2. THE WYATT FAMILY

Sir Henry Wyatt, the founder of the Kentish branch of the family, was a younger son of Richard Wyatt of Yorkshire 'by Margaret the Daughter and heir of William Bailiff .' Born about 1460, his early life is obscure, but some time before 1483 he entered the service of Henry Tudor, the exiled Earl of Richmond. 'Never any servant in this world was more faithful . . .' said the family tradition, set down by Thomas Scott at the beginning of the seventeenth century, '. . . neither was Sir Henry Wyat's council nor his pains, adventures, courage and sufferance equalled by any . . .' He was, so the tradition ran, imprisoned, tortured, and cross-questioned by Richard III in person, who lamented that his own servants had not such fidelity. This fidelity was rewarded by Henry both with word and deed:

The Earl of Richmond anon after he was crowned King entertained (Henry Wyatt) then coming out of imprisonment and affliction in Scotland first with most gracious words unto himself and then with this speech unto the Lords. Both I and you must bid this Gentleman heartily welcome, had not he above human strength or example also shewed himself our constant friend, neither had I enjoyed now the Crowne, nor you that Peace and prosperitie, and honour which you now possess.²

Whatever services Wyatt had in fact performed, he was high in the king's confidence, and became a member of his Council. By 1492 he was sufficiently wealthy to purchase Allington Castle and estate from the trustees of Robert Gainsford, and to undertake substantial modifications to the building.³ He served Henry VII both in Scotland and in Ireland, and was an executor of his will. 'Study to serve me,' Henry was later alleged to have said to him, 'and I will study to enrich you.'

After 1509 he retained the confidence of the new king, and was created a knight of the Bath at his coronation.⁴ In spite of his advancing years, he served in the French campaign of 1513, and was present at the battle of the Spurs.⁵ At one time he was treasurer of the king's Jewels, but it was not until 1523, when he was already over

---

¹ MS 29. The genealogy goes back another four generations. See Appendix II.² MS 29. The possible circumstances of this imprisonment are discussed by Agnes Conway, Henry VII's relations with Scotland and Ireland, 7-8.³ W. Martin Conway, Archaeologia Cantiana, xxviii, 337-62.⁴ W. Shaw, Knights of England, I, 148; 23 June 1509.⁵ It was probably for his service at this time that he was created a Knight Banneret, a dignity which Scott wrongly believed to have been conferred upon him by Henry VII. Shaw, II, 36.
60, that he received his first high office in close proximity to the king’s person. In that year he became Treasurer of the Chamber, a post which he held until his virtual retirement from public life in 1528. It is possible that the stormy politics of the next few years were not to his liking, but his age alone is sufficient explanation of his retirement. He died on 10 November 1537, and was buried at Milton near Gravesend.

Henry Wyatt married late in life, probably about 1500, his bride being Anne, daughter of John Skinner of Reigate, Surrey. Several anecdotes were recorded by Thomas Scott to suggest that Anne was a formidable dame and an extremely competent housewife, but there is no contemporary evidence of her personality. She bore Henry three children, Thomas, born about 1503, Margaret, later the wife of Sir Anthony Lee, and Henry, about whom nothing is known, and who presumably died in infancy.

Thomas followed his father to court, with every prospect of a distinguished career. He seems to have been introduced as early as 1516, and to have taken up residence there shortly after going down from St John’s College, Cambridge, in 1520. Shortly after his arrival, being an accomplished and personable young man, he became an Esquire of the Body, and received his first regular office when he became Clerk of the King’s Jewels in 1524, a preferment which he clearly owed to his father’s influence. In 1526 he gained his first experience of diplomacy, with Sir Thomas Cheney in France, and in January of the following year took it upon himself to accompany Sir John Russell to Rome, as is described in MS 18. Whether or not the story of his cartoon pleased the king’s humour, he certainly benefited in experience from his trip, and qualified himself for further service. In 1529–30 he was high marshal of Calais, and was sworn of the Council in 1533.

It was at this time, somewhere between 1529 and 1533 that his confession to the Council on the nature of his intimacy with Anne Boleyn is alleged to have been made. Wyatt had known Anne since childhood, for their fathers had been colleagues, friends and neighbours in Kent. On her return from France in 1521 their friendship had been resumed, and there is plentiful literary and other testimony to the fact that that friendship was warm, and at times romantic.

1 According to Scott, Allington was known as ‘Lady Wyatt’s house’, because of Sir Henry’s frequent absences. The story of her encounter with the Abbot of Boxley is printed by Bruce, Gentleman’s Magazine, September 1850, 236–7.

2 Letters and Papers of the reign of Henry VIII, IV, 2037, 2075, 2135, 2163, 2194.

3 See p. 183.

4 Professor Kenneth Muir discusses the literary and other evidence concerning this relationship in Life and Letters of Sir Thomas Wyatt, 13–37.
Wyatt was estranged from his wife, Elizabeth, the daughter of Lord Cobham, whom he had married some time before 1520, and it is not surprising that court gossip commonly considered them to be lovers. If such a relationship ever existed, it had come to an end by 1532, and no suggestion was ever made that Wyatt was involved in the Queen’s alleged post-nuptial infidelities. Neither her rise nor her fall made any appreciable difference to his career; he continued to enjoy the king’s confidence, and to accumulate properties in Kent by grant and purchase. Although he was arrested briefly at the time of the Queen’s trial, and claimed that ‘these bloody days’ had broken his heart, no accusations were brought against him, and by October he was in service with the king’s forces against the rebels in Lincolnshire. He was knighted on 18 March 1537, and thereafter his career was almost entirely diplomatic. The greater part of the last five years of his life was spent on missions in Spain, France, Flanders and Italy. It was in the latter country in 1538 that he incurred the bitter enmity of his fellow diplomat Edmund Bonner, later Bishop of London, who denounced him for treasonable correspondence with the exiled Reginald Pole. As long as Cromwell was in power, these accusations fell on deaf ears, but after the minister’s execution on 28 July 1540 his papers were examined and Bonner’s charges found a more receptive audience. On 17 January 1541 Wyatt was arrested, and many observers thought him destined for summary execution.

In prison he compiled two lengthy documents in his own defence, and it appears highly probable that Bonner’s charges were malicious. About 20 March he was released, apparently on the intercession of Queen Catherine Howard, and the Lords of the Council hastened to announce that he had confessed his fault and submitted to the king’s mercy.

His son, with whom his relations always seem to have been good in spite of his estrangement from his wife, inherited his very considerable estates, but there is some doubt about the prosperity of the elder Sir Thomas’s affairs at the time of his death. In the summer of 1542 he had completed a substantial sale of land to the Crown, and it is

1 Muir, 24. Wyatt would certainly not have survived the crisis of 1536 if he had been intimate with Anne Boleyn after she had become the King’s mistress.
2 *L and P*, XIII (ii), 615. Bonner to Cromwell, 15 October 1538.
3 Particularly Marillac, the French ambassador, who wrote that Wyatt was taken to the Tower ‘... so bound and handcuffed that everyone could only suppose ill, for it is the custom in this country to take them to prison unbound’. J. Kaulek, *Correspondence Politique* (Paris, 1885), 261–3; quoted by Muir, 176.
possible that he was much encumbered by debt.\textsuperscript{1} It is not any part of my intention to assess his stature as a poet or man of letters, but as a highly cultivated man and an important figure at court he knew and was known by almost every person of intellectual and political eminence in the period. His early death was mourned by a host of friends, and numerous epitaphs and tributes were written, among others by John Leland, the antiquary, Sir John Mason, and Sir Thomas Chaloner.\textsuperscript{2}

The younger Sir Thomas did not aspire to such a status. He can only narrowly have avoided a wardship, and had a reputation for wildness and impetuosity. In April 1543 he was before the Council for taking part with the Earl of Surrey in a street riot in London, as a result of which he spent a month in the Tower. In the autumn of the same year he joined a regiment of volunteers raised by Surrey to take part in the siege of Landrecies, and distinguished himself in the subsequent campaign. When, or for what services he was knighted is not known,\textsuperscript{3} but it was presumably for some act of valour or skill. Curiously enough the family papers contain no mention of the event. For several years after 1543 Wyatt served abroad. He took part in the siege of Boulogne in 1544, and joined the English council there in June 1545. The fall of his friend and patron the Earl of Surrey in the latter part of 1546 probably persuaded him to prolong his stay abroad, and it may well have been at this time that he undertook the journeys referred to in MS 17. It is not clear when he returned to England, but from the evidence of MSS 17 and 23 it seems that he witnessed the disturbances of the summer and autumn of 1548.\textsuperscript{4} The same papers also indicate that he was in favour with the Protector, and conformed willingly to the religious changes of the new regime. There is no evidence to suggest, however, that he played a partisan role in the crisis of October 1549. From the fact that he earned a certain disrepute in Kent as an incloser, it is clear that he had no particular sympathy with the Protector’s social policy, but in that he was no different from the other gentry of the country.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{1} According to DNB these lands were sold by Sir Thomas the younger in November 1543. However, according to L and P, (XVIII, i, 436) 1,259l 8s 2d was paid to Sir Thomas on 8 July 1542, in ‘...full payment of 3669l 8s 2d for his manors of Howe and Wyndhill.’ Sir Thomas’s dealing in land were large scale and complex, but it is probable that this sale was undertaken to relieve pressure on the estate.

\textsuperscript{2} Muir, 217, 220. MS 11 is George Case’s translation of Chaloner’s epitaph.

\textsuperscript{3} Shaw, II, 65, suggests 1549 or later, but he is already being described as Sir Thomas by 1544 (L and P, XX). On the other hand, he is not so described in the previous year, and he may well have been dubbed in France for his services there.

\textsuperscript{4} See pp. 55, 165.

\textsuperscript{5} For some further consideration of this, see TTC, 48, 84.
In November 1550 he was nominated to the commission set up to determine the boundaries of the Calais pale, and in the same year served as Sheriff of Kent. According to the author of MS 10 the Duke of Northumberland was ‘his very good lord’, until it came to the question of the succession crisis, and it seems that he made a good profit out of the relationship. Like most of the other gentlemen who were more or less bound to Northumberland, however, he drew back in alarm from the conspiracy of June–July 1553, and was one of the first in Kent to declare for Mary. In the autumn of 1553 his position must have seemed secure. Even if we accept the theory that he was a convinced protestant, he made no public demonstration of the fact, and there is no hint that he was out of favour with the Queen. Before Christmas, however, he had become deeply involved in the conspiracy originated by William Thomas and Sir James Croftes to frustrate the Spanish marriage by armed rebellion. Forced into premature action in January 1554, he exploited to the full the close relations which he had formed with a number of his Kentish neighbours about five years before, when they had collaborated in a plan to support the Protector’s government with a selective militia. The existence of this scheme gave him a ready means of mobilization, and alone of the four projected risings, that in Kent assumed dangerous proportions.

The danger of Wyatt’s rising lay not so much in its size, for it received very little active support outside Kent, but in its proximity to London, and in the feebleness with which it was opposed. In Kent only Henry Neville, Lord Abergavenny, and Sir Robert Southwell stood firm for the Queen, and they could raise little following. On the Council Stephen Gardiner, the Lord Chancellor, advised first negotiations and then flight. London was reported to be waverung, and the politque lords who had supported Northumberland were reluctant to raise forces which might be used for their own discomfort. In the event, partly because of Wyatt’s own mistaken tactics, partly because of the Queen’s resolution, and partly because the Londoners feared for their property, the rebels were turned back from Temple Bar, and the movement collapsed. Wyatt and a large number of his followers were taken prisoner, and their trials spread over the next five weeks. The Council was divided in its attitude towards them, and most of the rank and file were soon released, and subsequently

1 In June 1550 he was granted lands worth 118l 6s 5d in reward for unspecified ‘services’. Calendar of the Patent Rolls, Edward VI, III, 337–8.
2 See p. 192.
3 TTC, 12–24.
pardoned. The position of the leaders, and particularly of Wyatt himself, was complicated by the desire of Gardiner and Simon Renard, the Imperial ambassador, to frame a case against Princess Elizabeth. Renard soon became alarmed at the leniency with which the rebels were being treated, and claimed that Prince Philip’s life would not be safe in England, nor the alliance stand any chance of success, if Elizabeth remained alive. He became convinced, however, that no action could be taken against her without conclusive proof of her complicity, because she had powerful friends and wide popularity. For this reason his friends on the Council made strenuous attempts to extract incriminating evidence from the leaders of the conspiracy.

How far they succeeded with Wyatt has been a matter of dispute ever since. The author of MS 10 is particularly concerned to defend his hero, both from the substantial charge of having conspired with the Princess, and also from the secondary charge of having made incriminating statements against her. It seems that either Wyatt was cruelly tortured with the hope of reprieve, or else that the Queen genuinely could not make up her mind between the logic of the situation and the importunities of his devoted wife, for nearly a month elapsed between his trial and execution. On the scaffold, on 11 April 1554, he stated categorically that neither Elizabeth nor the Earl of Devon, nor ‘... any other now in yonder holde of durance’ (the Tower) were privy to his rising. Whether or not this statement was true, it put an end to any hope of bringing the Princess to trial, and added to Wyatt’s posthumous reputation as a martyr to the national cause.

Sir Thomas left a widow and five children. Like his father, he had married young, in 1537; unlike his father’s, however, his marriage had been happy and fruitful, and his widow never re-married. She was Jane, daughter of Sir William Hawte of Bishopsbourne; and she lived until the early years of the following century, bequeathing her memories to her son George, her grandson, Thomas Scott, and others. George was the youngest of her children; born, so the story relates, only a few days before his father’s fatal rebellion, a circumstance which seems to have heightened his sense of filial piety.

1 TTC, 113–27.
2 Simon Renard to the Emperor, 3 April 1554, Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, XII, 201.
3 Chronicle of Queen Jane, ed. J. G. Nichols, Camden Society, xlviii (1850), 74.
4 The date of Jane Wyatt’s death is uncertain. She is described in MS 10 as ‘... a widow yet living’ (about 1595), but was certainly dead by 1618, when George was in possession of the estate. Richard (MS 38) speculated that she was probably buried at Southfleet.
According to the Patent Roll the other children were ‘Henry and Charles now (27 December 1555) dead, and Arthur . . . Jane, Anne and Mary now surviving’. Arthur, who would have been Sir Thomas’s heir but for the attainder, died before achieving his majority; Mary also appears to have died unmarried; Jane married Charles Scott of Egerton, and became the mother of Thomas; Anne married Roger Twisden, and became the mother of Sir William and the grandmother of Sir Roger.

Sir Thomas’s attainder plunged the family into poverty, from which it only slowly recovered. Most of the estate was distributed among those who had been active in suppressing the rising. However, a small residue, valued at £64 14s 7d p.a. was regranted to Jane in the autumn of 1555, and the Queen allowed her a personal annuity of 200 marks. The children were restored in blood by Act of Parliament in 1570, and at about the same time George was granted the small property of Wavering by the crown, but he was totally unable to occupy his father’s place among the gentry of Kent. In spite of the fact that he left so many writings, his career is surrounded by obscurity and doubt. He was admitted to Gray’s Inn in 1571; in 1582 he married Jane, the daughter of Sir Thomas Finch of Eastwell and became by her the father of five sons and four daughters; by 1593 he was settled in Kent; by 1618 he had inherited his mother’s properties at Boxley and Southfleet; by 1622 he had recovered the family possession of Boxley Abbey, where he lived until his death; he died at the end of August 1624 and was buried in the parish church at Boxley. Beyond this meagre framework, his biography is a matter of deduction and speculation. From observations in his writings it is virtually certain that he saw active service as a soldier, and from the admiration which he displays for Lord Willoughby and Sir Thomas Wilford, this was probably in the Netherlands. According to his own statement, he was present at the siege of Bergen-op-Zoom in 1588, but in what capacity is not clear.

1 Cal. Pat., Philip and Mary, III, 159.
2 Although the identification is not quite certain, he was very probably that Arthur Wyatt who matriculated Fellow Commoner at St John’s College, Cambridge, in 1561 (Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, IV, 480). He had died by 1570.
3 Sir Robert Southwell, Sir Thomas Cheney, and George Clarke were the principal beneficiaries of the share out. (Cal. Pat., Philip and Mary, I, 135; II, 67, 311).
4 Cal. Pat., Philip and Mary, III, 159.
5 J. Foster, Register of Admissions to Grays Inn (London, 1889), 41.
6 MS 38. Hasted, II, 125 et seq.
7 MS 37.
8 See p. 94.
It is tempting in the light of this to identify George with that Mr Wiatt who was commissary of musters at Ostend and Bergen-op-Zoom from 25 March 1588 to 1 January 1591. Unfortunately, this gentleman is clearly described on a number of occasions as Thomas Wiatt, and signs his letters thus. Moreover, the hand in which these letters are written is clearly not George's. More puzzling is the fact that a Captain Wyatt was constantly associated with Lord Cobham, Sir Thomas Wilford and Thomas Digges in organizing the Kentish musters in the late 1590s. This fits in perfectly with everything that we know about George's position and interests. Unfortunately this man also is called Thomas, not once but a number of times. As far as I can ascertain, there was no Thomas Wyatt among the resident gentry of Kent at this time, but it would not be safe to assume a confusion of identity. The only hint we get from George himself is his complaint to Lord Cobham, '... mine estate forceth me to retiere myself'. Quite probably he served in the Netherlands in the late 1580s without attracting either notice or reward, and spent the remainder of his life studying, writing, caring for his modest estates, and raising his numerous children.

George lived to be about 70, and his wife outlived him by almost twenty years, but the mortality of their children was heavy. One daughter, at least, seems to have died in infancy before 1600; two others, Catherine and Anne, died unmarried in 1608 and 1611; and a fourth, Elenora, the wife of John Finch Esq., was buried on 7 December 1623. The sons proved somewhat hardier. George suc-

1 Acts of the Privy Council (ed. Dasent) XXIV, 307. There are numerous references to this man as 'Mr Wiatt' or 'Capt. Wiatt' in the Calendar of State Papers, Foreign, 1589–90.

2 SP84/XXXV/136.

3 APC, XXVII, 105; XXVIII, 253; etc.

4 Sloane MS 358 in the British Museum consists of a narrative of a voyage by Robert Dudley (natural son of the Earl of Leicester) to the West Indies in 1594–5, by a certain 'Captain Wyatt', who accompanied him. G. F. Warner, who edited this MS for the Hakluyt Society in 1899, speculated that this was Capt Thomas Wyatt, the Commissary of Musters (xv). He describes himself as 'an old and discreet souldier', and Warner adds 'He was evidently a landsman on his first long voyage; and to judge from his scraps of latin and references to classical authors, he had some pretensions to scholarship.' The style of the work is very close to George's, and the MS is written in a hand very similar to one which appears a number of times in the commonplace book, but which I have not been able to identify. As far as I know, however, George never makes any remark which could be interpreted as a reference to such as experience.

5 She was buried in Boxley church on 27 March 1644. DNB wrongly states that it was Margaret, Sir Francis' wife, who was buried on that day. MS 37.

6 MS 37. Anne is described as the 'youngest daughter', and Elenora as the 'third daughter', so presumably there was another in addition to Catherine.
cumbed to a fever in 1619, when he was 17; Henry, who married in 1618, received the degree of M.A. in 1622, and entered holy orders, was 28 when he died around Christmas 1624. Thomas, the youngest son, who may have had some constitutional deficiency, died in 1625 at the age of 21. Only two, Hawte and Francis, lived a full span and left children of their own. Hawte, named after the family of his maternal grandmother, was born in 1594, and matriculated at Queen's College, Oxford, in 1611. He did not, apparently, take a degree, but was ordained some time before 1621, and accompanied his elder brother to Virginia in the capacity of preacher. He married, in 1618, Elizabeth Mitford, who accompanied him to Virginia and bore him two sons, George and Edward. By 1626 he was back in Boxley, where his wife died in childbirth and was buried in the parish church. Both his sons returned to Virginia in 1639, where Edward married Jane Conquest and became the ancestor of the Virginia Wiatts. In 1632 Hawte succeeded his father's lifelong friend, George Case as Vicar of Boxley, and in the same year his second wife, Anna Cox, also died in childbirth. He himself died in harness at Boxley in 1638, and was buried in his own church.

Francis, the eldest recorded child of George and Jane, was born in 1588, and matriculated at St Mary's Hall, Oxford, in July 1603. The following year, like his father, he was admitted to Gray's Inn, but

---

1 He had matriculated at Queen's College, Oxford, in the previous year. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, IV, 1690.
2 Foster, loc. cit. He was married on 8 December 1618 to Catherine Finch, daughter of Sir Henry Finch. He is described as 'minister of Boxley' in MS 37, which presumably means curate, since George Case was Vicar at this time. One of his sermons is preserved (MS 14).
3 MS 37. He was the only one of the brothers who entered neither university nor Inn of Court.
4 S. C. Wyatt, *Cheneys and Wyatts*, 114, states that George married and had children, but MS 37 clearly states that he died in 1619. Wyatt does not quote the source of his information, and since he appears to be ignorant of the existence of Henry, Thomas, Anne and Catherine, he is, perhaps, not to be relied upon. It is possible that the descendants he mentions were in fact derived from Henry.
5 Foster, IV, 1690.
6 Kingsbury, I, 516. He is described in this entry as 'Mr. of Artes', but there is no record of his having taken the degree.
7 S. C. Wyatt; *Cheneys and Wyatts* (London, 1959), 113.
8 MS 37.
9 MS 36 states that Hawte Wyatt 'hath issue now (1702) living in Virginia'. In 1655 Edward Wiatt received a grant of land from Pindavako the Protector of the young king of Chishoyack (MS in the Huntington Library, San Marino); the documentary evidence for Edward's life has now largely perished, but the relationship can be pieced together from the surviving eighteenth-century letters.
10 MS 37.
11 Foster, IV, 1690.
neither of these stages in his education resulted in any formal qualifications. The rise in his fortunes which occurred in and after the year 1618 can probably be attributed to his marriage in that year to Margaret, the daughter of Sir Samuel Sandys, son and heir to Archbishop Edwin Sandys. He was knighted on 7 July 1618,¹ and in the following year began to interest himself in the affairs of the Virginia Company, which at that time came under the effective control of his wife’s uncle, Sir Edwin Sandys. It was probably in order to strengthen his faction that Sandys secured two shares for Sir Francis, who made his first appearance at a Court of the Company on 13 November 1620.² Circumstances quickly thrust him to the fore, and on 29 January following the Earl of Southampton proposed him for the Governorship, in succession to Sir George Yeardley.³ The Court approved this suggestion two days later, and Wyatt duly took over his duties in Virginia in November of the same year.

The Sandys group were full of plans to strengthen and expand the colony, but these met with a disastrous setback at the end of March 1622, when a great Indian uprising resulted in many deaths, and severe damage to property. The consequent difficulties which beset the Company were aggravated by personal recriminations, and renewed factional quarrels. These disputes brought the affairs of the Company before the Privy Council in July 1622,⁴ and as a result an investigation was ordered, and carried out both in London and Virginia during 1623.⁵ In 1624 the charter of the Company was annulled, and Virginia became a Crown colony. It says much for Sir Francis Wyatt’s ability and integrity that the ruin of his original patrons did not leave him irredeemably compromised. In spite of the fact that he wished to retire at the end of his five-year term, a number of the planters petitioned for his continuance in office, and he became the first Royal Governor. His father’s death in the autumn of 1624 increased his eagerness to return to England, but King Charles retained his services on his accession in March 1625, and it was not until the following year that Sir Francis eventually returned to Kent.

His wife was with him for only about six months of this period. She reached Jamestown in December 1622, and arrived back in England ‘great with child’ in June 1623.⁶

¹ W. A. Shaw, *Knights of England*, II, 169. Both DNB and the Dictionary of American Biography state that he was knighted in 1603. A ‘Wyatt’, with no Christian name or place of origin specified, was among the 500 dubbed in July 1603 (Shaw, II, 126), but ‘Francis Wyatt of Kent’ was specifically dubbed on 7 July 1618. In any case Francis was only 15 in 1603.
² Kingsbury, I, 415.
³ Ibid., 436.
⁴ Ibid., 107.
⁶ Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, Addenda, no. 127.
In November 1639 he returned to Virginia for a second term, to find the colony no less faction ridden than during his first period of office. This time he was less successful in avoiding implication, and after an unhappy administration he was relieved by Sir William Berkeley, who arrived in February 1642. Sir Francis remained in the colony for several months to give his successor the benefit of his experience, and returned to England in 1643. According to his own testimony, the Company had defaulted in payment of part of his salary during his first term, and this time the Crown did the same. His son Edwin inherited the dreary pursuit of these arrears, as is described in MS 16. Sir Francis died in August 1644, the last of George's children, and was buried beside the others in Boxley parish church. His widow survived him by over forty years, and must have been approaching 90 when she died in October 1687.

In the course of 26 years' married life, Margaret bore Sir Francis five sons and one daughter. The last, named Virginia, was probably the child conceived in that country; she grew up to marry Thomas Bosvile, and become the mother of Margaret Bosvile, whom we have already noticed as the ancestress of the Earls of Romney. One son, William, died in infancy in 1627; another, George, at the age of 17 ten years later. Francis matriculated at King's College, Cambridge, in 1640 as a scholar from Eton, obtained his B.A. and a fellowship in 1643, and died of smallpox shortly before his father. Henry, the eldest son and heir, was born in April 1619, matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1638, and enrolled at Gray's Inn in 1640. The dates of his marriage and death are uncertain, but it is probable that his daughter Frances was already married to Sir Thomas Selyard when she inherited the estate. This, together with the fact that it was Edwin, rather than Henry who was petitioning for the debts owed to his father in 1665, suggests that he probably died between 1660 and 1665. Edwin, the youngest son, was born about 1629. He matriculated at King's in 1647, and joined the Inner Temple the following year. In 1658 he was called to the bar, became a Bencher in 1674, and a Sergeant-at-Law in January 1684, holding the post of Recorder at both Canterbury and Maidstone. In 1665 he married Frances, daughter of Sir Thomas Crispe of Quex, who bore him five sons and

1 'How much the company is behind in their promises and agreements with me, you cannot but understand, which wether they value or we here cannot be lesse than five hundred pounds yearly.' MS 3; William and Mary College Quarterly, 2nd series, VI, 121.
2 MS 37.
3 Venn, IV, 480.
4 See p. 2.
5 Foster, IV, 1690.
6 Venn, IV, 480.
7 See p. 4.
two daughters;\(^1\) only two sons, Francis and Richard, were still living when he died in December 1714, at the age of about 85. Although at least three of the children married, none produced heirs, and on the death of Richard in 1753 the estate passed, as we have seen, to Lord Romney.

\(^1\) MSS 37, 38.