

Title: Medieval deer parks in the LiDAR study area

Author: James McInnes

Date: October 2016

Summary: This paper summarises some of the key issues relating to deer parks, such as the dates of emparking and disparking, and then looks at each of the deer parks in the area covered by the LiDAR survey.

Acknowledgement: Quotations from the Goodwood manuscripts are by courtesy of His Grace the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, and with acknowledgments to the West Sussex County Record Office and the County Archivist.

This article is published with the kind permission of the author. This article is the work and views of the author from research undertaken in the Record Offices by volunteers of the Secrets of the High Woods project. South Downs National Park Authority is very grateful to the volunteers for their work but these are not necessarily the views of the Authority.

Medieval deer parks in the LiDAR study area

Graham Jones said that “we still do not know just how many forests and chases there have been in England and Wales”¹ and the same applies to deer parks. There is no doubt that deer parks were one of the dominant features of the landscape of eastern Hampshire and western Sussex between the 12th and 16th centuries. As late as 1610 when Speed drew up his maps, county by county, for ‘The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine’, he drew pales around 23 parks in the rapes of Arundel and Chichester alone.² However, as will be shown below, many of these had been disparked by 1610 and Speed’s maps reflect better the situation in the 1580s.

Away from the coastal plain, the land between the river Arun and the Hampshire border was heavily wooded during the medieval period and there is little doubt that hunting took place there. Although technically all forests were owned by the Crown, only one small area, the Broyle (north of Chichester) was a royal forest and that was disforested in 1227.³ In 1229 Henry III granted the Broyle to Ralph Neville, Bishop of Chichester and said that he could ‘make them parks if he will’.⁴ A number of parks were created out of the land disforested by the King, but the Broyle was not one of them. It had been the only royal forest in the western part of Sussex as Arundel forest was never a royal forest. This is significant because one of the aims of this study was to examine the relationship between the forest and the deer parks. Only East Dean was definitely emparked during the 12th century and it did not border the royal forest. There was, therefore, no link between parks and royal forests in the western part of Sussex.

The forest of Arundel covered the central portion of Sussex between Arundel and the Hampshire border. The bounds of the forest are crucial to determining whether a park was within or outside the forest. However, the bounds of Arundel forest changed over time and their precise location is often a matter of conjecture.⁵ So far, it has not been possible to discover whether parks such as those at Bignor and Cocking were within the forest or lay outside its border.

In some cases designating an area a ‘free warren’ was a precursor to it becoming a park. A free warren has been defined as the “right granted by royal license to an estate owner which gave them the sole right to hunt, on their demesne land, the beasts of the warren, namely hares, rabbits, wild cats, polecats, badgers, foxes, partridge, pheasant and pine marten.”⁶ It is noteworthy that this did not include deer.

¹ John Langton and Graham Jones, *Forests and Chases of England and Wales c1500-c1850: Towards a Survey and Analysis*, Oxford, 2008 p. 10.

² John Speed, *The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine*, 1611. Facsimile edition, (ed.) John Arlott, Phoenix House Ltd., London, 1953.

³ Calendar of Charter Rolls, 11 Henry III 4 February 1227.

⁴ W.D. Peckham (ed.), *Chichester Cathedral Chartulary* in Sussex Record Society XLVI (1941) Liber B, Entry No: 137.

⁵ Clough, M. (ed.), *Two Estate Surveys of the Fitzalan Earls of Arundel*, Sussex Record Society, 67 (1969) p. 92. Modern variants of names are given where they are known: those where there is uncertainty are placed in inverted commas. Bounds were given in the late 14th century: “Fishbourne to Crockerhill and Cudlow, and to ‘Ryham’ and Avisford, and thence through the marshes of Tortington to the river Arun, and following it to Houghton; thence to Bury and thence to Swanbridge and thence to Barkhale; thence to ‘Nonemaneslond’, and thence through Waltham to ‘Babele’, and thence to ‘Hayham’ of Cocking and North Mardon; thence to Compton, where the bounds curve down towards the sea. And formerly they began at Avisford, and thence to ‘Chesseharghes’ towards the south; thence to Molecomb and thence to ‘Wynkyngg’ and thence to Seabeach and thence to Crockerhill.

⁶ John Langton and Graham Jones, *Forests and Chases in England and Wales, c. 1000 to c. 1850. A Glossary of Terms and Definitions*. Accessed at <http://info.sjc.ox.ac.uk/forests/glossary.htm>

In the deer parks in the area studied only five grants of free warren have been found:

Name of warren	Date free warren granted
Bignor	1278
Halnaker	1253
Harting	1228
Treyford	1256
Trotton	1253

A licence of free warren did not necessarily lead to emparkment as is illustrated by the example of Didling for which free warren was granted in 1237, but it was never emparked. However five out of the six warrens in the area did become parks.

A chase was an “exclusive hunting reserve of landholder in which s/he had rights to hunt deer and boar, i.e. a private forest.”⁷ Cocking was licenced as a free chase in 1279 and Downley, the Rewell and Selhurst were recorded as woods with deer in free chase in 1302.⁸

The fact that nine of the parks had their origins in free warrens or chases should not be seen as indicating that such a designation was necessary before a park could be created. East Dean and Woolavington are examples of parks for which no record of previous licences for free warren or chase have been found. It is worth noting that in all the rights of free warren and chases were created in the 13th century. This might indicate that during the reigns of Henry III and Edward I hunting became increasingly popular and that this was a way in which the Crown could control its interests. Equally, the paucity of records for the 12th and early 13th century might be the reason why earlier evidence of the granting of free warren and chases has not been found.

Records for the setting up of deer parks have been equally elusive and consequently it is difficult to determine exactly how many deer parks there were in Sussex at any one time, when they were emparked and when they were disparked. In theory a licence to empark should have been obtained from the Crown as a fee or fine was payable for doing this. However very few licences to empark have been found and other evidence has had to be used to gauge when a park was created.

Liddiard has argued for continuity between late Saxon and early Norman deer parks.⁹ However there is no indication in the Domesday Book that there were any deer parks in the rape of Arundel.¹⁰

Following the Norman conquest the dominant landowner was Earl Roger of Montgomery. He was granted the rape of Arundel (which included what later became the rape of Chichester) and numerous other lands by William the Conqueror in 1067 or 1068. His descendants were created Earls of Arundel and their influence in the western part of Sussex is exemplified by the fact that in about 1400 they alone owned 12 deer parks in the area.¹¹

According to Salzman, the Great Park at Arundel was created by Earl Roger of Montgomery.¹² However there is no documentary evidence to prove that there was a park at Arundel until March

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 30 Edward I 19 March 1302.

⁹ Robert Liddiard. ‘The Deer Parks of Domesday Book.’ *Landscapes* 2003; 4(1), 4-23.

¹⁰ Following the Norman conquest in 1066 the rape of Arundel continued to the Hampshire border. By 1250 the rape had been sub-divided and the rape of Chichester was created.

¹¹ Clough, M. (ed.), *Op. Cit.* p. 94. The great and small parks in Arundel, Badworth, Bignor, Cocking, Downley, East Dean, Medehone, Selhurst, Shillinglee, Stansted and Woolavington.

¹² L.F. Salzman (ed), *The Victoria County History: Sussex*, Volume 1 p. 431.

1244 when timber from 12 oaks in the park of Arundel was mentioned in the Close Rolls.¹³ The earliest explicit reference to a park in the area was in 1189 when a Pipe Roll from the first year of the reign of King Richard I mentioned three times the 'Parco de Estdena'.¹⁴ No other parks were referred to in the Honor of Arundel. East Dean was probably emparked by William d'Aubigny (c1109-1176) the 1st Earl of Lincoln and the 1st Earl of Arundel.¹⁵ He had initially acquired the Arundel lands through his wife, Adeliza, who was King Henry I's widow and whom he had married in 1138. Henry II granted him these lands in his own right after his accession in 1154. Thereafter East Dean park was part of the estate of the Earls of Arundel.

Stansted was probably emparked by the Earls of Arundel during the late 13th century. An estate survey taken in 1301 valued the grazing in the park and said that there could be taken "10 buck and 12 does in the park, every year without damage."¹⁶ Downley park, at Singleton, was also probably imparked by the Earls of Arundel during the late 13th century.¹⁷

In a 1331 inquisition concerning the land and property to be returned to Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (died 1376) there was a reference to 'a new park called 'Shelerth'.¹⁸ Although no licence to empark has been found, there is little doubt that Selhurst was emparked between 1302 and 1326 when Edmund FitzAlan was the 9th Earl of Arundel (1285-1326). In his Inquisition post-mortem in 1326 appeared the first reference to Woolavington as one of his parks.¹⁹ It is possible, therefore, that Edmund FitzAlan was the only Earl of Arundel responsible for emparking more than one park.

The first reference to a park at Cocking was on 12 October 1349 when Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (died 1376) complained that Richard Gamelyn and others had hunted in his park at Cocking "and took and carried away deer".²⁰ The case might have been brought because the park was newly created and the Earl wanted to his establish that the land was no longer a free chase but a park. It is also possible that he had acquired the park recently from the Bavant family and wanted to mark his ownership. Until it can be discovered when the park was set up it is not possible to know what the main reasons were for bringing the case.

The other parks in the area were not emparked by the Earls of Arundel even if the land came later into their hands. Probably the earliest to be emparked was Elsted where, on 12 March 1263, the Prior of Boxgrove was fined for "trespass of venison made in the park of Elnested".²¹ It was probably John de Gatesden (1184-1258?) who was responsible for the creation of the park. He also had hunting rights at Demesford and Trotton, but neither of them were mentioned as parks until 1335 and he, his son, or his grandson, could have emparked those places.²² The inquisition after the death of Henry Husee (1240-1290) stated that there were three parks in Harting,²³ but it is not clear when they were set up.

¹³ Calendar of Close Rolls, Henry III: Volume 5, 1242-1247, HMSO, London, 1916 p. 174.

¹⁴ Pipe Roll, I Richard I, 1189. Accessed at: <https://archive.org/details/cu31924028014946>

¹⁵ Tierney (chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk) argued that William d'Aubigny was the fourth Earl of Arundel. See: M.A. Tierney, *The History and Antiquities of the Castle and Town of Arundel*, London, 1834.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 9.

¹⁷ This park has been excavated and investigated in detail by Mark Roberts of University College, London. A preliminary report can be found at: Roberts, M., (2014). The Institute of Archaeology Field Course 2014: The Search for the Lost Hunting Lodge of the Earls of Arundel at Downley, Singleton, West Sussex, UK. *Archaeology International*. 17, pp.109–121. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/ai.1722>

¹⁸ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 4 Edward III 15 January 1331.

¹⁹ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 20 Edward II January 1326.

²⁰ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 23 Edward III 12 October 1349.

²¹ Calendar of Fine Rolls, 47 Henry III 20 March 1263.

²² Calendar of Patent Rolls, 8 Edward III 3 July 1334.

²³ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 18 Edward I 18 August 1290.

A little more precision is possible in respect of the park at Treyford. In 1336 Nicholas de Vilers obtained confirmation of his right of free warren there²⁴ and in February 1344 he complained that men had hunted in his park at Treyford and carried away deer.²⁵ The park at Treyford was created between 1336 and 1344 by Nicholas de Vilers.

The first reference to a park with deer in it at Halnaker was in 1272.²⁶ At that point it was described as an old park which was being extended. The manor was held by the St. John family and it is likely that Robert de St. John (c1200-1266) was responsible for the emparkment.

Slindon illustrates the problems of understanding what was happening in the 12th and 13th centuries. The Archbishops of Canterbury acquired the manor of Slindon in 1106 and since it bordered Arundel forest there were numerous disputes between the Church and the Earls. The two sides reached an agreement in 1268 (which was confirmed in 1274), but crucially this was about the right to hunt in woods and no references were made to parks. A park was mentioned for the first time in a list of the customs of the manor of Slindon, drawn up in 1285.²⁷ There is insufficient evidence to say whether the park at Slindon was created between 1274 and 1285 or whether there was already a park in existence by 1274 but that it was simply not referred to in the agreement. Slindon was often occupied by Archbishops of Canterbury: Stephen Langton died there in 1228 and John Peckham (1230-1292) visited frequently. The Archbishops of Canterbury also held the manor of East Lavant, which was in the hands of Archbishop Lanfranc in 1086. It too had a deer park and the first reference to Foldey park, Lavant was in the 1285 customals. Once again, there is no evidence whether there was a park there earlier.

Whether Bignor was another medieval park is not known. Hunting certainly took place there, but the first reference to it as a park was not until 1524 when the Prior of Hardham Priory faced charges of deer poaching in the park at Bignor.²⁸ The setting up of one park can be dated with precision. On 30 May 1517 Sir Thomas West (c1475-1554) and his wife, Elizabeth Bonville, were given licence to enclose 300 acres for a park at Goodwood.²⁹ This they proceeded to do immediately. Goodwood is also the first park which can be ascribed definitely to the early modern period. Another deer park of modern creation was at Harting. John Caryll (1625-1711) built what came to be known as Lady Holt House and deer park. He was an active Jacobite supporter who often had to be absent from England, so the park was probably built after the restoration of Charles II in 1660 and before James II's departure in 1688.

The expectation might have been that the Earls of Arundel were responsible for setting up most of the deer parks in the area during the medieval period. However the Archbishops of Canterbury and four families with only local landholdings, St. John, de Vilers, de Gatesden and Husee also set up parks. Only the park at East Dean can definitely be ascribed to the 12th century, most were set up in the 13th century and in some instances the first written reference was in the 14th century.

²⁴ Index to Placita de Banco, p. 674.

²⁵ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 12 February 1344 p. 278.

²⁶ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 11 Edward I 19 June 1283.

²⁷ Redwood, B.C. & Wilson, A.E. (eds.), *Customals of the Sussex Manors of the Archbishop of Canterbury*, Sussex Record Society, 57 (1958).

²⁸ Edward Turner, *The Priory of Pynham, or De Calceto*, Sussex Archaeological Collection, Vol. XI (1859) pp. 112-113.

²⁹ 'For Th. West and Elizabeth his wife. Licence to empark 300 acres in the lordship of Halfnaked, Sussex, as granted to Hugh, eldest son of Lord St. John, and his heirs'. Letters and Papers Henry VIII, Vol. ii, 3311. 30 May 1517. Presumably, the earlier grant had not been acted on.

The table below lists the earliest written references to each deer park. This might be when the park was created, but in many instances it was probably set up a number of years earlier.

Name of Deer park	Owner when emparked	Earliest documentary evidence
Arundel	Earl of Arundel	1244
Bignor	Earl of Arundel	1524
Cocking	Earl of Arundel	1349
Demesford	de Gatesden	1335
Downley, Singleton	Earl of Arundel	c1280
East Dean	Earl of Arundel	1189
Elsted	de Gatesden	1263
Goodwood	West	1517
Halnaker	St. John	1272
Harting	Husee	1272
Lavant	Archbishop of Canterbury	1285
Selhurst	Earl of Arundel	1331
Slindon	Archbishop of Canterbury	1285
Stansted	Earl of Arundel	1301
Treyford	de Vilers	1344
Trotton	de Gatesden	1355
Woolavington	Earl of Arundel	1326

All the parks appear to have had a number of functions. There is, though, not enough evidence to say whether parks were used for hunting, for breeding, for fattening, for the larder and gift-giving or for a combination of all these. Certainly the parks were also used as coppices and pasture for cattle and sheep and pannage for pigs as well as raising game birds and rabbits and hunting animals other than deer. It is possible that the function of a park depended partially on its size.

Name of park	Approx. acreage
Arundel	823
Downley	646
East Dean	320
Goodwood	300
Bignor	200
Halnaker	150
Slindon	67
Foldey, Lavant	58

Parks, such as Halnaker, changed in size over time, but a rough estimate is given below for eight of the parks. It is difficult to imagine that deer could have been hunted in parks as small as those at Slindon and Lavant.

In 1570 a survey was taken which included some of the deer parks held by the Earl of Arundel.³⁰ It showed that there was an extremely active programme of deer management and that park pales were being kept in a good state of repair. It was recorded that in 1570 Halnaker had 800 deer, Downley, Singleton had 400, East Dean had 200, Selhurst had 110 and Goodwood had 30. There was nothing to suggest that deer management was about to cease as a significant part of the local economy.

Disparking

Unlike the licence theoretically required to set up a deer park, there were no rules governing the disparking of a site. It is extremely unusual, therefore, to be able to say with any certainty when a particular park was disparked. Some of the deer parks studied do not appear to have lasted into the early modern period. The last reference to deer in the park at Elsted was in the 13th century and deer parks at Demesford, Treyford and Trotton are not mentioned in any records found so far beyond the 14th century. It might be significant that these four parks were all close to Harting and as the parks there became more important the need and desire for these other parks diminished. Also it is worth pointing out that the last mention of there being deer in the parks at Demesford and Trotton was in 1335 and at Treyford 1344. Given the extremely high mortality rate of the plagues in 1348-1349 and 1361-1362, it is possible that there simply was not enough labour available to maintain the park pales of all of these parks. The two parks held by the Archbishops of Canterbury tell a similar story. There are no references to a deer park at Lavant after the 13th century and none to a deer park at Slindon after the 14th century.

The two parks at Harting survived into the 15th century, but when the male line of the Husee family ended with the death of Nicholas Husee in 1471 the parks passed to two girls aged 12 and 10. There are no records of the parks being used for deer after that date. However, the evidence is not strong enough to be certain that they were not used as deer parks. The tentative conclusion, though, is that the two parks at Harting were disparked following the death of the last male in the family that had set them up.

Most of the deer parks belonged to the Earls of Arundel so the reasons for their disparking are of special significance. None of them were disparked before the late 16th century so it is crucial to understand some of the difficulties facing Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580).³¹ He had married Katherine Grey in 1532 and they had one son, Henry, later Lord Maltravers, who was born in 1538, but died in 1556 leaving no direct male heir to the Earldom. It was then reported of the Earl that 'although he is of vigorous age his wife nevertheless, being infirm, cannot give him hope of having other children'.³² This increased the importance of his elder daughter, Mary FitzAlan, who had married Thomas Howard, later 4th Duke of Norfolk (1538-1572) in about 1555. However she died in 1557 shortly after giving birth to Philip Howard (1557-1595), later the 20th Earl of Arundel. Shortly after this Mary Arundel, the 19th Earl of Arundel's second wife, died in October 1557 with no issue from their marriage.³³ In 1556 and 1557 the Earl had lost a wife, son and daughter and it is

³⁰ Arundel Castle Archives MD 535. The survey of the Erle of Arundell his Landes which bene assurid in Rev'con to my L. of Sur[rey] Taken by Robert Harrys and John Dawbis alias Dobbs.

³¹ There is some dispute about his date of death as it was recorded as 20 August 1581 in the Calendar of State Papers Domestic Elizabeth I 1595-1597 p. 351 entry dated 24 January 1597. However a paper in the Lumley manuscripts gave his date of death as 24 February 1580.

³² Quoted in entry for Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel by Julian Locke in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2011.

³³ Entry for Mary Arundel by Pamela Y. Stanton in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2011.

not surprising that he came to rely increasingly on his son-in-law. John, Lord Lumley (c1533-1609) had married Jane FitzAlan (c1538-1577) the Earl's younger daughter between 1550 and 1552.³⁴

As was to be expected, there was a considerable transfer of land from the Earl to Lord Lumley and his heirs. No agreement from the time has been found, but a list of the properties was drawn up as a Feet of Fines in 1566.³⁵ As well as numerous manors and other estates which passed into Lumley's ownership, there were thirteen parks: Arundel, Badworth, Bignor, Cocking, Downley, East Dean, Goodwood, Halnaker, Medhone, Selhurst, Shillinglee, Stansted and Woolavington. The parks at Shillinglee (8 mile north of Petworth), Medhone (just outside Petworth) and Badworth (just east of Arundel) have not been included in this study. For reasons which are unclear the parks at Arundel, Badworth and Selhurst returned into the ownership of the Earl of Arundel. This left John, Lord Lumley and his wife, Jane, with eight parks relevant to this study: Bignor, Cocking, Downley, East Dean, Goodwood, Halnaker, Stansted and Woolavington.

Woolavington and East Dean were sold in 1578 and 1589 respectively to members of the Garton family. Giles Garton had made his money in the Sussex iron industry and was a significant figure in the Worshipful Company of Ironmongers, one of the twelve livery companies of London. There is nothing which indicates why either he bought Woolavington manor and park in 1578, or his son, Peter Garton, bought East Dean manor and park in 1589. There is no evidence that the Gartons were ever involved in hunting or in keeping deer, but equally there is no firm evidence when Woolavington and East Dean ceased to be used as deer parks.

The manor and park at Bignor was not sold to new industrialists of the Elizabethan era but to Richard Pellatt (or Pellett) whose family had been minor landowners in Sussex since the 13th century.³⁶ Pellatt was elected to Parliament in 1572 to represent Steyning and whether he bought Bignor in 1584 to increase his status in the county is now known. The park at Cocking was also sold by Lumley in 1584. Anthony Browne, 1st Viscount Montagu bought the "mannor park ferme and demesnes of Cockinge" including "the libertie of park and warren".³⁷ There is no evidence, though, to suggest that either Bignor or Cocking were being used as deer parks at the time of their sale or afterwards by the new owners.

When the manor and park of Halnaker was sold in March 1587 it differed from the others in that it explicitly included "all manner of bucks does and wylde beastes within the parke."³⁸ John Morley, who was a Member of Parliament in the 1580s having gravitated from being an official in the Exchequer to a country gentleman, had property in London, Suffolk and Berkshire, but no obvious prior interest in Sussex.³⁹ Nevertheless, he purchased an operational deer park. Once again there is no evidence that the Morley family used Halnaker park as a deer park and it had definitely been disparked by the 1620s.

The "parke of Downeley ... And all the Woods Underwoods in or upon the same Parke of Downeley" were sold, along with the parks at Stansted, by John, Lord Lumley to Thomas, Lord Darcy, Sir Thomas Walmesley and Sir James Croft in 1609.⁴⁰ In neither case was there a reference

³⁴ Quotation from the Calendar of State Papers Venetian in the entry for Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel by Julian Locke in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2011.

³⁵ Edwin H.W. Dunkin (ed.), *Sussex Manors, Advowsons etc recorded in the Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, (1914), Vol. XIX, p. 9.

³⁶ N.M. Fidge, Richard Pellatt in *The History of Parliament, 1558-1603* accessed at <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1558-1603/member/pellatt-richard-1587>

³⁷ WSRO: SAS-BA/48 12 February 1584.

³⁸ WSRO: Goodwood E288. Licence granted to John, Lord Lumley and Elizabeth to alienate to Robert Petre and John Morley 2 March 1587.

³⁹ W.J.J., John Morley, in *The History of Parliament, 1558-1603* accessed at <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1558-1603/member/morley-john-i-1587>

⁴⁰ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E431 f5. Copy of document dated 14 February 1609.

to vert and venison in the sale and there is no indication that either the park at Downley or the parks at Stansted were still being used for keeping deer by 1609.

Although not a medieval park, Goodwood was another which was sold by John, Lord Lumley in 1584 to Henry Walrond of Sea in Somerset. Walrond does not appear to have had any other interests before this in Sussex as the family's estates were in Somerset.

Although it was one of the parks which was passed to John, Lord Lumley, Selhurst park returned to and remained in the ownership of the Earls of Arundel and Dukes of Norfolk.⁴¹ It is not known how or why this happened, but as late as 1606 Thomas Howard, 21st Earl of Arundel (1585-1646) accused Sir Henry Goringe, Sheriff of Sussex and Surrey and others of breaking the fences at both Arundel Great park and Selhurst park and stealing deer.⁴² The parks were being actively used as they were "nyvryoned and fenced wth pales and mayneteyned and kept speceallie for the breed' and preservacon of ffallowe deare".⁴³ This is the clearest indication that parks did have specific functions and that in these cases it was for breeding and rearing fallow deer.

The eight parks which were sold by John, Lord Lumley between 1578 and 1609 all ceased to be deer parks. It was the debts that John, Lord Lumley and his father-in-law had acquired which explain why some of the estates had to be sold. In 1555 Lumley had agreed to help pay off the debts of Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580) including significant sums to a number of London merchants. The bulk of the money owed, though, was what was called the 'Florentine debt'. Henry VIII had been owed money by Florentine merchants, but they had been unable to pay and the Earl of Arundel agreed to take on this bad debt in 1564. By the time of the Earl's death on 24 February 1580 the 'Florentine debt' had reached the sum of £11,000 and was now owed to Queen Elizabeth. A paper amongst the Lumley manuscripts at Sandbeck Park, Rotherham, made it clear that the income of the land on which John, Lord Lumley depended to raise the money could not be improved other than by "Disparkinge of Parks".⁴⁴ The parks in Sussex do not appear to be referred to explicitly, but the conclusion is that the single most important factor in disparking in the western part of Sussex was John, Lord Lumley's need to raise money in an attempt to clear his and his deceased father-in-law's debts.

As far as the western part of Sussex is concerned, there were two periods of disparking: in the 14th century and in the late 16th century. The impact on land use is harder to determine. There is no doubt that some of the parks, such as Faldey park at Lavant, became coppiced woodland and parts of others, such as Selhurst park, were taken into arable use.

⁴¹ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E56 pp 281, 282. Land belonging to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk (engraved), with schedule. 790a. in the S.E. of East Dean parish (Selhurst Park).

⁴² TNA: STAC 8/45/17 Earl of Arundel v Goringe, January 1606.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ (ed.) Edith Milner, 'The Records of the Lumleys of Lumley Castle', G. Bell, London 1904 p. 71. Accessed at: https://archive.org/stream/recordsoflumleys00miln/recordsoflumleys00miln_djvu.txt

Arundel Great and Little Parks and the Rewell

According to *The Victoria County History*, the Great Park at Arundel was created by Earl Roger of Montgomery.⁴⁵ He had been granted the rape of Arundel (which included what later became the rape of Chichester) and numerous other lands by William the Conqueror in 1067 or 1068. Since Roger died in about 1094 the Great Park, if it was created by him, must have been established between the 1060s and 1090s. If this is the case, it was the first park created in Sussex. Liddiard, though, has argued for continuity between late Saxon and early Norman deer parks.⁴⁶ Ellis claimed that there were four Sussex parks recorded in Domesday Book: Rotherfield, Wittingham, Walberton and Waltham⁴⁷ and the last two of these were held by Earl Roger and were in what was the rape of Arundel.

Hugh d'Aubigny 5th Earl of Arundel died on 7 May 1243 and as he had no male heirs Henry III took his lands into his administration. As early as 17 July 1243 he issued an order that Roger de Stopham, his huntsman, should take 30 bucks and 6 stags from the late Earls "forests and parks" in Sussex and for Edward (the King's son) and send them to Windsor "finding salt to salt them".⁴⁸ It is quite possible that at least some of these deer came from the Arundel area.⁴⁹ However there is no documentary evidence to prove that there was a park at Arundel until March 1244 when timber from 12 oaks in the park of Arundel was mentioned in the Close Rolls.⁵⁰ On 4 November 1244 Henry III authorised expenses to be allocated to Geoffrey de Langele and Henry the Breton for administering the lands of Hugh d'Aubigny. This included a payment of "46s. 9d. for the livery of a park-keeper [in Arundel] at 1½d. daily".⁵¹ Since the park-keeper at Dunhurst received the same sum as did others in other counties, it would suggest that 1½d was the usual daily rate for a park-keeper in 1244. Presumably the administrators had borne the cost of paying for 374 days of park-keeping since the death of the 5th Earl and that money was now being recovered from Henry III.

The Inquisition post-mortem for John FitzAlan, 7th Earl of Arundel who died in 1272 stated that there were 28 acres of meadow in the park and that a parker rendered annually for his bailiwick a silver cup worth 13s. 4d.⁵² A more detailed account was given in the Ministers' and Receivers' accounts in 1275 including an outline of the bounds and that there were two deer-leaps on the east and two on the west side of the park and a number of gates were mentioned as was the sale of underwood.⁵³ The mention of meadow land in 'Parkwysse' merely confirms the presence of a park.

On 23 May 1276 an entry in the Close Rolls recorded, for the first time, the presence of deer in the Great Park: *To the sheriff of Sussex, keeper of the forest and park of Arundel. The king is sending to him Henry de Kendor, his huntsman, to take twenty bucks in the said forest and pork for the king's use, as the king has enjoined upon him, and the king orders the sheriff to permit him to take the bucks there, and to aid and counsel him, as he shall direct the sheriff on the king's behalf, and to cause reasonable expenses to be found for him and his dogs whilst they shall stay there for this purpose.*⁵⁴ It is likely that dogs were being used to drive the deer into nets so that they could be captured and transported elsewhere.

Further references to deer were made in the 1301 estate survey of the lands of the Earls of Arundel: "a large park with grazing worth £1 and 5. 0d. in pannage; 5 buck and 7 does may be taken there

⁴⁵ (ed) L.F. Salzman, *The Victoria County History: Sussex*, Volume I p. 431.

⁴⁶ Robert Liddiard, *Op. Cit.*

⁴⁷ W.S. Ellis, *The Parks and Forests of Sussex*, H. Wolff, Lewes, 1885 pp. vi-vii.

⁴⁸ Calendar of Liberate Rolls, 27 Henry III 17 July 1243.

⁴⁹ The pickled heads of eight boar that were demanded were to come from the Lewes area. *Ibid.* p. 196.

⁵⁰ Calendar of Close Rolls, 29 Henry III 29 March 1244.

⁵¹ Calendar of Liberate Rolls, 29 Henry III 4 November 1244.

⁵² Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 1 Henry III 1272.

⁵³ Arundel Honor (Including Arundel Town, Castle, Forest, &c., Charlton, North Stoke, West Dean): [Sussex] Description of Officer: Keeper TNA: SC 6/1019/22. Special Collection, Ministers' and Receivers' Accounts, General Series Bundle 1019. 3-4 Edward I 20 November 1274 to 19 November 1276. See VCH

⁵⁴ Calendar of Close Rolls, 4 Edward I 23 May 1276.

every year.”⁵⁵ It was the same 1301 survey which recorded for the first time a second park in Arundel: “The grazing in the small park is worth 5s. 0d., and 2 buck and 2 does may be taken there every year.”⁵⁶ There is no clear indication when or which of the Earls of Arundel created a second or ‘Little park’. Arundel was one of eight parks in Sussex which Edmund, Earl of Kent claimed had been broken into in 1329.⁵⁷

It is not clear from the accounts whether Henry VIII was hunting at Petworth or Arundel during his visit in August 1526,⁵⁸ but in a survey taken in 1570 it was stated that there were 300 or 400 fallow deer and about 24 red deer in the parks at Arundel, including about 30 fallow deer in the Little park. Furthermore, the pales were “in a conveynient state of reparacion⁵⁹ When Lieutenant Hammond passed through on his tour to the western counties he noted that there were stately herds of deer in Arundel.⁶⁰

In a document, written in January 1606, Thomas Howard, 21st Earl of Arundel (1586-1646) complained about the poaching of deer from Arundel Great Park and Selhurst park “both wch saide Parkes nowe are and for all tyme whereof the memorie of man is not contrarie have been nvyroned and fenced wth pales and mayneteyned and kept speceallie for the breed’ and preservacon of ffallowe deare”.⁶¹ This indicates that by the late Tudor period Arundel Great Park was used for breeding and rearing fallow deer.

There is no doubt that during the Civil War period the Arundel deer parks suffered serious damage. During or after the 1643-1644 sieges first by Royalist and then Parliamentary forces a large proportion of the park pales were destroyed. The depredations continued and in 1644 William March, on behalf of the Earl of Arundel, petitioned Parliament on a number of occasions to stop timber being taken from his forests, chases and parks in Sussex and from the killing of his deer and the throwing down of the park pales. James Hines of Arundel had sold large quantities of the Earl’s timber and Henry Howell and James Pinfold had taken timber to their own houses.⁶² Despite this, the parks continued to be maintained as deer parks. Repairs were carried out from 1657 onwards, but it is not clear how extensive these were and then the heard was replenished from Cowdray park.⁶³ A description of Arundel park drawn up in 1661 noted that it had 823 acres.⁶⁴

It appears that the Great park was let in 1702 and became a rabbit warren.⁶⁵ This probably marked the end of Arundel Great park as a deer park. However Little park continued to hold deer. The 1791 edition of *Topographer* stated that there were deer there in about 1750.⁶⁶

The Rewell, a wood to the west of the Great park, had also been used occasionally to keep deer. In an Inquisition post-mortem taken on 15 January 1331 ‘en la roule’ was one of the six woods in the

⁵⁵ Clough, M. (ed.), *Op. Cit.* p. 2.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 3 Edward III, 22 May 1329.

⁵⁸ Letters and Papers Henry VIII, volume iv p. 1058 4 August 1526.

⁵⁹ Arundel Castle Archives MD 535 f. 6v. The survey of the Erle of Arrundell his Landes which bene assurid in Rev’con to my L. of Sur[rey] Taken by Robert Harrys and John Dawbis alias Dobbs.

⁶⁰ L. G. Wickham Legg (ed.) *Relation of A Short Survey of the Western Counties*, Camden Miscellany, volume xvi (1936).

⁶¹ TNA: STAC 8/45/17 Earl of Arundel v Goringe, January 1606.

⁶² Mary Hervey, *The Life, Correspondence and Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel: ‘Father of Vertu in England’*, Artemis, 2005 pp. 445-6.

⁶³ Arundel Castle Archives A 262. Honours of Arundel and Bramber. Rentals and disbursements, 1657- 1662.

⁶⁴ A Description of Arrundell Parke, the Ruells, the Rooks Wood, & Meades belonging to the Right Honourable Thomas Duke of Norfolk Earle of Arrundell, Surrey, & Norfolk, herein particularly described By W: Cavell. Arundel Castle Archives PM 87 cited in VCH.

⁶⁵ Arundel Castle Archives A339 Manor and Borough of Arundel. Quitrentals and stewards’ papers, 1680-1804. 25 docs. (B2, box 1) quoted in VCH.

⁶⁶ *Topographer*, volume iii (1791) p. 202 cited in VCH.

free chase of Arundel with deer.⁶⁷ The last mention was in the mid-seventeenth century.⁶⁸ Deer continued to be present in the Forest of Arundel into the twentieth century.

⁶⁷ Inquisition post-mortem, 4 Edward III 15 January 1331.

⁶⁸ Arundel Castle Archives A 262 Honours of Arundel and Bramber. Rentals and disbursements, 1657- 1662. Cited in VCH.

Cocking

Cocking, like so much of west Sussex, was held by Earl Roger of Montgomery at the time of the Domesday Book (1086). Robert, son of Tetbald, was his sub-tenant and the manor descended through the FitzRalph family until Sarah FitzRalph married Roger de Bavant and brought the manor of Cocking with her in the 13th century.

Adam de Bavant (died 1292) was granted the right of 'liberam chaciam' or free chase in his manor of 'Kockyng' in 1279, but the Earls of Arundel were allowed to hunt there as well.⁶⁹ Since Cocking was noted as one of the bounds of the forest of Arundel, it is not surprising that the Earls had a particular interest in the area.⁷⁰ Adam de Bavant's grandson, Roger de Bavant (1304-1355), sold the manor of Cocking to Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (d1376) in 1339.⁷¹

The first reference to a park at Cocking was on 12 October 1349 when Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (d1376) complained that Richard Gamelyn and others had hunted in his park at Cocking "and took and carried away deer".⁷² The case might have been brought because his parks had been entered into or because he wanted to establish that he, alone, had rights over these parks. On 28 January 1350 the complaints were repeated.⁷³ The problems, though, continued as in January 1356 the Earl complained "that some evildoers broke his parks ... and free chaces", including Cocking and Cockynghay "hunted in them and carried away deer".⁷⁴ Far from the matter being resolved, the conflict grew as on 18 October 1357 the Earl alleged that the park at Cocking had been broken into again and they had "assaulted his men and servant at Cockyng at divers times."⁷⁵

The manor of Cocking continued to be one of the possessions of the Earls of Arundel and it was mentioned in a Feet of Fines in 1448 as belonging to William FitzAlan, 16th Earl of Arundel (1417-1487).⁷⁶ At some time in the second half of the 15th or first half of the 16th century the manor of Cocking passed to the College of the Holy Trinity in Arundel. This is known only because in 1544 the manor of 'Cokkyng' was one of those granted to Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580) following the suppression of the chantries.⁷⁷

Cocking was one of the numerous manors and parks that came into the hands of John, Lord Lumley (1533-1609) in the mid-sixteenth century. In the early 1550s Lumley had married Jane FitzAlan (c1538-1577) the daughter of Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580). It is possible that Cocking and its park were part of the marriage contract, but the transfer of land from FitzAlan to Lumley and his heirs was only formalised in a Feet of Fines dated Easter 1566.⁷⁸ However, Lumley did not hold the land for long and in 1584 he sold Anthony Browne, 1st Viscount Montagu (1528-1592) the "mannor park ferme and demesnes of Cockinge" including "the libertie of park and warren".⁷⁹ The sale excluded "any forests or chaces of the said Lord Lumley called the Overholte and Westholte". The chase at Overholt was conveyed in 1609 to Thomas, Lord Darcy, Sir Thomas Walmesley and Sir James Croft.⁸⁰

⁶⁹ Placita de Quo Warranto, Edward I 1279 p. 756.

⁷⁰ Clough, M. (ed.), *Op. Cit.* p. 93.

⁷¹ L.F. Salzman (ed.), *Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, Vol. XXIII (1916) Entry 1878.

⁷² Calendar of Patent Rolls, 23 Edward III 12 October 1349.

⁷³ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 24 Edward III 28 January 1350.

⁷⁴ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 29 Edward III 16 January 1356.

⁷⁵ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 31 Edward III 18 October 1357.

⁷⁶ L.F. Salzman (ed.), *Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, Vol. XXIII (1916) Entry 3091.

⁷⁷ Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, Vol. XIX (2), 800 (35) 23 December 1544.

⁷⁸ Edwin H.W. Dunkin (ed.), *Sussex Manors, Advowsons etc recorded in the Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, (1914), Vol. XIX, p. 9.

⁷⁹ WSRO: SAS-BA/48 12 February 1584.

⁸⁰ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E431 f5. Indenture dated 14 February 1609.

No evidence has been found yet that the park at Cocking was being used for deer after the fourteenth century and a park pale was not recorded on Saxton or Speed's maps of 1575 and 1610 respectively.⁸¹

⁸¹ Christopher Saxton (1575). WSRO: PMI 19; John Speed (1610). WSRO: PMI 18;

East Dean park

As the name implies, East Dean park, along with High Standings to the west, was an area of land set aside for deer management during the medieval period. During the first year of the reign of King Richard I, 1189, there was a Pipe Roll reference to the “park land and where the court of East Dean was set” and three times the ‘Parco de Estdena’ was mentioned.⁸² It is probable that East Dean was emparked in the 12th century. It is most likely that this was done by William d’Aubigny (c1109-1176) who was the 1st Earl of Lincoln and the 1st Earl of Arundel.⁸³ He had initially acquired the Arundel lands through his wife, Adeliza, who was King Henry I’s widow and whom he had married in 1138. Henry II granted him these lands in his own right after his accession in 1154. Thereafter East Dean park was part of the estate of the Earls of Arundel and descended as those lands did: sometimes held by the family and at others of the King. According to Eustace, East Dean was in the hands of the King between 1102 and 1135 and again from 1176 to 1191.⁸⁴ It is unlikely, therefore, that anyone other than William d’Aubigny would have gone to the expense of emparking. However, the first explicit reference to deer in the park at East Dean does not occur until the lands of Richard FitzAlan, 8th Earl of Arundel, were listed after his death in 1302.⁸⁵

The Earls of Arundel were involved in the political in-fighting in Edward II’s court and this led to the execution of Edmund FitzAlan, 9th Earl of Arundel (1285-1326). His estates were held initially by Edmund, Earl of Kent, Edward II’s half-brother. ‘Estdene’ was one of eight parks in Sussex which the Earl of Kent claimed had been broken into in 1329,⁸⁶ but he was executed on 3 September 1330. A survey of his estates was made on 4 January 1331 and this included references to “houses in the park” and the “park with deer” in East Dean.⁸⁷ On 30 March 1335 Richard FitzAlan, the 10th Earl of Arundel, complained that 12 people “had broken into his parks at ... Eleden ... hunted there and carried away deer”.⁸⁸ Furthermore he accused 13 people, including Henry Gerlaund, the Dean of Chichester, of entering the same six Sussex parks (including the nearby Downley and Arundel parks) and cutting down and taking away timber and other goods.⁸⁹ The fact that 24 people were named suggests that the 10th Earl had a need to establish his rights over his newly acquired inheritance.

Later the land came into the hands of John, Lord Lumley (1533-1609) in the mid-sixteenth century. In about 1550 John Lumley married Jane FitzAlan (c1538-1577) the daughter of Henry FitzAlan, the 19th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580). It is possible that East Dean was part of the marriage contract, but the transfer of land from FitzAlan to Lumley and his heirs was formalised in a Feet of Fines dated Easter 1566.⁹⁰ John, Lord Lumley, had little direct contact with East Dean park as he was custodian of and lived at Nonsuch Palace in Surrey.

In 1570 a Survey was taken by order of Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, (1536-1572) by Robert Harris and John Dobbs of manors etc. in Sussex belonging to the Earl of Arundel. East Dean park is described as having a circuit of one mile and three-quarters “wherin are 2 parcellis of wood, moste thereof being beche And ther ben at this present within the said Parke, aboute 200 deare, the

⁸² Pipe Roll, I Richard I, 1189. Accessed at: <https://archive.org/details/cu31924028014946>

⁸³ Tierney (chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk) argued that William d’Aubigny was the fourth Earl of Arundel. See: M.A. Tierney, *The History and Antiquities of the Castle and Town of Arundel*, London, 1834.

⁸⁴ G.W. Eustace, *Arundel: Borough and Castle*, London, 1922 p.34 and p. 40.

⁸⁵ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem iv, 90. Cited in *The Victoria County History, Op. Cit.* p. 95.

⁸⁶ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 3 Edward III, 22 May 1329 p. 429.

⁸⁷ Calendar of Inquisition post-mortem of Edmund, Earl of Kent, 4 Edward III, [1331].

⁸⁸ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 9 Edward III, 30 March 1335.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ Edwin H.W. Dunkin (ed.), *Sussex Manors, Advowsons etc recorded in the Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, (1914), Vol. XIX, p. 9.

pale thereof beinge in goo[sic] state of reperation".⁹¹ The Survey added that Sir Henry Weston (1534-1592) was the keeper and "under hym a servant of his, that taketh chardge, who dwellith in the lodge there, mete for a keiper and haith in Fee £3 10d by yere and 6 milke beastes pastured".⁹² This suggests that at the end of 1570 East Dean was a fully functioning deer park.

There only appears to be one later reference to deer being at East Dean park. The estate accounts of John, Lord Lumley for 1581 state that 'wild beasts' were transferred from Goodwood and East Dean to Stansted.⁹³

The LiDAR survey shows buildings centred on 489920 111980 and these are visible on the ground. A building also appears on a map drawn up of the Arundel estate in 1590 or possibly a little earlier.⁹⁴ When the 22nd Earl, Henry FitzAlan (1544-1580), died the Arundel estate passed through his daughter, Mary, to his grandson, Philip Howard, the Earl of Surrey. The map was drawn up for him, probably some time in the 1580s.

Lord Lumley sold East Dean manor (including the park) to Sir Peter Garton (a London man who had been an ironmonger) in 1589.⁹⁵ Peter Garton's father, Giles Garton, had already purchased Woolavington manor and park and Graffham manor from the Earl of Arundel and Lord Lumley in 1578. Peter Garton had been to St John's College, Cambridge in 1583 and was admitted at Gray's Inn in 1584. He married Judith Sherley on 9 May 1592 and the settlement between Peter Garton and Judith Sherley made on 7 May 1592 stated that Peter Garton (and his father, Giles Garton (1540-1593)) shall be seized of East Dean park late demised by Thomas Allen for 21 years from 25 March 1592 at an annual rent of £65.⁹⁶

Peter Garton, who died on 21 August 1606, and his wife, Judith, had nine children. He left two-thirds of his manor and lands in East Dean to Judith. To his son, Giles Garton, he left "all that woodland called by the name of Charleton wood scituate in Estdeene and Charlton, as the same now lyeth inclosed or fenced." He left the warren in East Dean to another son, Henry.⁹⁷ It is not clear whether East Dean park remained in the hands of the widow Judith Garton until her death in 1641 or if it passed to Henry Garton (1600-1641) along with the warren. However East Dean park probably became the property of William Garton (born 1641), the son of Henry Garton and his wife Dorothy Whitmore.⁹⁸ Eventually East Dean park passed to Robert Orme whose mother, Mary Garton, was Henry Garton's sister. She had married Humphrey Orme (1593-1653) and although Judith Garton's will did not make any references to land-holdings, the East Dean estate eventually descended to the Orme family.⁹⁹ This probably happened before William Garton, who had been declared a 'lunatic', died in 1675. Initially East Dean passed to Humphrey Orme and Mary Garton's son Robert Orme (1638-1669) and then he was succeeded by his son, Robert Orme MP (1669-1711) and he in turn by his son Garton Orme. Garton Orme (1696-1758) was MP for Arundel as well as Lord of the Manor in East Dean. Accusations of electoral corruption and other financial dealings left him in serious difficulties. In 1750 a private Act of Parliament allowed him to sell his estates and his daughter's

⁹¹ Arundel Castle Archives, MD 535, entitled The survey of the Erle of Arundell his Landes which bene assurid in Rev'con to my L. of Sur[rey] Taken by Robert Harrys and John Dawbis alias Dobbs. Fol. 32v. Thanks are due to James Kenny for supplying this reference.

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ Earl of Bessborough with Clive Aslet, *Enchanted Forest: The Story of Stansted in Sussex*, London, 1984 p. 30.

⁹⁴ Arundel Castle Archives PM 193. This map included six parks with palings, including East Dean park. Thanks are due to James Kenny for supplying this reference.

⁹⁵ Edwin H.W. Dunkin (ed.), *Sussex Manors, Advowsons etc recorded in the Feet of Fines in Sussex* Record Society, London, (1914), Vol. XIX, p. 142.

⁹⁶ WSRO: Lavington/95.

⁹⁷ PCC PROB 11; Piece: 109. The will of Sir Peeter Garton of Wo[o]lavington Probate: 22 April 1607. The land referred to is almost certainly to the north of the current village of East Dean.

⁹⁸ This is discussed in the will of Dorothy Garton of Woolavington PCC PROB 11; Piece: 210 Probate: 5 November 1649.

⁹⁹ PCC PROB 11; Piece: 189. The will of Judith Garton of Wo[o]lavington Probate: 9 May 1642.

portion for the payment of his debts. In 1752 he sold the East Dean estate for £12,000. According to 'The History of Parliament' he had an appalling reputation. "According to tradition, he got rid of his first wife by pushing her down a well, a story which received some support in 1845, when one of the Orme coffins on being opened was found to be full of stones. He was also supposed to have hired a highwayman to waylay his daughter on her way to London to protest against his alienation of her patrimony. For many years it was the tradition for owners and heirs of Lavington to commemorate him by spitting when they came to the boundary of the East Dean estate."¹⁰⁰ The Manor Court Rolls for Eastdeane (as it was consistently spelled) for 1676 to 1717 when Robert Orme and then Garton Orme were Lords of the Manor contain no references to East Dean park nor were there any indications that villagers were responsible for maintaining the pale. However, the records do show that there were about 25 customary tenants in the manor during this period.¹⁰¹

A detailed map of the estate was drawn up in 1597 by Richard Allin for Peter Garton.¹⁰² It shows about 305 acres enclosed with what looks like a pale. Trees are drawn on the map to indicate a wooded area. The map shows that most of what is now East Dean Park was held by Ralph Middleton (101 acres), with the southernmost portion being held by William Love and Thomas Hulle (69 acres). This indicates that East Dean park had been disparked by 1597. Since the last reference to deer in East Dean park was in 1581, it would appear that although a park pale remained for a while, East Dean park was disparked between 1581 and 1597. Middleton had leased the rectory and parsonage of Boxgrove and some land from John, Lord Lumley on 28 February 1585.¹⁰³ East Dean park is not shown as a park on Richard Budgen's map of 1724¹⁰⁴ (although Selhurst park is indicated) which reinforces the probability that the land was disparked by the end of the 16th century and probably around 1589 when Lumley sold the estate to Garton. There are linear boundaries marked between the landholdings within East Dean park, but of the owners only Ralph Middleton of Boxgrove appears to have made a will.¹⁰⁵ His eldest son, William, inherited his estate in 1621, but there are no references in his will to any specific parcels of land. It is worth noting that Middleton had lived at Nonsuch, where he must have met John, Lord Lumley, before coming to Sussex.¹⁰⁶

The East Dean estate was purchased by Sir Matthew Fetherstonehaugh, who had bought Uppark in 1747. He exchanged East Dean in the 1770s with Charles Lennox, 3rd Duke of Richmond (1735-1806).

Sir Matthew Fetherstonehaugh had a map drawn up in about 1756¹⁰⁷ and this was the second to show non-boundary features within East Dean park itself. Three 'cartways' were marked: all three ran between the north-east corner and the south-west at Counters Gate. Little gates were marked on the map in these two locations. It appears that these were alternative way of reaching Goodwood and Molecomb House from the village of East Dean (and vice-versa). The fact that a building was not marked on this map suggests that it had fallen out of use by 1756.

Yeakell drew up a map for the Duke of Richmond in the 1770s¹⁰⁸ to show the land he had swapped with Sir Matthew Fetherstonehaugh. It indicated four trackways across East Dean Park, but no other

¹⁰⁰ The History of Parliament. Accessed at: <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1715-1754/member/orme-garton-1696-1758> Date accessed: 21/3/2015.

¹⁰¹ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E49. One roll of 26 folios written on both sides mostly in Latin.

¹⁰² WSRO: Add Mss 48 838.

¹⁰³ WSRO: Goodwood E290.

¹⁰⁴ WSRO: copy of Reynolds 124.

¹⁰⁵ PCC PROB 11; Piece: 138. The will of Ralph Middleton of Boxgrove Probate: 26 November 1621.

¹⁰⁶ WSRO: Ep/1/1 1/9 Diocese and Archdeaconry of Chichester Deposition Book April 1599-Nov 1603 f 245. Deponent: Ralph Middleton gent. of Boxgrove. Lived Boxgrove 16 years. Before lived Nonesuche, Surrey 12 years. Born Cleveland, Yorks. Age 52. Wit. sign. Date: 23 July 1603

¹⁰⁷ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E4995.

¹⁰⁸ WSRO: Ms55 accessed at MF 290 (b).

features were marked. According to the Administrative History in the WSRO catalogue, the papers of the 3rd Duke of Richmond have not survived.

Another map drawn up Yeakell in 1781 names the area to the west of East Dean park as High Standings.¹⁰⁹ This name is highly suggestive as a stand was often put up close to the scene of a hunt so that it could be viewed. It was only after 1781 that the area came to be called Park Hill.

The tithe map of 1846/7 showed that the easternmost part of the area had been taken into arable production and that there were a number of trackways across East Dean park. There were no other features marked.

The first Ordnance Survey map, 1874, did not show any additional features, but the 1897¹¹⁰ second edition and 1912¹¹¹ third edition marked the well, two banks, 'old ruins' in the case of the second edition and 'ruins' in the case of the third, as well as a bank enclosing the area to the west, south and east. There was no obvious evidence in the census returns (between 1861 and 1911) that the buildings centred on 489920 111980 had human occupation. However it is likely that this was one of two buildings (the other was at Stansted Park) referred to by Salzman as "something in the nature of hunting lodges".¹¹² Following the beheading in 1397 of Richard FitzAlan, the 11th Earl of Arundel, for treason, an inventory of his estates was drawn up. According to Salzman this recorded: "At 'the house (manso) called Estdene in the park there' there were 16 table boards, with 11 pair of trestles, 12 forms, and a chair of Flanders – worth in all 10s. Also 'an old and worn-out cauldron' – 2s., and 3 pieces of old lead roofing buildings – 6s. 8d."¹¹³

¹⁰⁹ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E 30. A Terrier of the Manors of Boxgrove and Halnaker in the County of Sussex, The Jurisdictions and Royalties belonging to His Grace the Duke of Richmond &c. &c. 1781. Yeakell and Gardner, Surveyors.

¹¹⁰ Ordnance Survey Second edition (1897) Sheet XLVIII. 8.

¹¹¹ Ordnance Survey Third edition (1912) Sheet XLVIII. 8.

¹¹² L.F. Salzman, *The Property of the Earl of Arundel 1397*, Sussex Archaeological Collection, Vol. 91 p. 41, 1953.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

Selhurst

That the area around Selhurst was conducive to deer was demonstrated by Allen when he noted the presence of the bones of 13 red deer during the late Iron Age.¹¹⁴ There is, though, no suggestion that these deer were farmed or that there was a continuity of deer management in the area.

Selhurst park was in the parish of East Dean and, as such, it is not always easy to distinguish between Selhurst park and East Dean park in written records. Selhurst was held by the Earls of Arundel and the first reference to deer there was in the early 14th century. In an inquisition taken on 19 March 1302 following the death of Richard FitzAlan, 8th Earl of Arundel (1266-1302) Selhurst was named as one of '6 woods with deer in the free chace'.¹¹⁵ This was repeated in the inquisition for Edmund FitzAlan, 9th Earl of Arundel (1285-1326) in 1326, but in addition there was a reference to a park called 'Selers'.¹¹⁶ 'Sellers' was one of eight parks in Sussex which Edmund, Earl of Kent claimed had been broken into in 1329.¹¹⁷

Another inquisition, taken in 1331 concerning the land and property to be returned to Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (died 1376), referred to 'a new park called 'Shelerth'.¹¹⁸ Although no licence to empark has been found, there is little doubt that Selhurst was emparked between 1302 and 1326 and therefore Edmund FitzAlan, 9th Earl of Arundel was responsible for the emparking. Edmund FitzAlan had a troubled relationship with King Edward II, but his son Richard married the eldest daughter of Hugh Despenser in 1321. During the 1320s Hugh Despenser was Edward II's closest confidant and advisor and it is possible that one of Edmund FitzAlan's rewards for bringing the Despenser family into the Arundel title and for helping to suppress the 1322 rebellion by Roger Mortimer and others was to be allowed to empark Selhurst.

In an estate survey probably taken for Thomas FitzAlan, 12th Earl of Arundel (1381-1415) in the early 15th century there are references to both a park and a forest of 'Selersshe'.¹¹⁹

Selhurst continued into the early modern period as one of the Earls of Arundel's parks. The 1570 Survey of the estates of the Earl of Arundel show that it was being actively managed and maintained as a deer park. Not only did the Lodge have a keeper living in it, but there were about 110 deer and "the moste parte of the pale aboute the parke have bene newly amendid within theis ii yeres paste, and the rest is appoynted to be done this yere as we bene informed".¹²⁰ A map dating to perhaps the late 1580s in the Arundel Archives¹²¹ shows the fence around Selhurst park as being almost rectangular. A map drawn up by Richard Allin in 1597 marked Selhurst park but it was not denoted by a pale.¹²² However the map was designed to show the manors of East Dean, Lavington and Graffham and not Selhurst, so no conclusion can be drawn from the lack of a fence. That the fence was still there is demonstrated by the fact that in 1606 Thomas Howard, 21st Earl of Arundel (1585-1646) accused Sir Henry Goringe, Sheriff of Sussex and Surrey and others of breaking the fence at Selhurst park and stealing deer.¹²³ He complained about the poaching of deer from Arundel Great

¹¹⁴ Martyn G. Allen, *Excavations at Middle Barn, Selhurst Park Farm, West Sussex, Report on the animal bones*, April 2012. p. 3. Accessed at: https://www.academia.edu/9548202/Excavations_at_Middle_Barn_Selhurst_Park_Farm_West_Sussex_BX05-08_Report_on_the_animal_bones

¹¹⁵ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 30 Edward I 19 March 1302.

¹¹⁶ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 20 Edward II January 1326.

¹¹⁷ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 3 Edward III, 22 May 1329 p. 429.

¹¹⁸ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem 4 Edward III 15 January 1331.

¹¹⁹ Clough, M. (ed.), *Op. Cit.* p. 94. There is a discussion of the dating of the manuscript on pp. xxvi-xxvii.

¹²⁰ Arundel Castle Archives, MD 535 entitled The survey of the Erle of Arundell his Landes which bene assurid in Rev'con to my L. of Sur[rey] Taken by Robert Harrys and John Dawbis alias Dobbs. 1570.

¹²¹ Arundel Castle Archives: PM193.

¹²² WSRO: AddMss 48838. Map of the Manors of East Dean, Old Lavington and Graffham, in East Dean, Graffham and East Lavington, by Richard Allin 1597.

¹²³ TNA: STAC 8/45/17 Earl of Arundel v Goringe, January 1606.

Park and Selhurst park “both wch saide Parkes nowe are and for all tyme whereof the memorie of man is not contrarie have been nvyroned and fenced wth pales and mayneteyned and kept speceallie for the breed’ and preservacon of ffallowe deare”.¹²⁴ This indicates that by the late Tudor period Selhurst park was used for breeding and rearing fallow deer.

A map drawn up in 1629 by Thomas Kington shows part of a park paling south of Selhurst park farm.¹²⁵ It is named ‘Seabeach parke’ and is recorded as being 52 acres 3 rods and 2 perches. There are no internal features marked in the park, but the area is covered with trees. Just to the west of ‘Seabeach parke’ is ‘The High Laune’ which was 20 acres and 16 perches in extent. A park pale is drawn in perspective view on the south and western sides of ‘Seabeach parke’ and ‘The High Laune’, but the boundary on the east and north sides appears to be a hedge. It is possible that this area had been the southern boundary of Selhurst park, but no written evidence has been found so far to confirm this.

As late as 1666 there was a legal dispute between Richard Halsey and Owen Ludgater about ‘a park which is called Selhurst park’.¹²⁶ It is not clear whether Selhurst was still being used as a park or whether the name was a legacy of its earlier use. The same is true about documents dated 1756 and 1757 in a dispute about the ownership of part of the park between Edward Howard, 9th Duke of Norfolk and Sir Matthew Fetherstonhaugh.¹²⁷

¹²⁴ TNA: STAC 8/45/17 Earl of Arundel v Goringe, January 1606.

¹²⁵ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E4982 The true Plott and Contents of the Mannor of Oldburie and Sebeach Holden of his Maiestie by Lease to Sirr William Morley Knight Taken by Thomas Kington. 1629.

¹²⁶ TNA: E 134/18Chas2/Mich9 Halsey v Ludgater, 1666.

¹²⁷ Arundel Castle Archives: MD 1296.

Woolavington

At the time of the Norman conquest 'Levitone' (which later became Woolavington and is now East Lavington) was held by Osbern. He was a favoured clerk and a relative of Edward the Confessor.¹²⁸ However, Osbern worked with William I and not only kept his lands, which included Elsted, but was given further holdings in Bosham and was made Bishop of Exeter in 1072. When Osbern died in 1103 he passed his manors to the See of Exeter.

It is not clear when the Bishops of Exeter's overlordship of Woolavington ended, but in the 1230s John de Gatesden (1184-1258) acquired holdings in Sussex such as Trotton and Woolavington. The Inquisition post-mortem on his son, another John de Gatesden, confirmed that in 1269 he held Woolavington. The manor then passed either to his son, yet another John de Gatesden, or to his daughter, Margaret de Gatesden (1248-1311). On her marriage the manor passed to her first husband, John de Camoys, but then to her second husband, William Paynel (1260-1317).

Woolavington was not mentioned as one of the manors held by Richard FitzAlan, 8th Earl of Arundel (1266-1302) in the inquisition following his death taken on 19 March 1302.¹²⁹ However, in 1315 Edmund FitzAlan, 9th Earl of Arundel (1285-1326) made a grant of the manor of Woolavington for life to William Paynel.¹³⁰ This would suggest that the Earls of Arundel acquired the manor of Woolavington some time between 1302 and 1315. According to the Feet of Fines, the Earl of Arundel granted the manor of 'wollavinton' to William Peynel to "hold for life by render of a rose at Nativity of St John Baptist, with reversion to Edmund [FitzAllan] and his heirs".¹³¹ Payment of a single rose on 24 June each year can not be regarded as an economically viable contract, but no documentation has been found which helps to explain why William Peynel, who owned Woolavington through his wife, was granted the same manor for life by the Earl of Arundel.

When an inquisition was held for Edmund FitzAlan, 9th Earl of Arundel (1285-1326) in 1326, Woolavington was named as one of his parks.¹³² 'Wollavynton' was one of eight parks in Sussex which Edmund, Earl of Kent claimed had been broken into in 1329.¹³³ In 1331 'Wollavyngton' was described as a park with deer.¹³⁴ Whether Woolavington was a deer park before it was acquired by the Earls of Arundel has not been possible to determine. In 1237 John de Gatesden had been granted free warren in his demesne lands at Trotton and Didling.¹³⁵ He, his son, or his grandson did go on to create a deer park at Trotton because in 1335 Ralph de Camoys (his grandson) complained that Hugh de Bouoy and others "broke his parks at, Tradyngton [Trotton], Deniford and Alkesbourn, co. Sussex, hunted there and carried away deer, and his goods at the said towns of Tradyngton and Alkesbourn, and at Elnestede, Dydelynge, Rogate, Bradewatere, Durynglon, Benyngden and Berccampe".¹³⁶ This suggests a family interest in hunting, but no such documents have been found relating to Woolavington.

¹²⁸ Frank Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, Eyre Methuen, 1970 pp. 150, 164.

¹²⁹ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 30 Edward I 19 March 1302.

¹³⁰ L.F. Salzman (ed.), *Feet of Fines in Sussex* Record Society, London, Vol. XXIII (1916) Entry 1411.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 20 Edward II January 1326.

¹³³ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 3 Edward III, 22 May 1329.

¹³⁴ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 4 Edward III 15 January 1331.

¹³⁵ Calendar of Charter Rolls, i 231. 'Grant to John de Gatesden and his heirs of free warren in his demesnes of Tatinton [Trotton] and Dudelinges [Didling]'.

¹³⁶ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 8 Edward III 3 July 1334.

On 12 October 1349 Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (d1376) complained that Richard Gamelyn and others had hunted in his park at Woolavington “and took and carried away deer”.¹³⁷ On 28 January 1350 and 16 January 1356 the complaints were repeated confirming that the park was being used for deer during the mid-14th century.¹³⁸

During the 14th century Woolavington park was not used exclusively for deer. In 1397 Richard FitzAlan, 11th Earl of Arundel (1346-1397) directed Thomas Chamberlayne, the master of Arundel forest, to allow the parson of Woolavington to have ‘common of pasture’ for “one bull and 6 kyne in the parke of Wollavyngton to go there from hockdaye untyll the feast of the hollie crosse and for vj hogges in the tyme of mast that is to saye frome the feast of Saint Michaell unto the feast of saint Martyne next ensuyng yearly as of Ryght it doith partayne to his churche.”¹³⁹ This meant that the parson could use the park for one bull and six cows during the Summer as Hock day was the Tuesday two weeks after Easter and the feast of the Holy Cross was on 14 September. Furthermore, the parson could feed six of his pigs on the mast (the fruit of the beech, oak and other trees) between 29 September and 11 November.

As early as 24 May 1566 John, Lord Lumley (1533-1609) mortgaged Woolavington park, and other nearby land, for one year to Edward Jackeman and Richard Lamberte, two London Aldermen.¹⁴⁰ The agreement mentions the park, but it does not give any further details about it. The financial exigencies faced by Lord Lumley continued and on 20 June 1574 27 leases for 10,000 years each were agreed between Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580), John, Lord Lumley and his wife Jane and numerous local yeoman and others.¹⁴¹ None of these agreements make any specific references to a deer park, except where the boundary of a holding abutted the deer park.

The Earls of Arundel and the Lumley family finally ended their interest in Woolavington park in 1578 when Woolavington Manor, Woolavington park and Graffham manor were purchased for £4,000 by Giles Garton, a London ironmonger.¹⁴² Giles Garton’s son, Peter Garton, later purchased East Dean park in 1589.¹⁴³ In neither the case of Woolavington nor East Dean is there any evidence that the Garton family used the park for deer. However, when in 1593 Peter Garton assigned dower to his father’s widow, Margaret Garton, it included Woolavington park.¹⁴⁴ The agreement refers to “all that the park or grounde inclosed wch somtymes was stored & replenished wth deare wch was sumtymes kept & used for the keepinge cherishinge & breedinge deare nowe or late commonly called or known by the name of wollavington park ... now in the occupation of Peter Garton and divers others.”¹⁴⁵ This strongly suggest that, in the late Tudor period at least, Woolavington park was not used for hunting but for fattening and breeding dear.

¹³⁷ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 23 Edward III 12 October 1349.

¹³⁸ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 24 Edward III 28 January 1350 and Calendar of Patent Rolls, 29 Edward III 16 January 1356.

¹³⁹ WSRO: Lavington Mss 145 – copy of a 1397 document.

¹⁴⁰ WSRO: Lavington Mss 149 ff15r-16v.

¹⁴¹ Eric E. Barker, *Some Woolavington and Wonworth Leases*, SAC vol XCIV (1956) pp. 43-69.

¹⁴² Calendar of Close Rolls, P.R.O., C. 54/1032-1578.

¹⁴³ Edwin H.W. Dunkin (ed.), *Sussex Manors, Advowsons etc recorded in the Feet of Fines in Sussex Record Society*, London, (1914), Vol. XIX, p. 142.

¹⁴⁴ WSRO: Lavington Mss 21.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

A map drawn up in 1597 refers explicitly to 'Old Lavington Park'.¹⁴⁶ The park pale is shown on the map but internally the park is divided into numerous separate holdings with many different tenants. The largest field, which was 57 acres and did have trees marked on it, belonged to Nicholas Ide, but its use at the time – possibly coppicing – is not known. One of the tenants was Thomas Allin, presumably a relative of the map-maker Richard Allin. Two of the fields were named 'park meadow' (one of two acres and one of three) and were reminders of the days when it was a deer park.

¹⁴⁶ WSRO: AddMss 48838. Map of the Manors of East Dean, Old Lavington and Graffham, in East Dean, Graffham and East Lavington, by Richard Allin 1597.

Halnaker

The place-name has been spelled in numerous ways. According to Steer, the modern Halnaker comes from *Healfanaecer* meaning half a strip of ploughed land.¹⁴⁷ However, the VCH argues that the derivation from O.E. *healfanaecer*, 'half a strip of ploughed land' is very improbable because the -er termination did not appear until the 14th century.¹⁴⁸ Halnaker is also named Helneche, Halnacre, Halfnaked, Halfnakere, Halnaked, Halnak, Halnac, Haunak and numerous other derivatives.

The earliest written record of any hunting in Halnaker comes on 22 October 1253 when Robert de St. John (c1200-1266) was granted free warren on his lands.¹⁴⁹ However, there is no conclusive evidence whether it was he, or his son, John St. John (c1225-1302), who emparked Halnaker.

On 19 June 1283 a commission was set up to go to John St. John's 'old park of Halfnaked and view and adjudge upon the recent accretion of 60 acres which he has made there and enclosed with a dyke and hedge in such a way that deer can get in as it were by a deer-leap but cannot get out, to the damage of the king and of his ward' Richard FitzAlan (1267-1302) 8th Earl of Arundel. The writ for the commission goes on to claim that 'that on the day of the death of John FitzAlan 7th Earl of Arundel 'the said old park of Halfnaked was enclosed with a hedge in such a way that deer could get neither in nor out'.¹⁵⁰ Since John FitzAlan died on 18 March 1272 a precise date can be given for enclosing with a hedge. However, it was referred to as 'the old park' of Halnaker and it is possible that the enlargement by 60 acres took place then and that a park at Halnaker was created even earlier. There was a reference in 1329 to Halnaker park containing 150 acres (and being two leagues in circuit in 1337).¹⁵¹ If this is correct, it is possible that before 1272 the park covered about 90 acres and since it was already an 'old park' by then it increases the likelihood that the first park was created by Robert de St. John (c1200-1266).

Halnaker park was being actively used during the 14th century. During an inquiry on 13 May 1334 following the death of John St. John in 1329, Geoffrey le Taillour produced a sealed document declaring that he had the office and keeping of the park of 'Halfnaked' for his life, receiving 2d daily and 13s 1d for his robe.¹⁵²

On 7 March 1404 Hugh, the elder son of Thomas Poynings, who styled himself Lord St. John, was granted permission to empark 300 acres of his land at Halnaker. By the time Hugh predeceased his father in 1426, he does not appear to have emparked any of the 300 acres and this was only done in 1517 when Sir Thomas West (c1475-25 September 1554) and his wife, Elizabeth Bonville, through whom he had inherited Halnaker, were given licence to enclose 300 acres for a park.¹⁵³ These 300 acres became known as Goodwood park. Henry VIII certainly stayed at Halnaker as on 6 August 1526 the King left Arundel to stay at Halnaker with Thomas West.¹⁵⁴

A survey made for Thomas FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel in 1570 said that "The Parke thereof conteyneth by est[imation] iiij myles Compasse w^{ch} may yerely sustain viij^c [800] Deare, with some provi[i]on of haie in winter yf maste Fayle; and there be at this Survaye viij^c Deare as yt is enfourmed

¹⁴⁷ Francis W. Steer, *A Short History and description of Halnaker House*, no publisher, 1958 p. 1.

¹⁴⁸ Victoria County History: Sussex, Volume 4, p. 142 footnote 18.

¹⁴⁹ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 37-38 Henry III 22 October 1253.

¹⁵⁰ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 11 Edward I 19 June 1283.

¹⁵¹ WSRO: Burrell MF76, Add Mss 5689.

¹⁵² Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, John St John (died 1329) 8 Edward III, 13 May 1334.

¹⁵³ 'For Th. West and Elizabeth his wife. Licence to empark 300 acres in the lordship of Halfnaked, Sussex, as granted to Hugh, eldest son of Lord St. John, and his heirs'. Letters and Papers Henry VIII, Vol. ii, 331 l. 30 May 1517.

¹⁵⁴ Letters and Papers Henry VIII, Vol. iv, 2377 6 August 1526.

us. M^d that wthin half a furlong of Halnaker parke pale on the west side thereof lyeth a parke called Goodwoode Parke...¹⁵⁵ If the figure of 800 deer and the circumference are correct, Halnaker park was even larger than the Great Park at Arundel. According to the same survey “The soyle of the said parke is a sweet and short feede best for Deare and Sheepe.”¹⁵⁶ The 1570 Survey adds that parts of the park pale had been “Newly made and empaled and the rest is in good state of repacions at this present”.¹⁵⁷ Clearly, Halnaker was a fully-functioning deer park in 1570.

The manor of Halnaker passed into the hands of John, Lord Lumley (1533-1609) and in 1587 he sold it to John Morley of Saxham in Suffolk.¹⁵⁸ In a further document regarding the sale, dated 17 May 1587, mention is made of “the parke and groundes with pales called halfnaked parke als halnaker parke and all howses edifices, lodges” and other hereditments.¹⁵⁹ The sale also included “all manner of bucks does and wylde beastes within the parke.”¹⁶⁰

There is no evidence whether the Morley family used Halnaker park as a deer park. However, a map drawn up by Thomas Kington in 1629 shows the pale but within it there are eight large fields (covering over 150 acres), each with their own boundaries marked, and a few smaller ones as well as numerous buildings.¹⁶¹ This strongly indicates that deer were no longer being kept in the park by 1629. Sir John Morley, the son of the original purchaser, died in 1622, leaving his son and heir, William Morley, who had been born in 1606, a ward. It is possible that Halnaker ceased to be used as a deer park at this time, but it is perhaps even more likely that the Morleys never kept deer and that Halnaker ceased to be a deer park after 1587. The park pale continued to be a local landmark and in 1660 it was used to identify the location of certain fields.¹⁶²

The pale was still shown clearly on Budgen’s map of 1724,¹⁶³ but simply because the pale was extant does not mean that the land was still being used as a deer park. Sir William Morley died in 1701 and Halnaker passed to his daughter, Mary, who later married James Stanley, 10th Earl of Derby. Since he was Lord Lieutenant of Lancashire for most of their marriage it is unlikely that he spent much time in Sussex. He died in 1736 without any male heirs and his widow, Mary, did not remarry. When Mary died in 1752 the property passed to a distant relative, Sir Thomas Dyke Acland (1722-1785), who was a passionate stag hunter on Exmoor and in the Quantocks. The small park hundreds of miles from his home was of little interest to him and in 1765 he sold Halnaker to Charles Lennox, 3rd Duke of Richmond (1735-1806).¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁵ Arundel Castle Archives, MD 535 entitled The survey of the Erle of Arundell his Landes which bene assurid in Rev'con to my L. of Sur[rey] Taken by Robert Harrys and John Dawbis alias Dobbs. I gathering, 1570. Quoted in Francis W. Steer, *A Short History and description of Halnaker House*, no publisher, 1958 p. 3.

¹⁵⁶ The survey of the Erle of Arundell his Landes (1570) quoted in M.A. Lower, *Notes respecting Halnaker, Boxgrove etc*, Sussex Archaeological Collection ix (1857) p. 224.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁸ WSRO: Goodwood E288. Licence granted to John, Lord Lumley and Elizabeth to alienate to Robert Petre and John Morley 2 March 1587.

¹⁵⁹ WSRO: Goodwood E290. Conveyance from John, Lord Lumley to Robert Petre and John Morley 1587.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁶¹ WSRO: Goodwood E4981. The true Plott and Contents of Halnaker Parcke belonginge to Sr William Morley Knight taken by Thomas Kington. The larger fields were named: Rook Wood (35 acres), Bakers Hill (35 acres), The Hangar (29 acres), The Inclosure (23 acres), Hazelwood Coppice (21 acres), Great Meadow (17 acres), Little Meadow (8 acres) and Dog Kennel Wood (8 acres).

¹⁶² WSRO: Goodwood E311. Marriage settlement.

¹⁶³ WSRO: PM249 Plate 5. Richard Budgen (1724).

¹⁶⁴ WSRO: Goodwood E334-344. Deeds relating to the conveyance of the Halnaker estate to Charles, 3rd Duke of Richmond for £48,400.

Stansted

Royal associations with Stansted are very strong. Even before King John (January 1215) and Queen Elizabeth I (August 1591) visited, King Henry II was there between 10 and 17 July 1177.¹⁶⁵ There are references to Richard and Ralph, the King's falconers, being at Stansted in 1179 and in 1181 Silvester and his associates were looking after the King Henry II's birds at Stansted.¹⁶⁶ It is likely that these birds were used for hawking and hunting but there is no indication in the Pipe Rolls that Stansted was associated with deer at this time. This is, to some extent, reinforced by the Earl of Bessborough's comment that "J. H. Round in his introduction to the volumes printed by the Pipe Roll Society instances Stansted as one of the houses which the King [Henry II] had built in addition to his castles and refers to it as a place which he visited for hawking on the downs."¹⁶⁷ However Roger de Hoveden in his chronicle said that shortly after his coronation at Winchester on 17 April 1194 Richard the Lionheart hunted at Stansted. Hoveden wrote that: "On the twenty-eight day of the month of April, the king left Portsmouth, and proceeded as far as Stansted, for the sake of hunting."¹⁶⁸

During the medieval period, Stansted was part of the manor of Stoughton, although at times it was attached to Westbourne. It had belonged to Hugh d'Aubigny, 5th Earl of Arundel until his death on 7 May 1243. Stansted passed into the hands of the FitzAlan family and then descended through the Lumleys until the 17th century.

The earliest written reference to a deer park at Stansted indicates that it was emparked by or during the late 13th century. An estate survey of the Arundel lands taken in 1301 said that the grazing in the park was valued at £1/10/- and pannage was worth 10/- with the nuts in mast years.¹⁶⁹ The survey added that "underwood up to £2 in value may be sold from the park every year without damage. Five buck and 6 does may be taken in the forest, and 10 buck and 12 does in the park, every year without damage."¹⁷⁰ This was similar to the number of deer that could be taken from the large and small parks at Arundel without damage.

The 1301 survey also indicated how part of the boundary of the park was maintained. Seven bondmen had to hedge 11 perches each around the park whenever necessary, but they could keep the old fencing¹⁷¹ and Ralph Itherlane and William Husty (bondmen of Bourne) had to hedge 5 perches each round the park.¹⁷² A perch was a variable unit of measure, but Clough suggested that one perch was 16 feet. This would mean that hedging accounted for just over quarter of one mile of the boundary at Stansted park. Since hedging and paling are referred to separately, it is possible that part of the park boundary at Stansted was a hedge and therefore unlikely to be detectable on a LiDAR survey.

There is no indication in the 1301 survey either who was responsible for maintaining the rest of the boundary or whether it was a bank and ditch and a pale. There is no doubt that throughout the 14th century individuals had responsibility for maintaining at least part of the boundary of the park. A document, possibly late 14th century, stated that Thomas Palmere "fences 15 perches round the park."¹⁷³

¹⁶⁵ Robert Eyton, *Court, Household, and Itinerary of King Henry II*, p. 217.

¹⁶⁶ Pipe Roll, 27 Henry II 145 accessed at:

https://dms.ids.org/delivery/DeliveryManagerServlet?dps_pid=IE523043 *Et in liberatione Siluestri et sociorum ejus dum custodirent aves Regis apud Stanesteda .xvij. s. per breve regis.*

¹⁶⁷ Earl of Bessborough with Clive Aslet, *Enchanted Forest: The Story of Stansted in Sussex*, London, 1984 p. 15.

¹⁶⁸ H.T. Riley, *The Annals of Roger de Hoveden*, London, 1853 p. 324.

¹⁶⁹ Clough, M. (ed.), *Op. Cit.*

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.* p. 9.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.* pp. 10-11.

¹⁷² *Ibid.* p. 28.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.* p. 165. For discussion of the dating of the document see Clough's introduction on page xxvii.

There is a clear indication that Stansted park was not kept solely for deer. According to the 1301 survey Robert Moysaunt, a bondman of Bourne, “helped to drive the lord’s plough-beasts from [19] the park.”¹⁷⁴

As happened so often, references to the deer park in the medieval period came from cases brought against those who had trespassed there.

In 1306 William de Whiteway, a parker at Stansted, trespassed in the park and was convicted before the treasurer and barons of the Exchequer. At the time Edward I held the property as guardian of Edmund FitzAlan, 9th Earl of Arundel, during his minority.¹⁷⁵ On 30 March 1335 Richard FitzAlan, the 10th Earl of Arundel, complained ‘that divers persons had broken into his parks at ... Stansted ... hunted there and carried away deer’¹⁷⁶ and ‘that the Dean of Chichester and others cut down his trees ... and carried them away with other goods.’¹⁷⁷

There were in Stansted park (and also in East Dean park) buildings referred to by Salzman as “something in the nature of hunting lodges”.¹⁷⁸ Following the beheading in 1397 of Richard FitzAlan, the 11th Earl of Arundel, for treason, an inventory of his estates was drawn up. According to Salzman this recorded: “In the manor of Stansted were 10 table boards, 9 forms, 8 pair of trestles, 4 ‘cupbordes’, a ‘Flaunderscheyre’, and 4 stools – 13s. 4d. Also 2 ‘costrelles’ containing 16 gallons of verjuice, at 2d. the gallon – 2s. 8d.; 4 old andirons (*aunders*) – 3s. 4d.; and an iron fork – 12d.”¹⁷⁹

On the death of Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel in 1580 the estate passed to his son-in-law, John, Lord Lumley. It is not known when Stansted was disparked but in Lumley’s estate account for 1581 it is stated that ‘wild beasts’ were transferred from Goodwood and East Dean to Stansted.¹⁸⁰ There were still deer at Stansted after this as in February 1597 two men were interrogated about the unlawful killing of deer at Stansted.¹⁸¹ Furthermore, in 1599 John, Lord Lumley complained again about deer being killed at Stansted.¹⁸² In 1630 Richard, Lord Lumley also complained about two men unlawfully killing deer at Stansted.¹⁸³ There are no post-1581 references to deer in a deer park, but there were references to a Great and Little park at Stansted in 1609. In that year John, Lord Lumley conveyed the parks at Stansted, as well as Stansted Forest and the lodge of Stansted forest, to Thomas, Lord Darcy, Sir Thomas Walmesley and Sir James Croft.¹⁸⁴ There are no references in this document to rights of venison and vert or any other indications that the parks were still being used for deer.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 18-19.

¹⁷⁵ Earl of Bessborough with Clive Aslet, *Op. Cit.* p. 20.

¹⁷⁶ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 9 Edward III 30 March 1335.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁸ L.F. Salzman *The Property of the Earl of Arundel 1397*, Sussex Archaeological Collection, 91 (1953) p. 41.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁰ Earl of Bessborough with Clive Aslet, *Op. Cit.* p. 30.

¹⁸¹ Arundel Castle Archives: MD 282 11 Feb. 1596/7 Answers of William Fairemaner of Idsworth, co. Hants., yeoman, and George Knighte of Blendworth, co. Hants., husbandman, to interrogatories on a bill of complaint of John, Lord Lumley, relating to the unlawful killing of deer at Stanstead.

¹⁸² Arundel Castle Archives: MD283 Hilary 1598/9 Bill of complaint of John, Lord Lumley against George Upcott and John Deeringe, both of Buriton, co. Hants., gents., and Henry Shelley of co. Hants., gent., and Markes A Pytte of Northwood, co. Sussex, yeoman, for unlawfully killing deer at Stanstead. Also see: MD1527 Answer of Marcke a Pytt def. in a bill of complaint of John, Lord Lumley relating to a deer killed in Stansted Forest. 1599.

¹⁸³ Arundel Castle Archives: MD 286 [1630] Interrogatories administered to George Overy, esq. and John Arderne, yeoman, to the bill of complaint of Richard, Viscount Lumley, relating to the unlawful killing of deer at Stanstead.

¹⁸⁴ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E43I f5. Indenture dated 14 February 1609.

All of the maps of Sussex produced between Saxton's in 1575 and Budgen's in 1724 show the pale surrounding Stansted park.¹⁸⁵ The first map not to do so was the 1785 plan of Stansted itself.

Today Stansted has some excellent specimens of beech, but many of these were 19th century plantings. However in his *Essay on Modern Gardening*, originally written in 1771, Horace Walpole said that Stansted had "extensive lawns ... richly inclosed by venerable beech-woods and chequered by single beeches of vast size."¹⁸⁶ This indicates that some of the beech trees had been there from at least Tudor times. It is probable that the medieval park at Stansted consisted mostly of the European (or common) beech - *Fagus sylvatica*. The beech nuts would have been fed to the pigs and the underwood would have been a valuable resource. It is possible that the hedging was beech as well - it can be trained to produce a dense - all year round - impenetrable barrier which could either have been at the top of a bank or high enough to stop deer leaping over it.

¹⁸⁵ The maps were: Christopher Saxton (1575). WSRO: PM119; Robert Norden (1595). WSRO: PM333; John Speed (after Norden) (1610). WSRO: PM118; Johannes Blaeu (1645) 1663 or 1667 edition. WSRO: Reynolds 8; Robert Morden (1694 – modern pencil marking). WSRO: PM334 and Richard Budgen (1724). WSRO: PM249 Plate 5.

¹⁸⁶ Horace Walpole, *Essay on Modern Gardening*, 1784 p. 69 accessed at: <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=3jRJJQkZfrkC&dq=essay+on+modern+gardening&q=Stansted#v=onepage&q=Stansted&f=false>

Bignor

In 1278 Hugh Saunzaver claimed that King Henry III had granted him 'liberam warena' or free warren in Bignor.¹⁸⁷ Hugh died in March 1284 and in the Inquisition post-mortem it stated that he held Bignor of the heir of William Dyve, who was in the King's wardship.¹⁸⁸ Ralph Saunzaver, his heir, was born before 1262 and when he died in 1314 the Inquisition post-mortem said that he held the manor, including a 50 acre wood in the forest of Arundel, of Henry Percy, but it did not mention a park.¹⁸⁹ Henry Percy had married Eleanor FitzAlan, daughter of Richard FitzAlan, 8th Earl of Arundel (1267-1302), but he had died in October 1314 and his son, another Henry Percy (1299-1352) had not come yet into his father's possessions.

It is not clear when Bignor became part of the estates of the Earls of Arundel, but an inquisition, taken in 1331, concerning the land and property to be returned to Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (died 1376), did not include Bignor.¹⁹⁰ Neither was it included in a list of the manors belonging to the Earl of Arundel between 1415 and 1417,¹⁹¹ but it was one of the manors for which Thomas FitzAlan, 12th Earl of Arundel (1381-1415), was assessed for a subsidy in 1412.¹⁹² Bignor also appeared in the list of manors held by William FitzAlan, 16th Earl of Arundel (1417-1487) in 1448¹⁹³ and was mentioned again in 1536¹⁹⁴ and 1541.¹⁹⁵ There is no obvious reason why Bignor was not listed consistently as belonging to the Earls of Arundel, but it does make it difficult to know when the manor was actually acquired.

It has long been believed that Bignor was a medieval park. In 1867 Shirley wrote: "Bignor, where there was a park enclosed from the great forest of Arundel in the reign of Henry III."¹⁹⁶ This might have been a confusion with the granting of free warren to Hugh Saunzaver before 1278, but no evidence has been found so far to show that Bignor was emparked before the 16th century. However, it should be stressed that absence of evidence does not mean that it was not emparked.

During an Episcopal visit of Hardham Priory at Warningcamp in 1524, the Prior, Robert Pryklowe, "was asked, whether, since he had held his present office, then three years, he had not, with a man named Jefford, entered the park of the Earl of Arundel at Bignor for unlawful purposes, and in a scuffle wounded a man named Bager? To which he replied that it was not so. He acknowledged, however, that Jefford had with another person at his request met him a few days before at a place called Waterlake, near Bignor Park, at about nine at night, and from thence proceeded to the park, where he, the prior, and two others, one a servant of the house, watched at the gate while Jefford and his companion entered the park for the purpose of hunting the deer and that, after the absence of about an hour, they returned, and reported to him that they had killed two does, and wounded another; and that whilst this conversation was going on, and they were delaying a little before they proceeded to secure their spoil, a keeper named Bager came suddenly and unexpectedly upon them, attended by other persons; but that no scuffle ensued between Jefford and Bager; for as soon as they saw Bager and his companions approaching them, they all fled to the priory; nor before their flight were they ever nearer to each other than a furlong. The prior was then farther asked, whether the Earl of Arundel had been made acquainted not only with this, but with a previous invasion of his park

¹⁸⁷ Placita de Quo Warranto, 6 Edward I 1278 p. 755.

¹⁸⁸ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 12 Edward I 9 May 1284.

¹⁸⁹ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 8 Edward II December 1314.

¹⁹⁰ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 4 Edward III 15 January 1331.

¹⁹¹ National Archives: SC 6/1019/23 Special Collection, Ministers' and Receivers' Accounts 3 to 4 Henry V 21 March 1415 to 20 March 1417.

¹⁹² T. Herbert Noyes, *Roll of a Subsidy levied thirteenth Henry IV 1411, 1412*, in Sussex Archaeological Collection, Vol. X (1858) p. 131.

¹⁹³ L.F. Salzman (ed.), *Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, Vol. XXIII (1916) Entry 3091.

¹⁹⁴ Letters and Papers Henry VIII, Vol. xvi 37 20 July 1536 28 Henry VIII.

¹⁹⁵ Letters and Papers Henry VIII, Vol. xvi 93 26 May 1541 33 Henry VIII.

¹⁹⁶ Evelyn Philip Shirley, *Some account of English deer parks, with notes on the management of deer*, John Murray, 1867 p. 66.

a short time before? To which he replied that he had; and that he would accept of no pecuniary compensation for the damage done, but had freely forgiven them. Forty shillings, however, were afterwards demanded of them by Master Prestall, which they paid, but which the Earl refused to take.”¹⁹⁷

Leaving aside the morality of a poaching prior, this 1524 reference is the earliest to there being a deer park at Bignor.

In the early 1550s Lumley married Jane FitzAlan (c1538-1577) the daughter of Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580). It is possible that Bignor and its park were part of the marriage contract, but the transfer of land from FitzAlan to Lumley and his heirs was only formalised in a Feet of Fines dated Easter 1566.¹⁹⁸ This document not only included the manor of Bignor but also made explicit reference to ‘the park of Bygnor’.

In 1584 John, Lord Lumley, sold Bignor Park, including its lodge, to William Tyrwhit who might have been acting as an agent as it was immediately purchased from him by Richard Pellatt of Steyning and it remained in that family until 1702.¹⁹⁹ Richard Pellatt died in 1587 without leaving a will and there is no indication whether he was using Bignor Park for deer.

William Pellatt inherited Bignor Park in 1625 on the death of his father, John Pellatt who was Richard Pellatt’s grandson. Edward Hastler was appointed the rector of Bignor in 1632 and in 1637-1638 he petitioned the Council for unpaid tithes. He argued that “William Pellett stands seised of 200 acres in Bignor, which heretofore was a park, but for 40 years has been arable and coppice, and by that means has become tithable.”²⁰⁰ Although the case was not brought to a legal conclusion, it is unlikely that it would have been brought at all if Bignor Park had not been disparked by then. There is some supporting evidence for this in that in 1616 Thomas Pellatt left his son William £10 yearly “out of my Parke of Bignor”.²⁰¹ It is more likely that a fixed figure of £10 a year could be derived from a park if it had ceased its original function and was being rented out for arable farming and coppicing. This would suggest that Bignor Park was disparked in the 1580s or 1590s although the term ‘Bignor Park’ continued to be used consistently between the 17th and 20th century.

¹⁹⁷ Edward Turner, ‘*The Priory of Pynham, or De Calceto*’, Sussex Archaeological Collection, Vol. XI (1859) pp. 112-113.

¹⁹⁸ Edwin H.W. Dunkin (ed.), *Sussex Manors, Advowsons etc recorded in the Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, (1914), Vol. XIX, p. 9.

¹⁹⁹ Maberley Phillips, ‘*Pedigree and Genealogical Memoranda relating to the family of Pellatt*’, Sussex Archaeological Collection, Vol. XXXVIII (1892) p. 115. The surname ‘Pellatt’ and ‘Pellett’ are used interchangeably.

²⁰⁰ Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1637-1638 quoted in *Ibid.* p. 123.

²⁰¹ PCC Weldon 50 (will proved 16 May 1617) quoted in Phillips, *Op. Cit.* pp. 115-116.

Downley, Singleton

The park known as Downley, at Singleton, is being studied in detail by Mark Roberts, University College, London. He published some initial comments prior to the 2015 excavation season.²⁰²

Downley was one of the largest parks in the western part of Sussex as its perimeter measured 6.622km and it covered an area of 261.7 hectares or 646.5 acres.²⁰³ Although the Survey taken in 1570 estimated that it was three miles in circuit.²⁰⁴

In the Inquisition post-mortem for Edmund FitzAlan, 9th Earl of Arundel (1285-1326) taken in 1326, 'Dounle' was named as one of the Earl's parks.²⁰⁵ 'Dounleye' was one of eight parks in Sussex which Edmund, Earl of Kent claimed had been broken into in 1329.²⁰⁶ Another inquisition, taken in 1331, concerning the land and property to be returned to Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (died 1376), referred to a park called 'le Dunleye'.²⁰⁷ Since new parks were called 'new' in this document and Downley was not called 'new', it can be inferred that Downley had been a park for some time by 1331 and probably in the late 13th century. On 30 March 1335 Richard FitzAlan, the 10th Earl of Arundel, complained that 12 people 'had broken into his parks at ... Dounlegh ... hunted there and carried away deer'.²⁰⁸ Furthermore he accused 13 people, including Henry Gerlaund, the Dean of Chichester, of entering the same six Sussex parks (including the nearby Downley and Arundel parks) and cutting down and taking away timber and other goods.²⁰⁹

When the bounds of West Dean parish were copied out in the 15th century, one of the features referred to was 'la logge of Dounle'.²¹⁰ This lodge building was sufficiently substantial that two Earls of Arundel conducted their business and died there in 1524 and 1544 and in August 1526 King Henry VIII and his court stayed.²¹¹ Downley continued to be a significant park for much of the 16th century. The 1570 Survey showed that in many respects Downley was still being used actively for deer management. There were about 400 deer there and "a great parte of the Pale thereof is newlye repayred". However, "the old Lodge [was] Moche in Decaie and specially the tower thereof".²¹²

It is not known when Downley ceased to be used as a deer park, but no references have been found so far after the 1570 Survey. The "parke of Downeley ... And all the Woods Underwoods in or upon the same Parke of Downeley" were sold, along with the parks at Stansted, by John, Lord Lumley to Thomas, Lord Darcy, Sir Thomas Walmesley and Sir James Croft in 1609.²¹³ Although the lodge at Stansted was referred to specifically, there was no mention of a lodge at Downley.

²⁰² See: <http://www.ai-journal.com/articles/10.5334/ai.1722/>

²⁰³ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁴ Arundel Castle Archives, MD 535 entitled The survey of the Erle of Arundell his Landes which bene assurid in Rev'con to my L. of Sur[rey] Taken by Robert Harrys and John Dawbis alias Dobbs.

²⁰⁵ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem 20 Edward II January 1326.

²⁰⁶ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 3 Edward III 22 May 1329.

²⁰⁷ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 4 Edward III 15 January 1331.

²⁰⁸ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 9 Edward III 30 March 1335.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

²¹⁰ W.D. Peckham (ed.), *Chichester Cathedral Chartulary* in Sussex Record Society XLVI (1941) Entry No: 153. This entry was in Liber Y on folio 92r and Peckham described it as being in a 15th century hand. No more precise dating is possible.

²¹¹ N. Samman, 'The progresses of Henry VIII, 1509–1529' in D. MacCullough, *The reign of Henry VIII: Politics, Policy and Piety*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995 pp. 59–74.

²¹² Arundel Castle Archives, MD 535 entitled The survey of the Erle of Arundell his Landes which bene assurid in Rev'con to my L. of Sur[rey] Taken by Robert Harrys and John Dawbis alias Dobbs.

²¹³ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E43I f5. Copy of document dated 14 February 1609.

The Hundred of Dumpford

Four of the eight parishes that made up the Hundred of Dumpford had between them six or seven deer parks during the medieval period. It is not always possible to be certain which of the deer parks is being referred to in a document so this section will deal with the two or three deer parks in Harting and the parks at Demesford, Elsted, Treyford and Trotton.

Harting

For much of the medieval period the Husee family was closely linked with Harting. It is believed that William Husee (born in Normandy in 1030) was with William the Conqueror at the Battle of Hastings in 1066. William Husee's grandson, Henry Husee (born c1110), founded the Premonstratensian abbey at Dureford in 1169 and also a leper colony at Harting. The activities of individual members of the Husee family are difficult to determine as at least ten generations of men called Henry Husee named a son Henry.²¹⁴ The first reference to hunting within the manor of Harting was a grant of free warren given to Matthew Husee (1205-1253) in 1228 and confirmed in 1252. On 9 April 1266, possibly at the insistence of the future Edward I, Henry III gave Henry Husee (1240-1290) a licence to enclose a place at his manor of Harting, wherever might appear expedient, with dike and wall of stone and to crenellate the same and his right of free warren was confirmed again on 29 August 1271. According to a document dated 12 June 1279 John FitzAlan, 7th Earl of Arundel (1246-1272), of whom the Husees held Harting, gave Henry Husee permission to fence his park on the hill at Harting.²¹⁵

The inquisition after the death of Henry Husee (1240-1290) stated that there were three parks in Harting²¹⁶ and that these were held of Sir Robert de Tatteshale, who had taken the overlordship of Harting on the death of Hugh d'Aubigny, 5th Earl of Arundel in 1243. In addition Henry Husee (1240-1290) had been granted both Demesford park [now Dumpford, north-east of Harting] and Elnestede [Elsted] in 1279 for 20 years.²¹⁷ Since there were deer in Elsted park in 1263²¹⁸ it would suggest that this Henry Husee was an active supporter of deer hunting. This increases the likelihood that the three deer parks at Harting were created in the middle of the 13th century.

Following the death of Henry Husee (1265-1332) in 1332 an inquisition noted that in the manor of Harting there was 'a park above the hill with deer' and 'a park called Tullecombe'.²¹⁹ The Close Rolls added that there was a water-mill in Tullecombe and that the park had been jointly held by Henry Husee and Isabella his wife and so they passed to her.²²⁰ It was their son, Henry Husee (1295-1349), who married Katharine FitzAlan, daughter of Edmund FitzAlan, 9th Earl of Arundel (1285-1326) and cemented the links between the families.

It is not clear from the Calendar of Close Rolls how many parks Harting had in 1350.²²¹ 'le Netherpark', which was north of Harting, was held by Katharine, the widow of Henry Husee (1295-

²¹⁴ G. E. Cokayne, *Complete Peerage of England Scotland Ireland Great Britain and the United Kingdom*, Sutton Publishing Ltd, 2000, p. vii.

²¹⁵ Rotula Hundred (Record Commission), ii, 212. See also: W.D. Peckham (ed.), *Chichester Cathedral Chartulary in Sussex Record Society XLVI (1941) Liber A*, Entry No: 789.

²¹⁶ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 18 Edward I 18 August 1290.

²¹⁷ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 18 Edward I February 1290.

²¹⁸ Calendar of Fine Rolls, 47 Henry III 20 March 1263.

²¹⁹ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, Henry Husee (died 1332) 6 Edward III 7 March 1332.

²²⁰ Calendar of Close Rolls, 6 Edward III 18 March 1332.

²²¹ Calendar of Close Rolls, 24 Edward III January 1350.

1349) and she had rights of estover, which were limited to collecting firewood, in 'le Overpark' which was south of Harting. There was no specific mention of Tullecombe, but since 'le Netherpark' had a water mill and Tullecombe had one in 1332, it is likely that Tullecombe and 'le Netherpark' were the same. There was no mention of a third park and the only reference to a third park found so far was in the Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem in 1290: it is possible, therefore, that there were never more than two parks in Harting. In 1464 'le Netherpark' was called 'Downpark' and in 1370 'le Overpark' was called 'Uppepark'.²²²

This male line of Husees came to an end with the death of Nicholas Husee (1417-1471) in 1471. The two parks were left to his 12 year old daughter, Constance, and his younger daughter, Katherine, aged 10. Constance, who married Henry Lovell and later Roger Lewkenor, was assigned Overpark (or Uppark as it was called) and Katherine, who married Reginald Bray, was granted Netherpark or Downpark. This divided estate became the subject of litigation, but although the term park is used, there is no clear evidence that deer were being managed in either Uppark or Downpark. Harting was soon divided into the separate manors of East, West and South Harting, each with their own lines of descent.

Another deer park was created in Harting during the 17th century. The Caryll family had purchased part of the manor of West Harting and John Caryll (1625-1711) had built what came to be known as Lady Holt House and deer park. John Caryll was an active Jacobite supporter and was not able to remain in England during most of William III and Mary's reign (1688-1702), so the park was probably built after the restoration of Charles II in 1660 and before James II's departure in 1688.

Elsted

At the time of the Norman conquest 'Halestede' (which later became Elnestede and then Elsted) was held by Osbern. He was a favoured clerk and a relative of Edward the Confessor.²²³ However, Osbern worked with William I and not only kept his lands, which included Elsted, but was given further holdings in Bosham and was made Bishop of Exeter in 1072. When Osbern died in 1103 he passed his manors to the See of Exeter.

In the 1230s John de Gatesden (1184-1258?) acquired holdings in Sussex such as Trotton and Woolavington and the family also had interests in Elsted. Who was responsible for emparking Elsted cannot be determined but on 20 March 1263 the Prior of Boxgrove was fined for "trespass of venison made in the park of Elnested".²²⁴ The family tree of the de Gatesdens lacks clarity and certainty and so no definitive statements can be made about Elsted in the mid-13th century. John de Gatesden (1184-1258?) was granted rights of free warren at places like Trotton in 1237 and it is unlikely that any descendant of his would have emparked Elsted.

The manor passed through John de Gatesden's granddaughter, Margaret de Gatesden (1248-1311), to her first husband Sir John de Camoys. In about 1279 Sir John de Camoys leased Elsted to Henry Husee (1240-1290) for his life. When Husee died in 1290 Sir John de Camoys took oaths of fealty from the tenants and cut down two trees. At this point, according to the Inquisition post-mortem "Sir William Paynel with many others entered the park, chased away the men of Sir John, killed and chased away the deer, cut down a tree, and closed the park".²²⁵ This seemingly strange action can perhaps be explained by the fact that in about 1285 Margaret left her husband, Sir John Camoys, and

²²² H. D. Gordon, *The History of Harting*, London, 1877, p. 46.

²²³ Frank Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, Eyre Methuen, 1970 pp. 150, 164.

²²⁴ Calendar of Fine Rolls, 47 Henry III 20 March 1263.

²²⁵ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 18 Edward I August 1290.

went to live with Sir William Peynel. This highly unusual development for the 13th century appears to have been relatively amicable as Camoys gave Paynel Margaret's goods and chattels.²²⁶

Trotton

In 1237 John de Gatesden had been granted free warren in his demesne lands at Trotton and Didling.²²⁷ He, his son, or his grandson did go on to create a deer park at Trotton because in 1335 Ralph de Camoys (his grandson) complained that Hugh de Bouoy and others "broke his parks at, Tradynghon [Trotton], Deniford and Alkesbourn [probably near Horsham], co. Sussex, hunted there and carried away deer, and his goods at the said towns of Tradynghon and Alkesbourn, and at Elnestede, Dydelynge, Rogate, Bradewatere, Durynglon, Benyngden and Berccampe".²²⁸

Demesford

In the Inquisition post-mortem for Henry Husee in 1290 it was stated that Sir John Camoys had granted to Husee the park of Demesford for twenty years or for his life and that after that it would descend to Sir William Paynel.²²⁹ Obviously Demesford was emparked by 1290, but since Husee only had the park for his life and would not be able to pass it on to his son and heirs, it can be questioned whether he would go to the expense of emparking it himself. It seems probable that Demesford was already emparked when Husee took a 20 year lease on it in 1279. This was the same year in which Husee leased Elsted and it raises the possibility that it had been emparked by John de Gatesden.

The next reference to a park at Demesford was in 1335 when Ralph de Camoys complained that Hugh de Bouoy and others "broke his parks at, Tradynghon [Trotton], Deniford and Alkesbourn, co. Sussex, hunted there and carried away deer".²³⁰ In the Assize Roll for 1248 Demesford was called Dyneford.²³¹ As this document makes a reference to a park at Trotton and a separate reference to a park at Demesford (what is known now as Dumpford), it would appear as though these were two parks even though Demesford was in the parish of Trotton. No later references have been found to a park at Trotton, but "the park of Dumford, als Damford als Dempford" was referred to in a Feet of Fines in both 1628 and 1664.²³² There is no indication whether the park was still being used for keeping deer during the 17th century.

Treyford

Treyford was one of the manors given to Roger, Earl of Montgomery following the Norman conquest and it remained part of the honor of Arundel. In the early 12th century the Vilers family acquired an interest in Treyford and in 1256 Robert de Vilers obtained a grant of free warren.²³³ This was a controversial move as he was accused of appropriating a new warren at Treyford in 1274.²³⁴ Nicholas de Vilers obtained another confirmation of the right of free warren in 1336.²³⁵ Only eight years later, in February 1344, he complained that Sir Thomas Camoys, Robert

²²⁶ Rotuli Parliamentorum (Record Commission), Volume i, 146, 147. 30 Edward I 1302. It is worth adding, dear reader, that she married him in 1298.

²²⁷ Calendar of Charter Rolls, i 231 21 Henry III 1237. 'Grant to John de Gatesden and his heirs of free warren in his demesnes of Tatinton [Trotton] and Dudelinges [Didling]'.

²²⁸ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 8 Edward III 3 July 1334.

²²⁹ Calendar of Inquisitions post-mortem, 18 Edward I 8 September 1290.

²³⁰ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 8 Edward III 3 July 1334.

²³¹ The Historical Gazetteer of England's Place Names accessed at:

<http://placenames.org.uk/browse/mads/epns-deep-06-hu-subcounty-000002>

²³² Edwin H.W. Dunkin (ed.), *Sussex Manors, Advowsons etc recorded in the Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, (1914), Vol. XIX, p. 152.

²³³ Calendar of Charter Rolls, i, 453. 40 Henry III 1256.

²³⁴ Rotula Hundreda (Record Commission), ii, 213.

²³⁵ Index to Placita de Banco, p. 674.

Markaunt, John de Lyons and others had “hunted therein and took and carried away deer, killed 4 bullocks and 2 mares of his there, worth 4l. [£4] and assaulted his men and servants so that he lost their service for a great time”.²³⁶ The Earl of Arundel already had an interest in the park as the entry in the Calendar of Patent Rolls ends: “By fine of 1/2 mark, and at the instance of the earl of Arundel”. This would indicate that Treyford was emparked some time between 1336 and 1344. Whether the claim was brought simply to establish de Vilers right to a park or whether there really was an incursion is not known. However, Sir Thomas Camoys was the son of Ralph Camoys who complained about his own park at Trotton being broken into in 1335.²³⁷ In 1347 Richard FitzAlan, 10th Earl of Arundel (died 1376) increased his interest in the manor of Treyford, presumably including the park, by acquiring it from Robert and William de Vilers, the sons of Nicholas de Vilers.²³⁸ The legality of this transfer was challenged and in 1385 John de Berwick son of Joan (sister of Robert and William de Vilers) successfully claimed the manor against the Earl of Arundel. The jury awarded the manor to John for his life, with reversion, if he died without heirs, to the earl.²³⁹ In 1423 the trustees of Thomas FitzAlan, 12th Earl of Arundel (1381-1415) obtained a licence from the King Henry VI to grant the manor of Treyford, following the death of the current holder, to the hospital of the Holy Trinity in Arundel.²⁴⁰ The hospital held the manor of Treyford until the Dissolution of the Monasteries.

Although a fairly precise date of c1340 can be given for emparking, there is no indication when Treyford was disparked. The map of the estates of the Earls of Arundel drawn up in the late 16th century shows a park pale at Downley, East Dean, Goodwood, Halnaker, Selhurst and Arundel Park, but not at Treyford.²⁴¹ There are, though, no references to a park at Treyford after 1344 and it is possible that it fell into disuse fairly rapidly.

²³⁶ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 18 Edward III 12 February 1344 p. 278.

²³⁷ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 8 Edward III 3 July 1334.

²³⁸ L.F. Salzman (ed.), *Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, Vol. XXIII (1916) Entry 2054.

²³⁹ Add. MS. 39375, fol. 40V, quoting De Banco Rolls, 8 Richard II, m. 358 Quoted in VCH.

²⁴⁰ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1 Henry VI, 20 June 1423.

²⁴¹ Arundel Castle Archives: PM193.

Slindon and Lavant

The Archbishops of Canterbury had three deer parks in the rapes of Arundel and Chichester during the medieval period: Tangmere, Slindon and Lavant. Since Tangmere lies wholly outside the LiDAR study area it has not been included in this survey.

The Domesday Book stated that part of Lavant was held by Lanfranc, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the rest by Earl Roger of Montgomery. The portion held by the Archbishops of Canterbury became known as East Lavant (with West Lavant as a tithing within it) and Mid Lavant was the manor and parish held initially by Earl Roger. Slindon only came into the possession of the Archbishops of Canterbury in 1106, but was always likely to have a greater presence in the documentary record as it lay on the border of Arundel forest.

There were constant disputes between the Earls of Arundel, who owned Arundel forest, and the Archbishops of Canterbury, who hunted there without the permission of the Earls. These came to a head in the mid-13th century when Boniface of Savoy was Archbishop of Canterbury and an agreement was finally reached which included references to Slindon. According to the Calendar of Charter Rolls “the said archbishop and his successors shall have all their wood and holding at Slindon free, so that the said Sir John [FitzAlan 7th Earl of Arundel (1246-1272)] and his heirs shall have no rights of coursing or hunting therein or any other right.”²⁴² This 1274 statement was a confirmation of an agreement that had been made in the Chapel at Slindon in January 1268.²⁴³ It is worth noting that the term ‘wood’ and not ‘park’ is used and this was repeated later when the Archbishop accepted that “the places called Overs and Baycumbes in the wood of the archbishop” should not be closed, but remain open “so that the deer may freely pass from one wood to another.”²⁴⁴

The first, and most revealing, reference to Slindon and Lavant as parks was in a listing of the customs of the manors drawn up in 1285.²⁴⁵ The park at Slindon covered 68 acres and within it there were an additional 3½ roods of pasture.²⁴⁶ Six tenants of the manor had to perform services directly related to the deer in the park. Their duties included: “He shall carry the lord’s venison, when he moves from Slindon, to the dwelling place at which he next lodges at the lord’s food.” And “he shall stand at the buckstall (*stabit ad stabiliam*) when the lord to come, at the lord’s food.”²⁴⁷ The editors say that the word *venire*, to come, is presumably the copyist’s error for *venari*, to hunt.²⁴⁸ None of the tenants at Lavant had similar duties. Tenants of both manors had the duty of fencing the park. At Slindon 22 of the customary tenants had to perform fencing service: “he shall fence 24 feet about the park with well made hedging (*melior’ sep’ clastur*) [which] he shall cut and collect for 1 work.”²⁴⁹ The tenants, therefore, were responsible for 176 yards [160.9 metres] of the park boundary, but there is no indication how the rest of it was fenced. Whereas at East Lavant (or Loventon as it was called), the park of Foldey contained 57 acres and 1 rood and each of the 25 customary tenants had the duty to “fence round the park for 12 feet for 1 work.”²⁵⁰ The tenants, therefore, were responsible for fencing 100 yards [91.44 metres] of the park, but again there is no indication how the rest of it was fenced.

Slindon and Lavant were eight miles apart and it is possible that the Archbishops of Canterbury used the two parks in different ways. It is also possible that Foldey park at East Lavant went out of use

²⁴² Calendar of Charter Rolls, 2 Edward I 14 October 1274.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁵ Redwood, B.C.; Wilson, A.E. eds., *Customals of the Sussex Manors of the Archbishop of Canterbury*, Sussex Record Society, 57 (1958).

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.* p. 1.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.* footnote 3.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.* p. 2.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.* p. 19.

fairly soon after 1285 as there were no further references to it in the Patent Rolls whereas there were eight references to the Archbishop's park at Slindon between 1314 and 1358.

On 30 April 1542 the ownership of the manors of Slindon and East Lavant passed from the Archbishops of Canterbury to the King.²⁵¹ The document also granted the park of Slindon to the King, but made no mention of a park at East Lavant. This would indicate that the park of Foldey had been disparked some time before 1542. The term 'the Lavant Lawne' was still being used in 1599 to describe 13 acres in Lavant, but deer did not graze there any more.²⁵² This is confirmed by the East Lavant estate map drawn up by Thomas Kington in 1630 which does not show a pale or any vestiges of a park in field names or boundaries.²⁵³ In the late 17th or early 18th century Foldey became Faldy and was a coppice of 114 acres.²⁵⁴ This indicates that Foldey park covered only half the area that became Faldy coppice. By 1727 the coppice was called 'Valdoe', the name by which it is known today.²⁵⁵

Slindon continued to be used actively as a deer park and successive Archbishops of Canterbury were keen to maintain their interests and rights there. In 1314 Archbishop Walter Reynolds complained that trees had been felled at Slindon²⁵⁶ and in 1317 he ensured that "the persons who broke his park at Slyndon, co. Sussex, hunted therein and carried away deer" were investigated.²⁵⁷ This was ineffective as in 1323 he complained that "Robert de Morleye and Thomas de Hevere and others broke his park at Slyndon, co. Sussex, hunted therein and carried away deer".²⁵⁸ It is unclear why Robert de Morley (died 1360), whose estates were in Norfolk, and Thomas de Hevere, who held Hever in Kent, should have been accused.

In 1344 Archbishop John de Stratford confirmed the appointment of Roger de Spyney, his huntsman, as keeper of the park, warren, and out-woods of Slindon.²⁵⁹ However this did not stop Sir Thomas de Camoys, who had his own deer parks, and others from breaking the park of Slindon, hunting therein and carrying away deer. Furthermore they assaulted the king's men and servants there, whereby he lost their service for a great time."²⁶⁰ In 1350 John le Venour was granted a licence by King Edward III to keep the park at Slindon,²⁶¹ but the following year there was an attempt to find John Wodeward who was appointed by Edward III "to have the keeping of the park of Slyndon, which is of the temporalities of the archbishopric Canterbury, in the time of the late voidance of the archbishopric, who has committed divers wastes as well of vert and venison as otherwise and is now a fugitive from justice".²⁶² John le Venour was not in disgrace as he was confirmed in post, for life, in 1358.²⁶³

²⁵¹ Letters and Papers Henry VIII Vol. xvii 443 34 Henry VIII 7 June 1542.

²⁵² WSRO: Goodwood E743 9 May 1599. Conveyance from Thomas Cesar and Robert Webbe, to Thomas Bennet, jun., of London, mercer.

²⁵³ WSRO: 4983.

²⁵⁴ WSRO: Goodwood E322 15 May 1705. Post-nuptial settlement on the marriage of Mary, daughter of Sir William Morley of Halnaker and James Stanley, 10th Earl of Derby.

²⁵⁵ WSRO: Holmes and Campbell & Co. Mss 869 30 May 1727. Lease from Thomas May to Thomas Heberden.

²⁵⁶ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 8 Edward II 18 November 1314.

²⁵⁷ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 10 Edward II 2 May 1317.

²⁵⁸ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 17 Edward II 11 August 1323.

²⁵⁹ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 18 Edward III 28 February 1344.

²⁶⁰ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 22 Edward III 22 August 1348.

²⁶¹ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 33 Edward III 16 November 1358.

²⁶² Calendar of Patent Rolls, 25 Edward III 5 September 1351.

²⁶³ Calendar of Patent Rolls, 33 Edward III 16 November 1358.

All this indicates that during the first half of the 14th century Slindon was being used as a deer park and being actively managed on behalf of the Archbishops of Canterbury. Although the term 'park' continues to be used in relation to Slindon, no references have been found after 1358 indicating that it was being used for deer. By 1450-1451 the manor of Slindon was being rented by Robert Huberden [called Hiberden in other documents] for £26 13s. 4d., but there were no references to parks in the document so it is not certain that this included the area which had been a park.²⁶⁴ However there were separate references to Slindon park and Slindon manor in 1542 when the Archbishops of Canterbury had to give up Slindon.²⁶⁵

²⁶⁴ Lambeth Palace Library: ED1260 (f. 11) Accounts of various ministers for Aldwick, Bersted, Lavant, Nyetimber, Pagham, Shripney, Slindon, Tangmere and Tarring. 1450-1451.

²⁶⁵ Letters and Papers Henry VIII xvii 443 34 Henry VIII 7 June 1542.

Goodwood park

Since Goodwood park lies immediately to the north of Halnaker park it is often difficult to distinguish between the two in the written records. The proximity of the two parks was confirmed in a survey made for Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, (1536-1572) in 1570 which stated “that wthin half a furlong [i.e. 110 yards] of Halnaker parke pale on the west side thereof lyeth a parke called Goodwoode Parke.”²⁶⁶

On 30 May 1517 Sir Thomas West (c1475-25 September 1554) and his wife, Elizabeth Bonville, through whom he had inherited Halnaker, were given licence to enclose 300 acres for a park.²⁶⁷ A dispute soon arose between West and Thomas FitzAlan, 17th Earl of Arundel (1450-1524), because the land ‘lieth unto the Forest or Chace of the seid Erle called the Forest or Chace of Arundell’.²⁶⁸ The arbiters noted that the new enclosure begins ‘in the Northsyde of the seide parke of hafenaked and extendeth toward the Northe as far as there proper grounde lieth levying lands for a ffree borde wtoute the seide park’.²⁶⁹ Thomas West was allowed to continue the emparkment but without ‘makyng of ane Saltrye’.²⁷⁰ The fact that West was not allowed to build a deer-leap would have helped to protect the interests of the Earls of Arundel as it meant that none of their deer could jump from their forest into Goodwood park and become the property of the Wests.

It is not clear why Thomas West, when he was almost 40, decided to create a park in the late 1510’s. He had been a soldier and fought in France and there was a family interest in hunting. Thomas West’s father, also Thomas West (c1457-1525), had strong links with Henry VIII and had been one of his commanders in France and was with him at his meeting with Francis I, the King of France, at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520.²⁷¹ On 28 May 1517 Henry VIII had set up an enquiry to assess the impact of emparkment since 1493. Commissioners were appointed for each county and Thomas West was one of seven men chosen to examine Surrey and Sussex.²⁷² It is likely that this was Thomas West senior, who was the 8th Baron de la Warr and it is possible that the son wanted to have a deer park as his father did. The family relationship with the King continued as on 6 August 1526 Henry VIII left Arundel to stay at Halnaker with Thomas West.²⁷³ Unfortunately, there is no record of what he did there.

In 1540 Thomas West surrendered Goodwood park and other parts of the Halnaker estate to Henry VIII in exchange for the lands of the former nunnery at Wherwell, Hampshire.²⁷⁴ Although he leased back a farm at Halnacker, he did not do the same for Goodwood park.

In 1541 Henry VIII let the manor of Halnaker (including Goodwood park) to Sir John Jenyns for 40 years, but in 1554 Queen Mary granted the land to Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Aundel (1512-

²⁶⁶ Arundel Castle Archives, MD 535, entitled The survey of the Erle of Arundell his Landes which bene assurid in Rev’con to my L. of Sur[rey] Taken by Robert Harrys and John Dawbis alias Dobbs. I gathering, 1570. Quoted in Francis W. Steer, A Short History and description of Halnaker House, no publisher, 1958 p. 3.

²⁶⁷ ‘For Th. West and Elizabeth his wife. Licence to empark 300 acres in the lordship of Halfnaked, Sussex, as granted to Hugh, eldest son of Lord St. John, and his heirs’. Letters and Papers Henry VIII, Vol. ii, 331 l. 30 May 1517. Presumably, the earlier grant had not been acted on.

²⁶⁸ Award of Arbitration, WSRO: Goodwood E279. One of the signatories was Thomas Wolsey, Cardinal and Archbishop of York.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁷¹ Letters and Papers Henry VIII, Vol. iii, 704. 26 March 1520.

²⁷² Letters and Papers Henry VIII, Vol. ii, 3297. 28 May 1517.

²⁷³ Letters and Papers Henry VIII, Vol. iv, 2377 6 August 1526.

²⁷⁴ Deed of Surrender and Exchange, WSRO: Goodwood E281.

1580).²⁷⁵ In the early 1550s John Lumley had married Jane FitzAlan (c1538-1577) the daughter of the 19th Earl of Arundel. It is possible that Goodwood was part of the marriage contract, but the transfer of land from FitzAlan to Lumley and his heirs was formalised in a Feet of Fines dated Easter 1566.²⁷⁶ However, a document drawn up in 1575 referred to a 1563 lease of Goodwood park from Henry FitzAlan, 19th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580) to Sir Thomas Palmer.²⁷⁷ Palmer had been one of the Earl's nominees for Parliament and had worked for him since the 1550s and in 1577 he started building Parham house.²⁷⁸

The survey of the Earl of Arundel's estates taken in 1570 stated that Goodwood park had a circuit of two miles and that within it there was a fair mansion house, garden and orchard. The park was described as being "well woodded, the moste parte of yonge oickes and ther be of lait about 30 deare putt thethir by Sir Thomas Palmer".²⁷⁹ The fact that the trees were mostly oak, and not beech, makes it unusual, but since it was only emparked in 1517 it was also the newest of the parks in the vicinity. Exactly how Palmer used Goodwood is not known, although he did stay there in 1573,²⁸⁰ but he did stock it with deer so it must have performed at least some of the functions of a deer park in 1570.

John, Lord Lumley sold the property in 1584 to Henry and Elizabeth Walrond for £2,400. This included 'all conies and free warren and liberties for keeping deer and conies in the Park'.²⁸¹ A further sale took place on 9 May 1590 when Thomas Cesar and Robert Webb sold Goodwood park, including the house conies and free warren, to Thomas Bennett. This sale document made no references to deer and raises the possibility that Goodwood was no longer being used as a deer park in 1590. Bennett too sold it on and in December 1608, the park was conveyed to Sir Edward Francis (who was acting for Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland (1564-1632) the owner of Petworth).²⁸² On 30 June 1614 Sir Edward Francis sold to the Earl 'all that part of the said park and ground inclosed which lyeth on the North side of certain ground in the said park called old park alias the lower park'.²⁸³ This included Middle park, West Lawn and East Lawn which had another seven years of a lease to run for which 4s 4d extra 'had to be paid for each extra acre of East Lawn that was ploughed'.²⁸⁴ Clearly the park at Goodwood had been broken up some time before 1614.

It is likely that Goodwood was disparked by 1605 as it was recorded that John May of Lavant rented about 60 acres of 'Ground called Old Park', late in the occupation of John May, and that it was leased for 11 years to William Aylmer and Jeromy Legate, both yeomen of Westhampnett.²⁸⁵ Goodwood park had been divided into separate owners and occupiers, possibly in the very early

²⁷⁵ WSRO: E284. Contemporary copy of Grant.

²⁷⁶ Edwin H.W. Dunkin (ed.), *Sussex Manors, Advowsons etc recorded in the Feet of Fines* in Sussex Record Society, London, (1914), Vol. XIX, p. 9.

²⁷⁷ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E679. Assignment of a term of years.

²⁷⁸ R.J.W. Swales, Sir Thomas Palmer in *The History of Parliament, 1558-1603* accessed at: <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1509-1558/member/palmer-thomas-1520-82>

²⁷⁹ Arundel Castle Archives, MD 535 entitled *The survey of the Erle of Arundell his Landes which bene assurid in Rev'con to my L. of Sur[rey]* Taken by Robert Harrys and John Dawbis alias Dobbs. Fol. 29v.

²⁸⁰ The Corporation of Rye addressed a letter to him at Goodwood on 26 November 1573. Accessed at: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/hist-mss-comm/vol31/pt4/pp2-38>

²⁸¹ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E734. Conveyance from John, Lord Lumley to Henry and Elizabeth Walrond of Sea, Somerset.

²⁸² WSRO: Goodwood Mss E745. Conveyance.

²⁸³ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E750. Conveyance from Sir Edward Franncneys of Petworth, to Henry, Earl of Northumberland 1614.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁵ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E744. Lease for 11 years at an annual rent of £18.

17th century as in 1616 there was a reference to 'Old Parke alias the Lower Park' and other land 'as now severed from Goodwood Park 'by a rayle hedge ditch or fence'.²⁸⁶

All the conveyances from 1590 until 1657 refer to 'conies, free warren and liberty to keep conies', but in none of them are deer mentioned.²⁸⁷ Indeed, no references have been found so far to Goodwood park being used as a deer park after 1584. It appears probable that Goodwood was disparked in the 1580s.

The whole of the Goodwood estate was purchased by Charles, 1st Duke of Richmond and Lennox (1672-1723) in the mid-1690s.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁶ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E694. Conveyance.

²⁸⁷ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E754. In 1657 Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland (1602-1668) sold John Caryll of Harting the newly erected house and surrounding lands.

²⁸⁸ WSRO: Goodwood Mss E784. Conveyance.