

The Manorial History of Little Ellingham.

COMMUNICATED BY

J. C. TINGEY, F.S.A.,
V.P.

The excuses for offering the history of a manor in an obscure parish are that the writer is a native who believes he knows more about it than others and that the account of it as given by Blomefield is sadly inaccurate. Not that there is any wish to cast stones at the county historian, for, obviously, to correct is a more simple task than to originate, nor is it forgotten that what follows is but the narrative of one manor, whereas Blomefield essayed that of all in Norfolk. The frequent references to the County History sufficiently explain that his debt to Blomefield has not escaped the writer, who, with all modern facilities, is best aware of the trouble and research which the corrections have necessitated, and the demand that Blomefield should have attempted the like, supposes him to have been superhuman. He could not have undertaken his great work had he not had the collections of others, and, being obliged to accept these at their face value, mistakes in them found their way into his pages.

It so happens that someone gave him a note relating to Little Ellingham misdated by some three centuries and exhibiting other errors and omissions which entirely misled him and seriously deteriorated the value of his account of the lordship, where he had also to contend with the difficulty of non-resident lords through several centuries and much fictitious litigation.

Again, manorial history as a whole is little more than lists of the country gentry coupled with some genealogy, to which Blomefield added the lists of the clergy. This was admirably suited for the age in which he wrote, but now quite out of date except as a groundwork for something more extensive.

The writer is sensible that much of what has been said equally applies to him and is under no delusion that the following pages can be favourably compared with Blomefield's history of Fersfield; on the other hand, anyone who will carefully read the published list of the rectors of Little Ellingham will question whether the proof sheet escaped revision.

We must begin with the well-worn story: One Aluric, a freeman, held Little Ellingham in the time of King Edward the Confessor, but at the Conquest he was displaced and his land given to Earl Ralph de Guader, on whose rebellion in 1075, King William confiscated it, and the Sheriff of Norfolk, Robert Blund, managed the estate until his death, when Godric Dapifer took charge of it, having it in his keeping when Domesday Book was compiled.

It is with this manor that we are exclusively concerned, and, let it be said at the outset, that the Warennes and the Mortimers never had anything to do with it. They held eighty acres in the township, which with other lands in Scoulton and Rockland were given by the Conqueror to the Earl of Warenne, and eventually

constituted one of his fees. So it was King William I. and not one of his successors, as Blomefield supposes, who put the Earl in possession. Moreover, our manor from the 13th until the 17th century was, and probably still is, held of the Bardolfs of Wormegay and their successors by the service of a sparrow hawk.¹

It will be necessary to bear this in mind, because the Warrene fee and neighbouring manors occasionally cross our path, and it is somewhat unfortunate that a junior branch of the Warennes, not the Earls, were ancestors of the Bardolfs, but as the Bardolfs did not inherit Little Ellingham from that source it will not greatly trouble us.

Then again, Blomefield² imagined that a place in Forehoe Hundred called *Aluncham* in Domesday Book referred to Little Ellingham, but the *Victoria County History* has rendered it *Ahincham*, more reasonably setting it down to Hingham, though anyone who will take the trouble to examine the *Domesday Facsimile*,³ will sympathize with Blomefield in his error.

For two hundred years from the date of the Survey no mention of the manor has been discovered. William Bygod, who went down in the "White Ship" in 1120, explained in his charter to Thetford Priory that Giraldus Seuci had given the monks two parts of his tithes in Ellingham,⁴ and, similarly, King Henry II. about 1160, that Herbert de Craneton had given them three men in Ellingham with all their lands,⁵ which, in the 15th century, amounted to thirty acres, affording a rental of 10s. 2d.⁶ Nothing more is known of the donors, and it cannot be asserted that they were lords of the manor.

¹ *I.P.M.*, 10 Ed. III., etc.

² Vol. ii., p. 490.

P. cxli.

⁴ *Bl.*, vol. ii., p. 109.

⁵ *Ib.*, p. 111.

⁶ Lib. Bodl., *MS. Gough*, 18,074, f. 25.

The defective note,¹ to which allusion has been made, misled Blomefield into affirming that Sir William Wysham was lord in 1110. The record from which it was taken has been discovered and displays the transcriber as hopelessly at fault, among many mistakes being the date. It should be 1410, where we shall have cause to deal with it as it is of help in elucidating some involved procedure. The fact that the manor and advowson were united from the time a church is first heard of until the 18th century is, also, most helpful to our inquiry and, occasionally, it will be necessary to name the patrons, none of whom were Warennes or Mortimers, in support of our arguments.

Blomefield is a little nearer the mark when he tells us that "in 1227 Giles de Wachesham (Wattisham) settled on Alan de Crepinges the customs and services due from half a knight's fee here." It may be so, but instead of "here" he should have said "in Deopham and Ellingham,"² and, as Great Ellingham intervenes between Deopham and Little Ellingham, one would think that the fine was more likely to refer to Great Ellingham. And yet in 1302 and 1360, Roger Cosyn held a fee in Deopham and Little Ellingham,³ which was, doubtless, the same as Creping's, though since Cosyn is not mentioned as a lord in Little Ellingham in 1315, the part of his fee in the township must have been very small, and, as the sequel will show, the dates make it plain that it was no portion of the manor under consideration.

Having effectually cleared the ground, it is our duty to make an attempt at reconstruction. The township must have been a fief of some person of standing, and it is curious that inquisitors and such like for so many

¹ *Frere Papers*, Norf. and Norw. Arch. Soc.

² *Fines*, 12 Hen. III., 378.

³ *Feudal Aids*.

years did not consider it worthy of mention in their returns. Possibly the manor decayed through neglect or the unrest of the period, but the land was always there, even if uncultivated, but enough remains to show that this was not entirely the case.

From the 13th century onwards there is ample proof that the manor was parcel of the barony of Wormegay, but an *inquisition post mortem*¹ returned in 1562—among much interesting information—says it was held of the Manor of Cantley Bardolf, a part of the same honour, as its name implies. As the theory meets all known facts it is assumed that, in the 12th century Little Ellingham Manor was considered to be nothing more than an appurtenance of Cantley Bardolf.

Like our subject, Cantley had been forfeited by Earl Ralph, and, at the Survey, was in the keeping of Godric Dapifer. It is supposed to have been granted by William Rufus, with other manors in Norfolk, to Gerard de Gournay in return for his support against Robert Curthose.² Most likely Little Ellingham went with it, and the barony of Gournay in England practically dates from that time. As his name indicates, Gerard lived at Gournay in Normandy, where he owned the Pays de Bray, and seldom, if ever, visited England. He married Ediva, a grand-daughter of William the Conqueror and daughter of the first Earl of Warenne, and accompanied Curthose on the first crusade. It appears that he returned to Normandy, and some years afterwards he started with his wife on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem and died on the journey about 1105.

His son, Hugh de Gournay, succeeded him, and it is asserted that he lived to a great age, dying in the Holy

¹ Ch. 4 Eliz.. Vol. 133, No. 80.

² *Records of the House of Gournay.*

Land in 1180, that is to say, seventy-five years after his father. However, he seems to have been born in the closing years of the 11th century, and, being a minor at his father's death, was brought up at the court of his great-uncle, King Henry I.; yet afterwards he supported William, the son of Robert Curthose, and later sided with King Stephen or the Count of Anjou, as suited his inclination. He joined the unsuccessful crusade of 1147, but for us his most interesting action was the gift to the Nunnery of Clair Ruissel in the Pays de Bray of three shillings which Ralf de Agia formerly had from the Church of Little Ellingham.¹ This was about 1170 and shows that the church had then existed for some years and it belonged to the Barony of Gournay. Hugh married, first, Beatrice, daughter of Hugues, Count of Vermandois, and, secondly, Millicent, daughter of Thomas de Marle, Lord of Coucy in Picardy, and her eldest surviving son, Hugh, succeeded his father.

The second Hugh de Gournay was present at the siege of Acre, and in the wars with France for the possession of Normandy it was he who surrendered the all-important fortress of Château Gaillard to the French King, who, suspecting Hugh of treacherous intentions, afterwards seized all his Norman possessions. Meanwhile, and for a similar reason, King John seized all his English estates, giving those in Norfolk to John le Mareschal.² The last were soon restored, but Hugh retiring to England when Normandy was surrendered, Philip of France confiscated the Pays de Bray and the Norman property. He died in 1214, leaving by Julia, daughter of Aubrey, Count of Dampmartin, a son, Gerard, who died shortly after his father, and Hugh, his actual successor.

¹ *Records of the House of Gournay*, pp. 89, 119, 216.

² *Rot. Norm.*, vol. i., p. 92.

When the family came to live in England they appear to have made their Manor of Mapledurham in Oxfordshire their principal residence, but the last Hugh apparently joined the Barons against King John, and the advisers of the boy-king, Henry III., seized all the Gournay fiefs and gave them to William de Cantelupe, Hugh's brother-in-law; however, they were restored in 1222. Hugh died in 1239 and was buried at Langley Abbey. By his wife, Matilda, who afterwards married Roger de Clifford, he left an only daughter and heiress, Julia, who, together with her lands, was placed in the wardship of her cousin, William de Cantelupe. Eventually she married William, Lord Bardolf of Wormegay, and thus the Gournay fief became merged in that barony.

Julia died in 1295, and Millicent, heiress of the Cantelupes, who married, as her second husband, John de Montalt, died in 1299, and Julia, daughter of Roger de Clifford, married Roger de Montalt.¹ One or other of these facts may explain why, in an obscure feodary of uncertain date, a copy of which, now in the Bodleian Library,² belonged to both Thomas Martin and Blomefield, but has not found a place in *Feudal Aids*, it is stated that Guy de Butetourt held Little Ellingham under Hugh Bardolf and he under Robert de Montalt. This sets the statute *Quia Emptores* at defiance, and, if any confidence can be placed in the feodary, the name may be used to differentiate the Gournay fief from the true honour of Wormegay, and the empty distinction troubled no one. Montalt and Bardolf are associated by Blomefield under Castle Rysing, but the property of the former soon afterwards came to the Crown and we hear no more of them.

¹ *Baronage of England*, Dugdale.

² *MS. Gough*, Norf., 28.

So much for the lords of the fee. The lords of the manor now claim attention. As early as 1155, when the Gournays' Manor of Wendover in Buckinghamshire was seized by King Henry II., Amfrid de Botetourt is discovered rendering an account for it to the Sheriff of that county, and in 1169 the same name occurs under Norfolk and Suffolk, and apparently Wayland Hundred, for amerciements amounting to two marks and a half.¹ Again in 1185, the *Rotulus de Dominabus et Puellis* makes it plain that Amfrid had a son named Guy; moreover, Picun Botetourt was accounting with the Sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk in 1161 and 1162.

The Botetourts were Normans, and John Bromton names the family as one which came over with the Conqueror and was given lands by him in England, though no member of it has been found as a tenant *in capite* in Domesday Book.

About the time when Hugh de Gournay settled in England a Guy de Botetourt is mentioned as holding two knights' fees and a half of him in Norfolk and Suffolk,² and in 1229 the last of the Gournays enfeoffed Roger de Botetourt of three carucates of land with the appurtenances in Caister and Cantley,³ the last, according to our theory, including Little Ellingham. It is suggested, therefore, that when we first meet with the Botetourts, they were the dapifers or stewards of the English possessions of the Gournays, becoming in course of time their tenants or mesne lords, and, as we proceed, this idea will gather strength.

It may be mentioned here, that in 1254 a Guy de Botetourt obtained a charter of free warren in all his demesne lands in Norfolk.⁴

¹ *Pipe Rolls.*

² *Lib. Rub. de Scac.*, p. 142.

³ *Fines*, 13 Hen. III., 394.

⁴ *Rot. Pat.*, 37, 38, Hen. III., pt. ii., m. 7.

The Hundred Rolls, the record of an inquiry made in 1274 into the abuses which had sprung up during the Barons' War, at last place us upon sure ground. The Jurors of Wayland Hundred affirmed that Guy de Botetourt claimed the assize of bread and ale in Ellingham, and those of Mitford Hundred that Guy de Botetourt of Ellingham claimed similar liberties in Woodrising and Cranworth, but in neither case was the warrant for them known. In like manner, he claimed to have free warren in Little Ellingham in 1286,¹ and, though the Jurors declared they were ignorant of the warrant, he probably had it by the charter granted to him or his father 1254.

In 1277, William Bardolf, holding three knights' fees of his father's inheritance and another of his wife's, the Gournay fief, was summoned to attend the muster at Worcester for the expedition against Lewelin, Prince of Wales, with four knights. He went, therefore, himself accompanied by Roger de Coleville, Guy de Botetourt, and John de Gournay.²

William Bardolf also attended the muster at Rhuddlan in 1282 with Guy de Botetourt, Alan de Twytham, and Edmund de Bassingburne, and Guy was a commissioner of array in Norfolk and Suffolk in 1297. At the close of that year he received a direct summons to the muster at Newcastle in order to perform military service, in person, against the Scots, and similarly in the following year, and in 1301.²

After the disaster at Bannockburn, the Parliament at Lincoln in 1315 decided upon the levy of one man-at-arms from every township in England. One result was a record known as the *Nomina Villarum*, giving the names of all hundreds, wapentakes, and townships

¹ *Assize Rolls*, 14 Ed. I., 575.

² *Parliamentary Writs*.

throughout England, with those of their respective lords.¹ In Little Ellingham and Tofts, by which we may understand Rockland, and probably Rockland St. Peter, the lords were Guy de Botetourt, John de Thorpe, Robert de Ellingham, Agnes de Caston, and Oliva and Margaret Berry. It does not follow that Guy de Botetourt's Manor extended into Rockland, though possibly it did. John de Thorpe of Ashwellthorpe had married Alice, widow of William de Mortimer and mother of Constantine de Mortimer, thus holding the Warenne fee in right of his wife. Berry's Manor in Rockland certainly extended into Little Ellingham, but Alexander de Ellingham is doubtful. His principal manor was Great Ellingham, which may have run into Little Ellingham or Rockland, or both, but he seems to have had another in Hingham,² perhaps the present Gurneys' Manor, and some portion of it may have been in this township. Agnes de Caston may be dismissed, as her manor was in Caston and Rockland; and the holding of the Cozyns of Deopham was too insignificant to demand attention.

In addition to Ellingham, Guy de Botetourt held in Cantley, Witton, Upton, Cranworth, Kimberley, and Carleton,³ all of which at the Survey were "lands of the King which Godric keeps." Moreover, Cantley, Cranworth, Kimberley, and Carlton had belonged to the barony of Gournay, and, if the truth were known, the same might be said of Upton and Witton. Most likely the early history of all these manors is practically the same.

In all probability Guy de Botetourt revived the Manor of Little Ellingham, and from what has been said about

¹ *Parliamentary Writs*, vol. ii., div. 3, pp. 297-416.

² *Blomefield*, vol. ii., p. 445.

³ *Parliamentary Writs*.

Woodrising, he appears to have had a dwelling or manor house here. The church, too, was built in his time, but whether on the site of the older one is uncertain, and his arms—or, a saltire engrailed sable—which have an affinity to those of the Gournays of Harpley, were in a window on the south side of the nave in Blomefield's day. His wife's name was Ada, and when he died, about 1316, there is reason to suppose that he was buried under the north wall of the church, where there now is a sepulchral arch.

The next lord was Sir John de Botetourt, who presented to the living in 1317, but among Guy's children there is no mention of one named John,¹ and though Sir John was a great man in his day his biographers² confess their ignorance of his parentage. He died in 1324, when a grandson aged seven was found to be his heir, so it is evident that he was not a young man when we first meet with him at Ellingham, and it is probable that he was a younger brother of Guy, whose father, to all appearances, was another Guy. The Rev. George Crabbe³ makes John de Botetourt of Ellingham the great-grandson of Guy and quite a different person to the historic John, but he has not the support of chronology. As will be seen, Sir John married a lady named Maud, who was a widow and claimed her dower in Little Ellingham in 1325, so we thus have sufficient proof we are only dealing with one man.

Sir John was Governor of St. Briavel's Castle and Warden of the Forest of Dean, and he served in the expeditions of King Edward I. to Gascony and Scotland, being present at the seige of Caerlaverock Castle in Dumfriesshire, for in a poem known as "The Roll

¹ *Hist. of Thompson*, Crabbe; *Suff. Inst. of Arch.*, vol. viii., p. 137.

² *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, etc.

³ *Hist. of Thompson*.

of Kalaverock," composed at the time, he is mentioned thus:—

Cil ke a tout bien faire a cuer lie
 Au sautour noir engrellie
 Jaune baniere ot e penon
 Johans Boutetourte ot a noun.¹

He married Maud, sister and heiress of Hugh Fitz Otho (Danmartin), and so became possessed of Mendlesham in Suffolk and the office of *Cuneator*² or Mint Master. He joined the Earl of Warwick in carrying off Piers Gaveston from the Earl of Pembroke, but made his peace with the King in 1313. As Admiral, he burnt Cherbourg in 1294, and in command of the Fleet in the expedition against Scotland in 1314 it was his good fortune to prevent the capture of King Edward II. in his flight from the Battle of Bannockburn, for which he was awarded 500 li.³

Blomefield says that in 1322 Sir John de Botetourt sold the manor to Sir Robert de Bures, and for this statement he had the evidence of the feet of fines. Further, on the like authority, that the same Robert purchased the rents and services due to the Manor of Berries or Barries in Rockland from lands in Little Ellingham.⁴ In neither case is there any mention of Wysham or Reydon, nor is any reason given to make us doubt the facts. Yet, in 1332, Sir John de Wysham died seised of the manor, leaving a son, John, then twelve years of age,⁵ and the King seized the manor and the wardship of the boy for the term of the minority. The widow, however, Lady Hawisia de Wysham, survived her husband for several years, and in 1336 petitioned the King

¹ *Archæologia*, vol. xxi., p. 215.

² *Ib.*, vol. xvii., p. 210.

³ *Hist. of Excheq.*, Madox, vol. i., p. 392.

⁴ 18 Ed. II., 982.

⁵ *I.P.M.*, 6 Ed. III.

that the manor might be restored to her, giving as her reason that she and Sir John de Wysham had jointly bought it of Sir John de Botetourt and had together enjoyed it for ten years, that is, until the death of her husband,¹ the possession of Sir Robert de Bures being entirely ignored.

It seems that the ten years must be taken literally and not as a round figure, and thus they bring us back to 1322, when, as has been seen, Sir Robert de Bures was the recorded purchaser. How could Blomefield stop to bring the contradictory evidence to agreement? But was Hawisia related to Sir Robert de Bures? Apparently not at the date in question. She was a daughter of Sir Nicholas de Ponyngs,² who was probably an uncle, though some say a brother, of Thomas, first Lord Ponyngs,³ and the Ponyngs and the De Bures held neighbouring estates in Suffolk. Acton was the home of the latter family, the Ponyngs being lords of Great Bures,⁴ where Hawisia first married and apparently passed her second widowhood. Most likely she was also buried there, though her heart, as that of Dame Hawise Ponyngs, was interred in the Church of the Grey Friars at Dunwich.⁵

If it is not permissible to say that Robert and Hawisia had been playmates, there is every reason for concluding that they were intimately acquainted. Young people were not allowed to marry as they wished in those days, and, if this were a novel, a very pretty tale could be invented; but we must not depart from facts. It is immaterial whom Robert married, but he was present when, in 1314, Hawisia took for her first husband John, son of Robert de Reydon⁶ (now Raydon, adjoining

¹ *I.P.M.*, 10 Ed. III.

² *Harl. MS.*, 381, f. 132.

³ *Sussex Arch. Coll.*, vol. xv., p. 15.

⁴ *Feudal Aids*, 1316.

⁵ *Weaver's Fun. Mon.*, 721.

⁶ *Harl. MS.*, 381, f. 132.

Layham and Hadleigh, Suffolk, and not far from Great Bures), who settled the Manor of Bowthorpe, near Norwich, on the young couple.¹ Of this union there seems to have been but one child, Alice, who eventually married Sir Andrew de Bures, the son of Sir Robert.²

All this explains subsequent events, but gives no clue to those of 1322, when Alice could not have been more than seven years old, and, though a child marriage or betrothal is not thereby rendered impossible, it is certain that Andrew had an elder brother living; moreover, at his father's death he was not the heir.³

The obscurity is faintly illumined by a side-light thrown by the *Placita de Banco*⁴ in 1325, when, Sir John de Botetourt having died in 1324, his widow, Maud, brought an action against Andrew, son of Robert de Bures, claiming, as her dower, a third part of the Manor of Little Ellingham and other lands from him and Robert de Bures and Hillaria his wife, and John de Wysham and Hawisia his wife. Robert, Hillaria, John, and Hawisia appeared and stated that they were the holders and prepared to answer Maud, and that Andrew had nothing to do with the matter, as she must have been aware. Further explanatory evidence is missing, and we do not know what actually occurred beyond that Sir John and Hawisia possessed the manor and he had a charter for free warren here in 1328.⁵

The Wyshams were a Worcestershire family, in which county the Botetourts held Waley Castle in Northfield, so the two households may well have been on friendly terms. Sir John de Wysham was a man of some note in his day, for in 1316, two years after the disaster at Bannockburn, he was Captain of the Town of Berwick-

¹ *Bl.*, vol. ii., p. 386.

² *Add. MS.*, 19,121.

³ *I.P.M.*, 5 Ed. III.

⁴ 19 Ed. II., *Hill. Rot.*, 247.

⁵ *Rot. Cart.*

upon-Tweed, and the next year, when it had long been beseiged by the Scots, he was sent to relieve it. He returned on 6th December, so we cannot hold him responsible for the surprise and capture of the town in the following March.¹ He was Governor of St. Briavel's Castle and Warden of the Forest of Dean from 1310 to 1318,² in which year he was made Keeper of the Castle and Honour of Knaresborough,³ and in 1328 he was appointed Steward of the Household.⁴

His widow's petition⁵ was successful, which means that she obtained possession of the manor and estate at Little Ellingham as her own right to do with as she pleased. Apparently the King did not give up Sir John de Wysham's other estates nor the wardship of his son, for, in 1334, when he would be about fourteen years of age, he was granted a pardon for marrying without the King's licence.⁶ We must not be in too great a hurry to exclaim "What a naughty boy!" There was no registry office in those days, and it is difficult to understand how such a youngster could have induced even a disreputable cleric to perform the ceremony. Far more likely everything was done *à la mode* in the presence of his friends and neighbours with total disregard to the boy's feelings, and let us hope he described his experiences as "ripping." The elders would be aware of the consequences and pay the fines for the pardon without demur. At all events the poor lad could hardly have put his hand upon the money.

If Hawisia found a wife for her son while a minor, may it not be surmised that she was in favour of child-marriages and wedded her daughter to Andrew de Bures at a very tender age? In that case, a reason for

¹ *Archæologia*, vol. xxvi., pp. 325, 329.

² *Cal. Rot. Fin.*, 1307-1319, pp. 76, 363.

³ *Cal. Inq. Misc.*, 1307-1349.

⁴ *Rot. Pat.*, 2 Ed. III., pt. ii., m. 24.

⁵ *Cal. Inq. Misc.*, 1307-1349, No. 392.

⁶ *Rot. Pat.*, 8 Ed. III., pt. ii., m. 33.

the actions of Sir Robert de Bures in 1322 may be discovered.

In 1339 a writ was issued for the proof of age of John de Wysham,¹ but the return is not forthcoming. However, on all showing he must have attained his majority by 1341, and in that year he granted all his estates in Suffolk, Surrey, Sussex, Kent, and Worcestershire to his mother,² who then settled them with this Manor of Little Ellingham upon him in tail, with remainder to her grandson, John de Bures,³ so it is evident she had no other children save Alice and John, or they would have figured in these transactions. John, too, recognized that, for lack of issue, his nephew, Alice's son, would be his heir. The nephew, John de Bures, seems to have died without issue before 1355, for in that year this manor was once more settled upon Hawisia for life, with remainder to John de Wisam and Joan, his wife, and his heirs, with remainder to Sir Robert de Bures, *knt.*,⁴ who was probably the second son of Sir Andrew. It may be mentioned that neither Robert nor any of his descendants ever had a male heir, and in course of time this branch of the de Bures family became extinct.

Hawisia died in 1359,⁵ and none of her posterity attained to so much fame as her husband, Sir John de Wysham. The historians of Worcestershire and other counties are unable to tell us whom they married, and very little is known about them. At the inquest held on his mother's death, John de Wysham, the heir, is said to be of the age of twenty-six years and more, but the above ages and dates show him to have been nearly forty. Possibly the jury gave the number of

¹ *I.P.M.*, 13 Ed. III.

² *Rot. Claus.*, 15 Ed. III., pt. i., m. 16d.

³ *Ib.*, 16 Ed. III., pt. i., m. 21d.

⁴ *Fines*, 30 Ed. III., 963.

⁵ *I.P.M.*, 33 Ed. III.

years since his father's death, which was sufficient for the purpose.

For nearly fifty years after Hawisia's death the records are almost a blank as regards Little Ellingham and the Wyshams, and the next information they afford confronts us as a maze of litigation, most of which is probably fictitious. Naturally, John de Wysham had died in the interval; when, is not known, though it is quite plausible to assume that he was the same individual who, as Sir John de Wysham, presented to the living in 1387. In 1395, Sir William Wysham presented. He must have been the son of John, in other words, the grandson of Hawisia, for otherwise the heir of Sir Andrew de Bures would have been in possession. In 1402, Sir William and his wife, Margaret, settled on Katherine, wife of John de Wysham, an annuity of ten pounds from this Manor of Little Ellingham, giving John power to distrain for the money upon them and the heirs of Margaret, or upon those who should, in future, be possessed of the manor.¹

Blomefield, with such information as he had, reasonably concludes that Katherine was the mother of Sir William, but subsequent events prove that she was his daughter-in-law. It will be shown, too, that this fine had no reality; besides, in 1359, it was found that the manor was worth per annum less than half the sum named.² By 1404, Sir William had managed to get outlawed.³ One would hardly think that such a proceeding was beneficial to his interests, yet probably it was "according to plan." He obtained a pardon in 1411 for not appearing to answer Edward, Duke of York, and Thomas Guldesfield, clerk, touching debts

¹ *Fines*, 3 Hen. IV., 23.

Inq. Misc. Cancell., File 288, n. 18.

² *I.P.M.*, 33 Ed. III., No. 22.

of twenty pounds and four pounds respectively,¹ and if this was his only offence it was nothing more than contempt of court. The King claiming the estates of the outlaw, an inquiry was held concerning those in Norfolk. The return stated that there were none but that of Little Ellingham, and, since Sir William had parted with this without fraud or collusion to John Seint Jermyn, citizen and grocer of London, by a feoffment dated 12th Jan., 1402, there was nothing for the King to seize,² and let it be noted that the King's writ is dated some years later than the inquest.

We next find Thomas Lathe as lord of the manor, which Blomefield, unaware that Sir William Wysham had a son, explains by saying that Thomas had married Alice, Sir William's daughter. If this is true, she did not bring him the manor, which, if it had not been sold, would by the entail have gone to her brother at her father's death, and, seeing that Sir William was party to a fine in 1411, and his widow to another in the next year, the date of his decease is determined with sufficient accuracy. Moreover, Lathe declared that he had the same *status*³ in the manor as John Seint Jermyn as though he acquired it from that source, and Blomefield⁴ tells us that he was the second husband of Alice, daughter of John Hawkyns, but he gets out of the difficulty by saying that she was the second wife. Alice Wysham is, therefore, a nuisance, and no evidence has been found to support Blomefield's assertion of her existence.

A climax was reached in 1410, when Thomas Lathe impleaded John, son of Sir William Wysham, for driving

¹ *Cal. Pat.*, 1408-1413, p. 258.

² *Inq. Misc. Cancell.*, File 288, n. 18.

³ *Plac. c. Rege*, 11 Hen. IV.; *Rot.*, 594, m. xxxiii.

⁴ *Vol. vii.*, p. 449.

away twelve cows and fifty calves from the Manor of Little Ellingham. This John admitted, claiming his right to distrain because the ten pounds granted by his father and mother to his wife was some years in arrear. Thomas then proved that at the date of the levying of the fine William and Margaret had nothing in the manor in demesne, nor in possession, nor reversion, seeing that they had previously sold it to John Seint Jermyn, and so the case was decided in favour of Lathe.¹

Even in the next year William and Margaret are discovered releasing the manor to Stephen atte Lathe, clerk, "which he has of their gift";² but this was most likely preliminary to something more substantial, for in 1412, we find John Fitz Rauf, esquire, Stephen atte Lathe, Thomas Ellingham and others were querents in a fine by which Thomas Lathe, Alice, his wife, and Margaret, widow of Sir William Wysham, conveyed the manor to John Fitz Rauf and his heirs for ever.

What was the outcome of all this nonsense in which all parties from the King downwards are involved? Even the existence of the cows and calves is doubtful. Manifestly it broke the entail. It is all very well to say that for the Wyshams this distant estate, scarcely paying its way, was a white elephant and they were anxious to part with it; but did they face the ruinous legal charges extending over ten years? Most likely John Fitz Rauf was recognized from the beginning as the ultimate purchaser, and being already possessed of the Manor of Scoulton Old Lands and others in Great Ellingham and Rockland, the acquisition of this one was important in order to consolidate his estate. It may be supposed, therefore, that he was willing to

¹ *Plac. c. Rege*, 11 Hen. IV.; *Rot.*, 594, m. xxxiii.

² *Fines*, Hen. IV., 143.

give a fancy price and paid most of the expenses. Let us hope that when all the legal claims had been met there was something left over for the Wyshams.

The part played by Thomas Lathe is not easy to understand. Though he may have presented to the living in 1408 at the dictation of another, he was the actual patron and lord of the manor for some years, having obtained possession through John Seint Jermyn. Blomefield says of him, that he was a great favourite of King Henry IV.,¹ and it is certain that he was esquire of the King's body² and accompanied him to Wales in 1405.³ He died 23rd August, 1418, and was buried at Stradsett, where his brass effigy is now zealously preserved.

An inventory made in 1571 of the evidences of the manor then existing mentions a deed from Robert Couclife to Thomas Lathe "concerning" (not "of") the manor and advowson, but no date is given.⁴ Couclife had been Rector of Wheatacre, which living he exchanged for that of Little Ellingham in 1401. His immediate successor, appointed in August, 1408, resigned in the following November, possibly to make room for Stephen atte Lathe, who has already been noticed, but these two were mere pawns in the legal transactions.

John Fitz Rauf, like the Ponyngs, Reytons, and Bures, came from the borders of Suffolk and Essex. The home of the family was at Pebmarsh in the latter county, in close proximity to Bures St. Mary, and though Hawisia de Wysham was probably dead before John Fitz Rauf was born, he would often have heard her named. By 1387 he had married Margery, the grand-daughter and co-heiress of Sir Robert de Mortimer, of Scoulton, and in 1402 the Manor of Scoulton Old Lands, some part of

¹ Vol. vii., p. 452.

³ *Ib.*, m. 3.

² *Rot. Pat.*, 6 Hen. IV., pt. i., m. 4.

⁴ *Frere Papers*, N. and N. Arch. Soc.

which lay in Little Ellingham, and manors in Tottington and Great Ellingham were assigned to him as his wife's marriage portion.¹

Constantine, the father of Sir Robert de Mortimer, had in 1319 obtained a licence to crenellate his manor-house in Scoulton,² though it is impossible to say whether he proceeded any further. In this dwelling, whether manor-house or castle, the earthworks of which could still be traced in 1848 in a field called Hall Hills,³ Sir John Fitz Rauf, when he was in the neighbourhood, resided with his wife, who through her mother's previous marriage was half-sister to Sir John Fastolf, the builder of Caister Castle.

Sir John Fitz Rauf, as has been seen, acquired the principal manor of Little Ellingham in 1412, and thus the whole village was practically owned by one man, who was, in addition, the nearest approach to a resident lord it had known for many years.

He died in 1418 and was succeeded by his son, John Fitz Rauf, but it does not appear that either father or son was present at the Battle of Agincourt, or took part in King Henry's expedition to France in 1415. The father may well have been too infirm, but the son, named in Sir John Fastolf's will⁴ as his nephew, we might have expected to find accompanying his uncle; the more so, seeing that they were both brethren of St. George's Gild (the soldiers' gild) in Norwich, and in the list of brethren their two names occur side by side. However, in 1429, Sir John Fitz Rauf was repaid twenty marks which he had lent to the King, and was one of the Commissioners of Array in 1436, and also one to inquire into the misrule at Norwich in 1433.⁵ He was

¹ *Bl.*, vol. i., p. 511.

⁴ *Paston Letters*, No. 332.

² *Rot. Pat.*, 13 Ed. II., m. 30.

⁵ *Cal. Pat.*, 1429-1435, 61, 351, 521.

³ *The House of Gournay*, vol. i., p. 432.

three times Sheriff of Norfolk, namely, in 1421, 1422, and 1435, and is said to have married a daughter of Lady Bouchier, but, she dying without issue, he took for his second wife Julianna Brown, or Brende.¹ He died in 1440 and his wife in 1446, both being buried in Scoulton Church,² where their altar tomb remains, though despoiled of the effigies, arms, and inscription.

To him succeeded John Fitz Rauf, his son, who was Sheriff of Norfolk in 1444-5 and died in the November following his term of office. He married Alice, daughter of Sir John Walesburow, of Cornwall, and cousin of Alice Chaucer, a grand-daughter of the poet, who became Countess of Suffolk.³ Alice Fitz Rauf survived until 1471, when, in accordance with her will, she was buried in the Priory Church of Ixworth.⁴

Her son, William Fitz Rauf, died in his father's lifetime, leaving no heir by his wife, Maud Baynard, and Little Ellingham came to his sister Elizabeth, who brought it in marriage to another Suffolk man, Sir Robert Chamberleyn, of Gedding Hall.

When the youngest John Fitz Rauf died it may be assumed that the family were loyal subjects of the House of Lancaster, since the right to the throne was not then in question. In Sir Robert Chamberleyn's case everything was different. We find him presenting to the living of Little Ellingham in 1454, and the next year the rival houses first came to blows at St. Albans. It is not known that Sir Robert was present at the fight, or, indeed, at any of the battles during the Wars of the Roses, but there can be little doubt that he was

¹ For these alliances and much more relating to the family see *The House of Gournay*, pp. 863, 933.

² *Consist. Court of Norwich*, Reg. Wilby.

³ *The House of Gournay*, p. 865.

⁴ *P.C.C.*, Wattys, 2.

at heart a supporter of the Yorkists. In 1462, when Margaret of Anjou had taken Bamborough Castle, he is discovered in the north among the forces of the White Rose,¹ and in 1466 he was appointed Controller of the Customs in the Port of Poole.² In 1475, Edward IV. having overcome all opposition at Tewkesbury, Sir Robert is mentioned as going with the King to France on the expedition to recover the lost provinces, which ended feebly in a truce without any fighting, and the same year and the next he was given estates in Suffolk and Essex.³ Again, in 1478, he was one of those selected to inquire into the possessions of George, Duke of Clarence.⁴

After the death of John Fitz Rauf, a jointure being given to Alice, his wife, his estates were divided between his daughter, Dame Elizabeth Chamberleyn, and his sister Maud, who married Sir Robert Conyers, of Finningham, with remainder to her sister Joan.⁵ Scoulton fell to the share of Maud, and Sir John Paston, writing to his brother in 1478, says, "I her telle that my cosyn, Sir Robert Chamberleyn, hath entryed the Manor of Scolton upon your bedffelawe Conyverse";⁶ but, if there was any truth in the rumour, Sir Robert was shortly compelled to evacuate. However, in 1485, King Richard III. gave him the custody of all lands late of John Conyers, esquire, during the minority of the heir, Thomas Conyers. About the same time he was Knight of the Body, and, with his son Ralph, he was appointed Constable of Beaumarys Castle, Keeper of the Forest of Snowdon, and Sheriff of Anglesea.⁷

¹ *Paston Letters*, No. 464.

³ *Ib.*, 1467-1477, pp. 515, 569.

² *Cal. Pat.*, 1461-1467, p. 514.

⁴ *Ib.* 1476-1485, p. 110.

⁵ For the partition of the estates see *The House of Gournay*, pp. 707, 863, 934.

Paston Letters, No. 821.

⁷ *Cal. Pat.*, 1476-1485, pp. 496, 509, 510.

With the Battle of Bosworth the rule of the House of York came to an end, and Henry VII., the first of the Tudor sovereigns, obtained the throne. We must suppose that Sir Robert was unable to submit to the changes of the time but was secretly intolerant of the new dynasty, though there was no direct descendant of the late rulers. At all events, he got into trouble and was attainted by Parliament for high treason,¹ for which he was beheaded on 12th March, 1491.² What his actions precisely were is not easy to grasp, but another man, Richard White, of Thorpe Parva in Norfolk, was associated with him in the attainder. We gather that, on different occasions, they had plotted the King's death, levied war against him, and traitorously adhered to the King of France, the ancient enemy of the realm. As no mention of the subject has been found in printed histories of the time, it seems to have been a ridiculous matter undeserving of notice. The King, too, appears to have considered it of little importance and was lenient in his treatment of the family. The estates which Sir Robert had held in right of his wife, Little Ellingham being one of them, were untouched, though Gedding with others belonging to him were confiscated and given in 1495 to Sir Roger Ormiston, servant of the King's mother,³ who had married Elizabeth, Sir Robert's widow.

Very little appears to be known of Sir Roger Ormiston,⁴ but probably he came from the north-west of England. As he presented to the living in 1494, he must have married before that date. He died in 1504, leaving all the estates he had of the King's gift to his wife,⁵ who survived him, and who was buried in Ixworth Priory in

¹ Stat., 7 Hen. VII., c. 22.

² *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

³ *Rot. Pat.*, 11 Hen. VII., m. 15 (7).

⁴ See *Vic. Co. Hist. Lancs.* The place-name is now "Urmston."

⁵ *P.C.C.*, Helgrave, 15.

1519.¹ So at her death the Lady Elizabeth Chamberleyn, as she preferred to be styled, was able to pass on the family property unscathed to her sons, to whom a pardon had been granted not long after their father's execution,² and the attainder was reversed in 1531.³

The eldest son, Ralf, died childless in February, 1522, and his wife appears to have predeceased him. The *inquisition post mortem* gives the information that he then held the Manor of Kirkhall in Rockland and no other property in Norfolk, so if he ever possessed Little Ellingham it had already passed to his brother and heir, Edward.

This Edward, who was afterwards knighted, married Joan, daughter of John Starkey, of Oulton in Cheshire,⁴ and had three sons, among whom his estates were divided after his death, which occurred on 15th July, 1541.⁵ The eldest, Ralf, had Gedding; the second, George, had Barnham Broom; and the third, Leonard, had Little Ellingham. It is a question whether Leonard found a suitable residence here. From his *inquisition post mortem*⁶ we learn that the manor-house had ceased to exist, and that he dwelt in Tenement Drowes, which he may have rebuilt. It stood near the site of the present clock-tower and was demolished some sixty years ago. He married Margaret, daughter of William Calibut, of Castleacre, and died 20th August, 1561, leaving five sons, the eldest of whom, John, then seventeen years of age, eventually succeeded his father.⁶

It may be that John Chamberleyn found the property heavily mortgaged, but if not, he, like many of his class, speedily encumbered it. He borrowed money of Edward

¹ P.C.C., Hodder, 31.

² Cal. Pat., 1485-1494, p. 345.

³ *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

⁴ *Frere Papers.*

⁵ I.P.M., Ex., 33 Hen. VIII., ser. ii., vol. 641, No. 14.

⁶ Ch., 4 Eliz., vol. 133, No. 80.

Flowerdew of Wymondham in 1571,¹ and by 1577 he was heavily indebted to the Corporation of Norwich. To extract himself he offered the manor for sale to that body, who at first were inclined to accept it, going so far as to advance him £360 of the purchase-money. Yet they afterwards refused it and became importunate for the return of the sum due to them, even threatening Chamberleyn with arrest.² In these straits he was compelled to part with the property, and, finally, obtained a purchaser in Robert Flynt in 1579.³

Blomefield states that Flynt already had a mortgoge on the estate, and, under the circumstances, it is not impossible; moreover, just before it was conveyed to him by fine, he with others received a "precipe" to surrender it to John Chamberleyn and others.⁴ In 1581 he settled the manor on his wife, Susan, for life as her jointure,⁵ and, as collector of the subsidy, he entered into a bond with the Crown for £2,600 in August, 1591.⁶ Perhaps the annoying and undesirable post was too much for him, for he died on 15th November following⁷ and was buried in the church, where a brass plate recorded that he left ten children by "a virtuous wife by birth from Montague." The explanation is, that Susan was the daughter of William Browne, of Elsing,⁷ whose elder brother, Sir Anthony Browne, having been Master of the Horse to Queen Mary, was created Viscount Mountague; so the epitaph was not strictly true. Naturally the Brownes were Romanists,

¹ *Frere Papers*.

² *Norw. Corp. Arch.*; *Assembly*, 15th March, 3rd April, 19 Eliz.; *Court* 26th March, 16th July, 20 Eliz.

³ *Fines*, Trin., 21 Eliz.

⁴ *Frere Papers*.

⁵ *I.P.M.*, Ch. 34 Eliz. vol. 233, n. 77.

⁶ *Exch. K.R. Mem. Roll.*, Mich. 3 Jas. I.; *Rot.*, 522.

⁷ *I.P.M.*, *ut supra*.

and when the Archdeacon held his visitation in 1587, he was informed by the churchwardens of Little Ellingham that the Lady Susan Flynt had not partaken of the eucharist nor attended her parish church for a whole year.¹ Her husband is also said to have been of the same persuasion but, as no complaints were laid against him, he may not have been a bigot.

In May, 1594, Susan remarried Thomas Woodhouse, gentleman, and for some years he held the manor in right of his wife. However, in 1599, it was taken into the hands of the Crown until Robert Flynt's debt under his bond was satisfied, and consequently, in 1605, Thomas and Susan, as executrix of her first husband, with her trustees under the settlement petitioned for its restoration.² How the bond was redeemed is not clear, but the manor was restored,² and in 1610 Thomas and Susan parted with their interest in it to her son, Robert Flynt,³ who at his father's death was aged fourteen years, nine months and eight days. In 1599 he married Mary, daughter of Thomas Baxter, of Tasburg,⁴ who at one time had a small holding in Little Ellingham,⁵ and in 1615 Robert sold the manor and advowson to Thomas Pettus.⁶

Pettus probably lived in Norwich, and, like the elder Robert Flynt, he settled the estate on his wife, Anne, daughter of Callibut Walpole, of Houghton. He died some years before her without surviving issue, on 18th October, 1618, and his nephew Thomas, eldest son of his brother, Sir Augustin Pettus, knight, of Rackheath, by his first wife, Mary Violet, then aged twelve, was his heir.⁷

¹ Norw. Corp. Muniment Room.

² *Exch. K.R., ut supra.*

³ *Fines, Norf.*, Pasch., 8 Jas. I.

⁴ *Tasburgh Register; Harl. Socty.*, xxxii., 23.

⁵ *I.P.M.*, Misc. Ch., 19 Jas. I., vol. 771, No. 94.

⁶ *Cal. Fines, Norf.*, Mich., 19 Jas. I. The fine itself is astray.

⁷ *I.P.M.*, Misc. Ch., 19 Jas. I., vol. 771, No. 94.

In 1641, this Thomas was created a baronet for his loyalty to King Charles I.,¹ though in what it consisted is uncertain. As his half-brother, Sir John Pettus,² spent his fortune in the King's cause, the baronetcy may have been given to the elder brother by reflection as better able to support the title, but that the family were zealous Royalists is beyond a doubt. Sir Thomas married, first, Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Thomas Knyvett, of Ashwellthorpe, who died in 1653, and he in 1654, though not before he had married, secondly, Anne, daughter of Arthur Everard, of Stow Park, Suffolk.

By his first wife he left Sir Thomas, the second baronet, who married Elizabeth, daughter of Walter Overbury, of Barton, Warwickshire, and died without male issue in 1671, when the title fell to his eldest brother, Sir John Pettus. Sir Thomas, the second baronet, however, left a daughter, Elizabeth, who married Rowland Okeover, of Okeover, Staffordshire,³ and on them our manor was settled. Okeover sold it to William Colegrave, of Charter House Yard, London, and Sir John and his eldest son, Horatio, confirmed the conveyance in 1691, releasing all their right to the reversion at the same time.⁴

William Colegrave and all his descendants were Romanists, and it was during his ownership that James Stuart, son of King James II., landed in Scotland. Though soon expelled, it was supposed that all the Roman Catholic gentry were aiding and abetting, and in order that their lands might be known, an Act of Parliament was passed, after the rebellion of 1715, compelling them to register their estates.⁵ Mr. Colegrave, then of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, registered his in Little

¹ *Wotton's Eng. Baronetage*, ii., 269.

² *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

³ *Wotton's Eng. Baronetage*.

⁴ *Norf. Arch.*, vol. xiii., p. 284.

⁵ 1 Geo. I., st. ii., c. 55.

Ellingham, at the Quarter Sessions at Norwich on 30th April, 1717, his sons, Henry and William, acting as witnesses.¹ William Colegrave, senior, died in 1721 and was buried in St. Sepulchre-without-Newgate on 3rd October. His wife's name was Frances; she predeceased him, being buried in the same church, 16th April, 1709.

The eldest son, Henry, described as of Gray's Inn, succeeded, and in conjunction with his brother William conveyed the advowson of Little Ellingham to the Rev. John Cater of Thompson in July, 1722,² and died in the following October, being buried in St. Sepulchre's Church on the 11th of that month.

Thus the manor came to his brother, the above William Colegrave, one of whose first acts was to come to Norfolk, doubtless with the double intention of viewing the estate in Little Ellingham, which he had so recently inherited, and appearing at Quarter Sessions to register it. This he performed at Lynn on the 22nd January, 1723.³ In 1722 he married Margaret, daughter of Richard Walmesley, of Sholley, Lancashire,⁴ and by her he had, at least, three sons—the second, Merry, appears to have died a minor—and four daughters,⁵ the youngest of whom, Anne, married Thomas Manby, of Dounsell Hall, Essex, and her descendants eventually inherited her father's estates.⁶

William Colegrave's will was proved in May, 1749.⁷ By it he bequeathed his real property to his eldest son, William, who, like his father, shortly, and for the same purposes, proceeded to this county, registering his Norfolk estate at Norwich on the following 12th July.

¹ *Reg. of Papists' Estates*; with the Clerk of the Peace, Norf.

² *Rot. Claus.*, 9 Geo. I., pt. 19, n. 10.

⁵ *Rot. Claus.*, 23 Geo. II., pt. 20, n. 17.

³ *Reg. of Papists' Estates*, *ut supra*.

⁶ *Landed Gentry*.

⁴ *Harl. Socty.*, xiv., 727.

⁷ *Rot. Claus.*, *ut supra*.

He styled himself "of Cann Hall," a house in the parish of Wanstead, Essex, and there both he and his father before him probably lived. On 31st August, 1762, he married Mary, daughter of Francis Manby, of Dounsell Hall, and sister of Thomas Manby already mentioned,¹ but the union was fruitless. By his will, dated 24th February, 1793,² he entailed his real property upon his brother Robert and his heirs male, with remainder to his nephew, John Manby, remainder to his great nephew, William Manby, an infant son of Francis Manby, John's brother, remainder to Richard, second son of the same Francis, and so on, and dying on the ensuing 27th April, he was buried near his mother in the Church of Ingatestone near Chelmsford.

Of Robert Colegrave not much is known. In his will, dated 8th May, 1798, and proved 26th June, 1801,³ it is found that he married twice and, beyond expressing a wish to be buried near his mother and children, he makes no other allusion to the latter. So it is probable that he died without surviving issue, and that his sons mentioned in his brother's will did not attain their majority. His second wife, Elizabeth, survived him and was living in 1825.⁴

With the death of Robert Colegrave the family became extinct in the male line, though two of his sisters were then living, namely, Bridget unmarried, and the widow of Thomas Manby, Anne, who died in 1810.

By the entail Little Ellingham Manor came, in 1801, to her eldest son, John Manby, who married Harriet Maria Cliff, of Brigg, Lincolnshire, but died without issue, 5th January, 1819.⁵

¹ *Landed Gentry.*

² *Dodwell*, 249, Somerset House.

³ *Abercrombie*, 372, *Ib.*

⁴ *Oxford*, 163, *Ib.*

⁵ *Landed Gentry*

To him succeeded his nephew, William Manby, of Dounsell Hall and Cann Hall in Essex, and of Bracebridge and Mere Hall in Lincolnshire, who was the son of Francis, second son of Thomas and Mary Manby, and was born 24th February, 1788. In 1805 he obtained an Ensign's commission in the 44th or East Essex Regiment of Foot, of which he became Lieutenant in 1807 and was transferred in 1812 to the Royal York Rangers as Captain. He was promoted Major into the 5th West India Regiment in April, 1817, placed on half pay the following August, and he retired in 1825.¹ He married at Gibraltar, 12th June, 1810, Catherine Anne Sarah, eldest daughter of General Sir John Fraser, G.C.H., and having taken the name and arms of Colegrave in 1819, he died on the 27th May, 1868, and was buried at South Weald in Essex.

On his death, his eldest son, John William Manby, a Lieutenant in the 3rd Light Dragoons, who was born at Ceuta in Morocco, 20th October, 1811, inherited the estates and immediately assumed, by Royal licence and in pursuance of the will of his great-grand-uncle, the surname of Colegrave,² afterwards resuming that of Manby in addition. He married, 29th September, 1835, Louise Maria, only daughter of Lieutenant John Matcham Isaac, son of Nicholas Isaac, of Maisefield, Gloucestershire, and dying on 17th January, 1879, was buried at St. Mary's R.C.C., Fulham. He had three sons, of whom, the eldest, William Richard, born 21st August, 1840, entered Holy Orders of the Church of Rome; the second, John, died in infancy; and Thomas, his successor, who was born 30th December, 1847.

This Thomas Manby-Colegrave married, first, on the 16th September, 1879, Alice Amy, daughter of Colonel

¹ Information supplied by Col. J. R. Harvey, D.S.O.

² *Changes of Name*, Phillimore and Fry, 67.

Stewart, who died childless on 17th December, 1880, and, secondly, on 8th February, 1882, Alice, daughter of Frederick Caley Worsley. He died on 19th May, 1898, and was buried at Fulham, leaving an only son, Gerald Thomas, born 26th February, 1886, who on attaining his majority conveyed the freehold lands of Little Ellingham Manor to William Robert Goulder, Esq., who now resides at the Hall. Mr. Manby-Colegrave being attached as Lieutenant to the Royal Garrison Artillery, was killed in action near Arras on 21st April, 1917, and was buried in the New British Cemetery at Haute Avesne. He had married, on 17th October, 1907, Hilda Mary, daughter of James Thunder, of Bellewstown, co. Meath, by whom he had Pamela, born 6th July, 1908, and Gerald Francis Anthony, born 16th February, 1912.

VIVANT ET VALEANT.
