



W.L. Watson lith.

Hambart imp.

MUNTHAM.  
VIEW EAST OF THE MANUFACTURING OF PAPER.

# FINDON.

BY THE EDITOR.

(Continued from Vol. XXVI.)

I proceed to redeem a promise, given in our last volume,<sup>1</sup> to finish Findon, though I rather fear my readers would have been better pleased with its breach than its observance; for a second glass of sherry seldom seems so well flavoured, or, another, cup of tea so refreshing, as the first. Still, a promise is a promise.

Before going further I must, however, correct the error in the pedigree<sup>2</sup> of the owners of Findon Place manor, of having placed the death of William Margesson in 1779 instead of in 1848, an anachronism patent, indeed, on the surface (and probably a typical one only), as it makes his son to be born twelve years after his death; still, it is one for which I am responsible, and for which I offer an apology to the family in connection with whom it occurs. The name also of Mrs. Lyall, who kindly contributed the beautiful drawing for our lithograph of Findon Church, should not have been omitted.

I spoke<sup>3</sup> of Findon Park as an interesting appurtenance to Findon Place manor: and such I now hope to make it out to have been. Let us, therefore, follow out this branch of our subject, before proceeding to Muntham and Cissbury. And this leads us to ask ourselves, "What is a Park?" And I hope I shall not offend the susceptibilities of those who honour any country seat to which there is a paddock and a lodge with the title of park, and who would perhaps be affronted if that dignity were not bestowed on their own home—if I tell them that not one place in a thousand has any real claim to the appellation.

<sup>1</sup> Page 260.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 264.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 220.

A park (*parcus*) had, and has, a well defined legal meaning; and there were four indispensable requisites to its existence. 1. An inclosure. 2. Vert. 3. Venison. 4. A Royal licence (or prescription that pre-supposed one) to impark (*licentia imparcandi*). The inclosure may have been either by pale, or wall, or hedge—and the *haice* of Domesday, which were really a species of park, must have had all three, and probably a ditch, dyke, or moat (*fossatum*) as well. I do not find the beasts of park mentioned by name, as the beasts of forest are, and which all the old writers on that “princely diversion” of the chase agree were—the hart (“the most stateliest that doth go upon the earth,” and that “which doth carry majesty in his countenance and gait”), the hind, the buck, the boar, and the wolf—but, as a Park is said to differ from a Chase *only* in its being enclosed, the beasts of park may be safely asserted to have been the same as those of Chase, and these were the buck, the doe, the roe, the martern, and fox. Of these the three former alone constituted “Venison,” and therefore I presume a park may have existed without containing the two latter. How they found their way into the protection of a park at all, it seems difficult to say, except that, being pursued in hunting, they may have been admitted to the privilege accorded more properly to those which united to this the property of “being good for food.” For although venison (*venatio*) etymologically comprises both classes, the better opinion is that it was applied only to animals which were edible, or, to use a homelier phrase, to “shooting for the pot;” and this, indeed, is the test of modern sport. The capture of a conger eel or a badger would seldom satisfy or gratify; but if it is a clean run salmon, which lays its spangled sides before us on the bank, or a “right and left” are well knocked over out of the whirring covey, we feel at once we have had “good sport.”

As the stag or hart represents the red-deer, so do the buck and the doe the fallow-deer, species. The roe is the smallest of the deer tribe. The martern, or martin, of which there never was great store in the forests south

of the Trent, was yet plentiful in Westmoreland in Martindale. Each species had terms of art applicable to itself. Thus, a buck was called the first year a fawn, the second a pricket, the third a sorel, the fourth a sore, the fifth a buck of the first head, the sixth a buck, or great buck. So, also, a doe was the first year a fawn, the second year a pricket's sister, the third a doe. A roe was the first year a kid, in the second a gyrle, in the third a hemuse, in the fourth a roebuck of the first head, the fifth a fair roebuck. A martern in the first year was a martern cub, and in the second year a martern. So, foresters and good woodmen, did say a brace or a leash of bucks or foxes, a bevy of roes, a *Richesse* of marterns.

And then as to Vert. As the green herb is "for the service of man," so is it required for the food, and to form the covert, for the lower animals. And there were nice distinctions here too. There was, or ought to be, the over-vert and the nether-vert, neither of which did, and the special vert which did, bear fruit of itself "to feed the deer withal." To the over-vert, or *haut boys* belonged all the great trees of the wood, including the ash and the holly; and to the nether-vert, or southboys, all underwood, bushes, thorns, gorse, and (according to some) fern, bracken, and heather; whilst special vert included pear-trees, crab-trees, hawthorns, blackbush, and such like.

Manwood, in his quaint style, gives three reasons why forest laws preserved the vert. 1. The very nature of the beasts is to resort to the woods; 2. because it bears fruit which is good for deer in winter; 3. *propter decorem* (for the comeliness and beauty of the same), for the very sight and beholding of the green and gracious woods and forest are not less pleasant and delightful, in the eye of a prince, than the view of the wild beasts of forest and chase; and therefore the grace of a forest is to be decked and trimmed up with a store of glorious green coverts as if it were green arbours of pleasure for a king to delight himself in, because that in the forests there are the secret pleasures and princely delights of kings, for kings and princes do resort unto the forests for their

pleasures of hunting, having for that time laid aside all cares, to the end that they might there be refreshed with some quiet, being wearied with the continual business of the Court<sup>4</sup>.

There is certainly truth in this, and before we are too hard upon the Plantagenet kings for the undoubted grievances of many of their forest laws, we should do well to place ourselves in their position, and consider how implanted in the breast of man is the love of wild sport. Does not every one, who has earned his autumn holiday after a busy session or season, feel this in our own day in a smaller way, and plunge into the same sort of distraction? Is he really less vindictive, in spirit at least, towards the poacher, who has ginned his hares, or even to an unfortunate gleaner who has unintentionally "put up" the "marked down" covey? We certainly have not, since the murderous days of sheep-stealing law, seen a brother's life taken for that of a brute; but have not many of us seen an ill-behaved pointer left for dead in a ditch for "running into" his game? Indeed, there is probably nothing which tries good temper more, and in which self-command is more beautiful and rare, than (take it throughout) a day's shooting.

And again, as there was a difference between a Forest and a Chase, so our ancestors saw, and graphically describe,<sup>5</sup> a corresponding one between the character and habits of the beasts of the one and of the other. For the former do make their abode all the day time in the great coverts and secret places in the woods, and in the night season they do repair into the lawnes, meadows, pastures, and pleasure feedings for their food and relief, and therefore they are called *Silvestres*; according as the prophet David saith:<sup>6</sup>—

Thou makest darkness that it may be night, wherein all the *beasts of the forest* do move. The lions roaring after their prey do seek their meat from God. The sun ariseth, and they get them away together, and lay them down in their dens.

<sup>4</sup> Laws of the Forest, p. 120.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Ps. 104, v. 20—22.

But the beasts of Chase, they do make their abode all the day time in the fields, and upon the hills or high mountains, where they may see round about them afar off, who doth stir, or come near them; and in the night season, when everybody is at rest and all is quiet, then they do repair unto the corn fields and valleys below, where the lawnes, meadows, and pleasant feedings are for their food and relief, and therefore they are called *Campestres*. And good King David is again made to vouch for this,<sup>7</sup> when he says—

I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he goat out of thy folds, for all the *beasts of the forest* are mine, and so are the cattle upon a thousand hills.

And lastly, there must have been a Royal grant: for as all the wild woods and uncultivated land of the country which, in the original distribution, were not thought worth allotting, remained in the Crown, and as the right of a freeholder to kill game on his land<sup>8</sup> did not extend to preserve and appropriate it, it required a special grant from the Crown to enable him to do so; and numerous, accordingly, in the older records are licences for this purpose.

Now, had Findon Park these requisites for a park? Though long since *disparked* (which happens when any of the above-named attributes of a park ceases), and, therefore, perhaps, not laying claim to a place among Mr. Evelyn Shirley's list of the Deer Parks in England (although Mr. Lower mentions it among them),<sup>9</sup> there is indisputable evidence of its having once been one.

As early as 1298 Wm. de Braose VI. speaks of it as his park of Findon—

Nostro parco de Findon,

and prior to 1269 it was the park of the Abbey of Dureford.<sup>10</sup> I have not been able to come across the *licentia imparcandi* for it in the Records, but the long prescriptive

<sup>7</sup> Ps. 50, vv. 9, 10.

<sup>8</sup> 26 S. A. C., p. 230.

<sup>9</sup> 20 S. A. C., 232.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 225.

usage, implying a Royal grant, is as good proof of it as we need require.

The wall, though broken down, can still be traced, which enclosed its entire area. The *hautboys* and the special vert are still there, while the deep dells of Chanctonbury, in which it is situate, exactly afford that leeward retreat which the deer would require. In old maps there is still the "warrener's cottage," as it is called (behind the present farm-house), which I should, perhaps, dignify with the name of "lodge," for so it is described as far back as 1551, when we read (Add. MS. 5685, "Findon") of the park as

*"In tenurá Johannis Tulley,"*

and as parcel of the manor lands in this parish, and of

The lodge inside the same park, and a piece of pasture with pannage called *le Newparke*.

Here lived, doubtless, the Palliser or keeper of the Park, an officer who, we remind ourselves, has grown, like Parker and Forester, into a proper name of some celebrity, recalling to our minds a great metropolitan of the sixteenth, and admiral of the eighteenth, century. Of that functionary we do not say, that he must have equalled in splendour or picturesqueness of apparel the Forester of Chaucer, who

— was cladde in Cote and Hode of grene ;  
 A shefe of Peacock arwes bright and kene  
 Under his Belt he bare full thriftily :  
 Well coude he dress his takel yemanly.  
 His arwes drooped not with Fetheres lowe,  
 And in his hond he bare a mighty Bowe.  
 A not-hed hadde he, with a broune visage,  
 Of wood-craft coude he well alle the usage.  
 Upon his arme he bare a gay Bracer,  
 And by his side a Sword and Bokeler ;  
 A Cristofer on his brest of silver shene ;  
 A horne he bare ; the baudrick was of grene—  
 A Forster was he sothily, as I gesse.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Canterbury Tales.

yet he certainly had some distinguishing dress to mark his rank, and (as that is the livery of even "George Ranger's" metropolitan staff of the nineteenth century) probably a "grene" one; for in 1363 John Mowbray

Granted the custody of his Park and warren of Findon to Robert Croak for life, with 2d. *per diem*, wages, and a robe, or silver mark, yearly.<sup>12</sup>

The next question is, to the lord of what manor did our Park belong? To Wiston or Findon Place? For whom was the venison fattened? For it must be remembered that though these parks were places for the *protection* of the deer, it was much the same sort of protection as unfortunate broods of modern pheasants experience at the hands of their lords and keepers, or that a Dorking fowl or Hampshire hog has to be thankful for, when crammed for the market. They were driven from the greater unenclosed spaces, the forests, to be there shot down (the enclosures prevented their being hunted with hounds) and packed off to adorn the larder, or improve the digestion, of the neighbouring baron.

The Lord of Wiston might not unnaturally lay claim to it as appurtenant to his fine old baronial demesne close under the great hill of Chanctonbury. But we cannot help thinking this question is set at rest by the evidence before adduced that W. de Braose VI., then Lord of Findon Place manor,<sup>13</sup> distinctly called it *his park*,<sup>14</sup> and that "Jno. de Mowbray III., of Axholme," who, in the fourteenth century gave the robe and silver mark to the Findon park keeper, was at the time Lord of Findon Place manor. Besides which it is in the parish of Findon, and it is not Wiston Park, but Findon Park. Moreover, Wiston was itself a park, and could, therefore, not require another, and is marked in Speed's map of 1610 as containing a herd of 300 head of deer.<sup>15</sup>

The parks of former times were always at a distance from the residence of the proprietor, and occupied the

<sup>12</sup> 5 S. A. C., p. 145, citing, Pat. 43 Ed. III.

<sup>13</sup> 26 S. A. C., p. 262.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, p. 225.

<sup>15</sup> Shirley's Deer Parks in England, p. 50.



worst and wildest parts of the manor.<sup>16</sup> There can be little doubt, therefore, that, like all uncultivated lands of that manor, it formed part of the demesnes of Findon Place, the descent of which it followed till the time of Henry Goring (*tempore* Chas. I.). He conveyed it in fee to Lionel, Earl of Middlesex, Lord High Treasurer of James's reign, for £525. The misfortunes and impeachment of that nobleman are well known. Sprung from a somewhat obscure origin and suddenly promoted, with an unprecedented rapidity, to one of the highest posts in the kingdom, the temptations of which he found himself unable to resist, he was impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors, for bribes and other misapplications of the public money, and sentenced to lose all his offices, be fined £50,000, imprisoned in the Tower during the King's pleasure, and rendered incapable to sit in Parliament.

The privilege of the pulpit, sufficiently great in our own days, was much greater then, and more liable to abuse; and church going must have been a far from pleasant occupation when one was liable any Sunday to be personally *preached at*—a state of things which actually happened to the poor Treasurer, when in the beginning of his troubles, attending service with the King at Greenwich, the Royal chaplain—choosing St. Matthew iv, 8, for the text of his sermon—pointed with his finger at him as he sat below, exclaiming

“That man” (reiterating it), “that man that makes himself rich and his master poor, he is a fit Treasurer—for the d——!”

The Earl abashed drew his hat (men did not then “pray uncovered,” I suppose,) over his eyes. The King, in a pew above, seemed rather to enjoy the joke, and smiled maliciously!

Whether the fine was paid to the Crown I do not find, but I suppose not (it was a very large one in those days); and that the Park got into the King's hands in consequence on an extent, for it was appraised and sold to John, 4th Earl Thanet, then Lord of Findon Place, who,

<sup>16</sup> Shirley's Deer Parks in England, p. 50.

on the petition of the Earl of Middlesex, obtained a grant of it in fee by letters patent from Chas. I., in 1634. Such, at least, seems the result of a somewhat intricate series of transactions connected with the Park, ranging from about 1623 to 1643. In 1643, Earl John conveyed it by feoffment to Sir John Fagg, of Wiston, in fee, in whose family it remained till 1749, when Sir Robert Fagg devised it to his sister, Lady Goring, from whom it passed to her son, the late Charles Goring, Esq., and still forms part of the property of his son, the Rev. Jno. Goring, under the more modest name of Findon Park Farm. The descent of Wiston and the pedigree of the Gorings, having already appeared in these volumes,<sup>17</sup> I need not pursue it further here, as connected with this subject.

The outside admeasurement of the farm is about 550 acres and the inside about 300, the difference being to be accounted for by the former including 250 of tenantry Down. The only remains of the Park proper are some 30 or 40 acres of "Vert," the rest having long since been cleared for arable purposes; but these are enough, without more, to identify it with the park of 1269. While it formed part of the estate of Edw. Shelley, a former owner of Findon Place Manor, it was settled, as we have hinted,<sup>18</sup> differently from the rest of that manor. The recovery "of all the lands, tenements, and hereditaments called or known by the name of Findon Park," having been suffered to the use of Edw. Shelley *for life*, remainder to the use of trustees for twenty-four years, remainder to the use of the heirs male of the body of Edw. Shelley; limitations which, as the event proved, made no difference in the eventual devolution of the Park (which followed that of the rest of Findon Place), as Edw. Shelley had sons. But the question was (as will be observed) distinctly raised in the above limitation, whether Edw. Shelley, to whom a *life* estate had been given, took an estate of inheritance by virtue of the grant in the same conveyance<sup>19</sup> to the heirs of his body. A question which, as we have seen, was decided in the affirmative.

<sup>17</sup> 5 S. A. C., p. 1 *et seq.*

<sup>18</sup> 26 S. A. C., p. 245.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 221.

I proceed to Muntham. Some confusion, or at least difficulty, in tracing the descent of this estate, arises from the fact that there is another freehold of the same name in the parish of Itchingfield in the same county, about twenty miles north-west of Findon, known as "Chitty's," and as paying to the lord of the manor of Thakeham "1d. for a Heriot, 1d. for Quit rent, 1d. for a Relief." Where the parish in which the particular Muntham is situated is named in the records, there is, of course, no doubt as to which is intended, but this is not always the case, as we shall presently see.

Another difficulty arises from the circumstance that our county historians, on the one hand, treat Findon Muntham as a subsisting manor, while the local stewards and practical men on the other, declare that they never heard of such a manor! (Truth, lying, as usual, half way between the extremes, and both sets of informants having some ground for their position.) It *was* indisputably a manor. It *has* from some cause ceased to be one. Cartwright, therefore, misleads us, when he says "The demesne lands" (which imply a manor) "attached to this estate" (*i.e.* Findon Muntham) "*contain* 1600 acres," and again, "the manor *extends* over a great part of Washington."<sup>20</sup> And Mr. W. Smith Ellis,<sup>21</sup> and even Mr. Dudley Cary Elwes<sup>22</sup> fall into the same mistake. Cartwright thinks also that, because the house of our Muntham ("house *on a hill*") is in a deep dell, it *derived* its name from, but that Itchingfield Muntham, because it is on high ground, *gave* its name to, its possessor,<sup>23</sup> and speaks of both a Findon and an Itchingfield family of de Munthams as having the same arms, a lion charged with a fess. He gives us<sup>24</sup> an engraving of those arms from a seal of John de Mundeham, who probably had land in Findon, as we shall presently see; and Mr. Ellis connects them with the Combes of Norfolk, and thinks they were branches of the family of Mundham, of Mundham in that county, who had resided

<sup>20</sup> Rape of Bramber, p. 89.

<sup>21</sup> 24 S. A. C., p. 36.

<sup>22</sup> Castles, &c., of West Sussex, p. 94.

<sup>23</sup> Rape of Bramber, 89 n. and 328.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71.

there for several generations.<sup>25</sup> Perhaps the earliest mention of our Muntham is in an agreement between the Prior and Monks of Sele and the Incumbent of Findon (referred to in our last Vol. in connection with Findon Place), whereby the Prior and monks conceded to the Church of Findon all the small tithes of sheep and other animals, and of all emoluments arising from four enclosures for sheep (*de quatuor bercariis*), in the same vill of Fyndon, two of which were in Mundeham (Muntham), a third in the tenure of H. Whitelofe, and the fourth in the furze (*de furse*) of the priory. It was further agreed that the Vicar of Findon should receive the tithes of any lands subsequently assarted (cleared), and the Priory those “of the lands *in Mundeham* now furze, but which may be hereafter cleared and tilled.”<sup>26</sup> Where, however, it will be observed nothing is said of Muntham being a manor. And as the disputes between the Prior and Vicar arose out of doubts as to the boundaries of the demesne lands of Findon Place manor, the tithes of which W. de Braose VI. gave to the Priory, it would seem as if at that time Muntham was part of that manor, though it is difficult to reconcile this theory with that of its being a submanor of Thakeham, as we shall presently see it was.

In the 14th century Johannes de Mundham had lands in the parish of Sullington, which adjoins Muntham.

In 46 Ed. III. (1373), Thomas, the son of the above-named John de Mundham “released all his right”—without saying what it was—“in the manor of Muntham *in the parish of Findon*” (and which he probably inherited from his father), “to Thomas Cornwallis of London his heirs and assigns,”

relaxavit Thomæ Cornwalllys de Londino et heredibus et assignatis suis totum jus suum in manerio de Mundham in parochiâ de Fyndon et tres acras prati in Wassingeton et Thakeham.<sup>27</sup>

How it passed from Cornwallis to Edmund Mille, Milne, or Mulne, into whom we next trace it, I do not find; but

<sup>25</sup> 24 S. A. C., p. 31-36.

<sup>26</sup> 10 S. A. C., p. 121.

<sup>27</sup> Harl. MS. 1176. 24 S. A. C., p. 86.  
Claus. 46 Ed. 3. m. 33.

in 12 Henry VI., 1434, *John Apsley*, whom Cartwright<sup>28</sup> erroneously calls *William* (being then lord of half the manor of Thakeham), by a deedpoll reciting that Edmund Mille held of him the manor of Muntham as of his share of the manor of Thakeham by fealty and the service of 2s. 3d.

ut de pro parte suâ manerii de Thakeham per fidelitatem et servitium duorum solidorum et trium denariorum

declared that he had granted and confirmed to the said Edmund, his heirs and assigns, the said manor of Muntham to be held of him and his heirs by fealty and the service of two cross bows (*catapultarum*).<sup>29</sup> Whether this was the Itchingfield or Findon Muntham does not appear for certain from the above record, but that it was the latter is pretty clear from the next one. Moreover, though the former was a freehold held of the manor of Thakeham, I do not find, from any authentic record, it was itself ever a submanor of that manor: yet Mr. Lower calls our Findon Muntham "an outlying portion of the *Itchingfield* Muntham manor."<sup>30</sup> Can it be that our county writers have not apprehended the distinction between a *freehold held of a manor*, and a *submanor*? Edmund Mille died in 1452,<sup>31</sup> and by an Inquisition *post mortem*, 19 Ed. IV., 1480, taken upon the death of his son Richard Mille, whose death has been placed<sup>32</sup> in these vols. in 1478, the jury find he was seised in his demesne as of fee "of the manor of Muntham and of certain lands and tenements called Palmer's Combe & Flood's in *Findon* in the said Co. & of certain lands & tenements called Cobden in Sullington" (the adjoining village to Findon, as we have said), and they further found that the said manor of Muntham was held of *John Apsley* as of his manor of *Thakeham*, in the said Co., by fealty and one *barbed arrow*: a change of services from the cross-bows which it is not easy to explain. In this record I think the juxtaposition of Muntham manor with the "lands in Findon," shews it was that manor which was intended.

<sup>28</sup> Rape of Bramber, p. 243.

<sup>29</sup> Claus. 12, H. VI., pars 1, m. 21.

<sup>30</sup> History of Sussex, p. 56.

<sup>31</sup> 17 S. A. C., p. 111.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

The atte Milnes or Mulnes of Greatham were a well-known family of that day, and Richard atte Mulle (for the "n" was now dropped), who died in 1504, was lord of Pulboro' manor as well as of Greatham.

The residence of the Pulboro' branch was Mille Place, probably in the manor of Nutbourne, of which Edmund atte Milne<sup>33</sup> possessed half in 13 H. VI., 1435 (not 1452, as Mr. Turner<sup>34</sup> has it.) Ann, his daughter, married William, son of John Apsley, and so carried the Pulborough manor into that family, and they had a son, Nicholas Apsley.

Dallaway makes Ann in one place<sup>35</sup> the heir of her brother Richard, but in another<sup>36</sup> attributes to Richard a wife and family! So in one place<sup>37</sup> he makes her marry Nicholas, in another<sup>38</sup> William, the father of Nicholas, Apsley!

By an Inquisition *post mortem*, 1 Ed. VI., 1547, the jury found that Nicholas Apsley was seised in his demesne as of fee of and in one messuage, and certain lands and tenements in Fyndon, with their appurtenances, called Mundham; and they say that the said messuage, lands, and tenements in Fyndon, called Mundham, are, and at the death of the said Nicholas were, held of John Apsley, as of his manor of Thakeham, by the service of one knight's fee and 2s. 3d. for the Sheriff's aid; and were worth per annum £15 10s. Where, it will be observed, Muntham is not expressly called a manor. In the next document, however, it is again described as such.

By an Inquisition *post mortem*, 35 Eliz., the jury find that John Apsley was seised of and in *the manor* of Mundham, *alias* Muntham, with its appurtenances, in the said County (of Sussex), and of and in divers lands and tenements with their appurtenances, *in Findon*, in the said County, called Muntham, and of and in one virgate of land in Fyndon aforesaid, called Flood's land, and of one parcel of land in Fyndon called Blackdown; and that George Apsley, Esquire, was the son and next heir of

<sup>33</sup> 17 S. A. C., p. 121.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>35</sup> Rape of Arundel, p. 320.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 240.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 320.

the said John, and of the age of 28 years and upwards; and that the manor of Muntham, and the lands and tenements in Fyndon, called Mundham, are held, and at the death of the said John *were held, of Edw. Apsley, Esquire, as of his manor of Thakeham*, by fealty and other services.

Neither Mr. Blaauw<sup>39</sup> nor Cartwright<sup>40</sup> in their Apsley pedigrees make any mention of the above-named George, though Berry does; nor do either of them give us any Edward, of whom, as Lord of Thakeham, John could have held Muntham in 1593, as we see he did; for their Edward, son of Richard (whom Cartwright, however, calls Thomas) was his younger son; and there was no failure of the issue of Thomas, or at least of William, his elder sons, which could account for Thakeham manor being in the younger line.

In 1596 the property finally left the Apsley family; for in 38 and again in 41 Eliz. recoveries were suffered of the manor in favour of Henry Shelley; in both of which George Apsley appears as vouchee, and was therefore at the time, I presume, seised of it in fee simple or in tail. As the recoverers in the recovery Rolls were generally men of straw, and the real intent of the conveyance does not appear from them, we are left in ignorance what was the settlement thereby effected. The "uses" were generally declared in the deed to make a tenant to the *præcipe*, but as this deed now began to be done by "lease and release," which came into use about this time, but did not require the publicity of enrolment, the real nature of the transaction frequently does not appear. In the Inquisition, however, on the death of George Apsley, who died (4 James I.) 1606, Muntham is not mentioned among his possessions. He, and not Jno. Apsley, as Cartwright has it,<sup>41</sup> must have sold it, therefore, to Henry Shelley in 41 Eliz.,<sup>42</sup> and from Shelley it passed to Henry Goring in 1604, Thomas Shelley appearing then as vouchee.<sup>43</sup> In 1625<sup>44</sup> (1 Chas. I.) (Shelley being again vouchee), Sack-

<sup>39</sup> 4 S. A. C., p. 220.

<sup>40</sup> Rape of Bramber, p. 242.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid*, p. 89.

<sup>42</sup> Recov. Rolls Pasch. T. 1599.

<sup>43</sup> Recov. Rolls Hil. T. 2 Jac. 1.

<sup>44</sup> Recov. Rolls Pasch. T. 1 C. 1.

ville Crowe *armiger* "recovers" a property in Findon, Washington, and Sullington, which though neither called Muntham nor a manor, and described as "1 *messuagium*, 1 *columbarium*, 1 *gardinum*, 300 *acræ terræ*, 20 *acræ prati*, 250 *acræ pasturæ*, and 50 *acræ briuarii*," clearly included Muntham, as we shall presently see.

This Sir Sackville, however (for he was raised to a baronetcy in 1627), did not find the money for the purchase, and was not in fact the real purchaser. Indeed he was a needy man, and died an insolvent, in the Fleet Prison, in 1681.<sup>45</sup> The money was really John Middleton's; and accordingly 11 years later we find a deed (12 Chas. I.) between Sackville Crowe, Knight and Baronet, of London, of the one part, and Jno. Middleton, of the Inner Temple, Esquire, of the other part, whereby, after reciting that the said Sackville Crowe, by an Indenture tripartite, dated 30th May, 1625, between Thos. Shelley, of Steyning, of the 1st part, Sackville Crowe, of London, Esq., now Knight and Baronet, of the 2nd part, and Thos. Allanson, of London, gentleman, of the 3rd part (leading the uses of a common recovery had and suffered between the said parties in Easter Term, 1 Charles I), was seized of and in one *farm*, known by the name of Mundham, *alias* Muntham, in the County of Sussex, and the messuages, barns, stables, buildings, orchards, gardens, lands, tenements, rents, reversions, meadows, pastures, woods, and underwoods, to the same belonging, situate, lying, and being in the parishes of Findon, Washington, and Shillington (Sullington), to him and his heirs for ever in trust, and for the *commodité* of Jno. Middleton, of Horsham, Esq., and his heirs (the consideration of the conveyance being £500, mentioned to be paid by Sackville Crowe, whereas in truth it was paid by Jno. Middleton to the said Thos. Shelley) the said S. Crowe, by the appointment of the said J. Middleton, did grant unto the said J. Middleton, his heirs and assigns, all that *farm* called or known by the name of Montham, *alias* Mountham, to have and to hold the said

<sup>45</sup> See Burke's Extinct Baronetage.



farm and lands, and all other the premises, unto the said John Middleton, his heirs and assigns for ever, to the only use of the said John Middleton, his heirs and assigns for ever.

This Jno. Middleton was of a family, and a man himself, well known in the County. He sat as member for Horsham in 1614, and again in 1620, 1623, and 1625.<sup>46</sup>

In his family Muntham remained for a century, passing under the will of Thomas Middleton in 1692 (who I think was a nephew of John, and was himself also conspicuous in the County, having been M.P. for Shoreham in 1639, 1640, and 1660),<sup>47</sup> to Charles Goring, as the surviving trustee of the will, and from him to his cousin and heir, John Middleton,<sup>48</sup> who had also served in three Parliaments, and who after having resided many years at Muntham, died at Dorking in 1743, at the age of 75, where a somewhat fulsome and lengthy inscription, with which I need not trouble the reader, adorned (or disfigured) a mural monument over the vault where he lies interred, representing him (as usual in those "good old days") as the personification of all the virtues, instead of a "miserable sinner," and as "sinful dust and ashes." The cousinship between Charles Goring and John Middleton was, I think, this: Mary, the daughter of Sir H. Goring, of Highden, married Thos. Middleton, of Hangleton; and the said John was their son. Mary's brother, Captain Henry Goring, had a son, who was Sir C. Goring.

In Sept., 1743, the said John Middleton granted to Sir Jno. Webb and John Webb, his eldest son, the *mansion* and *farm* of Muntham, to hold to such uses as Cowdray, and other Sussex manors comprised in the marriage settlement of Anthony, 6th Viscount Montague and Lady Barbara, his wife, daughter of the said Sir Jno. Webb, stood limited (such limitations being to Lord Montague for life, then to secure a jointure to the said Lady Barbara, and subject thereto to the use of the first son of the marriage in tail male).

<sup>46</sup> Cartwright's Rape of Bramber, p. 347.

<sup>48</sup> From Lady Bath's title deeds.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid*; and 5 S. A. C., p. 86.

The Middleton pedigrees in Berry, Burrell, the Harl. MS., and Cartwright, all provokingly stop short with the John of 1635; and the mural monument to the John of 1743, which might have contained the connecting link between them, and which I have myself inspected in the crypt, where it seems to have been consigned during the recent restorations of the church, contains no clue to it. I am thus deprived of a means on which I had reckoned for filling up the *hiatus*. Genealogical difficulties are often cleared up by tombstones, and in the present instance I think we should have preferred the statement of the descent to the laudatory inscription.

In 1765 Lord and Lady Montague and Anthony Browne, their eldest son, released the mansion house and farm, "*theretofore the estate of the said Jno. Middleton,*" from the limitations of the deed of 1743, and conveyed them for £6,300 to William Frankland, Esq., in fee. By "having been the estate of John Middleton," seems to be meant that he was the real beneficial owner, and not merely legal owner, as the heir of a trustee (Charles Goring), who had died intestate; and we know *aliundè*, that he resided there many years.<sup>49</sup> This Lord Montague, who owned also the neighbouring princely property of Cowdray, built, it is said, the present house at Muntham for a hunting seat, and it was much added to by Mr. Frankland. We have delineated it as it was in 1830; but its present noble proprietor has, by heightening it with gables, and enfacing it with Bath stone, converted it from a plain red brick Georgian, to a far more important and ornamental Elizabethan, structure.

William Frankland (who was son of Henry Frankland, Governor of Bengal, and whose grandmother was the granddaughter of Oliver Cromwell), himself a great Oriental traveller, resided here on his return from India for many years, and died at 85, unmarried, in 1805. He cannot be said to have beautified the mansion by erecting the unsightly white wooden obelisk, so conspicuous in our drawing, but he was devoted to mechanics, and it

<sup>49</sup> Add. MS. 5685.

was connected with the apparatus necessary to carry on his favourite pursuit. The Muntham estate at that time included the Washington Manor (since sold to Chas. Goring, Esq., of Wiston), and passed by William Frankland's will to Admiral Henry Cromwell, who took the name of Frankland, and died in 1819, and then to the Admiral's widow, Mary, till her death in 1823; and thereupon to the Rev. Roger Frankland, Canon of Wells, till his death in 1826, when it devolved on his son Captain Frederic Wm. Frankland, who sold it in 1840 to Thos. Fitzgerald, Esq., of Binfield House, Berks, the father, if I mistake not, of the well-known secretary of the M.C.C., who doubtless imbibed on the table lands of these natural cricket fields that love for the "noble game," which he has so much assisted in promoting. Mr. Fitzgerald removed the obelisk bodily to the top of the Down, behind the house, to serve as a beacon at sea, although it has since disappeared also from that more conspicuous position, and in 1850 sold Muntham to the present possessor, the Most Noble Harriet, Marchioness of Bath, in fee. The estate so bought consists of about 377 acres in Findon, 30 in Sullington, and 2 in Washington, parishes.

Such is the history of Muntham. It is not altogether satisfactory. I have not been able to show what interest Cornwallis had in the manor. I should like to have traced how that right passed to the Apsleys, and also what interest Thomas de Muntham had in it, for it is observable he granted only all his *right*<sup>50</sup> in the manor, not the manor itself, which is consistent with his not being the actual lord; although, on the other hand, if his family gave the name to the manor, it looks very much as if it was his own. It would have been very interesting, too, to have had direct evidence of its creation, as well as of its existence, as a submanor of Thakeham. Above all it would have been desirable to know how, within a period of not more than five-and-twenty years after we find it called a manor, it comes to be described simply as a "farm."

<sup>50</sup> *Suprà*, p. 13.

“*Manerium*” was so well understood as being the legal description for a manor, that that word can hardly have been applied to it, as we have seen it repeatedly was, in several records, *per incuriam*, and the records are generally precise in accuracy of description. But the old books, even Sir M. Wright’s well-known one on Tenures, are sadly deficient in any minute information on the nature and incidents of subinfeudations. And the present lord of that half of the Thakeham Manor under which Muntam was held, assures me he has no materials from which these questions can be solved. Cartwright does not say whether Thakeham manor was held in chief of the Crown, but it is a remarkable fact connected with it, that, as it was owned four or five centuries ago, as we have seen, by Lords of undivided parts (derived from coheiresses of Stephen le Poer) so it is at the present time held by their respective descendants, or those who claim title through them, in undivided moieties also.

Such as it is, however, and whatever its history, Muntam is a singular and interesting place. Secluded more than the general run of country seats, shut in on three sides by hills, and shut out by them therefore from three-fourths of accessibility, it is a home which to many would seem unattractive: while to the lover of nature, or those who seek repose from the tumult of life, it possesses uncommon charms. As long ago as the Abbots of Dureford and Wm. de Braose coveted their rights of freewarren here,<sup>51</sup> and Roger de Covert poached on Findon Place manor,<sup>52</sup> and Anthony Lord Montague built his hunting box here, it was dear to the sportsman. But one must love the storm-swept old Downs, and the juniper-patched hill sides, for their own sakes, and to watch the habits, and to listen to the “ceaseless caw amusive” in “their airy city,” of the interesting and instructive tenantry of yonder beechwood rookeries, and be content to look sometimes on nothing for miles but a solitary Down barn or two,—one must not be offended by stiff rectangular plantations and steep banks rising

<sup>51</sup> 26 S. A. C., p. 224, 228.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 229.

sheer behind bay windows—before one can appreciate its beauties. Nay, time was when one had to endure a clipt yew avenue with its grassy alleys peering in at the drawing room balcony. The setting glories of a Western sun too never shine on Muntham, any more than they do on Wiston, Combe, or Danny, nor must you expect the cheery blue sea-line for your horizon, which enlivens the terraces of Arundel and Sompting Abbots, of Castle Goring, and Goodwood.

I must leave space for the estate of Cissbury, a name more venerable for its antiquity than any other in our parish, for it carries us back to the King of the South Saxons. I will not here dilate on the interests which attach to the hill itself. The works that have been carried on in former generations, and the light which modern researches have thrown upon them, are familiar to all our readers, and have already illustrated these and other volumes.<sup>53</sup> But I refer now to the estate, which very properly derives its name from it, lying as it does around and under its sheltering wing, its pleasure grounds straying into, and mingling with, its solitudes, with hardly a barrier of art between them.

This estate lies wholly within our parish, except so far as it includes that part of the manor or reputed manor of Sheepcombe, which extends into the parishes of Tarring and Broadwater. Of this manor I do not know as much as I should like. Mention of it occurs in very early records as part of the "*Feoda*" of Wm. de Braose, under the name of Shipcomb. It then passed, I think, by grant from the Crown (having got into Royal hands on one of the numerous attainders of the de Braoses and Mowbrays, to which we have adverted)<sup>54</sup> to the Principal and Vicars Choral of the Holy Trinity (*i.e.*, the cathedral church) at Chichester, a society which appears never to have exceeded 12 in number, and to have been originally mere deputies or proxies nominated by the prebendaries of the Cathedral (who, residing often on their parochial cures at a distance, were unable to attend in person to perform

<sup>53</sup> 24 S. A. C., p. 145, and the Journal of Anthropological Institute, for January, 1876. <sup>54</sup> 26 S. A. C., p. 221.

the daily service of the choir of the cathedral) and they had a house of residence appropriated to their use in 1395. In process of time it was deemed expedient to institute them a Collegiate body, who should lead a conventual life, which they did till the Reformation, and they were accordingly incorporated in 1464.

When the tide of modern Church Reform set in, this little nest-egg of sinecurism was sure to attract, and soon did attract, the lynx-eyed Ecclesiastical Commissioners in Whitehall, who first gathered it remorselessly into their own net, and then sold it in 1869 to the owner of Cissbury, whose family had long had a beneficial Church Lease on it for lives, originally granted by the Vicars Choral in 1612, and renewed by them ever since. In 1812 the Corporation seems to have owned an acreage of 730 acres, and this manor figures among them in a terrier of their estates in that year, as "Shipcomb (a manor) in the parish of Findon, 90 acres." Its actual admeasurement is 150, but this includes some 60 of Tenantry Down.

As early, too, as 1305, John de Shipcombe and Matilda his wife sold to Roger Parrimer one messuage and 4 acres, and in 1306, to Wm. de la Clyne 7 acres and pasturage for 100 sheep, in Findon, and in 1309, to Thomas Coteman one messuage and 29 acres, in Sheepcombe. As the only district in our parish called Sheepcombe was that manor, and as the conveyances were since the statute which prohibited the further creation of manors, and as the vendors were of the same name as the manor, I gather from these conveyances that they were sales by the then Lord and Lady of the manor of part of its demesnes. The *nucleus* of the Cissbury estate was a farm which, in 1663, Englebert Leedes, of Whitford, Yorkshire (and not Sir J. Leedes, who had occupied the farm), a son of Robert Leedes, Esq., of Englebert Hall, Yorkshire, conveyed to George, James, and Charles Fagge (sons of Sir J. Fagge of Wiston), *successivè* in tail, remainder to Sir John (who as we have seen owned Findon park about this time), in fee;<sup>55</sup> and George and

<sup>55</sup> *Ex relatione* H. Wyatt, Esq. Cartwright, however, gives no Charles in his Fagge pedigree.

James having died without issue, Charles, on his marriage resettled the estate, and in 1710, devised it to his son Charles, who (and not as Mr. Dudley Cary Elwes has it <sup>56</sup> "Sir Robert the great grandson of Sir John") in 1730, sold it to Wm. Cripps (not Cripp), <sup>57</sup> on whose death, in 1748, it passed to his son John and his grandson Wm. Groom, and so by marriage into the family of the present owner, as the subjoined pedigree will best show. For the Wyatt pedigree generally, however, I would, to avoid repetition, refer to Mr. Elwes' "Castles," &c., <sup>58</sup> where it is fully set out. Round this *nucleus* has gathered from time to time by purchases, by successive members of the same family, of adjoining portions of freeholds and copyholds (being, there can be little doubt, at some time or other held, as the *nucleus* of the estate was, of Findon Place Manor) till the whole has swelled into a considerable and very enviable compact property, of some 800 or 900 acres, the fortunate owner of which is my friend Hugh Wyatt, Esq., LL.D., Barrister-at-Law, of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, Recorder of Seaford and a magistrate of the county.

Serjeant Kinglake observed on the resemblance of the battle field of Inkerman to the configuration of our Findon valley, and a favourite artist is, I am told, while I write, visiting and adapting it for the landscape of that picture which will soon rival her "Balaclava Charge." So that ere long it may be said of Cissbury, that it has reappeared, *mutato nomine*, on the canvasses of Burlington House,

Grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulchris.

Better known by the truly Sussex name of Penfold, one surely not unsuited to the owner of a Sheepcombe (Valley of Flocks), and to a landlord of acres browsed on by the gentle denizens of our downs—Mr. Wyatt's father preferred to revive the patronymic of his maternal ancestors of Flansham and Court Wyke in this county, who claim through Richard Wyat, of South Haigh, Co. York, a common lineage with Sir Thos. Wyat

<sup>56</sup> Castles, &c., of West Sussex, p. 94.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.

the younger (the name seems formerly to have been spelt with one "t"), of Queen Mary's reign, whom, I am afraid, we must call one of the clearest traitors that ever lived, however much one may sympathize with his hatred of the Spanish match, which, nevertheless, did not proceed from any religious animosity, for he was himself a Romanist. We think with more pleasure of his father, Sir Thomas Wyat the elder, the poet and diplomatist, who was never so happy as in his woods at Allington Castle in Kent; whose poetry, though he, of course, has never deserved the extravagant praise, which has been lavished on his productions, of a comparison with Dante and Petrarch, nor perhaps the idolatry which his more accomplished contemporary Surrey bestowed on him, when he

Honoured the place that such a jewel trod,  
And kissed the ground wherein his corpse did rest,

may be said to have inaugurated, with his, a reformation in our English metre and style. It is true he frittered away his genius in frivolous love-songs and sonnets, but his mind occasionally takes a higher flight, and the following is not a bad specimen of his didactic vein, with which I will take leave of my readers, with the sincere hope that they may learn to extract from it in their hour of need—*quod longè absit*—the consolation which it seems capable of yielding.

Venomous thorns, that are so sharpe and kene,  
Beare flowers, we see, full fresh, and fayre of hue;  
Poyson is also put in medecine,  
And unto man his health does oft renue;  
The fyre that all things else consumeth clene,  
May hurt, and heale; so then if that is true,  
I trust some time my harm may be my health,  
Since every woe is joynd to some wealth.



## PEDIGREE OF THE WYATTS, OWNERS OF CISSBURY.

