ROMNEY MARSH
Persistence and Change in a Coastal Lowland

Edited by
Martyn Waller, Elizabeth Edwards and Luke Barber

www.rmrt.org.uk
Romney Marsh Research Trust
2010
The Romney Marsh Research Trust exists to promote, co-ordinate and disseminate research into the historical, social, economic and physical development of Romney and Walland Marshes and their immediate hinterlands. The Trust receives, raises and holds funds to meet grant applications to support and publish research into the Marsh and invites individuals to become Friends of the Romney Marsh Research Trust and to participate in lectures, conferences, field visits and research projects. Details of the Trust and membership are available on the web-site www.rmrt.org.uk.
Contents

List of Contributors vii

Foreword and publications of members of the Romney Marsh Research Trust from 2002 (Martyn Waller, Elizabeth Edwards and Luke Barber) ix

1. The Holocene Coastal Deposits of Sussex: a Re-evaluation (Martyn Waller and Antony Long) 1

2. The Mid-Late Holocene Evolution of Southern Walland Marsh and the Origin of the ‘Midley Sand’ (Jason Kirby, David Clarke, Tim Shaw and Emma Toole) 23

3. Holocene Fire Histories from the Edge of Romney Marsh (Michael Grant and Martyn Waller) 53

4. Adapting to PPG16: Planning-led Archaeology on the Walland, Denge and Romney Marshes of Kent and East Sussex, 1990–2010 (Casper Johnson) 75

5. The Romney Marsh Archaeological Gazetteer: its Creation and Use (Alan Tyler) 93

6. Overcoming disaster? Farming Practices on Christ Church Priory’s Marshland Manors in the Early 14th Century (Sheila Sweetinburgh) 97

7. ‘My boddye shall lye with my name Engraven on it’: Remembering the Godfrey family of Lydd, Kent (Terreena Bellinger and Gillian Draper) 117

8. Aspects of Corporate Landownership and the Fortunes of Livestock Farmers on Walland Marsh and Denge Marsh, c. 1730–90 (Anne Davison) 141


Index of Places and People 185
Contributors

LUKE BARBER
Sussex Archaeological Society, Barbican House
Museum, 169 High Street, Lewes, East Sussex BN7
1YE. E-mail: research@sussexpast.co.uk

TERREENA BELLINGER
95 Godinton Road, Ashford, Kent TN23 1LN.

DAVID CLARKE
Department of Geography, University of Liverpool,
Roxby Building, Liverpool L69 7ZT.

HADRIAN COOK
Centre for Earth and Environmental Science
Research, School of Geography, Geology and the
Environment, Kingston University, Penrhyn Road,
Kingston, Surrey KT1 2EE. E-mail: h.cook@kingston.ac.uk

ANNE DAVISON
50 Park Avenue, Maidstone, Kent ME14 5HL.
E-mail: contact_anne_davison@hotmail.com

GILLIAN DRAPER
Lynton Lodge, 1 Clarendon Road, Sevenoaks,
Kent TN13 1EU. E-mail: g.m.draper@kent.ac.uk

ELIZABETH EDWARDS
School of History, Rutherford College,
The University, Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NX.
E-mail: e.c.edwards@kent.ac.uk

MICHAEL GRANT
Wessex Archaeology, Portway House, Old Sarum
Park, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP4 6EB.
E-mail: m.grant@wessexarch.co.uk

CASPER JOHNSON
Archaeology, Transport and Environment, East
Sussex County Council, County Hall, St Anne’s
Crescent, Lewes, East Sussex BN7 1UE.
E-mail: Casper.Johnson@eastsussex.gov.uk

JASON R. KIRBY
School of Natural Sciences and Psychology,
Liverpool John Moores University, Byrom Street,
Liverpool L3 3AF. E-mail: J.R.Kirby@ljmu.ac.uk

ANTONY LONG
Environmental Research Centre, Department of
Geography, University of Durham, Science Site,
South Road, Durham DH1 3LE.

TIM A. SHAW
School of Natural Sciences and Psychology,
Liverpool John Moores University, Byrom Street,
Liverpool L3 3AF.

SHEILA SWEETINBURGH
11 Caledon Terrace, Canterbury, Kent CT1 3JS.
E-mail: S.M.Sweetinburgh@kent.ac.uk

EMMA TOOLE
School of Natural Sciences and Psychology,
Liverpool John Moores University, Byrom Street,
Liverpool L3 3AF.

ALAN TYLER
22 Albert Road North, Malvern, Worcestershire
WR14 2TP. E-mail: alantyler22@aol.com

MARTYN WALLER
Centre for Earth and Environmental Science
Research, School of Geography, Geology and the
Environment, Kingston University, Penrhyn Road,
Kingston, Surrey KT1 2EE.
E-mail: m.waller@kingston.ac.uk
7. ‘My boddye shall lye with my name Engraven on it’: remembering the Godfrey family of Lydd, Kent

Terreena Bellinger and Gillian Draper

Commemorative arts were a central feature of religious and family life in late medieval and early modern Lydd. The Godfrey family formed part of the social elite who lived and held property in towns of the Cinque Ports confederation from the 13th century, and some of their family members were remembered and celebrated in the churches of Lydd, New Romney and New Winchelsea. At Lydd church the Godfreys employed various methods of commemoration from c. 1430, both to revere their dead and praise their lives. As such, their surviving monuments offer the opportunity to examine commemorative culture in the context of the society of the late medieval and early modern period. This paper draws on new studies of the economy and society of the towns of the Cinque Port confederation to establish the background of the Godfrey family and their memorial art, and considers the Godfreys’ choice of commemoration in the light of recent examinations of the dedicatory culture of death.

Introduction

The Godfrey family of Lydd flourished in the 16th and 17th centuries and stamped its success upon the parish church through its striking monuments. Its rise in wealth and prominence is noteworthy and can be contrasted with other families such as the Strogulls and Stuppeneys who also lived and held office locally at the same period but then disappeared from Lydd, apparently through lack of heirs. The Godfreys reveal how a family could rise from the standing of yeoman to gentry in a Kent parish, and in so doing enter the world of those of greater-than-local substance. This, at least, was the aim of the memorial culture which the family developed, building it around a purported ancestor of the 15th century and drawing on the activity of antiquarians in the 17th century, particularly John Philipot, the Somerset Herald of the College of Arms. The family thus demonstrates the continuing meaning of memorialisation across the Reformation divide.

The Godfrey monuments are also remarkable because they record the lives and deaths of people of lower social position than most of those commemorated in the post-Reformation monuments surviving in parish churches, for example those of Sir Moyle Finch and his wife Elizabeth, Countess of Winchelsea, in Eastwell church, Kent, and that of Sir Thomas Cheyne, Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports (1536 to 1558), in Minster church, Sheppey (Llewellyn 2000, 3–4, figs 2a, 2b; Lehmberg 2004). The features of the monuments of such influential figures of the minor nobility and upper gentry reflect the riches and eminence which enabled them to commission large and
complex constructions from tomb-makers such as Ephiphanius Evesham, who built that of Sir Thomas Hawkins in the church of Boughton-under-Blean (1618) (Llewellyn 2000, 51, fig. 27). Their grand monuments usually consisted of recumbent effigies lying on tomb-chests within an ‘architectural setting or frame’ of which pillars, arches and porticoes were major components. The effigies echoed those of medieval knightly figures such as Sir Walter Menil in Lydd church but also replicated ‘the natural body displayed on the funeral bier’. From Elizabeth’s reign the representation of this natural body and the monumental appeal for prayers and escape from purgatory was replaced by ‘the social body’, with its praise of exemplary lives and stress on the civil and religious functions of the dead (Llewellyn 2000, 4, 7, 30, 37, 44, 55). The Godfrey monuments are of special interest as examples of those of the much wider range of social classes who commissioned memorials from around 1580, generally in the form of engraved stones, brasses or painted wood. Like the grander tombs of the more socially-exalted, the Godfreys’ memorials fulfilled the purpose of denying the separation of death and achieving the greatest possible continuity with the past, particularly so by a linkage which they made to the life and brass of a medieval Godfrey.

In addition, study of the Godfrey family opens up many aspects of life in the towns of the Cinque Ports and sets them in the longer-term context of the changing value and prosperity of the confederation, of which Lydd was part as a member or ‘limb’ of the Head Port New Romney. The history of the Godfreys enlivens what is known of the Cinque Ports from new studies of their economy, society, culture and religion, politics and buildings, not least because it was one of a number of families which ranged over several of the Ports during the period when these were of national significance in the Middle Ages. This study draws too on wider examinations of the memorial culture of death over the Reformation decades and is intended to make a further contribution to it (e.g. Bertram 1996; Saul 2009).

Between the 12th and the late 14th centuries the Cinque Ports which surrounded the Romney Marshes, Lydd, New Romney, Rye and Winchelsea, had national importance in wartime and as trading places. Rye and Winchelsea were Ancient Towns of the confederation. New Winchelsea and Rye had mayors from the late 13th century; in contrast New Romney and Lydd were under the jurisdiction of the lord’s bailiff, an office which nevertheless became one held by men who were chosen locally. The civic elites of these towns, including the Godfreys, developed early, and they began to express their place in society through church monuments and the founding of chantries. In the mid- to later 16th century, the Cinque Ports retained religious and political worth as the power base of the Lord Warden, with Sir Thomas Cheyne a Marian supporter, and as potential entry points to the kingdom in times of invasion (Fleming 1998, 123–44). As the towns’ importance faded in the early 17th century, and their moment on the national stage lessened, the Portsmen focused ever more strongly on their early symbols of urban authority and local self-government which were personified in the jurats, mayor or bailiff and other lesser officers such as town clerks and chamberlains. Until the late 14th century the civic elites had often comprised men with interests in more than one of these towns, for example through fishing enterprises or as pirates operating in groups. Many of the early elite families, conspicuously the Godfreys, disappeared in the later Middle Ages or became predominantly associated with one town only. As the infrastructure and economies of these towns were damaged by storms, harbour silting, inundations, plague epidemics, and French raids, their governments became ever more inward-looking, focusing on disputes of small matter between individual towns such as Lydd and New Romney, or among the confederation as a whole. Mayors and bailiffs such as Thomas Godfrey (II) of Lydd spent much time and effort on these disputes and administrative matters. For example, on 30th June 1605 New Romney sent an impatient letter to Lydd asking for a ‘dyrect and playne aunswer’ to an earlier enquiry about their joint ship service. This was not forthcoming, and the matter was dragged through the Cinque Ports’ courts of Guestling and Brotherhood. Despite the towns’ fading influence, the large and distinctive urban churches of the Cinque Ports remained vital sites of local devotion and commemoration, even perhaps of competition between the towns. Local families and town governments also promoted significant roles for these churches as centres of civic ceremonial, particularly after the Reformation.

The Godfrey family was an exceptional case of an elite family which survived right through the vicissitudes of the Middle Ages and then flourished in the 16th and 17th centuries, although this is partly a construct based on the family pedigree and monuments. Numerous members of a family named Godfrey held property in towns of the Cinque Ports confederation from the late 13th century, and they were commemorated in the churches of those towns: Lydd, New Romney and New Winchelsea. The earliest known...
member is Thomas Godfrey of New Winchelsea who, at the foundation of the town in the 1290s, held a valuable plot which lay between the main Monday market and the church of St Thomas. Godfrey also had a harbour plot and another plot in the southern part of the town. This pattern of landholding made him part of the civic elite of New Winchelsea, an elite which also included many members of the Alard family (Martin and Martin 2004, 96–8). St Thomas’s church at New Winchelsea contained two chantries of the Alard family, which were set up in the early 14th century. The two chantry chapels, which lie to the either side of the chancel, contain canopied monuments which are Alard tombs. By the later 15th century, one of the Alard chantries had ceased to function, a common feature of chantries, and the chantry was known instead as that of John Godfrey. In 1477 and 1478 Maline or Maud Farncombe received royal letters patent licensing her to make further endowments to the Alard chantries, and herself and her husband Simon, Godfrey and his wife Joan, Maline may have latched on to this former Alard chantry because it was already established or she may have been born into the Godfrey family (Martin and Martin 2004, 38, 79–80, 104, 141). In the 13th and 14th centuries, members of the Alard family had been of great local and regional consequence in roles such as admiral of the Cinque Ports fleet, and they had formed part of the town elites of both New Winchelsea and Rye. Another branch of the Alard family marked their rank by establishing a chantry at New Romney, which was a re-foundation of the former leper hospital there. But the Alard family disappeared from the elites of New Winchelsea and Rye, and perhaps became entirely extinct, in the heavy mortality of the mid- to later 14th century, which was in the order of at least 40% at Rye. The Alard chantry at New Romney passed into the hands of another minor landholding family, the Fraunceys, after the Black Death, in 1352 (Draper 2009, 41, 92, n.7, 102; Martin and Martin 2004, 67, 69; Draper and Meddens 2009, 510). The Godfrey family, however, was a complete contrast to the Alards. Men and women surnamed Godfrey continue to appear in great numbers in the records of this locality throughout the Middle Ages and beyond, accounting for the family’s appropriation of the former Alard chantry at New Winchelsea in the later 15th century.

Although there was a Godfrey chantry at New Winchelsea, it is the church of Lydd which contains the greatest number of memorials to the Godfreys. The earliest commemorates Thomas Godfrey who was buried at Lydd although he spent his life in Old Romney, as his brass memorial records (he is called Thomas Godfrey I in this chapter). Thomas Godfrey I can justly, if polemically, be described as taking advantage of widows and other bereaved people who were forced to enter the landmarket after the Black Death and subsequent epidemics of 1361, 1369, 1375 and 1390. Between 1390 and 1423 he bought up small pieces of land at Newland, an area which lay between parts of the parishes of Old Romney, Midley and Lydd at the head of the Wainway Channel. These pieces of land were assembled into a small estate which was sold between 1427 and 1430 to Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury. Chichele then used Newland in 1443 as part of the endowment of All Souls College, Oxford, his own chantry (Draper 1998, 114). Thomas Godfrey I was depicted on his brass in Lydd church as a married man with his wife beside him. The evidence of his property transactions at Newland shows that he was able to write Latin, which he used to endorse 25 Newland deeds with notes which enabled him to keep track of the properties which he had acquired. Otherwise little is known about Thomas Godfrey I but he became crucial to the construction of the Godfrey family identity in other brasses, monuments and pedigrees between the later 16th and the 18th centuries.

The Rise of the Yeomen and Gentry Lessees around Lydd and Romney

In addition to Newland, All Souls College and Canterbury Cathedral Priory acquired several other farms or small estates on Romney and Walland Marshes in the second half of the 15th century. For some decades these farms were leased out at low rents to people from local families often of the social grade of husbandmen, many of whom lived in Lydd or New Romney. Agriculture was rather depressed on Romney Marsh at this time and these people did not manage to establish themselves or their heirs as lessees in the long term, not even Thomas Godfrey I who had been instrumental in using the peasant landmarket to help Chichele gain the Newland estate. Members of the Godfrey family did not lease from All Souls College or Canterbury Cathedral Priory between the mid-15th and early 16th centuries but instead earned their living from the land or sea. Of thirteen Lydd wills of people from local families often of the social grade of husbandmen, many of whom lived in Lydd or New Romney. Agriculture was rather depressed on Romney Marsh at this time and these people did not manage to establish themselves or their heirs as lessees in the long term, not even Thomas Godfrey I who had been instrumental in using the peasant landmarket to help Chichele gain the Newland estate. Members of the Godfrey family did not lease from All Souls College or Canterbury Cathedral Priory between the mid-15th and early 16th centuries but instead earned their living from the land or sea. Of thirteen Lydd wills of members of the Godfrey family from the period 1455 to 1511, one testator was described as a mariner and one as a butcher. The butcher made bequests indicat-
ing that he was also involved in milling and brewing, with a diversity of occupations being necessary to make a living. He also had stock and land with crops being grown at Smalewes and at Byrdiskechen (Birds Kitchen, north of Lydd town centre, near Westbroke). Another testator, William Godfrey alias Fermor, was both a fishing master and a farmer: in 1504 he had nine boats to leave, as well as fishing tackle (which went to his servant), some animals, a tenement and 10.5 acres of land. The number of animals was small, sufficient for family use, but there were also 26 ewes. One other Godfrey testator was a fishermen: he left ‘one manfaire of flues, one manfaire of shot nets, one sprot net and one trouge (trug) of hooks’ and his ‘tenement called (fishing) cabin at the Nesse’ to his son, probably his son-in-law, Robert Hayton. The bequests of five other testators, which included ewes, cows, stock, ploughs and land, indicate that they too were farmers, many probably on a small scale, although one, John Godfrey junior, made bequests in 1510 of more than 65 ewes, five cows, lands and tenements. Part of the family was sometimes known as Fermour-alisGodfrey and some lived at Westbroke which lay along Denge Lane to the north of Lydd town centre in the direction of Newland and Midley.

The rise of the Godfrey family in 16th-century Lydd was closely tied to the fall of two other families of a similar social position. From the 1510s and 1520s two lessee families of Lydd and Romney, the Stuppeneys and the Strogulls, benefitted from the increased profitability of agriculture and opportunities for marshland reclamation, although from the 1540s outsiders, yeoman and gentry of the Weald and East Kent, then started to acquire the leases of the All Souls and Priory lands. Richard Stuppeney, yeoman of New Romney and bailiff of Lydd, leased ‘Stopene Marsh’ alias Ketepen from 1517 to 1532, and again from 1537. He also leased Newland from 1517 to 1524. At this time, Newland was approximately twice the size it had been when Thomas Godfrey I built up the property from small parcels acquired after the Black Death. This doubling in size was due to the addition of reclaimed land to the south-west, the Newe Innyngs (Draper 1997, 7–9). Stuppeney’s land was close to that of gentlemen such as Sir Richard Guldeford and John Elrington, knight, who were involved with the reclamation of land granted to them by Robertsbridge Abbey at the very end of the 15th century in the area of Guldeford Level. However with this leasing of Marsh land by gentry outsiders from the 1540s, Thomas Strogull of Lydd was one of the very few, if not the only, non-gentry local lessee of All Souls and Priory Marshland by 1545 (Draper 1997, 7, 18, n.91, 24, n.282). Thomas Strogull was, like Stuppeney, bailiff of Lydd, in 1539 to 1540 and similarly of some wealth. He leased Scotney and Bletching near Lydd for £64 in 1524, and the ‘Prior’s Marsh’, Broomhill, in 1533. Subsequently, between 1546 and 1560, the lessees of the properties which Stuppeney and Strogull had previously held were non-Marsh men, for example Thomas Colepeper of Bekesbourne, John Phillypp of Tenterden, and John Bakon of Walmer, near Deal. Although the Godfreys were not themselves lessees at this time, one Mr James Godfrey, and also his son-in-law, acted as feoffees or witnesses on behalf of outside lessees such as Stephen Thornherst, a major lessee who lived at Canterbury. James Godfrey, said to be of London, received bequests in Thornherst’s will of 1564 which were probably an acknowledgement of his professional activity on Thornherst’s behalf, perhaps as a lawyer (Draper 1998, 122). The outside lessees had wide concerns in landholding and other gentry interests: benefiting from the Dissolution, marriage alliances, religious disputes, involvement in the law and judiciary, and even intellectual pursuits in the writing of history. This is epitomised in William Lambarde, the first county historian, who was the father-in-law of Thomas Godfrey of Hodiford, the son of Thomas Godfrey II of Lydd (1553–1623) (Lee 1995, 408).

Although the Godfreys did not lease from All Souls College or Canterbury Cathedral Priory, a survey records their extensive landholding in and around Lydd in the manor of Old Langport in 1552 and later, a manor which comprised land both at Lydd and Old Romney. The Godfreys held land in different tenures, both copyhold and leases of the demesne, and were the most extensive tenants in the manor. They perhaps benefitted from the disappearance of the Stuppeney family from the town of Lydd, partly through early deaths, and also that of the Strogulls (Sweetinburgh 2009, 150). There are two large and early ‘altar’ or table-top tombs of the Strogull family, whose members were bailiffs and jurats, in Lydd churchyard, recording deaths which occurred between 1551 and 1619. However subsequently neither the church nor the graveyard contain memorials to them. In the late 16th century Lydd seems to have experienced depopulation, a widespread problem which
contemporaries usually attributed to the rise of sheep farming at the expense of cattle, or the failure to grow industrial crops such as hemp and flax. Several manors or farmhouses in and around Lydd were recorded as ruinous in 1576 and several men, including Thomas Godfrey and Peter Godfrey, were presented for failing to keep cattle as well as sheep and not cultivating flax and hemp according to the statutes which had been passed in 1508/9 and 1555. This ruination of manor and farmhouses probably dated from the major period of settlement contraction on south-east Walland Marsh in the first half of the 16th century, and markedly so at Old Romney. Despite the depopulation, such contraction did not occur in Lydd where there were a number of ‘suburban farmsteads’ with barns on the town’s periphery occupied by farmers with interests both in the countryside and the town (Gardiner 1998, 129, 138–9, 140–41). Such farmsteads are depicted on Matthew Poker’s map of 1617, including Westbroke or ‘Brick Howse’, where some of the Fermour-Godfrey family lived, certainly in the 16th century.25

The Godfrey Jungle
Between the death of Thomas Godfrey I in 1430 and that of Thomas Godfrey called ‘thelder’ in c. 1543, two women and sixteen men of Lydd surnamed Godfrey made wills.26 None of these eighteen people requested burial inside the parish church, a place of repute, as opposed to the churchyard, and this may explain why there are no brasses or other memorials to them in Lydd church. Although there thus are no Godfrey monuments between 1430 and 1567, these Godfrey wills are full of interest as they record bequests by, or to, more than 80 people born or married into the Godfrey family in this period. Some of these 80 clearly appear more than once in the wills, as mothers, daughters, nieces, nephews and so on. However, while it is possible to devise family trees from each will, these trees cannot be joined together to make a large one without much conjecture: they form a Godfrey jungle rather than a Godfrey tree in this period when there is no additional information available from parish registers.

‘Hastily tricked by Eschuceons in way of Alphabet’: the Godfreys from the 1540s
The Godfrey pedigree underwent reconstruction by ‘outsiders’, antiquarians and historians, from the early 17th century. The first was John Philipot, the Somerset Herald of the College of Arms and deputy to William Camden in the production of the ‘Visitation of Kent’. For the Visitation Philipot sought out and recorded the pedigrees and armorial bearings of 180 Kentish families of (aspiring) gentry standing and arranged them in alphabetical order, hence the description of one of the several copies of the Visitation that it was ‘hastily tricked by Eschuceons in way of Alphabet’.27 Trickering was a method of designating the tinctures found on representations of coats of arms or escutcheons, when they were recorded without colour in print or pen and ink. John Philipot had a special interest in Kent as did many heralds of the period 1565 to 1645. John was the son of the mayor of Folkestone, Henry Philipot, and his wife Judith. Henry died when John was a boy at school and he left instructions for John’s education to be continued from the income from 18 acres of land on Romney Marsh. Henry’s widow Judith seems to have remarried twice, firstly Thomas Stock, a yeoman of Bilsington, and secondly Robert Dering of Egerton, the uncle of Sir Edward Dering, the antiquary. John’s mother’s third marriage thus connected him to the ‘magic circle’ of Kentish gentry in the mid-17th century (Gardiner 1933, 47; Stanford London 1949, 24–6).28 John was apprenticed as a woollen-draper to a citizen and draper of London and he became a freeman of the Drapers’ Company in 1611. However he directed his interest in antiquities towards a career in heraldry, purchasing the office of Somerset Herald from its previous holder and taking a bribe of £30 in 1638 for procuring a coat of arms for ‘some meane man’ (Stanford London 1949, 29, 36). In addition to the Visitation, he also produced a roll of arms of the Constables of Dover Castle and Lord Wardens of the Cinque Ports in 1627 (Steer 1956).

The Visitation of Kent was copied several times in the 17th and 18th centuries, for instance by the Kentish topographer and historian Edward Hasted, and in some copies further pedigrees of Kentish families were added to Philipot’s original work. ‘Mr John Saunders the Painter-Stainer’, for example, reproduced Philipot’s work with the addition of the arms attributed to Sir Edward Dering, which included a ‘fanciful motto in mis-shapen Saxon characters’. This was perhaps the boldest attempt to carry back a pedigree to an historical period of great interest to Kentish antiquarians, notably to Dering and William Lambarde, author of Archaionomia (1568) and A Perambulation of Kent (1576), whose own family was represented in the Visitation (Wright 1950, 380). Philipot’s original work was signed by members of the families of the county of Kent to record their rights
to use the arms and crests which he depicted. In the late Middle Ages the heralds of the College of Arms, founded in 1484, were the official gate-keepers of the system for the formal recording of armorial bearings and later for controlling their use. By the early 16th century it was expected that those applying to have arms recorded would be of the rank of gentleman; by 1530 a property or income qualification was, at least in theory, applied by the heralds, although they were open to cash incentives and deceit to ensure a grant of arms.29 In 1673 a royal declaration enforced the authority of the Earl Marshal in determining grants of arms, which were subsequently to be made by royal letters patent. The period covered by the Godfrey monuments, which employed heraldry and arms, thus embraces all these changes.

There are late medieval heraldic bearings in Lydd church but these should be regarded as ‘mercantile devices’ deriving from civic office rather than coats of arms; for example, the devices such as crowned initials or quartered shields which appear on the 15th-century corbels of the nave probably commemorated men who had bequeathed money to repair of the nave such as Richard Pulton in 1475. Another such device on a corbel in the church bears the crowned initials I.F. or T.F., and probably indicated a member of the Fermour, i.e. Godfrey, family (Scott Robertson 1880b ‘Churches …’, 435, 449). The approach of death on occasion prompted those who had been part of urban government in the Cinque Ports to claim the right to bear arms. In her will of 1476, for example, Katherine Pope described herself as the widow of Thomas Pope II of Rye, armiger or esquire, the attendant of a knight.30 Pope had been MP, bailiff, and mayor of Rye in various years between 1442 and 1454. His widow appropriated the title and station of esquire which was given once only to Thomas, at the end of his life, in a deed of 1455. Although as an esquire Thomas Pope was in theory entitled to a coat of arms, he was clearly not an attendant of a knight, but rather a member of a civic elite.31

The four indents in the shape of coats of arms which are now missing from the brass memorial of Thomas Godfrey II in Lydd church may have been markers of civic position rather than arms or escutcheons. One was still present in the very early 17th century, when Philipot made his ‘Notes taken of Arms Monuments &c in Severall Churches in Kent’. It is said to have shown ‘the arms of Godfrey’, a chevron between 3 pelicans’ heads erased, vulning (Councer 1960, 84).32 Such a chevron between three pelicans’ heads also appears on the three shields above a bust of Thomas Godfrey II and on a shield above the brass inscription of Mary Godfrey, the daughter and heir of Thomas Partridge (Plates 7.1 and 7.2). It appears too in the copy of the Visitation of Kent in the handwriting of Sir Edward Dering.33 Given the propensity of Philipot and Dering to invent and falsify genealogical evidence, no absolute reliance can be placed on their record of the heraldic bearings on the brass of Thomas Godfrey I (Heal and Holmes 1994, 36–7). The Godfreys of the early 17th century were nevertheless happy to appropriate the heraldry surrounding Thomas Godfrey I and his wife to help both Philipot and the builders of their monuments construct their armigerous reputation. Besides monuments, new windows also offered sites for family display after the Reformation, with arms replacing images of the saints or other religious themes in urban churches such as Lydd and Rye, although the windows and the arms do not necessarily now survive (Councer 1980, 79).

Reading Bodies of Evidence

In perpetuity was a chief element of religious belief and family pride in late medieval and early modern Lydd, and monuments to its dead continue to decorate the walls, floors and windows of the church. Whether they take the form of slabs, brasses, statues, glass or restoration work these relics were intended as reminders to those still alive of a once-lived wish: to be kept in memory.34 The monumental epitaphs, figures and inscriptions took the place of the dead who were named and fixed by the artistic and economic process of commemoration. The dead, and their relatives, took the opportunity to re-member their bodily and familial achievements by substituting for their living presence images and words which gave them life again. The material body, absent through death, was re-formed or re-lived through the creations of biographical or autobiographical memory. One such name, body and re-membering belongs to the Godfrey family. Thomas Godfrey II, in his will of 1621, ordered that ‘a verie fayre Tombestone be layde over the place where my boddye shall lye with my name Engraven on it’.35 This stone is one of several monuments to the Godfrey family which have survived; they vary considerably in style, quality and size, whilst their inscriptions range from formulaic prose to evocative biography. Since c. 1430 the Godfrey family employed various methods of remembrance, both to celebrate their dead and praise their religion. As such, their surviving monuments offer the opportunity to examine com-
memorative culture in the context of the society of the late medieval and early modern period, and these monuments were the starting point for this study. Detailed analysis will focus on the monuments of four members of the Godfrey family: Thomas Godfrey I (d. 1430), Peter Godfrey (d. 1567), Mary Godfrey (d. 1581), and Thomas Godfrey II (d. 1623).

The Godfreys: Primary and Secondary Sources for Monuments

Lydd is extremely fortunate in its range of sources. In total, the Godfrey family have one late medieval and six early modern monuments remaining in the church. These range in date from c. 1430 to c. 1623 (see Table 7.1).

The gap of 137 years between the ‘founder’ member’s brass and the next surviving Godfrey monument is intriguing, and will be considered below. For the period 1427 to 1654 three Godfrey wills of Lydd have been identified as proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, and a further 24 proved in the Consistory Court. Three of these wills, belonging to Thomas Godfrey I, Peter Godfrey, and Thomas Godfrey II, are linked to four of the surviving Godfrey monuments. The churchwardens’ accounts are another useful source which cover the key years of religious change: 1520 to 1558 (Finn 1911, 328–427). The accounts record many aspects of church life including the selling of commemorative items such as brasses, wax and images of saints in 1547, as well as the cost of burials, and bequests made to the church.

Secondary sources are also plentiful. In 1799 Hasted recorded the history of Lydd and its church, along with a potted Godfrey history (Hasted 1799, viii, 420–39). Other antiquarian records include those of William Berry, John Weever, and Thomas Oyster as well as the Somerset Herald, John Phillipt (Berry 1830; Weever 1631; Oyster 1895; 1912). Lydd’s monumental inscriptions were transcribed, in part, by the Reverend Thomas Cobb, curate of Lydd, about 1730, and by the antiquarian the Reverend Bryan Faussett in 1756. In the 1920s Leland L. Duncan incorporated Cobb’s original record of the inscriptions on monu-
ments inside the church, and his notes on them, into his own updated and expanded edition which also covered those in the churchyard (Duncan 1927).41

The 1920s also saw Griffin and Stephenson produce two books on monumental brasses which included Lydd in their entries (Griffin and Stephenson 1923; Stephenson 1926).

Religion and the Art of Remembering

Skeins of religion, kinship, and social hierarchy were drawn together through commemorative displays, and Lydd families were not unusual in the way they sought expression in these arts for their faith, grief, consolation, or pride. Lives were re-inscribed on brass and stone so that the loss of bodies to death did not entail the complete annihilation of names, authority, or purposes, at least for those Godfrey husbands, wives, children, or parents who were wealthy. But what might funeral art have meant to its original still-living spectators? How critical was its performative function and commemoration more generally to Lydd’s parishioners? Why have monuments been lost or moved? What can be revealed about family piety through related documents such as wills, testaments and town records? In this second part of the paper, these questions will be related to the practical formation of monumental art, memory and lineage as well as the naming and maintaining of commemorative bodies, both collectively and individually.

As the ‘cathedral of the Marsh’, Lydd church is arguably the most impressive Marsh church. The surviving building was primarily built between the late 12th and early 13th centuries, corresponding with the area’s high point of settlement in the 1200s; the tower was a later addition in the 15th century (Barber 2006, 16–17; Tatton-Brown 1989, 254).42 Like most churches, it has been subject to many alterations over the years, and contains a diverse range of monuments which cover around 700 years of local and family history (Plate 7.3) (Scott Robertson 1880b, 427–50).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated to:</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type and measurements in mm</th>
<th>Present location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas I and wife</td>
<td>d. 1430</td>
<td>Brass on slab: male effigy, 1231 × 379; female effigy, 1199 × 453; double canopy, 2033 × 1005; foot inscription in Latin, 83 × 439 remains, orig. 875, indent filled with cement; 4 shields, all lost: lower sinister (left) 145 × 115, lower dexter (right) 145 × 120, upper sinister very worn, upper dexter effaced; Purbeck marble slab, 2580 remains × 1125 remains. Style: London D.</td>
<td>Nave: central aisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and Jone</td>
<td>d. 1566/7</td>
<td>Brass on slab: male effigy, 504 × 171; female effigy, 484 × 157; foot inscription in English, 112 × 593; inscription indent filled with cement, c. 65 × c. 380; sons’ indent, filled with cement, c. 160 × c. 160; daughters’ indent, filled with cement, c. 155 w; Purbeck marble slab, 1930 × 825. London workshop.</td>
<td>Nave: central aisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>d. 1580/1 Brass dated: c. 1600</td>
<td>Brass on slab: English inscription, 210 × 473; shield, 214 × 473; non-Purbeck slab, 1855 × 810. London workshop.</td>
<td>Chancel: floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas II</td>
<td>d. 1623</td>
<td>A) Slab: English inscription.</td>
<td>Chancel: floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas II</td>
<td>d. 1623</td>
<td>B) Mural bust: English inscription.</td>
<td>Chancel: north wall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1. Godfrey Monuments in Lydd church.
living could make provision in advance for the afterlife by confession, almsgiving, undertaking pilgrimages, purchasing indulgences for sin or, like John Aylwyn in 1494, commissioning a striking new window in Lydd church featuring the names of eight family members. In 1476 John Seawlys made a more typical bequest of £10 ‘to make a new glass window’ displaying not a family name but the seven sacraments. This was to be set near the porch at the west end, replacing a smaller window and matching another large window there in size. Seawlys’s bequest may suggest that the tower was not then built, unless the base of the tower, with its double doors, was itself regarded as the ‘porch’.

Although Lydd testators sometimes left bequests for a priest to celebrate for their souls in the 15th century, these were not directed towards a tradition or practice of chantry provision centred on particular built spaces in the church such as the porches, as at Rye (Draper 2009, 115–16, 119). Instead testators such as Simon Fyssherman and Thomas atte Brege of Lydd wished to be commemorated by the reading out of their names on Sundays. In addition to the new glass window of the seven sacraments, Seawlys funded the pewing of Lydd church in his will, specifically so that his and his relatives might be specially recommended to the congregation’s prayers as benefactors of the church.

After death parishioners needed to be remembered in the intercessory prayers of the still-living in order to shorten their time in purgatory, and this could also be achieved by means of the careful dialogues enacted by the dead on their funeral monuments. Furthermore,
symbolic rituals and ceremonies such as mass, Easter or the saints’ feast days, were contained within a liturgical structure which ensured that life, death and time itself were experienced through the continual re-enactments and re-memberings of Christian bodies, and particularly that of Christ’s body. The mysteries of death and rebirth, hope and salvation, meant that physical engagement within a Christian liturgical framework was an essential feature of late medieval English parish life (Burgess 2000, 44). Through monumental art the body in effigy is usually portrayed ‘not (as) a dead body: rather it is (like) an icon of the risen glorified body of the redeemed Christian’, particularly in 15th-century brasses (Bertram 1996, 62). In choosing or viewing or praying near the monuments, individuals were reminded of their part in the ongoing community of faith, one of several strategies to ensure that the social and religious body could actively participate and remain within liturgical and commemorative re-enactments, even after death.

These strategies can be glimpsed in some of Lydd’s late medieval and early modern wills. In brief, and depending on their date, these documents highlight essential commemorative acts, including lights to be lit or obits to be held (yearly prayers for the souls of the testators on the anniversary of their deaths). Not all commemoration required a monument, and people who did not have the money or status for one could instead make bequests to keep the dead in living memory. For example, in a typical will dated 1517, Agnes Godfrey left her soul to God, her body to be buried in the churchyard, and a light to Saint Katherine.48 Isabel Godfrey willed in 1512 that she too should be buried in the churchyard; this was followed by the request that priests would sing at Lydd church in commemoration of her soul.49 Neither women specified whether their graves were to be marked or named in some way.

After the Reformation some of Lydd’s testators declared their intentions for burial and remembrance in more detail, as did Peter Godfrey in his will dated 1567: he asked that ‘my Bodye be buryed in the Churche of Lydde … betwene the Tombe Stone of Roberte Cockeram and the Tombe Stone of Thomas Godfry there, and that a fayre Tombe Stone be layed over the place where I shall bye buryed’ (Plates 7.5 and 7.6).50 He had previously acted as executor for his friend, Rafe Willcockes. Willcockes had similarly requested that ‘a faire tombe shalbe made over my grave at the discretion of my executors’, to be placed ‘in the middle pace of the same church’, i.e. the central aisle (Duncan 1927, 59).51 Both pre- and post-Reformation church burials signalled the social standing of the dead, as well as the interlinked relationships between families, friendships and wealth. The most influential wealthy dead were buried close to their favourite altar or image, frequently near family
members of earlier generations, and preferably where they would be in view of a large and benevolent praying congregation. This occurs in Peter Godfrey’s and Rafe Willcockes’ testaments: in their desire for brasses prominently laid in the ‘middle pace’, and carefully placed in relation to the memorial stones of family or friends. The consolation of commemoration, memory and tradition was still sought in post-Reformation churches, albeit in increasingly secular ways. The often elaborate and self-promoting Elizabethan funeral monument has frequently been considered in humanistic terms, whilst ignoring the medieval religious continuities that were undoubtedly transformed into these early modern forms of commemoration. Indeed, the post-Reformation funeral effigy represented a ‘social self’ established by ‘a status and authority that has a moral and spiritual dimension’ not merely a secular one (Bartram 2007, 138). Furthermore, a member of another principal family of New Romney and Lydd, Clement Stuppeney, junior, persuaded the town authorities of New Romney and Lydd to conduct their civic elections around the tombs of his forebears which he caused to be rebuilt in the chancels of the parish churches of these towns. In so doing Clement reclaimed their unreformed, Catholic souls for Protestant salvation by the use of large and functional flat-top stone tomb chests with inscriptions which stressed the Stuppeneys’ urban office-holding and the spiritual and moral authority which they exercised through the town courts. On the rebuilt tomb of Richard Stuppeney at New Romney the brass ‘picture’ which Richard himself had chosen was replaced with an inscription stating that Clement, his great-grandson, had caused the tomb to be re-erected for the use of the meeting and election of the mayor and jurats of the port; this was a ceremonial performance which included the taking of oaths. At Lydd the verse epitaph on the re-erected tomb of Clement Stuppeney, senior, nevertheless did not throw off all influence of medieval and pre-Reformation religious practice: it referred not only to the sudden transitory nature of life but also to the fragility of man as a pilgrim on earth (Sweetinburgh 2009, 159–63).

*Hic iacet Thomas Godfrey: the Godfreys’ Choice in Commemorative Art*

What, then, can monuments tell us of the past? They may be the only source or witness to have survived but they may be problematic in interpretation (Saul 2009, 369). Commemorative art was formulaic and as historical sources they often reveal more about their makers than those they commemorate. Yet funeral monuments both shaped, and were shaped by, their social setting, and at some point in the commemorative process decisions concerning location and design were made by testators (or their family members or executors), a marbler (brass maker) or cleric. Ultimately these affect the voice, authority and form of the monument, for example, the oldest brass now found at Lydd which was made for John Motesfont, priest, in 1420. He requested his ‘corruptible body to (be) buried in a grave in most holy mother church’, a choice loaded with religious and social meaning. He bequeathed several books, including four to the college of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Oxford (Oriel College), and a copy of *Pars oculi* to Andrew Aylwyn, the priest of Lydd. He also left 20 marks (£13 6s. 8d.) to Lydd church to buy an antiphonal. Motesfont is depicted in academic dress with a now-mutilated prayer scroll issuing from his mouth. His effigy is framed by a damaged marginal inscription, whilst four surviving indents show where heraldic-type shields once sat. Symbols of religion, learning and kinship were deliberate choices made in the commissioning process that would affect how Motesfont and his monument were ‘read’ by the congregation, and were in keeping for a man of his position in the church. As such the monument exudes authority through its location and design. Whilst it is impossible to say whether John Motesfont commissioned this brass, his request for a ‘grave in most holy mother church’ placed his ‘corruptible’ earthly remains in the heart of the ecclesiastical body of commemoration. Thomas Godfrey I’s brass was the monument which marked out pre-eminence among those of the 15th century in Lydd church, certainly among the laymen, and stands witness to the success of his acquisitive land transactions during the late 14th and early 15th centuries (Plate 7.7). This is a large husband-and-wife memorial which contains two imposing front-facing effigies framed within a double canopy that is now partly lost; Thomas’s wife was named Joan. The male effigy stands a little taller than its female counterpart, a typical feature in brasses unless the commemorated female was a particularly wealthy heiress. Both effigies are dressed in civilian clothes, with the mound on which the male stands showing very faint signs of flower engravings. Joan is taken to have been the daughter of one John Tamworth, apparently on the basis of Philipot’s pedigree and mention of a man named John Tamworth after Joan in Thomas’s will. John Tamworth was a minor local landholder and possibly also a minor royal official. He was
one of twelve men who held an inquisition into the proposed reduction of the ambit of the walls of New Winchelsea in 1415. Tamworth witnessed a quitclaim by John Pelham, knight, lord of the rape of Hastings, to Battle Abbey in 1430, Robert Oxenbregge of Rye being another witness. He may have been the John de Tamworth who inspected a royal inquisition made before Robert de Herle, royal justice and warden of the Cinque Ports, into some wreckage found off the Isle of Sheppey.

On the brass of Thomas Godfrey I and Joan his wife there is a Latin inscription foot plate which follows the *hic iacet* style in which the name, place of origin, and date of death are noted. The inscription is mutilated with the final part now missing but it was recorded by Cobb, curate of Lydd, in the 1730s. It reads in translation: ‘here lies Thomas Godfrey formerly of Old Romney who died on the fifth day of the month of August in the year 1430’. It finished with the part now missing, ‘*Cuius anime propicietur deus amen*’: ‘may God propitiate (make favourable) his soul amen’ (Councer 1960, 84). This was a formulaic conclusion to such an inscription which did not call directly on the viewer in the same way as the phrase *orate pro anima* (pray for the soul of) which often appears in surviving monuments of all kinds in other churches, although notably not in Lydd. Both Lydd and New Romney appear conservative in religious practice over the middle and later decades of the 16th century and it would be impossible to argue that the epitaphs on the brasses of Thomas Godfrey I and John Motesfont in the early 15th century represent any kind of very early reformist sentiment. If Cobb was correct that the inscription *Cuius anime propicietur deus amen* still survived in the early 18th century on the brass of Thomas Godfrey I, the removal of this part cannot be attributed to earlier iconoclasts, to whom it may have been relatively inoffensive anyway. In any case the same phrase on the near-contemporary brass of John Motesfont still remains. The mutilation of the inscription of Thomas I remains a mystery.

The brasses of Thomas Godfrey I and his wife are set in a fine Purbeck marble slab. In the four corners of the slab there are indents that now show where heraldic shields were placed. The Reverend Thomas Cobb already noted these were lost by 1730, although his record may not be entirely reliable since he also observed that the slab had ‘very many figures’ (Duncan 1927, 44). The slab does show evidence that it has been cut down during its time in the church, perhaps to accommodate later repaving schemes, but no indents can be seen to suggest that ‘figures’ such as groups of children have since disappeared, nor does the testament of Thomas Godfrey I mention that he (or Joan) had any children, either living or dead.

Repaving and re-ordering of monuments has led to some slabs suffering severe cracks, but Thomas Godfrey I’s impressive slab is generally in good condition with no physical indication that it has been moved from its position in the nave where Cobb recorded it. In 1567 Peter Godfrey requested burial ‘betwene the Tombe Stone of Roberte Cockeram and the Tombe Stone of Thomas Godfrey’; Cockeram had been buried in 1508. Peter Godfrey’s request is significant as it
shows that Thomas Godfrey I’s monument lay in the nave from at least the mid-16th century. Monument placement was an essential part of the commemorative process and a brass of the quality of that of Thomas Godfrey I would have been laid in one of the most viewed and sought-after areas in the church, prompting prayers and remembrance from both the clergy and the congregation on a regular basis. The nave would thus have been a highly appropriate location, and probably the original one. Cobb’s notes also stated that in 1730 Thomas Godfrey I’s monument still lay immediately to the west of Peter Godfrey’s, and east of the memorial to ‘Katherine the daughter of Peter Maplisden, Gent., Jurate of Lid, wife of John Bate Gent.’ However, nowadays Thomas Godfrey I’s brass is framed, east and west, by monuments to men of the Bate family of the mid-17th century. Moreover, in 1730, according to Cobb, Robert Cockeram’s brass still lay next to Peter Godfrey’s brass on its eastern side, but at present the latter has a memorial to John and Thomas Bate (d. 1642 and 1657) to its east, and the brass of William Dallet (d.1598) to its west. The Bate family began a contentious rise to economic power as butcher-graziers of Lydd in the late 15th century, a rise which is reflected in the movement of some of their 17th-century monuments to the places of greatest visibility and importance, apparently after around 1730 (Dimmock 2001, 18–19; Draper 1998, 116; 2009, 120, 125, 159).

When Thomas Godfrey I of Old Romney made his will in 1427 he desired that his body be buried in the parish church of Lydd, yet he made no mention or provision for a commemorative stone or brass. Whilst it was not unusual for such commissions to have lacked testamentary instructions it is clear from his will that another form of commemoration, prayers, should occur immediately, both at his burial and during the next day’s masses. An extended period of remembrance followed, for which his executors were to find a priest to celebrate mass at Old Romney for his soul and those of Joan his wife, for John Tamworth, all his benefactors, and all faithful dead for forty days. His executors were also to find another priest to celebrate in Lydd church, where he was to be buried, for the much longer period of ten years. He left further instructions that the high altar and fabric (fabrice) of Lydd church should be given 6s. 8d. and 13s. 4d. respectively. He bequeathed the same amount to the fabric of St Clement’s church in Old Romney, and lesser sums to the high altar and fabric of Sellindge (Sellyng) church, also in Kent. The Godfrey stone and brass in Lydd church would have been considered a longer-term commemorative item than prayers, although in keeping with common practice during the 15th century, they were quite likely to have been in place within a year or two of death.

Between the 13th and 15th centuries memorial brasses became the most popular and adaptable form of funeral art in English churches. Their success was due in part to their flexibility in size, their price and style: inscriptions, heraldry, canopies, group and individual effigies were all common mix-and-match components. By the 1400s there were two major workshop traditions working in London which supplied brasses to clients throughout the country. These brasses ‘were nearly always set into slabs of Purbeck marble in the workshop and transported with their slabs even into districts which had perfectly good workable stone of their own’ (Bertram 1996, 11). Stylistic analysis has assigned Thomas Godfrey I’s brass to the workshop series known as London D, which flourished from around 1410 (Emmerson 1978, 51). Despite the fact that Lydd fringed the coast during the Middle Ages the cost of transporting his Purbeck marble slab from London must have been high. Although Godfrey had accumulated money during his land transactions, he seems to have remained a man of reasonably modest means, who would have been in the middle of the range of wealth compared with lessees on Romney Marsh in the second half of the 15th century (Draper 1998, 126, n. 46).

The likely costs involved in Thomas Godfrey I’s commemoration make clear the priority of many Christian men and women at this time. At the end of life this relatively modest if entrepreneurial landholder, who had made a good profit from the turmoil in the landmarket after the Black Death, invested precious family resources in both his immediate and longer-term commemorative needs, i.e., bequests to the church and priests singing for up to ten years. Furthermore, although this status-filled and prominently placed memorial was not a testamentary request it was carefully chosen, both for its ability to glean prayers and its potential to initiate the commemoration of the Godfrey name in perpetuity, perhaps particularly in the apparent absence of children. It can only be surmised, however, whether the final choice of monument belonged to Godfrey during his lifetime or his executors after his death.

The ‘Mayntenyng’ of Memory

Less than a hundred years later, another Thomas, a member of the family branch called Godfrey-alias-
Fermour, requested in his will that his lands and tenements should be sold in the event of his heir dying in minority. From this, half the proceeds were to be used in ‘mayntenyng of Jesus masse in the church of Lyde’, with the remainder to fund an ‘honest’ priest to sing at Lydd church ‘for my soule my father my mother my frends soules and all Christen soules’. The Jesus Mass and the cult of the Holy Name were strongly supported in the nearby parishes of Tenterden and New Romney (Lutton 2006, 69–80; Draper 2007b, 80–81. The value of ‘mayntenyng’ forms of commemoration in Lydd appears of primary concern. Yet by the time the next surviving Godfrey brass was laid down, barely forty years later, a very different religious climate was in operation. An example of this change can be seen in a will belonging to Edward, another member of the extensive Godfrey family. Dated 1551, the introductory clause places the document firmly in the context of the life, times and religious practices of the Reformation: Edward VI was noted to be king of England, France and Ireland, as well as ‘defendor of the feythe, and in erthe of the churche of England’. Edward Godfrey left his soul to God, and his body to ‘the churchyard of the parishe of Lyd’. Bequests were then made to the poor, as Edward VI’s religious injunctions enjoined, and lightsilver, obits and other religious bequests were eschewed. Nevertheless, the formulaic language found in wills suggests that the ‘mayntenyng’ of memory remained intrinsically important. For example, Thomas Strogull ‘thelder’, was a contemporary of Peter Godfrey who made his will when he was ‘in good helth and perfite of Remembraunce (thanked be God)’, whilst Elizabeth Strogell’s will of 1569 declared herself ‘sicke in Bodye but in good mynde and perfecte remembraunce’. This remembraunce, or, in the words of a certain John Godfrey whose will dates to 1572, this ‘good and perfect memory’, may sound like a hollow flourish but was part of a practice in which the powers of recollection of the testator were usually stated. The Cinque Ports and Romney Marsh had a highly-developed literate culture from the 13th century (Draper 2007a, 213–18); however, memory and commemoration became increasingly textualized from the 15th century, as the authoritative remembrance and embodiment of families in written wills and pedigrees, in church windows and in monuments and heraldry of the late medieval and early modern period demonstrates. This is keenly expressed in the monuments of Thomas Godfrey II. It is not surprising, therefore, that when wills were written the body could be weak but the mind had to be perfite.

Here lyeth buryed the Bodyes of Peter Godfrye and Jone his wyfe...

In Lydd’s extant 15th-century brasses, the monumental body may be somewhat fragmented through time, but the material quality of the effigies was originally high since they were made from hammered metal. These brasses were made by London marblers from good-quality sheets of latten, often three feet square and brought in from the Low Countries. Yet by the mid- to late 16th century brass making was an industry in decline and quality was lower. The ‘fayre tombe stone’ set down in response to Peter Godfrey’s testamentary request consisted of a slab, brass effigies and an inscription in brass. At the time when these brasses were created the metal was normally made and plate-rolled by London craftsmen; alternatively it came from the dissolved religious houses and was reworked as palimpsest brasses. Palimpsests are ‘part or parts of a brass that have served as part of one memorial and later, turned over, as part of another’ (Page-Phillips 1980, 13). This practice frequently occurred between the years c. 1530 to c. 1585. The metal used for Peter’s brass is only two millimetres thick, which suggests that it is too thin to be a palimpsest; it was therefore probably made by plate-rolling. Another example of deterioration of quality can now be found immediately west of Peter’s brass. The inscription of William Dallet, a bailiff of Lydd who died in 1598, shows the effects of using very thin plate-rolled metal, especially when compared with the hammered metal of the surviving medieval brasses. It is a functional monument, but very thin, which has led to buckling on the surface. Peter Godfrey’s monument was made in a period when brasses deteriorated in quality and became particularly vulnerable to theft and vandalism although, of course, this was not exclusively by Protestant reformers, nor was it restricted to the 1500s. Furthermore, the changes of the Reformation meant that it was no longer acceptable for commemorative forms to incorporate traditional pleas for intercessory prayers, or references to the saints. Within this context, and as it finally became a predominantly Protestant town Lydd’s inhabitants had to rethink their ways of commemorating the dead.

All that now remains on the surface of the ‘fayre Tombe Stone’ requested by Peter Godfrey in 1567 are two pleasing effigies of a husband and wife dressed in civilian clothing, along with a foot inscription in English which plainly notes their names as Peter and Jone Godfrey, along with their dates of death and number of offspring. Two cement-filled indents
indicate where the brass plates depicting the Godfreys’ sons and daughters were at one time placed beneath their parents’ effigies. Near the top of the Purbeck marble slab another cement-filled indent signifies a now-lost brass inscription. Fortunately its wording was recorded by Cobb:

‘Peter for God did pray whilst that God lyfe him gave Now rests his Soule with God and Bodie in the grave.’

Although its literary merits might be justly doubted the verse was obviously a good-humoured play, and pun, on the family surname. As such, it succeeds in being truly memorable. ‘God’ is the sounding refrain which, when joined with ‘pray’ and, to a lesser extent ‘gave’ and ‘grave’, forms an insistent rhyme that orally, visually and audibly connects the Godfrey family to God’s name. A simple couplet, then, but with a rather clever commemorative outcome in which the Godfrey family’s name is united and ‘mayntenyed’ not only under God’s authoritative name but also under Peter’s secondary control.

Here lieth Robert…and John…and Mary…

Although the Godfrey name continued to be remembered in wills in the later 16th century, it was not until the beginning of the 17th century that more of their monuments were installed in Lydd church. Two brass plaques commemorate Godfrey children, a baby called Robert and a youth named John. However, the third monument is in memory of Mary Godfrey (nee Partridge), the only female member of the family for whom a monument survives solely in her name in the church (see Plate 7.2). Mary was the first wife of Thomas Godfrey II. She died in 1581 and her memorial was subsequently made in 1600. The monument consists of a brass inscription and separate brass shield; these are set on a non-Purbeck slab in the main chancel. Cobb recorded the monument in the ‘North Isle of the Chancel’, which was also noted by Faussett. Unsurprisingly, the memorial inscription is firmly situated within the parameters of family and inheritance. Although the memorial names her as its subject, her monumental body is geographically and physically located through family connections: the references to her father in Sussex, her husband in Lydd, her maternal role in the Godfrey dynasty. Essentially she is reinscribed as daughter, wife and mother: ‘Here lieth Mary, sole daughter and heire of Thomas Partridge of the Isle of Oxney Gentleman, first wife of Thomas Godfrey of Lid Esquire, by whom she had issue one only sonne, Peter. The saide Mary died 19th January Anno Domini 1580’. Rather crudely inserted above the words ‘of the Isle of Oxney’ is a later ‘correction’ reading ‘Iden in the County of Sussex’. The inscription is filled with male bodies, yet at its heart is the recollection of Mary Godfrey’s life. Families often considered their female members to be inferior and as such they were left unnoted or ignored, which meant they frequently ‘slipped past genealogists’ (King 1991, 25). Although little is known of Mary Godfrey’s life she was indeed fortunate, for unlike many of her contemporaries she had two surviving bodies of re-membrance, her funeral monument and a son, Peter, who grew into adulthood.

To the memory of Thomas Godfrey Esquire…

Mary Godfrey’s husband was also fortunate in matters of commemoration. In 1621 Thomas Godfrey II made several choices. After leaving his soul in the hands of God he willed his ‘bodie to be buryed in the Chansell of the church of Lydde behind where I doe usually sitt, and that a verie fayre Tombestone be layde over the place where my boddye shall lye with my name Engraven on it’. A request to be buried near the place where one sat in life was not uncommon at this time, although whether Thomas Godfrey II’s request was due to family sentiment or was linked to a seat which he held in an official role is not known. Two monuments were subsequently placed in the chancel. This burial place and monuments allowed the dead body to reside in the heart of Lydd’s religious, familial and civic ceremonies, in a similar way to the Stuppeney tombs. The monuments of Thomas Godfrey II remain in the chancel to this day, having survived the bomb damage of the Second World War.

Thomas Godfrey II was commemorated with two monuments, ‘a Mural Monument against the North Wall of the Chancel, with a coloured Bust, and a flat Stone below’ (Plates 7.1 and 7.8). The bomb damage and varying records of Philipot, Cobb, Faussett and Oyler make it difficult to assess the exact historic locations of these two monuments in relation to one another. The ‘verie fayre’ stone in the floor is that mentioned by Godfrey II in his will and its inscription finishes with Godfrey’s year of death. Its focus is ancestral esteem, Godfrey’s military responsibilities, his hospitality to neighbours and his generosity to the poor. In contrast, the inscription below the bust focuses on Godfrey as a family man, a thrice-married husband and father of several children. This mural inscription
records that ‘these memorials’ were erected by Godfrey’s second son and his wife Sarah, perhaps referring only to the shields, bust and inscription rather than the flat stone as well. If the two monuments were closely erected together in time and space, their inscriptions could be read as one complete commemorative ‘text’ residing in two locations (albeit both in the chancel) although the floor inscription finishes with Godfrey’s year of death and thus has connotations of finality and textual closure. The mural’s inscription, celebrating different aspects of Thomas Godfrey II’s life, has an insertion which was probably engraved at a later date. This insertion, the ‘Godfrey’ surname etched above the forename ‘Thomas’, suggests that when the monuments were originally commissioned the surname was not required on both inscriptions. However, as time separated viewers from personal knowledge of the man it would have become expedient to clarify exactly who was the ‘sayd Thomas’, whose family features were so amiably described in the mural’s inscription and bust. The commemoration might have collapsed into insignificance or chaos if the body, name or person was mis-remembered.

Like all texts, monumental art is subject to time: apart from physical decay, time also separates words, figures, and intentions from its original authority. Whilst a monument may still ‘perform’ a function, for example through its dramatic imagery, pathos, social history or architectural impact, its commemorative role, in which the dead are celebrated and kept in memory, may no longer be valid. A brief example of this may be seen in the brasses now located on the nave’s north wall. Above a brass inscription made in memory of Laurence Stuppeney is a brass male effigy; the inscription and effigy are mounted together, almost as one, whilst beneath them a modern note states Stuppeney’s name and date of death. However, further analysis indicates that the effigy does not match the inscription or name to which it has been assigned. But correct naming is perhaps the major element of commemoration, for even though it is subject to subversion there are many secular and religious dynasties that are built on its premise, and rely on its written verity for their past, present and future continuation. This appears clearly in the three main components of Thomas Godfrey II’s restored wall monument: the inscription, the bust or effigy, and heraldic shields (Plate 7.1): The inscription recalls the legacy and comfort of his still-living children, all of whom are named and ‘all which he lived to see well disposed of in marriage into several worthy families and to bee parents of many hopeful children’. Thomas appears remarkably condensed and marginalised when compared with the written coverage given to his children and wives. However, this monumental re-membering was commissioned by Godfrey’s second son, also called Thomas, along with Thomas II’s
daughter-in-law, Sarah; whilst it suggests a genuine desire for paternal commemoration it simultaneously augments and consolidates the Godfrey name and its continued position within the parish.

Any lack of presence in the inscription is more than compensated for in the effigy where the patriarchal visage bears down authoritatively on the chancel’s religious and civic life. It also overshadows both his present and future family and those dynastic founders already commemorated in the church. Although authoritative, it also appears as a kind of family reunion, exemplifying how the ‘bearer of an illustrious name often felt a special solidarity with dead ancestors and descendents yet unborn’ (Houlbrooke 1984, 40). However, the heraldic shields that flank Thomas Godfrey II’s head both reinforce and confirm his continued ranking within the Godfrey dynasty, an authority accumulated through years of seemingly traceable, and undisturbed, family history.78

In 1619 John Philipot developed the Godfrey pedigree as part of his Visitation of Kent, in which Thomas Godfrey II is directly linked to Thomas Godfrey I via a family tree composed of neat ellipses which artfully glossed over the awkward period between 1430 and 1543. In his attempt to name, identify and stabilise the Godfrey family Philipot highlighted the perilous nature of genealogical remembrance. Dynastic confirmations, ancestral pedigrees, and armorial rights were sought in early modern England by families eager for social advancement. The authority which was granted by such rights meant that manipulation, reinterpretation and even reinventions of family histories often occurred in the hope of increased social reputation. Commemoration through funeral monuments was the chief material consequence of this desire.

Godfrey’s second monument is the ‘verie fayre’ slab to which he alluded in his will and which is set in the chancel floor. This memorial glances back to an ancestral past for its present justification. According to its inscription, by the time Thomas Godfrey II died in 1623 there was already a well-established tradition of Godfrey burials at Lydd church. Once again, the viewer is invited to consider the dead body within a familial context, although here the monument portrays a fixed family character united through social estimation, literacy and the rigours of tradition. We are urged to consider how this is ‘Wheire hee and his ancestours have continued in good esteem and reputa-}

No documentary evidence has been found to directly link the earliest Godfrey brass with Thomas Godfrey II’s family branch: it is possible that the brass of 1430 was simply appropriated as part of the creation of a 17th-century Godfrey pedigree, so tangibly arranged by Philipot. However, Thomas Godfrey II’s inscription also noted that he was ‘sonne and heire of Peter Godfrey of Lydd Gent’, the same Peter for whom a commemorative brass was made in the late 1560s and which now lies beneath the nave carpet along with the brass of Thomas Godfrey I. This is confirmed through testamentary evidence. However, the lack of Godfrey monuments from 1430 to 1567 is interesting for a number of reasons. Although burials in the churchyard or appropriation by others may help to explain this gap, it is also possible that Godfrey monuments were erected and subsequently destroyed or removed: indeed Thomas Godfrey II’s inscription suggests as much by the words ‘funeral monuments yet extant’.

During the middle of the 16th century thousands of Christian monuments were destroyed in England. This period ‘provided the key ideological justifications and practical precedents for later monument destruction’ (Lindley 2004, 57). When funeral monuments were stripped from the dissolved monastic houses their materials were subsequently auctioned, and parish churches were not immune from similar destruction. However, even before the Reformation it was not unusual for churchwardens to sell brasses and stones. The churchwardens’ accounts make several references to paving repairs in the church, and it is likely that loose stones and brasses would have been repaired or removed during the 16th century. Removal would certainly have helped utilise the limited yet valuable sacred space available within the church. The accounts make reference to the practice of selling brasses during the Reformation period. In 1539–40 the churchwardens received ‘By old Brass, from Oliver Darbissherr and others, 3s. 11d.’ In 1549 James Martin, the churchwarden, received the following: ‘And of 3. 4d. rec of Rob’t Patwyn for olde brasse’, as well as a further ‘4s. by hym rec for olde brasse’ from a man called Read. To whom this ‘old brasse’ belonged is not known. Of course, it was not only funeral arts that were subject to such treatment. In 1547 a number of commemorative items are detailed as being sold by the Lydd churchwardens. This comprehensive list is worth quoting in full:

‘Et for £7 8d. by them received of the goods of the church, viz., tabernacles Images tables bords brasse Iron wex leade pewter old hangyngs et Curtaynis
with divers other thynges by them sold hoc anno., £7 7d. Received by them from William Barrow for the portion of a certain board (tabula) of the Passion of Christ, the same William sold for them, 16d.’ (Finn 1911, xxv, 383, 397, 402).

This loss and destruction must have unsettled those families who sought to legitimise their dynastic foundations through visual commemoration. In early modern England the universal nature of death ‘was profoundly damaging to the social fabric. The ritual thus demanded that social bodies after death had to be differentiated one from another; a task which was mainly the responsibility of the monumental body’ (Llewellyn 1991, 59). Thomas Godfrey II’s monuments certainly distinguishes his name from the memorials and lives of other prominent Lydd families, for example, from the Strogulls’ impressive altar or table tombs in the graveyard, as well as from the similar tomb commissioned for Clement Stuppeney. When Thomas Godfrey II referred to his family’s ‘yet extant’ memorials he (re)created and added to the Godfrey memory an entire heritage of monuments, some lost, some surviving, some perhaps that never existed. In this case, Godfrey’s right to commemoration is based on a circular motion, in which individual and collective family worth is formally established and legitimized through the very monuments, literacy and will-writing on which it depended.79

Furthermore, commemorative bodies could have an impact on their immediate society. Godfrey’s will made substantial provision for the poor inhabitants of Lydd, some of whom were to be given aid on the days preceding, on, and after his burial, as well as £10 of current money within a week. Lesser payments were also bequeathed to the poor, including those in the parishes of New Romney, Old Romney, Ivychurch, Warehorne, Iden, Newchurch and Snargate. His memorial inscription commends the good works he undertook in life (and death), in which he is described as ‘hospitable to strangers and charitable to the needy’. Yet ironically it is the cold stone words that recall Godfrey’s charity with more commemorative strength than his physical bequests could ever manage. A day, a week, a year, or even a decade of benevolence falls into oblivion when compared to his still-prompting, still-reminding stone.

Jewellery was another useful tool used to ensure that the dead’s name and date of death were kept in constant sight, mind and touch of the immediate family circle. This strategy was employed in the will of Thomas Godfrey II, primarily through the bequest of death’s head rings to various members of his family: these included his sons and grandchildren, his ‘brother’ Richard Allard and wife, his cousin Thomas Bate and wife, his cousin Peter Godfrey and sons William and Edward, his cousin Joane Godfrey, as well as his daughters-in-law whose rings were to include ‘two letters for my name, And the yeare of our Lord’. His daughter, Mary, was left the following: ‘I give unto my daughter honnywood a ring of gold of twenty shillings pryce with a deathes head in it and two letters for my name, to be delivered unto her within three months next after my decease’.

Conclusion: the Godfrey name...in perpetuity?

Jewellery was an extremely tactile form through which memory was promoted, but was only one of several commemorative strategies available to and adopted by the Godfrey family between the 15th and 17th centuries. Pre-Reformation religious bequests were an integral part of commemoration; through these donations the bodies of Christ, the testator, and the church itself were simultaneously celebrated. This was achieved, in part, through direct material contributions to the church’s upkeep including bequests of money, specified restoration work, or items that glorified the church and its clerics, such as stained glass, books or robes. It was also physically enacted through the religious services, as seen in Isabel Godfrey’s request for priests to sing for her soul at Lydd church in 1512, as well as in the commissioning of monumental art. The first Godfrey known to have been remembered and celebrated in this manner was Thomas I, his impressive brass possibly commissioned because he lacked a direct heir to whom his newly-acquired wealth, and memory, could be bequeathed. Placed in the nave, his brass, name, and monumental body would have been in constant mind and view of Lydd’s early parishioners, even if they were not directly related to the Godfrey family. By the 1620s his namesake, Thomas II, had ‘prooved’ the family name through a combination of wills and monuments, in effect strengthening the Godfrey memory into a credible and sustained family history. However, despite Philipot’s help, Thomas Godfrey II did not, or could not, cast further back into his family’s monumental past than 1430: perhaps family monuments predating 1430 had been commissioned but subsequently lost and forgotten by the time he died in 1623; or, more likely, Thomas Godfrey I’s steady economic success in the late 14th
and early 15th centuries meant, quite simply, that he was the first of the local Godfreys for whom large-scale commemoration was financially, and socially, possible. Although a direct line of descent has not been discovered, Thomas II and his immediate family made clear their ancestral debts. The prominent rise of other families in Lydd during the 15th and 16th centuries, including the Bates, Stupperneys and Strogulls, placed increasing, if temporary, pressure on the sacred space available to parishioners. This may have slowed the spread of the Godfrey’s monumental art at this period, although theft and vandalism may have also had an impact on what remains of their memorials and related commemorative choices.

Overall the Godfreys demonstrate the ways in which local standing was expressed and reinforced through a multitude of carefully-chosen forms of commemoration. Lydd’s inhabitants and town government were not torn apart by religious strife in the middle decades of the 16th century, as the nearby town of Rye was, and the Godfrey family moved seamlessly from the expression of traditional Catholic sentiment in the brass of Thomas Godfrey I, and the appeals for prayers in wills, to the use of monuments to express its local identity and repute. Both because of the family’s longevity and their rise in social status, their monuments demonstrate the continued significance of commemoration over the course of the religious changes of the mid-16th century, employing not only brasses but also heraldry, plaques, stones, a bust and particularly inscriptions. These gave the opportunity to reiterate the life of Mary Godfrey in terms which reinforced the aspirations of the family to connect itself with those of the rank of gentry, a social group which had great weight in Elizabethan Kent. Increased contacts with gentry from beyond Lydd, in the form of ‘outside’ lessees of land on Romney Marsh, perhaps stimulated the Godfreys to seek and promote a standing which was admired in their local community and which had not been available to their forebears apart, perhaps, from Thomas Godfrey I. In promoting this standing, careful choice of marriage partners for women of the family was a traditional element which is found elsewhere, but the Godfreys also benefitted from their large numbers which enabled them to outlive the Strogull and Stupperney families, and to take up essential roles in the town government which connected them via their administrative activity to the Head Ports and even to the Lord Warden of Cinque Ports himself. While the Godfrey monuments never reached the complexity of design or scale of expenditure of those of the upper gentry and minor nobility in Kent, they are nevertheless worth consideration for the light they shed on the lower gentry.
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Notes
1. The following summary is taken from Barber et al., Lydd; Draper, New Romney; Draper, Rye; Martin, New Winchelsea. See also Clarke et al, Sandwich.
2. Many men called Thomas Godfrey or Godfrey alias Fermour lived in and around Lydd and the eldest was often called Thomas. Roman numerals appended to the names of the two who receive most discussion in this chapter are used only for the sake of clarity; Thomas Godfrey I and II were not necessarily direct descendants.
3. East Kent Archives Centre (EKAC) NR/CP/31–4. A letter of 18 September 1604 from Thomas Godfrey of Lydd asked that Romney be a means to obtaining a billet (tax exemption) of £4 for them from Sandwich at the lay subsidy known as a fifteenth, probably Thomas Godfrey II, EKAC NR/CP/28.
4. There is insufficient evidence to prove Thomas Godfrey of Winchelsea was a forebear of the 15th-century Godfreys but the forenames of those commemorated at the former Alford chantry suggests they were: Thomas, John and Simon were very common in the very limited range of forenames used by the Godfreys of Lydd. A John Godefray was recorded under the Hundred of Oxney in 1334/5, Hanley and Chalklin, ‘Lay Subsidy’, 149.
5. East Sussex Record Office (ESRO) RYE 146/3.
6. These operations ceased in the year of the death of Thomas Godfrey of Old Romney, thus identifying him with the one commemorated by the brass in Lydd church.
7. The Newland deeds, 60 in total, are in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Bodl.) MSS DD All Souls c129. Thomas Godfrey also wrote one of the deeds of a transaction in which he was not directly involved, Draper, ‘Literacy’, 83–90.
8. He died in 1430, before All Souls was founded and endowed, although leases were available from Canterbury Cathedral Priory before this time, Draper, ‘Farmers’, 1998, 116–17, 124.
9. John Godfrey (mariner), 1505, Centre for Kentish Studies (CKS) PRC 32/8/93; John Godfray (butcher), 1485, left to his son Vincent Godfrey all his implements of a brewer and a miller, PRC 32/3/75. In general a testament makes religious disposi-
tions and bequeaths some personal property, and an associated will bequeaths real property, but the distinction is not always precise. ‘Will’ is normally used here to cover both.

10. The tenement where he lived, with 4 acres attached, was situated in Verelston. He also had 6.5 acres in Sandforth, CKS PRC 32/8/25.

11. Thomas Godfrey (1511), CKS PRC 32/10/120. Shot nets and flues were drift nets for herring, the former used in local coastal waters only and the latter also in the North Sea. Sprot nets were for sprats. A manfare was the equivalent of three nets or the share of one working crewman, Sweetinburgh, ‘Fishing and Fishermen 19–20; Sweetinburgh, ‘Strategies of inheritance’, 93–105. The ‘fishermen-farmers’ of Lydd were examined in Dimmok, ‘English small towns’, 5–24.

12. Bequests give only an impression of the wealth of testators, since many goods, lands, etc, may have been disposed of in life. William Godfrey alias Fermor (1455) of Westbrooke in Lydd, mentioned only a cow and horse; he had land at Bletching in Lydd and at Newsland, CKS PRC 32/1/74. Simon Fermor alias Godfray (1463), bequeathed 15 acres and some rents, PRC 32/2/129. John Godfray alias Fermor, of Westbrooke in Lydd (1484), bequeathed 5 cows, 20 ewes and tenements and lands, PRC 32/2/597; Michael Godfray, who died a young man in c. 1497, left clothes to his sisters, 2 ewes and 2 acres of land, and also a tenement which was apparently rented out, PRC 32/4/136. John Godfrey junior (1510) left 65 ewes, 5 cows, lands and tenements, PRC 32/10/55. Two men, both named Thomas Godfrey, who died in 1497 and 1498, made wills which gave no indication of their economic activity, and one was perhaps elderly, PRC 32/4/146, 32/5/131.

13. Modern Westbrooke Farm, House and Cottages lie off Denge (or Dennes) Lane which leads north out of Lydd towards Midley, OS Explorer 125; Gardiner, ‘Settlement Change’, 139. Few medieval houses survive from Lydd but several of the late 16th and early 17th centuries contain smoke-blackened timbers indicating re-use from earlier buildings, Pearson, ‘Medieval Houses’, 96.

14. The lessees were firmarii or, in English, farmers, Draper, ‘Farmers’, 115–16, 118–24; Draper, ‘Leasing’, 18, 24). The surnames Stuppeney and Strogull each had various spellings.

15. Canterbury Cathedral Archives (CCA) DCC BB 186/139.

16. Bodl. MS DD All Souls c183, item 47; Draper, ‘Leasing’, 4, 15; Canterbury Cathedral Archives (CCA) DCc BB 86/139.

17. The lessees were firmarii or, in English, farmers, Draper, ‘Farmers’, 115–16, 118–24; Draper, ‘Leasing’, 18, 24). The surnames Stuppeney and Strogull each had various spellings.

18. CCA DCC BB 186/40; Bodl MS dd All Souls c325, c184, items 3 and 4 in wooden box. John Strogull, apparently the son of Thomas Strogull, was also a wealthy man. He lived in Lydd town and farmed 145 acres in the Aldington bailiwick of Lydd (one of the several manors), about 15% of the total, Gardiner, ‘Settlement Change’, 140.


20. Similar was true of the Sussex gentry and their involvement in marshland reclamation and leasing around Rye in the mid- to later 16th century, Draper, Rye, 183–5.

21. Thomas Godfrey II had three wives: Mary Partridge, Elizabeth Pix, and Elizabeth Allard. Lambarde seems to have been the father-in-law of Thomas Godfrey II’s son, also called Thomas (whose mother was Elizabeth Pix), but he is known as Thomas of Hodiford. He married Margaret Lambarde in 1618; she died in 1661, according to William Berry’s pedigree. Thomas of Hodiford then went on to marry the Sarah who is mentioned on Thomas Godfrey II’s funeral bust.


23. ‘Mr [George] Mann’s booke…Old Langport’, covering parts of Lydd and Old Romney, CKS U1043/M4, entries 61 to 83. This detailed and complex document was updated more than once after 1552 with the names of new tenants, and continues to provide new material about this extensive manor, Gardiner, ‘Old Romney’, fig. 6; Barber et al., Lydd, 24–5.

24. According to Duncan, Monumental Inscriptions, 1, nos 5, 5a. Thomas Strogull had at least 10 landholdings in Old Langport manor recorded in 1552, mostly in Old Romney, CKS U1043/M4. ‘Table-top’, rather than altar, tombs was probably a more appropriate and certainly less contentious term for contemporaries. Richard Stuppeney, senior, simply prescribed his own grave stone ‘to lie two feet above the foundation’, Sweetinburgh, ‘Eternal Town Servants’, 160.

25. Westbrooke Farm appears to be depicted on Poker’s map and called Brick Howse. An excavated trackway dating possibly from the late 12th century ran in a line south of Burnthouse Wall to modern Westbrooke House and continued to be maintained until at least the 15th or early 16th century, Barber et al., Lydd, 39, and fig. 3 (annotated copy of Poker’s map). Westbrook Farm, Denge Lane (TR 02 SW 5/50 II 2), was apparently listed Grade II in 1973 and described as a ‘small C17 farmhouse. 2 stores. Ground floor red brick and grey headers, above tile-hung. Tiled roof with pentine behind on the west side and in the centre portion of the front on the east side. This portion on the east side with the pentine roof contains the doorway and a chimney-breast. 2 windows’. A photo taken in 2003 on the Images of England website, number 175245, bears little resemblance to this description.

26. William Godfrey alias Fermor proved 1456, CKS PRC 32/1/74; Simon Godfray alias Fermor, 1463, PRC 32/2/129; John Godfray alias Fermor, 1484, PRC 32/2/597; John Godfrey, 1485, PRC 32/3/75; Michael Godfrey, 1496, PRC 32/4/136; Thomas Godfray, 1497, PRC 32/4/146; Thomas Godfray, 1499, PRC 32/5/31; William Godfrey alias Fermor, 1503, PRC 32/8/25; William Godfrey alias Fermor, 1503, PRC 32/8/25; John Godfrey, 1505, PRC 32/8/93; John Godfrey alias Fermor, 1510, PRC 32/10/36; John Godfrey, 1510, PRC 32/10/55; Thomas Godfray, 1511, PRC 32/10/120; Isabel Godfray, 1512, PRC 32/11/52; Agnes Godfray, 1517, PRC 32/12/35; John Godfrey, 1520, PRC 32/13/7; Thomas Godfrey alias Fermor, 1527, PRC 32/14/223; John Godfrey, 1529, PRC 32/15/70. Thomas Godfrey ‘the elder’ made bequests to priests, clerks and poor people at his ‘furthe bering’ and more to refresh his poor neighbours on that day, at his month’s mind. This detailed and complex document was updated more than once after 1552 with the names of new tenants, and continues to provide new material about this extensive manor, Gardiner, ‘Old Romney’, fig. 6; Barber et al., Lydd, 24–5.

27. Not all the copies were arranged alphabetically, e.g., R. Hovenden (ed.), The Visitation of Kent, Taken in the Years 1619–1621, by John Philipot, Harleian Society 42 (1898).


29. Successful candidates for a record of arms were required to have an income from land of £10 per annum, or moveable wealth of £300; Noble, History of the College of Arms; http://www.college-of-arms.gov.uk/About/01.htm [4 June 2009].

30. CKS PRC 32/2/364.

31. ESRO RYE/136/187, 189, 190, 191, 193, 195; RYE/137/11.

32. It is not clear from Coucer’s edition whether the identification of the shield as the arms of Godfrey was made by himself or by editor, cf. p. 69. Coucer inserted Sa for sable before a chevron or before vulning. Philipot did not indicate the tinctures used by ‘tricking’ but they were supplied by the editor of his Notes.
33. As given in *Archaeologia Cantiana* 6 (1861), pl. facing p. 260, where this copy is described as ‘with additions’, 251. The additions comprise excerpts from the Lydd registers of baptisms, marriages and deaths 1542–1625, and excerpts of wills, 260, no. 267–9. Some may have been made by the un-named editor, the Visitation being printed in sections in *Archaeologia Cantiana* 4 onwards.

34. Further commemorative items can be found at Lydd church, e.g. inscriptions on Lydd’s bells date from the 17th century, Oyler, *Lydd and its Church*, 8. A full evaluation of the monuments in Lydd church funded by the Romney Marsh Research Trust covering all memorials showed that they range from medieval to modern and include candlesticks, flower stands and a processional cross, Bellinger, Monument and Transcription List.

35. CKS PRC 32/46/281. Abbreviations and contractions in primary sources have been extended.

36. Two Godfreys are also included in the War Memorial tablet on the tower’s north wall, whilst other Godfrey members are commemorated with tomb stones in the south aisle of the church and in the graveyard. Although the external inscriptions are almost effaced they were recorded by Duncan, *Monumental Inscriptions*, e.g. 27, 29, nos 314, 32. One J.D. Godfrey appears on the First World War Memorial next to the front door of Lydd Memorial Hall.

37. Peter Godfrey’s death was recorded on their brass in 1566, and Mary’s in 1580, which took the year to begin on 1 January not 25 March, the start of the civil or legal year.

38. Whether Thomas Godfrey’s floor and wall monuments should be counted as one or two memorials is a moot point. It is discussed in some detail in the section on Thomas Godfrey II.

39. Austine Godfrey, yeoman, 29 August 1650, TNA PROB 11/213; Whether Thomas Godfrey’s floor and wall monuments should be counted as one or two memorials is a moot point. It is discussed in some detail in the section on Thomas Godfrey II.

40. Whether Thomas Godfrey’s floor and wall monuments should be counted as one or two memorials is a moot point. It is discussed in some detail in the section on Thomas Godfrey II.

41. Now also available via the KAS website with the addition of Lydd’s ‘Chamberlains’ Account Book’, dating from 1475, is also printed, 13-328.

42. Lydd church’s origins may be of the 8th to 10th centuries. Lydd’s ‘Chamberlains’ Account Book’, dating from 1475, is also printed, 13-328.

43. George Slewse or Sluse of Rye glazed 2 windows at Lydd in 1527, the craft of stained glass-making being known at Rye by 1343–45. The replacement of glass at Lydd smashed or removed religious strife as that of Rye was.

44. As given in *Archaeologia Cantiana* 6 (1861), pl. facing p. 260, where this copy is described as ‘with additions’, 251. The additions comprise excerpts from the Lydd registers of baptisms, marriages and deaths 1542–1625, and excerpts of wills, 260, no. 267–9. Some may have been made by the un-named editor, the Visitation being printed in sections in *Archaeologia Cantiana* 4 onwards.

45. In 1484 Thomas Younge senior bequeathed five marks (£3 6s. 8d.) to, or perhaps towards, a new glass window in the chapel of St John the Baptist, CKS PRC 32/2/621; Scott Robertson, ‘Churches in Romney Marsh…Lydd’, 449–50.

46. CKS PRC 32/1/40; 32/2/362; 32/2/295; Scott Robertson, ‘Churches in Romney Marsh…Lydd’, 449–50. Lydd church had a north porch in the middle of which Henry Potten (d. 1647) was buried. The north porch existed in 1730 but had been removed by the late 19th century, Duncan, *Monumental Inscriptions*, 39, no. 446.

47. ‘Pro scabellacione videlicet le pyng’, Scott Robertson, ‘Churches in Romney Marsh…Lydd’, 450; CKS PRC 32/2/362.

48. CKS PRC 32/12/35.

49. CKS PRC 32/11/52.

50. 16 January 1567, proved 12 May 1569, CKS PRC 32/31/124.

51. The churchwardens’ accounts for 1556 highlight Peter Godfrey’s role in the administration of his friend’s will and highlights contemporary funeral practices: ‘Item payde by Peter Godfrey executor of ye testame’t of Mr Wylococke for ye ffece of ye grate bell at 2 seu’all for Mr wylococke due to ye churche, 2s. 8d. Item of him more for brekynge ye churche grounde 6s. 8d. Ite rec of him more for ye knell by 2 seu’all tymes for his wyff at ye buryall and mu’thes mynd for ye churches parte, 6s. 8d’, Finn, *Records of Lydd*, 417.


53. Close to John Motesfont’s brass is a floor slab which contains nearly-effaced indents of a priest, with a canopy and inscription. It is not known for whom this monument was made, but it suggests that Motesfont’s ecclesiastical brass was not a unique occurrence in Lydd church.

54. The pedigree described Joan as Johanna: fil… Tamworth. It records that Thomas’s ‘tomb’ (tumba) still existed in Lydd church, although Philipot’s earlier field notes church do not record her, *Archaeologia Cantiana* 6, pl. facing 260; Couner, ‘Church Notes’, 69, 84. Godfrey’s testament requested prayers ‘pro anima Iohanne uxoris mee, pro anima Iohannis Tenworth ac animabus omnium benefactorum meorum’. Reg. Chich. 2, 454.

55. ESRO RYE/146/2 (copy of c. 1585); WSRO COWDRAY/6(ii); CCA DCc Ch. Ant. C90; Martin, *New Winchelsea*, 46–7.


57. Over a century later, purgatory was written out of Henry VIII’s King’s Book (1543) and prayers for specific dead people were disallowed. Testators, or at least those professionals who wrote many wills, had regard to the severe legal, even capital, consequences of expressing proscribed religious views and the number of wills which specified masses or prayers for the souls of particular individuals was roughly half the level of the 1520s. Epitaphs of the 1540s, for example in Sussex, Yorkshire and Bedfordshire, also markedly avoided the formula ‘pray for the soul of’ replacing it with the expression ‘on whose soul god have mercy’, Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England*, 78–80.

58. Lydd and New Romney appear conservative in religious expression in performing the latter’s Passion Play, at least when it was safe to do so, in Mary’s reign, Draper and Meddens, *New Romney*, 55–8. The town governments were not torn apart by religious strife as that of Rye was.

59. There were no bequests to living children nor mention of the souls of any to be prayed for alongside those of his wife and benefactors, Reg. Chich., 2, 454. The churchwardens’ accounts make several references to pavers and paving during the 16th century, Finn *Records of Lydd*, 332, 336, 342, 355, 359, 363, 377, 381, 393, 398, 422.

60. Cockeram asked for burial in Lydd church without mentioning a memorial slab or brass. Depicted in civil dress, Cockeram’s brass effigy survives on a non-Purbeck slab in the central aisle, although an inscription and scroll are now lost, CKS PRC 32/9/78.

61. Although it appears unlikely, it is possible that Peter Godfrey is referring to a now-lost monument for another family member who was also called Thomas. Many difficulties arise in tracing these early relationships. A family reconstruction from wills of the mid- to late 16th century has shown that Peter Godfrey had a brother called Thomas, but this name is ubiquitous. Peter goes on to call his own son Thomas (this is Thomas Godfrey II, d. 1623).

62. Mapleden is in capitals.

63. From the churchwardens’ accounts for 1527, Finn, *Records of Lydd*, 401.
64. CKS PRC 32/24/14. Edward Godfrey’s will mentioned Peter Godfrey, probably the one who died in 1567. Edward owed Peter money for mortgaged land, and Peter was also one of the will’s executors.

65. Italics added. CKS PRC 32/24/16; PRC 32/31/121. Duncan recorded that the ‘earliest memorial in the churchyard is the altar tomb to the Strugell family in the north eastern portion of the yard dated 1551–1581’, also believed to be one of the earliest in the country. It may have been illegible before the 1920s and damaged by the bomb in 1940, Coatts, Brief History of the Church (n. d.) In 1581 John Struggel recorded his wish to be buried in the churchyard, ‘next unto my father and one decent tombstone to be made and set up with brickes over us and ingraven with some note of remembrance both of my father and me’, PRC 32/34/228.

66. CKS PRC 32/32/22.

67. Those of Thomas Godfrey I, John Motesfont (d. 1420, series B), and the delightful effigy of John Thomas (d. 1429, series D).

68. Latten, often spelt ‘laton’ or ‘latun’, was the word normally applied to brass plates during the medieval period, and used varying proportions of copper, zinc, tin, iron and lead. By c. 1485 the word ‘brass’ was being used in English wills, Norris, Monumental Brasses, 33.

69. Martin Stuchfield, pers. comm.

70. Religious sentiment varied in Cinque Ports towns in mid-16th century. The Rye town government led the inhabitants, not without discord, towards Protestantism from the 1530s, Draper, Rye, 126–7. New Romney retained traditional religious practices, such as its passion play, until the 1560s, supported by players from Lydd, but nearly all Kent towns and individuals largely conformed to Protestantism by the 1580s under the heavy influence of the Kentish gentry, notably on town governments. Draper, New Romney, ch. 7; Sweetingborough, ‘Eternal Town Servants’, 161. The 4th son of Thomas Godfrey, John, was sent to the Protestant school near Rouen, and then Hart’s Hall, Oxford, where he learnt, or improved, his French and Latin; he died aged 18 in 1612 as an inscribed brass plate in the chancel records. Lydd was probably not very different to other communities with Protestant leaders. Its families were subject to the fashions, and fortunes, of the religious climate, which was subsequently embodied by the marblers and artists beyond their parish, normally in London. However, the religious context that influenced the monuments made by the artisans in turn affected the kind of monuments that could be commissioned by Lydd’s monumental patrons.

71. The inscription is made from three separate pieces of metal, which have subsequently suffered slight mutilation. ‘[1] Here lyeth buried the Bodies of Peter Godfrye and Jone his / [2] wyfe, which Peter Decessyd the xth day of Marche in the yere of our Lorde God MCCCLXVI: and the sayd Jone Decessyd / [4] in the yere of our Lorde God MCCCLXVI: havynge by her v, s [remainder now lost]’. Cobb noted that there were originally five sons and four daughters.

72. Of course, it is possible that other Godfrey monuments were commissioned, for which there is now no evidence.

73. These were originally positioned on small stones in the chancel, but are now on the wall in the north aisle of the nave.

74. The original lettering is all upper case. No further information on this Thomas Partridge is readily forthcoming although there exists a lease of 20 August 1582 of a messuage and stable in Longer Street, Rye (a parish adjacent toiden) from Thomas Partridge of Sutton Valance, Kent, husbandman, to Anthony Quock, merchant, ESRO RYE/139/16.

75. In contrast Laurence Stuppeney’s brass and stone was originally in the chancel, but his brass inscription is now on the wall in the north aisle of the nave. The chancel was devastated by bomb damage during World War II. A bundle of correspondence from the 1940s notes the difficulties which Reverend W. Britton and Lydd’s parishioners faced in gaining approval from the Canterbury Diocesan Board of Finance’s Advisory Committee for the chancel to be rebuilt. This was in direct opposition to the Committee’s recommendations. The parishioners were successful, and the subsequent restoration work is quite outstanding, CKS P237/6/A/1.

76. From Philipo’s Visitation as printed in Archaeologia Cantiana 6, 264, these words probably being additions by the unnamed Victorian editor.

77. With thanks to Martin Stuchfield for drawing attention to this. It was suggested that the male effigy probably matches the ‘unknown’ lady whose effigy is also mounted on the north wall.

78. Duncan, Monumental Inscriptions, 41, no. 453, noted Godfrey’s shields as ‘illegible now as in Hasted’s time’. These have now been restored.

79. Great pride was obviously taken in the earlier Godfrey tombs. Thomas II’s will did not request burial either next or near to his parents’ memorial, the monumental brass of Peter and Jone Godfrey’s brass, possibly because all available ‘pitches’ had been taken.

80. Mary Honeywood later wrote her father’s biography, clearing him of blame for family disputes arising from unresolved property issues after his death, Bodl. MS Rawlinson D. 102.
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