth Parish Registers also remarks, "Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, began in 1577 to repair the Honour", i.e. the mansion house of Petworth and also to make his new work of building of the same honour to his great charge and brought water into every office of the said house." 10

7. Ibid., 7-8.
8. Ibid., 6-7.
9. Ibid. - quoted.
10. Ibid.
(Percy, Earl of Northumberland continued.)

The 9th Earl had even greater ambitions and planned to build a new mansion of even larger dimensions. However, the Star Chamber fine of £20,000, imposed after the Gunpowder Plot, somewhat cramped his style; he had, perforce, to be content with a mere enlargement of his father's residence. 11

The situation of Petworth is worthy of note, for it was within easy reach of Arundel and Cowdray, and not far distant from Stanstead. More mileage therefore presented no insuperable difficulty whenever an Earl of Northumberland, an Earl of Arundel, or, before 1572, his son-in-law the Duke of Norfolk, when staying with him, a Viscount Montague and a Baron Lumley wished to communicate with one another, even when all were away from Court. And, while Petworth is no more than 50 miles from London, the journey there was, by all accounts, a most hazardous undertaking down to the eighteenth century. 12 The proverbial foulness of Sussex roads, particularly through the Wealden clay, had its uses when the government was over-watchful or when the Queen threatened a visit. In June, 1583, at a time when the Earl had other matters on hand of a somewhat private nature, the Queen proposed to honour him with a visit to Petworth, and one of the regrettable obstacles to the plan referred to by the Earl's secretary in his letter to Sir Francis Walsingham was the shocking state of the roads which might necessitate the Queen's alighting from her litter to make her way on foot, though the hills were far too steep for her. Evidently, it was a wet summer. 13 The 9th Earl had a better opinion of the Queen's stamina when, in July, 1591, he endeavoured through Lord Cobham, Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, to obtain the honour which his father had sought so strenuously to avoid. 14 By 1591 the Sussex air was certainly healthier.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Henry Percy, 8th Earl of Northumberland, younger son of Sir Thomas Percy who was attainted and executed in 1537

11. Ibid., 6.
12. S.A.C.,xiv,14 et seqq.
for his prominent part in the Pilgrimage of Grace, and of Eleanor, sis. and coh. of George Harbottle of Beamish, co. Durham. 15 He was the younger brother of Sir Thomas Percy, the 7th Earl, who had been restored to his title and lands by Queen Mary in 1557 after the one had been in abeyance and the other vested in the Crown for 20 years, and who was attainted and executed in 1572 for his part in the Rising of the Northern Earls in 1569. At his death, his title passed by the reversionary clause in the patent of creation and despite his attainder, to his brother, Henry, who became 8th Earl. 16

c.1532, born. 17
1557, knighted. 18
1559-‘60, took part in the war against the Scots. 19
1569, remained loyal during his brother’s rebellion.
1571, took part in the current intrigues on behalf of Mary, Queen of Scots. Was one of those implicated by the confessions of the Bishop of Ross after the latter’s arrest in May. 20

13 October, 1571, was implicated by one of the Duke of Norfolk’s answers to questions put to him about the Ridolfi plot. The Duke confessed that one plan had been to convey Mary Queen of Scots, with Sir Henry Percy’s aid, to Scotland. 21

18 and 19 Oct., 1571, confessions of one, Edmund Powell, under examination, about intrigues between Sir Henry Percy, the Bishop of Ross and the Earl of Arundel, to remove Mary, Queen of Scots from captivity. But clearly the Earl of Arundel distrusted Sir Henry Percy. 22

Nov., 1571, arrested and sent to the Tower. 23

August, 1572, his elder brother, Sir Thomas Percy, 7th Earl of Northumberland, was executed. He succeeded to the Earldom. 24

15. G.E.C., ix, 728.
17. D.N.B., sub "Henry Percy, 8th Earl of Northumberland".
18. Shaw, ii, 70.
19. D.N.B.
20. D.N.B., sub "John Leslie". H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, i, 526-78; 544 et seq; 546 et seq; 549.
21. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, i, 535.
22. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, 1, 544, 546, 549.
23. D.N.B.
24. D.N.B., sub "Sir Thomas Percy, 7th Earl of Northumber-

land."
(Percy, Earl of Northumberland continued.)

1573, released from arrest. Commenced fresh intrigues.

June, 1583, Queen Elizabeth intended a visit to him at Petworth. The Earl's secretary, Sir William Cornwallis, replied expressing the Earl's pleasure but emphasising all the difficulties, the shortness of time for preparation, the state of the Countess' health, the condition of the Sussex roads etc.

17 Dec., 1583, interrogatories drawn up for the examination of the Earl concerning the departure of Lord Paget and Charles Arundel to France without licence.

20 Dec., 1583, confined to his London house on suspicion of having participated in the Throgmorton conspiracy and assisted in the visits to Arundel of Charles Paget and Lord Paget, and aided their flight on Throgmorton's arrest. Philip, Earl of Arundel, was confined to his London house at the same time. (See his biography).

24 Dec., 1583, examination of the Earl of Arundel about his dealings with the Earl of Northumberland in the matter. His answers.

28 Dec., 1583, examination of the Earl of Northumberland's servants.

9 Jan., 1584, examination of the Earl of Northumberland's servants.

29 Jan., 1584, Charles Paget's sister in a letter to her brother wrote of the trouble his visit to England had caused the Earl of Northumberland.

Feb., 1584, sent to the Tower. There he and William Shelley were closely examined.

He remained in the Tower, though his guilt was not proved, until 21 June, 1585 when he was found shot through the heart. A verdict of suicide was returned.

25. D.N.B.
27. Cal.S.P.D., 1581-90, 137.
28. Ibid., 159, no. 47.
29. Cal.S.P.D., 1581-90, 139.
30. Ibid., 140-141; 151.
31. Ibid., 156.
32. Ibid., 159, no. 14; 167, no. 79; 242, no. 74. D.N.B.
33. Cal.S.P.D., 1581-90, 159, no. 14; 187, no. 79; B.M.Lansd. MS, 45, no. 75.
34. D.N.B.; S.A.C., v, 195; B.M.Lansd.MS, 45, f. 175.
1580-1585, had been a J.P. Sussex. Sometimes of the Quorum.

(For his tenure of offices under the Crown, see Appendix 31.)

c. 1574, listed as the owner of an iron forge and a furnace in Petworth Great Park, in the hands of a Mr. Blackwell.

1576-1582, undertook the enlargement and repair of Petworth House. Estimated to have spent c. £7,000 on this.

Wife.

Catherine, his cousin, eldest d. and coh. of John Neville, Lord Latimer, by Lucy, 2nd d. of Henry Somerset, 2nd Earl of Worcester, and sister of Anne, Countess of Northumberland. They were married 25 Jan., 1562. She was aged 31 at her father's death in April, 1577 when she inherited Burton Latimer, Northants. She was living in London at the time of the Earl's death. She remarried, shortly after 5 Dec., 1587, Francis Fitton, then of Binfield, Berks., who d.s.p. 17 June, 1608. She died 28 Oct., 1596, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. I.P.M. and P.C.C. Admon.

Children.

Henry Later 9th Earl of Northumberland. Born shortly before 27 April, 1564 at Tynemouth Castle and styled Lord Percy from 1572-1585. J.P. Sussex, 1593 - end of reign at least. 5 Nov., 1632, died.

Thomas d.s.p. April, 1557.

William d.s.p. May, 1648.


Richard knighted, 1598. D.s.p. 1648 or 1649.


George died March, 1632.
(Percy, Earl of Northumberland, continued.)

Ann died in infancy.  
Lucy  
Eleanor

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Gray's Inn, 31</td>
<td>June, 1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>入学, 1594, 1597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joscelin</td>
<td>Middle Temple, 12 May,</td>
<td>1594.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Middle Temple, 12 May,</td>
<td>1597.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes

47. Collins, ii, 328; B.M.Lansd. MS, 874, f. 118.  
48. Gray's Inn Admissions, 47.  
49. Al.Ox., iii, 114.  
50. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 66.  
51. Al.Ox., cit.  
52. Gray's Inn Admissions, 63.  
53. Al.Ox., cit.  
54. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 66.  
55. Al.Ox., cit.  
56. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 71.  
57. Al.Ox., 11.  
58. Ibid.  
59. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 71.
(Percy, Earl of Northumberland, continued.)

Marriages of children.

Henry  md. Dorothy, widow of Sir Thomas Perrot, knt., and daughter of Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex. Issue. 61

Thomas  umd.

William  "


Richard  umd.

Alan  md. in 1608, Mary, d. and h. of Sir John Fitz of Fitzford in Devonshire. She remarried 3 times.

Joscelin  umd.

George  "

Ann  died in infancy.

Lucy  md. twice:- (a) Sir John Wotton, knt. (b) Sir Hugh Owen of Anglesey, knt.

Eleanor  md. Sir William Herbert, K.B., who became Baron Powis in 5 Charles I.

POOLE.

Origins.

Henry Poole who was a J.P. of Sussex in 1564 appears to have been no connection of the recusant family sometime resident at Lordington in the parish of Racton in West Sussex, the family of Cardinal Poole, or Pole. ¹

He appears in the bishop's letter of 1564 as a J.P. of the East part and is described as "Mr Henry Poole of Ditchling". (V.infra).

In his will he mentions among his relatives, Sir Giles Poole, knt., "my good brother", and refers to Sir Giles' son, Henry. He mentions in this will property not merely in Ditchling and Keymer in Sussex, but also in Somersetshire. (V. infra).

It seems therefore, that he was the Henry Poole whose name appears in the pedigree of the Poole family of Gloucestershire in the Visitation of that county for 1623,² as a son of Leonard Poole who died in Sept., 1538, and brother of Mathew Poole of Saberton, Gloucestershire, from whom the Pooles of Yorkshire were descended. He was also brother of "Gyles" Poole, who died in February, 1588, whose son was Sir Henry Poole, "of Saperton, knt." No further details of this Henry Poole are given in the Gloucestershire Visitation.

It is difficult to discover when he settled in Ditchling or acquired property there and in Keymer, since there is no trace of his name among the recorded fines for those places. Probably his Sussex property came to him by his marriage to Margaret, daughter of George, 3rd Lord Abergavenny, whose arms appear on the monumental inscription to Henry Poole in Ditchling Church, ³ and who is mentioned in her husband's will. Henry Poole, in his will, left his armour to "my good lord, Henry, Lord Abergavenny." ⁴

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in the 1570 or 1634 Visitations of Sussex, but appears in the 1623 Visitation of Gloucestershire. ⁶

1. For that family, see Elwes,178 et seqq; S.A.C.,xxi,73 et seqq; Harl.Soc.Pubns.,liii,89.
5. P.C.C. 15 Arundell.
Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Henry Poole of Ditchling, Sussex, Esq., son of Leonard Poole of Gloucestershire who died 30 Sept., 1538, and of Catherine, d. of Gyles Bridges, knt. 7

J.P. Sussex, 1564. 8

1564, in bishop's letter, described as a J.P. of the East part of the county, and a "mislyker of religion and godly proceedings". 9

1568, deforciant in fine with Margaret, his wife, for the manors of Hastings and Cullyngton. 10

Possibly a military man, judging from the great number of pieces of military equipment bequeathed in his will, - rapiers, daggers, corselets etc. 11

In his will, mentions among his friends, William Apsley Esq., "my very trusty friend" whom he appointed his executor, Mr. Richard Bellingham of Hangleton, Mr. John Eversfield, the elder, Sir John Pelham, knt., Mr. Anthony Stapley, Thomas Pelham, gent., and Mr. Richard Jefferys. His overseers were Sir John Pelham and John Shurley. 12

In this will, mentions houses, lands, tenements and hereditaments in Blackfriars, London; also property in Somersetshire including Compton Dando, Sheward's Wyke etc., whose disposal is to be supervised by William Apsley and Thomas Pelham.

28 March, 1580, died. M.I. in Ditchling Church. 13 In his will, directed that he should be buried in Ditchling Church, "behind my pewe there", and that his arms should be engraved on his tomb.

12. Another friend was Thomas Culpepper Esq. of Wakehurst who died in 1571, leaving his best gelding to Henry Poole, S.A.C., xlviii, 22.
13. Horsfield, i, 238; S.A.C., xiii, 255; xxviii, 134-16; lxxi, 147.
Wife.
Margaret, d. of George Nevill, Lord Abergavenny, and his wife, Mary, d. of Edward Stafford, Duke of Buckingham. She was probably the widow of one, John Cheyney. Living at the date of her husband's will, 28 Jan., 1580.

Children.
Thomas        Eld. son and heir. Mentioned in father's will.
John          Mentioned in father's will.
Francis       "   "   "   "
George        "   "   "   "
Henry         "   "   "   "
William       "   "   "   "

Education.
Father
Sons

Universities.                     Inns of Court.

Marriages of children.
Thomas       md. before 1576, Elizabeth, d. and coh. of Roger Wingfield of "Great Durham", Norfolk, Esq., (possibly East Dereham). Issue.
John         Francis       md. Ann, d. of George Covert of Slaugham Esq., the great-uncle of Walter Covert of Slaugham Esq. (*q.v.*). Issue.
George       Henry         William

Subsidy assessments.
(As of Buttinghill Hundred, Lewes Rape.)
14 Elizabeth Henry Poole Esq. in lands £20.
(As of Street Hundred, Lewes Rape.)
18 Elizabeth Henry Poole Esq. in lands £20.

15. S.A.C., xxviii, 136; lxxi, 147.
16. P.C.C. 15 Arundell. See also S.A.C., xxviii, 135-6.
17. Lincoln's Inn Admission Register, I, 60.
18. S.A.C., xlii, 255; xxviii, 135-6 & 136n. Also P.C.C. 15 Arun-
19. S.A.C., xlvi, 124, n. 31; xxviii, 136. Also xlvi, (dell. 122-74 and 129-130 and xii, 255.
PORTER.

Origins.

According to one writer, this family was a younger branch of the Porters of Markham in Nottinghamshire, which had settled in Sussex in the reign of Henry VI. Towards the close of the sixteenth century, their principal residences were at Cuckfield, Lamberhurst and Wadhurst, but the family became very widely spread in Sussex.

The first Porter named by Berry and Comber is Stephen Porter of Pevensey whose will was proved in November, 1495, and who directed that he should be buried "in the Church of Hurstmonceux". His son and heir, Richard Porter of Battle, whose will was dated 26 January, 1557, and who wished "to be buried in Battle Church", had, by his wife, Joan, daughter of John Wilgoose, five sons and a daughter. The eldest son and heir, John, is described as "of Battle and Bayham". This John Porter left a will dated 30 April, 1574 and proved on 26 January, 1575. He appears at the time of his death to have owned a forge in Bayham and to have been in charge of a forge in Frant, a few miles west of Lamberhurst, which belonged to Viscount Montague.

It was the eldest son of the above-named John Porter who was a Sussex J.P. for some years towards the close of Elizabeth's reign, and who was head of the family in 1580. He had five brothers and a sister. His brother next in age, Richard Porter gent., of Bayham, whose will was dated 22 August and proved 5 September, 1584, may have been the M.P. for Midhurst in 1571.

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in the 1570 Visitation. They appear in that of 1634, and that of 1662.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Porter of Cuckfield, gent., eld. s. and h. of John Porter of Battle and Bayham who died in 1574, (v. supra)

1. S.A.C., vii, 130.
2. S.A.C., ix, 36n.
3. B.C., 200; P.C.C. 26 Vox.
4. B.C., loc.cit; Lewes wills, (Battle), 181.
5. i.e. Bayham Abbey on the borders of Kent and Sussex in the Lamberhurst neighbourhood.
7. See Appendix 29 and S.A.C., iii, 241.
(Porter continued)

and of Anne, d. of Richard Isted of Mayfield by Joan, his wife.13. Named in wills of father, of brother Stephen, proved 6 May, 158114. and of brother George, proved 8 Feb., 1586.15.

Perhaps a lawyer (see under 'Education')

Perhaps M.P. Bramber, 1586.16.

J.P. Sussex, 1594 - 19.17.


Wives.

Md. twice:-
1) Winifred, d. and coh. of John Sackville of Chiddingly Park Esq. (q.v.) 20.

Children.22.

By his first wife:-

Sackville Later of Seaford Esq. Bailiff of Seaford in 1635 and in several subsequent years.23. Mentioned in 1634 Visitation.

John Under 21 in his father's will.

Henry Of Seaford, gent. Named in father's, uncle Thomas24 and brother Sackville's wills. Own will dt. 15 Apr., 1650, pr. 15 Sept., 1653.25.

Hanna

By his second wife:-

Timothy or Timothea 7 (a daughter) Bap. at Cuckfield, 15 July, 1599. Named in wills of uncle Thomas and of her mother.

8. B. &C., loc.cit.
15. P.C.C. 7 Windsor.
(Porter continued)

Education. Universities. Inns of Court.

Father Perhaps adm. Lincoln's

Sons Sackville, matric. pens. Sackville, adm. Nov., 1602

John, St. Mary Hall, Oxf., John, adm. Inner Temple, Nov. 1594. 30

aged 15. 29

Marriages of children.

Of the first marriage:-

Sackville md. three times:— (a) Elizabeth, d. and coh. of

William Hay of Bugsill. Md. at E. Grinstead, 3

Dec., 1612. Issue, 1 son, John aged 21 in 1634

and 1 daughter, Winifred. (b) Ann, d. of

Thomas Rootes. No issue. (c) Mary, d. of

— Warden and relict of Thomas Norton of Ringmer,


Will, pr. Apr., 1650. 32

John md. twice:— (a) James Graves, gent., who died

5 Aug., 1626. Issue, — Sackville Graves Esq. of

West Firle, later J.P. (b) William Thomas of

Lewes and Westdean Esq. M. Lic. at Lewes, 5 Jan.,

1629.


(Univ. of London M.A. thesis), 560–7.

17. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 36-41. (Missing

for June, 1595 and for 1596, nos. 37 (June); 38).

18. B. & C., loc. cit.


23. S.A.C., vii, 130 & 150.


25. P.C.C. 284 Brent.

26. Lincoln's Inn Admissions, 1, 84 (as "of Kent", but he was

left lands in Kent under his father's will); Black Book

of Lincoln's Inn, 1, 435.

Porter continued)

Marriages of children contd.

Of the second marriage:

Timothy [Name] or Timothea [Name] md., before 1634, Nicholas Easton of Bourne, Sussex.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hundred of Battle, Hastings Rape)

38 Henry VIII. Richard Porter in lands £2233.
14 Elizabeth Richard Porter in goods £11
" " Robert Porter (sewer) in goods £934.

(As of Ditchling, Street Hundred, Lewes Rape)

1-2 Charles I Sackville Porter, gent., in lands £335.

29. Al. Ox., iii, 1182.
30. Ibid; Inner Temple Admissions, 139. Apparently went there before his elder brother, Sackville.
31. B. & C., loc. cit.
32. P. C. C. 57 Pembroke.
33. P. R. O., E. 179/190/225.
34. P. R. O. E. 179/190/283.
35. P. R. O., E. 179/191/337a. No Porters of Cuckfield appear in the Subsidy Rolls for Lewes Rape before this. Assessments for Porters of Battle Hundred in Hastings Rape or for Frant in Pevensey Rape, after 38 Henry VIII do not appear to be relevant to this family.
ROBERTS.

Origins.

Thomas Roberts who was a J.P. in 1560 and 1564 and who is mentioned in the Bishop’s letters of 1564 as a J.P. of the "East partell" and a "mislyker of religion and godly proceedings"; appears to have been the descendant of a Kentish family whose pedigree is given in Berry and Comber.2

The original family seat was at Glassenbery in Kent where the elder line was still settled in the Elizabethan period, but the Roberts had by that time acquired both property and family connections in the adjacent county.3 For example, Walter Roberts of Glassenbery Esq., whose will was proved in 1522,4 grandfather of Thomas Roberts, the Sussex J.P., married, after the death of his first wife, into the family of Culpepper and subsequently into that of Naylor of Wakehurst in Sussex.2 His eldest son by his first wife, John Roberts, married a daughter of Sir Richard Sackville, while one of his younger sons, William, settled at Battle in Sussex, married into the Sussex family of Threele, and appeared in the 1570 Visitation of Sussex.6

The Roberts are known to have held land in the parish of Ticehurst, in Hastings Rape, by 1488 when Walter Roberts received a licence to impark land and woods there as well as in Cranbrook and Goudhurst, Kent.7 The manor of Boarzell in that parish came into their possession sometime after 1432. It is described by Horsfield as, "An old moated manor house of considerable antiquity" which was "for centuries the property and till lately the residence of the family of Roberts, a branch of that at an early period settled at Glastenbery, Kent."8 The manor remained in the possession of the Roberts and their descendants until 1859.9

2. B.&C., 29.
3. Ibid; Visitation of Kent, 1619, (Harl. Soc. Pubns, xlii, 93)
5. B.&C., loc.cit.
8. Ibid; Horsfield, 1, 589.
(Roberts continued)

Thomas Roberts, the J.P., who was the second son of Thomas Roberts of Glassenbery, Kent, and younger brother of Walter Roberts of the same whose will was proved in 1580, died in 1567 without direct heirs, and was buried in the chancel of Ticehurst Church. His will was dated 4th February, 1565, and proved 20th November, 1576. He left the reversion of his lands to his younger brother, John, who died in 1573 and was also buried in Ticehurst Church, and to his heirs.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation. Also in that of 1634.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Walter Roberts, gent., of Boarzell, in Ticehurst, 2nd son of John Roberts, gent., of the same, who died in 1573 (v. supra) and of Elizabeth, d. of Robert Rygotte of Colewicke, Bucks.

Under 21 in will of Lady Margaret Hendley als Roberts, 1597.


Wife.


11. P.C.C. 37 Carew.
12. John's will dt. 11 Aug. 1573, pr. 20 Nov., 1576; P.C.C. 37 Carew.
14. H.C. Ms. C. 27.,f. 89.
15. B.&C., loc.cit. John Roberts' first son, also Walter, died in infancy.
17. B.&C., loc.cit; P.R.O., C. 142/720/2.
18. B.&C., loc.cit; H.C. Ms C. 27,f. 89; P.C.C. 133 Berkeley.
Children. 19.


Anthony. Bur. 27 May, 1639 at Ticehurst.

Walter
Joan
Elizabeth.

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children. 21.

John md. Johan, d. of Spicer of Sandhurst, Kent. Issue.

Anthony md. - Issue.

Walter md. - Issue.

Joan md. four times: - (a) Anthony May of Pashley in Ticehurst, (b) Richard Alfrey of Carsfield, Sussex, (c) John Gyles of Penshurst. (d) John Busbridge of Haremre in Etchingham, Sussex.


Subsidy assessments.
(As of Hundred of Shewswell, Hastings Rape)

2 Elizabeth Thomas Roberts Esq. in lands £100.22.

(Commissioner)

37 Elizabeth Thomas Roberts, gent., in goods £6.23.

Mistress Elizabeth Roberts, in lands £9.


22. P.R.O., E. 179/190/266.
23. P.R.O., E. 179/190/332. Evidently the uncle and grandmother of the younger John Roberts. (B.&C., loc.cit)
SACKVILLE, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset.

Origins.

The early history of the Sackvilles who rose to such eminence in the sixteenth century lies outside the scope of this study; yet it is noteworthy that while they were of the new aristocracy and owed their title and much of their wealth to the Tudor dynasty whom they so outstandingly served, their origins were by no means obscure. Among the gentry and nobility of Elizabethan Sussex, there was, perhaps, no family which could rival them in influence at Court or in the county as a whole; of the other titled families mainly resident in Sussex, all but one fell foul of the government at one time or another during the reign. Members of the Fitzalan, Howard, Lumley or Percy families were, at some time during that period, under house-arrest, or were summoned for interrogation or tried for treason, and even Sir Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague, was numbered among the well-wishers of the Ridolfi conspiracy.1. Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, however, steered a steady course as a loyalist. Only Baron De la Warr, could claim a similarly consistent devotion.

The influence of the Sackvilles in Sussex itself was probably partly due to their long connection with the county. As Miss Sackville-West has written, "Sussex, in fact, was their cradle long before they came into Kent. Buckhurst, which they had owned since the twelfth century, was at one time an even larger house than Knole, and to their own vault in the parish Church of Withiam they were invariably brought to rest".2. Buckhurst House in the parish of Withiam, Hartfield Hundred, Pevensey Rape, had originally belonged to the family of Dene who had also held the manor of 'Brochest' at the time of the Domesday Inquest.3. Ralph de Dene who had held both of these properties at that time, left a daughter and coheirress, Ela, through whom they passed to her husband, Jordan de Sackville. From him they descended through generations of Sackvilles right down to the sixteenth century.4. It was only some time after "the more eligible residence of Knowle in Kent" had been conferred on Lord Buckhurst in June, 1566, that a considerable part of Buckhurst House was pulled down and the materials used for building the hospital called Sackville College in East Grinstead, founded in 1608 by the Earl of Dorset.5. Before that, Buckhurst House had been the

1. See Part III, ch. 1, and notes on these families.
2. V. Sackville-West: Knole and the Sackvilles, (1923) 18. Cf. S.A.C., ix, 178, which says Bayham Abbey in Sussex was, in early times, the family burial place. See also P.C.C. 17 Laffennam, the will of Sir Thomas Sackville, who died in 1433, and wished to be buried there.
main family residence, and tradition has it that the Queen's grant of Knole to the Sackville family was made "on account of the foul ways in Sussex" which made access from Buckhurst to London nearly impracticable in winter. Naturally the very inaccessibility of Buckhurst, "at that date still an uncultivated and almost uninhabited district where droves of wild swine rooted for acorns under the oaks", suggests that neither Lord Buckhurst, nor his father, Sir Richard Sackville, who had, in his time, considerable public responsibilities as under treasurer of the Exchequer, could have spent much time there. But their long association with the place must have lent the family a good deal of local prestige.

Old Buckhurst, the ancient home of the Sackvilles, has been described in an article in the Sussex Archaeological Collections. Of it nothing now remains, according to Horsfield, but "a solitary tower of good masonry", and there is some doubt as to the approximate date of the building whose ruins still survive. The existence of certain architectural plans for Buckhurst House, drawn up by one, John Thorpe, an eminent architect of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods living between 1570 and 1621, has sometimes led to the assumption that Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, actually carried them out, and that he founded & completed a residence there which was so shortly after abandoned in favour of Knole. This theory has been challenged by W.D. Scull, who gives reasons for believing that the existing ruins at Buckhurst are the remains of a building erected between 1501 and 1536. He refers to the device of Queen Catherine of Aragon embodied in the structure of the work, a conceit which would probably occur to no builder after the initiation of the "divorce" proceedings, - and to the will of Sir John Sackville, dated 1556, which refers to his "new lodgings at Buckhurst". It is suggested in W.D. Scull's article that Sir John Sackville and his son, Sir Richard "Fillsack", who has sometimes been described as the founder of the family fortunes, were content to live in what Thomas Sackville, the

---

3. Horsfield, i, 393-4.
4. Ibid. It seems that, in the case of the manor of Buckhurst, there was an interruption, for, in 1273, on the death of one of the Sackvilles, the manor was seized by the Queen's bailiffs for her own use, though the son and heir was granted free warren there in 27 Edward I. (Horsfield, i, 394) The manor itself was granted to Edward Sackville and Margaret, his wife, on 1 August, 1442. (B.&C. 300n.)
5. Horsfield, 1, 393.
6. S.A.C., xlix, 162; V. Sackville-West, op.cit, 39.
7. V. Sackville-West, op.cit, 39.
grandson, later considered cramped quarters, and that Thomas, whose correspondence shows that he was absent from Buckhurst a great deal, perhaps partly for that reason, intended to build a much larger mansion. This idea was apparently never carried out although architectural plans were drawn up, since Buckhurst realised it would be more practical to spend his time and money on reconditioning Knole.11.

It should, perhaps, be pointed out that although the Queen granted the reversion of the manor of Knole to Thomas Sackville in June, 1566, this grant was subject to a lease to the Earl of Leicester, by whom the estate was again sublet, and it was not until 1603 that Buckhurst, or the Earl of Dorset as he then was, came into possession. It was only then that he was able to set to work to re-build part of Knole House from the plans which had been supplied at an earlier date by John Thorpe, which project was finished in 1605, only three years before Dorset's death.12.

By Queen Elizabeth's accession, the Sackvilles, though still outside the ranks of the peerage, were very well established both socially and materially. Concerning their early history, Miss Sackville-West has written that the first Sackville of whom there is any authentic record is Herbrand de Sackville, a contemporary of William I whom he accompanied to England.13. "Descending from him is a long monotonous list of Sir Jordans, Sir Andrews, Sir Edwards and Sir Richards, carrying us through the Crusades, the French wars and the Wars of the Roses, but none of whom has the slightest interest until we get to Sir Richard Sackville in the time of Henry VIII to Elizabeth, from his wealth called 'Sackfill' or 'Fillsack' though not, it appears, either griping or penurious".14.

8. S.A.C., liv, 62 et seqq
9. Horsfield, 1 393.
10. S.A.C., liv, 68 et seqq.
11. Ibid., et seqq; cf. D.N.B., sub "Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst and 1st Earl of Dorset" etc., which says he re-built Buckhurst House between 1560 and 1565. On 20 August, 1602, Buckhurst wrote to Sir Robert Cecil that he had not been in Sussex "but on two days these five or six years". (H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, xii, 309).
12. D.N.E.; V. Sackville-West, 5, 38-9; H.M.C. Sackville (Knole) MSS, i, p. xiii.
13. V. Sackville-West, 29. et seqq.
(Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued.)

Despite this summary dismissal of all the early Sackvilles, it is, perhaps, worth noting that one of them was three times county member for Sussex in Richard II's reign, and their name occurs frequently on the list of early Sheriffs. They appear in the list of Sussex gentry of 1411, and, according to one writer, derived their arms chiefly from the De Veres, since Sir Jordan de Sackville who died in 9 John, had married a daughter of the Earl of Oxford.

At the beginning of the Elizabethan period, they had property scattered fairly widely through the Eastern part of the county, and in the course of the reign they acquired more. Apart from their lands in the parish of Withiam itself, including Buckhurst estate, the Sackvilles held the manor of Chiddingly in Shiplake Hundred which they acquired in 1345 by virtue of a marriage to a De la Beche heiress, though a Sackville had been named in a military return of 1316 as a landholder in Chiddingly parish. Thereafter, Chiddingly Park was the occasional, and sometimes the principal residence of the Sackvilles; John Sackville Esq. who died in 1557, the father of Sir Richard Sackville, had a seat there and resided at it in his later years.

Sir Richard Sackville was Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations in 1548, and among the lands which came to the Sackvilles in the 16th century, not a few had been monastic. For example, the prebendal estates of the Saxon College at Bosham which had been retained by the Crown after the Dissolution, were granted in 6 Elizabeth to Sir Richard Sackville, who shortly after exchanged these and other lands for the lands of the dissolved priory of Wilmington; the latter had formerly been in the hands of the Dean and Chapter of Chichester, and were more conveniently situated for the Sackvilles, being in Pevensey Rape, while

15. S.A.C., xxxi, 110.
18. S.A.C., vi, 76.
19. Horsfield, i, 393 et seqq.
22. S.A.C., xiv, 216; Horsfield, loc. cit; S.A.C. iv, 56 et seqq. A cadet branch of the family, lately of Dorking and subsequently of Blechingly, Surrey, leased certain property in Chiddingly previous to 1593. (V. infra, Sackville of Chiddingly; and P.C.C. 33 Nevell, will of John Sackville Esq. of Chiddingly, dt. 1593.)
Bosham was close to the Hampshire border. The manor of Folkington, adjacent to Wilmington, was also Sackville property at Sir Richard Sackville's death. The manor of Aldwick, formerly monastic property, was granted by Henry VIII to a Sackville jointly with another, though the Sackvilles gave up their rights in it in 1560. The site of the priory of Michaelham in the parish of Arlington, and all its dependencies, were granted after the Dissolution to Sir Richard Sackville, from whom they passed in 1 Edward VI to the Bakers of Mayfield. Subsequently they came into the hands of a branch of the Pelhams who fell on hard times financially, so that in 1601, to liquidate his debts, Herbert Pelham Esq. was obliged to convey the site of the priory itself and all its appurtenances including the manor of Michaelham, to Lord Buckhurst for £4,700. On the Dissolution of the College of South Malling, the parsonage and advowson of the vicarage of South Malling were granted by Henry VIII to one of the Palmers whose son re-conveyed them to the Crown. In 33 Elizabeth, these, together with the manor and other property were granted to Sir Thomas Sackville and his heirs in return for a sum of money, and they remained in Sackville hands until shortly after the death of Richard, third Earl of Dorset, in 1624.

Other lands included the manor of Brighthelmstone held by Sir Richard Sackville in 1566, the manor of Bexhill granted by the Queen to Lord Buckhurst in 1570, and certain property in the parish of Sedlescombe which came into the hands of the Sackvilles in the 17th century.

23. D.N.B.
24. S.A.C., viii, 195-6; also iv, 56n, and 58 et seqq; lxix, 5, & 48; Horsfield, 1, 325.
25. Horsfield, 1, 324.
26. S.A.C., xix, 112n.
27. S.A.C., xiii, 96.
28. Horsfield, 1, 325; see also notes on 'Pelham'.
29. S.A.C., xxvi, 82.
30. S.A.C., xxxiv, 194.
31. Horsfield, 1, 111.
32. S.A.C., xix, 22.
33. V.C.H. Sussex, ix, 278; S.A.C., lxvi, 181 et seqq; 191-2; and Horsfield, 1, 524.
The Sackvilles were not without their town properties in the Elizabethan period. In Lewes, the manor of Southover which formerly belonged to the priory of St. Pancras outside the town, was granted after the Dissolution first to Thomas Cromwell and later to Anne of Cleves, but reverted to the Crown in each case, and was finally granted by Queen Elizabeth in 1559 to Sir Richard Baker and Sir Richard Sackville, eventually coming into the sole possession of the latter.34. His son, Lord Buckhurst, built a mansion in Lewes towards the close of the sixteenth century, near the ruins of Lewes Priory, which was known as "Lord's House". It was burned down in the late seventeenth century.35. In London, Sir Richard Sackville bought in 1564, for £641. 5. 10d., "The whole of the land lying between Bridewell and Water Lane from Fleet Street to the Thames", including the town house of the Bishop of Salisbury, Salisbury House, later called Dorset House.36. When these premises proved inadequate they were extended into the Strand and eventually into Whitehall where a second Dorset House was built after the Fire on the site of the present Treasury.

In addition to their land and house-property, the Sackvilles had a considerable interest in the Sussex iron-industry. In a list of owners of forges and furnaces in Sussex dated 1574, Lord Buckhurst is entered as owning one forge in Fletching which was in the hands of Mr Leech, one forge in Ashfield in the hands of Mr Relf, and one forge and one furnace in Parrock in the hands of George Bullen.37. The Sackvilles also had interests in the industry outside Sussex.38.

34. Horsfield, i, 216.
35. S.A.C., xiii, 218; Horsfield, i, 215. On 29 March, 1576, Lord Buckhurst bought the Barony of Lewes from the Earl of Derby for £4,000. (P.R.O., Close Roll, 18 Eliz., pt. 5)
36. V. Sackville-West, 31; H.M.C. Sackville (Knole) MSS.; i, p.xiii.
37. S.A.C., iii, 242; see also Appx. 29 and Horsfield, i, 355, 314.
38. S.A.C., ii, 187.
Two of the three main branches of the Sussex Sackvilles in the Elizabethan period, namely the Sackvilles of Seddlescombe and the Sackvilles of Buckhurst in Withiam, were both descended from John Sackville of Chiddingly Esq. who had been Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in 1527-18, 1540-1, and 1546-7, and who died on 26 September, 1557. He had married twice and had issue by his first wife, Margaret, daughter of Sir William Boleyn of Blickling, Norfolk, and aunt of Queen Anne Boleyn. Their children were two sons, Richard and Christopher, and three daughters who married into the families of Lunsford, Ashburnham and Pelham respectively.

The eldest son who became Sir Richard Sackville of Withiam is described by Miss Sackville-West as "the founder of the family fortune". As first cousin to Queen Anne Boleyn, it is perhaps significant that the beginning of his public career can be dated from the opening of the Reformation Parliament in which he sat as M.P. for Arundel, being at that time steward to the Earl of Arundel. From 1529, his public responsibilities multiplied and with them the opportunities for the enrichment and advancement of himself and his family. He was appointed under treasurer of the Exchequer and treasurer of the army in about 1539, and in 1542 he became escheator of Surrey and Sussex. Meanwhile, he was constantly engaged in local administration as a J.P. and, for example, as a Commissioner for sewers, an important office in a coastal county. Under Edward VI he took a still more prominent part in public life, being appointed on 24 August, 1548, Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations, an office which gave him "ample opportunities of enriching himself". In 1552, three years after he had been knighted, he was made Commissioner for the sale of Chantry lands, and, in 1554, he became a Privy Councillor. Under Queen Elizabeth, he supervised the arrangements for her coronation, and was present at the first meeting of her Council. Among the duties allocated to him in the new reign were those of the Steward of the Duchy of Lancaster lands in Sussex; he was appointed to this office on the recommendation of the Earl of Arundel. He was a J.P. of Sussex from the beginning of the reign until 1565 and was Custos Rotulorum in

39. Horsfield, 1, 355; S.A.C., xxxi, 110; T.F.M. c.142/115/49.
41. B.&C., loc.cit.
42. V. Sackville-West, 31.
43. D.N.B.
44. D.N.B.
45. Cal.S.P.D., 1547-180, 123.
1562. He had been M.P. for Arundel in 1529, for Chichester in 1547, for Portsmouth in April, 1554, and in Elizabeth's reign was M.P. for Sussex, in 1559, and 1563. In addition to being related to the Queen, his own son and heir being her second cousin, Sir Richard was a friend of her former tutor, Roger Ascham, whom he encouraged to write "The Schoolmaster". Perhaps the most memorable thing about Sir Richard Sackville was the way in which he established the fortune of his family, acquiring monastic lands and ready money for himself and his descendants, and even for more distant relatives. His son and heir, Thomas, succeeded him in 1566.

One of the cadet branches of the family, the Sackvilles of Sedlescombe, were the descendants of Sir Richard's younger brother Christopher, who married Constance, daughter of Thomas Culpepper of Bedgbery, Kent. He was named in his father, John Sackville's will of 1556, and his own will was proved in 1558. He resided at Worth and left two sons, John and Andrew, of whom John, the elder, was for a time resident at Brede, and later at Sedlescombe, he having married a Sedlescombe heiress.

Another important cadet branch of the family, flourishing in Elizabethan Sussex, the Sackvilles of Chiddingly, were descended, not from John Sackville of Chiddingly Esq., who died in 1557, but from his uncle, Edward Sackville of Dorking, who was, himself, a second son. Edward Sackville's son and heir was William Sackville of Bletchingly, Surrey. He died in 1557. It was his eldest son, John, who settled at Chiddingly and headed this branch of the family in 1580, dying in 1593.

47. He was also elected for Kent but chose to represent Sussex. See Official Returns; and N. Fudge: The Personnel of the House of Commons, 1563-7 (Univ. of London, M.A. thesis) Sect III, 287.
48. Ibid.
49. D.N.B.; V. Sackville-West, 30-1.
50. E.g., S.A.C.; xxv, 41.
51. B.&C., loc.cit; D.N.B. sub "Sir Richard Sackville".
52. P.C.C. 48 Chayney; P.C.C. 46 Welles.
53. B.&C., loc.cit.
Whether armigerous.

The Sackvilles of Withiam, being of the peerage by then, were not mentioned in the 1570 Visitation. They appear in the 1411 list of Sussex gentry. 54. The Sackvilles of Seddlescombe appear in the 1634 and 1662 Visitations of Sussex. 55.

(1) Sackville of Buckhurst in Withiam.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst and eventually 1st Earl of Dorset, 3d. son and heir of Sir Richard Sackville, J.P. Sussex, 1559-1565, (v. supra) who died 21 April, 1566, and of Winifred, his wife, d. of Sir John Bridges, (or Bruges) who was Lord Mayor of London in 1520. She remarried William Paulet, 1st Marquis of Winchester and died in 1586 and was buried in Westminster Abbey. 56.

1536, born at Buckhurst in Withiam, Sussex. 57. Educated at the grammar school at Sullington. (See also under 'Education'). In early life, devoted himself, mainly to literature, collaborating with Thomas Norton in the writing of "The Tragedy of Gerboduc". Was also interested in music. By the age of 21, he was married and had entered on his political career. 58.

1558, M.P. for Westmoreland; 59, 1559, East Grinstead; 1563, Aylesbury. 60.

Appears to have had pecuniary difficulties early in life. 61.

---

54. S.A.C., xxxix, 101; S.A.C., vi, 76.
55. S.A.C., xxxix, 113, 125, H.C.MS, C. 27.
56. D.N.B. and G.E.C., iv, 422, say he was the only son. Cf. B.&C., loc.cit., which says he may have had a younger brother.
59. Was also elected for East Grinstead but chose to sit for Westmoreland. (G.E.C., iv, 422n.)
60. Official Returns;
61. D.N.B.; V. Sackville-West, 36-38.
(Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued.)

1563, toured France and Italy. 1564, acted as an envoy on the Pope's behalf in an attempt to restore the Supremacy of the Holy See. [Was abroad when his father died, 21 April, 1566, and no hurried home] 62.

June, 1566, the Queen presented him with Knole, but as it was let and sub-let, he could not take possession until 1603. 63.

8 June, 1567, was knighted and created Baron Buckhurst on the same day. 64.

1568 and 1571, on missions to France.
1572, one of the peers who sentenced the Duke of Norfolk to death. 65.
August, 1573, wrote to Burghley suggesting a marriage between the latter's daughter, Elizabeth, and his own son, Robert. 66.

Was made a Privy Councillor [between June, 1582, and February, 1586]. 67.

1587, Ambassador to the Low Countries after Leiseter's return. Lost the Queen's favour temporarily by his conduct of the peace negotiations with Spain. June, 1587, was abruptly recalled and placed under house-arrest for some time on his return. Restored to favour after Leicester's death. 68.

1589, nominated and instituted K.G.

No[1589 and 1598, Ambassador extraordinary to the Low Countries.]
1591, Commissioner for the Treaty with France. 1598, tried to negotiate peace with Spain.

1591, Chancellor of Oxford University.

63. V. Sackville-West, 5, 38; D.N.B.
64. D.N.B.; G.E.C., iv, 422.
65. D.N.B.
Nov., 1591 - May, 1592, joint Commissioner of the Great Seal.

May, 1599, Lord Treasurer. (For serious charges of corruption made against him while he was in office, and for a Star Chamber libel case arising therefrom, see Pt. III, ch. 1, n. 77.

1601, Lord High Steward presiding over Essex's trial.

Dec., 1601, joint Commissioner for office of Earl Marshal.

March, 1604, created Earl of Dorset.

1604, Commissioner for peace negotiations with Spain. King of Spain granted him a pension of £1,000.

In Sussex: - J.P., 1559 - end of the reign at least, of the Quorum from 1562, and Custos Rotulorum from 1573.

Commissioner for Musters & for the Restraint of Grain, c. 1585.

1569 and 1570, and August, 1586 to end of the reign at least, joint Lord Lieutenant of Sussex.

1584, appealed to Walter Covert for help in getting Sir Thomas Shirley and Robert Sackville the county seats.

These seats were contested by Herbert Pelham and George Goring. (For the unfriendly relations between the Pelhams and the Gorings one the one hand, and Lord Buckhurst on the other, see Part III, ch. 2. of this thesis, and MSS references there given).

Had extensive landed property in Sussex, his father having settled a great part of his estate on him even during his lifetime. In early life, he resided at Buckhurst and planned to re-build and extend the mansion there, though these plans were never carried out. (V. supra, notes on origins.)

68. D.N.B.; Cal. S.P.D., 1581-90, 420, no. 63; 422, no. 14; A.P.C., 1587-98, 176-17; H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, pt. iii, 280-1, 283-14; See also H.M.C. 2nd Report, 44 and 45; and B.M. Add. MS. 48116, ff. 51-79b, 81-84a; B.M. Add. MS, 48078, passim, and B.M. Add. MS, 48127, ff. 2-196.
70. D.N.B.
72. See Appx. 1.
Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued.

1569, obtained from King's College, Cambridge, a grant of the manor of Withiam and the advowson of the Church there.75.

Sometime before 1577, he built a house, soon afterwards burnt down, on part of the site of Lewes Priory, granted to his father.76 The Queen planned to visit him there in 1577 but the project was frustrated by the plague.77.

During his lifetime, he purchased a considerable amount of property in Sussex, paying, for example, £4,000 for the Barony of Lewes on 29 Mch., 1576,78 and £4,700 for the property of Herbert Pelham at Michaelham.79 He undertook the re-building of Knole shortly before his death at huge expense.80.

19 April, 1608, died suddenly at the Council table at Whitehall. Funeral service at Westminster Abbey. Bur. 26 May at Withiam, in the Sackville chapel adjoining the parish church.81. Will dt. 11 Aug., 1607; pr. 31 Jan, 1609.82. I.P.M., 83.

Wife.

Ciceley, d. of Sir John Baker of Sissinghurst, Kent, sometime Speaker of the House of Commons, and of Elizabeth, d. of Thomas Dinley. Md. in 1555. She died 1 October, 1615 and was bur. at Withiam, 8 Oct., 1615.84. Her will pr. Feb., 1616.85.
(Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued.)

86.

**Children.**


Anne Jane Mary

**Education.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Sons | |

| Henry, Hart Hall, Oxf., matric. entry dt. 22 June, 1582, aged 14. 104. |

86. G.E.C., iv, 423; D.N.B.; Collins, ii, 146.
89. D.N.B.
(Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued)

Education contd.

Universities. Inns of Court.

(Sons contd.)


Marriages of children.

Robert 2nd Earl of Dorset, md. twice, (a) Lady Margaret, only d. of Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk by his 2nd wife, Margaret, d. and h. of Thomas Audley, Baron Audley of Walden. Licensed by the Bishop of London, 4 Feb., 1580. She was suspected of attending Mass. They had six children of whom Richard became the third Earl and Edward the fourth. Richard alienated many of the Sackville lands. 109. She died 19 August, 1591 and was buried at Withiam. Robert Southwell, the Jesuit, published "Triumphs over Death" in 1596 in her honour. 110. (b) Anne, wid. of Henry Compton, 1st Lord Compton and before that of William Stanley, Lord Monteagle, 5th daughter of Sir John Spencer of Althorp, Northants. They were married, 4th Dec., 1592. Dorset complained of his wife's misconduct and was negotiating for a separation when he died. 111. There was no issue of this marriage. She died 22 Sept., 1618. 112.

90. G.B.C., iv, 423.
91. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 33-34.
92. See Appx. 2.
93. G.B.C., loc. cit.
94. P.C.C. 23 & 57 Dorset.
95. P.R.O., C. 142/312/128.
96. D.N.E.
98. Ibid.
100. Inner Temple Admissions, 20.
102. Al. Ox., loc. cit.
103. Ibid.; not in Admission Register.
(Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued.)

Marriages of children contd.

**Henry**

**William**

**Thomas**

**Anne** md. Sir Henry Glemham of Glemham, Suffolk. 113.

**Jane** md., in Feb. 1591, Anthony, Viscount Montague. They had six daughters, two of whom became nuns, and one son, Francis.114.

**Mary** md. Sir Henry Nevill, son and h. of Edward, Lord Abergavenny. He became 7th Lord Abergavenny.115.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hundred of Baldslow, Hastings Rape.)

38 Henry VIII Richard Sackville Esq., in lands £66.

(As of Hundred of Hartfield, Pevensey Rape.)

John Sackville Esq., in lands £3

his father

---

104. Ibid.
105. Al.Ox., loc. cit.
106. Inner Temple Admissions, 113.
108. Inner Temple Admissions, loc. cit.
109. D.N.B., sub "Robert Sackville, 2nd Earl of Dorset," see also e.g. B.H. Calendar C. 247.
110. Ibid; and G.E.C.; iv, 423.
112. Ibid.; G.E.C., iv; 423.
114. Ibid; S.A.C., vii, 173.
115. Collins, op.cit. ii, 146.
(Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued)

(ii) Sackville of Seddlescombe.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Sackville of Seddlescombe, Sussex, Esq., eld. s. and heir
of Christopher Sackville of Worth Esq. whose will was dt.
27 Aug., 1558, pr. 28 Feb., 1558.117 and who was the younger
brother of Sir Richard Sackville who died in 1566, and of
Constance, his wife, d. of Thomas Culpepper of Bedgbery, Kent,
Esq. 118.

1562-'3, Escheator of Surrey and Sussex.119.
1563, M.P. East Grinstead. 120.
1601 and 1602, J.P. Sussex, as "of Breade". 121. Also
mentioned in will of first Earl of Dorset as "of Breade Esq.".
1619, Commissioner for Musters.122.
Will dt. 21 Jan., 1618, pr. 30 Dec. 1619.123. I.P.M., 14 June,
1620.124.

Wife.

Joan, d. and coh. of John Downton of Seddlescombe, Sussex,
"Descended out of Dorset". Marriage settlement, 22 July,
1589.125.

Children.126.

Thomas Later Sir Thomas Sackville of Hancocks, Seddlescombe.
Perhaps cr. K.B., 6 Mch, 1617. 127. Aged 30 and more
in 1620. Will pr 26 June, 1639.128.
John knted., 16 April, 1628.129. Executor to brother,
Thomas,
Christopher Bap. 1598 at Seddlescombe.
Ann
Mary
Joan
Constance Bap. 1601 at Seddlescombe.

---

117. P.C.C. 46 Welles.
118. B.&C., 301; Collins, i1, 107.
119. See Appendix 31.
120. Official Returns.
121. Dorse Pat. Rolls, P.R.O., C. 66/1549 and 1594.
122. S.A.C., lix, 123.
123. P.C.C. 110 Parker.
124. P.R.O. C. 142/381/140.
(Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued.)

**Education.**

**Father**

- **Universities.**
  - Adm. Inner Temple, Nov., 1555.130.

**Sons**


**Marriages of children.**

- **Thomas** md. twice: (a) Elizabeth, d. of Samuel Boys of Hawkhurst, Kent. M. Sett. 2 Dec., 1615. Issue. She was buried 18 Sept., 1628 at Seddlescombe. (b) Ann, d. of Sir Edward Boys of Fretfield, wid. of Francis Warnett of Hampsted in Framfield who died, 1622. Issue.


- **Christopher**

- **Ann**

- **Mary**


---

125. B.&C., 301. See also Horsfield, 1, 524, 525, 526. The seat of the Downtons and later of the Sackvilles, was "Hancox" in Seddlescombe parish, Hastings Rape. See also Horsfield, 1, 514.

126. B.&C., 301.

127. Al. Ox, v, 1298; cf. Shaw, ia, 162.

128. P.C.C. 102 Harvey.

129. Al. Ox, loc. cit.; Shaw, ii, 194.

130. Inner Temple Admissions, 25.

131. Al. Ox, loc. cit.

132. Ibid.

133. B.&C., 301.

134. Cf. B.&C., 129, "of Fretwell".
(Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued.)

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hundred of Battle, Hastings Rape).

37 Elizabeth John Sackville, gent., in lands £5.135.

(iii) Sackville of Chiddingly.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Sackville of Chiddingly, Esq., s. and h. of William Sackville of Bletchingly, Surrey who was M.P. Bletchingly, 1541 and died, 1557, and of Rose, d. of Sir John Gainsford of Crowhurst, Surrey.
Was grandson of Edward Sackville of Dorking, Surrey who was 2nd son of Humphrey Sackville of the Withiam line, who died in 1488.137.
Bap. at Bletchingly between 1541 and 1544.138.
Held the manor of Polesden Lacy, Surrey.139 At an uncertain date he took up a lease of certain lands in Chiddingly, Shiplake Hundred, Pevensey Rape. In his will, he referred to "my lease of Chittinglighe".

J.P. Sussex, 1575 - 1593.140
1587, in certificate concerning the J.P.'s, mentioned as a J.P., then of Bramber Rape, and he and two other J.P.'s were described as "good Justyces, young men." 141.
Will pr. 9 May, 1593.142 He arranged for his lands to be sold to provide for his daughters. Admon. 15 May, 1596.143

135. P.R.O., E. 179/190/332.
137. B.&C., 300. Therefore a cousin of the Sackvilles of Withiam. Robert Sackville was mentioned in the will of John Sackville of Chiddingly, pr. 1593, as "cosin".
138. B.&C., 300 says he and his brother and sister were bap. there between those dates.
139. Ibid.
140. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 17 - 35. In the last of these lists, he is noted as "mort".
141. S.A.C., 11, 59.
142. F.C.C. 33 Neveil.
143. Lewes administrations, B. 2/219.
(Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued.)

Wife.

Anne, d. of Sir William Harvey, Clar. King of Arms. Appd. sole executrix in husband's will. Administration at Lewes, 15 May, 1596.144.

Children.145.

WinifredMd. in father's will
Anne " " " "
Judith " " " " " "
Mary Unmd. in will of brother-in-law, 1598. Buried at All Saints, Lewes, 27 Nov., 1660.
Rose Bur. 23 April, 1624, Hurstpierpoint.
Mildred unmd. in brother-in-law's will, 1598.
Cicely " " " " " "
Audrey " " " " " "
Elizabeth Bur. 1609, at Chiddingly.

Education.

Father Universities. Inns of Court.

Marriages of children.146.

Winifred md. as his first wife, John Porter of Cuckfield, gent. Issue.
Judith md. Christopher Gardiner, of Surrey.
Rose md. as his second wife, the Rev. Christopher Swale, D.D., Rector of Hurstpierpoint, 1607. He remarried, and died 7 Sept., 1645, being buried at Hurstpierpoint.

144. Ibid.
145. B.&C., loc. cit; all are mentioned in their father's will.
146. B.&C., loc. cit.
(Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, later Earl of Dorset, continued.)

Marriages of children, contd.

Mildred
Cicely md. Thomas Whatman
Audrey
Elizabeth.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hundred of Buttinghill, Lewes Rape)
2 Elizabeth John Sackville, gent., in lands £10.147.

(As of Chiddingly, Shiplake Hundred, Pevensey Rape)
14 Elizabeth John Sackville, gent. in lands £30.148.
18 Elizabeth John Sackville Esq.
   (Commissioner) " " £15.149.

147. P.R.O., E. 179/190/267. But it is possible that this
   may have referred to John Sackville, later of
   Sedlescombe. (v. supra).
148. P.R.O., E. 179/190/283.
149. " ; E. 179/190/298.
SCOTT.
Origins.
The Scotts of "The Moat", or "La Mote" in the parish of Iden in Hastings Rape, were a younger branch of the Scotts of Scott's Hall, Kent, a well-known Kentish family.¹

The manor of "The Moat" had been conveyed in 1460 to John Scott of Scott's Hall, later Sir John, who became Sheriff of Kent in 39 Henry VI, Comptroller of the Household to Edward IV, and sometimes Marshal of Calais.² From him it passed in 1486 to his son, William, later Sir William, also of Scott's Hall, who became Sheriff of Kent in 1490 and sometime Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports and Constable of Dover Castle.³ It was Sir William's second son, Edward, who married Alice, daughter of Thomas Fogge, serjeant-porter of Calais and of Ash, Kent, and who founded the family of Scott of the Moat in Iden, Sussex.⁴

Whether armigerous.
Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation of Sussex⁵ and in that of 1634.⁶

Members of the family.
Head of the family in 1580.
William Scott Esq. of the Moat, Iden, only son of Edward Scott Esq. of the same who died c. 1535, and of Alice, d. and coh. of Thomas Fogge of Ash, Kent.⁷

J.P., Sussex, 1559 and 1560.⁸

1564, mentioned in the bishop's letter as of the "East parte", "no Justice" but a "misliker of godlie orders."⁹

1. B. & C., 310.
2. Ibid; V.C.H., Sussex, ix, 154.
3. B.&C., loc.cit; S.R.S., xiv, no.914.
4. D.N.B., Sub "Edward Scott, ob. 1535".
5. Phillips, 9; H.C. MSS G.18 and D.11.
6. H.C. MS C. 27.
7. B.&C., loc.cit; Edward Scott's will, P.C.C. 29 Hogen.
(Scott continued)

1576, one of those examined for papistry by the order of the Bishop of Chichester. 10. April, 1580, named as one of those convened before the Commissioner of ecclesiastical causes and remaining abroad on bonds. 11. 1580, listed in the recusancy returns for the Archdeaconry of Lewes as one who refused to attend Church. His lands were valued at £100 p.a., and his goods at £100 "at the disposition of the High Commissioner of London". In another return of the same date, his wife, son, William, and daughters, Elizabeth and Eleanor, are also mentioned as absentees from Church. 12. Oct. 1585, was accounted a recusant and scheduled to provide a light horse for service as a token of his goodwill. 13. 1585 died. I.P.M. Will dt. 23 Jan., 1583, pr 27 Apr., 1586. 14.*

Wife.

Mary, d. of William, Lord Windsor. Sole executrix to her husband and residuary legatee. Held the Moat during the lifetime of her son, William, who died 1589. 15. Mentioned in son, William's will.

Children. 15.

William 2nd son. Aged 12 in 1570. Succeeded his father in 1585. Feb., 1585, one of those recusants listed as liable to furnish light horses for service in the Low Countries as a token of goodwill. 17. Nov. 1587, a recusant whose yearly rents and revenues were valued at £200. 18. 1589, died. Will dt. 22 Dec. 1588, pr. 11 Feb. 1589. 19.
Edward Aged 5 in 1570. Mentioned in father's and brother, William's wills.
Eleanor Mentioned in father's will as unmarried and under 24 years.
Elizabeth Mentioned in father's will as unmarried and under 24 years.
Margaret

10. S.A.C., iii, 90.
11. B.M. Harl. MS. 360, f. 49.
(Scott continued)

Education.
Universities. Inns of Court.
Father — Perhaps adm. Gray's Inn, 1525, or, perhaps, in 1551. 20.
Sons —

Marriages of children. 21.

Nicholas
William md. Elizabeth, sister of Sir Walter Leveson of Wolverhampton, Staffs. She held the Moat in 1605. Issue. 22.

Edward

Elizabeth Their brother, William, mentioned in his will his brother-in-law, John Hankins, who was to be an overseer. He did not say which of his sisters Hankins married.

Margaret

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Goldspur Hundred, Hastings Rape)

2 Elizabeth William Scott Esq. in goods £30.23.
14 Elizabeth William Scott Esq. in lands £15.24.
18 Elizabeth William Scott Esq. in lands £20.25.

37 Elizabeth Mistress Mary Scott in lands £10.26.

(As of Staple Hundred, Hastings Rape)
1-2 Charles I Mistress Elizabeth Scott in goods £3.27.

17. B.M. Harl. MS 703, f. 21.
18. B.M. Lansd. MS 53, art. 69.
22. V.C.H., loc.cit. According to this, their son, William, succeeded his father and held the property in 1620, Cf. B.&C., who show Edward's son, William, as succeeding to the family property. See also P.C.C. 24 Leicester.
23. P.R.O. E. 179/190/266.
25. P.R.O. E. 179/190/298.
The early origins of the Selwyns of Friston have become the subject of some controversy in the publications of the Sussex Archaeological Society. They are described in two early numbers as probably having been "on heraldic and other grounds" a branch of the great Yorkshire family of Salvayne, or Salvin, of Thorp-Salvin Yorks., whose first recorded ancestor was "Richard" de Cuckenai, mentioned in Domesday as a tenant of a considerable number of manors in Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire, and who was son of Jocelyn the Fleming who came in with the Conqueror.1. The arms of Selwyn are said to be nearly the same as those of Dawnay, a Yorkshire family, and it is suggested that they were assumed by the Selwyns on the marriage of one of them with an heiress of the Darnays.

This account is disputed by the writer of a later article who can see no resemblance at all between the arms of the Sussex Selwyns and those of the Yorkshire Salvins.2. He points out, however, that the Selwyns of Friston and the Selwyns of Matson, Gloucestershire, had identical coats of arms. He does not conclude that the Gloucestershire family were an offshoot of the Sussex one, or even that both derived from a common origin. Rather, he considers that the Selwyns of Friston adopted the coat already borne by the Gloucestershire family. He says that the Selwyns of Friston had their arms granted in May, 1611, which arms were borne by the Gloucestershire Selwyns from the early 16th century ..., yet that there was no connection "that can be traced or proved" between the two families genealogically. He does admit that this theory of heraldic borrowing would fall down if the Selwyns of Friston could be shown to have borne arms before 1611.

It is not intended to establish any genealogical connection between these two families or to explain the similarity between their coats. But it should be pointed out that the Selwyns of Friston appear in several versions of the 1570 Visitation of Sussex and that one of them was included in the 1411 list of Sussex gentry.3.

1. S.A.C., viii, 271; and xxiv, 38.
2. S.A.C., xxxviii, 164-15.
3. For the 1570 Visitation, v. infra. 1411 list, S.A.C., xxxix, 101.
In any case, it is clear that the Sussex family was one of considerable antiquity and had been indigenous to their district for many generations.

"The earliest connection of the Selwyns with the county is not ascertained. From 1299 to 1303, the name of Robert Selvans appears, but there is no further mention of anyone of this surname until John Selwyn married Catherine, heiress of Simon Sherrington, in the parish of Selmeston. This John is the first of his family mentioned in Berry and Comber's pedigree. His grandson, Nicholas Selwyn of Selmeston, appears on the 1411-12 Subsidy Roll as having lands to the annual value of £23. 6. 8., which lands were those called Southalle, lands in Firle, in Selmeston, Ripe, Alviston, Jevynton and in Northiam. He it is who appears in the 1411 list of Sussex gentry. This Nicholas died 4 April, 1416, and his I.P.M. was dated 1 November, 1420. His son, William, was born at Selmeston on 24 August, 1403, and proof of his age was taken in 1425.

The family subsequently moved to Friston where William's grandson, Thomas, died in 1539. It was at Friston that the family flourished until the male line became extinct on the death without heirs of William Thomas Selwyn on 9 Feb., 1705. By his wife, Margery, daughter and heiress of John Adam, who died 28 Oct., 1542, Thomas had a son, John, his only child, who succeeded him and was head of the family in 1580. He was a J.P. for nearly thirty years under Elizabeth.

The parish of Friston, near Eastbourne, is in the Hundred of Willingdon in Pevensey Rape, slightly to the West of Beachy Head. "The parish", says Horsfield, "is altogether on the Downs", and has extensive view over both the Channel and the Weald as well as of wide stretches of downland. Horsfield has little to say of the Selwyns beyond the fact that they resided for some time at Friston Place and succeeded the Etchinghams and the Wests in the ownership of the parish and also that there are two inscriptions to them in Friston Church.

5. _B.&C._, 114.
6. _S.A.C._, x, 142.
(Selwyn continued)

Whether armigerous.

Named in list of Sussex gentry, 1411. 13.
Mentioned in 1570 Visitation of Sussex, 14, and in that of
1634, 15, and also in that of 1662. 16.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Selwyn Esq. of Friston, only child of Thomas Selwyn Esq.
of the same who died in Sept., 1539, and of Margery, d. and
heiress of John Adam. (V. supra)

1542, aged 23 at father's I.P.M. 17.
1544, acquired one of the manors at Eastbourne, from Henry,
2nd Earl of Rutland and Margaret, his wife. 18.

1558, with his eldest son, obtained a grant of lands in
Otham. 19.
1564, bishop's letter, no Justice but a "favourer of godly
proceedings." 20.
1565-June, 1594, J.P. Sussex. 21

1587, in report on Sussex J.P.'s, described as a J.P. of
Pevensey Rape, "a good justice", "as well in respect of
religion as of the commynwealth!". But it was said that
new appointments should be made because Mr. Selwyn was
"Aged". 22

1588, assessed for £50 for the Armada Loan, - in the third
highest group with ten others. 23.

7 July, 1594, died. Buried at Friston, 18 July. Will dt. 25


Md. twice:-
1) Beatrix, d. of Thomas May. Issue. Bur. at Friston, 1 Feb.,
1578.
2) Grace, d. of Sir Edward Capell, knt., and relict of John
Executrix to her husband. She remd. as her 3rd husband,
William Cheyney, gent.

12. Horsfield, i, 283.
15. H.C. MS. C. 27.
16. S.A.C. xxxix, 125.
(Selwyn continued.)

Children.


Edward 2nd son. Of Bechington in Friston. Bap. 11 Dec., 1548. Executor to father, 1594 and had the manor of Pekedene. 23 April, 1596, Edmund Pelham of Battle and John Shurley of Lewes Esq. settled a dispute between Edward and his mother, Grace Selwyn, widow, concerning the administration of the late John Selwyn's will, in favour of Edward. 29. Edward's will dt. 16 June, pr. 16 Sept. 1618. 30. Bur. at Friston, 16 Aug., 1618.

John Bap. 29 Mch., 1551. No issue. Mentioned in father's will.

George Bap. 20 Mch., 1554. No issue.


Richard Bap. 30 April, 1560.

Margaret Bap. 14 August, 1552.

Alice Bap. 10 Nov., 1553.

Phillippa Bap. 11, bur. 14 June, 1564.

Beatrix Bap. 15 Aug., 1565.

Jane Bap. 2 Aug., 1566.

Margery

18. S.A.C., xiv, 121-12.
22. S.A.C., ii, 59.
23. S.A.C., i, 36.
24. P.C.C. 57 Dixy.
27. Ibid.
29. B.M. Add. MS 33, 137, f. 23.
30. Lewes Wills, A. 16/216.
31. S.A.C., xiii, 96.
(Selwyn continued)

Education.

Universities. Inns of Court.

Father

Sons

Thomas, matric. pens. from Clare Coll., Camb., Michs., 1565.32. Thomas, adm. Gray's Inn, 1570, from Staple Inn.33.


Marriages of children.36.


Edward md. Alice, d. of John Burton of Bourn, Sussex. M. Lic. Lewes 22 Sept., 1593. Issue, 3 sons, the second of whom, Francis, inherited Friston from his uncle, Thomas. He was then a minor. Alice was bur. 1 April, 1624 at Friston. M.I.


---

32. Al. Cant., pt. 1, iv, 42.
33. Gray's Inn Admissions, 40.
34. Al. Cant., loc.cit.
35. Gray's Inn Admissions, 45.
36. B.&C., loc.cit.
37. Lewes wills, A. 19/56.
38. See Feodary Survey of Thomas Selwyn, P.R.O., Wards 5/43, Pt.1, dated 20 James I.
(Selwyn continued.)

**Subsidy assessments.**

(As of Friston, Hundred of Willingdon, Pevensey Rape).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Henry VIII</td>
<td>John Selwyn</td>
<td>in goods</td>
<td>£70.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Selwyn</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£55.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Selwyn Esq.</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£40.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Selwyn Esq.</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£40.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

40. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
41. "     , E. 179/190/265.
42. "     , E. 179/190/283.
SHARPE (or Sharp).

Origins.

It is difficult to assemble much genealogical information about the Sharpes of Northiam: the name is all too common in Elizabethan Sussex, especially in the Northiam and Horsham districts. Yet there is no indication that these two groups of Sharpes were in any way related. Moreover, there are numerous wills, both of the Archdeaconry of Lewes and of the P.C.C., and numerous marriage licences granted at Lewes, relating to the Sharpes of Northiam, which seem to have no bearing on the family here under consideration.

The Sharpe family appears in this study owing to the place held by one, John Sharpe, on the Commission of the Peace for Hastings Rape from the beginning of the reign until his death in 1583. He appears in the 1570 Visitation as an armiger and as the son of Richard Sharpe of Northiam and of Alice, daughter of Nicholas Tufton, and it names his own wife and his six sons and five daughters. (V. infra) A fuller pedigree is given by Berry and Comber which shows that the family were newcomers to the county, having migrated from Kent in the time of John Sharpe's father, Richard. The earliest names given by Berry and Comber are those of Richard's father, John, of Benenden, Kent, and of the latter's brother, Thomas Sharpe of Sandwich, who is named in John Sharpe of Benenden's will, proved on 24 March, 1502. This John Sharpe of Benenden was plaintiff in fine with John and Nicholas Tufton, in-laws of his eldest son, Richard, for lands in Beckley, Sussex, in 1499. The same John Sharpe had apparently at least four children, since, apart from his eldest son and heir, two sons, John and Thomas, and a daughter, Margaret, appear in their father's will. Richard, the eldest, however, of Benenden, Kent, settled in Sussex soon after his marriage with Alice, daughter of Nicholas Tufton Esq. of Northiam and sister of Sir John Tufton, knt. and bart. Richard's will was proved in 1553 and there is an inscription to him in Northiam Church.

1. B. & C., 220.
2. Ibid; S.A.C., v, 72.
3. P.C.C. 24 Tastie. The inscription was apparently erroneously dated 1503; S.A.C. xxiii, 170; Horsfield, i, 517.
Richard Sharpe left two sons, John and Thomas, and four daughters. John Sharpe, the elder son, is the subject of this study. His younger brother, Thomas Sharpe of Northiam, predeceased him, his will being proved in 1560.4 He married Joan, daughter and heiress of one, - Strowde, who brought him a moiety of Goatley manor in Northiam parish to which she had succeeded in 1544 and of which they were both seized in 1555-16, although it had passed out of the Sharpe family ten years later.5 This Thomas Sharpe had an interesting grandson of the same name, second son of Thomas' eldest son, Richard. The younger Thomas Sharpe, an M.A. of Cambridge University, was instituted Rector of Beckley, Sussex in April, 1613, having been presented by his elder brother, John Sharpe, gent., then patron of Beckley.6 He was the author of some illuminating letters which give a vivid account of his sufferings at the hands of the Parliamentarians during the Civil War.7

Northiam is in the Staple Hundred of Hastings Rape, about eight miles North West of Rye, and bounded on the North side by the Rother which marks the Kentish border. On the east side lies Beckley parish, and on the West, Ewhurst. Horsfield, while saying nothing of the Sharpes beyond noting the inscriptions in the Church, finds signs of there having been a strong Puritan element in the parish in early times.8 Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in 1570 Visitation of Sussex 9 and in that of 1634.10 Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Sharpe of Wittersham, Beckley and Northiam, Sussex, and of Benenden, Sandhurst, Rolvenden and Hawkhurst, Kent, eldest son of Richard Sharpe of Northiam who died c. 1553 and of Alice, d. of Nicholas Tufton Esq. of Northiam. (V. supra).

5. V.C.H., Sussex, ix, 274 (Cf.E.A.E., v, 72)
7. S.A.C., xi, 73-17.
8. Horsfield, i, 516.
10. H.C. MS. C. 27.
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J.P. Sussex, 1559 - 1583.

Not mentioned in the bishop's letter of 1564.

Will proved, 1583. M.I. in Northiam Church.

Wife.

Alice, d. of Thomas Odiam of Witsham or Wittersham, Sussex.

Children.

Thomas
Nicholas
Richard
William
James
Edward
Dorothy
Anne
Mary
Joan
Anne

Education. Universities. Inns of Court.

Father Nicholas, perhaps he of Nicholas, perhaps
Sons that name who was a student student of Gray's Inn,
of Christ Church, Oxford, 1576, adm. as of
1563, from Westminster. B.A. Barnard's Inn.
16 Jan., 1568.

missing from lists for 1561 and 1562, (nos. 3 and 4).
14. Ibid.
15. B.&C.,loc.cit.
(Sharpe continued.)

Marriages of children. 18.

Thomas
Nicholas
Richard
William
James
Edward
Dorothy  md. John Davis.
Anne
Mary  md. Giles Geere, yeoman. His will pr. 1607. 19.
Joan

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Staple Hundred, Hastings Rape)
38 Henry VIII  Richard Sharpe, gent. in lands £32. 21.
2 Elizabeth  John Sharpe Esq.  "  "  £20. 22.
(Commissioner)
14 Elizabeth  John Sharpe Esq.  in lands £20. 23.

(As of Staple Hundred, Hastings Rape)
37 Elizabeth  Nicholas Sharpe gent. in lands £3
"  "  James Sharpe gent.  "  "  £4
"  "  William Sharpe gent.  "  "  £3 25.

1-2 Charles I William Sharpe
(Subcollector of Staple Hundred)

18. B. & C., loc. cit.
22. "  "  E. 179/190/266
23. "  "  E. 179/190/283.
24. "  "  E. 179/190/298.
25. "  "  E. 179/190/332.
SHELLEY.

Origins.

The family of Shelley are "of undoubted antiquity but the attempt to derive them from the date of the Norman Conquest fails". Cartwright gives a long pedigree for them in his "Rape of Bramber", but the early part is considered unauthentic by W. Smith Ellis, author of "Parks and Forests of Sussex". Mr. E. P. Shirley says that they were originally of Huntingdonshire, but Mr. M. A. Lower and Smith Ellis both consider that they were of Sussex origin and that they took their name from a park called Shelley, near Crawley in St. Leonard's Forest, near Horsham; a Sir John Shellygh was named in a Subsidy Roll of 6 Edward III as a taxpayer in the parish of Ifield. The earliest individual members of the family of whom any record is preserved were John and Thomas Shelley who were attainted and beheaded in 1 Henry IV for having adhered to Richard II, and Sir William Shelley who was not a supporter of Richard II and who retained his possessions and was ancestor of the sixteenth century Shelleys of Michelgrove, Patcham and Worminghurst.

The Michelgrove estate in the parish of Clapham, which extended from Shoreham in the East to Poling in the West, came to John Shelley who died in 1526 by his marriage to Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of John Michelgrove who was of the Faulconer family of Kent. They had held Michelgrove as early as 1279 of William de Braose, Lord of Bramber, by knight service, and early in the fourteenth century they assumed the name of Michelgrove. The Shelleys were apparently without much influence in the district before they acquired the Michelgrove estate. Sir William Shelley who succeeded his father, John Shelley, in 1526, at the age of forty, and who was Chief Justice of Common Pleas in the reign of Henry VIII, is reputed to have built the mansion at Michelgrove which became the residence of the senior line until about 1800. The Judge is said to have entertained Henry VIII there. But, "Michelgrove, one of the finest houses in Sussex, was to the grief of the district pulled down by Bernard-Edward, Duke of Norfolk, who purchased the estate in 1828."

1. S.A.C., xxiv, 8.
2. S.A.C., xxxvii, 35.
3. S.A.C., xxiv, 8; Horsfield, i, 376.
4. S.A.C., xxiv, 8; and xxxvii, 35.
5. S.A.C., v, 199.
6. S.A.C., xii, 11; xiv, 145; B.&C., loc. cit.
7. S.A.C., xiv, 145; ixxi, 145; ixxii, 11 et sqq.
(Shelley continued.)

The Shelleys had also Kingsham, a house in Chichester, said to date back to the time of Edward I, which came into their possession by marriage in the fifteenth century and was probably subsequently one of their places of residence. It was a place of some size and elegance. Further, by his marriage to Alice, daughter and coheirness of Sir Henry Belknap, Sir William Shelley, the Judge, acquired several manors near Beckley in Sussex. Sir William's two brothers next in age, Richard and Edward, founded two well-known branches of the family at Patcham and Worminghurst respectively.

Generally speaking, the Shelleys were a strongly recusant family, though Richard Shelley of Patcham who died in 1594 was an exception to this. He was, indeed, a Commissioner for Recusancy in 1580 and in the autumn of 1592 had charge of Edward Gage, the recusant.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1530 Visitation of Sussex, in the Windsor Herald's version of that of 1570, and in the 1634 Visitation of Sussex.

(1) Shelley of Michelgrove.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

William Shelley Esq., eld. s. and h. of John Shelley of Michelgrove, (himself eld. s. and h. of the Judge, Sir William Shelley), who died 15 Dec., 1550, and of Mary, d. of Sir William Fitzwilliam of Milton and Gainspark, knt.

Aged 12 at his father's death, and 21 on 14 Sept., 1559.

J.P. Sussex, 1560-1564.

1564, bishop's letter described him as a "myslyker of godly proceedings".

10. S.A.C., xxiv, 8; lv, 284.
11. S.A.C., xv, 168.
12. Horsfield, i, 376; B.&C., loc.cit. By this marriage, he became the brother-in-law of John Caryll of Warnham. (S.A.C., xxiii, 150)
13. B.&C., loc.cit. The Shelles of Worminghurst do not come within the scope of this study as no member of this branch of the family appears to have held any leading office in the county under Queen Elizabeth. But see note 55.
(Shelley continued.)

1569, did not appear at the assembly of the Sheriff and J.P's of Sussex to subscribe to the Council's order for the uniformity of public worship. 23.

1576, was on Bishop Curtis' list of those in his diocese suspected of popery. 24.

1580, he and several of his servants named in the recusancy return for the parish of Clapham in the rural deanery of Arundel as absentees from the holy communion and from divine service. 27. In a similar return for the Archdeaconry of Chichester, only naming more servants, it is noted that "William Shellye esquier of the parish of Clapham" was estimated to be worth £500 in goods and £500 in lands, and that he "was sent to the lords of her majesty's pryve Counsell and there remaineth at their honors disposition." 26. August, 1580, indicted for conspiring against the Queen's life and to place Mary Queen of Scots on the throne. Committed to the Fleet. 27.

Mch., 1581, his wife petitioned the Council, complaining of the indignities shown her by her husband's servants after his committal, and asking that proper provision be made for her. 28. August, 1582, was perhaps in the Marshalsea. 29. At liberty in 1583.

Dec., 1583, was suspected of complicity in the Throgmorton conspiracy. 30.

By Feb., 1584, had been committed to the Tower, together with Henry, Earl of Northumberland, his friend, and others. 31.

July, 1584, Sir Richard Shelley, his uncle, wrote to Burghley from Venice requesting an account of his nephew's imprisonment: 18 Nov., 1584, wrote to Burghley again saying "my nephew his adversitie trobleth me sore for I take as muche pryde that all the Shelleys contynewed trewe Subjects to her mtie as that

14. V. infra and Horsfield, 1, 377; S.A.C. ii, 62; 111,90; xii, 202 et passim, for references to their recusancy. For Richard Shelley of Patcham's position, see W.S.C.R.O.; D.R.O., 90/I/37, f.7, and A.P.C. 1580-1? also A.P.C., 1592, 329.


17. S.A.C. xxxix, 113; H.C.MS. C.27.


20. Ibid.


22. Camden Misc., ix,10.


24. S.A.C. iii, 90.
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they were constant in the Catholic faythe. Une Roy et une foy". "He may have erred in circumstances rigorously interpreted of the new lawes". 33.

16 Nov., 1584, Sir Richard Shelley also wrote to Walsingham, pleading on behalf of his nephew. "I conceive his fault is not of mallice". 34.

12 February, 1586, was tried at Westminster for high treason. He was condemned but sentence of death was not carried out. His estates were confiscated and restored only after his death to his heir, in the reign of James I. A valuation of his property was made and appears among the Sheriff's accounts for 1585-16. The scanty furniture of Michelgrove house suggests he resided there very little. Among the bedrooms named in the inventory were "Gunter's chamber" and "Mr Lewkenor's chamber", perhaps a reference to George Lewkenor of Chichester, the recusant; brother of Thomas and Richard Lewkenor, the J. Pts. (q.v.). 36. May, 1586, Sir Richard Shelley wrote to the Queen from Venice, asking her to pardon his nephew, William Shelley, condemned for treason. 37.

1588, was one of the Catholics in the Tower who used to meet from time to time to celebrate Mass. Another was Philip, Earl of Arundel, against whom he was induced to inform to the effect that the latter had asked for a special Mass for the success of the Armada. 38.

Was on the lists of Sussex recusants to be disarmed, Feb., 1586 and July, 1592. 39.

15 April, 1598, died, sp. 40.

25. W.S.C.R.O., D.R.O. 90/I/37, f. 55. See also F. 38.
26. Ibid. f. 2. Cf. S.A.C. ii, 62. In 1587 his yearly rents and revenues were assessed at £2,000 and the value of his goods at the same figure.
27. S.A.C., lv, 284; see also Ibid. v., 195.
28. Cal.S.P.D., 1581-190, 13
29. Ibid., 68. This may have been the Richard Shelley there in Oct. 1585. (Ibid., 276, no. 38.)
31. Cal.S.P.D. 1581-190., 159; see also 136, no. 21; 137, nos 30 & 39.
32. B.M. Lansd. MS. 42, f. 47.
33. Ibid., f. 51.
34. B.M. Harl. MS 286, f. 58.
35. B.M. Lansd. MS, 45, f. 164 et seq.
(Shelley continued.)

Wives. 41.

Md. twice:
1) Margaret, d. of Thomas Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton.  
2) Jane, d. and h. of John Lingen of Herefordshire. Born 1544. Bur. at St. Dunstan's in the West, 11 Mch., 1610. 1581, following her husband's imprisonment in 1580 she petitioned the Council concerning her situation. (v. supra and note 28) Feb., 1593, she was examined and found to have made enquiries of an "astronomer" of Cambridge as to how to recover certain money and jewels of hers and as to what would become of her husband, he then being "a prisoner and a dead man in law", and whether he would escape that year or the next, and as to what would become of her jointure. 42. Mch., 1594, reference to her having been imprisoned and now being released, and to arrangements made for her future. She was to live in Kensington under supervision. 43.

Children.

None. The line continued through his next brother, John, who died 27 August, 1592 and whose son, John was created a baronet as of Michelgrove in 1611. 44.

36. S.A.C. lv. 284. In Mch. 1594, his house at Michelgrove and other property, was leased to Sir John Caryll, Richard Hare and Edward Gage Esqs., the executors of the will of the late John Shelley of Michelgrove Esq. father of William. (P.R.O. Signet Office Docquets, P.R.O. Index 6800, f. 515). May, 1604, Lord Buckhurst and Cecil were given power by the King to compound with one Shelley and his friends for the lands of the late William Shelley, his father (sic, should read "his uncle") for £11,000. (Cal. S.P.D., Addenda, 1580-1625, 444). See also B.M. Lansd. MS 50, f. 39.


39. B.M. Harl MS. 703., f. 21 and f. 67b; he was still a prisoner, see H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, iv, 264.

40. B.&C., loc.cit.

41. B.&C., loc.cit.


43. Ibid., 470-472. See also H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, iv and v. passim.

44. B.&C., loc.cit.
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Education.

Universities.

Inns of Court.
Adm. Inner Temple, Nov., 1555. 45.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Clapham, Hundred of Brightford, Bramber Rape.)

38 Henry VIII  Sir William Shelley, kn.t., in lands & 
                 (Commissioner)  goods. £400.
                 John Shelley Esq.,  in lands. £30 46.
                  (Commissioner)

2 Elizabeth  William Shelley Esq.,  "  "  100 marks 47.

14 Elizabeth  William Shelley Esq.,  "  "  £100.48.

18 Elizabeth  William Shelley Esq.,  "  "  £100.49.

1-2 Charles I  Sir John Shelley, kn.t.,  and bart.,  "  "  £25.50.

45. Inner Temple Admissions, 23.
46. P.R.O., E. 179/190/229.
47. "  E. 179/190/268.
49. "  E. 179/190/297.
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(11) Shelley of Patcham.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Shelley of Patcham Esq., only s. of Richard Shelley of Patcham Esq., whose will was proved in 1552,51 and of Mary, d. of Sir Richard Urdiswick.52

1541, was one of the party of Thomas Fiennes, Lord Dacre, who poached on Nicholas Pelham's estate at Laughton, an incident which led to the death of one of the game keepers there. He was indicted with the others.53

1564, mentioned in the bishop's letter as no Justice but a "mysliker of godlie orders". 54

1576, was on the list of Bishop Curtis of those suspected of popery in his diocese.55

Feb., 1586, was possibly the John Shelley who was on the list of Sussex recusants to be disarmed.56

1587, was possibly the John Shelley, recusant, who was assessed as being worth £200 in revenue and £100 in goods.57

Wife.

Ann, d. of Agmondesham, and relict of Edward Warwick. She was bur. at Patcham, 13 Sept., 1553.59

51. P.C.C. 28 Powell. This Richard was the second son of John Shelley of Michelgrove Esq., who died in 1526, and brother of Sir William Shelley, the Judge. This Richard Shelley had lands settled on him by his father, 1524-'5, and was founder of the Shelleys of Patcham and Lewes.

52. Comber, loc.cit; B.&C., loc.cit; Comber, (Lewes), 247.
53. S.A.C., xix, 175-'6, 179.
54. Camden Misc., ix, 11.
55. S.A.C., iii, 90.
56. B.M. Harl. MS, 703, f. 21.
57. S.A.C. ii, 62.
58. P.C.C. 74 Spencer.
59. Comber, loc.cit; B.&C., loc.cit.
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Children. 60.

Richard

J.P. Sussex, 1575-194, frequently of the Quorum. 61. February, 1577, referred to in the Acts of the Privy Council as having been mistakenly displaced from the Commission of the Peace for religious reasons. He was therefore to be replaced, being "a gentleman very faithfull and of good service towards her Majestye" and was to be put on the Quorum, "for the quenching of all bruites and evell opinions conceyved wrongfully of his said displacing". 62. In the 1587 report on the Sussex J.P.'s, was named as being one in Lewes Rape and being "very well thought of" for executing his "offys.of peace". 63. Had been mentioned as a Commissioner for Recusancy for the Diocese of Chichester in a letter from the Privy Council, dated 24 Oct., 1580, to the Bishop of Chichester. 64. Was a Commissioner for Musters for Sussex, c.1585. 65. 4 Oct., 1594, died, aged c. 73. M.I. at Patcham. 66. Probably the John Shelley who was a defendant in a Star chamber case of 20 Elizabeth, against Gregory, Lord Dacres, plaintiff, who accused him and others of breaking and entering into Danny Park Hurstpierpoint, poaching deer, and of murderously attacking the keepers. 67.

John

Bur. at Patcham, 22 Nov., 1589.

George

James

Referred to in two MSS dt. 1576 as having been certified in the Exchequer as a fugitive overseas contrary to a Statute of 13 Elizabeth. 68. Will pr., 1612. 69.

Robert

Henry

Mary

Joan

Bridget

Dorothy

Anne

Catherine.

60. B. & C., loc. cit; Comber, (Leves), 247 et seqq.
63. S.A.C., 11, 59.
64. W.S.C.R.O., D.R.O., 90/I/37, f.7. See also A.P.C., 1580-1, 150, and A.P.C., 1592, 329.
65. B.M. Harl MS, 474, f. 81.
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**Education.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard, adm. to Inner Temple, Nov., 1553.70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry, adm. to Inner Temple, Nov., 1584.71.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marriages of children.**

**Richard**
- md. Dorothy, d. of - Hills. Issue, 6 s.; f d. Eld. son and h. was Henry Shelley of Patcham, born c. 1563, and probably the J. P. Sussex, 1585 - 1602 at least,73. Possibly also the M. P. for Steyning, 1586.74.

**John**
- md. Dorothy, d. of William Everett of South Malling on 28 May, 1570.76.

**George**
- md. Eleanor -.

**James**
- md. Eleanor -.

**Robert**
- md. Eleanor -.

**Henry**
- md. Eleanor -.

**Mary**
- md. as his second wife, at Patcham on 5 Nov., 1574.

**Joan**
- Edward Michelbourne of Clayton, Sussex, gent.

**Bridget**
- ...

**Dorothy**
- ...

**Anne**
- ...

**Catherine**
- ...

---

67. P.R.O., St.Ch. 5 Eliz., D. 15/27.
68. B.M. Lansd. MS. 683. f.37; B.M. Sloane MS, 3,194,f.9b.
69. P.C.C. 73 Fenner.
70. Inner Temple Admissions, 18.
71. Ibid., 110.
72. B&C., loc.cit; Comber, (Lewes), loc.cit.
73. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 27-44.
74. R.C. Gabriell: *Members of the House of Commons, 1586-17* (Univ. of London, M.A. thesis), 598.
75. Comber, (Lewes), 248.
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Subsidy assessments.

(As of Whalesbone Hundred, Lewes Rape.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38 Henry VIII</td>
<td>Richard Shelley</td>
<td>in goods</td>
<td>£100.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Shelley</td>
<td>&quot; lands</td>
<td>£6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Shelley, gent., goods</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Shelley Esq., &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Shelley gent., &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Elizabeth</td>
<td>John Shelley gent., &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(As of Lewes, Lewes Rape)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Elizabeth</td>
<td>Mr Richard Shelley</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Charles I</td>
<td>Henry Shelley Esq.</td>
<td>in goods</td>
<td>£4.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
77. " E. 179/190/267.
78. " E. 179/190/274.
79. " E. 179/190/283.
80. " E. 179/190/299.
SHEPPARD, (Shepherd, Shephard etc.)

Origins.

Little appears to be known of the origins of the Sheppards of Peasmarsh though they are among the families noted in the 1570 Visitation of Sussex, (v. infra), and appear in the Visitation of Kent for 1592, and also are represented on the Commission of the Peace for Sussex for at least seven different years of Elizabeth's reign, and, on one occasion a Sheppard is known to have been one of the Quorum.

Through the centuries, the name crops up in various parts of Sussex. One Frederick Shepherd Esq. is found at Folkington manor in the Rape of Pevensey, adjacent to Wilmington, in 1346. A John Shepherd, bailiff of Pevensey Rape, is found as one of the defendants in a lawsuit over the much disputed common land in Chiddingly, a few miles north of Folkington, called "The Dicker", in 22 Henry VIII. Further West, a Nicholas Shepherd appears at Steyning on 29 March, 1475, as a witness on the occasion of the proof of age of Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of John Michelgrove. And in the seventeenth century, there was a prominent family in Horsham of this name; they are known to have held a farm there of John Caryll of Harting Esq., at the time of the Parliamentary Survey of 1650. There are numerous references to them in the Sussex Archaeological Collections, and a genealogy is given by Comber. There appears, however, to have been no connection between them and the armigerous Elizabethan family settled at Peasmarsh at the other end of the county, nor, evidently, could the Heralds of the 1662 Visitation find any: on the 19th March, 1671, they posted up a Disclaimer of Arms for the county in East Grinstead, and among the "gentlemen" there stripped of their borrowed heraldic plumage was Nicholas Sheppard, or Shepherd, of Horsham. One imagines that he and his must have done all in their powers to avoid such a humiliation. Had they been able to establish any relationship with the Peasmarsh family who were recognised by the Heralds in 1570, the situation would have been saved for them. As it is, the Disclaimer must be taken to dispose of the question.

2. S.A.C., xiv, 263. Cf. xxiv, 220.
3. S.A.C., xiv, 234.
4. S.A.C., xii, 44.
5. S.A.C., xxiii, 284.
7. Comber, (Horsham), 325.
8. S.A.C., xxxix, 127.
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The genealogy of the Peasmarsh family given by Berry and Comber, goes no further back than that of the 1570 Visitation. It begins with one, Richard Sheppard of Peasmarsh, Sussex, who married Ann, daughter of John Atesbery of Westfield, Sussex, and by her had a son, Robert, eventually also of Peasmarsh, who was living at the time of the 1570 Visitation, and who signed the pedigree now in the College of Arms. This Robert was plaintiff in fine for the manor of Peasmarsh in 1557, together with his son, Alexander. This manor, in the parish of the same name, in Goldspur Hundred, Hastings Rape, had been a prebendal manor. At the Dissolution it was granted to Sir Anthony Browne, whose son, Viscount Montague, was the vendor of it, in 1557, to Robert Sheppard and his son, Alexander. In 16 Elizabeth, the said Robert Sheppard acknowledged that the advowsons of Northiam, Beckley, Iden and Playden, did not belong to the manor of Peasmarsh but were the property of Anthony, Viscount Montague.

Peasmarsh lies about two miles North-West of Rye at the extreme eastern end of the county, and not far from Northiam. It is not far South of the River Rother which marks the county boundary and the soil is enriched by that river though it is said to be sandy and dry in some places. The parish is described by Horsfield as possessing, in his time, an abundance of good timber and as being in the hop-growing area of the county.

Robert Sheppard of Peasmarsh who bought that manor and who appears in the 1570 Visitation, was a J.P. of Sussex from 1571 until his death. He died on 9 Nov., 1575, and his will was dated 31 October, 1575 and proved in the same year. His I.P.M. was dated 23 May, 1576, and says that at his death he held lands in Peasmarsh, Sedlescombe, Brede, Ewhurst, Rye, Udimore and elsewhere in Sussex, as well as lands in Tenterden, Blackmanstone and Margate in Kent.

This Robert Sheppard married twice: first, Elizabeth, daughter and coheirress of Alexander Wells of Rye, Sussex, and secondly, Agnes, daughter of Thomas Byrchett of Rye, she being named in her husband's will, her own will being as of 1576.

---

13. Horsfield, 1, 507.
14. Ibid.
(Sheppard continued.)

Tenterden, Kent, and proved in 1593.\textsuperscript{19} By his first wife, Robert had a son, Alexander, who succeeded him in 1575; by his second, he had one son, Robert, later of Tenterden, Kent,\textsuperscript{20} and four daughters.

The family is likely to have been indigenous to Sussex, or perhaps, to Kent. They had many links with the latter county in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; people of this name had also been known in Sussex long before the sixteenth century, though it is difficult to establish any connection between them and the Peasmarsh family.\textsuperscript{21}

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation of Sussex,\textsuperscript{22} but not in that of 1634.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Alexander Sheppard Esq. of Peasmarsh, eldest son and heir of Robert Sheppard Esq. of the same, who was J.P. Sussex, 1571 to his death on 9 Nov., 1575, (v. supra), and of Elizabeth, d. and coheiress of Alexander Wells of Rye, Sussex, his first wife. (V. supra).

Aged 15 in 1570, and a minor at his father's death. The wardship was sold to Edward Moore Esq., Gentleman Pensioner.\textsuperscript{23}

1557, had been a nominal plaintiff in fine with his father for Peasmarsh manor, and in 1597 was plaintiff in fine for the prebend, rectory and tithes of the same. He was deforciant for the latter in 1633, the tithes being quitclaimed to certain members of the Knatchbull family, relatives of his second wife.\textsuperscript{24}

18. P.R.O., C. 142/175/77 & 78.
19. P.C.C. 33 Nevell.
21. The Sheppards of Peasmarsh may have had relations at Guestling, between Hastings and Winchelsea. Robert Sheppard, the elder, mentioned them in his will. See also P.C.C. 22 Loftes, the will of John Sheppard of Guestling, of 1561.
22. V. Supra, note 9.
24. S.R.S., xx, 343. See also S.R.S. xxxiii, no. 64.
(Sheppard continued)

c. 1573, he and his father were concerned in a dispute with the Mayor of Rye over the repair of a sea-wall which was said to damage the haven of Rye, the Sheppards contending that if the breach were not filled in their houses and mills on the marsh would be endangered. 25.

1588, was assessed at £40 for the Armada Loan, the third lowest rate, with 15 others. 26.

June, 1602, J.P., Sussex, 27. and perhaps thereafter.

Date of death unknown. Apparently no will or I.P.M.

Wives. 28.

Md. twice:-
1) Elizabeth, d. of Richard Covert of Slaugham.
2) Ursula, d. of Richard Knatchbull of Mersham, Kent. She died in 1582. 29.

Children. 30.

By his first wife:-

William Only s. and h. Deforciant in fine for manors of Peasmarsh, Tillingham and Playden in 1614-15. 31. Died 8 June, 1634 at Battersea. I.P.M., 22 Sept., 1636. 32.

Ann
Jane
Ciceley
Sarah
By his second wife:-
Susan
Bridget

26. S.A.C. 1, 36.
27. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, no. 44.
30. B.&C., loc.cit.
32. P.R.O. C. 142/536/28. He was in trouble with the borough of Rye in 1604 for draining marshes nearby, so damaging their haven. H.M.C. 13th Report, iv, 31.
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Education.       Universities.       Inns of Court.
Father       -       -       -
Son       -       -       -

Marriages of children 33
Of the first marriage:-
Jane md. John Fowtrell of Rye, Sussex.
Ciceley md. - Franck of co. Lincs.
Sarah md. Thomas Sharpe of Cranbrook, Kent.

Of the second marriage:-
Susan Bridget md. at St. Mildred's, Poultry, 8 May, 1628, Rev. Thomas Bunbury of Netherhead, co. Kent. 34.

Subsidy assessments.
(As of Goldspur Hundred, Hastings Rape)
   (Agnes Sheppard, his wife, in lands £3.35.
2 Elizabeth Robert Sheppard, gent., in lands £4036.
14 Elizabeth Robert Sheppard Esq. " " £45.37.
18 Elizabeth Alexander Sheppard, gent., in lands £40.
   (Agnes Sheppard, widow, " " £30.38.

33. B.&C., loc.cit.
34. S.N.O., ii, 113.
35. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
36. " E. 179/190/266.
37. " E. 179/190/283.
38. " E. 179/190/298. There is an assessment for John Sheppard of Goldspur Hundred, Hastings Rape for 1-2 Charles I, (P.R.O., E. 179/191/377a), but he does not appear to be in the direct line of descent. (See B.&C., loc.cit., and Horsfield, i, 507.)
SHIRLEY.

Origins.

The spectacular history of this family during the Elizabethan period has attracted considerable attention from their own time onwards. They were one of the half dozen families contributing to all four categories of important county positions in Elizabethan Sussex, namely those of the Deputy Lieutenants, of the county M.P.'s, of the Sheriffs and of the J.P.'s, but unlike the other five, the Shirleys of Wiston were comparative newcomers to the county, at least as residents, although at the beginning of the fifteenth century they already held extensive lands there.

The early history of the family is described in an article by M.A. Lower, and a detailed and annotated pedigree is given in Berry and Comber. According to these authorities, the first member of this family to be connected with Sussex was Sir Hugh Shirley of Ettington, or Eatington, in Warwickshire, whom Mr Lower described as "an eminent personage". He attended John of Gaunt in his expedition to Guienne and held a number of offices such as those of the Constable of Higham Ferrers Park, of Constable of Donnington Castle and of Grand Falconer of Ireland. He was killed fighting for Henry IV at the battle of Shrewsbury on 20 July, 1403, and his name is immortalized in Shakespeare's "Henry IV, part I." This was the Shirley who married a Sussex heiress Beatrix de Braose, and so acquired the Sussex manors of Wiston, Ashurst, West Chiltington, Heene, Slaughters and Erringham. At his death, Sir Hugh left a son and heir, Ralph, who was then twelve years old, and who "also achieved considerable eminence in the stirring and eventful days in which he lived". He was knighted as a youth and subsequently acquired the Stewardship of the Duchy of Lancaster and other important offices. He accompanied Henry V to France, being with him at the siege of Harfleur, and he was a principal commander at Agincourt. He died abroad in about the year 1443.

1. The others were the families of Covert, Palmer, Parker, Pelham and Sackville.
3. S.A.C., v., 8n. says that the ancestors of the Shirleys were settled at Eatington, co. Warwicks, "immediately after the Conquest and probably anterior to that event". Sewallis, who is mentioned in Domesday Book as lord of Etendone, is described by Mr Lower as their ancestor. His immediate descendants, having land at Shirley in Derbyshire, took their name from that place. According to Mr Lower, Sir Hugh Shirley who obtained Wiston was eighth in descent from him. These statements have not been verified.
(Shirley continued.)

Sir Ralph's son, of the same name, who died in 1466, married three times; first, Margaret, daughter and heiress of Thomas Staunton of Staunton-Harold, from whom descended the elder line, the Shirleys of Eatingto and Shirley, Earl Ferrers; secondly, Elizabeth Blount, daughter of Sir John Blount, and sister of Walter, Lord Mountjoy, from whom descended the Shirleys of Wiston; and thirdly, Lucy, daughter of Sir John Ashton.

The Shirleys had now, for several generations, been lords of Wiston but they had not resided there. After the death of Ralph Shirley however, in 1466, his estates were partitioned, the Sussex and Buckinghamshire manors being allotted to the son of the second marriage, namely another Ralph, who then settled at Wiston.

This Ralph was Esquire of the Body to Henry VII and in Nov. 1503, he became Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex. His will, dated 11 February, 1509 and proved in 1510, directed that he was to be buried at Wiston. It is clear from his will that this Shirley was an agriculturist of some importance since he left his wife and son, Richard, ninety-one head of cattle and eight hundred sheep. Mr Lower says "This gentleman is the founder and patriarch of the Sussex Shirley. He had, by his wife, Jane, daughter of Thomas Bellingham, two sons, Richard, the elder, who succeeded him, and Thomas, the younger, who became the ancestor of the Shirleys of West Grinstead.

5. B.&C., loc.cit. Lower says thirteen. (S.A.C., v.8).
6. S.A.C. v, 8.
7. S.A.C., v.9; B.&C., loc.cit., says twice but gives the name of the second wife only.
8. But S.N.Q., ii,75, says Margaret, d. of Sir John Blount.
10. S.A.C., v, 10.
11. S.A.C., v, 11-12; xix, 68n; xxii,10; and notes on Shirley of West Grinstead.
(Shirley continued)

Sir Richard Shirley became Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex in Nov. 1513 and Jan 1526. He was also county M.P. for Sussex in the Reformation Parliament. In 1540 he was succeeded by his son, William, who died on 29 May, 1551, at the age of fifty-one, leaving two sons and a daughter. His elder son who was also his heir, was the notable Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston who was head of the family in 1580 and played a prominent part in the history of the county under Queen Elizabeth. His younger son was Anthony Shirley of Preston, which property he acquired through his mother, Mary, daughter of Thomas Isley of Sundridge, Kent, Esq., who, after William Shirley's death, remarried Richard Elrington Esq. From this Anthony descend the Shirleys of Preston, one of whom, Anthony's great-grandson, was created a baronet in 1665 at a time when the elder line had fallen on very evil days.

Despite the comparatively short time that the family had been resident in Sussex, they had, by Sir Thomas Shirley's time, become connected with many leading county families. Apart from the Blounts and the Bellinghams with whom their alliances have been mentioned, the Shirleys had, since the beginning of the sixteenth century, married into such Sussex families as the Chaloners of Lindfield, the Dawtreys of Petworth, the Michells of Stamerham and the Shelleys of Michelgrove. There were also some striking matches with families outside Sussex, for example, the marriage of Anthony Shirley of Preston with a member of the Walsingham family. In fact, by Sir Thomas Shirley's time, the family were well rooted socially, and their connections outside the county would have increased their influence within it. The marriages made by Sir Thomas' own daughters show that a connection with the Shirleys of Wiston was then valued even by members of some of the leading political families of England, and of the peerage. Their social prestige seems to have lasted long after disaster overtook the family.

12. S.A.C., v, 12-13; xxxii, 158.
13. S.A.C., v, 13-14; i.F.M., P.R.O., C.142/94/76; B.&C., loc. cit.
14. S.A.C., v, 13-14; xix, 63 et seqq; lxii, 89-91; B.&C., loc. cit.
15. B.&C., loc. cit. See also B.M. Harl MS, 703,f. 77b.
16. But S.A.C., ii, 99 & 101 is misleading. The lady referred to as the betrothed of Sir Thomas Pelham, 2nd bart. of Laughton, was apparently Judith, d. of Sir Robert Honywood of Pett, Charing, Kent, and widow of the younger John Shurley of Lewes who died in 1631 (q.v.) She was not a member of the Wiston family.
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Wiston House, the home of the Wiston Shirleys, was rebuilt in about 1576. It is situated at the foot of the Downs, on the North side, immediately below Chanctonbury Ring, and close to Steyning. It has been much altered by rebuilding. 17.

Whether armigerous.

The Shirleys of Wiston are mentioned in the Visitations of 1530 and 1570. 18. The Shirleys of Preston appear in those of 1634 and 1662. 19.

(1) Shirley of Wiston.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston, eld. son and heir of William Shirley of Wiston Esq. who died 29 May, 1551 and was buried at Wiston, 20 and of Mary, d. of Thomas Isley of Sundridge, Kent, Esq., William Shirley's step-sister. After William Shirley's death, she married Richard Elrington of Preston who predeceased her. 21.

Aged only 9 years old at his father's death in 1551. 22.

Early in life, he was patronised by the Earl of Leicester. 23.

1569, 1584, 1591, (then noted as in the Low Countries), referred to as a Deputy Lieutenant for Sussex. He was specifically dropped from the Commission of Lieutenancy in 1601. 24.

M.P. Sussex, 1572, 1584, 25-1593; Steyning, 1601, 1604, Sat on a few parliamentary committees. 26.

June, 1573-Jan., 1601, J.P. Sussex. Of the Quorum regularly from about 1584. 27. 1587, referred to in certificate concerning the Sussex J.P.'s as, with two others in Bramber Rape, "good Justyces, young men." 28.

17. Horsfield, i, 235; S.A.C., v, 8 et seqq.; 111, 84.
18. S.A.C., xxxix, 105; H.C. MS, D. 13; and Phillips, 10; H.C. MSS, D. 11 and G. 18. Also B.M.Add. MS, 17, 065, ff. 6b and 7.
19. S.A.C., xxxix, 113, 125; H.C. MS, C. 27.
20. Will P.C.C. 19 Bucke; I.P.M. P.R.O. C. 142/94/76.
22. S.A.C., v, 14.
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12 August 1573, knighted at Rye when the Queen first visited the town.

During his early years, perhaps c. 1576, he re-built Wiston House.

Nov., 1577, Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex.

1580, was a Commissioner for Recusancy for Sussex.

1583-14, had the custody of Anne, Countess of Arundel, at Wiston. There her daughter, Elizabeth, was born.

c. 1585, Commissioner for disarming the Sussex Recusants and Commissioner for Musters. He was also Commissioner for disarming the Sussex recusants in July, 1592.

1585-16, accompanied Leicester to the Low Countries with a troop of his own raising.

February, 1587, appointed Treasurer at War to the English army serving in the Netherlands, probably through Leicester's influence. Began soon afterwards to amass a fortune by speculating with the money granted for the payment of the armed forces. Was reported at one time to be making £16,000 p.a. over and above his salary by doing this, by selling concessions to victuallers and by acting as a money-lender.

23. D.N.B.
24. See Appendix 2.
25. In 1584, was supported, with Robert Sackville, by Lord Buckhurst and Viscount Montgomery, (both of whom wrote to the Sheriff, Walter Covert Esq., on the matter), against Herbert Pelham and George Goring, the rival candidates. (B.M. Harl. MS. 703, ff. 18b & 19b).
29. D.N.B.
31. P.R.O. Sheriffs
33. See notes on the Howard family.
34. B.M. Harl. MS. 474, ff 90b and 80b.
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1588, was assessed at the rate of £100 for the Armada Loan, the highest rate known in Sussex. 40. 1591, bought a manor of about 1,100 acres in Leicestershire from the Earl of Essex. 41. 1592, attempted, unsuccessfully, to buy the office of Comptroller of the Household through Burghley for £500. 42. 1593, bought property in Sussex from the Pellatt family. 43.

1591, the Queen appointed a Commission to enquire into his pecuniary position, but he continued to hold the office and was also Treasurer of the forces serving in France from 1591 on. 44. But there were many complaints about his discharge of his duties. He replied to some of these in a letter of 23 May, 1595. 45.

By March, 1596, it was reported that he owed the Queen more than he was worth. 46.

21 March, 1597, he went bankrupt. 47. The defalcations debited against him amounted to £120,000. 48. He was charged with peculation, and in the course of the subsequent enquiries, others were involved. 49.

35. B.M. Harl. MS 703, f. 67b.
36. D.N.B. For his intimate relations with Leicester, see B.M. Cotton MS. Galba, C. IX., f. 120 et seqq., 128, 136.
37. D.N.B. P.R.O., MS, Cal. Pat. Rolls, 30 Eliz. f. 13b; Signet Office Docquets I, P.R.O. Index 6800, f. 113; Cal. S.P. D., 1581-1603, 1, 663.
40. S.A.C., i, 35. He was in England then (B.M. Harl MS. 703, f. 53b & 54.
42. P.R.O., S.P. 12/242, f. 50.
43. S.A.C., xxxviii, 111 & 116.
44. D.N.B.; Cal. S.P. D., 1595-17, 44.
45. Cal. S.P. D., 1595-17, loc. cit.
46. D.N.B.
47. Dietz, loc. cit.
48. Ibid.
March, 1604, was arrested for debt and imprisoned in the Fleet though he was then M.P. for Steyning. The House of Commons raised the question of privilege and championed it with such zeal that eventually Shirley was released and took his seat.  

Was obliged to sell much ancient family property both in Sussex and elsewhere in the attempt to meet his debts. He kept only Wistoh which he settled on his wife.  

Oct., 1612, died, the year after his son Robert returned from abroad, heavily in debt. He was buried at Wiston. M.I.  

Wife.  

Ann, d. of Sir Thomas Kempe, knt., of Wollantighe, Kent. Md. in 1559. Wiston was settled on her by her husband when in financial difficulties. Will dt. 19 Feb., 1622, pr. 1623. Bur. 17 Feb., 1622, at Preston, her brother-in-law’s seat.  

Children.  

Later Sir Thomas Shirley, "the younager". Eld. s. and h. 6 years old at the 1570. Visitation of Sussex. M.P. Steyning, 1584, 1593; elected for Bramber & Hastings, preferred Hastings, 1601; Steyning, 1614, 1621. Accompanied his father to the Low Countries, 1585. Later did some military service in Ireland where he was knighted, Oct., 1589. Subsequently was at Court. The Queen was much irritated by his first and secret marriage and in Sept., 1591 he was committed to the Marshalsea where he remained until the following spring, 1593, served again in the Low Countries, holding the rank of captain. Became involved in his father's pecuniary difficulties. Resolved on privateering as a way out. Handed over his company at Flushing to his wife's kinsman, Sir Thomas Vavasour. Despite his seizure of four "hulks" in the Channel in 1598, and his pillaging of a township in Portugal in 1602, he was still troubled...
(Shirley continued.)

Children, continued

by his creditors. In 1600, his father brought a case on his behalf against the supporters of Sir Richard Weston of Sutton, Surrey, one of his creditors, in the Star Chamber. They were accused of breaking into the Shirleys' house in Blackfriars at about 1 o'clock on 31 July, 1600, and attacking the Shirleys, father and son, who were unarmed, and of attempting to break in again after they had been turned out. The answer of one, Thomas Lea Esq., was that he had been requested by Sir Richard Weston to recover a debt owed him by the younger Sir Thomas Shirley or to find out whether the latter acknowledged it. The upshot was a quarrel in which the younger Shirley denied "with lewd words" that he owed anything, and the elder Shirley spoke his mind about Sir Richard Weston. Thomas Lea was then thrust out of the house and the doors were locked, but as one of Lea's servants was still inside, he kicked the gate open and the servant escaped through it. He denied that he had intended to murder Shirley. 58.

1602, went on an expedition to attack the Turks in the Levant. Jan., 1603, captured by the Turks and remained their prisoner until Dec., 1605. Late in 1606, returned to England. Sept., 1607, imprisoned in the Tower for illegal interference with the operations of the Levant Co. August, 1611, confirmed in King's Bench as an insolvent debtor. 1612, his father died and his difficulties were thereby increased. 59. c. 1624, sold Wiston to Sir John Fagg and retired to the Isle of Wight where he died c. 1630. He left in MS "A Discourse of the Turks". 60.

56. D.N.B.
58. P.R.O. St. Ch. 5 Eliz., S. 67/18; and S. 67/37; also S.14/4.
59. D.N.B.
60. Ibid; S.A.C., v, 23-14.
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Children continued.

Anthony Later "Sir Anthony Shirley", 2nd son. 5 years old at the 1570 Visitation of Sussex. 61. 1585 -1602 at least, J.P. Sussex. 62. 1587, in certificate concerning the Sussex J.P's was referred to as dropped from the Commission of the Peace because he had a brother on it and there were enough J.P's for Bramber Rape without him. This report embodies at least one error. (V. infra.) 63. 1586, took part in the wars in the Low Countries and was present at Zutphen. 64. 1591, joined the Earl of Essex in his expedition to Normandy in support of Henry of Navarre and became an enthusiastic admirer of the Earl. Was made a knight of the Order of St. Michael by Henry IV of France. 1593, returned to England. The Queen was angry at his acceptance of this honour and he was imprisoned in the Fleet. He was examined by Sir John Puckering, the Lord Keeper, and by Lord Buckhurst and released on his retirement from the Order. 65. But he was commonly known thereafter as "Sir Anthony". 1595, was plaintiff in a Star Chamber case against various inhabitants of Tilehurst in Berkshire who had cut down and taken away grass in a meadow claimed by Shirley as his. The defendants, chief of whom was Thomas Alberie, showed that the land was confiscated land, originally belonging to Sir Francis Englefield, but taken over by the Crown in 14 Elizabeth because of his defiance of the Statute against persons staying beyond the seas without permission. In 16 Elizabeth, the land was granted by patent under the Exchequer seal to one, Thomas Stiff, for as long as it should remain in the Queen's hands, and Thomas Alberie became the sub-tenant and occupier. On Englefield's attainder Alberie became suitor to the Lord Treasurer for a new lease and at first this was not definitely granted or refused. Alberie therefore continued in occupation. He denied that Shirley

61.B.&C., loc.cit; Phillips, 10.
62.P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E.Circuit, Sussex, 27-44. But the list for 1586, (no.28), is missing and he is not on the 1587 list, nor on that for Jan. 1589, though he is on those for 1588 and June, 1589.
63.S.A.C.*, ii, 60. But the reference to his brother being a J.P is an obvious error. There is no evidence for this. It was Sir Thomas Shirley, the elder, who was on the contd.
(Shirley continued)

Children continued

had any title to the land and affirmed that the Queen had lately granted him the land for 21 years by patent under the Exchequer seal, retaining the reversion herself. In the course of the interrogatories, it transpired that the Earl of Essex had laid claim to the land and had sold his interest in it to Sir Anthony Shirley. 1595, planned a buccaneering expedition with Essex and his father to attack a Portuguese settlement in the Gulf of Guinea. Delay, due chiefly to Essex. 1596, started on an expedition with six ships but did not attack the settlement. Visited Dominica, coasted Venezuela and Columbia and called at Jamaica in Jan., 1597. He planned, after visiting Newfoundland, to return via the Straits of Magellan and the Pacific and Indian Oceans but all his ships but one mutinied. He called at Newfoundland and arrived in London in July, 1597, according to Sir Robert Cecil, "alive but poor". The same year, he accompanied Essex on the fruitless Islands Voyage. 1599, accepted Essex's invitation to conduct a company of English volunteers to Ferrara to assist the d'Este claimant to seize it, and left England with his brother, Robert, never to return. He found the succession dispute settled in Ferrara, and, according to Anthony Shirley, was instructed to continue to Persia on a diplomatic and commercial mission.

reference 63 continued

Commission of the Peace at this time, he being referred to as "knight" after 1573. (P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex 15 et seqq. He is still "Esq" in the June, 1573 list). The father was only 45 years old in 1587 when Anthony was 22.

64. D.N.E.
65. Ibid.; see also B.M. Harl. MS, 6996, ff. 81-91b.
66. P.R.O. Star Chamber 5 Eliz. S. 59/5; S. 42/25,
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But he had no official sanction from the government, and when he sought later to return to England, he was refused and English ambassadors abroad were warned to repudiate his claims. May, 1599, Anthony and Robert Shirley left Venice and travelled via Constantinople and Aleppo, and down the Euphrates to Babylon, and thence to Persia where they stayed for 5 months at the Court of the Shah. 67. While there, he corresponded with "Master Bacon" and the Earl of Essex, reporting on his opening up of relations with Persia and obtaining concessions for English merchants wishing to go there, describing the gifts of the Shah to him, including "16,000 crowns to bear my charges" on a hunting expedition, "30 horses with furniture, 4 saddles of gold and precious stones, 12 camels, 10 mules, 3 tents", etc. In a letter to the Earl of Essex, Shirley confessed to the vice of borrowing but said it had pleased God to enable him now to satisfy his debts if only his creditors would be patient until he could send the money. He promised to assist his father, that his "base frends" should have no cause to triumph over him, and said that he had a standing pension of thirty thousand crowns a year. 68. From Persia he travelled to Moscow, Stettin, Prague and Rome as the envoy of the Shah. His appeals for permission to revisit England were ignored. March, 1602, he was in Venice where he fell into debt and also under the suspicion of the English government on account of his correspondence with the Spanish king and his ministers. 69. April, 1603, arrested by the Venetian authorities, either as a debtor or as a conspirator against a friendly power, England. Imprisoned, but released after the accession of James I had changed the official attitude in England towards him. Feb., 1604, received a licence from the English government to remain abroad for some time longer and subsequently acted as informer to Cecil about plots being hatched abroad against England. Spring, 1605, sent to Prague. 1606, went to Morocco where he ransomed certain Portuguese prisoners but, on sailing with them to Lisbon, was

67. D.N.B.
68. B.M. Add. MS, 38,139, ff. 15-15b.
69. D.N.B; Cal.S.P.D. 1601-3, 159.
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unable to recover the ransom money. In Madrid, was commissioned to harass the Turks and Moors in the Levant. After an abortive attack on Mitylene in 1609, he was dismissed from his command by the Spanish government. 1611, returned to Madrid where he met and quarrelled with his brother, Robert. He was in dire poverty, and although the Spanish king allowed him a pension, most of it went to his creditors. He remained in Madrid in a state of destitution until his death after 1635, planning further adventures, associating with the Jesuits, and after 1611, compiling an account of his Persian experiences, published in London in 1613.

Robert Later "Sir Robert Shirley", 3rd son. Sometimes known as "Count Shirley". 1581, born. 1599, accompanied his brother, Anthony, on the abortive expedition to Ferrara and thence to Persia. When, at the end of 1599, Anthony left Persia, on his mission to the Courts of Europe, Robert remained as the guest of the Shah. May, 1605, he wrote to Anthony that he intended to leave Persia if possible, and in May, 1606, he wrote again describing the perils of the Persian Court. Before 1607, he married a Circassian, related to one of the Shah's wives. 1607, owing to Anthony's long silence, the Shah appointed Robert as a second envoy to the Courts of Europe including that of James I to obtain help against the Turks, and to open up commercial relations with other countries. Feb., 1608, left Persia with his wife. Visited Poland, and in June, 1609, Prague, where he was knighted by the Emperor Rudolf II and created Count Palatine of the Empire. He continued to Florence and to Rome, where, in September, he was received by the Pope. Met his brother, Anthony, in Milan, and continued to Spain where he transacted commercial business at Barcelona and Madrid. 1611, received his brother, Anthony, who was then very poor, at Madrid, and that summer left for England. In August, he stayed with his father at Wiston. In Oct., 1611, he was received by James I at Hampton Court and Prince Henry stood godfather to Robert's son. He was given an allowance. But the merchants were suspicious of him, fearing for their trade with Turkey. Jan., 1613, left London for Persia. June, 1615, arrived at Ispahan and was nearly poisoned. Later in 1615, left Persia on another mission, visiting Goa, Lisbon, Madrid and Rome. Jan., 1624, arrived in

70. D.N.B., S.A.C., v, 18-21; xviii, 108.
(Shirley continued.)

Children continued

England and stayed with his sister, Lady Crofts, at Saxham, Suffolk. Visited James I at Newmarket. Was provided by the government with a house on Tower Hill. 1625, another envoy arrived from Persia and there was a violent quarrel between them. The English government recommended both to return to Persia. March, 1627, they sailed in separate ships and on the way Robert Shirley's rival committed suicide. June, 1628, reached the Shah's Court. There he was told his services were unwanted. 13 July, 1628, died. The Shah was reported to be much moved. His widow went to Rome where she died in 1668. Their son, Henry, is known to have been alive in England in 1626 but he died soon after. 71.

Margaret Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation, but not represented in the M.I. at Wiston. 72.

Mary Robert, her brother, stayed with her in Suffolk on his visit to England in 1624.

Elizabeth (or Isabel, 73) Died, August, 1630. 74.

Elizabeth 75.

Jane

Anne Bap. at St. Anne's, Blackfriars, 1 January, 1574. 76.

Cecily Living, 1622. 77.

72. Phillips, 10; S.A.C., lxxii, 231.
73. S.A.C., v, 15; lxxii, 231.
74. B.&C., loc.cit.
75. Ibid.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid.
(Shirley continued)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Hart Hall, Oxf., matric. entry under dt., 1579, aged 15</td>
<td>Thomas, student of Inner Temple, 1581. Special admission in November.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sons

| B.A., 8 Feb. 1582. Fellow of All Souls, 1582. |
| Robert, M.A. Cantab., 1612.84. |

Marriages of children.

Thomas md. twice:-(a) Frances, d. of Sir Thomas Vavasour, knt. They were married secretly, in the summer of 1591. The Queen was much offended. (v. supra). 86. Issue, 3 s., one of whom was Henry, the dramatist, who died in 1627,87. and 4 d. Only one son, Thomas, survived his father. (v. infra, Epilogue to the family history of the Wiston Shirleys). (b) Judith, d. of William Bennett of London, and widow of - Taylor. They had 6 s. and 6 d. 88.

Anthony md. in or after 1593, Frances, d. of Sir John Vernon of Hodnet, Shropshire, by Elizabeth, sister of Walter Devereux, 1st Earl of Essex. Anthony's wife was therefore Robert Deveraux, Earl of Essex's first cousin. An unhappy marriage. No issue. 89.

Robert md., before 1607, Teresia, d. of Ismael Khan of Persia. He was "a Circassian of noble birth and of Christian faith, related to one of the Circassian wives of the Shah Abbas". 90. Feb., 1608, left Persia with her husband whom she accompanied on his European journeys as far as Prague, 1609, where she remained while Robert went on to Italy. She rejoined him in Madrid, March, 1611. That summer they went to England and stayed at Wiston with Robert's father. Nov., 1611, their son was born;

---

78. Al. Ox., iv, 1348.
80. Al. Ox., loc. cit.
82. Al. Ox., loc. cit.
83. Inner Temple Admissions, 108.
(Shirley continued.)

Marriages of children continued

Henry, Prince of Wales stood godfather. Jan., 1613, she accompanied her husband back to Persia and arrived with him at Isphahan in June, 1615 where they were nearly poisoned. She was with him in Rome in 1622 when Vandyck painted their portraits. She was also with him in England later and urged that he and the rival Persian envoy should sail for Persia in separate ships, in 1627. After her husband's death in 1628, she retired to Rome where she was "held in esteem because of her devotion to the Catholic faith". She had her husband's remains re-interred in the Church of Santa Maria della Scala and seems to have resided in the convent attached to the Church. She and her only son, Henry, received an annuity left them by Robert's mother of £40 p.a.

Henry was alive in England in 1626 but dead soon afterwards. His mother died in 1668 and was probably buried in the same tomb as her husband.91.

Margaret92.

Mary md. Sir John Crofts of Saxham, Suffolk.

Elizabeth (or Isabel) md. Sir Edward Onslow of Surrey who died in 1615. Issue.

Elizabeth md. Sir Pexal Brocas of Beaurepaires, Hants., a supporter of the Earl of Essex.93.

Jane md. Sir John Shurley of Isfield, (q.v.) Issue.

Anne md., c. 1590, John, 1st Viscount Tracy. Issue.

Cecily md., on 25 Nov., 1602, at St. Dunstan's in the West, Thomas West, 12th Baron De la Warr. Issue.94.
(Shirley continued.)

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Wiston, Hundred of Steyning, Bramber Rape.)

38 Henry VIII  William Shirley, gent. in lands £50.95.
               Anne Shirley         " " £50.

14 Elizabeth  Thomas Shirley Esq. " " £40.96.

18 Elizabeth  Sir Thomas Shirley, knt., " " £60.97.
               (Commissioner)
               Anthony Shirley Esq. " " £10.

Epilogue.

The heir of the Wiston Shirleys after the death of Sir Thomas Shirley, the younger, in c. 1630, was the only surviving son of his first marriage, Thomas, who was baptised at West Clandon, Surrey, on 30 June, 1597, and knighted at Oxford in 1645 by Charles I, for whom he "suffered". He was still living in 1664, and was father of Dr. Thomas Shirley, the physician to Charles II, who entered into protracted litigation concerning certain property at Wiston, valued at £3,000 p.a. which had been assigned to another during the Civil War.

The case went to the House of Lords on appeal, but Sir John Fagg, the defendant, was an M.P. and pleaded privilege, and a fracas ensued between the two Houses ending in the prorogation of Parliament, August, 1678. Dr. Thomas Shirley died and with him the line came to an end.

---

reference 88 continued

buried. D.N.B. mentions only five sons. Cf. B.&C.
89. D.N.B. sub "Sir Anthony Shirley"; Cal.S.P.D. 1595-7, 44
90. D.N.B. sub "Robert Shirley".
91. Ibid.
Cf. B.&C., loc.cit.
93. B.&C., loc.cit.
94. Ibid., but date of marriage here given as 1596; cf. G.E.C iv, 160.
95. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
96. " E. 179/190/283.
97. " E. 179/190/297.
98. B.&C., loc.cit.
99. D.N.B. sub "Sir Thomas Shirley, 1564-1630?"
100. Ibid; S.A.C., v, 22-25.
(Shirley continued)

(ii) Shirley of West Grinstead.

This family, a younger branch of the Shirleys of Wiston, appears in this study by reason of their representation among the J.P.'s and Sheriffs of Elizabethan Sussex. It was founded by Thomas Shirley, younger brother of Sir Richard Shirley of Wiston who died in 1540. (V. supra, and note 11).

According to one authority, the Shirleys of West Grinstead became lords of that manor by grant from the Crown on the attainder of Sir Thomas Seymour to whom it had previously been granted. How the property came to be in the Crown's possession to begin with, is not known. It was granted to Thomas Shirley, younger son of the Ralph Shirley of Wiston whose will was proved in 1510, and continued in the possession of this family until about 1607 when the manor and manorial residence were sold to Sir Edward Caryll of Harting. At that date, the male line of the West Grinstead Shirleys had died out.101.

Thomas Shirley, the first of the Shirleys of West Grinstead, described as of "The Marsh" in West Grinstead Esq.102, was M.P. for Steyning in the Reformation Parliament, his elder brother being one of the county members for Sussex.103. He married Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of Marmaduke Gorges als Russell of Gloucestershire, by whom he had two sons, Francis and William, and four daughters, Isabel, Eleanor, who married one of the Brownes of Betchworth Castle, Surrey, and Elizabeth and Joan.

Francis Shirley of West Grinstead succeeded his father in 1545 and was aged 21 and more on the 30 Jan., 1545.104. He was M.P. for Shoreham in 1555, a J.P. for Sussex, 1564 - 1578, and Sheriff for Surrey and Sussex in 1573-4.105. He died on 24 March, 1578. 106. By his wife, Barbara, daughter of Richard Blount of Mapledurham, he had two sons, Thomas and Richard, and two daughters, Elizabeth and Ciceley. Thomas was therefore head of the family in 1580.

101. S.A.C., xxii,10; also v., 11-12, and xix, 68n.
103. Official Returns.
104. Father's Will, P.C.C. 34 Wratley; I.P.M., P.R.O., C. 142/183/65.
106. I.P.M., P.R.O. C. 142/183/65.
Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Thomas Shirley Esq., eld. s. of Francis Shirley Esq., M.P. Shoreham, 1555, J.P. Sussex, 1564-1578, and Sheriff of Surrey and Sussex, 1573-4, who died 28 March, 1578, and of his wife, Barbara, d. of Sir Richard Blount of Mapledurham. (V. supra)

Aged 21 and more in 1578. 107.

J.P. Sussex, 1597-1600, but not of the Quorum. 108.

A staunch Calvinist. 109.


I.P.M., 31 August, 1606. 111.

Wives. 112.

Md. twice:-

1) Elizabeth - Deforciant in fine with her husband for Buddington in 1584. No issue.

2) Philippa, d. of Sir Edward Caryll of Harting. Living in 1606. 113.

Children. 114.

By his first wife: - None.

By his second wife: -


Barbara Aged 18 and unmarried in 1606.

Education. Universities. Inns of Court.

Father Perhaps the Thomas S., gent., adm. to Gray's Inn, 14 May, 1591. 115.

107. See his father's I.P.M., P.R.O., C. 142/183/65.
110. P.C.C. 3 and 39 Hudleston.
112. B.&C., loc.cit.
113. Ibid; & 359. (But Trenqualeon, loc.cit., says she was the only daughter of Edward Caryll 'of Washington')
(Shirley continued)

Marriages of children. 116.

Barbara md. twice:—(a) Sir Thomas Thornhurst who died, 1627. M.I., Canterbury Cathedral. (b) Anthony St. Leger.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Tithing of Grinstead, Hundred of Grinstead, Bramber Rape.

38 Henry VIII Francis Shirley, gent. in lands £5 13 4. Elizabeth Shirley, widow, £30.118.
   in lands £26.120. Francis Shirley, Esq., £26.120.

114. B.&C., 172.
115. Gray's Inn Admissions, 78.
117. B.&C. says she may have married secondly, William Blount, but that she is named Lady Snelling in her Inquisition Post Mortem.
118. P.R.O., E. 179/190/225.
119. " E. 179/190/268.
120. " E. 179/190/283.
121. " E. 179/190/297.
In spite of Horsfield's assertion that the Shurleys of Isfield were "a branch of the more distinguished family settled at Wiston", there is hardly any foundation for such an assumption. A scholarly article by the Rev. E. Turner, entitled "Isfield Place and the Family of Shurley", follows the lead of Mr. Evelyn Shirley, author of the "Stemmata Shirleiana", and shows that any blood relationship between the two families is unlikely before the marriage of Jane, the daughter of Sir Thomas Shirley the elder, of Wiston, to Sir John Shurley of Isfield. Despite the vagaries of Tudor spelling, there may be some significance in the fact that the name of the Isfield family is more frequently spelt with a "u", while that of the Wiston family is generally given an "i", or an "e", in the first syllable. According to Mr. Evelyn Shirley, the only real evidence of any kinship is found in the will of Ralph Shirley of Wiston, dated 11 February, 1509, in which John Shurley of Isfield is described as the testator's "cousin". In view of the common usage of the word at that time, Mr. Shirley dismisses such evidence as insufficient to warrant any large genealogical assumptions. The two families are therefore treated quite separately in this study. It is noteworthy that their coats of arms are quite different.

The origin of the family of Shurley is obscure. It is true that one pedigree traces them back to a John Shurley of Langfield, Yorkshire, Esq., but, according to Mr. E. P. Shirley, its authority is highly questionable. Both he and Comber agree that the first member of this family of whom any reliable information is available is the John Shurley of Isfield who possessed that manor towards the end of the fifteenth century, or at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The exact date of his coming into possession of the manor and of Isfield Place is unknown, but it has been suggested that the Shurleys may have purchased the property from the Wests, Lords De la Warr, since they were in possession of it a few years previously.

1. Sometimes spelt differently, but v. infra.
2. Horsfield, 1, 371.
3. S.A.C., xvii., 124 et seqq.
4. S.A.C., xvii., 133.
7. S.A.C., xviii., 134.
8. S.A.C., xvii., 124, (quoting); Comber, (Lewes), 252; B & C., 204.
This John Shurley of Isfield is described in his Monumental Inscription in Isfield Church as "Mr John Shurley Esq., sometime Chief Clerk of the Kitchen to our Sovereign Lord King Henry VII, and Cofferer to our Sovereign Lord King Henry VIII". He is also described as Cofferer to the King in the will of his brother-in-law - John Goring. In John Shurley's own will, there is further evidence of his connections with the Royal Household. In it he appointed Roger More, "sergeaunt of the King's Bakehouse", co-executor with his own son, John Shurley; Sir Richard Broke, knt, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, was appointed Supervisor; and Thomas Weldon, third Clerk of the Kitchen, was a legatee. Concerning his own family, the will mentions by name the testator's own father, Roger Shurley, though the only information about him is that he had held certain lands at "Prestend", or Presteign, in Herefordshire, which had formerly been the property of the testator's grandfather, William Walker. It also mentions the testator's deceased wife, Parnell, of the family of Grauntford, or Grandeford, and the testator's three sons, John, William and Edward, and his two daughters, Joan and Bridget.

John Shurley had, in fact, married twice; first, Parnell, daughter and heiress of John Grandeford, and secondly, Margery, daughter of John Goring. It was his second wife who was the mother of all John Shurley's children. Of these, it was his third son, Edward, who succeeded him.

Edward Shurley of Isfield, like his father before him, was Cofferer to Henry VIII and is commemorated in another Monumental Inscription at Isfield where he was buried, having died on 16 March, 1558. His wife was Joan, daughter of John Fenner of Crawley, Sussex, Esq., who later remarried Anthony Morley, the ironmaster. By her, Edward had three sons and possibly a daughter. Thomas, the eldest son, inherited Isfield.

It has been suggested by Mr. Turner, that it was Thomas Shurley, if not his father, who erected a smaller residence at Isfield in place of another much larger structure which the Shurleys found there on their arrival. Thomas does

10. S.A.C., xviii, 128.
11. P.C.C., 13 Jankyn. He died 3 August, 1527. (B & C., 204).
14. See notes on families of Fenner and Morley.
16. S.A.C., xviii, 127.
not appear to have been a J.P. or to have held any important county office, but he distinguished himself by marrying Ann, daughter of Sir Nicholas Pelham of Laughton, knt., niece on her mother's side of Sir Richard Sackville, and therefore first cousin to Lord Buckhurst, himself a cousin of the Queen. 17 She died on 6 April, 1571 and was buried at Isfield, and Thomas Shurley subsequently married Ann, daughter of Sir Thomas Wroth, knt. She survived her husband who died at Lewes, 18 January, 1579 and was buried at Isfield. His widow was living at Enfield in 1580. 18

By his first wife, Ann, daughter of Sir Nicholas Pelham, Thomas Shurley of Isfield Esq., had two sons and a daughter, his eldest son, John, succeeding him at the age of ten in 1579. 19 It was he who was head of the family in 1580 and who was on the Commission of the peace for some years towards the close of Elizabeth's reign.

This John had an uncle, also John Shurley, his father's younger brother, who was a lawyer and who founded a branch of the family at Lewes. Like his nephew he also sat on the Commission of the Peace and in Parliament as a borough member, so that some care is required in distinguishing them.

The parish of Isfield, 20 is about five miles North of Lewes and about three miles South-West of Uckfield. The remains of Isfield Place, "The old family mansion of the Shurleys", were still to be seen in Horsfield's time, though part of the building was then converted into a farmhouse. A description of it and of its subsequent alterations is given by Mr. Turner in his article. 22 Isfield Church is rich in Monumental Inscriptions concerning the family from the first John Shurley onwards. 23

17. S.A.C., xviii, 129.
18. For Thomas Shurley's M.I., see S.A.C., lxx, 159; for his I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/191/101. See also B & C., loc. cit.
20. Not to be confused with Ifield, near Crawley.
22. S.A.C., xviii, 124 et seqq.
23. S.A.C., xxiii, 167.
Whether armigerous.

A coat was granted to John Shurley, Cofferer to Henry VIII, though sometimes a different one was used by the family. 24

Not mentioned in the College of Herald's MS. version of the 1634 Visitation, but found in another version embodying additional pedigrees. 26

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John, later Sir John Shurley of Isfield, knt., eld. son and heir of Thomas Shurley of Isfield who died in 1579, (v. supra), and of Ann, d. of Sir Nicholas Pelham, his first wife. 27

Succeeded his father in 1579 aged 10 years. 28

1597 - end of reign at least, J.P. Sussex. 29

1593, M.P. East Grinstead, perhaps M.P. Steyning, 1597; Bramber, 1604; Sussex, 1626. 30

1603, knighted. 31

Sheriff of Surrey & Sussex, 1616-1617. 32

---

24. S.A.C., xviii, 134.
27. B & C., loc. cit. But F.E. Ball: Judges in Ireland, (1926), 1, 328, says that George, who became a Chief Justice of the Common Bench in Ireland, was their eldest son.
29. Dorset Pat. Rolls, P.R.O., c. 66/1468, 1482, 1493, 1523, 1549, 1594.
30. Official Returns. As "of Ifield" (sic). The M.P. Lewes, 1572, "of the Middle Temple, London" was his uncle, John Shurley of Lewes, who was also, probably, the M.P. for Lostwithiel, 1584, and for Lewes, 1588, John Shurley of Isfield being still in his 'teens at those dates. It is not certain which of them was M.P. for Steyning in 1597, but John Shurley of Isfield was the M.P. for Bramber, 1604, and the county member in 1626, his uncle, who was not a knight, having died ten years earlier. (Cf. H. Matthews: Personnel of the Parliament of 1584-'5, (Univ. of London, M.A. thesis), Sect. III, 203).
32. P.R.O. Sheriffs.
Deputy Lieutenant for Sussex sometime between Sept., 1624 and July, 1631. Date of appointment uncertain. 33

Was perhaps the Sir John Shurley involved in litigation concerning the payment of the Vicar of Cuckfield's stipend out of the Great Tithe. 34

1599, presented a vicar to the Rectory of Crawley, later criticised in the Act Book of the Archdeaconry Court of Lewes (1625) for slovenliness. 35

25 April, 1631, died. Buried at Isfield. Will dt. 25 April, pr. 30 May, 1631. 36 I.P.M. 18 Jan., 1632. 37 Had settled his lands, 15 Dec., 1625 and 23 April, 1631. 38

M.I. at Isfield which says he was "of an ancient Sussex family, of a magnanimous heart, of an exemplary industry, of a justice beyond exception", and that he was "stout in good causes, yea, and good in all causes". After references to other members of the family, the inscription continues, stating the purpose for which it was erected, namely, "That the fame of Sir John Shurley, being Deputy Lieutenant and Justice of the Peace and Coram of this County of Sussex, might be precious in the memory of all men 'till the last change of the last man". 39

Wives:

Md. twice;
1) Jane, d. of Sir Thomas Shirley of Wiston, knt., the elder, and sister of Sir Thomas, the younger, of Sir Anthony of Sir Robert. Issue, 3 sons and 7 daughters.
2) Dorothy, d. of George Goring of Danny Park Esq., Receiver of the Court of Wards, (q.v.) and widow of Sir Henry Bowyer of Cuckfield, knt. (q.v.) M.I. to her at Isfield. 41

33. S.A.C., xviii, 130-1; xl, 2, 5, 7, 32.
34. S.A.C., xlv, 4-8.
35. S.A.C., xlix, 61. See also lv, 3.
38. B & C., loc. cit.
39. S.A.C., xviii, 130-1, and lxx, 159.
40. B & C., loc. cit.
41. S.A.C., xviii, 130-1.
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**Children.**

**By his first wife:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date and Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Bap. 3 Jan., 1597.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciceley</td>
<td>&quot; 28 Feb, 1598. Dead, 1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>17 June, 1599. Bur. at Isfield/June, 1729.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>Bap. 4 July, 1602.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>&quot; 31 Dec., 1603.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>D.v.p.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By his second wife:** None.

**Education.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hart Hall, Oxf., matric.</td>
<td>Adm. to Inner Temple, entry 22 June, 1582, aged 14. 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sons**

- None.

**Marriages of children.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>Jane</th>
<th>Ciceley</th>
<th>Elizabeth</th>
<th>Charity</th>
<th>Anne</th>
<th>Mary</th>
<th>Hannah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>md. three times: (a) Sir Walter Covert of Slaugham, (b) John Frenoke, Issue. (c) Denzil, Lord Holles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md. Sir Thomas Palmer of Wingham, bart.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md. Sir Giles Overbury, s. of Sir Nicholas Overbury of Boniton, Gloecs. Issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md. John Doyley Esq., s. and h. of Sir Cope, or Hooper, 47 Doyley of Chiselhampton, co. Oxon. Issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. B & C., loc. cit.; S.A.C., xviii, 130-1.
43. Al. Ox., iv, 1348.
44. Inner Temple Admissions, 1, 63.
45. B & C., loc. cit. The M.I. of their father says that two of his seven daughters died v.p. and that the five others made "several marriages of good quality". It does not indicate which are referred to. All six daughters who married, appear to have 'married well'.
46. S.A.C., iv, 3.
47. S.A.C., xviii, 131.
(Shurley continued.)

Note:— Since Sir John Shurley of Isfield had no sons to succeed him, he settled his lands on his nephew, Robert, elder son of his younger brother, George, (cf. note 27) who was Lord Chief Justice in Ireland in the reigns of James I and Charles I. Robert died in 1646 and was buried at Isfield, leaving one son, John Shurley who d.s.p. in 1656. Isfield therefore went through Penelope, daughter of a younger brother of Robert, to her husband, Edward Radcliffe Esq. of Hitchin, Herts. 48

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Isfield, Hundred of Loxfield Dorset, Pevensey Rape).

38 Henry VIII Edward Shurley, gent. in lands £45.49
   (Commissioner)
2 Elizabeth Johana Shurley, widow, " " £20.50
18 Elizabeth Thomas Shurley Esq., " " £20.51
1-2 Charles I Sir John Shurley, knt., " " £20.52
   (Commissioner)

(ii) Shurley of Lewes.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Shurley Esq., second son of Edward Shurley Esq., Cofferer to Henry VIII, who died 16 March, 1558, (v. supra) and of Joan, d. of John Fenner of Crawley, Sussex Esq. She remarried Anthony Morley, the ironmaster. This John Shurley was the younger brother of Thomas Shurley Esq. of Isfield, and therefore uncle of Sir John Shurley of Isfield. (v. supra). He was the founder of a branch of the family at Lewes.

1572, M.P. Lewes. Probably also the M.P. Lostwithiel, 1584, and Lewes, 1588. May have been the M.P. Steyning, 1597, though this could also have been his nephew. 53

49. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
50. " E.179/190/265.
51. " E.179/190/298.
(Shurley continued.)

1585-1602 at least, J.P. Sussex. Of the Quorum from 1594. (His nephew was not at this time.)

1587, mentioned in the certificate concerning the J. P's as "very well thought of" for executing his office of the peace. 55

1588, assessed at £30 for the Armada Loan, in the second lowest group. 56

1587, Bencher of the Middle Temple. Reader, Lent, 1587 and Lent, 1596. Treasurer, 22 May, 1601. 57 Serjeant-at-Law, 1603. 58

John Rowe, the celebrated lawyer and antiquary, studied under him and was, for a time, his managing clerk. 59

Had a house in Lewes called "The Friars" or "Grey Friars". 60 It may have come to him by his first marriage, his wife, Elizabeth, having it from her sister, Joan, who was heiress to her uncle, John Kyme, the former owner. 61 The house, now dismantled, was apparently also the occasional residence of some of the Isfield Shurleys since the lawyer's elder brother, Thomas, and his nephew, Sir John Shurley, both died there. 62

2 Oct., 1616, died. 63 Bur. 5 Oct., 1616 at All Saints, Lewes. 64

Wives. 65

Md. twice:—
1) Elizabeth, d. of Richard Kyme of Lewes. She was unm. in the will of her uncle, John Kyme Esq. of Greyfriars, Lewes, on 14 Dec., 1570. She was bur. 30 May, 1580 at All Saints, Lewes.
2) Frances, d. of Henry Capell of Hadham, Herts. She remd. Thomas Trayton of Lewes at All Saints, Lewes, 25 June, 1633.

55. S.A.C., xi, 59.
56. S.A.C., i, 37, but here erroneously given as a knight. His date of death is also inaccurately given.
57. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 29.
58. A.I.Cant., pt. I, iv, 67; He was recommended for this status by Sir Arthur Capell on 27 Nov., 1600. (H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, x, 594).
59. S.A.C., xviii, 133.
60. S.A.C., x, 124-15.
61. S.N.C., i, 183.
62. S.A.C., xviii, 133.
64. B & C., loc. cit. 65. Ibid.
(Shurley continued.)

**Children.**

**By his first wife:**

Elizabeth, Bap. 29 May, 1580, at All Saints, Lewes, the day before her mother's burial.

**By his second wife:**

John Later of Grey Friars, Lewes, Esq. Aged 16 in 1616. Bap. 19 Dec., 1599 at All Saints, Lewes. Died at Lewes, 3 Oct., 1631; bur. same day at All Saints, Lewes, beside his father. 67

**Education. Universities. Inns of Court.**

Father Matric. Fell.Com from Queens! Coll., Camb., Michs., 1562. 68

In Adm. to Middle Temple, 5 August, 1565, from Clifford's Inn. Bencher, 1587; Reader, Lent, 1587 and Lent, 1596. Treasurer, 22 May, 1601. 69 Serjeant-at-Law, 1603. 70

Son -

John, adm. to Middle Temple, 13 Oct., 1615. 71

**Marriages of children.**

**Of the first marriage:**

Elizabeth.

---

66. Ibid.
67. Possibly a victim of the plague as he was so young and the burial so hasty.
69. Middle Temple Admissions, i,29.
70. Al.Cant., loc.cit.
71. Middle Temple Admissions, i, 104.
(Shurley continued.)

Of the second marriage:

John md. Judith, d. of Sir Robert Honywood of Pett in Char ing, Kent. She was bap. at Hollingbourne, 5 July, 1602, and bur. at Laughton, 21 Nov., 1638. She had remd. as his second wife, Sir Thomas Pelham, bart., of Halland in Laughton who was bap. at East Hoathly, 22 Sept., 1597, and bur. at Laughton, 28 August, 1654. She and John Shurley had one son and three daughters.

Note: After the death of John Shurley, serjeant-at-law, in 1616, the reversion of Grey Friars passed to his son John, and then to his grandson, also John, who died 26 August, 1647; 73 both the son and the grandson predeceased John Shurley, serjeant-at-law's second wife, Frances, who had a life interest in it. 74

Subsidy assessments.

(As of borough of Lewes, Lewes Rape.)

1-2 Charles I John Shurley Esq., in lands £4.75
(Mistress Shurley, widow) " " £2

73. I.P.M., C.142/570/147.
74. S.N.Q., ii, 183; S.R.S., xiv, nos. 946-949.
75. P.R.O., E.179/197/377a.
The parentage of Francis Spelman Esq. of Hartfield, Sussex, who was a J.P. of Sussex from 1565 to 1576, and Clerk of the Parliament from 1551 to 1574, is uncertain. Perhaps he was the third son of Sir John Spelman of Harborough, Norfolk, knt., and Justice of the King's Bench, who died in 1544. A Sir John Spelman appears as a nominal plaintiff in fine for Midhurst in 1535; perhaps this was the Judge. There appears to be no other reference to the family name in Sussex before Francis Spelman's time.

If this assumption is correct, Francis Spelman came from a family of ancient descent, originally of Hampshire and Wiltshire, of which a cadet branch settled in Norfolk in the 14th century, and he would have been the uncle of Sir Henry Spelman, the antiquary.

In 1550, Francis Spelman, described as of Gray's Inn, London, gent., bought from Lady Anne Knevett her manor of Bollebrook in Hartfield and Withiam for £220. It was conveyed to him and his wife, Margaret, and their heirs and assigns. Mr. Spelman was in possession in 1563. In 1565, Francis Spelman Esq. and Francis Spelman, his son and heir apparent, were plaintiffs in fine for the manor of St. Tye or Tighe in Cuckfield.

In the bishop's letter of 1564, "Mr. Francis Spilman of Hartfield" was described as "no Justice" but a "favouerer of godly proceedings". It was probably due to this that he was appointed to the Commission of the Peace in 1565. He remained on it until 1576 when, apparently, he died. No will or I.P.M. seem to have survived. He was apparently succeeded by his son, Francis, plaintiff in fine with his father in 1565 for St. Tye in Cuckfield.

5. S.R.S., xix, 50; S.A.C., lli, 35.
7. Camden Misc., ix, 10-11.
(Spelman continued.)

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in the 1570 or the 1634 Visitations of Sussex. In the Subsidy Roll of 14 Elizabeth, Francis Spelman was styled "Esq." (V.infra.)

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Francis Spelman Esq., son of Francis Spelman Esq. of Bolebrook in Hartfield, who was J.P. Sussex, 1565-176, and Clerk of the Parliament, 1551-1574, (v.supra), and who died in 1574, and of Margaret, d. of - , his wife, 9

1565, plaintiff in fine with his father for the manor of St. Tye. 10

17 Sept., 1588, Writ sent to the sheriff of Sussex commanding that Francis Spelman and Mary, his wife, agree with John Sedley, gent., concerning some lands in Bolebrook and Hartfield. Another writ of the same date, commanded that Francis Spelman Esq. and Mary, his wife, should agree with Robert Sackville Esq. concerning lands in Hartfield. 11

Dt. of death unknown. No will or I.P.M. There was apparently a lawsuit ending in Francis Spelman and Mary, his wife, relinquishing Bolebrook manor to Robert Sackville Esq. in 1588. 12 The Spelmans may have left Sussex thereafter.

His wife.

Mary, d. of - . (V. supra)

Children.

There is no evidence of any.

11. S.A.C.,lxvi, 121.
(Spelman continued.)

Education.

Universities.

Perhaps the Francis Spilman (sic) who matric. pens. from Trinity Coll., Cambridge, Easter, 1571.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hartfield Hundred, Pevensey Rape).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Francis Spelman, gent.</td>
<td>in lands</td>
<td>£16.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Francis Spelman Esq.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£20.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Commissioner)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Francis Spelman, gent.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>£20.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Middle Temple Admissions, 1,40.
15. P.R.O., E.179/190/265.
17. P.R.O., E. 179/190/298.
STANLEY.

Origins.

Thomas Stanley Esq., later Sir Thomas Stanley, appears in this study by reason of his membership of the Commission of the Peace for Sussex from 1597 to the end of the reign at least.

He was of Cumberland origin, being second son of John Stanley of Arnaby in that county, himself a second son. 1 Thomas' elder brother, Christopher, inherited the Cumberland property, while Thomas himself became attached to the household of the Earls of Northumberland, in which household he held the office of Steward from 1575 to 1590. (V. infra.) Since the Earl's household appears to have been run from Petworth rather than from Alnwick, it would seem that, at any rate from the time of his appointment to high office in that household, in 1575, Thomas Stanley was settled in Sussex rather than in Northumberland. 2

Whether armigerous.

Not in the 1570 Visitation of Sussex, but in the 1615 Visitation of Cumberland as a second son. (V. supra.) His younger brother, Richard's son, Thomas, appeared in the 1634 Sussex Visitation, 3 and a Richard Stanley in that of 1662. 4

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Thomas Stanley Esq., later Sir Thomas Stanley, knt., second son of John Stanley Esq., of Arnaby, Cumberland, and of ? 5

Became attached to the household of the Earls of Northumberland.

1575-31 May, 1590, Steward to the Earl of Northumberland and resided, probably, at Petworth. 6

1. Visitation of Cumberland, 1615, (Harl.Soc.Pubns., vii, 8 et seqq.)
2. I am grateful to Mr. G. Batho, M.A., for this information and for the MS references to the household accounts of the 8th and 9th Earls of Northumberland.
3. H.C. MS, C.27; S.A.C.,xxxix,113.
4. S.A.C.,xxxix,122.
(Stanley continued.)

Under the 9th Earl of Northumberland, in addition to his position as Steward until 31 May, 1590, he was Clerk of the Works for the period 15 August, 1585 to 28 Jan., 1587, and Payer of Foreign Payments for all the periods for which there are accounts. 7

25 February, 1588, received £35.16.8. for his annuity issuing out of the profits of the Great Park at Petworth, the Hammer, 8 and the furnace there, for the half year to Michaelmas,1587.

1589, a few months before retiring, he acquired the manor of Lee in Fittleworth and certain dependent tenements there. 9 Fittleworth parish in Arundel Rape lies only a few miles from Petworth, and Lee manor, before its conveyance to Thomas Stanley, was the property of William Lee Esq. and of Elizabeth, his wife. 10

1597 - end of the reign at least, J.P. Sussex but not of the Quorum. 11

May, 1597, he, and others, went surety for one, James Anton., a merchant, who had undertaken to fit out the army in the Netherlands with clothing, a certain sum of money being advanced by the government to Anton for this purpose. 12

14 March, 1604, knighted. 13

1606, he and his wife, Mary, were deforciants in fine for the manor of Lee which passed to Richard Stanley, gent., Sir Thomas' younger brother, Sir Thomas having no children. 14

He appears to have moved to Albury, Hertfordshire since, in his will, dt. 26 Feb., 1605, he directed that he should be buried in the church there, "near my pew door", and made a bequest to the poor of that parish. He also mentioned, "all the rest of my goods and chattels unbequeathed that lieth in the county of Hertford." In his will, he bequeathed "all my

8. Alnwick MSS, U.I.i. See also U.I.ii for payments to Edward Francis, his successor as Steward.
12. Cal. S.P. D.,1595-17, 411; see also 405,410,412,413.
14. S.R.S.,xix,265; B & C., 45.
lands in Sussex or elsewhere as also my house without Temple Bar near London" to his brother, Richard Stanley and his heirs, provided that 100 marks p.a. should be set aside for his wife's maintenance during her lifetime. He also mentioned the rent of "Barnesbie house in Southwark" which was to be discharged by his wife and his brother, Richard, jointly. In this will, various relatives are mentioned, including "my cozen, Edward Stanley, in the county of Cumberland" to whom he left "a gray gelding called Roger". The will was proved 3 May, 1607.

Wife.
Mary, d. of -Burton and relict of - Scroggs. 
Children.
None.

Education.

Subsidy assessments.
No relevant entries in the Sussex Rolls between 38 Henry VIII and 1-2 Charles I.

15. P.C.C., 40 Huddleston.
16. B & C., 45; Harl.Soc.Pubns.,vii,10; see also P.C.C., 40 Huddleston.
17. Ibid.
18. Gray's Inn Admissions, 23.
STANNYE, (Stanney etc.)

Origins.

Two members of the Stannye family were J.P.'s of Sussex during Elizabeth's reign, - William, who was on the Commission between 1565 and 1568, and Richard, who was on it from 1597 to 1599.

Although the surname is found in various districts, for instance, in the Lewes area, and at the Priory of Shulbred in the Hundred of Easebourne in the North part of Chichester Rape, it seems likely that both the J.P.'s came from a family settled at Wittering and Eston in the Manwood Hundred of Chichester Rape, and later at Chichester itself.

The Richard Stannye who disappeared from the Commission of the Peace in 1599, seems to have been the gentleman of that name who died in that year, and whose pedigree is traced back by Berry and Comber three, and possibly four, generations earlier. They suggest that the John Stannye who was M.P. for Chichester in 1467, 1472 and 1477, may have been the father of the John Stannye of Eston whose will, dated 21 Sept., was proved in , 1533, and who is himself mentioned in a deed of purchase of his younger son, Thomas, in June, 1536 as dead. This younger John Stannye was the great-grandfather of the Richard Stannye here in question. He was probably a Commissioner for the Subsidy of 1524 in the City of Chichester, and the "Master Stanney" who appeared in a document relating to a presentation of 13 May, 1524, concerning the boundaries of certain lands in Manwood Hundred.

According to Berry and Comber, the John Stannye whose will was proved in 1533 had two sons, John and Thomas, of whom the elder, John, died on 20 March, 1552, leaving a son, William Stannye, of Eston Esq., who was aged 24 and more at his father's death, and who died on 29 Sept., 1567, apparently at the early age of 39. He appears to have been J.P. from 1565 until his death, having been mentioned in the bishop's letter of 1564 as a gentleman who was "no Justice" but a "favourer of godlie procedings". By his wife,

1. S.A.C., x, 97.
2. S.A.C., xlvii, 18 & 23-4.
3. B. & C., 71; S.A.C., xxxii, 155-7; Chichester will, 2/110. See also, Lindsay Fleming: History of Pagham in Sussex, (Ditchling, 1949-50), i, 320, and iii, App., p. cxxv; also i, 1347.
4. S.A.C., xxiv, 70.
5. S.M.Q., i, 233.

(contd. on next page)
Gertrude, d. of Thomas Wells of Hampshire, who later remarried Thomas Chaderton of Eston, William had a son, Richard Stannye, of Wittering and Eston, who was aged 13 years and 8 months at the time of his father's Inquisition Post Mortem. (V. infra.)

It seems, therefore, that the Stannyes of Eston had been settled in the district immediately South of Chichester for some three or four generations before Richard Stannye's time, and that, from the status of substantial tenant farmers, they had risen to be lords of the manor of Eston by the mid 16th century. They also had tenements in Sidlesham, Almodington, Erneley and North Mundham, and some interests in the manor of West Thorney. 10 They appear to have had some genealogical connection with the Bartellots of Erneley. 11

The precise location of "Eston" is not easily identifiable. There are a number of references to a chapel there in the early sixteenth century, 12 yet there are reasons for thinking that, by the 1530's, it was a parish in its own right. The will of John Stannye of Eston, of 21 Sept., 1533, includes, among its bequests, "To the Church at Eston, a cow"; it also refers to his lands in the parishes of Sidlesham and Eston in Manwood Hundred.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1634 Visitation of Sussex. 13

(Footnotes contd. from previous page)

11. S.A.C., xxviii, 204-'5; xl, 126; B & C., 71.
12. S.A.C., xlii, 77; V.C.H. Sussex, iv, 211.
13. H.C., MS, C.27.
(Stannye continued.)

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Richard Stannye Esq., of Wittering and Eston, s. and h. of William Stannye Esq., J.P., 1565 to his death, who died 28 Sept., 1567, (v. supra.), and of Gertrude, d. of Thomas Wells of Hampshire. 14 She later re-married Thomas Chaderton of Eston.

Aged 13 years, 8 months, at the time of his father's I.P.M. 15 The wardship was sold to John Comber, gent. 16

J.P. Sussex, 1597-1599. 17

20 Feb., 1600, died. Will pr., 1600. 18 I.P.M., 4 Aug., 1600. 19 Bur. at Subdeanery, 23 Feb., 1600. 20

Wife.

-, d. of - Norton. Bur. at Subdeanery, 23 Feb., 1600. 21

Children.

Richard Of Eston. Aged 19 years, 8 m. at the time of his father's I.P.M. Slain in a fight at Chichester, 25 July, and bur. at Subdeanery, 27 July, 1610. 22

21. Ibid. The coincidence of her burial being on the same day as her husband's has not been explained.
22. B & C., loc. cit; also W.S.C.R.O., Subdeanery Par. Reg., entry for 27 July, 1610, burials; "Slain by William Riman, the son of John Riman, the 25th, being St. James, his day, without the North Gate in fight."
(Stannye continued.)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Clare Coll., Camb., c. 1596.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children.

Richard md. Bridget, d. and h. of Richard Ernley of Cackham and Ernley Esq., (q.v.). Md. in Subdeanery, 12 Feb., 1600. 25. Her will dt. 9 Feb., 1655; adm. granted 13 May, 1656 and 6 Feb., 1663. 26. Issue, 4 d., no s. 27.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Sidlesham, Manwood Hundred, Chichester Rape.)

38 Henry VIII John Stannye Esq. in lands £50.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>£20.28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Stannye, widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

? Elizabeth Richard Stannye Esq. " " £20.29

(As of South Street, Chichester.)

29 Elizabeth Richard Stannye Esq. " " £13.30

1-2 Charles I Bridget Stannye, wid. in goods £3.

Katherine Stannye, spinster in lands £1.31

Bridget Stannye, " " " £1.31

23. Al.Cant., Pt. 1, iv, 149.
24. Middle Temple Admissions, 1, 74.
26. P.C.C., 178 Berkeley,
29. " E.179/190/347.
STAPLEY, (Staple).

Origins.

There were two main branches of the Stapley family in Elizabethan Sussex, the Stapleys of Twineham in Lewes Rape, and the Stapleys of Framfield in Pevensey Rape, and later of Patcham. 1 The Framfield family were the cadet branch, founded by a younger son towards the end of the fifteenth century. 2

While it is not certain to which of these two lines the John Stapley, J.P. Sussex, 1559-1562, belonged, 3 it seems more likely that he was of the Framfield family. The head of the Twineham family at the material dates was, indeed, also one, John Stapley, son of the Richard Stapley who acquired Twineham manor in 1542. 4 This John Stapley was buried in Twineham on 14 October, 1568, 5 so that he could have been J.P. until within six years of his death at the age of about sixty-four. 6 Unfortunately there seems to be no reason for his disappearance from the Commission in 1562 unless, at fifty-eight, he chose to retire, a somewhat unusual course, considering the number of J.P.'s whose names remain on the list until removed by death. He is not mentioned in the 1564 bishop's letter. He had, however, a first cousin, of the same name, living at Framfield, concerning whom practically nothing is known except that he was the son of William Stapley, founder of the Framfield family, 7 and therefore was nephew to the Richard Stapley who purchased Twineham manor in 1542. This John Stapley of Framfield may have been the "cousin" of this name mentioned in the said Richard Stapley's will, dated 1546. 8 and it is suggested by Berry and Comber that he was the deforciant in fine for Broomham manor in 1537/8 and 1560, together with a wife named 'Jone'. 9 If this were so, he might well have lived until about 1562, the date when his namesake vanished from the Commission.

5. Comber, (Horsnham), 326.
6. He was aged 43 at his father's I.P.M. in 1547, (P.R.O., C.142/85/68).
8. Lewes wills, A.1/91; S.A.C., xxxii, 139.
Considering the fact that it was this branch of the family alone which made an appearance in any version of the 1570 Visitation, that they enjoyed a position of some importance in their district and intermarried with several of the chief county families, and that they eventually acquired a baronetcy, it does not seem unlikely that, even by the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, they had begun to eclipse the elder line.

It has been suggested that the Stapleys derived originally from the district of Battle in East Sussex since the name occurs frequently in the Battle Abbey deeds and there is a Hundred in that neighbourhood of the name of Staple. However, the Stapleys of the district were tanners, smiths and yeomen, so that if the assumption is correct, the Stapleys of Twineham and Framfield achieved a remarkable rise in the social scale in the course of the sixteenth century. This may have been responsible for their adoption of a coat of arms resembling that of the ancient family of Stapley in Cheshire, with whom they appear to have claimed kinship.

The first of the family of whom anything certain is known was Richard Stapley, "the elder", whose will was dated 10 March, 1505, and proved 24 April, 1505. His direction in that will that he should be buried in Buxsted Church suggests that he had resided in that parish for at least part of his life. Of his two sons, the elder, Richard, bought the manor of Twineham in the parish of that name in Lewes Rape in 1542, and resided there. Later in the century, his descendants acquired and resided at Hickstead Place, a mansion in that parish. William Stapley died seized of it in 1602.

The younger son of Richard Stapley, "the elder", William Stapley, who was appointed overseer to his father in 1505, but the date of whose death is unknown, appears to have established himself at Framfield in Pevensey Rape, perhaps towards the close of the fifteenth century. The family name is found amongst the earliest entries in the Framfield Parish Registers which begin in 1539. It appears to have been his son, John, who

11. S.A.C., 11, 102; vi, 79.
12. S.A.C., vi, 79; iv, 299; B & C., 85, note re Grant of Arms, Jan., 1592.
13. P.C.C., 29 Holgrave.
15. WiII, Lewes, A.1/91; I.P.M., P.R.O., C.142/85/68, as "of Twineham, gent."
17. S.A.C., 11, 102, 105.
18. S.A.C., 11, 102.
was J. P. at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. According to Horsfield, the Stapleys were "of considerable note" in the parish, where they continued to reside until c. 1620, when they removed to Patcham Place which they purchased from the Shelleys. 

Anthony Stapley of Patcham Esq., who was a Member of Parliament several times in Charles I's reign, was a hot Parliamentarian, and eventually one of the Regicides. At the Restoration, his son forfeited his estates but was subsequently pardoned and had them restored to him. He was created a knight and a baronet. The death of his only son without issue brought the line to an end.

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in Richard Turpyn, the Windsor Herald's version of the 1570 Visitation. Also in that of 1634, and that of 1662.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Stapley, gent., of Framfield, eldest son and heir of John Stapley, gent., of the same, probably the J.P. Sussex, 1559 - 1562, and of his wife, perhaps Jone, d. of -. (V. supra).

Born, 1539; died, 1593.

Mentioned in the Windsor Herald's version of the 1570 Visitation of Sussex. (V. supra).

Wife.

Jone, d. of Thomas Thatcher of Warbleton, Sussex. Her will dt. 3 Sept., 1594, pr. 18 Dec., 1596.

19. Horsfield, i, 363; S.A.C., ii, 102; xlvi, 158.
23. H.C. Ms, C. 27.
24. S.A.C., xxxix, 126.
25. B & C., 85, Cf. S.A.C., iii, 105, which gives Barbara d. of William Fowle of Rotherfield.
27. Lewes wills, S. Malling, B, 15.
(Stapley continued.)

Children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Later of Framfield, Esq., and perhaps, for a time, of Glynde. (See Subsidy assessments). Executor to mother, 1596. Overseer to brother, Edmund, 1603. 1564, bishop's letter, &quot;No Justice&quot; but a &quot;favouer of godly procedings&quot;. 1588, assessed at £40 for the Armada Loan, in the third lowest group. 13 March, 1606, died. I.P.M., 2 May, 1606.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Mentioned in mother's will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Died in 1637.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father

Sons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>B.A. from Christchurch, Oxford. Supd. 7 Feb., 1593-14. 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>md. three times: (a) Mabel, d. and coh. of Sir Roger Lewkenor. Issue, a son who died in infancy.  (b) Ann, d. of Thomas Morley of Glynde. Issue. 3 d. (c) Ann, d. and coh. of John Thatcher of Priesthawes. Dead before 24 Jan., 1612. Issue, including Anthony, later of Patcham, the Regicide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Thomas Boord of Lindfield. Md. at Framfield, 22 Sept., 1561. Died, 1600.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>md. - Stubbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References:

30. S.A.C., i, 36.
32. Lewes wills, S.Malling, B.119.
33. Al.Ox., iv, 1413.
34. B & C., 85.
35. Ibid., and 131.
(Stapley continued.)

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Borough of Framfield (sic), Pevensey Rape.)

38 Henry VIII John Staple, gent., in lands £40.37
   (Commissioner)

2 Elizabeth John Staple, gent., " " £20.38
   (Commissioner, as 'Esq'.)
Anthony Staple, gent., in lands. £15.

(As of Glynde, Hundred of Ringmer, Pevensey Rape)

14 Elizabeth Anthony Stapley Esq. in lands £15.39

(As of Framfield, Hundred of Loxfield, Pevensey Rape.)

18 Elizabeth Mistress Stapley, in lands £8.40

(As of Patcham, Lewes Rape.)

1-2 Charles I Anthony Stapley Esq., " " £10.41

37. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
38. " E.179/190/265.
40. " E.179/190/298.
STOUGHTON.

Origins.

The Stoughtons were originally a Surrey family, having been settled since at least the mid 14th century at the manor of Stoughton in the parish of Stoke-juxta-Guildford. It was apparently from this manor, which originated in lands which had formed part of the manor of Stoke, that the family derived its name, although the existence of a parish called Stoughton in West Sussex, in the neighbourhood of property acquired by a branch of this Surrey family in the sixteenth century, has caused some confusion.

It is not clear when the Stoughtons first became connected with Sussex, but it is possible that the first important stake they acquired in that county was the manor of West Stoke in Chichester Rape, which was granted by the Crown in 1559 to Thomas Stoughton and his cousin, George. Both of these persons were of the Commission of the Peace in 1559 and 1560, and Thomas was of the Quorum. George was appointed to the Commission to survey the Bishop of Chichester's lands in 1561. However, he died shortly afterwards, his will being proved on 12 June, 1563, he being styled "gent", as of "West Stoke, Sussex." He left no issue. After the death of his wife, Ciceley, the remainder of the manor of West Stoke was to go to Adrian, Thomas Stoughton's son.

Thomas, a descendant of the elder line of the Stoughton family, lived on until 1576. He was the eldest son of Lawrence Stoughton of Stoughton, Surrey, whom he succeeded in 1571. This Thomas Stoughton was M.P. for Chichester in March and October, 1553; in April 1554; for Guilford, 1559; for Chichester 1563, and for Guildford in 1572. He appears to have been one of Henry Fitzalan, Earl of Arundel's entourage, and was probably the Stoughton who in October, 1569 was Controller to the Earl, and was made privy to the current rumour that the Earl was to be denounced as guilty of treason.

1. V.C.H., Surrey, iii, 371; Surrey Arch.Coll., xxxii., 104 et seqq.
2. E.G., Elwes, 226.
(Stoughton continued.)

by Lord De la Warr. He is also likely to have been the Stoughton mentioned by Arthur Counter in his "Confession" late in 1560, as one of the local gentlemen with whom he had discussed the probability of the Earl attempting to oppose a marriage between the Queen and Dudley. He was described in the bishop's letter of 1564 as no Justice but a "miskyker of godlie orders" and "a stout worner of godlines". He was given there as "of Stansted." He was, however, again on the Commission of the Peace from 1571-16, when he died. Before his death, the manor of Stoughton in Surrey had been settled, in 1575, in tail male on Lawrence, his eldest son, on his marriage to Rose Ive, and it accordingly passed to him. But the Sussex manor of West Stoke passed to Thomas' second son, Adrian, accordingly, was head of the Sussex branch of the family in 1580. Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in a list of armigerous Surrey families appearing in the Visitations for that county of 1530, 1572 and 1623. Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Adrian Stoughton Esq., 2nd son of Thomas Stoughton of Stoughton, nr. Guildford, Surrey, and later of Stanstead, Sussex, who was a J.P. of Sussex, 1559 - '60, and 1571 - '6, when he died, (v. supra), and of his 1st wife, Elizabeth, d. of - Levkenor. J.P. Sussex, 1591 - end of reign at least, and of the Quorum from 1597. M.P. Haslemere, 1593; Chichester, 1597,1601,1604,1614. Recorder of Chichester, 1603 - '4.

16. Ibid.
17. Harl. Soc. Pubns.,xliii,87; liii,79. Perhaps she was a sister of Thomas Lewkenor of Selsey and of Richard Lewkenor of West Dean. (See will of George Stoughton, (contd. on next page)
Resided at West Stoke, Chichester Rape, Sussex. 21 The manor came to him under the terms of the will of George Stoughton, proved on 12 June, 1563. (V. supra).

25 Oct., 1614, died. I.P.M. 22 Will pr. 1614. 23 M.I. to him and his wife erected in 1635 in West Stoke Church. 24

Wife.

Mary, sister of Sir William Jordan of Whiteleigh, Wiltshire, Receiver General to Queen Elizabeth for Dorset and Somerset. 25

Children. 26

Thomas A minor at his father's death. 27 Died, 1626, leaving coheirnesses. 28

Adrian

Anne Died, 1640. 29

Mary

Sara

Anne

Elizabeth

Ellianor

(Footnotes contd. from previous page)

17. pr. 1563, P.C.C. 23 Chayre).
20. Inner Temple Admissions, 89.

23. P.C.C., 113 Laws.
24. Horsfield,ii,75; Elwes,218; Mosse,1371; S.A.C.,lxxiv,204.
27. See Feodary Surveys of Adrian Stoughton's property, dt. 5 April and 10 Sept.,13 James I. (P.R.O., Wards 5.43.Pt.1)
29. S.A.C.,xlii,31.
(Stoughton continued.)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adm. to Inner Temple,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov., 1578. 30 Called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to the Bar, 11 Feb.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1587. 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sons

| Thomas, B.N.C., Oxf. | Thomas, student of the |
| matric. 24 Nov., 1609, | Inner Temple, 1610. 33 |
| aged 15. 32          |                        |

| Adrian, B.N.C., Oxf. | Adrian, adm. to Inner |
| matric. 16 June, 1615, | Temple, Nov. 1614. 35 |
| aged 16. 34          | Barrister-at-law, 23   |
|                      | Nov. 1623. 36          |

Marriages of children.

Thomas md. Jane, d. of Sir Peter Garton of Woollavington, Sussex, kn., (q.v.)

Adrian md. Galathea, d. of Nicholas Cholmondeley, of the Inner Temple, London.

Anne md. in 1608, Thomas Bowyer of Leythorne, in North Mundham, Sussex, (q.v.) He remarried Jane, d. and h. of Emery Cranley, relict of Sir George Stoughton, cousin of Thomas Bowyer's first wife. 38

---

30. Inner Temple Admissions, 89.
31. Calendar of Inner Temple Records, 1, 342.
32. Al.Ox., iv, 1432.
33. Inner Temple Admissions, 191.
34. Al.Ox., iv, 1431.
35. Inner Temple Admissions, 209.
36. Calendar of Inner Temple Records, 11, 141.
38. S.A.C., xliii, 31.
(Stoughton continued.)

Marriages of children contd.

Mary md. George Gounter of Racton, Sussex. (q.v.)
Sara md. William Stiant of Chichester, Sussex.
Anne
Elizabeth
Ellianor

Subsidy assessments. 39
(As of West Stoke, Hundred of Bosham, Chichester Rape).

? Elizabeth Adrian Stoughton Esq. in lands £20. 40
1-2 Charles I Thomas Stoughton Esq. " " £6. 41
(Sessor of the Hundred).

39. In 2 Elizabeth, George Stoughton Esq., then Commissioner for Subsidies for Chichester Rape, was assessed at £20 in lands, (P.R.O., E.179/190/264). In 14 Elizabeth, his widow, Cyceley, was assessed at £10 in lands. In that year, one of the Commissioners for Chichester Rape was Thomas Stoughton Esq., but there is no assessment for him. (P.R.O., E.179/190/263).

40. P.R.O., E.179/190/347.
THATCHER. (Theccher etc.)

Origins.

There are references to Thatcher families in Sussex from at least the early fifteenth century on. However, the pedigree given by Berry and Comber goes no further back than one John Thatcher, of Ringmere, Sussex, and of St. Olave, Southwark; whose will was dated 10 January, 1499, and proved in 1502. It seems very probable that this John was descended from the Thatcher family that had been settled for some generations in that place. Such was the devotion of this John Thatcher to Ringmere Church, that he made a donation to it in 1499 for building purposes, and his son, John, also of Ringmere, who died without issue, directed in his will, which was proved in 1526, that he should be buried in the new chapel attached to the chancel of Ringmere Church, which "I have there edified and built." It was from a younger brother of this younger John Thatcher, namely from Thomas Thatcher of Westham, near Pevensey, that the Elizabethan family, the Thatchers of Priesthawes, descended. This Thomas Thatcher who died, 11 December, 1537, was succeeded by his son, John Thatcher of Priesthawes, then aged 31 years old and more, who was a J.P. early in the reign of Elizabeth, from 1559 to 1564. This John Thatcher was described in the bishop's letter of 1564 as a J.P. who was a "misltyker of religion and godly proceedings." He did not re-appear on the Commission. Of his two marriages, the first was into the Catholic family of Gage, his first wife being Agnes, daughter of Sir John Gage of Firle who died in April, 1556; the second was to Margaret, daughter of Sir Goddard Oxenbridge of Brede. Of the first marriage there was a son, John, who died during his father's lifetime, and two daughters; of the second there was at least one son, James, and a daughter, Katherine, who married Herbert Pelham of Buckstone. James was the head of the Thatcher family in Sussex in 1580.

1. S.A.C., xlv, 213; xxiv, 127.
4. E.P.M., 4 Nov., 1542, P.R.O., C.142/37/121.
7. B & C., loc.cit; and his grandfather's will, P.C.C. 25 Dyngeley.
8. There was also a son, Thomas (P.C.C. 25 Dyngeley). It is not clear whether he was a child of the first or second marriage. Comber, (Lewes), 286, says he was of the first, but he gives no authority, and Thomas is not mentioned in the pedigrees of the 1570 Visitation. If he were of the
(Thatcher continued.)

From the time of the marriage between John Thatcher and Agnes Gage onwards, there was a marked tendency among the Thatchers towards alliances with Catholic families, and from the death of this John Thatcher on 9 February, 1574, the family relapses into obscurity since the name does not appear on any of the Commissions of the Peace, or among county or borough members for Sussex, nor among the Sheriffs, between then and the end of the reign.

Priesthawes, or the Priest House, the residence of the Thatchers during the Elizabethan period, "is popularly supposed to have been a religious foundation, but this is an error as there is not the slightest documentary or architectural evidence in favour of the tradition." 10 It is situated in the parish of Westham, one of the two parishes of the Liberty of Pevensey. It is not clear when the mansion was built; one writer suggests that it was late in the reign of Elizabeth or during that of James I, and mentions a description of it contained in a survey of 1620. He points out that there is no mention of the house in the Pevensey Corporation Rate Book for 1527. 11 Yet, as in all the versions of the 1570 Visitatio the Thatchers are clearly described as "of Priesthawes", it seems likely that the house was built between 1527 and 1570. This assumption is strengthened by the evidence of an enquiry about the quarrying of building materials from the ruins of Pevensey Castle, made by John Thatcher in 1559 and 1561, for the purpose of building Priesthawes. 12

The tradition that Priesthawes was originally an ecclesiastical foundation which, after the Dissolution, came into the hands of the Thatchers, may have arisen through certain lands in Glyndley, adjoining Priesthawes, having belonged to the Prior of New Priory, at Warbleton, before they became the property of Thomas Thatcher after the Dissolution. The so-called "old place", apparently ruins of an older building beside the mansion itself, was perhaps not originally a religious house, but rather a grange belonging to the Priory. However, since most of the mansion was allowed to decay after the death of the last of the Thatchers in 1649, its early history is difficult to reconstruct. 13

8. (Contd.) first marriage, it would not be clear why he did not succeed to the Sussex estate but settled instead in Hollingbourne, Kent. (B & C.,157 n.)
10. S.A.C.,xliv,204 et seqq; cf. Horsfield, i,303.
11. S.A.C.,xliv,164 et seqq; 204 et seqq. See also S.A.C.,xxviii, 178.
13. S.A.U.,xliv,204 et seqq.
(Thatcher continued.)

Whether armigerous.

Mentioned in the 1570 Visitation, and in that of 1634.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

James Thatcher Esq. of Priesthawes, younger son of John Thatcher Esq. of the same who was a J.P. Sussex, 1559-64, and mentioned in the bishop's letter of that year, and who died on 9 February, 1574, (v. supra), and of his second wife, Margaret, d. of Sir Goddard Oxenbridge, knt., of Brede Place.

1580, "Mr. James Thatcher, his wife, Mistress Anne Thatcher, and Margerie Thatcher" and two others, were returned as recusants in the parish of Westham in the rural deanery of Pevensey.

1599, became a trustee for the sale of the lands of Herbert Pelham of Hellingly Esq., his brother-in-law, (q.v.), to discharge the latter's debts.

1606, sold his own manor of the Arches in Framfield which he inherited from his father, to John Peckham.

1612, settled his lands.

31 January, 1613, died. I.P.M. and Feodary Surrey.

Wife.

Mary, d. of Sir Edward Gage, knt. of Firle, who died 26 Dec. 1567. She was b. 18 Sept. 1550. Marriage settlement, 2 August, 1567.

14. H.C. MSS, D.11 & G.18; Phillips, II.
15. H.C. MSS., C.27.
16. Not clear whether he was his father's second or third son owing to the obscurity of his relationship to his brother, Thomas. See note 8.
17. Perhaps his daughter-in-law.
22. P.R.O., C.142/333/36; Wards 543, Pt.1, dt. 1619.
23. B&C., loc.cit; and 295.
(Thatcher continued.)

Children. 24

John Later of Priesthawes Esq. Aged 40 and more at his father's death. Inherited Priesthawes from him. Plaintiff in fine for manor of Mersham, 1620. Had been brought up at Rome and was for a time page to Cardinal Allen. 25 Known to have been there in 1596, 26 and was perhaps the Thatcher, "a young man and heir to a great living" noted as coming to England from Cardinal Allen in August, 1594. 27 In June, 1599, he was in Paris, interceding by letter with Cecil for permission to return to England. 28 Died without issue, 3 Sept., 1649. M. I. at Westham, describing him as the last of the once "noble family" of Thatcher who were allied to many leading families. Certain of his property was held to have escheated during the Interregnum and his attempt to convey some of his lands to certain persons in Ireland was frustrated. 29 Will dt. 30 Nov., 1637, pr. 1 May, 1657. 30

William Younger son. 31 Died without issue, 1620, and was buried in East Hendred, Berks. By 1614 was heavily in debt and trying to sell lands. 32

Katherine Mentioned in father's settlement of 1612. Deforciant in fine for Mersham, 1664. Will dt. 4 Aug, pr. 15 August, 1664. 33

Margaret Settlement of 1612.

Elizabeth " " " , then a widow.
Philippa " " " ; deforciant in fine for Mersham, 1620, then a widow.
Ann " " " ; deforciant in fine, 1620.
Susan " " " ; mentioned in brother John's will.
Mary " " " ; she and her 1st husband deforcients in fine, 1620; in sister's will of 1664.
Dorothy " " " , then unmarried.

26. S.A.C., xii, 211n; xiv, 264.
29. S.A.C., xxiv, 252-'3, 260, 266, 279-'80.
31. S.N.Q., iv, 159.
32. S.N.Q., iv, 126 & 159; H.M.C. 7th Report, 120.
33. P.C.C. 95 Brun. She and her sister Dorothy, mentioned in H.M.C. 7th Report, 120.
(Thatcher continued.)

**Education.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marriages of children.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John</th>
<th>Katherine, d. of Robert Audeley of Bere-Church, Essex, Esq. No issue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Anne, d. of Sir Thomas Tresham, before 24 Jan., 1612. No issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Maurice Kyffin Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>- Rooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippa</td>
<td>Thomas Pudsey Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Bartholomew Fromond of Cheam, Surrey. Issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>twice, (a) William Eyston Esq. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) - Winchcombe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subsidy assessments.**

(As of Willingdon, Hundred of Willingdon, Pevensey Rape.)

2 Elizabeth John Thatcher in goods £16.

(Commissioner, as "Esq.

James Thatcher in lands £4. 39

---

34. S. N. Q., iv, 159.
35. Al. Ox., iv, 1468.
37. B & C., loc. cit.
38. S. N. Q., iv, 128, 159, 189.
(Thatcher continued.)

Subsidy assessments continued.

14 Elizabeth  John Thatcher  in goods  £15.  
  (Sessor of the Hundred).
  (As of Hellingly, Hundred of Dyll, Pevensey Rape.)

18 Elizabeth  James Thatcher Esq.  in lands  £30.  
  (As of Hundred of Willingdon, Pevensey Rape.)

18 Elizabeth  John Thatcher  in goods  £6.  

40.  P.R.O., E.179/190/283.
41.  P.R.O., E.179/190/298. There are other assessments for persons of the name of Thatcher residing in the Hundreds of Totnor, Richmonden and Danehill Horsted, all in Pevensey Rape, between 38 Henry VIII and 1-2 Charles I, but they do not appear to relate to the Priesthawes family. (P.R.O., E.179/190/225; E.179/190/283; E.179/190/298; and E.179/191/377a.) It is possible, however, that the John Thatcher of Bedingham in Totnor Hundred who was assessed at £15 in goods in 38 Henry VIII, (P.R.O., E.179/190/225.) was the same as he who was assessed at £16 in goods in 2 Elizabeth, as of Willingdon. (v. supra.)
THREELE.

Origins.

The William Threele who was a J.P. of Sussex in 1559 and 1560 appears to have been the William Threele of Bexhill who heads a pedigree given by Berry and Coniberg, and whose administration was dated 5 Feb., 1563.

There was also a family of this name resident at Loxwood in Wisborough Green, but there seems to have been no William Threele among them living at the material dates. No definite connection has been established between the Threeles of Wisborough Green and those of Bexhill, though such a connection at an earlier date seems very likely.

The Threeles of Wisborough Green have been described as "an ancient family", and it may have been one of them who was Marshal to the Household of William, Earl of Arundel, and who died in 1465, being buried in the collegiate chapel at Arundel.

Concerning the early history of the Bexhill Threeles, practically nothing is known. The parentage of the William Threele of Buckholt in Bexhill, whose administration was dated 5 Feb., 1563, and who may have been the J.P. of 1559 and 1560, is unknown. He may have been the William Threele who had the lease of certain lands in Pevensey of the Duchy of Lancaster from Henry VIII, a lease renewed to one John Threele, in 25 Elizabeth. William Threele of Bexhill was

1. P.R.O., Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 1 & 2; B & C., 273.
2. P.C.C. 7 Chayre.
3. Horsfield, ii, 155; B.M. Add. MS, 5,678, f. 35b.
4. B & C., 132. William, son of Edmond Threele who died in 1527, appears to have predeceased his father, since his brother, Thomas, succeeded to the family estate.
5. For the two pedigrees, see B & C., 132 & 273. S.A.C., lvii, 215, claims that the William Threele who heads Berry's genealogy of the Bexhill Threeles was the son of Richard Threele of Loxwood who purchased Drungewick manor in 1605. Clearly this is an error since the William Threele in question died c. 1562.
6. S.A.C., xiii, 89n.
7. Ibid; for an account of this family, see S.A.C., liv, 167.
8. S.A.C., lxxxv, 55.
9. S.A.C., xxv, 24.
plaintiff in fine for the manor of Patchurst in 1560, and was named as dead in an indenture concerning his estates of the 19 December, 1562. He married twice, first, Ann, d. of Christopher Kendall of Ripon, Yorkshire, and secondly, Ann, d. of Giles Fynes of Arlington and Claverham. She was dead by 1562. He was succeeded by Robert, the son of his first marriage.

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in the 1570 Visitation, but they appear in that of 1634, as do the Threeles of Loxwood.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

Robert Threele of Hawkhurst and of Bexhill, gent., eld. s. and h. of William Threele who was probably the J.P. of 1559 and 1560 and who died c. 1562, and of his first wife, Ann, d. of Christopher Kendall of Ripon, Yorkshire. (V. supra).

Before 24 May 1578, committed to the Tower, and later to the Fleet, for uttering 'certaine lewd speaches'. It was not known whether these proceeded from malice or infirmity.

Will dt. 27 July, pr. 1 August, 1587.

Wife.

Unmarried. He was succeeded by John Threele, his half-brother, of Bexhill and of Pakyns, Sussex.

Education.

Universities. Inns of Court.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of Hundred of Bexhill, Hastings Rape.)

38 Henry VIII William Threele, gent., in goods £60.

2 Elizabeth William Threele Esq., Commissioner for Hastings Rape, but no assessment given.

11. H.C. MS, C.27; S.R.C.,xxxix,114; Horsfield, i,428.
15. P.R.O., E.179/190/225.
16. P.R.O., E.179/190/266.
WEST, Baron De la Warr.

Origins.

According to Collins and to Berry and Comber, the first recorded ancestor of the West family, later Barons De la Warr, was Sir Thomas West, knt., who married Eleanor, daughter and heiress of Sir John de Cantilupe of Hempston Cantilupe in Devon, knt., and of Snitterfield in Warwickshire. ¹ This Sir Thomas West is sometimes described as the first Baron West, apparently by virtue of a summons to a Council in the reign of Edward III, although other genealogies give his grandson, also Sir Thomas West, husband of Joanna la Warr, as the first Lord West.

It was through the marriage of this grandson into the la Warr family that the Barony of la Warr, or De la Warr, and much De la Warr property came into the West family early in the fifteenth century. Joanna la Warr was the daughter of Roger, third Baron De la Warr, by his second marriage, he having already two sons by his first; these two sons in turn succeeded him in title but both of them died without issue. On the death of the younger of them in 1426, Joanna was his sole heir. She had married Thomas, Lord West, in about the year 1390, but both her husband and their eldest son, also Thomas, predeceased Joanna's brother, the last of the De la Warrs, who died in 1426. Consequently the heir both to the West title and estates and to the De la Warr title and inheritance was Reginald, Joanna's younger son. He became third, (or fifth) Lord West, and sixth Baron De la Warr. ²

The family of De la Warr had for long been well known in the West of England where their earliest connections are to be found. For example, by the marriage of one, John De la Warr, who died c.1273, to a Sussex heiress, Olympia de Fokington, they acquired a number of Sussex manors including that of Folkington itself and also Isfield, which in Elizabeth's reign, was the property of the Shurleys. ³ The De la Warrs seem also to have had interests in the Midlands since the wills of several generations of them directed that they should be buried in Swinestead Abbey in Lincolnshire, and at least two wills were dated from Wakerley in Northamptonshire. ⁴ On the failure of the male line in Sussex in 1426, the bulk of the De la Warr property passed to the Wests.

1. A. Collins: Peerage of England, (1812), v, 1; B & C., 2a.
5. S.A.C., lxxxii, 59.
The West family, however, were already "owners of considerable property in the county". Among their possessions there were the two important houses of Ewhurst in Shermanbury and Offington in Broadwater, the latter becoming the family's main residence in the Elizabethan period. Offington is situated approximately eight miles east of Arundel, immediately to the north of present-day Worthing. This, and Ewhurst, came to the Wests by virtue of a marriage in the later fourteenth century to a Fitzherbert heiress, the Fitzherberts having recently acquired them by a marriage to the Peverel heiress.

In fact, like the Lewkenors, the Wests derived much of their property from a series of highly profitable marriages. E.P. Shirley wrote that, "The Wests are remarkable not so much for the antiquity of the family as for the early period at which they attained the honour of the peerage". Considering that their first recorded ancestor was living in the mid 14th century, it might, indeed, seem surprising that his great-grandson, Reginald, should, in 1426, have held two baronies and very considerable property, were it not for the fact that Reginald's father, grandfather and great-grandfather, had all married wealthy heiresses.

The record did not end there, for Reginald's great-grandson, Thomas, ninth Baron De la Warr, married Elizabeth, daughter and coheiress of Sir Richard Bonville of Halnaker, or Halfnaked as it was sometimes called, an ancient fortified house adjacent to Boxgrove priory. This house, and the patronage of the priory, were brought to Sir Thomas by his marriage, he having already the two Sussex residences of Offington and Ewhurst, and other lands within and without the county. The ninth Baron spent considerable time and money on the improvement and beautifying of Halnaker. He was also apparently much attached to Boxgrove priory, a Benedictine foundation established early in the 12th century, for, when the house was about to be dissolved, he sent a petition to Cromwell begging him to hold his hand.

7. S.A.C., lxxxi, 59.
9. S.A.C., xxiv, 9.
10. His great-grandfather, the first Sir Thomas West, married Eleanor, d., and h. of Sir John de Cantilupe who had property in Devon and Warwicks; his grandfather, the second Sir Thomas West, married Alice, sister and h., of Sir Edmond Fitzherbert, and so acquired the Fitzherbert and Peverel inheritances; his father, Thomas, 1st Lord West, married Joanna, eventually the De la Warr heiress. (See B & C., loc. cit.)
12. S.A.C., lxxxi, 63 et seqq.
if the dissolution must be carried through, to grant the site to him, Lord De la Warr, since he was the patron, and many of his wife’s ancestors were buried there. When the priory was dissolved, the site was, in fact, granted to Lord De la Warr for the sum of £126.13.4. 15 Unlike some of his contemporaries, Sir Thomas seems to have desired to possess this property for sentimental rather than acquisitive reasons. From 1536 onwards, he consistently opposed the Dissolution, and disliked the new service-books, and was even imprisoned for a month in 1538 as a suspected source of disaffection. 14 It was in the chancel of Boxgrove priory that he had built himself a lavishly decorated tomb-chapel, though it was not his fate to be buried there. 15 His wife, who predeceased him, was buried there, however, and there is a monumental inscription to her. 16

Perhaps it was to prevent his taking steps at any time to restore the monks at Boxgrove, 17 or at least because his affection for the place, and his obvious regret at the change it had suffered, might influence others, that Lord De la Warr was compelled to exchange it with the Crown for the dissolved Nunnery of Wherwell in Hampshire, in 1540. 18 As a part of his side of the exchange, Lord De la Warr was required to surrender his estate and mansion of Halnaker, adjacent to Boxgrove priory, which he had acquired through his wife, and on which he had lavished care and money. He, not unnaturally, made some difficulty about this, but Henry VIII was adamant, perhaps remembering his visit there in August, 1526, when Lord De la Warr had been his host, and coveting the property. 19 Elizabeth, Lord De la Warr’s wife, wrote to Cromwell on the 8 November, 1539, begging him to give her “Reasonable leisure to depart from thence, Halnaker, considering that all our corn and cattle and other provision is here upon Halnakyd and Boxgrove and in no other place and we can make no shift now for no money till summer”. 20 The matter was, however, hurried on,

13. S.A.C., xv, 103 et seqq.
14. D.N.B.
15. S.A.C., lxxxi, 64.
18. S.A.C., lxxxii, 64; and xv, 83.
19. S.A.C., vii, 218–19; D.N.B.
20. S.A.C., vii, 218–19; quoted from M.A. Wood, Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies, (1846), iii, 82.
and Lord De la Warr retired to his house at Offington, "With a reluctance that can be imagined after all he had done to beautify Halmaker". 21 At Offington, he seems to have lived in some style-and was described by Henry Machyn, the diarist, an admirer of his, as "the best housekeeper in Sussex". 22 Offington House, according to an inventory of this period, contained 65 bedrooms and 98 bedsteads. When he died, on 25 Sept., 1554, it was in Broadwater Church that he was buried, in a tomb he had prepared for himself there. 23 In the meantime, Halmaker, now in the King's hands, was allowed to go to ruin, and was not occupied until Sir John Morley acquired it in Elizabeth's reign. 24

The ninth Baron who died in 1554, left no children, and all his four full brothers had died without issue. 25 However, his eldest brother of the half blood, the eldest son of the eighth Baron's second marriage, Sir George West of Warbleton, who had died in 1538, had left two sons, William and Thomas.26 The elder of these, William, had been adopted by the ninth Baron as his heir, some time after 1540.27 The ninth Baron appears subsequently to have regretted his action, since, in 1549, he accused his nephew of attempting to poison him in his impatience for his inheritance. 28 On this charge, William West was disabled, on 1 February 1549, from inheriting the title, but he was later forgiven by his uncle who gave him a pension, a house in London, and the manors of Offington and Ewhurst. He was not restored in blood until April, 1563, and not given the title of Baron De la Warr until 5 February, 1570. 29

21. S.A.C., lxxxii, 64.
22. S.A.C., xxiv, 9; D.N.B., sub "Sir Thomas West, 9th Baron De la Warr".
23. S.A.C., lxxxii, 64; D.N.B.; G.E.C. (1916), iv, 157; n. 27.
24. D.N.B.; S.A.C., lxxxii, 64.
26. Ibid; will of Sir George West, P.C.C. 10 Cromwell.
27. D.N.B.
28. D.N.B. sub "Sir Thomas West, 9th Baron De la Warr".
29. B & C., loc. cit; D.N.B. sub "Sir Thomas West, 9th Baron De la Warr"; and sub "William West, 1st or 10th Baron De la Warr".
(West, Baron De la Warr, continued.)

Members of the family. 30

Head of the family in 1580.

Sir William West, first or tenth Baron De la Warr, son
and heir of Sir George West of Warbleton, Sussex, who
died in 1538, and of Elizabeth, d. and coheirress of Sir
Robert Morton of Lechlade, Glocs. 31

After 1540, adopted by Sir Thomas West, ninth Baron, as
his heir.

1 Feb., 1549, attainted and disinherited on a charge of
attempting to poison his uncle. Subsequently forgiven
by the latter who gave him a pension, a house in London,
and manors in Offington and Ewhurst.

1563, restored in blood.

1570, knighted, and created Baron De la Warr.

1572-1592, summoned to Parliament. Sat at the trials of
the Duke of Norfolk and of the Earl of Arundel. 32

October, 1569, rumoured that he had charged the Earl of
Arundel with treason, but he denied this. 33

Nov., 1569 and Nov., 1570, one of the three joint Lords
Lieutenant for Sussex. 34 1585, one of the Commissioners
for musters in Sussex. 34

1571 - Jan., 1595, J.P. Sussex. 35 Of the Quorum.

30 Dec., 1595, died at Wherwell, Hampshire. 36

30. Though a noble family, were mentioned in the Windsor
Herald's version of the 1570 Visitations of Sussex,
(B.M. MS, 17,065, f.7b), and in the 1594 Visitations
(H.C. MS, C.27).


32. See note 29; also G.E.C. (1916), iv, 158-19.

33. H.M.C. Hatfield MSS, i, 428, 432, 435.

34. See Appendix I, and B.M. Harl MS, 474, f. 80b.


(West, Baron De la Warr, continued.)

Wives.

Md. twice:- (a) Elizabeth, d. of Thomas Strange of Chesterton, Glos. Md. before 1555.
(b) Ann, d. of Henry Swift of Andover, Hants., relict of Thomas Oliver. She remd. Richard Kemiss of Andover and survived him.

Children.

Of the first marriage:-

Thomas Second or eleventh Baron De la Warr. Aged 40 in 1596, 7 Dec., 1597, knighted. On succeeding his father, he claimed the precedence of the ancient barony. This claim was recognised by the House of Lords, 14 Nov., 1597. M.P., Yarmouth, I.O.W., 1588-9; Hampshire, 1588-9; Aylesbury, 1592-5. J.P. Sussex, 1596-Jan., 1602. Of the Quorum. 1601, sat at the trial of the Earls of Essex and Southampton. 24 March, 1602, died.

Mary Died, 1630.

Jane

Of the second marriage: None

37. Ibid.
41. Official Returns. His uncle, Thomas West, was Sheriff of Hampshire in 1585-6, (P.R.O. Sheriffs), and apparently M.P. for Chichester, 1571, (Browne Willis, iii, 85), and for East Loce, 1572-83, (Official Returns), since Thomas, the eleventh Baron, would have been too young.
42. P.R.O. Assizes, 35, S.E. Circuit, Sussex, 38-44.
43. G.E.C., (1916), iv, 160. His uncle, Thomas West, was fined for complicity in Essex's rebellion, and his own son, the future 12th Baron, was imprisoned for the same reason but escaped lightly. (D.N.B. sub "Thomas West, 3rd or 12th Baron De la Warr").
(West, Baron De la Warr, continued.)

Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Son

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Inns of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marriages of children. 45

Thomas  Second or eleventh Baron, md. 19 Nov., 1571, 
Anne, d. of Sir Francis Knollys, K.G., and of 
Mary, d. of William Cary.  Issue.

Mary  md. Richard Blount of Dedisham who died 30 April, 
1628, (q.v.).

Jane  md. four times:— (a) Thomas Wenman, at St. 
Dunstan's in the West, on 9 Jan., 1572.  Issue. 
(b) James Grasse Esq.  (c) Thomas Tasburgh Esq. 
(d) Ralph Sheldon Esq.

(Footnote from previous page)

44.  D.N.B., B & C., loc. cit; according to Sir Thomas 
Shirley, the elder, writing on 26 May, 1602, he 
left his son and heir in "a most broken estate." 
(H.M.C.Hatfield MSS, xii,166).

The name 'Wilgoose', though liable to many whimsical variations of spelling, appears to have been known in Sussex as early as the mid 14th century. 1

However, the pedigree of the family of that name which was settled at Salehurst in Hastings Rape in Elizabeth's reign, has not been traced back very far by Berry and Comber. 2 The earliest name they give, using as their authority B.M.MS.1562, a MS. combining the pedigrees of the 1530 and 1634 Visitations together with certain additional information is that of one, possibly William, "Wildegos", who, by an unknown wife, had two sons, John and Thomas, of whom the latter left no issue. John was appointed executor to a cousin of his, Thomas Wilgoose of Hartfield, whose will dated 30 Sept., 1491, was proved on 27 July, 1496. 3 The Hartfield property of this cousin appears to have passed to John Wilgoose's second son, also called Thomas, the elder son, Edward, remaining a bachelor. The younger Thomas, however, married Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of John Hilles, and they had two sons, John and Alexander. Thomas Wilgoose, their father, died on 1 Sept., 1541. 4

When Thomas Wilgoose died on 1 September, 1541, his son and heir, John, was barely fourteen years old. 5 It was he who was to settle at Iredge Place in Salehurst parish in the Hundred of Henhurst in Hastings Rape, not far from Burwash. This district is described by Horsfield as being a hop-growing centre and a valuable source of iron ore, iron foundries having once been situated in the parish. Of Iredge Place, he says, it is "a mansion of considerable antiquity. It was formerly the property and residence of the numerous and highly respectable family of Wildigos from whom it descended about the middle of the 18th century into the family of Fowle and from them to the Peckhams". Since John Wilgoose, who acquired Iredge in 1560, had married before that time into the family of Culpepper of Wigsell,

1. S.A.C., liv,130; xxxi, 99-103.
2. B & C., 10.
3. P.C.C. 34 Vox.
5. Proof of age, 18 March, 1542; B & C., loc.cit.
it seems likely that it was due to this connection that he moved from Hartfield in Pevensey Rape to Salehurst, for Wigsell was also situated in Salehurst parish. 6 John Wilgoose, and later his son and heir, appear on the Commission of the Peace for Hastings Rape in the latter part of the reign, the son being numbered of the Quorum.

Despite the comparative brevity of the established pedigree of the Salehurst Wilgooses, they do not appear to have been newcomers to the county, and it appears likely that there was a connection between them and their namesakes of fourteenth century Sussex.

Apart from the Culpeppers, their only Sussex connections of any note in the Elizabethan period, appear to have been the Porters of Battle. John Wilgoose who settled at Iredge Place had a paternal aunt, Jane, who married Richard Porter of Battle. Their grandson, John, was a J.P. in the 1590's, (q.v.)

Whether armigerous.

Not mentioned in any version of the 1570 Visitation, but do appear in that of 1634.

Members of the family.

Head of the family in 1580.

John Wilgoose of Iredge Place in Salehurst, Esq., eld. son and heir of Thomas Wilgoose of Hartfield, Sussex, who died 1 Sept., 1541, and of Elizabeth, d. and h. of John Hillese. She remarried William Oxenden Esq., of Wingham, Kent. 8

Aged 14 on 18 March, 1542. (V. supra.)

1560, plaintiff in fine for manor of Iredge, 9 and for tenements in Salehurst in 1561; also for Bexsewell manor, with another, in 1561. 10

---

6. Horsfield, 1, 580 et seqq.
7. H.C. MS, C.27.
9. S.R.S., xix, 244.
(Wilgoose continued.)

Nov., 1574, wrote to Burghley interceding for the liberation of one, Clifton, Wilgoose's former schoolmaster, now imprisoned at Canterbury for non-conformity. 11

1585 - Jan., 1595, J.P., Sussex. 12

1587, certificate concerning the Sussex J.P.'s, described as a J.P. of Hastings Rape. "A cold professor of religion". Said to be resident in a town on the Northern border of Sussex but to spend most of his time in Wales, letting his Sussex house to Mr. Turwhit, "a notable recusant". 13

He became involved in several Star Chamber cases: -
(a) In 28 Elizabeth, he was the defendant against Robert Walsh of Etchingham, Sussex, Esq., who complained against him that he, Wilgoose, at divers times since he became a J.P., had, of his own authority dismissed various persons brought before him by the constables and other officials, they being suspected of burglaries or worse offences, without even examining them or taking sureties. Wilgoose was also accused of maintaining in his service "two very bad and lewd persons" and of countenancing their malpractices in the neighbourhood, and, when the matter aroused criticism, of bringing sundry "lewd and frivolous actions and suits of law", including one against the plaintiff, to distract attention. 14
(b) In 28 Elizabeth, he was the defendant, again against Robert Walsh of Etchingham, Sussex, Esq., who complained that he, Wilgoose, with his son, John, and with "divers other malicious and ill disposed persons", 15 "of malice and of hatred of longe tyme borne unto your said subject by the said John Wilgoose, the father," and "by the procuraments and instigation of the said John Wilgoose, the father", on 26 Jan., 1585, had assembled and broken into Walsh's watermill at Salehurst and done much damage there. Wilgoose and others were accused

11. B.M. Land. MS, 19, f. 86.
13. S.A.C., 11, 58. See below for his Star Chamber action in 35 and 36 Elizabeth, concerning some property in Wales.
14. P.R.O., St. Ch. 5 Eliz., W. 2/1. See also F.26/14, and W. 67/13.
15. Two of these were the "two very bad and lewd persons" mentioned in the other Star Chamber action of 28 Eliz., between Walsh and Wilgoose. (P.R.O., St. Ch. 5 Eliz., W. 2/1).
(Wilgoose continued.)

of similar riots committed at various times since the previous November, and Wilgoose was also said to have been maintaining various persons bringing far-fetched lawsuits against him, the plaintiff. In his answer to Walsh's accusations, Wilgoose remarked on Walsh's insubordination to him as a J.P. and remarked that he had had to deal with Walsh on a number of counts, e.g. for the latter's treatment of certain poor persons, because Walsh was harbouring slanderous literature, and for various other offences. The dispute over the mill was on account of Walsh's damming up of the water which was to drive Wilgoose's projected iron-mill further down. 16

(c) In 35 and 36 Elizabeth, he was the plaintiff, with his son John, in an action against the family of Ragland, concerning the title to certain manors in Glamorganshire. 17

14 April, 1586, leased premises in Etchingham. 18

17 August, 1606, buried in Salehurst parish church. 19 I.P.M.

**Wife.**

Elizabeth, eld. d. of William Culpepper of Wigsell, Sussex, Esq. She was named in her father's will, dt. 16 Nov., 1559, then married. 21

**Children.** 22

John Later Sir John, of Iredge Court, Salehurst, Sussex, knt. Succeeded his father aged 40 and more. 3 March, 1569, appointed captain of the footbands in Hastings Rape. 23 In 28 Elizabeth, was involved in his father's lawsuit against Robert Walsh in the Star Chamber, Walsh being plaintiff, and in 35 Elizabeth, he and his father were plaintiffs in a Star Chamber action against members of the Ragland family about property in Wales. (V. supra). J.P. Sussex, 1597 -

----

16. P.R.O., St.Ch. 5 Eliz., 45/17. Robert Walsh v. John Wil- 
goose.
17. P.R.O., St.Ch. 5 Eliz., W.7/8; W.62/28; see also F.2/21; F.28/39; F.6/4; F.17/4. Apart from these cases, Wilgoose was involved indirectly in a dispute over a wardship. (P.R.O., St.Ch. 5 Eliz. W.56/15).
23. B.M., Harl MS, 703, f.59b.
(Wilgoose continued.)

Children contd.

1602 at least. Of the Quorum. 24 37 Eliz., he and his son, Thomas 25 were plaintiffs in a Star Chamber action against one, John Parry of Accornebury, co. Hereford, John Wilgoose's brother-in-law. Parry, who had married Margaret Wilgoose and later had ignored his promises to make satisfactory provision for her and their child's support and who had grossly mismanaged his estates and been outlawed for debt, was accused of violence towards those who were acting as bailiffs for his property. 26 23 July, 1603, knighted. 27 2 Dec., 1636, buried at Salehurst. 28 Administration, 1 March, 1637. 29 I.P.M., 30 Aug., 1637. 30

Thomas
Mary
Margaret
Involved in the Star Chamber case between her brothers and her husband. (V. supra).

Anne.

Education.

Universities. Inns of Court.

Father

John, Hart Hall, Oxf., John, adm. Gray's Inn,
matric. entry, 22 March, 28 Oct., 1584. 31
1583, aged 15. 33

Sons.

John, adm. Gray's Inn,
Thomas, adm. Lincoln's Inn,
matric. entry, 22 March,
matric. entry, 28 Nov.,
1583, aged 15. 33
1581, aged 13. 35

25. As Sir John Wilgoose does not appear to have had a son, Thomas, and in any case did not marry until 1587, the reference is probably to his younger brother, Thomas.
27. Shaw, ii, 119, as "of Kent".
28. S.A.C., xxv, 168; B & C., loc.cit.
29. Lewes administrations, B.7/38.
31. He was also defendant in fine with his brother, John, and the latter's wife, for Iredge and other manors, in 1614. (S.R.S., xix, 244).
33. A.Ox., iv, 1632.
34. Gray's Inn Admissions, 65.
35. A.Ox., loc.cit.
36. Lincoln's Inn Admissions, 1, 106.
(Wilgoose continued.)

Marriages of children.

John md. Grace, eld. d. and one of three coheirresses of Bryan Annesley of Lee in Lewisham, Kent, Esq. Md. 16 Oct., 1587, at Lee, Kent. She was maid of honour to Queen Elizabeth. Bur. at Salehurst, 17 Aug., 1644. Issue. Their s. and h., Sir Annesley Wilgoose, d.v.p., the family inheritance passing eventually to his only surviving son, Robert, who died without male heirs in 1642. Iredge then passed to the heirs of his sister Anne who married Sir John Fowle of Sandhurst, Kent.

Thomas md. =, widow of = Smith of Mepham. Issue.


Anne md. John Finch of Rolvenden, Kent. Md. 11 July, 1595 at Echinghams Sussex.

Subsidy assessments.

(As of the Hundred of Henhurst, Hastings Rape.)

| 2 Elizabeth | John Wilgoose, gent., in lands | £15.40 |
| 14 Elizabeth | John Wilgoose, gent., " " " | £20.41 |
| 18 Elizabeth | John Wilgoose, gent., " " " | £25.42 |
| 37 Elizabeth | John Wilgoose Esq., " " " | £10.43 |
| 1-2 Charles I | Sir John Wilgoose, knt., " " " | £5.44 |

37. B & C., loc. cit.
38. S.A.C., xxv, 150.
40. P.R.O., E.179/190/266.
41. P.R.O., E.179/190/283.
42. P.R.O., E.179/190/298.
43. P.R.O., E.179/190/332.
44. P.R.O., E.179/190/377a.
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