

CHAPTER 7 - THE MANOR HOUSE

The manor house that wasn't

The manor house that wasn't. This sums up the ancient house so wantonly demolished early in 1971 after centuries of continuous use as a dwelling and home. The appellation "Manor House" or "Manor Farm" given to this building is very misleading and probably only came into use early in the 19th century; the Hall was the largest house in the parish and it therefore followed to the Victorians that the second largest should take on the name "Manor House", ignorant of the fact that no documentary evidence existed to support the assumption. Just where stood the home of the Heriz family, and what happened to it during the vicissitudinous years following their extinction, will probably never be known.

Given to Newstead in 1286

The building about which this chapter is chiefly concerned had its origins, documentary at least, in the 13th century as part of the possessions in Stapleford of the Prior of Newstead. In the cartulary for that monastery (ante 1286) is recorded the fact that Adam Marescal gave to Newstead "the rood of land in the territory of Stapleford that lies within the cultura of the said canons near unto their mansion in the aforesaid vill."¹ Don't run away with the idea of a huge house containing many rooms and offices; it would be only a fairly ordinary house but possibly a little larger and perhaps rather more substantial than the average dwelling house in those days. At the inquisition held in August 1288 it was found that the Prior of Newstead "held in Stapleford, in demesne, one messuage and one virgate of land worth yearly 50 marks" (£33:6:8). This is an enormous sum of money and one cannot help suspecting that there is an error somewhere. The reason for this, and other inquisitions of a similar nature was, as has already been stated, the Taxation of Pope Nicholas IV, but this amount of £33:16:8 does not appear in that record; in fact the whole value of the church and the convents possessions in Stapleford amounts to only 20 marks, i.e. £13:6:8, £20 less that the value set upon the house and virgate alone and ignoring the other rents.²

In the King's hands after dissolution-the account of Henry Gaswayne

With the dissolution of that monastery its spiritualities and temporalities passed into the King's hands and much was, of necessity recorded in the national archives and therefore it is possible to build up a fairly accurate idea of what Newstead's possessions in Stapleford comprised.

¹ NL36

² PRO. C 145/47

The main source of information is the account of Henry Gaswayne, the Bailiff here, and which is set out in detail in the preceding chapter; this can be augmented with information taken from deeds and depositions made later in the same century.

The principal item, of course, is the house itself, “the mansion of the rectory” (nothing to do with the curate who served the church), 5 oxgangs of glebe, 6 oxgangs of other land, together with a pasture known as “the Holme”, a dovecote, a tithe barn, the tithes of hay, of corn, wool and lambs, 9 cottages and tenements with their appurtenant lands, a garden, and 4 shillings rent of assize from free tenants. In addition, there were two more cottages and 6 more closes amounting to 28 acres of land and all let to divers tenants.

A more detailed look

Now a more detailed look at these items but not necessarily in the order set out above.

The tithes of corn, wool and lambs together with the barn had been demised, in the Prior of Newstead’s time, to Richard Archar(d) for £7:6:8 and from whom they eventually found their way into John Teverey’s hands who “pulled down the barn and carried it away” about 1581-2.³

The four shillings rent of assize from free tenants not particularised cannot be commented upon.

As for the 9 cottages and tenements, the most expensive one was the tenement let at 18s0d a year to Thomas Dullye; (this is an error on the part of the Westminster scribe and should be Tulle (Tole, Towle) as later information proves). These premises were later demised to Laurence Broadbent in 1575 and three years afterwards, in 1578, were leased to John Teverey when he paid two years rent as a fine, the rent being still the same. With this holding went 2 of the 6 oxgangs on non-glebe land, which 2 oxgangs were later on in the occupation of Richard Towle, Thomas’s son.⁴

Next in order of value were the tenement and lands in the holding of Hugh Chambers at 17 shillings a year, and which were demised in 1573 to Richard Trowell, one time curate of Stapleford.

Then comes John Greene’s cottage at 8 shillings a year and which, in 1578, was shewn to be in the occupation of John Grimes when it was demised to John Teverey along with Thomas Tole’s tenure; here again Teverey paid a fine of two year’s rent upon entry.

³ DEP.EXCH E134.36 ELIZ.I Eas.7(Notts).

⁴ Lands of Dis. Relig.Houses. SC 6 Hen VIII 7384 m 40 and Augmentation Office E310-22-114-23.

A little lower down in annual value was (George) Burton's at 6s.8d and with which cottage went two other of the 6 oxgangs of land which, later on, were leased to John Steele.

Next comes Thomas Harryson's and William Bryghte's cottages both at 5 shillings as well as another one for William Bryghte (perhaps "junior") at 4s8d, followed by Henry Briggs's at 3 shillings and Thomas Wryghte's at 2 shillings.

Robert Teverey had the garden at 4 pence. Total value of these rents £3:13:8.⁵

On 30th March 1590, at about the time the "manor" changed hands, Thomas Neale the Auditor appended the following memorandum to what appears to be a register of two of the properties above mentioned i.e. the one at 18 shillings and the one at 17 shillings a year. "Item her Ma tie hath no manor or lands in the towne above specified saving onlie xxxvij s viij d for rent of other landes in Stapleford and the parsonage of Stapleford at viij li per annum. Whereof the one parte is granted in farme and the other parte for term of years". By simple arithmetic it can be readily seen that the 17 shillings plus the 18 shillings plus 38 shillings 8 pence amounts to the £3:13:8 already mentioned for the tithes of corn, wool and lambs plus 13 shillings 4 pence for the tithe of hay. Forty shillings for what was probably the rent of the house and its appurtenant lands is not included as the property was sold about this time.⁶

The remaining 2 cottages and 6 closes of land do not come to light until 1597 when we find that the former were let to John Perry and John Warburton (the curate of Stapleford) each at 12 pence a year. Unfortunately, the names of the tenants of the 6 closes are not given but the names of the closes, their size and value are. Yuleholme (much later to be corrupted to "Ewe Lamb"), 8 acres at 3s 4d a year; Blacke Acre. 8 acres, also at 3s 4d a year; Little Hefeholme, a 4 acres, 16 pence; Swanhooke. 2 acres, 12 pence; Goosholme, 2 acres, 12 pence; and lastly Garholme, 4 acres, at 16 pence. Totals-28 acres, 13 shillings 4 pence a year.

The Auditor, (this time Francis Neale), makes a most revealing footnote to this list of overlooked possessions once belonging to Newstead. "I do not finde that the Queen hath had any Rent answered for the premises and yet do finde good matter whereby it doth appeare that the premises do of right belong to her Highness". The premises were then (1597) leased to William Harlow for 21 years for a fine of 20 shillings and the yearly rents of 13 shillings 4pence.⁷

⁵ Lands of Dis. Relig. Houses SC 6 Hen VIII 7384 m 40 and Augmentation Office E310-22-115-42.

⁶ Augmentation office E 310-22-115-42.

⁷ Augmentation Office E 310-22-115-63.

Mention of some of the foregoing names is made in a grant dated 7th Feb 1570 of certain lands belonging to the Crown and which recently had been in the possession of the Prior of St. John of Jerusalem of Clerkenwell. The grant was made to a Nicholas Mynne and amongst many items from a wide area of the country were “those parcels of meadow in Yuleholme and one other parcel of meadow called Blacke acre containing by estimation 2 acres of the annual value of 7 shillings. And one parcel of meadow called the fehoilm of 1 acre and of the annual value of 3 shillings now or lately in the tenure or occupation of John Martyne of Stapleford and other inhabitants.”⁸

The Manor House and land

There is now left the main item and the one which chiefly concerns this chapter-the house, with the dovecote, 5 oxgangs of glebe land, the “Holme Close”, the tithe of hay and the remain 2 of the 6 oxgangs of land. These had been leased by the Prior of Newstead to Peter Martyll (erroneously given as “Michell” in an ancient deed) for 60 years by an Indenture dated 4th April 1538 when they were described as “the mansion house of the Rectory of Stapleford with all tithes of hay pertaining to the same, and to the lands, meadows, pastures, tofts and crofts, with the “downe coppes” (probably intended for “town cops”-“cops”- a pile of sheaves.) and elsewhere appertaining”. The rent was 53s 4d a year (40s for the house and 13s 4d for the tithe of hay) out of which 4s were paid to the Archbishop of York for Synodals. As 6s was the sum stated in the “Valor Ecclesiasticus” and in Henry Gaswayne’s Account for Synodals to the Archbishop one wonders where here, too, is an error or whether the remaining amount of 2s was made up from other sources.⁹

The house of Peter Martyll

The house of Peter Martyll occupied the same site and indeed became part of the enlarged dwelling of George Jackson in the century following. When, in the 19th century, misfortunate dictated that the estate had to be sold, there was a dovecote; whether or not it was the actual one dating from Tudor times will never be known; it was sited opposite the house, across Pinfold Lane in a garden which ran at the rear of six cottages which fronted onto Church Street near to the junction with Pinfold Lane. The position of the glebe lands we do not know, neither do we know where lay the other 6 oxgangs of land. The “Holme” was a pasture with the Erewash on its eastern side and the town’s pastures of Sandiacre on the west and was granted to Peter Martyll for the freeing up of the Stone Meadows, Nether and Upper, from paying any tithe hay. Why such an arrangement should have been made is not disclosed. Peter also enjoyed the “the tithe hay of the hades and baulks within the fields of Stapleford”.¹⁰

⁸ C66/1063 m.19.

⁹ E 310/41/12

¹⁰ Depos. Exch, E134. 36 Elix I. Eas. 7 (Notts)

The Martylls, or Martin as it later became known, were not a Stapleford family as such but the name occurs in numerous deeds etc. and the family appears to have been domiciled in Chilwell. Peyer Martyll met an untimely end at the age of 60. At about 6 o'clock in the evening of July 5th 1546 he intended to cross a plank bridge (worth $\frac{1}{2}$ d!) leading to the Holme close; the bridge suddenly overturned while he was on it and was precipitated into the ditch below where he lay until 10 p.m. and died therein. Thomas Milner, a man of honest reputation and standing, was the one who discovered the body. Coroner's Inquest.¹¹

A prudent man Peter, he had, of course, made a will and a point of interest in that instrument is the appointment, as Supervisor, of his brother-in-law William Stanbanke, clerk. The monks of Darley following the inevitable dissolution of their House, sold the next presentation to St. Peter's, Derby to Peter Marten, alias Martyll, of Stapleford, who, however, died before he had chance to exercise that right. His executors were allowed to present in 1552 but it was afterwards taken over by the Crown. In this solitary instance the presentation was of William Stanbanke; uncle to the patrons John and Richard Martyll. Cox's Churches of Derby.

Agnes Martyll, a daughter of Peter, married a son of Thomas Tole (probably John) and became the mother of Peter, Humphrey and Richard Tole. Elizabeth, widow of Peter, occupied the farm for the rest of her life and upon her death late in 1557 the lease went to their son John Martyll.

The will of Elizabeth Martyll

A slight digression now concerning an item which can, perhaps, better be included here than later on. By her will Elizabeth Martyll directed her executors to dispose of the residue of her goods "for the good of her husband's soul and of her own, for the poor and for mending of the highways and otherwise".¹² This practice of leaving money, or goods to be sold for money, for the upkeep of the local highway, was very prevalent in Tudor time and several Stapleford wills of this period particularise even more so, stipulating that certain sums be applied to the mending of "Saints Sithe Bridge". This was the bridge over the River Erewash on the Nottingham to Derby road as it entered Sandiacre. In the Valor Ecclesiasticus of Henry VIII reference is made to Sandiacre Church and also to a chapel in Sandiacre dedicated to St. Sytha (or Osyth), who was a daughter of Frewald a Mercian prince.¹³ The actual site of the chapel is not known but information suggests that the bridge took its name from the chapel in the proximity of which it probably stood.

¹¹ KB 9/567 m 178)

¹² REG At YORK Vol.15 Pt 3 F 183v.

¹³ V E Vol III p 159.

John Martyll

John Martyll now had the house and lands and by this time the family name was more commonly known as Marten. He had married Katherine the widow both of Robert Tevereys and Roger Oker (or Okes) and so he had become her third husband. By all accounts it was a mis-alliance and in his will (John died early in 1570) he complains of “all such things as she has purloined away from me; i.e. the lease of the parsonage of Stapleford granted out of the monastery of Newstead; the will of Roger Okes; also the deed and composition made between the heirs of the Tevereys and the township of Stapleford; and the composition between Stapleford and Stanton-juxta-Dale; and an obligation wherein one Poul (?) and one Wilson are bound to me for my “safftie”.¹⁴ There were no children from this union and the lease then passed to Peter Martyn (Marten), John’s other brother; it will be remembered that in an earlier chapter it was stated at the Archdeacon’s Visitation in 1587 that “Mr John Tevereys and Peter Martyns are the farmers of the tithes.”

Disagreement between the Tevereys and the Martells¹⁵

It seems that from an early start the Tevereys and the Martells could not agree amongst themselves and the discord could have stemmed from the settlements made at the time of Katherine’s marriage to John, reaching such a climax that Sir Gervase Clifton, Sir Anthony Styrley and Peter Ros, esquire were called in to arbitrate. By their award made 1st May 1568 John and Katherine were to enjoy rents or an annuity to the yearly value of £13:6:8 from premises which had been Robert Tevereys in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, or elsewhere to the yearly value of £20. Also, they were to have one cottage and its croft in Stapleford, wherein, John Trussell (one of the supervisors of Elizabeth Martyll’s will) was dwelling at the time of making the award, for and during the lifetime of Katherine after John died. If Katherine survived, she was to have a croft in Sandiacre called the Holme, for 60 years. John was to have one half of the wheat and rye which had been sown by him upon any of the aforesaid premises which had been Robert Tevereys’. Katherine and John were to have such goods and chattels as they might lawfully claim being in the custody of John Tevereys who was to have a reciprocal arrangement. The two Johns were bound to each other in the sum of £200.

Further disagreements

The arbitration didn’t settle matters however, for after the death of John Martyll John Tevereys summoned Peter Martyll and Roger Hanke, executors of the will of John Martyll, to appear at the Assizes touching the obligation. Tevereys asserted that John Martyll, in his lifetime, had withheld from him 1 young colt, 1 spit and a hovel of six bays, and therefore the obligation was forfeit. The defendants countered that

¹⁴ Reg at York Vol. 18 f.177v

Katherine, during her lifetime, had not had the croft called the Holme to which she should have been entitled after the decease of her husband. It appears that the case went against the executors, but nothing daunted and feeling himself to be the aggrieved party, Peer Martyll petitioned the Queen in 1574 setting out his case and making the point that he and Roger Hanke were poor men, (they probably had to find £200) and that in all the breach of the award had only amounted to 5 marks. He implored Her Majesty to order John Teverey to “the Whitehall in Westminster” to answer to the Masters of thy Request.¹⁶

Manor house in the possession of John Broadbent

Soon after 1587 Peter Martyll relinquished the lease of the “parsonage”, but appears to have remained in Stapleford. A Christopher Bancroft next possessed the premises but only for a very short time for around the year 1590 the property came into the possession of John Broadbent but whether by lease or purchase at that particular time is not clear, he certainly became the owner later on and the estate seems to have comprised the house, the Holme close, a dovecote, the 5 oxgangs of glebe and the 6 oxgangs of other land plus the tithes of hay.

By all accounts John Broadbent was not a welcome addition to the village and simply did not fit in and from an early beginning was at loggerheads with many, principally the Tevereys. One of the first things he did was to take action against Christopher Bancroft (who had on his side William Walker and Peter Chambers) for any waste or spoil made or done to the house, buildings, woods etc. belonging thereto. The Inquiry was held in Stapleford on Thursday April 11th 1594 before John Alton, Lancelot Rolston, Henry Handley, Robert Baynbrigge and Christopher Pym. The witnesses for the defendant were few, Peter Martyll, then aged 60, Robert Trees, husbandman, and William Turn bull, tailor, but were sufficient to provide evidence to the Commissioners to find that Bancroft had no complaint to answer.¹⁷

Contention between Teverey and Broadbent

We have seen in a previous chapter his endeavours to enforce payment of the tithe of hay (1592) to which he was entitled; this sort of action would not be confined to that year only and no doubt many such actions followed for which no record has survived.

After the inquiry concerning waste etc. there followed in 1595 an accusation levied against John Teverey in the Archdeacon’s Court concerning burial dues. In 1601 a cause pending between Broadbent and Gervase Teverey was heard in the ecclesiastical court at York when many of the deponents were Stapleford people.

¹⁶ Court of Requests REQ 2/238/13.

¹⁷ DEPOS. EXCH. ROLLS E 134. 36 ELIZ I EAS. 7 (Notts)

In 1612 there was again contention between the same two protagonists, this time regarding the repairs to the chancel of the church and payment of 6 shillings and 8 pence for every person buried in the chancel. The matter was decided in the Archdeacons' Court on June 20th when it was recited that Gervase Teverey held in fee farm the tithes of corn, wool and lambs, and Broadbent the fee simple of the parsonage house, the glebe land and the tithe hay of Stapleford. The court ordered that the chancel should be repaired and the charges therefore be divided into three equal parts whereof Gervase Teverey was to pay two parts and John Broadbent one part. This arrangement to continue between them and their heirs whenever the chancel required repairing.

Six shillings and 8 pence was the sum due for everybody who was buried in the chancel except such as had been owners and farmers for the time being of the glebe in Stapleford; it was further ordered that the money from such burials should also be divided into three equal parts, whereof Gervase Teverey was to have two and John Broadbent one part. It was also agreed that Gervase Teverey and his heirs should pay, for every burial of any of his family in the chancel (and as far as we know the Tevereys vault was in the nave), two parts of 6 shillings and 8 pence to John Broadbent and his heirs; likewise JB and his heirs were to pay to GT or his heirs two parts of 6 shillings and 8 pence for the burial of his family in the chancel. The court costs were divided, as might be expected, two parts to be paid by G.T. and one part by J.B.¹⁸

Five years later (1617) there was more rouble and, as usual, John Broadbent was the instigator of it. For about 18 years he had refused to pay his contribution to the Common Fine and Thirdborrow's Allowances amounting to 1 shilling and 9 pence yearly and Sir Percival Willoughby (with whom he was on intimate terms actively colluded with him in the avoidance of his obligation. (See chapter on The Common Fine.) Broadbent and Willoughby were the defendants in this complaint brought by Gervase Teverey, Mark Teverey and Luke Fawkener.¹⁹

Broadbent granted arms and serves as constable

Broadbent was what we would call a "social climber*; he applied for and was granted in 1601 the Arms "Party per pale ERMINE and AZURE; a fess wavy GULES. The crest, a pheon ARGENT embrued GULES". Notwithstanding this he was still liable to serve as constable for the parish and in January 1613 did not appear at the Quarter Sessions to take the oath. He was ordered to serve in that office until the next sessions and was then to be at liberty to serve in that office by deputy during his term.²⁰ He probably did very little as constable and on April 12th 1613 was at the

¹⁸ Arch. Deacons Reg. No. 18

¹⁹ DEP. EXCH. E134 15 Jas. I Trin 7 (Notts)

²⁰ NQS Vol.3 p127.

Sessions charged with refusing to punish a vagrant brought before him. For this transgression he was later fined 6 shillings and 8 pence.²¹

Boabdent's debts

He probably considered himself on a par with the Tevereys, especially as he was on such close terms with the Willoughby family, an association which, together with his ambitions to be a great "I am", cost him dearly in his attempt to keep up with the Jones's. He borrowed £30 from Sir Percival Willoughby in 1596²² sold the "Holme" for £90 in 1619 to Thomas Charlton of Sandiacre²³ and when he made his will in 1636 confessed to owing £400 to divers persons. An improvident father, he did not even provide his daughter Mary with a dowry when she married Gervase Jackson.

He was not without is followers however, and it looks as if the Tole (Towle) family were, at least, on sufficiently favourable terms with him for them to name one of their sons after his son Valentine. Percival, another son of J.B's died in 1661.²⁴

Mary Broadbent, wife of John, died early in 1627²⁵ but as to when John himself died there is some doubt. His will is dated 18th February 1636 but was not proved until January 3rd 1650 by Gervase Jackson. There is no entry of his burial in either the Bishop's Transcripts or the extant Parish Register, and as he failed to provide himself with a monument his date of death can only be a matter for conjecture.

John Broadbent's will

By his will he appointed Gervase Jackson, in whom he had "great trust and confidence" and who had married his only surviving daughter, Mary, (another daughter, Francis, had died in 1610²⁶ , to be his sole executor; to sell the estate, pay his debts, and divide the remainder between his son, Valentine, and daughter Mary JB's will PCC 1659 Fol 15. Some agreement must have been reached between the interested parties for the house and lands came into the Jackson family.

Valentine Broadbent left the parish and founded a family elsewhere; an indication of this is in Winchester Cathedral where a tablet to the memory of a Cornelius Davenport Broadbent, son of the Revd.C I Broadbent, who died in India 7th January 1877 aged 40 years displays the Arms as granted to John in 1601.

The Jacksons

A great deal concerning the Jackson in Stapleford at the turn of the 16th century is still very obscure and a few well-placed items of genealogical content would be invaluable in unravelling several knotty problems relating to them. The fact that the

²¹ NQS Vol. 3,pp. 139 and 155.

²² CAT. ANCIENT DEEDS C 7213 Vol II

²³ DEED IN Nottm. Library

²⁴ BT's

²⁵ BT's

²⁶ BT's

Jacksons were in Stapleford before 1600 is very evident. Margaret Storer, daughter of Roger who died in 1593, married a Thomas Jackson; Cisseley Greasley, daughter of Thomas who died well before 1585, married John Jackson who died in 1609 leaving two sons, Gervase and John, both under age at the time of making his will in 1599. This John also mentions cousins Henry, John, William and Francis Jackson though not their place of abode; however, the indication here is of a family already with many branches.

Gervase Jackson

Gervase, son of John, fits very well into the scheme of things except that, by his inheritance at least, one would not have thought him to be a suitable match for the daughter of our ambitious John Broadbent; he married Mary Broadbent about the year 1615 and on December 3rd 1616 their son, George, was baptised in Stapleford.²⁷ The Bishop's Transcripts are non-existent which would tell if there were more children of this union but evidence of a later date suggested that perhaps there were at least two more, a son Valentine and a daughter Grace.

Gervase Jackson appears to have taken over his father-in-law's estates long before that person's demise. In the Subsidy Rolla of I Chas.I (278th March 1625-26) he answers for the land for which JB. answered in the Subsidy of 20 Jas.I (24th March 1622-23 March 1623); in both instances the subsidy was 6 shillings on land valued, for taxation purposed at 30 shillings.²⁸

Apart from odd items of office as one of the churchwardens (1615-6 and 1630-1) very little is known of Gervase. He was involved in a case of bastardy brought to the Quarter Sessions in April 1625. A Margery Storer had been delivered of a bastard of which Richard Huson was the putative father. With the connivance of his father, Francis, Richard had absconded without taking care or making provision for the child. Gervase Jackson had allowed (in what capacity is not stated) Margery to be "brought in" before the delivery of her child whereby the parish was likely to be chargeable with its upkeep. Storer was sent to the House of Correction for a year and the Overseers of Stapleford were to allow her 6 pence a week by monthly payments whilst she remained there. Of this sum Gervase Jackson was to pay 2 pence, Francis Huson 2 pence and the parish 2 pence, per week.²⁹

On 1st October 1638 he appeared before the Quarter Sessions and was committed to gaol in default of security, and to appear at the Assizes for offering 20 shillings to someone named Henson to burn down Gervase Teverey's barn.³⁰

Not such a paragon of virtue as John Broadbents' will would have us believe.

²⁷ BT.

²⁸ E 179-160-291 & E 170-160-284.

²⁹ NQS Vol 7, p170.

³⁰ NQS Vol.10 p.87.

Precisely when Gervase died cannot be ascertained; he was evidently alive in January 1650 when he was granted probate of his father-in-law's will. A Gervase Jackson was buried at Stapleford on March 19th 1672 but there is nothing to indicate that this was the Gervase Jackson who married Mary Broadbent; there is neither will nor Administration Bond which could give a clue. Furthermore, as early as 1650, in the Constable's Accounts where one would expect to find some mention of him-not a word! The name George Jackson appears quite extensively and one can only assume that he, like his father before him, took over and answered for the family estates at an earlier period of time than would be expected.

George Jackson-the elder

Despite John Broadbent's dreams of grandeur, the Jacksons were still only a yeoman family albeit a fairly substantial one; the occasional reference as "Mr" or "gentleman" suggests that they were regarded on a plane beneath the Tevereys, Palmes and Warrens, but a little above the other inhabitants. Even in the early 1700's the parish registers are very occasional in the use of titles for them, and apart from references to "Old Mrs. Jackson" and "Young Mrs. Jackson" there is nothing to indicate or suggest any elevated status.

George Jackson died 5th September 1684 as a tablet in the church testifies. His wife was named Elizabeth and apart from her mention on the same tablet we know nothing more about her. According to Thoroton, George was, for a time, Chief, or High, Constable of the Hundred and was appointed about the year 1661, serving in that capacity until his death. From his will, written by himself, it appears that the usual jointure was made between he, his wife and their only son George; that there was only one child of his marriage we are, therefore, left in no doubt.³¹

George Jackson-the younger

George Jackson the younger married, firstly (1667) Sarah Stanfield of Chilwell and who died in September the following year after giving birth to a daughter, Elizabeth. He next married Mary Millward (1670) and fathered several children of whom Israel, Mordecai (who married Elizabeth Fox of Stanton), and Sarah are the only ones who survived into adult life.

It was this George Jackson who rebuilt the house in 1689 and which retained its aspect of many gables and mullioned windows until its woeful end. He died c. 1716, his second wife having pre-deceased him as far back as February 1681. At the time of his death, he was living with his daughter Sarah and son-in-law Henry Oldershaw. Although there is no will, an Inventory to the value of £85:13:6 gives a good picture of his condition. It is clear from this that he occupied a room in the house of Henry, and although the furnishings were sparse-a bedstead with feather-bed and two

³¹ Will at York.

blankets, 6 leather chairs and a clock-they would be adequate for a many of advancing years living with is daughter. He also had a “parcel” of books and his horse but not least of all two bonds for security totalling £55=10=0 plus £18:17:6 owed to him by son Israel.³²

Israel Jackson

Israel Jackson was the eldest son and heir and appears to have married his first wife c. 1696-7, of whom it is only known that her name was Dorothy. Of the three children born of this marriage two died in infancy and the third, a daughter Mary, later married a John Jackson of Beeston and does not concern this history. Dorothy died at the end of May 1706 and Israel married, for the second time about a year later. This one’s Christian name was Hannah and is as much as is known about her; she became the mother of seven children-two of whom, Israel and George, died in infancy. Penelope, the eldest child, married Thomas Bryan of Aston-upon-Trent, Ann, the second child, married a Surgeon in the Dragoons, Joseph James, in 1741. It is said that she was looking over the garden wall when Joseph’s Regiment passed by, and fell in love with him at first sight. It is she who becomes all important later on. Hannah, the third daughter, died in 1761 at Mansfield Woodhouse and was unmarried. Nehemiah was the eldest surviving son and John, born early in 1721, completes the score. I make a point of reciting the family of Israel and Hannah as they have great bearing on later events.

Israel sells land

Within a year or so after his marriage-when the usual settlements would have been made-Israel seems to have been in need of money: we find him selling (5th April 1699) 1 cottage, 7 lands, 1 beast pasture and 2 sheep gates to George Brown who had married Elizabeth, daughter of Jacob Eaton (not to be confused or mistaken for the family of the 19th century which gave its name to Eaton’s Road).³³ and one cottage and 1 close of 2 roods to John Oldershaw for £19-10-0 on the same day.³⁴ There was also a sale on the same day to Moses Atkin, but unfortunately the deed is almost indecipherable and no pertinent details are legible.³⁵

Again, a few years after his father’s death, he indulged in a little land selling; rather more this time, some 14 acres for £305-11-0 to John Gregory of Breaston in May 1719³⁶ who also bought from Henry Oldershaw in September of the same year the land-without the cottage- which John Oldershaw, father of Henry, had purchased from Israel Jackson. These transactions, perhaps not important in themselves, are

³² INV. York. 1716.

³³ DD 193/2 NCA

³⁴ M 5296 N City Library.

³⁵ M 3693 N City Library.

³⁶ DDPF 138/69

indicative of how land in Stapleford was gradually changing ownership-especially outsiders.

John Jackson

Israel Jackson was buried 5th January 1722 and left a widow Hannah, who later married George Johnson a staymaker of Stapleford. Of the children, Nehemiah was the eldest son and at the time of his father's death was under age; he inherited the estate but did not enjoy it for very long, dying unmarried in April 1738 when the property devolved upon his younger brother John.

He came into his inheritance early in life thus giving him the opportunity, coupled with his evident shrewdness, of increasing his possessions and bettering his position. This John appears (precise details of this Jackson family are singularly lacking) to have married someone with the name of Hannah about the year 1742, from which union there were two children, a girl and a boy. The daughter Elizabeth, was born in 1745 and later married Thomas Brailsford at Scarcliffe , Derbyshire on September 9th 1773; she died May 8th 1774 and was buried at Stapleford. Son John was born August 18th 1748 and died, unmarried, on March 29th 1770. Hannah, wife of John, the elder, was buried March 7th 1779.

John Jackson was not long before he married again, this time the bride was Elizabeth Searson and the ceremony took place at Heanor on April 8th 1780. She was 36 and he by this time was 59, nevertheless two children were born to them, a daughter, another Elizabeth, baptised August 29th 1780 and a son, another John, baptised April 27th 1783.

Whilst previous members of the Jackson family had been content with yeoman status and an occasional allusion to gentility, John, besides adding to his land and property later bought the patronage of the living and, as an outward sign of that status appears to have displayed the arms: OR, a lion statant GULES. On a chief GULES three pole axes OR. For a crest a demi-lion rampant OR holding in its paws a pheon AZURE. The motto "Esto quod esse videris" ("Be what you seem to be"). This, however, could be spurious as no authoritative printed references corroborate the fact.

A man of business and an acquisitive one, he was sharp and it was well for people to be wary of him in their dealings with him. Even his relations were not immune as the two following instances illustrate.

A letter written by Joseph James to his daughter at the time of her marriage warns here- "I desire you to go to Boden and of your Uncle Jim ask that he will oblige your Uncle Jackson to let the deeds be read over as they say where he had his money. Another thing I desire is that you will be upon your guard, and take care that your

Uncle Jackson does not deceive you". Extract from a letter, now lost, produced in court and which helped to prove HC's inheritance.

The further indication of this lamentable trait is his character is revealed in the will of his sister Hannah. She refers to "a sum of £200-or some other less sum which is secured to me and charged upon certain lands etc. in Stapleford in the possession of my brother John Jack secured by a certain deed now or late in his possession and for which he now pays me only £6 a year interest."- a poor return on her portion which would be settled by her father. The wording clearly indicates a grievance as well as suggesting that she was not too sure as to just how much she was entitled. (Also, from this will we learn of the names of her sister Ann's children: John; Gustavus Broadbent; Hannah; and Mary Broadbent James. The Jacksons certainly had not lost sight of the fact that they were descended from the Broadbents).³⁷

John Jackson b.1783

John Jackson died in June 1808 and was survived by his widow, who died in December 1821, daughter Elizabeth, and son John, both of whom never married.

John, of course, inherited the estate, after due provision had been made for his mother and sister, and seems to have increased the extent of his "empire". It is known that he indulged in the purchase of more land, and also built several cottages amongst which were two, now demolished which stood next to the "Chequers" Inn-which he also owned; no doubt the bricks came from his own brickworks-up Pasture Road-as did those with which he rebuilt the perimeter wall to his garden and into which he incorporated, in blue brick his initials "JJ" and the year, "1822"; a feature which could still be seen on the Pinfold Lane side up until the time of its demolition.

An Assessment made 1812-1813 for tax on specified items gives a small glimpse of the Jackson ménage. Only one horse for riding or for carriage, 3 other horses (presumably draught), 2 greyhounds, no servants, and no armorial bearings. This last item belies the assumption that the family was entitled to a coat of arms, the only authority for which is an old print of the alleged arms. Not exactly an opulent household for No. 2, Stapleford. JJ. paid no tax on hair powder-no such genteel refinements for him!-can this be taken as an indication of his parsimony and a forerunner of his eccentricity? Incidentally, the only persons to pay tax on hair powder were Sir John Borlase Warren and Thomas Antill.³⁸

³⁷ Will at York.

³⁸ NCL M 199

Death of John Jackson 1854

The last of the Jacksons died 26th January 1854 his sister having pre-deceased him in 1849. He had made no will, in fact he had an aversion to will-making and had declared that none of his ancestors were in the habit of making them, and if they had done so, then, like his own father, had not enjoyed good health after so doing. A foolish notion, especially for one in his position, and one which brought about unfortunate repercussions for Stapleford.

Naturally, people were well aware that John Jackson had no immediate relations, and as his estate was of considerable size, there was much speculation as to possible beneficiaries. One person who, it is alleged, had been promised a share in the estate was the housekeeper, Sarah Radbourne; she had entered the service of the Jackson during the lifetime of sister Elizabeth. Her family hailed from Boulton, near Derby, and had been known to the Jacksons for many years but had become reduced in circumstances. -Sarah's mother had been buried at the expense of John Jackson (presumably the younger).

Forged will

His dislike of will-making being known to his immediate servants and friends, the former would not dare to ask him to make one, and the latter, if they ever broached the subject, were no doubt rebuffed. The situation being this, the way was open for schemers, plotters and unscrupulous retainers; such were the main characters in the drama which was to develop and which began towards the end of 1852. The players in these most discreditable happenings were Sarah Radbourne, (house-keeper); John Oldershaw, (estate workers-he kept J.J.'s books, managed his brick-yard and, it was said, had hopes of marrying Sarah); William Wragg, (farm worker and waggoner); Mary Wragg, (wife of William and sister to Sarah); and Elijah Barker, (a shoemaker of Derby). Two lesser characters were Joseph Sills, senior, and Joseph Sills, junior (workers on the estate and one-time tenants of the Jackson).

In December 1852 Wagg went to see Elijah Barker who, although only a shoemaker, had some slight knowledge of the law and who had, on occasions had done work for John Jackson in a matter concerning Chancery proceedings. (More penny-pinching! Why didn't the man employ a proper lawyer!) He asked him if he would make a will for Mr. Jackson and, as this did not seem to be an unreasonable request, he agreed to do it; Sarah Radbourne also called upon him, a few weeks later, and put to him the same request. By this will the bulk of the estate was to go to Sarah with bequests to a few others, a sum of money to the poor and an annuity of £50 to the Vicar and his successors. (One of the touches to give verisimilitude to the whole thing was that was that the will should appear to be discovered in the presence of the vicar, presumably after the funeral.)

Barker drew up a will in May 1883 and gave it to Wragg who returned several times for minor alterations to be made—probably the conspirators could not agree amongst themselves as to who was to have what. Whilst all this was going on Elijah Barker had occasion to dine with Jackson at the Manor House but neither of them mentioned the will. John Jackson certainly would not as he knew nothing of it, but one marvels at the restraint of Barker at not even enquiring whether or not the will covered all points to his satisfaction.

Early in November of the same year Wragg went again to Barker and gave instructions for the making of a fourth will which, when drawn up, duly received the approval of Wragg when he collected it at the end of that month. Shortly after this visit he again went to see Barker and took with him a piece of paper which bore John Jackson's signature, and asked him to copy it on to the will. It now became quite clear what Wragg was about; Barker was horrified and refused absolutely. In desperation Wragg offered him £5000, complaining that if he didn't do it none of them would get a farthing, anyway no one but the two of them would know of the forgery. Barker pointed out the terrible consequences which would follow should it be discovered and would still have none of it.

So much work having been put into the nefarious plans, which looked as if they were about to be thwarted, the conspirators were left to their own devices. They had decided upon a course of action but at Christmas Wragg once more approached Barker and asked him yet again whether he was prepared, or not, to do that which they wanted; he still refused and Wragg then told him it didn't matter anyway as John Oldershaw would do it.

In January of 1854 John Jackson became very ill and with the prospect of losing all for which they had schemed Oldershaw took it upon himself to forge a fresh will and sign it. (It was said that the pen was put into the testator's hand and that Oldershaw guided it in the signature). He then took it to the two Sills's who, more than likely not knowing much about such matters and probably being in awe of Oldershaw, attested to it. This was on the 25th January and was the day before John Jackson died.

On Friday the 27th Wragg saw Barker and told him the old gentleman had died, whereupon the latter enquired if the deceased had made a will and got the reply, "No, but we have got that one of John Oldershaw's". Barker was astounded that they were going through with it and was so perturbed that on the following Monday he went to see Sarah Radbourne but got no change from her.

Will declared a forgery and miscreants charged

After the funeral, which took place the following Friday, February 2nd, (a long time to keep a body but perhaps it was a severe winter and no grave could be dug), the

will was admitted to the Archdeacon's Court for probate, but Edward Searson, a maternal cousin of John Jackson, declared it to be a forgery and had it impeached in both the Ecclesiastical and Civil Courts. The upshot of this was the miscreants Oldershaw, Radbourne, the two Wraggs and the two Sills's were charged with "conspiring together to utter a forged will and to have it admitted to Probate". Wragg had been apprehended by Searson in the Warren Arms; Barker was also present and when Wragg was able to have a quiet word with him he offered £10,000 if he would keep out of the way and at the same time prevent another witness from going into Court. Benjamin Heard, a Derby constable, apprehended Sarah Radbourne at the Manor House where he saw a great quantity of valuables being put into a box; £155 in notes, £51-10-0 in gold and £4:2:6 in silver.

The trials

The accused appeared at the Shire Hall, Nottingham in February 1854 and then had to wait until the Spring Assizes at York in 1857 where the case lasted two days and 21 witnesses were called. The two Sills turned Queen's Evidence and admitted the signature to be a forgery and were acquitted. Oldershaw, Radbourne and the Wraggs were found guilty and were sentenced to two years imprisonment with hard labour. The judge had a few sharp words to say about the case in general to the effect that too much expenses had been incurred as well as great inconvenience to so many people. Furthermore, the case could quite well have been settled at Nottingham.³⁹

As the judge had remarked, "too much expenses had been incurred", and still more was to come. The trial and conviction of the criminals was not the end of the matter so far as the disposal of the estate went and the whole sorry affair dragged on until 1866. Four claimants came forward in the hope of grasping a tidy windfall; Edward Searson, the maternal cousin; Hannah Cartledge, great-grand-daughter of Joseph James and Ann Jackson; Charles Butler, just what relationship his claim was based upon I have been unable to discover; and Sarah Radbourne, who claimed that Elizabeth Jackson, wife of John, adopted her and prevailed upon her to live with them on the understanding that they would have her all. It would be well for would-be claimants to descent from this family to note that no one by the name of Jackson came forward, or is ever mentioned, to claim the estate.

Hannah and Charles denied Edward Searson's right to any interest in the estate, although he was later awarded the personal estate which included many fine pieces of silver and furniture. Hannah, Sarah (presumably after her release from gaol) and Charles agreed to share the properties and land buy in 1866 this agreement was declared fraudulent as against Hannah and was set aside. Charles Butler (who had become bankrupt as had Edward Searson) and his assignee, John Simpson, Auctioneer, were ordered to re-convey to Hannah Cartledge such of the estate as

³⁹ Nottm. Journal 1857.

Charles had taken in the share-out. (Hannah had successfully filed a bill in Chancery against Sarah Radbourne in 1865).

Here again it must be emphasised that no one by the name of Jackson is involved. Twelve years had elapsed since the death of John –ample time for work to have got around, especially with the publicity the affairs had been given, to enable any “outlying” relations to have stated their claim. The fact that the law acknowledged Hannah Cartledge to be sole heiress is further proof that no present-day Jacksons are descended either from John, the father, or even from Israel,

Estate put up for sale in 1866

The estate was re-conveyed on May 31st, 1866 and on June 19th the house and lands etc. in Stapleford went up for sale. During the time of the legal battles the house had not remained empty and in 1864 was occupied by a John Robinson who also farmed a considerable part of the land.

At the time of John Jackson’s death, the value of the real estate was put at more than £30,000; it was also thought that there was land elsewhere, but this is conjecture. The servants, to strengthen their claims under the forged will, destroyed all deeds etc. that were in the house and this is the reason why, at the time of the sale, JJ.’s right to the properties was established in a variety of ways. It is amazing how the stupidity of one man, by not making a will, could have adversely involved so many people and so detrimentally affected his own estate as well as the parish in general. Even poor Hannah had no option but to part with her inheritance in order to meet the costs of litigation etc.

The Auction took place on Tuesday, 10th June 1866 at the King George IV Hotel, Nottingham and was held by John Simpson. It comprised the advowson of the Perpetual Curacy; the Manor House; 134 acres of arable meadow and pasture land; two public houses and several cottages and gardens, all to the yearly value of £525. The total proceeds amounted to only £11,351-just a slight difference from the figure of £30,000 quoted above,

J. Sherwin Gregory was the principal purchaser; he bought the Manor House, orchard, fishpond and 20 acres of land as well as the Nine Leys Close (then in the occupation of William Clifford): Hillfield House, out-buildings and paddock; the Ryecrofts; Queens Closes; Kirkgate Close, and Kerrigate Close with its house, orchard and garden.

The Advowson of the annual value of £152 was bought by a Mr. Morris of Lincoln’s Inn; Barnaby Close by Frederick Pigg; Parter Close by R.Duar; Deborah’s Close with its house and garden by W.Barton; Crabtree Close by John Daykin; Plum

Pudding meadow by Samuel Fairfield; two cottages and a seat in the gallery of the church by Charles Butler-small beer in comparison to what he had hoped to possess.

Of the two public houses sold, “The Rose and Crown” (situated opposite Wesley Place Chapel), together with two houses and gardens were bought by Augustus Wallis. “The Chequers”, with six cottages, their yards, gardens and stables were bought by N Tarr. Also in the sale were Windmill Close, house and garden; a stable and loft; and a dovecote, garden and eight cottages.

The Manor House demolished

Since that time the owners and occupiers of the Manor House have been many; in its latter days it ceased to be a farm-what land remained to it proving too much of a temptation for the owner not to part with it for building speculation-, until early in 1971 when, after a losing battle against officialdom, the house succumbed to the demolition gang and a part of Stapleford, which had stood through many changing centuries, had gone for good, When one examined the rear of the house one became instantly aware that, somehow, it did not quite match up to the front portion; the lean-to partially obliterated some very old windows and once inside the kitchen one could not help feeling that, of all the rooms in the old house, this was indeed the most ancient; so different from all the other rooms its heavily, many beamed ceiling and wide fire-place proclaimed that this must really be an original room of the pre-1689 period of the house.

With its passing went one of the many school-boy legends about the house, namely, that an underground passage led from there to the church and from the church to the Hall. Alas! the old house did not even have a cellar.

