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‘A HOUSE RE-EDIFIED’ – THOMAS SACKVILLE AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF KNOLE 1605-1608

Summary

Thomas Sackville was a courtier and a politician during the reigns of Queen Elizabeth I and King James I. Shortly prior to his death in April 1608, Sackville began work on his largest architectural project, the transformation of the archbishops’ great-house at Knole, near Sevenoaks in Kent. The house holds a seminal position in the landscape of country houses of the period, and as Sackville’s only surviving house, is an important monument to his ambitions as patron.

However, Sackville’s significance as a patron has often been underplayed, in the same way that his position as a leading politician and a minister of state has often been seen as only a brief interlude between the hegemony of William and Robert Cecil – Sackville’s predecessor and successor as Lord Treasurer respectively. The research of this thesis focuses on Sackville’s transformation of his house at Knole, highlighting the fact that during his political apogee, Sackville was a leading patron of his day, who employed the finest artisans, craftsmen and artificers available to him.

In the historiography of English architectural history, Knole is often sidelined, and seen as the last moment of Elizabethan building practice before the innovations of the Jacobean period. This not only underplays the complexity of the building’s development, but also detracts from what Thomas Sackville aimed to achieve during his campaign of building at Knole between 1605 and 1608. New evidence has afforded a fuller insight into Thomas Sackville’s role as patron and also the extent to which his numerous intellectual and cultural interests were brought to bear on the transformation of the house. This evidence suggests that what Sackville achieved at Knole was a remarkable synthesis of what was inherited from the existing fabric and what was newly built, and the product of this synthesis was a house that reflected both Sackville’s intellectual and political ambitions.
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Introduction

Viewed from the garden on the south side of the house, the first impression of Knole near Sevenoaks in Kent, is that it is a house all of a piece, with a central range with a seven-arched loggia flanked by two symmetrical towers (fig. 1). However, a closer inspection reveals that the lowest tier of windows does not correspond with the mullion and transom windows above, and the Chapel, which protrudes from the east end of the façade, sports large arched windows, something which would suggest that the house’s building history is more complicated than it first appears. This is something which is confirmed when the house is viewed from the north, where the medieval towers and battlements sit alongside seventeenth century gables and Georgian sash windows, a confection of additions and alterations instigated by successive generations of occupants (fig. 2).

The first published accounts of Knole’s building history were written by the authors of the historical and topographical surveys of the English Counties, such as William Lambarde’s *Perambulation of Kent* of 1576. Although often incorrect in their detail, these texts were broadly accurate in their understanding that the house had been constructed by Archbishop Thomas Bourchier in the second half of the fifteenth century, and that it had been altered by Bourchier’s successors at the See before being dramatically remodelled by Thomas Sackville, 1st Earl of Dorset in the early years of the seventeenth century. What is surprising to learn is that Sackville’s transformation of Knole was not widely celebrated or indeed acknowledged by his contemporaries. This is especially apparent in comparison to Audley End in Essex – the Jacobean residence of the Earl of Suffolk, and a house which figures heavily in contemporaneous travel journals of visiting dignitaries.¹ For the writer John Evelyn, Audley End was a ‘goodly house’ of a ‘mix fabric, twixt antique & modern’ while his impression of Knole following a visit of July 1673 was that of ‘a great old fashioned house &c.’² This lack of interest in Knole can be seen to reflect Evelyn’s attempt to establish the classical style as the leading canon of architecture in England. His disregard for the ‘Modern (or Gothic rather) Congestions of Heavy, Dark, Melancholy and Monkish Piles, without

---

¹ William Brenchley Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners in the days of Elizabeth and James I comprising of translations of the Journals of the Two Dukes of Wirtemberg in 1592 and 1610*, London, 1863, pp. 64, 135.
any just Proportion’ helped him to promote the work of Inigo Jones, an individual who, over the course of the eighteenth century became a hero of the neo-Palladian movement in architecture.\textsuperscript{3} Although Evelyn’s views reflected the wider shift towards a strict, classically inspired architectural taste, his opinions were not all-pervasive. In 1697, the Dutch artist Leonard Knyff travelled to Knole in order to create the bird’s-eye view of the house for his \textit{Britannia Illustrata} of 1707, a publication that set out to illustrate the most significant houses and gardens in England.\textsuperscript{4} Engraved by Johannes Kip, Knyff’s west prospect of Knole is the earliest known depiction of the house and as such, it is also a significant piece of evidence for understanding the evolution of the building and the garden (fig. 3).\textsuperscript{5}

By the middle of this century, attitudes towards what was conceived as ‘Gothic’ architecture were changing, and at Knole there was growing interest in the history of the development of the house.\textsuperscript{6} In 1741, the land surveyor William Gardiner produced a plan of the medieval cellars at Knole, a view of the south façade and also a bird’s-eye view of the house (figs. 4 & 5).\textsuperscript{7} A circle of important writers and philosophers including Edmund Burke became associated with the house through Lady Elizabeth Germain (1680-1769) (called from hereon in Lady Betty Germain, as she is better

\textsuperscript{3} John Evelyn, \textit{An Account of Architects and Architecture}, in Roland Freart, \textit{A Parallel of the Antient Architecture with the Modern, In a Collection of Ten Principal Authors who have Written upon the Five Orders}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition, 1707, pp. 9-10.

\textsuperscript{4} ed. John Harris & Gervase Jackson-Stops, \textit{Britannia Illustrata – Knyff & Kip}, Bungay, 1984, p. 176. For the payment to Knyff ‘for drawing of Knole’ of 1697 see CKS U269 A198/3. For the idea of \textit{Britannia Illustrata} serving as a means by which to compare country houses on a national arena see John Summerson, \textit{The Unromantic Castle and Other Essays}, London, 1990, p. 84.

\textsuperscript{5} Two further views were taken for John Harris’s \textit{History of Kent} of 1719 – one of the south prospect (again engraved by Kip) and another of the west by Thomas Badeslade (fl.1712-c.1742) (engraved by John Harris) document the alterations made to the house and garden in the first two decades of the eighteenth century.


\textsuperscript{7} The Plan of the Cellars in the Poets Parlour at Knole is endorsed, ‘A Plan of His Grace the Duk of Dorset at Knole Near 7Oaks in the County of Kent William Gardiner Deline 1741’. Although not signed or endorsed, the view of the south front of Knole in the lobby to the Brown Gallery shares the same ‘Scale of feet’ and is clearly in the same hand. Likewise there is a strong similarity in the handling of the shading on the barrels in the cellar drawing and the shadows cast in the south front elevation and those of the bird’s-eye view that hangs in the private apartments at Knole. Coincidently, a William Gardiner served as steward to the Duke of Dorset from around 1764 onwards and it is possible that he had been in the employ of the family since 1741.
known) who following her widowhood in 1718 came to live at Knole, establishing herself in the antiquated apartments of the east range. It was through Lord George Sackville (1716-1785), (the adopted son of Lady Betty Germain) that Edmund Burke (1729/30-1797) came to admire Knole, describing the house as ‘the most interesting thing in England. It is pleasant to have preserved in one place the succession of several tastes of ages; a pleasant habitation for the time, a grand repository of whatever has been pleasant at all times’, while Horace Walpole wrote that the outer court had ‘a beautiful simplicity that charms one’.8

Paul Sandby’s *West View of Knole House* c. 1770 shows the broad, leisured landscape of cattle, deer and riders on horseback occupying the expanse of lawn in front of the outer court, timeless and permanent (fig. 6). In the distance can be seen the house and the neo-Gothic belfry that had been set up in around 1745, one of a number of alterations that had been made to the house by Lionel Sackville, 1st Duke of Dorset (1687-1765).9 This phase of improvements at the house was characterised by efforts to assimilate alterations into the style of the existing fabric designed to emphasise the notion of a house unchanged by time, a romantic ideal propagated by Burke and his contemporaries.10 Although the 1st Duke of Dorset sought to modernise the State Apartments by adding new doorways to the Withdrawing Chamber, Cartoon Gallery and the King’s Bedroom at Knole, the decorative paintwork undertaken by Mark Anthony Hauduroy in 1723 in the Cartoon Gallery was specifically designed to be in keeping with the original Jacobean scheme.11

There was also a growing appreciation of the importance of the collections at Knole, and in particular there was a recognition of the significance of the royal furniture which had been acquired by Charles Sackville, 6th Earl of Dorset (1642-1706), which

---

10 For the construction of the Cook’s Tower see the petition of the Mason Richard Bird of February 17, 1746. CKS U269 E13/2.
11 For the joinery work of 1708 see CKS U269A228/4, for Hauduroy’s bills see CKS U269 A232.
had come as perquisites of his office as Lord Chamberlain to William III. In addition, there was an ever-expanding collection of pictures, many of which had come to Knole when the 6th Earl of Dorset inherited the Cranfield estate following the death of his mother, Frances Cranfield, in 1687. This substantial collection of pictures, tapestries and furniture – largely the collection of the Jacobean Lord Treasurer Lionel Cranfield (1575-1645) had been brought by the cartload from Copthhall in Essex to Knole between 1700-1701, and put on show for the ever-increasing number of visitors to the house.

The number and quality of the paintings on display at Knole prompted the publication of the first guide to the house, which, like many others of its day, served to provide a commentary not to the house and gardens but to the art collection. In 1795, *Biographical Sketches of Eminent Persons, whose Portraits form part of the Duke of Dorset’s Collection at Knole* was published by Henry Norton Willis, who had served as secretary to John Frederick Sackville, 3rd Duke of Dorset (1745-1799), when Lord Steward of the Royal Household. This short publication provided brief biographical accounts of thirty-nine subjects in the portraits in the Brown Gallery at Knole. It had been the 3rd Duke’s acquisition of Old Master paintings while in Italy and also his patronage of the English artists Joshua Reynolds and Thomas Gainsborough, which established the collection at Knole as one of national significance, and as the collection grew, so did literature on the house.

In 1817, the first guide to both the house and its collections was published, written by the house steward John Bridgman. It provided a room-by-room description of the most significant areas of the house, and its format set a precedent that would be

---

13 For the movement of goods from Copthall to Knole see CKS U269 E79/2. These furnishings were set up in the show rooms by 1730. See Inventory of Knole 1730 – transcription at Scotney Castle.
15 Henry Norton Willis’s obituary can be found in *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, July, Part Two, 1819, p. 276.
followed for the next century. This was until Charles Phillips produced his two-volume study *The History of the Sackville Family* (1929), a thorough survey of both the house’s and the family’s history. In his researches Phillips drew heavily on the manuscript library at Knole, the series of household papers, private and official correspondence of the Sackville family which today is held at the Centre for Kentish Studies in Maidstone.

As Phillips acknowledged in the introduction to his text, the manuscript collection at Knole suffered a series of calamitous events that have resulted in the loss of the majority of the family papers that date prior to 1650. The most significant period of loss appears to have been during the Parliamentary sequestration of Knole, which had first begun in August 1642 when Colonel Sandys and his company of horsemen had forced entry into the house and broken into a number of trunks and boxes. Important papers relating to the Sackville’s London residence at Dorset Court on Fleet Street would also have been lost when the house was destroyed in the Great Fire of London. To make matters worse, in the first half of the seventeenth century there was a family habit of destroying personal correspondence and reusing old ledgers and account books.

The final disruptive event for the Knole manuscript collection came in the late eighteenth century when the failed politician and would-be historian Nathanial Wraxall (1751-1831) held the entire archive of papers to ransom. A lifelong friend of Lord George Germain (Sackville), Wraxall had been invited by the 3rd Duke of Dorset in the summer of 1797 to view the muniments room at Knole with a mind towards possibly publishing a work based on the documents there. After the 3rd Duke’s death in 1799, Wraxall became embroiled in a bitter dispute with the Duchess of Dorset over an alleged promise for payment for his work on the archive, and the Duchess was forced to

---

17 John Bridgman, *Historical and Topographical Sketch of Knole in Kent*, London, 1817, p. 79. Bridgman was Steward at Knole from at least 1794 onwards CKS U269 A119/1.
19 CKS U269 E15 – ‘The hurte done at Knole House the 15th Day of August 1642 by the Company of Horsemen brought by Cornell Sandys’.
20 For an example of this see CKS U269 E79/1. Here, an inventory of the clothing of Richard Sackville 3rd Earl of Dorset contains notes in the hand of Richard Sackville the Earl of Dorset, relating to estate matters.
pay seven hundred pounds to retrieve the papers.\textsuperscript{22} In a series of his notes, Wraxall relates that the papers at Knole had, for a very long time, been tumbled together in a room at the top of house, before being collected and roughly sorted at the order of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Duke. He lamented the loss of so much of the archive, and in particular the almost complete lack of papers dating from the time of Thomas Sackville 1\textsuperscript{st} Earl of Dorset.\textsuperscript{23}

The loss of important documentary evidence has frustrated any meaningful understanding of Thomas Sackville’s rebuilding of Knole, despite the fact that it has long been recognised as one of the house’s two most significant phases of development. For a long time there were only cursory scholarly investigations into the architectural development of Knole. In 1951, F R H Du Boulay published a small selection of documents relating to Thomas Bourchier’s phase of building at the house, while in 1971 P A Faulkner published, ‘Some Medieval Archiepiscopal Palaces’, which, for the first time, explored the possibility that the outline of the early phase of Archbishop Thomas Bourchier’s work could be identified in the fabric of the east range of the house, an interpretation followed by Anthony Emery in his recent study \textit{Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales}.\textsuperscript{24} The brevity of the Crown’s ownership of Knole (1538-1550) was reflected in Knole’s entry in the fourth volume of the \textit{History of the King’s Works} of 1982. Howard Colvin and his fellow contributors suggested that Henry VIII’s work at the house was minimal and very difficult to identify, either in the surviving documentary evidence or the building itself.\textsuperscript{25}

Knole’s intrinsic duality – part medieval great-house, part Jacobean country house – has meant that it has often occupied an awkward position in the literature concerning the construction of Elizabethan and Jacobean Country Houses. The unparalleled survival of the early-Jacobean State Apartments at Knole has ensured that the interiors of the house have featured heavily in Mark Girouard’s publication \textit{Elizabethan Architecture}, and the house also has a strong presence in Anthony Wells-

\textsuperscript{23} ibid. p. xi.
Cole’s seminal *Art and Decoration in Elizabethan and Jacobean England*. Despite this, Knole lacks the attention that its significance deserves; it does not for example figure in Malcolm Airs’s important study *The Tudor and Jacobean House – A Building History*, and the fullest scholarly description of the house is Nicholas Cooper’s concise entry in his *The Jacobean Country House*. Nor has Knole been the subject of a monograph study, such as Simon Thurley’s work on Hampton Court, Alice Friedman’s publication on Wollaton Hall or Jill Husseley’s PhD thesis on Burghley House. Both Vita Sackville-West’s *Knole and the Sackvilles* (1922) and Robert Sackville’s *Inheritance – The Story of Knole and the Sackvilles* (2010) take the house as their principal subject, but both also begin the story in 1604, when the Sackville family established Knole as their main residence, and their focus lies in the relationship that successive generations of inhabitants shared with their immediate surroundings.

Yet, as Maurice Howard has recently reasserted, ‘transformations’ of existing structures in Elizabethan and Jacobean England are an extremely important aspect of building practice in the period, and are equally representative of attitudes towards building as the more celebrated ‘new builds’ of the day. In June 2006, the National Trust, who have held responsibility for Knole since the house passed into their hands in 1946, commissioned Oxford Archaeology to undertake a thorough survey of the house. This was done in order for the National Trust to gain a comprehensive understanding of the asset which had been placed in their care, with a mind towards both the conservation and the interpretation of the house and its contents. The result was the publication of a conservation management report and an archaeology report, along with an extensive gazetteer of the house. Although the archaeological survey was based solely on visual

---


examination and did not employ any intrusive archaeological methods, it produced by far the most complete account of the development of the building’s history to date, and resulted in the creation of the phased typology (fig.7).

This thesis picks up where Oxford Archaeology’s research left off, and investigates arguably the most important phase in the building’s history – the period of ownership of Thomas Sackville between January 1604 and April 1608 which saw the transformation of a medieval archbishop’s great-house into a Jacobean courtier’s country house. Although the focus of this thesis is the house itself, the thesis takes an interdisciplinary approach similar to that taken in the recent collection of essays in *Patronage, Culture and Power – The Early Cecils, 1558-1612* edited by Pauline Croft.30 It is often the case that many seemingly disparate aspects of an individual’s patronage come together in the creation of a new home, and this is why country houses continue to prove to be extremely important repositories of evidence for understanding life in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. This thesis explores how Sackville’s varied cultural interests and influences were manifest in his transformation of Knole.

The first part of this thesis sets out the key cultural moments in Sackville’s life – his education, early travel, diplomatic career and political apogee as the Lord Treasurer to both Elizabeth I and James I. Until relatively recently, this career was often neglected and under-studied. However, through thorough research, the literary historian Rivkah Zim has reconstructed Sackville’s reputation and career, re-establishing him as an important figure in the political landscape of sixteenth-century England. This thesis furthers this research, by identifying both the individuals and the events that would have shaped Thomas Sackville as a patron of the arts, and aims to establish Sackville’s reputation as one of the leading patrons of his day. In particular it demonstrates the means by which continental ideas and practices were transmitted to England during the sixteenth century both by influential courtiers such as Sackville and by the craftsmen in his employ. The second chapter investigates Sackville’s motivations for his acquisition of Knole in 1569 and for the first time, the complex legal wrangling that surrounded Sackville’s acquisition of the house is deciphered and important new evidence brought to bear on what is often a confusing and poorly documented period in the house’s history. The section goes on to complete the biographical account of Sackville’s life,

and ends on a discussion of his financial position and his role as patron during the apogee of his power between 1599 and 1608.

The second part of this thesis provides an account of the transformation of Knole between 1605-1608. It begins by providing the context for Sackville’s work at Knole and discusses why he chose to return to a house that he had seemingly abandoned thirty years previously. It also highlights other important architectural projects which Sackville supervised or contributed to immediately prior to his involvement at Knole. It challenges established notions as to the identities of the craftsmen who helped in Sackville’s transformation of the house and also identifies those moments where Sackville’s involvement can be most clearly seen, and speculates as to the extent to which he dictated other aspects of the house’s redesign. In the concluding section, there is a discussion as to how successful this transformation was, and asks what this phase of building can tell us about both the theory and practice of building in early-seventeenth century England.
Part One: A life in ‘Seven Degrees’: the cultural career of Thomas Sackville, Baron Buckhurst and 1st Earl of Dorset (1535/6-1608)

Chapter One: Education and Early Career

In the most recent study of the career of Thomas Sackville, 1st Earl of Dorset (1535/6-1608) (fig. 8), the literary historian Rivkah Zim has suggested that there are two separate modern conceptions of Sackville. The first, the courtier poet of the 1560’s, the second, the little known Lord Treasurer to Elizabeth I and James I.¹ In an effort to reconstruct an understanding of the man, Zim argues that ‘experience of the young poet affected the ideas and talents of the mature councillor’, thus reconciling the two historical constructs.² According to Zim, three facets of Sackville’s life help frame an understanding of his mentality and behaviour – eloquence, money and the law. She argues that the practice of poetry provided him with the skills of persuasion, and his wealth gave him the confidence to voice his opinions, but it was his legal training, with its emphasis on equality before the law and moderation that ‘provided many of the premises and conventions of his mentality’.³

In her work on Thomas Sackville, Zim also highlights the various anomalies and paradoxes inherent in the man and his actions. To account for these paradoxes, Zim provides two possible explanations. The first is the paucity of surviving private correspondence relating to Sackville, something that inevitably frustrates any attempt to reconstruct his character. The second is a personal reticence on Sackville’s part, for he was a man with a natural aptitude for discretion, and as Zim suggests, ‘a tactical preference for acting behind the scenes’.⁴ Both considerations have a bearing on Sackville’s rebuilding of Knole, because there are very few clues as to what were his plans for the house, how he intended to use it or, indeed, what his feelings were concerning the original building there. As a result, any understanding of his intentions for its transformation must be informed by what is known of the experience of the man, his education, his cultural environment, his travel, his friends, and surviving records of

² ibid. p. 200.
his wider patronage. This chapter aims to set about reconstructing a picture of Thomas Sackville as a patron of the arts, and attempts to provide the intellectual and cultural context for Sackville’s work at Knole. In order to achieve this, it provides a new chronological survey of Sackville’s life, stressing experiences which shaped his cultural interests in the context of his life at Court and on his estates.

George Abbot’s (1562–1633) *Sermon Preached at Westminster May 26 1608*, was the first published description of Sackville’s life. As a former chaplain to Sackville, and a recipient of his patronage, Abbot’s *Sermon* is partisan, occasionally inaccurate, and largely derived from Holingshed’s *Chronicles* and statements made by Sackville in his own will. The most interesting part of Abbot’s biographical sermon is when he quotes Elizabeth I’s version of Sackville’s life which, following a ‘speciall piece of service’ Elizabeth ‘was pleased to decipher out his life, by seven steps of degrees’.

Today these ‘seven degrees’ still prove a useful framework on which to hang Sackville’s long career. In Elizabeth I’s account, the first degree was that of his youth, when Sackville studied at the University of Oxford and at the Inner Temple, where ‘he gave tokens of such pregnancie, such studiousnesse and iudgemnt, that he was held no way inferiour to any of his time or standing’. The second degree was spent in travel, in France and Italy, and where ‘he profited very much in the languages, in matter of story and state’. The third was that of his coming to court, ‘where on divers occasions he bountifully feasted her Highnesse and her Nobles and so he did to forren Embassadors’. The fourth ‘was his imployment of higher nature’ when he undertook diplomatic missions to France and the Low Countries. The fifth degree was a show of temperance and moderation, when Elizabeth ‘was pleased to command him unto his owne house, there privately to remaine till her farther pleasure was knowen’. The final two degrees represented Sackville’s apogee as a politician as he was elected as a privy councillor and later Lord Treasurer, ‘in which place she noted the ‘countinuall and
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excessive paines, and care which his Lordship did take in her buisnesse, his fidelity in his advices, his dexterity in advancing of her profit'.  

A rather less generous appraisal of Sackville’s early career was put forward by the politician and master of the court of wards, Robert Naunton, in his *Fragmenta Regalia* (c.1634), a series of brief biographical sketches of Elizabethan courtiers. Although Naunton praised Sackville for his elocution, sense of decorum and ‘the excellency of his pen’, he also criticised him for the immoderations of his youth. He was, according to Naunton, ‘without measure magnificent till upon the turn of his humour and the alley that his age and good counsel had wrought upon these immoderate courses of his youth and that height of spirit inherent in his house’. Here Naunton was followed by Aubrey in his *Brief Lives*, who described Sackville as a man who was ‘extravagant beyond all bounds and soon fell into considerable difficulties, but he was so humiliated by being kept waiting by one of his creditors that he embraced a magnificent economy’. Due to the fact that there is so little documentary evidence relating to this period in Sackville’s life, it is difficult to know whether to believe Naunton and Aubrey in this instance. At about the time that Sackville turned thirty he wrote ‘Sackvyle’s Old Age’, a long autobiographical poem, which gives the sense that he had reason to feel remorse for various indiscretions of his youth. Likewise, his father’s will does not give the impression that there was a tremendous amount of warmth between father and son, especially in comparison to Thomas’s sister Anne, who was referred to in generous terms of affection.

The English antiquary and writer John Aubrey also provided a ‘brief life’ of Thomas Sackville, which follows Abbot’s account, and which was not revised until the twentieth century, when scholars such as Paul Bacquet and Rivkah Zim reappraised his career as poet, courtier and politician. Over the course of four published articles, Zim has discussed almost every record of Sackville’s life that has survived. However, the subject of Thomas Sackville’s patronage of architecture and the arts still demands close scholarly attention, something that is remedied here.
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Early Education

Thomas Sackville was born to Sir Richard Sackville (1507-66) and his wife Winifred (née Brydges) in either 1535 or 1536, being 72 at his death in 1608. His place of birth is not known and the details of his childhood remain obscure. It is likely Thomas spent his early childhood in Sussex. The majority of the Sackville estates were situated in the north east of the county, around the areas of East Grinstead and Hartfield. From 1544 onwards, his father Richard held the position of steward to the Archbishop of Canterbury’s estates in Sussex, an appointment that would have necessitated his spending time near to the Archbishop’s lands in Pagham and South Malling. The principal family residence in Sussex was the ancestral seat of Buckhurst near East Grinstead, which had been recently rebuilt by Richard Sackville’s father, John Sackville (c. 1484-1557). It is likely that Thomas spent the earliest years of his life at this house.

During the 1550s, less time was spent at Buckhurst, probably due to the acrimony that developed between Richard and his father, which resulted in his temporarily being cut from his inheritance. Richard’s appointment as Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations led to the purchase in 1552 of Westenhanger, near Ashford in Kent, from Edward Fiennes, 1st Earl Clinton (1512-1585), a property removed from his father’s estates and closer to the Kentish estates that would increasingly occupy his time. Time was then split between Kent, Sussex and the Sackville residence in
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18 Heraldic Devices on the surviving gatehouse depict the devices of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. John Sackville’s will of 1556 also describes his ‘newe lodgins at Buckhurst’, PRO NA PROB/11/42B/48.
London, Derby Place. Situated just east of Blackfriars, Derby Place had been built in the late fifteenth century by Thomas Stanley. Stanley had married the mother of Henry VIII, Margaret Beaufort, in 1472, and was created Earl of Derby in 1485. Sackville held Derby Place from 1552, and would retain it until he acquired the lands that had belonged to the Bishopric of Salisbury at St. Brides in April 1564.

Abbot’s *Sermon* gives no information as to Thomas’s earliest tuition, but in ‘Sackvyle’s Old Age’ Sackville relates, ‘while learnyng i [a] desire while i applye/ the lateen tounge and while i reade the greke’. His father, Richard Sackville, was celebrated in Roger Ascham’s *Scholemaster* as ‘A lover of learing, & all learned men’, and, according to Ascham’s account, it was at Richard Sackville’s suggestion that the *Scholemaster* was written. In the preface to this work, Ascham recollects conversations that were held during an evening in late 1563 in William Cecil’s chamber at Windsor Castle. The guests were discussing education, and in particular, the severity of discipline used by schoolmasters. Following a reading in Greek of Demosthenes’ *On the False Embassy* against Aeschines, Richard Sackville took Ascham to one side, and told him that before he was fourteen, his schoolmaster had beaten from him ‘all love of learning’. In his attempt to rectify this, Richard Sackville suggested that Ascham assume responsibility for the education of his grandson, Robert Sackville, and charged him with finding a suitable master for both Robert and Ascham’s own son.

The *Scholemaster*, prepared and written for Robert Sackville (c.1561-1609), shows the concerted interest that Richard Sackville had in the education of his heirs. Although Ascham had no part in the early education of Thomas, it is clear from his account that Richard sought to make amends for his own unhappy education by providing the best possible schooling for those in his family. Furthermore, through his position at court, Richard Sackville was part of a group pressing for educational reform based on classical models, underpinned by their belief in the primacy of Latin and
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Greek. It is safe to assume, therefore, that Thomas Sackville was given the best possible education, one based upon humanist principles and one that would supply him with both the linguistic and the rhetorical skills he would later require in his career as a courtier and a statesman.

**Oxford and the Inner Temple**

Tradition associates Thomas Sackville with Hart Hall Oxford, the university to which his sons were sent.\(^{27}\) There are no surviving college records that confirm this, but other sources make it clear that Sackville did study at the university. In her account of Sackville’s life in *Sermon*, Elizabeth I relates that Sackville studied at Oxford, and in March 1592 Sackville himself wrote to the university on the subject of academical dress, where he made reference to the garb worn ‘in my time’.\(^{28}\) What is certain is that in November 1554 Sackville was admitted to the Inner Temple, where, according to Abbot, ‘he tooke the degree of Barrister’.\(^{29}\) Here he followed both his father and his father-in-law, Sir John Baker, both benchers of the Inner Temple, and in that capacity responsible for both administration and the educational programme of the Inn. Training in law had numerous practical benefits and familiarised its students with the complex litigation associated with land disputes and local government, and was increasingly a prerequisite for office in Tudor government. By 1563, thirty per cent of the members of the House of Commons had been admitted to one of the Inns of Court, and by 1601 this figure had risen to fifty-five per cent.\(^{30}\)

There were also further benefits to be had from participation in life at the Inns of Court. Following the efforts of reformers such as Sir Thomas More, Sir Thomas Elyot and Sir Thomas Smith, the courts had incorporated a broader range of cultural activities into their curriculum, and by the second half of the sixteenth century young men from genteel families were attending the Inns of Court in order to complete their humanist
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education.\textsuperscript{31} The focus of this education was the study of rhetoric. Cicero had championed language as an effective medium of persuasion, and at the Inns of Court, Cicero’s theories were taught through the practice of rhetorical exercises. These were performed in arguing the ‘moot’, a practice encouraged by Thomas Elyot in his \textit{The Book called the Governor} (1531).\textsuperscript{32} As Zim suggests, Sackville’s education in the law seems to have provided many of the premises and conventions of his mentality, and in a broader sense, the methods and substance of this education were fundamental in shaping his intellectual and cultural outlook.\textsuperscript{33}

It is clear that Sackville flourished during his time at the Inns of Court, which were celebrated in March 1560 by Jasper Heywood in his verse preface to \textit{The Seconde Tragedie of Seneca}, as to ‘where Minervaes men... And finest witts doe swarume’\textsuperscript{34}. Heywood was right to recognise the significance of the Inns of Court as the cultural epicentre in mid sixteenth-century England, for during this period nearly every writer and poet of note had been connected to them.\textsuperscript{35} As a resident of Gray’s Inn and a leading figure in the development of Elizabethan drama, Heywood was well positioned to identify Thomas Sackville, and in particular, ‘Sackvyldes Sonetts’, as worthy of singular praise.\textsuperscript{36} In his inclusion of Sackville in this verse preface, Heywood situated Sackville within the company of two other young lawyers, Thomas North (1535-1603?) and Thomas Norton (1530/2-1584). Thomas North, the younger son of Edward North, 1\textsuperscript{st} Baron North, was admitted as a member of Lincoln’s Inn in February 1556, and was celebrated by Heywood for his 1557 translation of Bishop Antonio de Guevara’s \textit{The Diall of Princes}, a Spanish adaptation of the ‘Meditations of Marcus Aurelius.’ As the illustration on the frontispiece suggests, the \textit{Diall} was intended to serve as a manual for the Marian government, to ‘serve to high estates for counsell, to curious serches of


\textsuperscript{32} ‘The discussion of a hypothetical doubtful case that may be used for discussion. Revived in the Inns of Court after falling into disuse, and introduced into universities where law is studied.’ \textit{Oxford English Dictionary}, Volume IX, Oxford, 1989, p. 1062.


\textsuperscript{34} \textit{The Second Tragedie of Seneca entitled Thyestes faithfully Englished by Jasper Heywood}, London, 1560, p. 12.


\textsuperscript{36} \textit{The Second Tragedie of Seneca}, London, 1560, p. 12.
antiquityes, for knowledge, and to all other virtuous gentlemen for an honest, pleasaunte, and profitable recreation'.

It is clear that in his introductory preface to *The Seconde Tragedie of Seneca*, Heywood was not only identifying the literary champions of the Inns of Court, but was also defining the membership of a literary group whose members had been influenced by the works of Seneca and Cicero. These figures engaged with the development and assimilation of the linguistic conventions associated with the classical authors along with the ideas and concepts contained in their works. One aspect of Cicero’s work which was especially appealing to Sackville, Norton, and North was the concept of the ideal gentleman and courtier, an idea drawn directly from Cicero’s conception of the ideal orator as a cultivated man of affairs. When Heywood wrote of ‘their works with stately style, and goodly grace t’endight’, he alluded to the didactic works such as the *Diall*, in which North, Norton and Sackville took a particular interest. It is unsurprising, therefore, to learn that Thomas Sackville’s first surviving sonnet is included as a preface to Thomas Hoby’s (1530-1566) translation of Castiglione’s *Il Cortegiano*, a project begun as early as the reign of Edward VI, but not completed and published until 1561.

As Zim has suggested, the fact that Thomas Sackville played such an active part in the translation of Castiglione testifies to the relationship between theory and practice in literature and in politics from his earliest days as a courtier. Much later in life, when Sackville came to formulate his iconographic scheme for the Great Painted Stair at Knole, he returned to these ideas of courtly virtue which had captured his interest at this important period in his intellectual development.

Beyond the translation itself, Sackville also composed a verse epitaph for the double tomb monument to Thomas Hoby and his brother Philip (1504/5-1558) at Bisham in Berkshire. Probably written around 1568, the poem extols the virtues of the two brothers, and gives a strong semblance of the personal attributes that Sackville
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regarded most highly. The two brothers were wise, courteous courtiers, and Thomas 'Well learned & languaged noman beside' [16].

Two woortie knights, and Hobbyes both by name, 5
Inclosed w^th in this Marble stone do rest.
Philippe the first in Cesars coort hath fame
Such as tofore few legats like possess
A diepe discoursing head, a nobl breast
A courtier passing & a courtis courteis knight
Zelous to god, what gospel he possest profest
When greatest stormes gan did dym the sacred light
A happie man, who death hath now redeemed
From care to ioye, that can not be esteamed. 10
Thomas in France possesth yssust the legats plac
And w^th such wisdome there to guide the same
As had an great honor to his race
If sodden fate had not enveyed his fame
ffirme in gods trueth, gentell a faithfull frend 15
Well learned & languaged noman beside
Gave comie shape w^ch made revevl his end
Sence in his floure in paris towne he died
leaving w^th childe behind his wofull wife
In forien land w^th heapes off, oppre^st w^th heapes of griefe
ffrom part of w^th when she discharded was 20
by fall of tears w^th that faithfull wiefes do sheade
The corps w^th honour brought she to this plac
performing her all dew unto the dead
That don this noble tombe she caused to make
And both these bretheren closed w^th in the same 25
A memorie leaft here her for virtues sake
In spite of death to honor them w^th fame
Thus lived they dead & we learne well therby
that ye & we and all the worlde most die
Figures such as Thomas Sackville had spent their formative years as sons to prominent Edwardian administrators who had risen under the aegis of the pro-Italianate Duke of Northumberland, and through his dealings with Hoby, and his association with North, Sackville emerges as an important exponent of the transmission of Italianate culture into English court culture. It was not until the political difficulties of the second half of the 1560s that the English court became more introverted in its cultural outlook, and even then this was tempered by the legacy of the 1550s and early 1560s. In this respect, scholars such as R J Baskerville are correct in identifying the period 1547-c.1560 as an exceptional moment in the reception of classical ideas and influences, inspired through the experience of the Italian peninsula.

**Gorboduc and the Revels of 1561-2**

The other translator with whom Sackville is known to have collaborated during his time at Inner Temple was the writer and lawyer Thomas Norton (1530/2-1584). Having matriculated from Michaelhouse, Cambridge, Norton was employed as a tutor to the children of Protector Somerset. Admitted into the Inner Temple on 28 June 1555, and praised by Jasper Heywood for his ‘ditties’, Norton collaborated with Sackville in the production of *Gorboduc*, the first blank-verse tragedy in English which was performed at the Inner Temple on 27 December 1561 as part of the seasonal revels, and again on 18 January 1562, before the Queen at Whitehall. Set within a wider tableau of masques and performances at the Inner Temple, such as *The Prince of Pallaphilos* and *Beauty and Desire*, *Gorboduc* sought to advance the marriage suit of the royal favourite Robert Dudley, styling him, in Marie Axton’s words, as the lawyers’ ‘Christmas Prince’. This show of allegiance was in gratitude of Dudley’s intervention at court on behalf of the members of the Inner Temple, who had been in dispute with
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the Middle Temple over the rights of jurisdiction of Lyons Inn, one of the Inns of Chancery historically under the authority of the Inner Temple. As governor of the Inner Temple, Thomas’s father Richard Sackville formally pledged his support and that of his successors to Dudley.

As Marie Axton suggests, the Inner Temple-Dudley connection was most likely mediated by Richard Sackville, and the production of Gorboduc and the accompanying masques and plays can be seen as a product of Sackville’s position as both privy councillor and Inner Temple member. Unsurprisingly, those who followed Richard Sackville in their allegiance were Richard Onslow (1527/28-71), Anthony Stapleton (by 1514-1574), and Roger Manwood (by 1532-92), all senior figures at the Inner Temple and close friends of his. In orchestrating these events he managed to achieve both a short-term victory over the Middle Temple, while also forwarding Privy Council calls for a resolution on the question of Elizabeth’s marriage.

Based upon Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae, the tragedy tells the story of the legendary British King Gorboduc, his wife Videna and their sons Ferrex and Porrex. In the play, Gorboduc divides his kingdom between his two sons, sparking a quarrel over the portions of their inheritance. Led by ambition and jealously, Porrex murders his brother, only to be murdered himself by his revengeful mother. Meanwhile, the opportunistic Duke of Albany tries to seize the kingdom, and civil war ensues. By the end of the play the people have turned on Gorboduc and Videna, killing them both, and the country is plunged into chaos.

Literary historians have contested the extent to which the play is indebted to Seneca, but the lack of personifications and Aristotelian unities of time and place, mark Gorboduc as a progressive play, moving towards the flexibility and freedom of the great Elizabethan dramas. What is of most importance is Thomas Sackville’s synthesis of traditional historical sources with classical, (and in this instance, predominantly Senecan tragedy) to create an engaging evocation of civil war as the result of a divided succession. As Zim has suggested, ‘Sackville clearly had a sense of the past as a construct: something made by the imaginative insights of others, such as Virgil and
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Petrarch, or Livy and Tacitus.’[^48] The works of Thomas More and Edward Hall, which also owed a similar debt to the early English chronicles, were also important to Sackville. According to the 1565 title page of *Gorboduc*, Sackville contributed the fourth and fifth acts of the play, which have been said to ‘contain the play’s most affective and politically significant poetry’.[^49]

The extent to which Sackville was involved in the overall direction of the Christmas revels is not necessarily easy to grasp. Norton was evidently a key protagonist, but his role may well have been overstated. S F Johnson is right in asserting that Norton’s political anxieties may have been higher than those of Sackville, but his suggestion that Sackville’s involvement was designed to heighten its profile and help defuse any adverse reaction to the political messages, underplays the extent of the influence that the Sackville family held over the Inner Temple at this time.[^50] The suggestion that Thomas Sackville’s contribution went beyond the production of the two acts for *Gorboduc* is also given by the fact that he sponsored Arthur Broke’s (d. 1563) honorary entrance to the Inner Temple in February 1562, in acknowledgement of Broke’s contribution of ‘plays and shows at Christmas last’.[^51] Broke is best known to posterity as the author of *The tragical historye of Romeus and Juliete*, written first in Italian by Bandell, and nowe in Englishe, first published in November 1562, which also suggested that he was the author of the masque of *Beauty and Desire* that accompanied *Gorboduc*.

The lack of surviving accounts from the Inner Temple covering the period of the Christmas celebrations makes it difficult to chart any financial contribution Richard Sackville may have provided for the proceedings, and, despite his role as governor, he remains a distant figure in the records of the Inner Temple during the period of his son’s attendance – his time predominantly occupied with Privy Council matters during the early part of Elizabeth’s reign. However, it is clear that the leading figures in the Inner Temple were beneficiaries of Richard Sackville’s political patronage, and enjoyed inclusion in parliament thanks to his influence. Richard Onslow’s inclusion in the parliament of 1558 for Steyning, and Anthony Stapleton’s representation in the Parliament of April 1554 for East Grinstead – both seats controlled by Sackville – can

be seen as representative of this patronage. Manwood, who appeared as the ‘chief baron of the Prince’s Exchequer’ in the Christmas revels was, like Richard Sackville, heavily involved in Kentish affairs at this time, and both were on the commission that supervised the restoration of Rochester Bridge earlier in 1561. Richard Onslow and Anthony Stapleton also participated in the dramatic celebrations acting as ‘Lord Chancellor’ and ‘Lord Treasurer’ respectively.

An Entertainment at Sackville House

This was not the first time that Richard Sackville had been involved in the production of theatrical display, as, following the accession of Elizabeth I, he had been placed in charge of the arrangements for the queen’s coronation. Nor was it the last. During July 1564, and shortly after the purchase of Salisbury Place on Fleet Street, Richard Sackville played host to the queen on a number of occasions. On the 5th of that month, Sackville provided a feast for the queen and the court, accompanied in the evening by a series of dramatic performances. The Spanish ambassador, Guzman de Silva, described the events in his dispatch of 10 July to the King of Spain. When he arrived at the house he had been ushered into a room while the Queen walked in the garden with her ladies. Later, he was received by the Queen and was brought up ‘into a very large gallery, where she took me aside for nearly an hour’ and discussed matters between herself and Philip II, after which supper was announced, and ‘served with great
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57 Guzman de Silva does not make it clear in his missive of the 10th where precisely these events took place, and this is probably due to the fact that he did not know himself. However, he confirms that it was Sackville’s residence in a later dispatch of 9 October 1565.
ceremony’. While dining, the Queen ordered her musicians to play the Clement Jannequin composition *Battle of Pavia*, before retiring to her chamber prior to the commencement of the dramatic proceedings. First, a ‘comedy’ was performed by torchlight in the hall. Significantly, and like the majority of other courtly dramas, the play dealt with the subject of marriage. Elizabeth, perhaps typically, sought to change the subject and inquired of the ambassador as to whether the young prince Don Carlos had grown.

After the comedy had ended, a number ‘of certain gentlemen who entered dressed in black and white’ performed a masque before the Queen. After the dance, one of the courtiers approached the queen and presented her with a sonnet in English, which she went on to describe to the ambassador. This done, the Queen then proceeded to a further gallery where ‘every sort and kind of preserves and candied fruits that can be imagined’, were displayed on a long table. This episode, shortly before Richard Sackville’s death and at the height of his political power, shows him as an accomplished host, capable of providing a sophisticated programme of entertainment for the queen, her courtiers and foreign ambassadors. As at the Christmas revels of 1561/2, Richard Sackville employed a combination of theatrical devices to forward his, and his allies’, policies before the queen. The fact that Robert Dudley, now 1st Earl of Leicester, was present that evening might well suggest that the July festivities sought to promote the same cause as the Christmas revels of 1561/2.

It is important to remember that Thomas Sackville was not present during the 1564 revels at Sackville House, so it is impossible to credit him with any part of the proceedings. However, the episode demonstrates the key role that Richard Sackville must have played in developing his son’s cultural interests. Although Thomas could not have been the courtier who presented Elizabeth I with the sonnet, it is precisely what could be expected of him during this period. As his father’s political heir, Thomas employed his literary talents to further family causes, whether they involved the politics of the Inner Temple or the broader causes of his father’s faction at Court.

It is clear that although Thomas would have been groomed as his father’s political heir, he followed a different path early in his career, for while Richard had
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gained his wealth and preferment through governmental administration, Thomas Sackville chose to pursue a career in diplomacy. In this respect he may well have been influenced by the careers of his father’s friends Thomas Chaloner, Nicholas Throckmorton and Nicholas Wotton, all of whom served as diplomats to the crown. Of the three figures, Thomas Chaloner (1521-65) is perhaps the most interesting. Although he served four successive Tudor monarchs in a variety of guises, he is best known for his English translation of Desiderius Erasmus’s *Praise of Folly* (1549), one of a number of other significant publications. Among his literary friends were Thomas Wilson, Barnaby Googe, George Ferrers, and Thomas Sackville.61

Chaloner had also been one of the original contributors gathered by William Baldwin (d. 1563) to begin work on the *Mirror for Magistrates*, a popular series that took the form of a collection of visionary poems warning against the vices and misconduct of public officials, to which he contributed the ‘tragedy’ of Richard II. Conceived during the reign of Mary I, the *Mirror* was suppressed until Elizabeth’s accession, and only published in 1559. It had been commissioned by the printer John Wayland, as a continuation of John Lydgate’s *Fall of Princes*, itself an English version of Boccaccio’s *De casibus virorum illustrium*. Thomas Sackville was to contribute the prefatory ‘Induction’ and ‘Henry Duke of Buckingham’ to the second part of the *Mirror*, published in 1565, but he had been in discussion with Baldwin as to the form and order of narration for the first edition during the Marian reign.62

Richard Sackville and Thomas Chaloner were good friends, and Chaloner’s correspondence demonstrates the affection held between the two. They had mutual friends, such as Chaloner’s brother-in-law Thomas Farnham (1527-62). Farnham had enjoyed Sackville patronage, standing for the family-controlled constituency of East Grinstead in 1558, and his older brother John served the family for the majority of his life, living at the Sackville residence at Salisbury Court, known as Sackville House.63 When Thomas Farnham died in September 1562, his widow Helen was consoled at Chaloner’s home at St. John’s Clerkenwell by Thomas Sackville and Nicholas
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Beaumont – another beneficiary of Sackville patronage. In his will, Thomas Farnham asked Thomas Sackville to devise a suitable inscription for a plate that was to be given to Henry Hastings, 3rd Earl of Huntington (c. 1535-1595).

The Departure for Italy 1563

The idea that travel was beneficial to young Englishmen as part of their education was one that had become increasingly prevalent in the mid-Tudor period. From the 1540s onwards, religious pilgrimage was giving way to a new cultural pilgrimage, with Rome and its antiquities the ultimate destination. Italy became a place where young gentlemen who had been given a humanist education came to learn first hand, through experiencing the survivals from Roman civilization, and by participating in Italian Renaissance society. This shift in attitude was reflected in new forms of publication such as William Thomas’s *The Historie of Italie* (written 1554-49, published 1561) and *Principal Rules of the Italian Grammer, with a Dictionarie for the better understanding of Boccace, Petarcha, and Dante*, which included descriptions of various cities and important landmarks and replaced the earlier sixteenth-century pilgrimage texts such as *Pylgraymage of Sir Richarde Gulforde Knyght*, (1511). The phenomenon that would become the ‘Grand Tour’ was in its nascent form.

In Elizabeth I’s epitome of Sackville’s life, the queen describes the second degree of Sackville’s life: ‘his travell, when being in France and Italy, he profited very much in the languages in matter of story and State’. Language skills were one of many skills to be gleaned from time spent abroad. Henry Knolles was put forward for a diplomatic position at the Spanish Court thanks to the fact that he had ‘as sufficient italien as any other enlishe gentilmen’, while Dr. Valentine Dale was put forward by Nicholas Wotton (ambassador in France under Mary I), on account of his proficiency in
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64 His close association with the Farhams, and through the Farhams the Sackvilles, must have led to his 1584 seat for Bramber. For Helen Farham’s account of her husband’s death see *CSP Foreign Series of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1562*, London, 1867, p. 325.


Latin, Greek and French. The best-documented continental tour of the mid-sixteenth century was that of Thomas Hoby, who was encouraged to travel by his elder half-brother Philip in order to gain experience of the foreign courts, manners and languages that would in turn prepare him for a life in diplomatic service. Sackville's association with the Hoby brothers has already been mentioned, and their influence on him cannot be underestimated. At the start of the 1560s, Sackville would have been surrounded by figures encouraging him to travel. Aside from academics such as Ascham and Cheke, numerous other members of his own generation travelled. John Brooke (alias Cobham), perhaps one year Sackville's senior, was one such figure, who, like Sackville, studied at the Inner Temple and was destined for a career in diplomacy. Another lawyer-turned-courtier who would provide diplomatic services for Elizabeth was Henry Kingsmill, who was again perhaps one or two years older than Sackville. Kingsmill studied in Paris, where in 1552 he shared lodgings with Thomas Hoby; the two met again in Padua in August 1554. Another student of Padua in the 1550s was Sackville's cousin, Thomas Alford (c. 1530-92) who was living at 'the great court' of Salisbury House by 1564. The motives for travel, as outlined above and related by Elizabeth, were reason enough for Sackville to travel, but there is no doubt that with Sackville’s intellectual interests focused on the classical period and contemporary Italian culture, Italy represented hallowed ground.
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71 Sackville and Cobham would go on to work together in welcoming Paul de Foix and his diplomatic embassy to England in 1571.
Sackville’s Time in Italy and Rome

There were two routes into Italy from England, one through mainland France, the other through Central Europe. There is no record of Sackville’s itinerary, so it is impossible to state with any certainty the precise route that he took although the likelihood is that he would have avoided France, as the country’s wars of religion had recently recommenced. A travel journal of 1564 made by the gentleman Richard Smith, a member of the party of Sir Edward Unton (1534-82), is the closest contemporary itinerary that survives for the period. Sackville was not a member of Unton’s party, but the two aspiring courtiers would have known each other from their time together at court and at the Inner Temple.

Landing between Flushing and Middelburg, the Unton party stopped at Antwerp, to view and admire the city’s mercantile wealth, the two exchanges, and stately Guildhall. From there they travelled east towards Maastricht, where they stayed one night before heading to Cologne. Following the course of the Rhine, they passed through Mainz, Oppenheim, Worms and Speyer, before leaving the river and heading further south to Augsburg. From Bavaria, they travelled due south to Landsberg and then on through the Alps, via Mittenwald, Innsbruck, Brixen, Sterzing, Botzen and Trent, before finally arriving at Treviso on the 29th of April.

Once in Italy, the tour began in earnest. The first stop was Venice, ‘one of the ‘ffayrest stytes of sumptuous byldinges in chrystendon’ and where Unton’s party saw a crocodile brought from Ethiopia. At Padua, (one of the few cities Thomas Sackville is alleged to have visited) the Unton party visited the tomb of Antenor and the house of Titus Livy. From Padua and Ferrara, the group travelled to Bologna before heading through the Apennines to Florence. The final leg of their journey was to Rome, their most southerly destination on the itinerary. Throughout their trip, William Thomas' The historie of Italie (1549, reprinted 1561, 1562), served as their guide and was regularly

---

77 Sackville is mentioned as being in Padua in 1563 in Jonathon Woolfson Padua and the Tudors, English Students in Italy, 1485-1603, Cambridge, 1998, p. 267, although no reference to primary material is given.
consulted along the way. Maurice Howard has demonstrated the significance of this text in the development of classically inspired architecture in England, and has drawn attention to Thomas’s sensitivity to the significance of antique remains, as he celebrated their survival and lamented their loss. Howard also highlights the fact that the text was dedicated to John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, who in 1550 sponsored John Shute’s journey into Italy, a trip which resulted in the publication in 1563 of the first architectural treatise in England, The First and Cheife Groundes of Architecture. Like Shute, Thomas borrowed heavily from Vitruvius in his description of the orders, and as Howard argues, entered into the discourse surrounding notions of decorum in architecture, stressing the public benefits to be gleaned from modern buildings.

Thomas’s *historie* represents a unique moment in the history of architecture in England, because for the first time, readers were urged to visually engage with material objects and to learn from that experience. Therefore, Thomas’s text emerges as much a description of the country and its places of architectural merit as a history of its political and social development. When Thomas wrote that he desired nothing more than to ‘see some of those wonderful temples or edifices upon pyllers in theyr olde facion’ in Rome, he articulates the primacy of the antique and its revered status for travellers to the eternal city.

At Rome, both ancient and modern buildings were to be observed. The Palazzo Farnese, incomplete when William Thomas visited in 1546, would be ‘the gallantest thing, old or new, that shall be found in all Europe’, while St Peter’s, also under construction, was another site worthy of admiration. The Pantheon was celebrated, as were the columns of Trajan and Antonius, the triumphal arches, pillars and various remains. Thomas’s *historie* furnished its readers with the means for understanding the classical idiom, and provided them with both the stylistic language required to describe various aesthetic attributes and the historical information regarding their construction. Whether Sackville used Thomas’s *historie* or an indigenous text, Alberti’s *Descrittione*

---

78 It is clear from the Smith diary of the Upton tour that Thomas’s text was being used as their guide, for in Venice Smith thought that the *Historie* was ‘more in the prayse of itt that it doth deserve.’ Yeames, ‘The Grand Tour of an Elizabethan’, 1914, pp. 92-113. During Thomas Hoby’s tour, Leandro Alberti’s *Descrittione di tutta l’Italia* was used as the handbook to their travels.


Both texts would have demanded of him that he engage with the classical architecture of Rome. He would have been made aware of what was modern, what was ancient and what, out of the ancient, had been incorporated into the modern. With his court connections, and at a time when Elizabeth I’s government retained credibility in Catholic Europe, Sackville would have been permitted access to the more private palaces of the cardinals and legates in Rome.

If Sackville’s travels had been leisurely up to this point, events would take a remarkable turn during his time at Rome, when he found himself thrown into prison. The precise sequence of events is difficult to unravel, but it is clear that he was arrested in December 1563. By early 1564, news of this had reached England, and in a letter of 29th January to the papal diplomat Gurone Bertano, William Cecil sought information regarding the arrest. Bertano’s response does not survive, but it appears that Sackville, his servant Mr Travers and two other servants, had all been interned in close prison ‘so that no man might speak with them’. The charge is not known. The likelihood is that Sackville and his party were arrested as heretics, or as supposed spies. As ever, the evidence is difficult to interpret. On the one hand, the letters of petition sent for his release were addressed to the Civic Prefect, as opposed to the Inquisition, suggesting that he had fallen foul of local authorities rather than that of the Church, and this could possibility be the instance when Sackville fell foul of his creditors, to which Naunton referred. On the other, a letter that survives from the English Catholic exile, Sir Richard Shelley, from c.1566, criticising the policy of Pius IV towards Sackville and clearly stating that too much responsibility had been put on the young Sackville, ‘ch’era anco stato nell’ Inquisitone’, suggests otherwise.

The petition that was sent to the prefect was written by the leading members of the English hospice in Rome, all of whom were Catholic exiles. They testified to Sackville’s station, and refuted the claims that ‘the illustrious Sir Richard Sackville and Master Thomas his son are not of noble birth in England’. Events took a further turn when Sackville became embroiled in Papal attempts to reconcile the English Church

---

82 ibid. p. 34.
84 Quoted in, C G Bayne, Anglo-Roman Relations, 1558-1565, Oxford, 1913, pp. 308-309.
with Rome. These plans had largely been orchestrated by Bertano, who had begun his overtures towards Cecil in September 1563. Here, Bertano picked up where Abbot Martinengo, the papal nuncio charged with negotiating England’s reunification with Catholic Europe, had left off earlier in Elizabeth’s reign.\footnote{Kenneth Bartlett, ‘Papal Policy and the English Crown, 1563-1565: The Bertano Correspondence’, \textit{Sixteenth Century Journal}, XXIII, No. 4, 1992, pp. 650-651.}

As Sackville languished in prison, diplomatic exchange between Cecil and Bertano accelerated, Cecil noting to Bertano at Rome that ‘the Queen’s Majesty [is] much delyted with [Bertano’s] wrytyngs’.\footnote{ibid, p.653.} Having been released, Sackville was summoned to a special audience before Pope Pius IV.\footnote{\textit{CSP Relating to English Affairs Preserved Principally at Rome in the Vatican Archives and Library}, vol. I, Elizabeth, 1558-1571, Hereford, 1916, p. 163.} He also held two other meetings with Cardinals Morone and Borromeo, both senior figures in the Papal administration, and advocates of the proposed reconciliation. The results of their discussions are recorded in a memorandum dated 3 May 1564 made by Abbot Papaglia, who had been present at all these meetings. Here the Pope outlined his intentions for his Nuncios to be allowed entry into England, promising Elizabeth his ‘fatherly affection and with all the love that she can desire’, and assuring her that the intentions of the Holy See were honourable.\footnote{Pollen, ‘Testimonial by Bishop Goldwell’, 1906, p. 6.} Sackville himself could attest to this, and was charged by the Pope to deliver these matters in person to the Queen.

It is easy to observe Bertano’s hand in much of the proceedings here. In a dispatch of 22 April 1564 to the London-based Genoese merchant Benedetto Spinola, Bertano related that Sackville was soon to depart for England, having been flatteringly received by the Pope.\footnote{Report on the Pepys Manuscripts, preserved at Magdalene College, Cambridge, London, 1991, p. 19.} He would leave, Bertano cryptically remarked, 500 crowns richer, and unaware of the fact that Bertano had ‘done more in the matter than he yet knows’.\footnote{idem.}

It is worthwhile considering Sackville’s experiences in Rome. Privileged English travellers such as Sackville would have been permitted to view the treasures of the Vatican – Smith mentioned ‘dyvers other things of as old pictures holy reliqukes’ when recalling the Unton party’s visit to the Vatican, along with the various works currently being undertaken by Pius IV to develop and beautify the Vatican Palace.
'which wille beynge fynshed the goodlyest palace of the world'. It is of significance that Sackville’s audience with the Pope and the Cardinals was one of the last of its kind for English travellers to Rome under Elizabeth I, and he would have been one of the final Elizabethan courtiers to have viewed the audience chambers and halls of the Vatican complex. When Sackville came to build at Knole, he incorporated a number of classically-inspired features into the body of the existing house. Although there would be no direct visual quotation from what Sackville had seen in Rome or elsewhere on his travels, this journey was clearly an influential period in Sackville’s life, and the experience would later manifest itself in changes made to the house.

The Return Journey – Netherlands and France

By November 1564, Sackville had reached Flanders on his return journey, and was ready to cross to England. Here he encountered a further delay. The Spanish ambassador, Guzman de Silva, wrote to his king that Sackville had recently communicated with his father, giving an account of his time in Rome and the Pope’s Commission. The Pope had expressed his surprise that the Queen could not see the error of her ways. Sackville responded that she feared a return to Rome would lead to the loss of her throne and an unfavourable marriage that suited only the Catholic Princes. The Pope replied that none of this would be the case, and that he would ensure that she was at liberty to marry whomsoever she pleased. This message was communicated by Sackville from Flanders to his father, who in turn conveyed the Pope’s promises to the Queen without Cecil’s knowledge.  

Two letters addressed to Sackville, surviving in draft form at the Papal archives in Rome, help relate what happened next. Sackville had been ready to depart for England from Antwerp, when he had been stayed by the wishes of his father, who feared Thomas would suffer the displeasure of the Queen if he returned. The second draft, by Cardinal Morone, stressed the delicacy of the situation and the importance of the role of Thomas’s father in the plans to reconcile Elizabeth I with Rome. Morone wrote that Sackville was right to postpone his return, but revoked Sackville’s call for the

---

dispatch of a third Papal Nuncio, and reiterated that this business should only be conducted in secret through himself and his father.\(^{94}\)

Thomas Sackville was a pawn in a dangerous game. He was, in effect, a papal agent, and his call for a dispatch of the Nuncio in his place was undoubtedly an attempt to extricate himself from the situation. The extent to which his father backed the papal proposals is hard to quantify; his commitment to the reformed religion seems to have been steadfast throughout his life, despite the fact that his wife Winifred secretly practised Catholicism.\(^{95}\) As it has been seen, through his patronage of comedies and masques, Richard Sackville was a leading member of the faction calling for Elizabeth to marry, and may well have seen a rapprochement with Rome as a means of furthering Dudley’s marriage suit, a proposal Richard Sackville had publicly supported during the Christmas festivities of 1561/2. Equally, Richard may have seen this exercise in the same light as Cecil, as an opportunity to gather information regarding Rome’s position and intentions towards England.

Whatever the case, Elizabeth was not to be moved. Typically, she entertained the idea long enough to give her suitors hope before disappointing them. Throughout 1564 and most of 1565, Cecil maintained his correspondence with Bertano. This would come to nothing, but while it continued, Thomas Sackville was forced to maintain his exile abroad. Having been halted at Antwerp, he travelled to Paris, the city to which Morone’s second draft of around December 1564 was sent. By this point the Queen’s displeasure appears to have rescinded; in November 1564 Thomas Sackville was writing to her and providing her with intelligence from France.\(^{96}\) Following the recovery of Le Havre and the signing of the Treaty of Troyes (April 1564), the break in the hostilities in France made travel far safer than it had been when Sackville had left for Europe in 1563.

The precise date when Sackville returned is not known, and it has always been assumed that he spent a considerable period of time in Paris. He had certainly returned before March 1566, when Guzman de Silva noted that Sackville had been nominated as the diplomat to be sent to undertake negotiations for the proposed marriage between


\(^{96}\) The whereabouts of this letter is not known. Its contents are recorded in a sale catalogue of 1869, a copy of which is held in East Sussex Record Office. See ESRO DLW 561.
Charles, Archduke of Austria, and Elizabeth I. This appointment had to be postponed, and ultimately abandoned, due to the rapidly failing health of Sackville’s father, Richard, who made his will on 22 March, and died just under a month later on 21 April 1566.

Sackville’s travels had been long and eventful. He had spent over two years away from home, and had travelled extensively through Italy, the Low Countries and France. If the aim of his travel had been to prepare him for a life of diplomacy, then it had been entirely successful. His experience at Rome, and the secret diplomacy surrounding the overtures made towards Elizabeth by the Pope, would have given him unparalleled experience in the double-crossing world of European diplomacy. In this, he evidently acquitted himself sufficiently well to be trusted by both the Pope and Elizabeth I, and reaped the reward upon his return when he was knighted and created Baron Buckhurst on June 8th 1567. Sackville’s religious convictions had been placed under scrutiny during his time abroad, and may even have been compromised, but it seems that despite the dangers that he encountered during his early travels, Sackville remained an advocate of continental travel and encouraged his children and his extended family to follow in his footsteps. Four sons travelled abroad, two of them extensively, as did his sons-in-law Henry Glemham and Henry Neville. In 1587, Sackville brought his second son William on his embassy to the Netherlands and towards the end of his life appears to have planned a continental tour of the north of Europe for his grandson Richard Sackville.

98 On 30 March de Silva noted that Thomas had asked to delay his departure because his father was on the point of death. CSP Relating to English Affairs Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simancas, vol. I Elizabeth, 1971, p. 526.
99 BL Harley Mss/1776/48 clearly relates that the creation was undertaken ‘one Sonday the viij th of June in the viij th year of Queene Elizabeth’. He was led by Edward Windsor of Bradenham, 3rd Baron Windsor and Thomas Wentworth, 2nd Baron Wentworth, and his mantle, arms and hood were held by Henry Carey, 1st Baron Hunsdon.
100 In her Memoirs, Lady Anne Clifford wrote that this trip was ‘upon a pre-engagement to his grandmother and others of his friends before he married me’ which gives the firm impression that this decision was in line with Thomas Sackville’s own wishes. Anne Clifford, The Memoir of 1603 and The Diary of 1616-1619, (ed. Katherine Acheson), Broadview Editions, Ontario, Canada, 2007, p. 227. These plans were carried through despite the protestations of the Countess of Cumberland who, fearing her son-in-law might be converted to Catholicism, asked the young Richard Sackville to ‘hold yr Course, by the grace of god is so arm yr self, both inwardly with graces & outwardly with all good preparations that, howsoever you shall bee mightily assaulted as I have
There is also evidence to suggest that Sackville was acquisitive during his time abroad, for when he returned to England in 1566 he brought with him the Italian musician William Daman (d. 1591), a recorder player from Lucca. Described in the return of aliens for the Parish of St Peter-le-Poer of 1571 as ‘William de Man, born in Lewklande, a musician, has been in England 67 years, who was brought into England by my Lord Buckhurst and servant to the same’, Daman was probably recruited by Sackville during his time at Rome.\(^{101}\) There is also the possibility that two Italian cassoni at Knole, one in the entranceway of the Outer Wicket, the other in the King’s Room Closet [F146] came into the Sackville collections in the same manner (fig. 9).\(^{102}\)

By extension it is likely that Sackville was acquisitive in a number of other ways, acquiring knowledge of Italianate art, manners and culture, and also material tokens of Italian cultural achievement.


\(^{102}\) I am grateful to Christopher Rowell for this suggestion. However, Martin Drury has suggested a date of c. 1580 for these chests which would make it impossible for them to have come into the collection in this manner. If this date for the chests is accurate, then perhaps they were brought back from Italy by Thomas Sackville the younger during his extensive travels in Italy from 1595 onwards. See Martin Drury, ‘Italian Furniture in National Trust Houses’, *Furniture History*, Vol. XX, 1984, pp. 38-45 at pp. 38-39.
Cardinal Châtillon and Sackville’s fortunes at Court

Increased responsibility followed Sackville’s elevation to the peerage, and in early September 1568 Sackville was charged with hosting the Huguenot refugee, Cardinal Odet Châtillon (1517-1571) and the Bishop of Arles. Châtillon and his retinue (around thirty strong) had travelled to England to seek support for the French Protestant cause from the Queen. However, Elizabeth and her courtiers were unprepared for Châtillon’s arrival, and soon began to express concern as to how they were going to accommodate the Cardinal and his train. On 11th September, Sir Thomas Gresham wrote with concern that he had been forced to entertain the Cardinal at his house in Bishopsgate because the Bishop of London was unable to receive Châtillon at Fulham Palace.\footnote{CSP, Domestic Series, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, 1547-1580, London, 1856, p. 316.} The next day, a short tour of the city was conducted, where the group visited the French Church, the newly built Exchange at Cornhill, and St. Paul’s Cathedral.\footnote{John Stow, Annals, London, 1631, p. 662.}

With the Queen away on progress, the French were housed at the Charterhouse at Sheen, where the Sackville family had rented rooms since around 1559.\footnote{John Cloake, Palaces and Parks of Richmond and Kew, Vol. I, The Palaces of Shene and Richmond, Phillimore, Chichester, 1995, p.112.} The events of Châtillon’s stay are related in a letter from Sackville to the Council of 29th September 1568, in which he attempted to absolve his guilt, having incurred the Queen’s displeasure for failing to entertain Châtillon in a manner befitting the Cardinal’s station. Believing that silence would further his culpability, Sackville provided William Cecil with his version of events.\footnote{NA SP/12/47/87} According to his account, he had been called on to prepare Sheen only two days prior to Châtillon’s arrival, at a time when he was some thirty miles away from the palace.\footnote{The likelihood here is that Sackville was at Buckhurst.} Having ridden all night to get there, he showed the queen’s officers those parts of the house that he possessed along with the furniture that he had there.\footnote{Sackville had only a linen tablecloth where they demanded damask, he lacked plate, and what glass vessels he did have were deemed insufficient by the officers of the Queen. NA SP/12/47/87}

Having called around for last minute provisions, and forfeited his own basin and ewer, Sackville met the Cardinal and the Bishop of Arles and showed them to their
lodgings. As he wrote, he had ‘acommodated his L as well as might be wth so shorte a warning’. Urgent matters on his own estates had then called him away, and arriving in Sussex, he found one of his houses all but completely burnt ‘as CC will not reparie’. However, in failing to accommodate Cardinal Châtillon to a sufficient standard, Sackville learnt another lesson the hard way. He had been put upon at the eleventh hour, but he had failed his Queen, and from that moment on he would be at pains to ensure that such mistakes were never repeated and quickly established a reputation for himself as a generous host.

However severe, the Queen’s displeasure was short-lived, and was soon alleviated – largely out of necessity. By 1569, the ensuing crises surrounding Mary Queen of Scots in the north had forced Elizabeth I to rally those courtiers loyal to her, and Sackville was returned to favour. The fall of Thomas Howard, 4th Earl of Norfolk (1528-1572), following his involvement in these events, weakened the standing of his father-in-law Henry Fitzalan, 12th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580) in Sussex, and created a power vacuum that Sackville set to exploit. The ancient family of Fitzalan of west Sussex was to be superseded by the newly ennobled Sackvilles of the east, an usurpation made complete when Sackville replaced Fitzalan as a Lord Lieutenant of Sussex in November 1569 – a commission which he shared with Anthony Browne, Lord Montague (1528-1592), and William West, 1st Baron De La Warr (c. 1519-1595).

109 NA SP/12/47/87
110 NA SP/12/47/87. It is very difficult to know which house this is but the suggestion is here is that it was the Lord’s Palace in Southover, Sackville’s residence in Lewes.
111 In November Buckhurst learnt from his friend, Sir Thomas Heneage, that his presence had been requested at Court by the Queen. Report on the Manuscripts of Allan Finch, Esq. Burley-on-the-Hill, Rutland, Vol. I, Hereford, 1913, p. 7.
The French Embassy of 1571

Following the papal bull of excommunication of 25th February 1570, and the growing threat of invasion, Elizabeth I desperately needed a foreign ally. In her attempt to find one, she looked to France, and sent an embassy to the country to this end, headed by Sackville. Ostensibly, Sackville’s mission to France was to congratulate the French King Charles IX on his marriage, and to be present for his triumphal entry into Paris, but the real aim was to begin secret negotiations for the proposed marriage of Elizabeth to the brother of the French King, the Duke of Anjou and Alençon.113 Plans for a union of the French and English crowns had been mooted as early as 1565, and had probably begun in earnest during Cardinal Châtillon’s stay in England. It was Sackville’s mission therefore to convince the French that Elizabeth was committed to the marriage proposal that had been put forward.

The substantial survival of Sackville’s correspondence during this embassy makes it possible to reconstruct much of his journey. In her study of the correspondence which covers the embassy, Rivkah Zim has been able to demonstrate how Sackville was able to shape his readers’ reading of events through his use of rhetoric and other linguistic devices.114 Much of this correspondence was addressed to Thomas Heneage (1532-1595), a successful courtier and, judging by the intimate terms of affection in which he was addressed, a close friend of Sackville’s. Their letters are of special importance because it shows Sackville unbound by the formality of official correspondence, and he often divulged more about his personal experience to Heneage than he did to Lord Burghley or the Queen. This section will highlight the key cultural moments during Sackville’s embassy; what he saw, those he met, and the ways in which he conducted himself as a courtier, a friend, and a representative of the Queen.

Sackville travelled in great style, accompanied by the young Edward Manners, 3rd Earl of Rutland (1549-1587), and a large company of knights and gentlemen of the

113 Sackville’s own recollection in his will that his mission was to begin secret marriage negotiations between Elizabeth and Henry, son of Henry VIII of France, is a mistake.
Rutland, a former royal ward who had recently been involved in the suppression of the Northern Earls, accompanied Sackville into France to ‘see the country’, and sent his impressions of his journey back to William Cecil, taking note of principal officers in Picardy, and sketching rough plans of two forts. In many ways, accompanying an embassy such as Sackville’s was the ideal opportunity to travel as a cultural tourist, for it provided safe passage through foreign lands, and often afforded access to palaces and other places of interest that may have otherwise been off-limits to regular travellers. It also provided the opportunity for young men such as Rutland to see at first hand the machinations of European diplomacy, a prerequisite for any career at court. As such, Rutland’s letters home are a useful supplement to Sackville’s correspondence, as Rutland noted his responses to the houses and towns that they visited en route to Paris.

Another member of Sackville’s delegation was Guido Cavalcanti, a second-generation Florentine merchant-turned-diplomat. His father sold luxury goods to the court of Henry VIII, and Cavalcanti had followed in the family business, specialising in jewellery and woollen imports before turning his hand to diplomacy. As an English-born Florentine, Cavalcanti had the unique advantage of being trusted by both sides, a useful position during negotiations for marriage between a protestant queen and a catholic prince. In the formalised world of sixteenth-century diplomacy, Cavalcanti’s loosely defined position enabled him to act as a go-between for the two parties, and it was Cavalcanti who presented a portrait of Elizabeth to the Duke of Anjou, something Sackville’s role as ambassador did not allow.
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115 ‘And as his embassage was great, so was his charge no lesse in furnishing himselfe and his traine accordingly, being both in number and furniture, such in every point as did appertaine’ Stow, *Annals*, 1631, p. 668.
116 CSP Relating to English Affairs Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simancas, Vol. 1 Elizabeth, 1894, p. 288.
Following bad weather at Dover, Sackville arrived at Calais on the 7th February 1571, some time after the rest of his party. At every juncture, Sackville was impressed by the veneration showed towards him and his party. At Boulogne, Sackville was met by the Baron Bornoiset and treated to feasts and gifts of wine and hippocras from the local dignitaries, answering in Italian to their French. In an attempt to repay their generosity, he offered two English greyhounds and a couple of his mastiffs that the French had admired, and promised to send more on his return to England.

On 12th February he reached Montreuil, a fortified town in the Pas-de-Calais. Here he was received outside the gates by Monsieur de Mailly, with whom Sackville dined. En route to Abbeville, attempts were made to course a hare and hunt boar, ‘but he boar was past from thens not half an hower before we came.’ After a night’s stay at Abbeville, Sackville and his party travelled to Amiens, where they were greeted with the obligatory discharge of harquebusiers and met by the lieutenant and the mayor. There Sackville was shown the sights of the city, and in a letter to Heneage, he related his experience of the town, one ‘above all others that I have sene most delectable with so faire, large and even streets, so full of plesaunt walkes, so beautiful eleven ryvers passing through the same in divers places, of sete and strength so impregenable, and so excellent and so rare a churche within the same, as I promise you I think I may justly prefer yt before any of those in Italye’.

These comments represent the solitary written expression of Thomas Sackville’s response to architecture. As the largest cathedral in France, Notre-Dame d’Amiens was an impressive structure, but his comments relate that Sackville engaged with and responded to the built environment during his travels in France and Italy. It would be dangerous to read too much into them, but it is clear from his enthusiasm that Amiens had a strong impact upon him. In style, the Cathedral can be described as universally perpendicular-Gothic, displaying none of the architectural language of renaissance classicism. Whether the comparison between Amiens Cathedral and the churches that Sackville had seen in Italy reflects an acknowledgement of established canons in

---

121 ibid. pp. 15-16.
122 ibid. p. 16.
architectural taste is impossible to state, and it is only safe to say that Sackville’s statements show an enthusiastic appreciation for late-Gothic ecclesiastical architecture.

Sackville’s time in Amiens was further enlivened with a feast in a banqueting house. There, on a large table, he found numerous subtleties of sugar in various forms such as fruits, hogs’ feet and his own arms, ‘so lively counterfeted as maini of us were beguiled, taking them for natural’. As he suggested to William Cecil, his entertainment at Amiens had far exceeded his expectations. The party now headed towards Paris, but before doing so, they visited the two châteaux of François, Duc de Montmorency, Chantilly and Écouen, two great monuments to the achievements of the French Renaissance. The visit was recorded by Rutland in a letter to William Cecil of 18th February 1571. It is clear that Écouen had a profound impact on the Earl, as he described the palace as having no match in England, ‘either for good site or uniform and costly building’. Rutland’s admiration of the location and disposition of Écouen is predictable enough, but his appreciation of the uniformity of the façade suggests an understanding of some of the basic precepts of classically inspired architecture. These châteaux were also treasure houses of antiquity. On display within the rooms of Chantilly were numerous medals, fragments of architecture and marble busts salvaged from the ruins of Rome.

At Paris, news of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton’s death reached Sackville. This seems to have had a profound effect on him, and in a heart-felt letter to Thomas Heneage he wrote that, ‘you see how our friends faile in this world and that ther is nothing but transitory treasure here’. After reminding Heneage of his affection towards him, he remarked that God had made him so happy by the Queen’s favour, ‘and the love and friendship of you and the few friends whom I have chosen’.

---

123 idem.
125 ibid. p. 188. This entry is not calendared correctly, and appears a year earlier than it should in the published calendar.
128 ibid. pp. 16-17.
St Denis and Paris

However much Nicholas Throckmorton’s death may have affected him, Sackville still had important business to conduct. By 17\textsuperscript{th} February, he was waiting for his lodgings to be prepared just outside Paris, and spent the time viewing Saint Denis, where he was shown the collection of national treasures by the Grand Prior of the abbey. Here he admired the monuments to the French kings, which were ‘well placed and preserved’.\textsuperscript{129} On the 21\textsuperscript{st} Sackville, Walsingham, Rutland and others from his retinue rode towards Paris. On the way they were met by French nobles, knights and gentlemen, who conducted Sackville to his lodging which had been prepared with the King’s furniture ‘exceeding riche and sumptuous’.\textsuperscript{130} On arrival in Paris, Sackville dined with Walsingham and the French Diplomat Bertrand de Salignac de Lamothe Fénélon, where Sackville earnestly reassured the French courtier of Elizabeth’s conviction on the subject of her proposed marriage and an audience with the French King, which was granted for the 23\textsuperscript{rd} February.

On that day, two French nobles escorted Sackville to court in a cavalcade of horse and coach. At the time, the French court was at the Château Madrid (also called the Château Boulogne), the large renaissance palace built for Francis I near the Bois de Boulogne to the west of Paris.\textsuperscript{131} After waiting for the king to finish eating, Sackville was received into the Presence Chamber, where they discussed matters of State. Here Sackville played the role of diplomat with ease, putting a positive light upon all events and demonstrating the English commitment to the marriage alliance. He also gave the king gifts of six richly caparisoned Hackney horses.\textsuperscript{132} Afterwards he spoke with Catherine de Medici, who, on the French side at least, was the keenest exponent of the marriage alliance. The next day, Sackville was called to view the evening ‘Triumphes,

\textsuperscript{129} NA SP 70/116
\textsuperscript{130} NA SP 70/116
\textsuperscript{131} It is Holinshed who notes that the Court was held there. Holinshed’s Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland, Vol. IV, London, 1808, p. 259; M Chateret, Le Château de Madrid Au Bois de Boulogne, Paris, 1987.
\textsuperscript{132} Two further horses were given on behalf of Robert Earl of Leicester to the King’s brother. See CSP Venetian 1558-1580, London, 1890, p. 465; Correspondence Bertrand de Salignac, Seigneur de la Mothé Fénélon, Ambassadeur de France en Angleterre de 1568 a 1575, Part. 4, Paris and London, 1840, pp. 34-35.
barriers, and pastimes’, at Charles, Duke of Lorraine’s house in Paris. Later, on the 1st March, he was invited to hunt with the King at the Bois de Vincennes. The king, having learnt of Sackville’s store of greyhounds, had specially replenished the park with fallow deer, which Sackville set his dogs upon, although, as he wrote to the Queen, ‘the dere ran better for their liefes/ than the dogs did for my plesure’.\textsuperscript{133} As a result, the French King and his party fell upon the herd of deer with swords, easily slaying the deer and sparing none, an event that seems to have distressed Sackville.

After these leisurely pursuits, the negotiations continued, albeit in secret. The Queen Mother, Catherine, was at pains to keep the negotiations discreet at all times and suggested that their next meeting should be held in the gardens at the Tuileries. Sackville was told to come with three or four men at the most, under the auspices of viewing ‘gardens and roiall buildings’.\textsuperscript{134} It would so happen that the Queen would run into him there, allowing them to have further discussions in private. Catherine de Medici was a keen patron of the arts, and in particular of architecture. Her chief architect was Philibert de L’Orme whose work on the royal tombs Sackville had admired at St. Denis. In the last years before his death in 1570, L’Orme had been involved in the development of the Tuileries, part of the palace of the Louvre. Catherine had begun acquiring land for the project in 1563, and work was well in hand, and under L’Orme’s instruction when he published his treatise \textit{Architecture} in 1567.\textsuperscript{135} Only one wing of the planned palace was built before the architect’s death, and this is what Sackville would have seen during his visit of March 1571. On the courtyard side towards the Louvre, the ground floor was decorated with a banded French Ionic order of pilasters of the type illustrated in the \textit{Architecture}. On the garden side there was a similar arrangement, but with an open loggia with alternating columns and pilasters and a terrace placed above. Internally, a complex staircase led from the ground floor to the principal rooms on the first floor containing the state apartments. Both the work of Philibert de L’Orme and the project at the Tuileries were known to English courtiers, and in September 1568, the ambassador to France, Sir Henry Norris (1525-1601), wrote to William Cecil informing him that he was sending him ‘a boke of Architecture, made

\textsuperscript{133} NA SP70/17/1075.
\textsuperscript{134} NA SP70/117 Quoted in Rivkah Zim, ‘Dialogue and Discretion’, \textit{The Historical Journal}, 1997, p. 301.
by him that makethe the Tuillers here which being yet begun, wil be a statle howse’. In 1571 Sackville saw first hand the very latest achievements of the French Renaissance, projects that had gained notoriety in England before they had even begun. On this occasion, visiting the architectural sites and gardens served as a ruse for the delicate negotiations over the Anjou marriage, but it must have been the case that many hours of leisure during the embassy were spent visiting other palaces in and around Paris.

There was still much more to see. Diplomatic formalities dictated that he should not stay any longer than his embassy required, and so in order for the secret negotiations to continue, Sackville needed an excuse to stay put. The French King suggested that he should stay for the triumphal entry into the city to celebrate his marriage, which was planned for the 5th March. As an ambassador of peace, Sackville was not permitted to participate in the procession itself, and there was also the question of ambassadorial precedence, a worry voiced by the French King to Sackville during his audience.

In fact, those responsible for the production of the entry were at pains to downplay any militaristic overtones to the pageant. The entry, which, after postponement, went ahead on the 6th March 1571, was a celebration of the hope and optimism emanating from the latest respite in the religious wars that had resulted in the signing of the Peace of Saint Germain. The procession itself was a fine example of Renaissance civic pageantry, as the city commissioned two royal poets, Ronsard and Dorat, working in collaboration with the city alderman, humanist and poet, Simon Bouquet, to devise the theatrical programme. These individuals provided instructions to the court artists, Germain Pilon and Niccolò dell’Abate, as to the design of the pageant ephemera for the event. These mainly consisted of large triumphal arches based upon Roman models, accompanied by a huge painted Serlian perspective piece that introduced the themes of the dramatic tableau. On one side was the King’s device of twin columns, with the figures of Piety and Justice below. On the other was an identical pair of columns surmounted by the arms of France and the Holy Roman Emperor, and with personifications of Luck and Abundance. In the centre of the scene, Maiestas sat triumphant, setting both Fear and Fury into flight. This iconographic programme was
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136 NA SP 70/102/32
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far more sophisticated than anything that Sackville would ever have seen in England, and certainly more complex than the pageants that had been organised by his father for the entry of Elizabeth I into London in 1559.  

The report of the entry that Sackville promised Elizabeth does not survive, but there is no doubt that, as an accomplished poet in his own right, and as someone who had been responsible for creating works such as Gorboduc, Sackville would have appreciated and indeed understood these pageants.  After being delayed some days further, Sackville returned to England, leaving Rutland in France to continue his travels. His embassy had been a success of sorts, and he awaited the return visit of the French delegation to England later that year.

**The embassy of Paul de Foix to England, 1571**

Arriving back in England by Easter, Sackville returned to Court. By August, it was time for a second round of diplomatic negotiations, and for Sackville to play host to the French party led by Paul de Foix (1524/28-1584). Early in his life, de Foix was destined for a career in the church, having studied Greek, Hebrew and theology at the University of Toulouse. He was an excellent scholar, and returned to Paris to study law, mathematics and philosophy, establishing himself as one of the most cultivated men of his day. These gifts where evidently recognised by the French crown, and he was sent on numerous diplomatic missions on their behalf. He had also spent considerable time in England in 1562-66, and had been heavily involved in negotiating the treaty of Troyes in 1564.

On 12th August, Bertrand de Salignac, the resident French ambassador in London, reported to his King that de Foix and his party had arrived at Dover and had been received by ‘le jeune Coban’, Sir Henry Brooke, alias Cobham (1537-1592). He
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139 ibid. p. 11.  
140 NA SP70/17/1075.  
was escorted by Cobham to London, where he was met at Blackfriars by Sackville and the newly promoted joint commander of the English fleet, Sir Charles Howard (1536-1624). Other members of this greeting party included Sir John St. Leger, (1516-93/96), Sir Humphrey Gilbert (1537-83) who had been wounded in Le Havre in 1563, and Sir George Bores. There were also members of Sackville’s retinue. John Farnham was present, as was Bartholomew Clerke (c. 1537-1590). Educated at Eton and King’s College Cambridge, Clerke had accompanied Sackville to France earlier that year, and was to spend the months following his return engaged in a Latin translation of Castiglione’s *Courtier*, which may well have been commissioned by Sackville as a diplomatic gift intended for de Foix.

Many of the letters written to William Cecil (now Lord Burghley), relate Sackville’s frustration, caught between his attempts to be both a good host to his guests and a good subject to his Queen. This was not an easy accomplishment, with the Court away on progress in Hertfordshire and the Queen prevaricating on any decision to marry. As Mary Hills Cole has suggested, Elizabeth I used the disruption of the progress season to cultivate a policy of irresolution, something which was embarrassingly apparent during de Foix’s embassy of 1571.

For example, de Foix and Sackville were keen to establish a time at which an audience could be given, but with the Queen otherwise engaged in hunting at Hatfield an answer did not come quickly. Sackville’s letters convey the exasperation which both he and de Foix experienced during this week as they attempted to learn whether, on arriving near Hatfield, de Foix should dine with the Earl of Leicester at Court or be lodged at Brocket Hall (of John Brocket 1540-98). The Court then moved towards Essex, and on to Audley End. On the 30th August, the Queen, Lord Burghley, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir George Carew, Sir Charles Howard, Thomas Cecil and Sackville

144 NA SP12 80/20
145 This is an idea which was first suggested to Rivkah Zim. I am grateful to her for generously sharing her thoughts on this with me. Clerke’s ties to the Sackville family were strong. In his will of 1589, he makes references to his great obligations to Lord and Lady Buckhurst, asking them to accept his most valuable horse, his most valuable possession. He also wished his daughter Cicely to be brought up by her namesake, Lady Buckhurst’s ‘virtuous tuition’. Hasler, *The History of Parliament, The House of Commons, 1558-1603, Members A-C*, Vol. I, London, 1981, pp. 613-614.
147 NA SP/12/80/21/1+2.
148 NA SP 12/80/22
escorted de Foix to the University of Cambridge, where they were greeted at Trinity
College by the vice-chancellor, Dr. John Whitgift (1530/1-1604). Following their arrival
through streets lined with scholars, the party inspected the various colleges, and were
particularly pleased with the Master of Peterhouse Andrew Perne’s (1519?-1589)
library, believed to be the finest in England. After disputations at various schools and at
Trinity College, the Earl of Hereford, Sir George Carew, Sir Charles Howard, Thomas
Cecil, Thomas Sackville, and Paul de Foix were admitted as Masters of Arts of the
University.¹⁴⁹

By the start of September, the ambassadors were back in London, and it was
Sackville’s responsibility to play host. They dined with him, and visited the Tower of
London, where they were escorted by the Lieutenant of the Tower, Owen Hopton (c.
1519-95).¹⁵₀ Hopton then brought the party back to his house and provided them with a
banquet, and sent them on their way with a ‘good peale of ordinans’.¹⁵₁ As ever,
Sackville was at pains to demonstrate that diplomatic etiquette was being accorded, and
he let Burghley know, not a little proudly, that they had been escorted by ten knights
and gentlemen and thirty ‘tall fellows’ in livery, with ‘their halbordes in very good
order’.¹⁵²

Along with banquets, armed escorts, and tours of the city, diplomatic missions
demanded a steady flow of gifts to oil the wheels of negotiation. Sackville was duly
charged with providing a gift of plate to the value of seven hundred French Crowns.¹⁵³
Sackville personally supervised this commission, meeting with the master of the jewel
house, John Astley (c.1507-1596), and working closely with the two goldsmiths,
Brandon and Patrick, with Sackville believing it to be ‘so well sorted and the plate so
fair.’¹⁵⁴ This gift was gracefully received by de Foix, but the Frenchman left the country
having failed to broker a marriage settlement. Sackville had done everything he could,
but ultimately the embassy, and a year’s work, had come to nothing. He had been
chosen for his tact and manners, and his intellect and his largesse. His success was in
embodying those virtues set out in Castiglione’s text that meant so much to him. During
his time away he had been exposed to the very latest achievements of one of the most

¹⁵₀ NA SP 12/81/2
¹⁵₁ NA SP 12/81/2
¹⁵² NA SP 12/81/2
¹⁵₃ NA SP 12/81/3
¹⁵₄ NA SP 12/81/3
pre-eminent and sophisticated renaissance courts and had seen at first hand the work of its leading architects. These diplomatic missions were also the chief means by which English courtiers could procure architectural treatises published in Europe. For example, Philibert de L’Orme’s *Premier Tome de l’Architecture* (Paris, 1567) was acquired by the ambassador Henry Norris in Paris for Lord Burghley.\(^{155}\) Androuet du Cerceau’s *Second Livre d’architecture* (Paris, 1561) served as a rich source of inspiration for the design of the high-status chimneypieces in Sackville’s transformation of Knole, and it is likely that he owned a copy of this book himself, having acquired it during his travels.

Evidence of how architectural treatises were exchanged can be found within the library of George Abbot (1562-1633) at Lambeth Palace.\(^{156}\) Abbot’s copy of Jean Cousin’s *Livre de perspective* (Paris, 1560)\(^{157}\) had belonged to William Cecil, having been given to him by Nicholas Throckmorton in 1561,\(^ {158}\) while his copy of Jacques Androuet du Cerceau’s *Third Livre d’architecture* (1582)\(^ {159}\) is inscribed with the name of the diplomat Henry Cobham (1537-1592).\(^ {160}\) Cobham had been part of the greeting party that had received Paul de Foix in England in 1571, and had also been with Sackville when the two went to Dover to meet the Duc de Montmorency in the following year. Between 1579 and 1583, Cobham served as the English Ambassador to France, and it must have been during this time that he acquired his copy of Du Cerceau’s book.\(^ {161}\) He later accompanied Sackville to the Netherlands for his diplomatic mission of 1587. The third architectural treatise in Abbot’s library was Serlio’s *De architectura* (translated by Martin, Paris 1545), although this book has no inscriptions that give any clues as to its provenance.\(^ {162}\)
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155 SP 70/102/32
157 LPL RA 7735/A6 [**]
158 ‘Guilielmi Cecilis ex dono Nic: Throkmerton’ inscribed on title page. LPL RA 7735/A6 [**]
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160 ‘Henry Cobham’ inscribed on the front cover.
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Abbot has no legacy as an architectural patron, nor did he have any strong links to Burghley, Throckmorton or Cobham, so it is difficult to understand precisely how these books came into his ownership, but their existence shows how frequently texts such as these were shared, and it is very likely that Sackville exchanged architectural treatises with his peers in a similar manner.
Chapter Two: The Courtier, County Magnate and Lord Treasurer, 1572-1608

After his return from France there was a marked change in Sackville’s career. Although Sackville had a number of qualities that lent themselves to the subtleties of diplomatic negotiation, he appears to have focused his efforts and resources towards the development of the family estate in Sussex. As a result, after 1572, when Sackville accompanied the Earl of Pembroke and Lord Windsor to Dover in order to receive François, Duc de Montmorency (1530-1579), Paul de Foix and Bertrade de Saligners, references to Sackville in foreign correspondence and the state papers become increasingly rare.\(^1\) If the 1570s saw a discernable shift in Sackville’s activities, the decade also saw other aspects of his personality come to the fore. It was an inevitable consequence that Sackville’s acquisition of land and increasing dominance of country affairs in Sussex would lead to the flaring of local tensions, and in the 1570s signs of a more robust and aggressive individual emerge from Sackville’s correspondence.

As the only surviving son of his deceased father, Thomas Sackville stood at the head of a family that was increasingly influential in Sussex.\(^2\) Sackville was able to increase his standing in the county by focusing his acquisition of land and property in Sussex, financed through the sale of family property held elsewhere in the country.\(^3\) Another reason for Sackville’s ascendancy was that he had profited directly from the fall of Thomas Howard, 4\(^{th}\) Duke of Norfolk. Following the Duke’s execution in June 1572, Sackville set about exploiting the vacuum left in Sussex, and soon began carving up Norfolk’s estates. Correspondence from the 1570s relates that Sackville had a claim to the stewardship of the Duke’s lands in Sussex, which Sackville claimed the Duke had promised to him during his arrest at Howard House (Charterhouse in London).\(^4\)

In order to maintain influence in Sussex, Sackville mobilised members of cadet branches of his family to fulfil various roles in local government and his household. The extremely rare survival of a letter sent to one of Sackville’s household servants,
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\(^1\) BL Harley MS. 260/250 6 June 1572 ‘The Officers of he Queens Household the Earl of Pembroke the Lords Windsor & Buckhurst with might traines were gone to Dover to Receive Monsr. De Montmorencie the French Ambassador’.
\(^3\) Manors in Devon, Dorset, Kent and Surrey, were all released to help centralise Sackville’s power in Sussex. See *CPR, 12 Elizabeth I*, Vol. V, 1569-1572, London, 1966, pp. 72, 74, 139, 144, 147, 458, 549.
\(^4\) CKS U269/C3/1-3
Maurice Sackville, shows how severe and exacting Thomas Sackville could be in his displeasure. Written on the 11th May 1575, the letter begins with the assertion that ‘I do not like this doble deling’. Maurice Sackville had incurred his master’s anger by allowing an appointment of personnel in the kitchen without consulting him beforehand. Sackville’s immediate family was small, as none of his brothers had lived beyond infancy. His relationship with his only sister, Anne (d.1595) had been strained from at least 1568, when her husband Gregory Fiennes, 10th Lord Dacre (1539-1594) had complicated Sackville’s reception of Odet de Coligny at Sheen in September of that year. There had also been disputes arising from their father’s will over property in Kent, Essex, Sussex and Oxfordshire, and Sackville had sided against his sister in her dispute with Margaret, her husband Gregory’s sister, and Margaret’s husband, Sampson Lennard (1544-1615). In 1573, his cousin the County Sheriff, John Pelham (1537-80), Edward Gage, Anne Dacre, and others – all described by Sackville as ‘utterly separate in friendship from me’ – rode into Buckhurst Park and hunted without permission, actions which Sackville considered to have been designed ‘in spite unto me’. Incensed by this, Sackville threatened his park keeper with dismissal if he ever allowed them to return. Two years later, relations between Pelham and Sackville had improved, and Pelham returned to Buckhurst Park to hunt. Unfortunately, Sackville had failed to inform his servants of this reconciliation. Unsurprisingly, considering Sackville’s previous threats, the keeper did everything in his power to eject Pelham from the park, much to Pelham’s indignation.

5 The likelihood is that this Maurice Sackville is the same Maurice Sackville who would become rector of Withyham, and later, parson of Ockley. BL Add. MS39444.
6 BL Add 33084/10
7 NA SP 12/47/87
8 NA C2/Eliz/B29/59 Sir Richard Sackville’s will stipulated that Anne could enjoy her mother’s annuity of 500 marks, as long as she would agree to sign any legal documents that her brother required of her.
10 BL Add 33084/17
11 BL Add 33084/17
12 BL Add 33084/17
Sackville and the Wealden Iron Industry

One of Sackville’s key sources of revenue during the 1570s was derived from his involvement with the Wealden iron industry. This was a family business and one pursued by his father, who had gained a reputation for aggressive land acquisition in Sussex and Kent. In 1570, Archbishop Parker wrote in complaint to the Queen that when he first came to the Archbishopric in 1559, Richard Sackville petitioned him for the lease of the manor of Charing, a former residence of the Archbishops of Canterbury that had since fallen into disrepair. After Parker told Sackville of his intention to repair and use the house, as it stood conveniently in the middle of the diocese, Sackville sued the Queen for the lease, ‘intending, as I was credibly informed, in this wood, being very night to the house of Charing to erect up certain iron mills; which plague, if it should come into that country’. Such was the demand for raw materials that ironmasters such as Sackville would go to unusually dangerous lengths to ensure their stocks of timber. This was the case in April 1572, when disputes over felling had bubbled over into violence. Sackville related his version of events in a letter to his cousin and county Sheriff, John Pelham (1537-80), a relation through his father Nicholas’ marriage to Sackville’s aunt Anne, sister to his father. According to his account, Sackville had set four of his fellers to work at Homewood, before they were accosted by servants in the employ of George Goring, another local landowner and a rival to Sackville.

Fostered by the growth in the market for iron in London and the South East, and benefiting from the influx and expertise of French ironmongers, the industry had undergone massive expansion over the course of the sixteenth century. The Sackville family held considerable land in Ashdown Forest, the epicentre of the industry, which provided the founders with ore and timber, the two raw materials necessary for iron production. To this end Sackville acquired a series of manors in and around Ashdown
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14 BL Add33084/12
Forrest, which included Parrock forge and furnace, the furnaces of Maynard’s Gate, Sheffield, Hartfield, Ashfield and Fletching. The majority of these were leased to others and run by them on his behalf, which helped distance Sackville from any financial repercussions of failing businesses. It allowed him to include conditions in the leases that ensured his tenants would provide provisions for his household. For example, Richard Leeche at Fletching was responsible for providing provisions for Sackville whenever he was in residence at Buckhurst or Lewes, while another associate and family servant, John Garaway, who ran the iron mill at Parrock, was responsible for providing victuals at Buckhurst and Knole.

A major consideration for all those involved in the production of iron was the supply of fuel, which usually took the form of coppiced wood, such as oak or beech. As a result of the success of the industry, the Weald suffered heavy deforestation, and stocks of wood became ever more valuable. The survival of a paper book of instructions, set out in Sackville’s own hand, and dating from either 1570 or 1571, gives an indication of the level of Sackville’s personal involvement in the timber trade. The principal aim was to survey all the land in the half Hundredth of Loxfield in Sussex, of which Sackville held the stewardship, to discover what wood they held and whether the tenants would be willing to sell their stocks of timber. Richard Leeche of Fletching (d.1596), a relative (Leech’s uncle was Richard Baker, Sackville’s father-in-law), and a gentleman servant to Sackville, provided the information for the survey, and it is likely that he was responsible for carrying out the survey itself. Throughout the 1570s, Leeche was Sackville’s principal ironmaster, responsible for the management of the Sackville forge at Fletching. The two appear to have been close, as Leeche’s will makes
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16 In 1571 there was a large acquisition of land in the area when the manors of Imberhorne, Munckloe and Sheffield were purchased. See CPR, 12 Elizabeth I, Volume V, 1569-1572, London, 1966, p. 147.
17 Parrocke was run by George Bullen, Maynard’s Gate by Arthur Middleton and Ashfield by a Mr Relf; Mousley, Sussex Country, 1955, p. 390; Henry Cleere and David Crossley, The Iron Industry of the Weald, Cardiff, 1995, pp. 149-150.
18 ESRO SLR/1/2/1-2. Leeche was noted in the 1574 survey of Sussex Ironworks. BL Stowe. MS. 570/103-4. Straker 56-7. For the Lease of 25 March 1571/2 of Parrocke forge see ESRO SRL/7/3.
19 ESRO SRL/13/1-25. I am very grateful to Rivkah Zim for sending me a copy of these documents.
20 On 5 February 1572 Buckhurst was granted a 21-year lease of the woods of the Hundred of Loxfield, on the proviso that he would build no Iron forge or furnace, and that he would sell firewood to the tenants of Loxfield at the rate of 6d a load. CPR, 12 Elizabeth, Volume V, 1569-1572, London, 1966, p. 368.
numerous references to the generosity shown to him by both Lord and Lady Buckhurst, whom he asked to continue their kindness towards his wife. Leeche’s preferment and seat for Camelford in 1593 was owed to his association with the Sackvilles, and was a reward for long service to the family.

Sackville’s ownership of Knole 1569-1574 and the Motivations for the Acquisition

The constant demand to acquire new woodland in order to maintain Sackville’s participation in the Wealden iron industry appears to have been a major motivation in his acquisition of the Manor of Knole in late 1569. It is clear from a set of deeds of sale dating from 1553 that an iron furnace had been established within the manor by the time that Sackville came to acquire Knole. Further evidence of these motivations can be seen in the details of a manorial survey of Knole made for Sackville in around 1570 which had cost him ‘great chardge […] xx markes or viiiijli- or thereabouts’. This document, primarily an audit of the rental values of all of the lands contained within the manor, includes a number of annotations in a second hand, believed here to be those of Thomas Sackville himself. These relate to queries in the rentals for each property in the manor and crucially, the number of loads each parcel of woodland of the estate was estimated to yield. At over four hundred acres, the park at Knole was abundantly populated with oak and beech, and was described in Sackville’s survey as ‘being verie fayre and parkelike ground’. The timber stock was estimated to yield a value of over £1000.

There is also evidence to suggest that Sackville established a household at Knole between 1569 and 1574. Covenants contained within a copy lease between Sackville and one of his iron masters for the Manor of Parrock in Sussex, which was to begin on the 25th of March 1571 but had probably been drawn up sometime prior to this, dictated
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23 ESO D/DL/C44
24 CKS U269 E/336/3
25 CKS U269 E/336/3
26 CKS U269 E/336/3
that the lease owner had to provide coals and cords from the Manor of Parrock for the provisioning of Sackville’s households at both Buckhurst and Knole.27

Sackville’s tenancy of Knole has two distinct phases – the first, this brief spell in the early 1570s and the second, the period from January 1604 until Sackville’s death in April 1608. It is very important to open up again the question of how Sackville first came to acquire the Manor of Knole, because there are fundamental errors in the house’s literature that are often repeated and inevitably confuse what is already a complicated story. Tradition has always held that Elizabeth I granted the manor of Knole to Sackville in 1566, an idea that was established by the mid seventeenth century and in print by 1659 in the poet and writer Thomas Philpot’s (d.1682) work Villare Cantianum, or Kent Surveyed and Illustrated.28 Like his contemporary Henry Killburne, whose Topography or Survey of the County of Kent With some Chronological Historicall was also published in 1659, Philpot’s Villare Cantianum was often inaccurate in the information that it provided, and his version of the ownership history of Knole is a case in point. Philpot’s account of the very earliest ownership of the manor has been entirely disproved by the twentieth century scholarship of Phillips and Du Boulay, and his version of the complexities of the mid-sixteenth century ownership conflict with the information provided in calendared papers of the Patent Rolls.29

The belief that Knole was granted to Sackville in 1566 was perpetuated by a host of subsequent authors writing on the house, and both John Harris in his 1719 History of Kent, and Edward Hasted in his second edition of his History of Kent (1797-1801), used Philpot’s account as their source for the ownership of the house.30 In turn, the late eighteenth-century guidebooks to the house, H N Willis’ Biographical Sketches of 179531 and John Bridgman’s An Historical and Topographical Sketch of Knole.

27 ESRO SRL/7/3 Copy lease between Thomas Sackville and John Garraway.

28 Largely the work of his father, the Somerset herald John Philpot (c.1589-1645).

29 For example, Philpot suggests that Henry VIII’s enforced purchase of the manor occurred in the twelfth year of his reign, when in fact the estate passed into the crown’s hands in 1538. See Thomas Philpot, Villare Cantianum, or, Kent Surveyed and Illustrated, London, 1659, p. 318.


31 H N Willis, Biographical Sketches of Eminent Persons, whose Portraits form part of the Duke of Dorset’s Collection at Knole, with a Brief Description of the Place, Embellished with a Front and East View of Knole, London, 1795, pp. x-xi.
begun in 1795 but not published until 1817) followed Hasted’s account.\(^{32}\) Bridgman’s \textit{Sketch} was the first published source to voice the tradition that the house had been given to Sackville to provide him with a home nearer to court than his properties in Sussex, a tradition that was allegedly carried down from Thomas Sackville himself.\(^{33}\) A few years later, John H Brady’s 1839 \textit{The Visitor’s Guide to Knole} added to the confusion when he suggested 1567 and 1569 as prospective dates for the supposed grant of Knole, although he gave no indication as to where his evidence for this came from.

One or another of these dates of 1566, 1567 or 1569 was maintained in the house literature until 1931, when the local historian Gordon Ward published his \textit{Sevenoaks Essays}.\(^{34}\) Through his researches of various title deeds then held at the muniments room at Knole, Ward was able to demonstrate that Thomas Sackville had enjoyed effectual ownership of Knole between 1570 and 1574, after which he granted the lease to John Lennard, and was also able to show that Sackville had bought the Lennards out of this lease in 1604, and then purchased the freehold of the manor from the Crown, effectually dismissing the idea that the house was obtained by royal grant in 1566, 1567, or 1569.\(^{35}\)

Both Vita Sackville-West, in her \textit{Knole and the Sackvilles} of 1922, and Charles Philips, in his \textit{History of the Sackville Family} of 1929, either failed to find these title deeds or chose to ignore them and continued the tradition of the 1566 grant.\(^{36}\) This is a surprising oversight on Philip’s behalf, as he was otherwise a relatively thorough historian in the practice of citing both manuscript and published sources. His account of Sackville’s acquisition is remarkably short, and does not fully take into account material that had been brought to his attention in Thomas Barrett-Lennard’s \textit{An Account of the Families Barrett and Lennard}, which had been published in 1908. This text reproduced

\(^{32}\) John Bridgman, \textit{An Historical and Topographical Sketch of Knole in Kent; with a Brief genealogy of the Sackville Family}, London, 1821, pp. 8-21.

\(^{33}\) ‘A tradition is current in the family, said to have been delivered down from the first Earl, that the Queen’s motive in bestowing this house upon him was to keep him near her court and councils, that he might repair thither, on any emergency, with more expedition than he could from Buckhurst, for, at that period the roads in Sussex were at all times impassable’, ibid. p. 10.

\(^{34}\) Lionel Sackville-West, \textit{Knole House, Its State Rooms, Pictures and Antiquities}, Sevenoaks, 1906, p. 4.


a series of transcriptions of letters and documents within the Barrett-Lennard archive (now held at the Essex Record Office) that related to the ownership disputes over Knole in the late 1560s, involving Thomas Sackville and John Lennard, which called into question the notion that the house was simply granted to Sackville at some point in the 1560s. Philips was aware of the significance of these documents, and reproduced the relevant transcriptions from Barrett-Lennard in an appendix, but skirted around the complexities that arose from their discovery in the main body of his text.

When Vita Sackville-West came to write the National Trust guidebook for Knole, an attempt was made to incorporate the Lennard material into the house’s history, although Ward’s findings from the muniments room at Knole were still ignored. It was not until the publication of Robert Sackville-West’s edition of the guidebook in 1998 that the four hundred year old tradition of Elizabeth I’s grant of Knole to Thomas Sackville was seriously called into question in the house’s literature.37 Robert Sackville-West’s chapter, ‘Knole and Thomas Sackville’, draws on the researches of Linda Stewart in her unpublished thesis ‘Across the Miry Vale’, an investigation into the circumstances and motivations behind Sackville’s move from the ancestral home at Buckhurst to the new country seat at Knole.38 Stewart’s thesis challenged the existence of the supposed grant of 1566 and revisited the documents that had been brought to light by Gordon Ward, highlighting the fact that no documentary evidence supports the hypothesis that Elizabeth I granted the house to Sackville in 1566 or at any time thereafter. New documentary evidence can now help to shed further light on the circumstances surrounding Thomas Sackville’s involvement at Knole during the late 1560s and early 1570s which aids an understanding of Sackville’s motivations for acquiring the house, both in 1569 and again in 1604. This new documentary evidence also helps to build a picture of the size, extent and condition of the house that Sackville reacquired in 1605 and also gives an indication as to how the house may have changed during this interim period of 1547 to 1604.

The Dispute

The ten-year period from 1566-1574 was a period in Knole’s history when the house’s ownership was contested by a number of suitors. Although often acting through servants and agents, the main protagonists in the dispute were Thomas Sackville and John Lennard of Chevening. John Lennard (1508-1591) was a successful lawyer of Lincoln’s Inn and custom brevium of the Court of Common Pleas. Through his success as a lawyer, Lennard had enlarged his estates and obtained advantageous marriages for many of his children. For Sampson, his eldest son, Lennard procured a match with Margaret Fiennes, sister of Gregory Fiennes, 10th Lord Dacre (1539-1594). This represented a considerable step up the social ladder for the Lennards, but the match came with its problems. Gregory Fiennes was a weak-minded individual, who intended to leave all of his property in the event that he died without issue to Margaret, his sister, and in effect to the Lennard family. Understandably, this caused friction between John Lennard, anxious to consolidate his son’s inheritance, and Fiennes’ wife Lady Anne Dacre, Thomas Sackville’s only sister, who was a strong character keen to prevent the alienation of her husband’s estates. These disputes were argued at Court and were only resolved in 1571, when a settlement was reached whereby Sampson Lennard stood to receive one-third of the Dacre lands, which consisted of 18 manors, one of which was the manor of Herstmonceux in Sussex. As was suggested in the previous chapter, Sackville’s relationship with his sister during this period was not a happy one, and Anne accused her brother of siding with the Lennards in the dispute over her husband’s estate. These events provide the immediate context for Sackville and Lennard’s dealings with one another.

The majority of the evidence relating to the disputes of the late 1560s is found in the Barrett-Lennard papers, which are now divided between the records offices in Essex and Kent. Those at Essex consist predominantly of what survives of John Lennard’s
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correspondence, and a small collection of miscellaneous bills and vouchers relating to household matters. At the Kent Archive at Maidstone there are a series of leases, a number of which are copies that John Lennard collated when he was putting together his case for the ownership of Knole, along with a memorandum written by Thomas Sackville outlining his legal claim to the manor. The only survivals from this period in the Sackville papers are a series of indentures made by Thomas Sackville regarding the lease of Knole, a note of quit-rent arrears for the manor and three contemporaneous but incomplete surveys of the manor. At Longleat House there are two further surveys of the manor in the Dudley papers, but neither provides any detail beyond the rental value of the manor and the list of tenants. Likewise, the D’Isle manuscripts, previously at Penshurst but now held at the Centre for Kentish Studies, provide scraps of evidence and nothing more. At the National Archive however, there are a number of documents from the Courts of Chancery and Star Chamber that have never been discussed in the previous literature, and the discovery of these documents goes some way towards untangling the confusion surrounding this complicated and protracted dispute.

Perhaps the most significant document in these various papers is a set of memoranda written by Thomas Sackville, and now held within the Lennard Papers at Maidstone. The document, endorsed ‘Collaycons & notes of the tytle of the lease of Knolle Sevenook Panthurst Whytley & other things collected & made by the l Buckhurst’ is a three page document, written in the first person but not in Sackville’s hand, almost certainly a copy made after the original. The document provides a schedule of the ownership of the various parts of the manor of Knole, which during the previous twenty or so years had been alienated and granted to a number of different parties. Sackville, employing the skills that he had learnt during his training at the Inns of Court, queried the legal validity of a number of these grants and likelihood must be
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that these notes were made in preparation of the case at the Court of Chancery between Sackville and Lennard.\textsuperscript{51} What is important to note is that at no point whatsoever in this document does Thomas Sackville make any reference to a royal grant, something that strengthens the idea that this was a romantic notion passed down by the owners of the house, and possibly fabricated by Sackville himself in an attempt to gloss over this murky period in the house’s ownership.

A similar set of memoranda was compiled by John Lennard and survives in two bound volumes of papers entitled ‘The notes of Lennards Title to knoll panthurst & wicliiff woods’, one written in Lennard’s own hand, the other in notary script, something that suggests that these memoranda were being dispatched to the various parties involved in the dispute. This was certainly the case in late 1569 when John Lennard sent a copy of his notes to Sir William Cordell (1522-1581), Master of the Rolls.\textsuperscript{52} For some reason Sir William Cordell’s letter to Thomas Sackville survives in the Lennard collection and is appended to the ‘pacquett of wrytngs parte wherof conserne suche proofs & allegacions as he [Lennard] hath collected to prove his interest & lawful coming by the lease of the said howse’.\textsuperscript{53} As Master of the Rolls, Cordell served as one of the principal judges in the country, and his influence in matters such as this could prove instrumental. Cordell had served as an executor of Richard Sackville’s will and his brother was a close friend of Thomas Sackville. However, he was also on friendly terms with Lennard, and it was perhaps due to his allegiance with both Sackville and Lennard that Cordell sought to distance himself from the dispute, stating to Sackville that ‘I ment not any more to have delt wth yor Lordship towshyng knoll or to have remembred the name therof unto yow, but this occasion ys now happened’.\textsuperscript{54} In the letter, Cordell advised Sackville that he thought Lennard’s claim to the house was stronger than his, and went on to suggest that the two might resolve the matter by each nominating a judge to arbitrate on each of their behalf.\textsuperscript{55}

This scenario had first been put forward by the Clerk of the Peace for Kent, John Frankelyn, in an undated letter also reproduced in the ‘notes’.\textsuperscript{56} During the dispute
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Frankelyn acted as an agent for Lennard, and in his letter, Frankelyn described a meeting that he had held with William Lovelace on Lennard’s behalf. Frankelyn had complained that neither he nor Lennard, fearing the house was falling into disrepair, had been able to visit Knole because the house was kept by force and the gates fastened shut. Lovelace, who during the dispute ostensibly acted in the interests of Sackville, agreed to the suggestion that two judges might resolve the matter, on the proviso that John Welsh, another Kentish judge, had no part in the matter.

William Lovelace (d. 1577) was a leading figure in Kentish affairs at this time, and a key individual in the Knole dispute. As Sergeant at Law from 1567, Lovelace was one of the leading judges in the country and had enlarged his estates in the county on the back of his success as a lawyer, often profiting from the economic difficulties of his clients. Personal gain had certainly been on Lovelace’s agenda during his involvement at Knole. Along with a certain John Dudley, Lovelace had been made one of two executors to the will of Thomas Rolf of Swinfield (1518-1566), an MP and a collector of customs for Sandwich and a lesser member of the Kentish gentry. It was probably during his association with the Southwell family in 1539 that Rolf’s designs on Knole were first born. Robert Francis (c. 1506-1559) had overseen the purchase of lands around Otford and Knole for the Crown, and in 1546 had been granted the stewardship of the manor of Knole and Otford. In a letter of the 3rd March 1564/5, Thomas Rolf wrote to John Lennard lamenting that ‘bothe or desiers is bent to covet one thinge’ while insisting that he had ‘always deisered to enjoye Knoll’, and went on to allude to the ‘continuall travel & paines’ that he had suffered in obtaining the lease of the property. These difficulties to which Rolf referred relate to his failed
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58 Bindoff, *HOP, The House of Commons, 1509-1558, Volume III, Members M-Z*, London, 1982, p. 209. For the will, only proved in May 1568, see NA PROB 11/50 Babington Register. In 1539, Rolf held the office of auditor in the Office of General Surveyors, and five years later shared the auditorship of the lands of Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, with Francis Southwell.
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attempts to obtain the lease from Lord Cobham, who claimed the property from an earlier agreement with Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester.61

Leicester had been granted the manor of Knole in fee simple by the Queen in 1561, as part of a larger grant of land in the area, in an attempt to reinstate the lands that his family had lost when his father had been attainted.62 Leicester’s interest in the house seems to have been negligible, and aside from the two rental surveys of 1561 and 1563, there is very little record of his ownership.63 Rather, Leicester allowed his brother-in-law Henry Sidney to use the house, which he appears to have done during the Christmas period of 1563, when £16 pounds was spent on provisions for the household there.64

The lease agreement between Leicester and Rolf only survives in draft form in the Lennard Papers and is dated to the 1st of February 1566, due to become active on Lady Day of the same year (25 March).65 It is not clear as to whether this was the first or second lease that had been made for Rolf, as it appears that, having repelled Cobham’s interest, Rolf was forced to travel to London to sign various indentures ratifying the clauses in the lease at the Exchequer before signing a new lease.66 Matters are confused further, because in 1565 Leicester returned the Manor of Knole to the crown in exchange for substantial lands in Warwickshire. Despite the change in the ownership of the freehold, Rolf’s lease remained valid.

Rolf’s draft lease is an interesting document, containing a number of stipulations related to the house and detailing the various concessions that he was forced to make in order to gain ownership of the property. The fact that two out of the three individuals who witnessed the lease can be identified as Leicester’s agents reinforces the idea that the lease was made very much on Leicester’s terms.67 There must have been some
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concern on his and his agents’ behalf as to whether Rolf had the means by which to pay the rent of £200, because Rolf’s lands in Blean (north of Canterbury) were to be held in forfeit in the event of late payment.  

The lease also included articles reserving the right for Leicester and members of his family to occupy the house at any time, except for a select number of areas that were solely reserved for Rolf’s use. These were the stables and lodgings on the north side of Green Court, the Gatehouse, and the Bourchier Tower. Although married, Rolf had no children, and these areas of the house would have provided ample accommodation for what must have been a relatively small household for Knole’s size. It is likely that, as Rolf only intended to occupy a small section of the house, Leicester and his agents feared Rolf might plunder the redundant areas of the house for valuable building materials. To prevent this happening, the lease related that Rolf was free to alter the house as he saw fit, so long as he rebuilt along the existing footings within two years of taking them down.  

Whether or not Rolf ever held such designs is impossible to say, as he died in November 1566, less than a year after signing his lease. The brevity of his tenure would have made Rolf one of Knole’s least significant occupants had the events in the aftermath of his death not been so consequential. Rolf had made William Lovelace and John Dudley (Leicester’s agent) the only executors of his will, a decision that was almost certainly a further concession in his attempt to obtain the lease of Knole. Understandably aggrieved by Thomas Rolf’s decision, his brother John Rolf took matters into his own hands, and on the night of Rolf’s death destroyed the wills and testaments that declared Dudley and Lovelace as executors. The events of that night are recorded in a number of dispositions made at a series of cases at the Court of Star Chamber that were begun in 1567. The version of events given by the various defendants is often misleading and occasionally contradictory, but a basic account of events can be drawn from the dispositions.

Rolf had been ill for the best part of 1566, having contracted an illness in London early in the year. Fearing the worst, Rolf carried his will and his papers in a
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large box wherever he went. As he lay dying in his chamber at Knole, the contents of this box were removed, and a number of documents were extracted and cast into the kitchen fire. John Rolf, who seems to have orchestrated these drastic measures, then travelled to his brother’s home in Canterbury and destroyed further papers. His aim was to remove any record of the appointment of Lovelace and Dudley as executors, so that he could claim his brother’s estate. Over the course of the case Lovelace and Dudley were able to discredit John Rolf as a reliable witness and established their legal right as executors of the will, with full control over Rolf’s estate. This divided all interest in Rolf’s property and the leases that he held between the two of them, something that would prove to be of some significance in the ensuing events.

Following Thomas Rolf’s death, John Lennard seems to have taken the initiative in his attempts to seize the lease. His main claim to it lay in his own record of Thomas Rolf’s promise to him in a letter of the 3rd of March 1565; ‘I do hereby faithfullie promise bothe to yow and Mr Dudley in yor behalf’. Dudley had previously acted in Lennard’s interest, writing letters to Thomas Rolf on his behalf in an attempt to convince Rolf to give up his lease. Rolf had been unmoved, but following his death, Lennard still saw John Dudley as the key figure in his efforts to claim the lease. However, if Lennard was going to obtain to the property he would have to convince both Dudley and Lovelace to release their respective interests in the lease.

In his ‘Notes’, Lennard claims that he paid John Dudley 600 marks for his interest, and offered Lovelace the same amount for his. This Lovelace denied. The lease for Knole was in high demand. William Brooke, tenth Baron Cobham (1527-1597), Sir Henry Sidney (1529-1586) and Sir Christopher Alleyn of Ightham Mote (d. 1586), were all named by Lennard in his notes as prospective suitors to Knole. Due to this demand and competition, Lovelace enjoyed a commanding position, and seems to have waited to see who would provide him with the best offer. It was at this point that Lennard asked the local judge John Frankelyn to mediate with Lovelace on his behalf. Although
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meetings were suggested, Lovelace was not to be moved, and the ownership hung in the balance.

In 1570, Lennard assigned the lease on Knole to his son Sampson Lennard in an attempt to further his hold on what he had of the lease. This was probably a reaction to Thomas Sackville’s increased involvement in events. On the 26th of May 1570, Sackville launched a suit against Lennard in the Court of Chancery, where he aimed to refute Lennard’s claims to Panshurst Park and Whitcliff Wood, two large areas of land appended to the Manor of Knole. Whitcliff and Panshurst had been alienated from the manor during the ownership of John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland. Northumberland had leased the manor of Knole to two local landowners, Thomas Culpepper and George Harper in 1552, but the house and gardens were to be left out of this agreement. This lease had been continued by Cardinal Pole, and was still active when Lennard and Sackville came to Knole. From what survives of the court documentation it is clear that Lennard successfully refuted Sackville’s claims, and won the case. Again it is not clear what legal right Sackville thought he had to the lands, but the suggestion is here that he had purchased the two areas of land from the recipient of the Culpepper estate, Thomas Bacon, using his agent Davie Treavor as an intermediary.

Despite the defeat at the Court of Chancery over Whitcliff and Panshurst, Sackville pursued his attempts to obtain the house itself. This was despite the fact that Dudley had, according to Lennard, already sold his interest in the lease to Lennard for 600 marks (£400). This idea is supported by statements in Sackville’s ‘collaycons and
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notes’ where he related that although a price had not been agreed on, both Dudley and Lovelace had promised their interest in the lease to him. Dudley then ‘revolted from his promise’ and sold his interest to Lennard for £400. In his ‘collaycons’, Sackville deliberated as whether it was legally viable for him to offer Dudley a similar sum and thus obtain his interest in the lease. He decided that it was, and over the course of two successive days in the middle of July 1570, Sackville paid Lovelace and Dudley £1000 each for their interest in Knole. At the same time, and in an attempt to strengthen Sackville’s claim, Lovelace had granted Sackville’s servant Davie Trevor as his attorney with power to enter and deliver possession of Knole. Following this, Sackville appears to have sent his own retainers to guard the house, refusing Sampson Lennard entry. John Lennard noted that ‘The possession of Knoll howse is forcebily kept by my Lords servants and the bridges broken down’. The fact that Lennard also noted that his son and his son’s wife had been to the house to try and speak ‘wth my lorde’, suggests that Sackville had established himself at Knole by the end of 1570.

A broad narrative of events can now be put forward. In November 1566 Thomas Rolf died, having made William Lovelace and John Dudley executors of his will, but having stated his preference for Lennard to take up his lease. The repercussions of the events following Rolf’s death took some time to resolve, as various legal cases were heard at the courts of Chancery and Star Chamber, following which Lovelace and Dudley were able to establish themselves as the executors of Rolf’s estate. These disputes were largely resolved by May 1568 when Rolf’s will was finally proved. Lennard had been able to purchase Dudley’s interest in Knole, but unable to convince Lovelace to part with his portion. Although he employed a number of agents to act on his behalf, Lennard could not buy out Lovelace, who seems to have preferred Thomas Sackville and the £1000 that he offered. The fact that Dudley appears to have sold his interest to both Lennard and Sackville is confusing, and may well represent Dudley’s divided loyalties, but whatever the case, following the sale of his interest to Thomas Sackville, Sackville occupied the house and kept it by force. Lennard’s conveyance of
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the lease to his son did little to stop this, and for the next four years, Sackville held the lease of the house and the manor.

On the 13th of February 1574, Thomas Sackville granted the interest he bought from William Lovelace and John Dudley to John Lennard, and Rolf’s lease that had passed from Lovelace and Dudley to Sackville finally passed to John Lennard, almost a decade after he had begun his attempt to obtain it. It is impossible to say what motivated Sackville to release his interest in the property. It might have been the case that the crown interceded on Lennard’s side, but the issue appears to have been resolved privately between Lennard and Sackville. There is the possibility that further proceedings in the Courts of Chancery, which have since been lost, ruled in Lennard’s favour and forced Sackville to rescind his claim. It is also possible that Thomas Sackville’s diplomatic mission to France in 1571 proved so financially draining that he simply did not have the means by which to maintain a third residence. Whatever the case, in the next thirty years following the grant of February 1574, Thomas Sackville would have almost nothing to do with Knole.

86 CKS U269 T1 Bld. A [A:8:14]
87 John Stow, comments on the fact that the great frost in France in the winter of 1571 inflated prices and he also makes numerous allusions to Sackville’s generosity and largesse. See John Stow, Annals, London, 1631, pp. 668-669.
88 On the 8th of September 1576 a letter by an unknown author to an unknown recipient from Knole related that there were various covenants in place that entitled Sackville to venison from the park at Knole. There appears to be no record of these covenants in the surviving documentation.
Lord’s Place, Lewes

A major consideration behind Sackville’s decision to abandon Knole must have been his appointment as Lieutenant of Sussex. This position necessitated that he spend an increasing amount of time in the county as he organised the defence of the coast and movement of personnel and munitions across the South East. He conducted these affairs from his house at Lewes and in an attempt to establish a better footing in the town, Sackville tried to convince Richard Polsted (1543-1576) to part with his lease of Stoneham in Lewes, as ‘I kepe hous now in Sussex’.\(^{89}\) Despite the increased time that was spent in Sussex, Sackville’s surviving correspondence makes it clear that the 1570s were spent in peripatetic fashion, as Sackville divided his time between Buckhurst, Lewes, Sackville House in London and the Court – wherever it may have been at the time.\(^{90}\)

In August 1573, Sackville was charged with entertaining the Queen at Westenhanger during a three-day visit in her summer progress through Kent. By this point the house seems to have returned to royal ownership, as the Surveyor of the Works carried out the necessary repairs rather than Sackville, who acted in the capacity of ‘keeper’ of the house.\(^{91}\) Another Royal visit was planned to Sackville’s property in Lewes for the progress of 1577. In anticipation of the visit, Sackville wrote to the Lord Chamberlain, Thomas Radcliffe, 3\(^{rd}\) Earl of Sussex (1526/7-1583), on the 4\(^{th}\) July, desperate for information on the particulars of the Queen’s visit.\(^{92}\) He wrote that time was short, and that he had already attempted to procure provisions in Sussex, Kent and Surrey, but that they had already been taken by Lord Arundel, Lord Montague and others. Out of necessity he would have to buy from Flanders, but could not do so until he knew when, and for how long, the Queen planned to stay. Sackville also voiced concerns over the suitability of his house in Lewes, and whether it was fit for the purpose, writing, ‘I can but besech of god that the hous do not mislike her: that is my chief care: the rest shalbe performed with that good hart: as I am sure yt wilbe accepted’.\(^{93}\)

\(^{89}\) SHC 6729/9/36. Buckhurst offered his interest in Whitley Park
\(^{90}\) BL Add. MS. 33084/19
\(^{92}\) BL Cotton/TitusBII
\(^{93}\) BL Cotton/TitusBII
What Sackville could not have known is that the plague would prevent the Queen’s progress into Kent, and cause her to bypass Lewes, saving him from the stresses of a royal visit. The family had held influence in Lewes since 1559, when Richard Sackville was granted Lord’s Place, the former residence of Thomas Cromwell in the large Cluniac priory in the manor of Southover, following his appointment as Lord Lieutenant and senior knight of Sussex. Sackville had furthered the family’s influence on the town when he purchased the Barony of Lewes from the Earl of Derby for £4,000 on 29th March 1576. William Camden in his Britannia asserts that Thomas Sackville renovated the Lord’s Place (also called the Priory House), ‘into a dwelling house’. This property is often confused with the nearby Southover Grange, built in 1572 by William Newton, who is often erroneously described as Sackville’s steward.

Sackville’s appeal to the Lord Chamberlain for the Queen to postpone her visit until the next year when ‘we had ben to happy’ [to receive her], raises the possibility that he was in the process of rebuilding his house at Lewes at that time. No plan survives of Sackville’s house at Lord’s Place and there is some debate as to where the building actually stood. Recent opinion holds that the post-Dissolution mansion of Lord’s Place was only a relatively conservative conversion of the monastic site into a secular dwelling built within the area of the surviving ruins. Lord’s Place was dismantled in 1668 and there is almost no record of its layout or plan. The only record of the house’s size and disposition comes in the form of John Deward’s 1618 bird’s eye sketch (fig. 10. East Sussex Record Office A 2187). Deward’s view depicts a L-shaped mansion house with a walled enclosure, and gives little indication as to its relationship with the monastic ruins. However, archaeology on the site has yielded various finds that support Camden’s assertion that Sackville was responsible for remodelling the house. Sections of decorative plasterwork, tin-glazed floor tiles (fig. 11) and sections of Caen stone with renaissance carving on one side and segments of thirteenth-century string-course on the other, have all been taken from the priory site. Some of the larger sections of masonry have been re-situated at nearby Fairhall house where they remain today.

95 Mousley, Sussex Gentry, 1955, p. 216.
Of the surviving material from Lord’s Place, the majolica floor tiles are perhaps the most interesting. The best of these were sent to the British Museum, while the more damaged pieces have remained at Barbican House in Lewes. They are of tin glazed-earthenware, and were made to a size of 14cm square. The tiles fall into two classes, one represented by a sole survival of a tile of geometric design (fig. 12) the others of figurative representations of animals enclosed within a circular frame of blue, white, red and yellow (fig. 13). All of these tiles are typical of mid-sixteenth century ceramics that sought to imitate Italian majolica, but were produced either in Antwerp or by immigrant artisans working in England. In his study of Hill Hall, Richard Simpson has highlighted the existence of immigrant ceramicists who were active in both London and Norwich from the late 1560s onwards.

What is especially remarkable about the Lord’s House floor tiles is their strong similarity to those that survive from Sir Thomas Smith’s 1568-9 phase of rebuilding of the west range at Hill Hall. Richard Simpson has been able to demonstrate how the geometric tile would have formed a repetitive pattern, (fig. 14) and although the tile from Lord’s Place is damaged, a similar reconstruction of the pattern shows the remarkable resemblance between the Lord’s Place tile and those from Hill Hall. It is clear the two are variations on the same design, used extensively in the production of ceramic floor tiles in the sixteenth century. It is impossible to say whether Sackville sourced his majolica from Antwerp or from the workshops of Norwich and London, but considering Sackville turned to Flanders for the provisioning of his household, it is easy to imagine him turning in the same direction for choice commodities such as majolica floor tiles.

However fragmentary the evidence, the sophistication of materials used at Lord’s Place strongly suggests that Sackville sought to furnish his home in the most up-to-date style and that, like Smith, Sackville sought to emulate what he had seen in the tiled chambers of Écouen which he visited in early 1571. Likewise, the profusion of classically inspired carved stonework strongly suggests that he had been influenced by what he had seen in the work of Philibert de l’Orme in St Denis, Château de Madrid and the Tuileries. This is significant, because Sackville’s architectural legacy has hitherto
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been limited to his work at Knole, but it seems that as early as the 1570s, some thirty years prior to his transformation of Knole, Sackville undertook a substantial remodelling of his Lewes home, using prestige materials that he had first seen during his travels.

For Sackville, the decade of the 1570s was a period of centralisation and consolidation, but not one of unequivocal success. Disputes with the Gorings, Dacres and Pelhams had been coupled with Lord Burghley’s rejection of Sackville’s proposed marriage suit between his son Robert and Cecil’s daughter Elizabeth. Despite Sackville’s claims that he ‘aske not to make this matche for your moni, but for your assured frenship’, this ambitious dynastic match would have guaranteed Sackville’s participation in the highest realms of government office. Nevertheless, during the 1570s Sackville was able to demonstrate to the Queen and her council that he was a trustworthy and able lieutenant, and during the following decade, when the threat of a Spanish invasion became ever more real, Sackville’s authority and influence would be regularly called upon in the defence of the country.

The first half of the 1580s began much as the last decade had finished, with Sackville dividing his time between Sussex, London and the Court. He continued to expand his estates and added the manors of Ringmer (1580), Southover (1582), Iford (1584) and Fiskeridge (1585) to his already substantial land holdings in Sussex. February 1580 saw the significant marriage of his eldest son Robert to Lady Margaret Howard (c.1560-1591), only daughter of the executed Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk (1538-1572). This proved a successful marriage which produced a number of children including two male heirs. By July 1580, Thomas Sackville was back at Lewes, petitioning Sir William More on behalf of one of his servants for the position of the gaoler of Lewes. In November 1581, Sackville was again petitioning on behalf of a servant in a strongly worded letter to the Major and Jurats of Rye, for the inclusion of
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Thomas Edolf as a Jurat. In October 1584, Sackville was at Buckhurst, again entreating More and the justices for the peace in Surrey to act favourably towards his servant Ralph Petley, an officer in Ashdown Forest.

**The Mission to the Netherlands in 1587 and its aftermath**

In recognition of his faithful service, Sackville was appointed to the Privy Council in February 1586. Thirteen months later, Sackville was despatched to the Netherlands. Ostensibly his mission was to reassure the Dutch of the continued support of the English in their war against the Spanish, but the real purpose of Sackville’s embassy was to begin secret peace negotiations with Spain. It was probably in preparation for this diplomatic mission that Thomas Sackville commissioned a suit of full armour, including garniture for the field from Jacob Halder, at the Royal Workshop at Greenwich. Remarkably, both the presentation drawing for the commission and the suit of armour itself survive (fig. 15).

As ever, this mission involved a programme of ceremonial entries and visits on his route towards the Court at The Hague. These were recorded by his son’s tutor Maurice Kyffin (c.1555-1598), a Welsh scholar whose most famous work *The Blessednes of Brytaine* (1587) was written for Elizabeth I’s accession-day celebrations and who later translated Bishop John Jewel’s justification of the Elizabethan religious settlement, the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* into the Welsh classic, *Deffynniad Ffydd Elwys* (1594). Between 1580 and 1582, Kyffin prepared Sackville’s sons William, Henry and Thomas for matriculation at Hart Hall Oxford, and it seems likely that he impressed his emphatic Protestantism on the young William (1569/70-1592) who later embarked on a career as a soldier, fighting for the protestant cause in France. Kyffin’s account of their journey in the Netherlands was dedicated to William, and the description of the journey set out to describe ‘such townes, and places, as His Lo: past thorow, in the Lowe Cuntries: Together, with the manner of his Interteinment, And divers other Occurents, by the way, woorth the noting’.
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Sackville was accompanied on his embassy by Bartholomew Clerke, Henry Brooke (Cobham) (1537-1592), the mathematician and muster master Thomas Digges (c. 1546-95), and Thomas Sherley of Wiston (c.1542-1612) (treasurer-at-war) along with Sherley’s wife, sons and daughters. The party arrived at Flushing, where they were greeted by the resident governor of the town, Sir William Russell (c. 1533-1613). The next day, Sackville was entertained by the Princess of Orange in a house nearby, before travelling to Middelburg, where he was received by the Burgomasters of the town ‘and very much welcomed by the English marchants there’. From there he continued to Dordrecht, where he was ‘most noblie received’ by the Burgomasters and accompanied to his lodging ‘where he was very hono’ably feasted’. The day before he departed, Sackville walked out to view the town and stopped to inspect a house which was being completed for the Earl of Leicester on his return. Afterwards he was taken to the city hall, and entertained in the ‘highe Banketting Turret’, which was furnished with a revolving circular table, so alien to Kyffin that the only thing he could liken it to was a millstone. After an evening’s feasting, Kyffin lamented the fact that the Dutch, so industrious ‘by Arte and Nature in their buylding and fortification’ were so ‘so fowly overseen and besotted wth the Detestable vice of drinking’. This aside, Dordrecht remained the finest town that Kyffin had encountered, with the Mint of Holland named as one of the places that Sackville visited.

At another feast at Rotterdam, Sackville was presented with two marzipan subtleties adorned with gilt leaves bearing Latin inscriptions welcoming the English embassy. Here, Sackville visited the house where Erasmus was born, ‘wheron was a superscription of gold signifying the same’. Travelling by barge, a novel form of transport for Kyffin, the party arrived at Delft where Sackville was met by Maurice, Prince of Orange, and his General, Count Philip of Hohenlohe-Lagenburg.

At The Hague, where Sackville was to stay until the 20th April, Kyffin remarked upon the sumptuous feasts and a special display of fireworks. These were fired into the air ‘comet wise’ and somewhat dangerously, ‘below, were let flie among their leg[es], that what wth the sighte of the wilde flame, singeing their Clothes, and the crakling sounde it made wth all, you shold have them run all on a heape, like shepe, to save
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themselves’. After these festivities, the party moved on to Leiden, which was praised by Kyffin for its newly founded University and its numerous printing presses. At Utrecht, Sackville was greeted by peals of shot and a mounted cavalcade, and it was here that he met Count Newenar and Sir John Norris (c.1547/50-1597).

The next stop was Amsterdam, where Sackville took time to walk around the city, and view the city’s hospital. Kyffin wrote that ‘for the rare workmanship, skilful contriving, and extraordinarie commodities thereof, is thought by men that know muche, and have travild far, to be one of the cheefest hospitalles in all Christendome’. At Haarlem, the party were taken to the church of Grote Kerk (St. Bavo) in the city square, where they were shown a cannon ball that had been fired at the church during the siege of Haarlem in the 1570s, which remained embedded in a wall of the church. At the city hall, Kyffin noted the portraits of all the Counts and Countesses of Holland, and took time to note them down in order of succession.

During his time in the Netherlands, Sackville was deeply preoccupied with matters of State, as he saw the legacy of Leicester’s mismanagement in the faces of the starving troops. Nevertheless, his embassy still afforded him time to visit important sites throughout the country, and to see the very latest in domestic and military building. There was also time to meet important intellectuals. Towards the end of his account of Sackville’s embassy, Kyffin notes that during his stay he became acquainted with the Italian protestant historian and intelligencer Pietro Bizzarri (c.1525- d. after 1587). Bizzarri had spent time in England at the University of Cambridge and at the courts of Edward VI and Elizabeth I, and had dedicated his De principe tractatus to Elizabeth, a manuscript which extolled the virtues of an ideal ruler. Thanks to the intercession of Archbishop Parker, Bizzarri received a pension from Bishop John Jewel of Salisbury.

A regular correspondent of Burghley and Walshingham, Bizzarri had written to the latter in September 1586, relating that he had composed an epigram and epitaph on
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Sir Philip Sidney which he had printed and was sending to Walshingham. He did however compose a printed verse panegyric for Sackville, ‘Noble growth of auncient stock:/ the glory of thy race, and Cuntries Cheef Renown’, which celebrated Sackville’s role and that of Elizabeth I in the struggle for peace in the Low Countries, and illustrates that even in a period of extreme tension and conflict, Sackville and his retinue attracted the leading humanist scholars.

On his return, Sackville was refused access to the Queen. He had incurred the Queen’s displeasure by offending Leicester. His endorsement of the capable Norris as overall commander had been taken as a slight by Leicester, who ensured that Sackville and Norris’ return to England was not a happy one. The backlash was sharp, and the Queen’s anger vehement. Sackville was placed under house arrest, and, according to Abbot, shut himself away from his wife and children, ‘A rare example of obedience, and observance unto his Soveraigne’. He stayed shut away for over nine months, during which time he petitioned the Queen to be restored, writing from his ‘poor house in London’ on the 15th of September 1587. He also did his best to make amends with Leicester, who was increasingly being urged by Burghley to end the dispute. Sackville also wrote to Leicester himself, from Buckhurst, on the 26th August, 1588, sending a stag, ‘as a pore token of my skillfull cunning’ and as ‘a faithful testimony of my good will unto you’.

Nine days later, Leicester was dead, and Sackville’s political recuperation was complete. Despite this, Sackville had clearly suffered during his isolation. Writing to his cousin Francis Alford in September 1588, Sackville described how he felt his age, and that the time were ‘full of miserie, and daungers’ and his ‘mynde [was] quite aliened from that course of life’. Sackville had good cause to indulge in such sentiments. In 1586, his mother Winifred had passed away. In 1587, two of his eldest son Robert’s children, Thomas and Winifred, had died in infancy, something that would have taken a large toll on the family unit. Nevertheless, Sackville mustered both his strength and some two thousand English soldiers to be sent from Sussex to help Henri IV in the
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religious wars in France. One of those who travelled to aid the French King was William Sackville, Thomas Sackville’s third son, a committed protestant who died fighting for that cause in February 1592.\textsuperscript{123}

**Sackville’s Finances**

By 1605, Thomas Sackville was in a position to make generous gifts due to the fact that he enjoyed large fees from his position as Lord Treasurer, an appointment that he received in 1599 following the death of Lord Burghley. As at Oxford, his chief rival for the position seems to have been Essex, but as Rivkah Zim has argued, Elizabeth I sought the continuity that Sackville’s appointment would ensure rather than risk the potential turmoil that Essex’s appointment posed.\textsuperscript{124} This proved an astute judgement, and when Essex attempted his ill-fated coup, Sackville was on hand to help defuse the crisis and preside over the trial that led to Essex’s execution.

In the years following his appointment as Lord Treasurer, Sackville established himself as one of the leading counsellors of the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean court, resulting in sizeable gains to his finances. What survives of Thomas Sackville’s general accounts provides a vital avenue into both Sackville’s public and private affairs. These come in the shape of three sets of accounts, the first of which is a set of household accounts of Michael Heydon for the year 1604. These accounts are primarily concerned with the management of Sackville’s land estate, but do provide information regarding the cost of maintaining Sackville’s household during that year.\textsuperscript{125} The remaining accounts are Edward Lyndsey’s accounts as Receiver General to Thomas Sackville and date from 1607 to 1608, covering a variety of payments and receipts in and out of Sackville’s coffers. The first set is a fragmentary series of loose folios (CKS U269 A1/2) originally from a bound volume, which record payments made in the period from 23-31 May 1607 and receipts made between 1-22 July 1607. The other is a complete volume (CKS U269 A1/1) that begins with payments from the 1\textsuperscript{st} July and ends on the 5\textsuperscript{th} May 1608. These two sets of accounts are the only survivals of Sackville’s personal finances and as such are an incredibly valuable source for
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understanding Sackville’s economic position during his apogee as a councillor and a statesman. They also give vital clues as to Sackville’s activities as a patron, as they record many of the names of the craftsmen and artisans that he employed.

A comparative series of accounts survives for Robert Cecil, in a single bound volume that covers the period 1608-1611, which record both revenue and expenditure.\textsuperscript{126} These accounts are arranged into a series of sub-sections, and provide greater detail than the Sackville accounts, but are still useful for comparison. Cecil’s overall operation was larger than that of Sackville’s, namely because he held the position of Master of the Court of Wards, Secretary of State and (after April 1608) Lord Treasurer simultaneously, accumulating an annual income estimated at £49,660.\textsuperscript{127} Due to the fact that the accounts for June 1607 in the Sackville accounts are completely missing, it is impossible to come up with a precise figure for annual income and expenditure. However, by taking a monthly average from the existing eleven months, it is possible to estimate that the income recorded in the accounts in the last year of his life was approximately £21,250, while his expenditure from the account was around £20,647.\textsuperscript{128} Monthly outgoings never exceeded income, and by the end of the year, Lindsey’s account was actually in credit to the tune of almost £100.

It becomes apparent that Sackville and his Stewards could be remarkably accurate in their projections for expenditure for each coming month, because the majority of payments made were to creditors who had already submitted their bills, something that suggests that Sackville kept a close handle on his personal affairs. At both the beginning and the end of the month, Sackville credited the account with large lump sums which were entered into the account in his own hand. For example, between the 1\textsuperscript{st} and the 5\textsuperscript{th} of August 1607, Sackville paid £2,070 into the accounts in this manner in eight separate payments. In effect, Sackville was using Lyndsey’s account as what would today be described as a current account – one that was always kept in credit – used to disburse the majority of his spending and to record some of his sources of revenue.

\textsuperscript{126} HHA A/160/1
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Overall, it is possible to see that Thomas Sackville was able to afford an annual expenditure of at least £20,000 without having to rely on loans, and the accounts only record the existence of two relatively small loans (one of £300 and the other of £40) both taken from Arthur Jeffery.\(^{129}\) However, what is immediately apparent is that Lyndsey’s account books only tell part of the story, and their major limitation is that they fail to provide information as to where Sackville sourced the funds that he so regularly deposited in Lyndsey’s account. This was a sizeable amount of money. Of the £19,487 that was credited into Lyndsey’s account, over 50% came in the form of these payments. The next section of this chapter aims to identify the various sources from which Sackville generated his vast wealth, and looks to see the way in which this wealth was spent.

The greater part of Sackville’s wealth was derived from his extensive landed estates in Sussex and the other Home Counties, which in 1611 generated a gross income of £10,111 and a net profit of £6,059.\(^{130}\) A significant portion of this sum was generated by tenements and houses in London, the majority of which were situated in and around Dorset House and were part of the lands that had formerly belonged to the Bishop of Salisbury. These included Dorset House itself, Dorset Alley, Hanging Sword Court, Bishops Court and a number of other tenements on Fleet Street and Shoe Lane. In 1607-8, many of these tenements were leased to Thomas Sackville’s servants and secretaries, but it is clear that Sackville understood the potential of London’s lucrative rental market and built speculatively in the area to this end.\(^{131}\) Frustratingly, only a small number of Sackville’s rents were entered into Edward Lyndsey’s account books, and the huge revenues that were generated by Sackville’s Sussex estates appear to have been entered elsewhere in his accounting system.

Along with his landed interests, Sackville held a farm on the pre-emption of tin, and shared a patent with Robert Cecil for the manufacture of starch, bought from Sir John Packington. In 1604, when Thomas Sackville and Robert Cecil came to renegotiate the farms on the collection of customs, they created the Great Farm of
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Customs, Sackville’s most significant legacy as Lord Treasurer. Having created the farm, Sackville and Cecil combined forces and froze out the Earl of Northampton’s rival syndicate, which gave them control and a share in its profits of the farm which for Robert Cecil totalled £1,560 a year.132

Members of Sackville’s family also contributed to the family income. Thomas Sackville’s son Robert shared a monopoly on the export of iron ordnance with his brother-in-law Sir Henry Neville.133 This was not without its risks. In 1602 Robert Sackville had sent an assignment of cast iron pieces with a value of £2,000 to Middelburg, which was taken by pirates. In an attempt to recover his losses, Robert then sent a man-of-war to seek prizes off the coast of Spain.134 There is no evidence to suggest that Thomas Sackville dabbled in such speculative ventures, although he did try to forward the careers of the adventurers Sir Edward Michelborne (c.1562-1609) and the explorer James Rosier (1573-1609).135

By the turn of the century, Sackville appears to have scaled back his involvement in the Wealden iron industry, although he was still leasing a forge and collecting revenue from the sale of cords of timber in Sussex.136 He also made profits from the sale of livestock and the products of his agricultural estates. Thomas Heydon’s Household Accounts for the year 1604 provide a useful insight into the scale of the Sackville operation. Between the 1st October 1603 and the 21st September 1604, sales from Sackville’s estates had generated £4,379 4s 7d, a sizeable addition to his already considerable income.137

There were also the significant sums that came through Government office. Sackville’s basic annual fee as Lord Treasurer was £366, but as Lawrence Stone has demonstrated, the real income came from unofficial sources – Stone estimated that the post brought in around £2,780 per annum for Robert Cecil.138 There is ample evidence that Sackville’s income was supplemented in a similar manner, as government positions

134 NA SP89/2/36
136 CKS U269 A1/1
137 CKS U269 A2/1/10
were purchased through him and his agents; Bishop Goodman later noted that ‘the greatest gettings were in Treasurer Dorset’s time’. Sackville’s profiteering inspired resentment amongst those disenfranchised by the late-Elizabethan government, and during the first years of the seventeenth century, Thomas Sackville was the target of a sustained and vitriolic attack on the Privy Council. These attacks were headed by the former customs collector, Anthony Atkinson, who produced a series of manuscript pamphlets of serious libel against Sackville, which levelled numerous charges of corruption against the Lord Treasurer. In these pamphlets, which were widely disseminated across various sections of society, Atkinson listed a catalogue of Sackville’s misdemeanours that included the accusation that Sackville’s daughter managed the sale of government offices on her father’s behalf, that Sackville had defrauded the conveying of the ordnance, the sale of corn licences, the Customs, the Exchequer, the maintenance of Royal houses and parks, and that he had also corrupted the justice system by threatening those who sought to expose his malpractice.

In fact, Sackville actually appears to have been remarkably methodical in his approach to his suitors, creating and enforcing a strict queue which potential suitors were not allowed to jump or circumvent. At Sissinghurst Castle in Kent, there is a remarkable double portrait of Thomas Sackville as Lord Treasurer and Earl of Dorset accompanied by a secretary (fig. 16) who should be identified as John Suckling (c. 1569-1627), Thomas Sackville’s principal secretary. Sackville’s likeness is taken from his standard portrait type by John de Critz, while the portrait of Suckling is a competent character study, depicting the secretary passing letters to his master. These are actually petitions, and are each inscribed by their sender. For example, one reads, ‘To the R honorable Thomas Earle of Dorset Lo high Tres of England The humble petition of the
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Merchant Adventurers’. The portrait is by an unknown artist, although it can be dated from between 1604 (Thomas Sackville’s creation as the Earl of Dorset) and his death in April 1608, and might well be the portrait described as the ‘Great Picutre conteyninge two portaites in a guilt frame’ that hung in the Dining Room at Buckhurst. The composition of the painting is almost unique, and falls into a very narrow set of early seventeenth-century portraits depicting servants and secretaries, of which the closest parallel is probably Thomas Braithwaite making his Will (Abbot Hall Art Gallery Cumbria) of 1607. The attribution of the portrait is problematic, but the carpet at the foot of the painting, a Lotto rug with a cartouche border in the Anatolian style, is close (but not identical) to a type used in the studio of Robert Peake the Elder, in portraits such as Robert Sidney, 1st Earl of Leicester (c. 1605). What makes this portrait doubly remarkable is the fact that it celebrates Sackville’s patronage as Lord Treasurer, and the crucial role that John Suckling played in that network.

Suckling frequently received substantial fees upwards of £100 for forwarding suits of petitioners, and for a short period prior to the death of his patron in 1608, occupied a similar position to that of Sir Michael Hickes, principal secretary to both William and Robert Cecil. A good example of how Sackville and Suckling generated their wealth is that of Sir Richard Preston who, having received a grant of a Crown debt of £2,317 of the arrears owed by Nicholas Smythe, former Receiver of Crown lands in Middlesex, Hertfordshire, and Essex, traded this grant to Lionel Cranfield, in exchange for a loan, who in turn half sold it to his brother-in-law John Suckling, who had probably negotiated the grant to Preston in the first place. For his troubles, which had
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probably been minimal, Sackville received £50 in gold from Suckling and Cranfield.\textsuperscript{149} In a similar vein, Sackville also received a cut of the revenue generated by Robert Sharpeigh, the Receiver General for Kent, Surrey and Sussex, which was presumably in recognition of his part in Sharpeigh’s commission.\textsuperscript{150}

Another individual often associated with the accusations of corruption that were levelled at Sackville as Lord Treasurer was Lady Anne Glemham, Thomas Sackville’s eldest, and most favoured, daughter.\textsuperscript{151} She was certainly not averse to offering bribes herself, and in November 1604 wrote quite candidly about ‘viiiij score pounds’ that was given to Sir Julius Caesar for his favour, although she did urge Caesar to ‘dispatch this mater with all convenient speed care and secrecy’.\textsuperscript{152} In 1603, Robert Cecil had told his principal secretary Michael Hicks that the best way to obtain Thomas Sackville’s favour was to offer Lady Glemham a bribe,\textsuperscript{153} and this was certainly an approach that was taken by Lionel Cranfield, who furnished Glemham with personal loans in an attempt to gain her father’s favour.\textsuperscript{154} In fact, Glemham appears to have been particularly susceptible to these approaches. Various covenants in her father’s will seem to have been deployed in order to discourage her from squandering her sizable £4,000 inheritance. She clearly had expensive tastes; in 1607 the cargo ship The Flower (financed by Cranfield) contained crystal glasses and ‘thither full of divers things’.\textsuperscript{155} As Linda Levy Peck has demonstrated, gift giving was an integral part of the patronage system at the early Jacobean Court, and the lines between gifts and bribes were often blurred.\textsuperscript{156} Unsurprisingly, Sackville’s accounts record a number of gifts, such as the gloves from John Ramsey, Viscount Hadington, the horse from Sir Robert Brett, and the
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buck from Sir Richard Preston. Sackville had few qualms about offering backhanders himself. Perhaps the best example of this was his eventual acquisition of the freehold of the Manor of Knole, which involved some very suspect book keeping at the Exchequer and probably required the complicity of a number of its senior officers.

Along with these ill-defined gifts and rewards, Sackville also enjoyed a Spanish pension in recognition of the part that he played in the peace treaty signed between England and Spain in 1604, probably close to the £1,500 Robert Cecil received from the Spanish each year. He also held the wardship of Christopher Gardiner, grandson and heir to the London leather seller William Gardiner (1531-97) which was granted to him in 1602. However, even taking into account the wardship, the Spanish pension, Sackville’s profits as Lord Treasurer and his landed income, it is only possible to account for just three quarters of the twenty thousand pounds or so that was recorded in the accounts between May 1607-1608. The suggestion must be, therefore, that Sackville’s income was heavily supplemented through the gifts and bribes he accepted from those seeking preferment.

Expenditure

What is significant for the purposes of this study is that of the £18,927 recorded as being spent over the eleven months between May 1607 and April 1608, only about 14% of that figure was designated for building work at Knole. This gives the firm impression that the project did not put a massive strain on Sackville’s finances, and did not prohibit the expansion of Sackville’s estates. In November 1605, at a time when work at Knole had just begun and expenditure would have been at its height, Sackville was still able to find £8,440 for the purchase of the Manor of Ringmer and various other
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lands in Sussex from Sir George Rivers, while in 1607 Sackville bought lands to the value of £2,689. To put Sackville’s expenditure at Knole into some form of context, Sackville was spending as much maintaining his household (£2,643) in 1607-8 as he was on the works at Knole.

In fact, the major drain on Sackville’s finances was his ever-expanding family, and by the year 1600, they were heavily dependent on him for their upkeep and living. Despite the fact they were both married, Sackville continued to subsidise the living costs of his daughters Anne and Mary, paying for Anne’s riding charges and clothing for Mary’s children. Thomas Neville, Mary Neville’s only son, seems to have been educated alongside Thomas Sackville’s other grandsons Richard and Edward, the sons of Robert Sackville, both of whom were brought up in considerable luxury. Over and above the £100 that was given to their father as an annuity, Sackville also sponsored lessons in fencing, riding and dancing and bought numerous beaver hats, silk stockings, points and garters for these two grandchildren.

Sackville also suffered the ongoing inconvenience of financing his son Thomas’s continuous and expensive adventures throughout Europe. Born in 1571, Thomas had pursued wanderlust from an early age and from 1595 onwards travelled periodically into mainland Europe to fight in the Catholic League against the Turkish Empire. In 1597 he accompanied his brother-in-law Henry Neville in Europe in 1607.
another attempt to join the Holy Roman Emperor in his fight against the Turks.\textsuperscript{168} In 1600 he returned again, this time accompanied by his brother-in-law Henry Glemham, who incurred the Queen’s displeasure for associating with the leading Jesuit Robert Parsons in Rome.\textsuperscript{169} In 1602, Sackville voiced hopes that after two further years fighting abroad, Thomas might be ‘satisfied if not surfeited of his desire, and be able to serve her Majesty, which is my only hope.’\textsuperscript{170} It was a vain hope, as in September 1607 Thomas was back in Brussels, dining with the Archduke and Infanta.\textsuperscript{171} A series of letters written late that year to Sir Thomas Edmondes, Ambassador to the Archduke, convey the anxiety and upset which Sackville had to endure while his son was away. One letter asked Edmondes to ensure that Thomas was careful with his money and did not suffer at the hands of others, while another asked Edmondes to induce Thomas to be ‘considerate to whom about him he comits his monies for they pray upon him & abuse him, & turn him to his meditacons & contemplacons of heaven into w\textsuperscript{ch} he is so far rapt’.\textsuperscript{172} Despite these fears, and his continuing wish for his son to return home, Sackville was still willing to provide him with an allowance of £200 a year and to send him substantial sums for the purchase of books.\textsuperscript{173}

Sackville had also had to endure the considerable costs of his son Henry’s mental illness. In 1602, Sackville related to Robert Cecil how Henry had been a healthy child, much favoured by Elizabeth I who admired the curls in his hair, but following an illness Henry lapsed into ‘a great lethargy from which time he hath fallen into a distraction of his senses.’\textsuperscript{174} By this time, attempts to cure Henry had cost in excess of £2,000, and had led Sackville to send to him to the spa at Pont-a-Mousson.\textsuperscript{175} This had failed to produce a cure, and Sackville resolved to send Henry to the waters at Padua,

\begin{footnotes}
\item[168] In November 1597 Thomas wrote a long letter to his father from Padua relating the various difficulties that he had endured on his route from France NA SP85/2/58.
\item[169] Calendar of Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, Part X, London, 1904, pp. 295, 406. See also NA SP 98/1/136+138 for Thomas Wilson’s reports of Glemham’s whereabouts in Italy.
\item[172] BL Stowe 169/147; BL Stowe 169/160.
\item[173] CKS U269 A1/1.
\item[175] ibid. p. 309.
\end{footnotes}
ordering his son Thomas to ‘be his conductor’ into Italy.\textsuperscript{176} Sadly this proved no more successful, and by 1605\textsuperscript{177} Henry had returned home to England, where he was cared for by his wife Alice and a number of servants.\textsuperscript{178}

Sackville’s sons-in-law also caused problems. As mentioned previously, Sir Henry Glemham got himself into considerable trouble with Elizabeth I while in Italy. As the highest ranking Catholic nobleman in England, Thomas Sackville’s son-in-law Anthony Maria Browne, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Viscount Montagu, was frequently associated with Catholic conspiracies, and heavily implicated in the Gunpowder Plot of 1605. Under duress, the conspirators to the plot had admitted that they had sent letters to leading members of the Catholic nobility warning them not to attend Parliament when it opened that term, and that Montagu was amongst those who received such a letter. Montagu was thrown into the Tower of London for his supposed part in the plot but later released with a fine at his father-in-law’s intercession.\textsuperscript{179} Although Montagu’s Catholicism was problematic, his estates were more than large enough to support himself and his wife, and as such he did not seek the support or the appointments which Sackville provided for two other sons-in-law, Henry Neville and Henry Glemham. Neville held the monopoly on the export of iron ordinance, shared with Robert Sackville, and Glemham owed his position of Lieutenant in the Tower of London to Sackville’s influence.\textsuperscript{180}

Sackville’s accounts also mention various moments of charity such as the ’sad coloured Cloake w\textsuperscript{th} yo\textsuperscript{th} lo: gave to a poore boy’ and the various monies that were distributed amongst the poor in Lewes and Sevenoaks.\textsuperscript{181} As Rivkah Zim has suggested, Thomas Sackville had an acute awareness of, and concern for, the misery of poverty, which is epitomised in the bequest in his will for a granary stocked for the provision for the poor in Lewes.\textsuperscript{182} However, alongside a genuine empathy for the plight of the needy,

\textsuperscript{176} ibid. pp. 309, 461.
\textsuperscript{177} In 1605, Henry’s signature appears on a property settlement. See ESRO SAS-RF/3/177.
\textsuperscript{178} See CKS U269 F2 for marriage settlement, NA C142/310/71 for lunacy, and HRO 44M69/5 for 1623 administration and accounts.
\textsuperscript{179} CSP James I, 1603-1610, 1857, pp. 246, 251, 274.
\textsuperscript{180} Calendar of the Manuscripts of the most Honourable The Marquess of Salisbury, Part XV, London, 1930, pp. 322 & 323.
\textsuperscript{181} CKS U269 A1/1
\textsuperscript{182} Zim, ‘Sackville Thomas’ ONDB, Vol. 48, 2004, p. 548. Sackville also highlighted the need to stock London’s granaries during times of plenty so that the poor could survive in times of need. (ed. John Bruce), ‘Diary of John Manningham of the Middle
Sackville spent extravagantly, showed considerable largesse, and indulged in all the trappings of high office and estate. When he bought, he bought the best, employing the most sought after artisans, and the shift in Sackville’s capacity to spend and patronise the arts following his appointment at Lord Treasurer is epitomised in the beautifully sculpted silver vessel of a heraldic leopard, now held in the Moscow Kremlin Museums. Made in London in 1600-1, the precise provenance of this highly unusual example of English Silver Sculpture is difficult to unfurl, but the likelihood must be that it was given as a gift to Elizabeth I by Thomas Sackville, the leopard device a pertinent reminder of their shared Boleyn ancestry.

Unsurprisingly, the artisans and merchants from whom Sackville bought were those who supplied the court. For example, Sackville bought from the mercer and moneylender Sir Baptist Hickes, later 1st Viscount Campden (1551-1629), who supplied the court with silks and other choice fabrics. Another individual who Sackville bought from regularly was the London Skinner and Upholsterer of Saint Mildred Poultry, Robert Singleton (d. 1612), who between 1607-8 was paid £814 for wares for Knole, Dorset House and the Court. Judging by the range of items that he supplied to both Sackville and his other major patron, Robert Cecil, which included hangings, matting, bedding and upholstery wares, Singleton must have been one of the leading figures in the world of early seventeenth-century interior decoration, supplying leading courtiers with the soft furnishings needed to adorn their homes.

There were also other craftsmen in Sackville’s employ who supplied the court. John Bankes, the Royal Coachmaker, is named in both Cecil’s and Sackville’s accounts and was most probably responsible for the numerous coaches and litters listed in Sackville’s will. Another artificer was John Lewgar, who was paid on various occasions in the 1607-8 accounts for coffers and boxes for Sackville, some of which

---

185 HHA A160/1/18/18v/26v/42v. Singleton was also in the employ of Lionel Cranfield. In August 1610 he was paid £2 12 00 for ‘work and Stuff’. CKS U269 AP2.
186 John Bankes, Coachmaker of Saint Martin in the Fields, 07 July 1642 NA PROB 11/190 Cambell Quire Numbers 86-131. Bankes was granted the Office of making the King’s coaches, close cars, &c. 6 January 1604 NA SP14/6 (Docquet), Hatfield House Archive A160/1/138v.
might be amongst those that remain at Knole. It is interesting to note that John Lewgar owed his appointment as Royal Coffer Maker to a petition written by Sackville in July 1606 to Sir William Knollys (Treasurer of the Household) and Sir Edward Wotton (Comptroller of the Household), in which Sackville described Lewgar as not only a ‘very sufficient and skillfull workman but also a right honest and serviceable man.’

Dedications and Literary Patronage

Alongside his promotion of skilled craftsmen such as Lewgar, Sackville also supported scholars. After his return from France in 1571, Sackville had commissioned Clerke to stay with him at Sackville House and produce a Latin translation of The Courtier, and it was here where the Catholic exile Robert Parsons was housed by Sackville in 1574, following his resignation from his Oxford fellowship. Another scholar who benefited from Sackville’s patronage was the Huguenot refugee Claude Holyband, who dedicated his French schoolemaister of 1573 to Sackville’s son, Robert. In his preface epistle to this work, Holyband wrote that if he succeeded in winning Robert’s patronage, he ‘had gotten for my pretie pa’phelet a profitable patro’ young and notable, a Salomon in witte’.

Sackville also rewarded those who dedicated books to him. Rivkah Zim’s survey of the thirty or so books connected to Sackville draws a number of valuable conclusions from the character and the content of the various dedications to Sackville throughout his career as a poet, courtier and statesmen. Zim highlights that the number of books dedicated to Sackville was relatively modest in comparison to those dedicated to the likes of other leading councilors such as Burghley, Walshingham and Hatton. One possible explanation as to why so few books were dedicated to

187 CKS U269 A1/1.
188 NA SP15/38/62
190 ‘Paid to m’ John Silvester of yo’ lo: guift the some of ffive poundes in respect of a book w’th he hath dedicated to yo’ lo: as by yo’ lo: warrant appeareth vth’ CKS U269 A1/1
Sackville during the time he served as Chancellor of Oxford is that Sackville was not popular with fervent Calvinists at the university, who would have preferred as their Chancellor the Earl of Essex, Sackville’s chief rival for both the Chancellorship and the position of Lord Treasurer.\(^{193}\) Added to this was the fact that Sackville’s position as a pillar of the established religion was, in Michael Questor’s words ‘not entirely unproblematical,’ and it is possible to understand why certain dedicatees were deterred from seeking Sackville’s patronage.\(^{194}\) Nevertheless, those dedications that were made provide some of the best evidence as to Sackville’s intellectual interests as he came towards the end of his life. For example, Thomas Sackville’s chaplain, Francis Godwin, dedicated his *Catalogue of the Bishops of England, since the first planting of Christian Religion in this Island* of 1601 to Sackville. As Zim points out, the warmth of the dedication to Sackville suggests that the two shared literary sensibilities as well as an enthusiasm for antiquarian interests and the episcopacy.\(^{195}\) Likewise, the number of historical titles that were dedicated to Sackville gives the firm impression that his antiquarian interests were both well known and celebrated. In 1600 Thomas Danett’s *A continuation of the historie of France from the death of Charles the Eight...* was dedicated to Sackville, while Sir John Doddridge’s work *History of the Ancient and moderne Estate of the Prinicipality of Wales*, (not published until 1630 but which includes a dedication to Sackville dating from 1603) thanked the Lord Treasurer for his part in providing access to state papers, held at the Tower of London, which served as the repository for the primary evidence upon which this book was based.\(^{196}\)

Dodderidge no doubt received help in his research from Robert Bowyer (d. 1621), one of Thomas Sackville’s principal secretaries, who had come from a prominent Chichester family and was the son of the Keeper of the Records in the Tower, William Bowyer. Having studied at Oxford, Bowyer spent a short time at Clifford Inn before joining Middle Temple in 1580. After several failed attempts to become clerk of the Parliaments, Bowyer was Sackville’s secretary by at least 1597,\(^{197}\) but had probably
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\(^{194}\) Michael Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England, Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550-1640*, Cambridge, p. 60  
\(^{197}\) In 1587 Bowyer was involved in dealing surrounding the reversion of the lease of the manor of Hangleton in Sussex CKS U269 C2 Attached to Sackville’s letter of 27
been in his service since 1594 when Sackville recommended him to act as deputy to John Parker in a Chancery post. It must also have been Sackville who was responsible for Bowyer’s acquisition of his father’s old position at the Tower in 1604. As a member of the Elizabethan College of Antiquaries, Bowyer’s cultural interests had a strongly historical bent, and had no doubt been cultivated by his father, who left his son a thirteenth-century manuscript chronicle in his will. By the end of his life Bowyer had amassed his own collection of manuscripts, records and printed books, all of which he left to his nephew Henry Elsynge, with whom he shared the post of Keeper of the Tower Records.

The evidence of Sackville’s Library

Further evidence of Sackville’s antiquarian interests can be found in the Itinerarium ad Windsor written by the lawyer, antiquary and Recorder of London, Thomas Fleetwood (c.1525-1594). Within the text, Fleetwood described conversations that were supposedly held in early spring 1575 between himself, Lord Buckhurst and the Earl of Leicester as they rode from Leicester House in London towards Windsor Castle. The prose is a typical example of humanistic discourse which uses the

November 1597 are notes in Sackville’s hand, relating Bowyer’s role. The letter is also endorsed in Bowyer’s own hand and notes that he delivered the letter himself.


Will of Robert Bowyer, Clerk of the Parliament of the City of Westminster, Middlesex, NA PROB 11/140 Savile Quire Numbers, 63-115.

BL Harleian MS 6234, John Bruce, ‘Particulars respecting Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, with a fragment of the Itinerarium ad Windsor, written by Mr. Serjeant Fleetwood, Recorder of London, Communicated by John Bruce’, Archaeologia, XXXVII, Part 2, pp. 351-359. There is some confusion as to when precisely the discussions were supposed to have happened. John Bruce, in the nineteenth century read Fleetwood’s ‘I for my parte ame like in this could and blusteringe moneth of Nisan to become yellowe…’ as July, which is difficult to reconcile with the fact that the Jewish
medium of dialogue to discuss a subject, and there is every possibility that the
Itinerarium may not actually record a real event. Nevertheless, the depiction of
Sackville as the learned antiquary who shared with Fleetwood a passion for British
history reinforces the idea that Sackville managed to maintain his intellectual interests
as a courtier. According to Fleetwood’s account, the Earl of Leicester was in St. James’
Park when he saw Lord Buckhurst and Fleetwood riding alone together. Asked by
Leicester why this was, John Dudley replied that ‘it is their condition to separate
themselves from all companye when they ride into the countrye, and then their manner
is to use argumentes of eare and very straunge thinges, sometimes parleamente matters,
sometimes of chronicles and historyes, but cheifelye of the antiquityes of this realme of
England, for they be both marveylouslye given to be antiquaryes’. In the Itinerarium,
Leicester then asked Dudley to elaborate what he meant by ‘antiquaryes’. Dudley
replied that, if asked, both Sackville and Fleetwood would be able to relate the history
of Leicester House and other properties in the surrounding area, providing the
etymologies and ownership histories for Temple Bar, Ivy Bridge, the origin of St.
Clement Danes, the Savoy, Charing Cross and St. James. In doing so, Dudley created a
historical itinerary that retraced their journey back from St. James Palace to Leicester
House.

Suitably impressed, Leicester then asked whether the two knew of other places
outside of London, and being assured that they did, called to talk to the two of them.
When asked what they were currently discussing, Sackville replied, ‘my old frend Mr.
Recorder and I doe evermore use to discourse of one matter of learning or other when
wee cane gett any leisure or tyme convenyent. Our talke was at this tyme of the
excellencye of the regall dignetye of a kinge, and especiallye of the royall majestie of
the Kinge of England’.

Leicester then asked questions as to the regal authority of the queen in
relationship to that of a king. At this point Fleetwood provided a full explanation as to
the validity of female rule, basing his argument on a number of historical precedents.

calendar month of Nisan falls between the months of March and April in the Gregorian
Calendar, months when cold and blustery weather would be expected.

204 Dennis Moore, ‘Recorder Fleetwood and the Tudor queenship controversy’ ed.
Carole Levin & Jeanie Watson, Ambiguous Realities: Women in the Middle Ages and
This humanistic dialogue is characterised by a particular pedantry that does not make for scintillating reading. Nevertheless, whether real or imagined, the *Itinerarium ad Windsor* gives good evidence of Sackville’s intellectual interests, and his reputation as a learned historian in the practice of studying and acquiring manuscripts and printed histories. William Cecil was one of the leading figures in this group, a collector of ‘old monuments’, and who employed artificers to restore manuscripts.\(^{206}\) Part of the Cecil manuscript collection was broken up following a sale of 1687, but the sale catalogue, which survives at the British Library, relates Cecil’s involvement in the network of scholars who shared manuscripts amongst each other. Lot 44 was *Le Chronique de Jean Froissart des guerres de France & D'Angleterre*, (MS. Mostyn 206) given to Cecil by Thomas Sackville himself, evidence that he, like Cecil, Parker and others was in the practice of collecting and sharing manuscripts.\(^{207}\)

This group would find a cohesive form with the establishment of the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries, established in 1586.\(^{208}\) Although it has been argued that the tradition associating aristocratic figures such as Sackville and Burghley with the Society should be disregarded, because neither of their names appear on the registers of Society, there should be no doubt that Sackville was a keen antiquarian.\(^{209}\) In fact, both heralds and historians consulted his library and manuscript collection. For example, the present Society of Antiquaries holds a herald’s book containing copies of armorial bearings copied in 1589 from originals from Sackville’s library.\(^{210}\) His manuscript collection was also consulted by the eminent herald Robert Glover (1543/1588) in 1583 for his genealogical history of the Earls of Surrey, which gives the strong indication that it was an expansive and well esteemed collection.\(^{211}\) There also appears to have been a large family archive of papers dating back to the eleventh century. At Knole, there is an impressive genealogical table dating from 1622 that traces the Sackville lineage back to the Norman Conquest. What is remarkable about this pedigree is the fact that the artist, who, judging from stylistic evidence was the genealogical specialist Morgan Colman,
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\(^{210}\) SA MS 4/126 ‘Ex libro baron Buckhurst’.

\(^{211}\) BldL Dugdale MS 39, Glover borrows ‘ex scripto cartaceo antiquo in custodia Dm de Buckhurst, 1583’.
has chosen to depict the manuscripts and documents then in the Sackville collection, all of which have since been lost.

It is only through these chance survivals and a degree of reasoned conjecture that any reconstruction of Sackville’s library and manuscript collection can be attempted. An undated ‘Catalogue of my Lord Dorsett’s Bookes at Knole’ is the first surviving catalogue for any library of the Sackville family. The catalogue contains annotations in the hand of Richard Sackville, 5th Earl of Dorset (1622-1677),212 and is made up predominantly of ancient and modern histories, a number of dramatic works, and a series of grammar books, and appears to have no connection whatsoever to the library of Thomas Sackville.213 Of the 59 texts, almost all were published between 1650 and 1670, and today it is this collection that makes up the core of the library at Knole.214 Judging from the fact that in 1682 the 5th Earl’s books could be contained within a closet, it would appear that there was no designated library room at Knole when Thomas Sackville transformed the house between 1605-8.215 The constant movement of books between the numerous Sackville residences makes it difficult to define any permanent collection much before 1700, when the collections at Copthall and Buckhurst were brought to Knole.216 During the summer of 1624, when the newly created Earl of Dorset, Edward Sackville, was in the process of establishing himself at Knole, he transported a host of household goods to the house from Dorset House in London. Amongst these was a ‘greate Standart wth m Lords books in yt’ which were ‘packed up everye shelife by themselves’.217 The 1618 inventory for Buckhurst, a house that was used mainly as a hunting retreat for the 3rd Earl, (as it had been for Thomas Sackville)

212 CKS U269 E2/1
213 The only texts which are earlier are Anumianus Marcellius, The Roman Historie…London 1609, Ben Johnson’s Masques (1606-1630) and possibly Marlow and Chapman’s Hero & Leander, 1598 although this may well have been a subsequent publication.
214 I am grateful to Mark Purcell, Libraries Curator of the National Trust, for his thoughts and views on the Library at Knole. A preliminary survey (March 2007) of the collections held in the private apartments at Knole can be found at the National Trust Archive at Scotney Castle, Sussex.
215 CKS U269 T71/3. ‘In master Powles Closet, There is my Lords Liberary of Bookes, and the Clossett is hange with purple and white Hangings’. This was the Library of Charles Sackville 6th Earl of Dorset (1643-1706), Earl following the death of his father in 1677.
216 For the movement of books see, CKS U269 E1 which is another undated ‘Bookes carried to Knowle’ written largely in the hand of the 5th Earl; it lists books of a similar date to CKS U269 E2/1.
217 CKS U269 C4/2.
also lists a number of household furnishings used to accommodate books. The Dining Chamber at Buckhurst had a ‘Standing Deske for Bookes to stand upon’, the Earl’s bedroom had a ‘Deske to lay a book on’, the bedchamber had a ‘fayer Presse with 3 partitions with bookes’ and ‘litle deske to lay a booke on’, which altogether give the impression of a house well stocked with reading material. This is certainly something that is suggested by the diaries of Lady Anne Clifford. She and her husband kept their books in their closets, and included works as diverse as Chaucer, Michel de Montaigne’s *Essays or morall, polite and militarie discouresses* (English translation by John Florio of 1603), Ovid’s *Metamorphoses, A Trageical history of the Troubles and Civil Wars of the Low-Countries* (1583), and *Leicester’s Commonwealth* (1584). The suggestion is that at least some of these books were inherited from the library of Thomas Sackville.

Altogether, there can be no doubt that Thomas Sackville’s library would have been an impressive collection of texts and manuscripts. The scale of his collection, and his deep interest in books, is confirmed by his gift of nearly 200 volumes to the Bodleian Library in 1602.

Sackville’s bequest to the Bodleian came in the form of a cash sum of £100 that was used to purchase texts, all of which were stamped with his coat of arms. Almost all of these original calfskin bindings have since been replaced, making it impossible to reconstruct precisely what was bought. However, two texts do retain the Sackville arms. These are Cermisonus Antonius’s *Consilia medica*, Venice of c. 1495, and *Trilogium anime* by Ludovicus de Prussia edited by Nikolas Glasberger. Another fifteenth century text known to have belonged to Thomas Sackville was the *Recuyell of the Histories of Troy*, c.1475, which is now held at the British Library. The text contains an inscription that relates that the book belonged to Sackville’s daughter, Lady Anne Glenham, in 1613, who had received the book as part of the contents of Horsley Place,
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219 ‘Upon the 9th I went up to see things in the closet and began to have Mr Sandys his Book read to me about the Government of the Turks, my Lord sitting the most part of the day reading in his closet’. (January 9th 1617) *The Memoir of 1603 and The Diary of 1616-1619 Anne Clifford*, p.107.
bequeathed to her in her father’s will.\textsuperscript{223} It would appear, therefore, that various bequests to family members of Sackville’s household goods in his will led to the dispersal of his library. Further losses to the original collection were no doubt incurred following the seizure of Knole by parliamentarian forces in 1642, and it likely that what remained at Dorset House was destroyed in the Great Fire of 1666.

Perhaps the most interesting gift that he gave to the Bodleian Library was the coloured marble portrait bust of Thomas Bodley, given in 1605, which is displayed in Duke Humphrey’s Library.\textsuperscript{224} As one of only a small number of known commissions by Sackville, the survival of this classically inspired piece of sculpture must be seen as representative of Sackville’s appreciation of classical forms and their suitability for certain contexts such as this. In July 1624, amongst other household stuffs sent from London to Knole, were ‘Two Chestes wherein are a doz’ of Roman Emperors pictures’.\textsuperscript{225} These were popular decorations for elite households in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, inspired by the collection of eight Roman Emperors commissioned from Giovanni da Majano in the late 1510s by Cardinal Thomas Wolsey, although the precedent for sets of twelve Emperors had probably been derived by the famous series of that number painted by Titian in around 1537-38 for Federigo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua. For example, the Banqueting House at Theobalds was decorated with a series of portraits of Emperors.\textsuperscript{226} The Elizabethan Serjeant-at-Law William Lovelace (d.1577) owned a series of collections of them, as did the Jacobean Lord Treasurer Lionel Cranfield, whose house at Copthall contained twelve ‘Emperors heads’ in the late 1620s.\textsuperscript{227} It is unlikely that these were pieces of statuary, as in 1629 the heads at Knole were described as being ‘in frames’,\textsuperscript{228} and in 1645, what is now known as the Brown Gallery at Knole was described as ‘the Passage where the Emperors head hangs’.\textsuperscript{229} At this time there were ‘4 Anticke pictures’ at the foot of the Great Stair which were probably placed there with a mind towards the neo-classical decoration of
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Today, there are still a number of wooden plinths at Knole that could conceivably date to the early seventeenth century, (although some are clearly later creations) which would have originally supported sculptural busts, which give the indication that portraits and busts *alla antica* were an important aspect of the decoration of Sackville interiors in the early seventeenth century which have since been lost, probably during the enforced Parliamentary sale at Knole in 1645 and 1646.

Conclusions

This chapter has focused on a number of key aspects of Thomas Sackville’s life prior to the commencement of his building at Knole which, in a variety of ways, may have informed and shaped his approach to transforming the archbishop’s house. As it can be seen, Sackville maintained his reputation as an important antiquarian scholar, and brought those with similar interests into his fold. In fact, the titles of the books that were dedicated to Sackville make it clear that he still enjoyed his reputation as a poet despite the fact that his last recognised works were written almost half a century earlier. Likewise, Sackville’s continued links to the Inns of Court, and in particular, the Inner Temple, ensured that he also received dedications to legal treatises. Altogether, the subjects of those texts dedicated to him demonstrate that Sackville maintained the interests of his youth into old age, something which gives weight to Zim’s assertion that the ‘experience of the young poet affected the ideas and talents of the mature councillor.’

This is significant, because it makes it possible to appraise Sackville’s architectural legacy at Knole in the light of the cultural experiences of his youth, which as these first chapters have shown, were extremely important in shaping his intellectual and cultural outlook. What is known of his education and time at the Inns of Court shows that he had a strong intellect, capable of synthesising the vernacular with the new classically-inspired forms in which Sackville was so interested. This newfound passion motivated Sackville to undertake a long and dangerous journey through

---

230 ‘One round [sic] square table 4 Anticke pictures 1 glass Lanthorne 1 Square table Upon the Stayres Head’ CKS U269/O10/1
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central Europe in order to visit Italy, the land of antiquity and home to the classically-inspired literature which proved of such importance for Sackville’s own work. Although this journey was prolonged when Sackville became caught up in the various intrigues surrounding Rome’s attempts to reconcile Elizabeth I with the Papacy, it eventually afforded Sackville access to important areas of the Vatican that would become inaccessible to English travellers in the years following Elizabeth’s excommunication. His diplomatic missions to both France and the Low Countries expanded his cultural horizons yet further, as there he viewed the most significant architectural projects of the day.

Sackville’s acquisition of Knole of 1569, largely motivated by his involvement in the Wealden iron industry, was also an important moment in his early career, and although he later abandoned the property and concentrated his efforts on his Sussex residence, it would prove to be of significance in years to come. Despite being poorly documented, Sackville’s work at Lord’s Place in Lewes shows him to have been a patron keen to replicate what he had seen when abroad – something that situates him at the cultural avant-garde of his day. Along with these intellectual considerations, it is also clear from Sackville’s accounts that he felt it important to keep up with court fashions and that he patronised the finest artisans and the most accomplished artists available. At the same time, Sackville also had a deep-rooted interest in the past and the idea of the past as a construct. What little is known of his library relates that Sackville owned a number of historical manuscripts, which he shared with his intellectual peers, something which can be seen in his association with individuals such as William Fleetwood, and his employment of Robert Bowyer. Dedications to Sackville, and books inspired by him, suggest that these interests were continued throughout his life, and informed Sackville’s transformation of Knole, an idea that will be discussed further in the subsequent chapters.
Chapter Three: Motivations

Thomas Sackville and the attempted acquisition of Otford Palace

A key consideration in Sackville’s dealings in the 1604 agreement which resulted in his acquisition of Knole is the fact that Sackville had held a prolonged and well-documented interest in the Manor of Otford. From early 1600 onwards, Sackville continually petitioned Robert Sidney (1563-1626) to release his interest in Otford, and aimed to out-maneuvre Sidney by heightening anxieties at court over the crown’s ability to maintain the property.¹ The series of surveys of the Archbishop’s Palace at Otford made during Elizabeth I’s reign chart a steady decline in the house’s fabric as it fell into a state of dereliction.² A memorandum, appended to a survey of 1596, relates that the Sidneys had themselves been attempting to obtain the fee-farm of the house and park at Otford, and were willing to repair the house at their own cost on the proviso that they could remove the two large lodging ranges of the base court.³ As Governor of Flushing (Vlissingen), Sidney was rarely in England, and his domestic affairs were conducted by his principal secretary at court, Rowland White.

White’s correspondence with Sidney provides much of the information regarding Sackville’s attempts to obtain the Otford estate.⁴ On January 11th 1600, Rowland White wrote to Sidney telling him that the Queen was being continually pressured to sell Otford House. This she seemed reluctant to do, and instead issued a

¹ On the 14th of March 1552, Henry Sidney was made High Steward of Otford and Knole, and gained a lease of the Little Park of Otford. APC Volume IV, 1552-1554, London, 1892, p. 242. The lease for the Little Park was renewed on the 26th of March 1568. CPR, Elizabeth I, Volume IV, 1566-1569, London, 1964, p. 235.
² The ‘Inquisition and survey’ of the Queen’s mansion-house and park at Otford of the 13th of December 1596 estimated the cost of the repairs at £1,868 2s 3d. BL Lansdowne 82/117 The Survey of Otford made in February 1597 recommended that even if the house was repaired it would still be unsuitable for the Queen’s use due to its unhealthy location. NA E178/1165
³ BL Lansdowne 82/117 There were further suitors to the house and park at Otford. On the 21st of June, an unknown suitor (possibly William Brooke, 10th Baron Cobham 1527-1597) wrote to Burghley seeking his preference for Otford. ‘Otford being so near to my house, I have long desired to have some estate in it, and once moved you in the matter, and you wished I had it. I will buy it of the Queen… if I may have a good estate in the park, I will build a pretty house at my own charge’. NA SP12/259/54
second survey to assess its state of repair.\(^5\) Predicting his master’s response, White added ‘it is now full time to take the allarum, for it must surely be my Lord Treasurer or Lord Cobham, and in your Absence they will geo about to get it away’.\(^6\) White was right in raising these fears because, as he reported, two of Sackville’s servants had travelled to Otford ‘and viewed it’.\(^7\) Over the course of the following days, it transpired that the cost of demolishing the palace would be so great that it was preferable to sell it in a state of ruin.\(^8\)

According to the circulating gossip, Sackville sought to obtain Otford on behalf of his son and political heir, Robert, who ‘hath a great Mind to it, in Hope of a better footing in Kent’, further evidence to suggest that Sackville sought to expand his influence there by establishing a house in the north-west of the county.\(^9\) In 1602, the lawyer and diarist John Manningham recorded the rumours that Sackville planned to buy John Sedley’s house at Aylesford, near Maidstone in Kent.\(^10\) There is also a draft lease, drawn up in 1603 between Thomas Sackville and Robert Sidney for Leeds Castle.\(^11\) This was never signed or indentured, and probably represents an attempt by Sidney to strike a compromise with Sackville by providing him with a viable option to Otford. These were dynastic considerations, planned by Sackville with his legacy in mind.

As when Sackville had attempted to obtain Knole in around 1569, he risked antagonising the established local landowners, and at Otford he not only had to contend with Robert Sidney, but also with Henry Brooke, 11\(^{th}\) Baron Cobham (1564-1619), White duly noting in code that there was ‘some unkindness between 900 [Sackville] and 400 [Lord Cobham]’.\(^12\) Sackville’s overtures were also rebuked by Robert Sidney’s wife, who visited Sackville and ‘discreetly with some little vehemency, delivered her

\(^7\) ibid. p. 451.
\(^8\) Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L’Isle and Dudley preserved at Penshurst Place, Kent, Volume Two, 1934, p. 429.
\(^9\) ibid. p. 197.
\(^11\) CKS U1475 E63A.
\(^12\) Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L’Isle and Dudley preserved at Penshurst Place, Kent, Volume Two, 1934, p. 432.
mynd’. Undeterred, Sackville continued in his efforts. On April 2nd 1600, Rowland White recalled a conversation that had taken place with Sackville in the Treasurer’s private chamber at Richmond Palace. Firstly, Sackville asked him whether White was Postmaster of the Court, and the Queen’s servant. He answered that he was, and Sackville gave White parcels to send for him. As he was leaving, Sackville called him back into the room and pressed him on the subject of Otford. He reprimanded White for advertising the conversations that White had held with Sackville’s Gentleman of the Horse, which Sackville alleged had been conducted without his knowledge. In this discussion, the Gentleman of the Horse had related that Sackville had ‘fought to have some Parke or other neare London, but could not compas it; that all [Sackville’s] Parkes and Landes were 28 Mile of, fowle Way’. According to White, Sackville’s servant had also suggested that his master was willing to pay more for Sidney’s interest than it was worth, and that Sackville would procure a property of greater profit than Oftord for Sidney from the crown, in exchange. White was also promised a sweetener for his troubles. Sackville then admitted to White that he ‘did greatly desire Oteford Parke’, and ‘it is true that I have no Place neare to London to retire unto, and therefore shuld be glad of it, if Sir Robert Sidney wold part with it’.

This document represents the most forthright expression of Sackville’s motivations behind his attempts to obtain Otford and his eventual acquisition of Knole. It becomes apparent that Sackville required a place to which he could retire, and that he desired a park near to London, as his own parks and lands were situated too far from the city and were only accessible by poorly maintained roads. Aside from these practical considerations, it is also clear that there were important dynastic ambitions, as the Sackville family attempted to establish itself in Kent, driving their influence northwards to gain greater control of the Kent and Sussex Weald. It is clear, therefore, that from around 1600 onwards Thomas Sackville was in the market for a country house situated within reasonable travelling distance of London. On the 14th August 1601, he took out a twenty-one year lease of West Horsley Place from his son-in-law Anthony Maria

15 ibid, p. 183.
16 idem.
Browne (1574-1629), who had married his daughter Jane in 1591.¹⁷ When his
grandfather died on October 19th 1592, Anthony Maria became 2nd Viscount Montagu,
and inherited a fortune estimated to provide an income of between £3,600 and £5,400 a
year.¹⁸

With the majority of his lands situated in Sussex, Anthony Maria Browne
established Cowdray as his principal residence, leaving Horsley free for his father-in-
law’s use, and it would appear that this lease was only an official stamp on what had
been a pre-existing arrangement.¹⁹ In July 1591, Sackville had arranged to meet Sir
William More at Horsley, and the suggestion must be that he had established himself
there by this point.²⁰ Certainly by July 1599, Horsley was deemed to belong to
Sackville, and was described as such by Sir Charles Danvers (?1568-1601) in his
itinerary for the royal progress of that year.²¹ Although there is no documentary record
of a royal visit, it must be assumed that the itinerary was adhered to. There is also a
series of undated letters, written by Sackville’s wife Cicely from West Horsley to Sir
William More of Loseley, which must date prior to More’s death in November 1600.
One such letter is particularly revealing. Writing ‘absens of my Lorde’, Cicely asked
More to use his local influence to excuse a neighbour of hers, ‘one Elliotte a carpenter’
from conscription to the armed bands. She asked this because Elliot was at the time in
the employ of her husband, occupied in the repair of his ‘howse and Stables’.²²

The house that stands today at West Horsley has been remodelled at various
points throughout its history, and the earlier phases of building have been largely lost.
The large brick mansion had been forfeited to the crown from 1538 following the
attainder of its owner Henry Courtenay (1498/9-1539), and an inventory drawn up by
royal commissioners gives the impression of a substantial house with all of the requisite

¹⁷ In 1608 Sackville was paying rent of £164 10s 4d for half a year’s rent of the mansion
house of West Horsley and other lands to his son-in-law.
147-148.
¹⁹ This is suggested by the fact that his household ordinances were written for
Cowdray. ‘‘A Booke of Orders and Rules” of Anthony Maria Viscount Montague in
Sackville’s will, the grant of the lease was made on the 14th of August 1601 at a rent of
£221 5s 10d. NA PROB 1/113 Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Dorset Quire Numbers
1-56, f. 7.
²⁰ SHC 6729/7/91
²¹ Calendar of the Manuscript of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury preserved at
²² SHC 6729/6/42
staterooms for the accommodation of the crown. Traditionally, the early seventeenth century additions to the house have been attributed to Anthony Maria Browne, but the suggestion here is that at least some of this work should be ascribed to Thomas Sackville and dated to the period c.1600-1604.

A series of buildings relating to work at West Horsley survives in the account book of 1604 of Michael Heydon, steward of the household to Thomas Sackville. As Cicely Sackville’s letter to More suggested, the work that was undertaken was carried out in both the stables and the house itself, and appears to have been managed by the carpenter John Elliot, who must be the same ‘Elliotte’ mentioned in her letter. The accounts only record a modest expenditure of £65 5s 3d over a nine month period, but it is clear from the references to the ‘new howse’ and the construction of new staircases and floors that this work constituted more than just running repairs.

It is also clear from what survives of Sackville’s correspondence that West Horsley became Sackville’s principal residence outside of London, and Sackville frequently retired there, especially in times of ill health. Towards the end of his life Sackville also rented Clandon House from Sir Richard Weston (1591-1652), a house situated just over a mile away from West Horsley, and which was presumably rented as additional accommodation for Sackville’s household when he stayed at Horsley. Some indication of how much time was spent at Horsley is suggested by the fact that of the £1,220 spent by Sackville on kitchen expenses in 1604, 35% of this sum was spent at Horsley, with the remainder expended at Dorset House, a figure that would suggest that Sackville was spending a considerable amount of his time at West Horsley. This has to be tempered slightly by the fact that Cicely, Thomas Sackville’s wife, appears to have been in almost permanent residence at the house, maintaining a household there throughout the year. Nevertheless, the fact that approximately a third of Sackville’s

---

25 CKS U269 A2/1
26 On 30th of September 1600 Sackville wrote to a ‘Mr. Reynolds’ from Horsley relating that illness had kept him from court. *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, Vol. 10*, 1600, 1904, p. 329
28 For letters sent by Cicely from Horsley see, SHC 6729/6/42, SHC 6729/6/43, SHC 6729/10/102, SHC LM/COR/3/661, BL, Add. Ms. 12506/193
household expenses were being designated for Horsley gives an indication of how important the house was for him and his immediate family. Why, then, did Sackville require Knole when Horsley seems to have served as a suitable residence to which to retire? West Horsley was easily accessible from London, especially so on occasions when the Court resided at Richmond or Hampton Court. It was also deemed suitable for entertaining members of the royal family. Writing from Horsley on the 1st August 1605 to Gilbert Talbot, 7th Earl of Shrewsbury (1552-1616), Sackville related that Prince Henry Frederick had visited him at Horsley the day before ‘when he did accept in the most gentle and gracious sort that might be my pore entertainment’.29

Yet while West Horsley was of sufficient status for the entertainment of one royal, it appears that it was simply too small for the accommodation of the entire royal family. The fact that there was a now a royal family – as opposed to an elderly and infirm Queen – with each of its principal members served by their own individual retinues, conditioned the way that grand houses were organised and designed. This was a key consideration for Thomas Sackville when he sought to acquire and develop his own seat outside London. It is understandable therefore that Sackville was forced to look elsewhere for a suitable country house.

The projects for the Royal Palaces of Eltham and Ampthill 1603-5

In order to get a full sense of Thomas Sackville’s architectural knowledge – his understanding of the processes by which large-scale elite commissions were organised, planned and realised – it is necessary to look to projects which Sackville would have known and participated in prior to, and during, his transformation of Knole. His involvement in the royal projects at both Eltham Palace in Kent, and Ampthill in Buckinghamshire provides important clues as to the extent of Sackville’s personal involvement in architectural programmes of his kind, and in particular, the transformations of existing medieval structures. Elizabeth I’s parsimony in building, and her reluctance to maintain the numerous palaces she inherited, (Otford is a case in point here), meant that there was no royal residence designated solely for leisurely pursuits such as hunting and hawking. However, following James I’s accession, the

29 LPL TALBOT PAPERS 3202/28
Office of Works focused its efforts on creating a suitable hunting lodge for the King and his family.\textsuperscript{30}

With a mind towards this, works were begun at Eltham in Kent, which James I had deemed ‘not fitt for our abode’ during a stay in or before May 1603.\textsuperscript{31} By 1604 substantial works were in hand, as repairs were made to the presence chamber, the Princes Chamber ‘on the Queen’s Side’, and the windows of the great chamber on the Queen’s side.\textsuperscript{32} The declared account for 1603-1604 in the records of the Office of Works relates payments to masons in helping measure all of the rooms for a plan to be given to Thomas Sackville for ‘t’alteracon of the same’, a plan that can be connected with two plans of Eltham, both by John Thorpe, one held at Hatfield and the other at the National Archive (fig. 17).\textsuperscript{33} The fact that Sackville was altering architectural plans showing planned proposals can be seen as a clear indication that he was actively involved in the design processes of the Office of Works during this period.\textsuperscript{34} However, despite the fact that substantial work was undertaken between 1603-1605, the project at Eltham appears to have been abandoned, for payments of August 1605 relate that the surveyor John Thorpe was in the process of surveying and appraising alternative properties for the crown.\textsuperscript{35}

One residence that was seriously considered for development was Ampthill in Bedfordshire. Ampthill had been built in the early fifteenth century as a double-courtyard house that sported its own hunting park and had come to the Crown in 1524. By 1605, the house had fallen into a state of ruin, and was in need of major reconstruction, but its location and its amenities were obviously suitably attractive for the house to be taken seriously as a possibility. As at Eltham Palace, Thomas Sackville was instrumental in planning the transformation of the property into a residence suitable for James I’s recreation and use. Not only did he mobilise the workforce, he also played a part in the design process, something that suggests that James I had entrusted the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} Nicholas Cooper, \textit{Houses of the Gentry 1480-1680}, New Haven and London, 1999, p. 110.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Colvin, \textit{HKW, Vol. IV, (Part Two)}, 1982, p. 84.
\item \textsuperscript{32} idem.
\item \textsuperscript{33} ibid. p. 85. Thorpe’s Plan is NA SP12/24/150
\item \textsuperscript{34} R A Skelton & John Summerson, \textit{A description of Maps and Architectural Drawings in the Collection made by William Cecil First Baron Burghley now at Hatfield}, Roxburgh Club, Oxford, 1971.
\item \textsuperscript{35} NA E403/2724/79 £40 for surveying unspecified lands that the King had appointed. NA E403/2725/93 16 August 1605, payment for other unspecified surveying work, NA E403/2725/111 October 1605 £10 for surveying in Kent and Sussex.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
project to him. Furthermore, there are a number of pertinent similarities between the
work that was being proposed at Ampthill, and the work that Sackville was in the
process of undertaking at Knole, and in the absence of plans and correspondence
relating to his work at Knole, these documents give vital clues as to the level of
Sackville’s personal involvement in large-scale architectural projects of this kind, and
help relate what features of the royal palace he may have sought to replicate at his own
house at Knole.

On the 3rd of August, two days after he had entertained the Prince of Wales at
West Horsley, Sackville wrote from Dorset House to the Officers of the Works
outlining the plans for Ampthill. According to Sackville, the King had given him
‘express pleasure’ for the building of a ‘fitt convenient’ house upon the ruins of
Ampthill.36 Sackville made it clear that the lodge should not be designed to house the
King when ‘in State’ but would serve solely as a residence for the King when he hunted
at the park. Along with the apartments designated for the King, the house was also to be
planned with the requisite rooms for the accommodation of the Queen and the Prince.
Provision was to be made for further lodgings ‘because it may be that some occasion
maie require the attendance of some of the Councill upon his Maiestie there, I wishe
also that some convenient Roomes for half a dozen privy Councillors besides’ the Lord
Chamberlain, the Lord Treasurer, the Comptroller, the Master of the Horse, and the
Principal Secretary.37 Had the project been realised, Ampthill would have been a
substantial building, far larger than lodges built for occasional use, such as that
designed in around 1605 by Robert Stickells for the royal palace at Richmond.38

Sackville’s letter to the Works specified that the Surveyor (Sir David
Cunningham) and the Comptroller (Simon Basil) were to survey not only the ‘stately
place where the old ruines of Ampthill do remaine but also any other place (if there
such there be) which may be found fitter and more Convenient in respect of water or
any other Comoditie for the seat of a house there for his Majestie in your opinion’.39
Regardless as to whether they could find a better site, the team were ordered to survey
the existing ruins and to make an estimate as to the cost of rebuilding the house on

37 idem.
170-177; Nicholas Cooper, Houses of the Gentry 1480-1680, New Haven and London,
specifications outlined above. William Portington, the Master Carpenter of the Works, and an individual responsible for providing materials at Knole, was ordered by Sackville to survey the woodlands surrounding Ampthill to assess whether there was sufficient timber stock for the build.⁴⁰

Sackville was also at pains to stress the importance of this matter for the contentment of the King and the preservation of his health, and related to the officers that ‘whenever you shall need with my advice or help in anything, you shall find me so ready and willing as even with my own person I will come to the place, if need be’.⁴¹ At the foot of the letter Sackville appended a post-script saying that he had written a similar letter to ‘a very excellent surveyor Mr. Thorpe, who shall not only survey it but make very fair plots’.⁴² These ‘fair plots’ of the house survive in John Thorpe’s Book of Architecture at the Soane Museum in the form of two highly finished designs, the first of which is inscribed ‘Ampthill old howse enlarged’ (fig. 18).⁴³ Both the high level of finish and the addition of a yellow wash on the plan, indicating the inner courts, strongly suggest that these served as presentation drawings shown to Sackville and the King. What is of particular interest is the fact that Thorpe’s plans are clearly rationalised drawings of an earlier design held at the Hatfield House collection (fig. 19). The sketch shows a large courtyard house, approached through a gatehouse, with a centrally placed hall (30 ft. x 60 ft.) featuring porticoes at front and back, leading to two grand staircases and a series of apartments for the king and queen.

The rough handling of the pen and ink has led scholars to believe that the plan may not have been the work of a trained professional, and it has been suggested that whoever was responsible for the drawing was someone familiar both with architectural text and with the needs of royalty, but lacking the skill to produce a drawing sufficiently finished to serve as the basis for estimates or for the direction of craftsmen.⁴⁴ Theoretically, the plan should be the work of Sir David Cunningham, the Scottish gentleman appointed as Surveyor of the Works following James I’s accession, an

⁴¹ idem.
⁴² idem.
⁴⁴ Cooper, Houses of the Gentry, 1990, p. 35.
individual who would also fit the description of a knowledgeable designer lacking the requisite skill to render an accurate ground plot.45

However, the hand bears a strong resemblance to that of the Comptroller of the works Simon Basil. This can be observed in his sketched notes for his design for the theatre of Christ Church Oxford of 1605 (fig. 20), and most clearly in his plans for Sherborne Castle (c.1600-1609) and the royal lodge at Bagshot Park (1610).46 The large capitalisation of the letter ‘C’ in ‘Court’ is a characteristic of Basil’s handwriting as can be seen in his correspondence, as is his particular way of rendering the letter ‘K’ and the letter ‘Q’.47 Another key similarity in the plan for Ampthill and that of Bagshot Lodge is the way that Basil indicated the mullions of the windows with a simple series of dashes. In the Ampthill sketch this is done in a hurried fashion but the similarity is still there to be seen.

Despite its hurried style, Basil’s sketch for Ampthill has been noted for its remarkable sophistication in its planning, and its emphasis on symmetry identifies it as a remarkably classical conception for this date.48 In his catalogue of the Thorpe plans, John Summerson suggested the influence of Palladio’s design for the Villa Sarego (Book II, p. 68) but the sketch corresponds more closely to a design by Sebastiano Serlio in his unpublished Book VI of his architectural treatises.49 The plan is described by Serlio as being for a ‘House of a Gentleman to be built outside the city’ (fig. 22) and was evidently adopted for Ampthill for its suitability to the specifications of the 1605 project. It was obviously deemed that a country house designed for an Italian nobleman could happily serve as a hunting lodge for an English King.

47 The best example of this can be seen in a letter written to Robert Cecil in the State Papers. NA SP 14/46/44
The similarities between Serlio’s design and those for Ampthill can be seen most clearly in the arrangement of the axial hall, the paired principal stairs and the two flanking courtyards. Serlio’s plan has two loggias at either end of the hall, a feature followed in both the sketches. The second loggia in Serlio’s plan leads to a large courtyard garden with another continuous loggia running around three of the four walls. Across the garden is a further range of lodgings which Serlio suggested could be repeated in a similar fashion around the flanking walls of the courtyard, something that was adopted in both the plans for Ampthill.

The major innovation in the Ampthill sketch was to turn Serlio’s plan on its head, transforming Serlio’s courtyard garden into a base court, and the central vestibule into a gatehouse. This decision was a necessary one, because Thorpe’s plans make it clear that the existing gatehouse of Ampthill, with its octagonal stair turrets seen in the plan below, was to be incorporated into the new building. The other change was the duplication of the double courtyard arrangement, doubling the accommodation in this area of the plan, and allowing for each ‘side’ of the house to have its own long gallery overlooking the courtyard. These considerations were specific to the requirements of the royal household, and it is easy to understand why Serlio’s plan was enlarged and developed in this way. His plan made provision for only four noblemen, while it is conceivable that Ampthill should have the capacity to accommodate three royal households and up to a dozen councillors and courtiers. These were practical solutions for practical problems.

Yet despite these changes, the integrity of the original design was maintained throughout. The Serlian design’s defining feature – that of the centrally placed hall with its symmetrical lodging ranges – continued to shape Thorpe’s development of the earlier sketch. It is clear that whoever was responsible for the sketch was among the avant-garde of architectural planning at the time, and it is understandable that there have been hopeful, if not overly optimistic, attributions of this drawing to Inigo Jones. The leading candidate for the drawing must be Simon Basil, whose familiarity with Serlio is borne out in his 1605 design for the theatre at Christ Church Oxford, which owes much

---

50 This plan contains two paper flaps that illustrate proposed changes to the structure, and probably relate to the 1605 plans. See Skelton & Summerson, *A description of Maps and Architectural Drawings*, 1971, p. 80.
to the Serlio woodcuts of a theatre in *Il secondo libro di perspettiva*. This theatre was set up in the hall of Christ Church College for the royal visit hosted by Sackville as Chancellor of the University, the scenery of which was created under the supervision of Inigo Jones. During the construction of the theatre space, Thomas Sackville became involved in the debate as to where the King’s seat should be placed within the auditorium. Thomas Howard, 1st Earl of Suffolk, and others, voiced concerns that the audience would be unable to get good sight of the King unless his seat was raised higher. Sackville, however, supported the original position set out by Basil and the workmen of the Office of Works, wherein it had been argued that the effect of perspective work in the stage would be compromised if the King’s seat was raised any higher. As John Orell has suggested, Sackville and the Vice-Chancellor appear to have been alive to the experiment in neo-Vitruvian scenery and Serlian auditorium design, while the Court sought to impose a traditional scheme whereby the monarch sat in prominent view of the audience, regardless of whether this hindered his experience of the performance.

These designs for a royal residence at Ampthill and the discussions of arrangements at Christ Church help illustrate the fact that in 1605 Sackville was closely involved with the work of both John Thorpe and Simon Basil, the latter being an individual who was an exponent of the work of Sebastiano Serlio. Although the planning of Knole was heavily conditioned by the pre-existing medieval fabric, there are moments in Sackville’s work that suggest that the imposition of a classically inspired symmetry was a key consideration in the changes that he made to the house. These features will be discussed in greater detail later in the subsequent chapter, but it is worth remembering that throughout the planning of Ampthill and the creation of the Christ Church theatre, Sackville was deeply involved in his building work at Knole, and that all of the considerations and ideas that related to these projects can equally be applied to Knole.

---
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Sackville, John Thorpe and the plans for Buckhurst House, Sussex

As the projects at Ampthill and Eltham Palace show, during the first years of James I’s reign, Sackville and John Thorpe developed a working relationship in their attempts to realise the crown’s ambitions for a royal hunting lodge. Moreover, it is known that Thorpe worked on a private commission for Sackville in the last years of Elizabeth I’s reign. Although his family trade was stone masonry, John Thorpe forged a career in surveying the homes and lands of leading courtiers, ministers and landowners, and often submitted his own designs for these patrons.54 Amongst the various sketches, plans and drawings in the so-called Book of Architecture of John Thorpe held at the Soane Museum, is a double page plan for the massive remodelling of the Sackville family seat at Buckhurst in Sussex (fig. 23). It is one of Thorpe’s largest conceptions, which envisaged a near-symmetrical house built around five courtyard spaces. John Summerson sensibly suggested that the sheer size and scale of the design is such that it could only have been conceived following Sackville’s appointment as Lord Treasurer.55 This suggestion is supported by stylistic evidence. The scaled rule in the Buckhurst plan matches that on the survey of Eltham Palace (1604), which, when combined with the circumstantial evidence regarding Sackville’s appointment as Lord Treasurer, gives a sensible date range of c.1599-1604 for the drawing.56 Like Thorpe’s drawing for Ampthill, the Buckhurst plan is finished with an ink wash over the courtyard spaces, and towards the left hand side of the drawing contains a small number of annotated additions, which propose an alternative arrangement for the chimneystacks in the western range of officers’ lodgings. This would suggest therefore that Thorpe’s plan was commissioned and later annotated by Thomas Sackville, who, in the years leading up to the acquisition of Knole, had very real ambitions for enlarging his ancestral home in Sussex.

Described by Leland as ‘The Anncientest house of the Sachvilles’, Buckhurst had served as the family’s principal residence from at least the thirteenth century, when

56 idem.
it was described as a ‘well-built dwelling house’. From what has survived of the building fabric it was obviously a substantial establishment, and a depiction of the house from the ‘Buckhurst Terrier’ – a survey of 1597 of the Sackville lands in the area – shows a sizeable property surrounded by six large towers, of which only one still survives. This sole remnant of the old building displays the monogram lettering and the arms of the family, together with the Argon device of the pomegranate, which confirms that this gate tower was constructed during a phase of building undertaken by John Sackville, Thomas Sackville’s grandfather. These changes to the house were mentioned in John Sackville’s will, which made reference of the ‘Newe Chambers between the Tower and the Barne’.

The inventory of household furnishings compiled at Buckhurst in 1618 provides some indication of the size of the house, and gives an indication as to the status of the property. The inventory only lists nineteen rooms, including a gatehouse chamber, a gallery, the tower chamber ‘next to where my lord lyeth’, a dining room, parlour, and the ‘Green Chamber over the Parlour’ which served as a withdrawing chamber. The fact that the description of the rooms given in the 1618 inventory corresponds closely to those mentioned in the 1556 will of John Sackville, gives the strong impression that the house had been not been altered since the first quarter of the sixteenth century. In 1618 the house was richly adorned with tapestry and portraits but the sense given from the inventory is that, despite its size, Buckhurst only had the capacity to accommodate a small number of visitors.

Further clues as to the limitations of Buckhurst are hinted at in Thomas Sackville’s will. In the appended codicil, Sackville designated a large sum of money for three architectural commissions, all of which were for projects in Sussex, further evidence of Sackville’s preoccupation with his legacy. Perhaps the best example of this was the one thousand pounds specified for the creation of a family chapel at Withyham. A similar sum was set aside for the construction of a granary at Lewes, and two thousand more was designated to stock the granary with wheat for the poor in times of need. Most significantly, the residue of Sackville’s ready money was to be used by Robert Sackville, ‘to build Buckhurst house withal soe as yt be reduced to a convenient
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house’. This is the strongest indication that Buckhurst did not satisfy Sackville’s requirements and was in need of whole-scale modernisation.

By the last decade of the sixteenth century, Sackville’s position on the Privy Council necessitated his spending nearly all of his time in attendance to the Queen. He was able to avoid neglecting his Sussex affairs by delegating responsibility to his eldest son Robert, and as a result he spent increasingly less time in Sussex. In a letter to Robert Cecil of the 20th of August 1602, Sackville wrote that he had only spent two days in Sussex over the previous five years. In another letter to Cecil of the 4th September 1605, Sackville related that he had not visited Buckhurst for the space of seven years, and although the house was still reserved for his use, it is clear that it had become surplus to his requirement. The surviving accounts support this, for in the final years of Sackville’s life there was no permanent household maintained at Buckhurst. It could have been expected that Robert Sackville would have used Buckhurst as a base from which to conduct both family and government interests in Sussex, but instead he chose to establish himself in the nearby manor house of Bolebrooke, a brick mansion house acquired by the Sackville family in 1590. Substantial parts of this house still remain (fig. 24 & 25). The large brick gatehouse with its polygonal turrets and ogee caps has much in common with the gatehouse at Sissinghurst, and almost certainly shares a mid sixteenth-century date, so it seems that Bolebrooke, built to a more modern design, was preferable to the older house at Buckhurst.

Although the plans drawn up by Thorpe were never completed, it is worthwhile considering what changes were planned for Buckhurst. If the remodelling had gone ahead, it would have changed Buckhurst beyond all recognition, creating a vast residence that would have borne no resemblance to the existing structure. The modern literature on country house design, often preoccupied with charting a linear progression in style and design, normally underplays the significance of this drawing due to its
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conservative design. It does not, for example, look forward to the innovations in the design of Hatfield (fig. 21), and in fact, as John Summerson has demonstrated, the plan for Buckhurst shares more common ground with the design of Lord Burghley’s family home of Burghley House than any other great house of the period. Both plans retained the feature of a vast gatehouse structure placed centrally to the front of the house, and Buckhurst follows the disposition of two corner towers and bay windows seen at Burghley, albeit on a much-extended front.  

As Sackville’s predecessor as Lord Treasurer, Burghley’s model was an obvious example for Sackville to follow, and as Summerson suggests, it is possible to draw a parallel between Sackville’s dual development of his ancestral seat in Sussex and the country house at Knole, and William Cecil’s work at Burghley House and the more accessible palace at Theobalds in Hertfordshire. Very much as at Burghley, the plan for Buckhurst synthesised classically inspired features with established and traditional design motifs. The main courtyard was perfectly square, featuring classical porches with double columns which were of superimposed orders like those at Cobham Hall (fig. 26). The hall was traditionally positioned on a medieval plan, although a ceremonial procession way led to a grand staircase that communicated with the range of prestigious rooms. These included a great chamber and a withdrawing chamber which led towards two prodigiously proportioned galleries running the length of the entrance front, one for ‘my Lo:’ the other for ‘ye lady syde’. Beneath the two galleries were a series of lodging apartments, all divided into three rooms, comprising of an entrance way or antechamber, a partitioned area for a privy, and a larger bedroom with a fireplace. Where possible these rooms were placed either in the corner of the range or in line with a large bay window in order to maximise the light that these rooms received. The provision of these rooms, combined with the inclusion of a tennis court within the plan, makes it clear that Buckhurst was designed with a mind towards the entertainment of the court.

Although the plan fails to indicate rooms specifically designated for royal use, recent literature suggests that the prestigious suite of chambers based around the two courtyards on the garden side could be easily converted into a series of state apartments.  
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certainly conceived at a time when Elizabeth I was still on the throne, when there was no immediate need to accommodate the entire royal family.

What becomes apparent is that, after a sustained period of benign neglect, Thomas Sackville toyed with the idea of dramatically remodelling his seat at Buckhurst. These plans were worked up to the point whereby a finished design was produced, one that appears to have incorporated elements of existing fabric, and something that gives the firm impression that the plans for Buckhurst were considered seriously and were not merely the hopeful overtures of a surveyor seeking the Lord Treasurer’s patronage. It is difficult to know precisely why these plans were abandoned, but one possibility is that, after consideration, Sackville thought the project simply too large and complicated to achieve. The arrival of a new monarch and new royal family must also have had a significant bearing on his decision to abandon Buckhurst for a project that was more easily achievable. It was within this context that Sackville cast his eye towards Knole for the second time.

**Sackville and the choice of Knole**

Establishing a household at Knole and developing the fabric was an attractive proposition to Sackville for a number of reasons. Firstly, Knole was closer to London than Buckhurst and was far more easily accessible from court. It sported a deer park, and had all of the amenities that Sackville had identified as requisite for the accommodation of the royal family and the court. There were also a number of practical considerations that governed any large-scale building project such as the one that Sackville envisaged at Knole, many of which are epitomised in Sackville’s letter to officers of the Works. One of the first instructions that he gave was for the officers to investigate alternative sites around Ampthill that could be ‘found fitter and more Convenient in respect of water or any Comoditie for the seate of a house’. Knole’s grounds supported underwater springs that fed the house with clean water, something that was rare for a house on a hill.

Another key consideration was the provision of timber for the construction of the new house. Accordingly, Sackville had sent the King’s Woodward to Ampthill to
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investigate both the quantity and the quality of the local timber stock. Despite the fact that the manor’s woods had been used extensively in the production of glass during the middle years of the Lennard tenure, the evidence suggests that this was managed sensibly, and that the wood was coppiced rather than felled. Indeed, Sackville’s will makes a number of stipulations as to the management of the woodlands within the manor. As part of the settlement, Sackville’s widow Cicely was entitled to the ‘Loppes and toppes’ of the timber in the park, on the proviso that it was only used for fuel and firewood at Knole, and that the timber ‘maybe so carefullie and skilfully Lopt or topt as he do not dye &/ perishe therby but to prosper and spring after yt in such good sort as apperteynth’. What is striking is that Sackville made more provision for the timber stock at Knole than he did for any other aspect of this or any of his other buildings and lands, further testament to the value of this woodland.

The final consideration was a more general one and involved the disposition of the house, its location and its situation, all of which were deemed to affect whether the site was conducive or detrimental to the health and wellbeing of its occupants. When Henry VIII seized Knole from Archbishop Cranmer in 1537, Cranmer’s secretary Ralph Morice noted the conversations that were held during this forced exchange, stating that his master had minded to have ‘retained Knol unto himself’, protesting that Knole was too small a house for the King’s use. Unfortunately, these protestations fell upon deaf ears. The King replied that he would ‘lye at Knolle, and moste of my house shall lye at Otteforde’. His reasoning for residing at Knole as opposed to Otford was due to the low lying situation of Otford, which he described as ‘rewmatike’, likening it to the Archbishop’s Palace at Croydon, where he could ‘never be withoute sycknes’. Knole, on the other hand, Henry believed was ‘on a sounde, perfaite, holsome grounde’, a suitable home for a hypochondriac king.

In this instance, Henry VIII was voicing established theories prevalent in the sixteenth century on building practice as set out in Andrew Boorde’s *The Boke for to Lerne a Man to be Wyse in Buyldyng* of 1540, which forms part of a longer work, the *Dyetary of Health*, which was published in the late 1540s. Within this book, Boorde dealt with the practical considerations of the location of a house, and stressed that supplies of both wood and water were essential for the establishment of any ‘howse or
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masyon place’. Water was needed for washing, baking and brewing, and to serve in
case of fire, while wood was required for fuel and for the building and repair of the
house’s fabric, and Knole had abundant supplies of both. The house’s situation, one that
offered both of these choice amenities, also satisfied another important specification in
Boorde’s text. This was the ‘pulruse prospect’ demanded by Boorde, which, if found
lacking could lead to the ‘motygycacion of the vytall and anymall and spyrytuall
powers’. In other words, if the house lacked a commanding and attractive view, then
the likelihood was that it was positioned on low lying ground, associated with rheumatic
miasmas as described by a fearful Henry VIII. There is no doubt that the considerations
that had informed Boorde’s Dyetary of Health and had shaped Henry VIII’s
hypochondria also had a considerable bearing on Sackville’s decisions to establish a
household at Knole and to invest heavily in its renovation. He was fully aware himself
of the benefits of country air, and following an increase in cases of the plague in
London in 1569, Sackville had thought it best to ‘take the aier of Buckhurst for six or
seven daies before my return to the Courte’.

These considerations became increasingly prevalent in the years leading up to
his death, when Sackville frequently complained of failing health. Letters to Robert
Cecil list an unhappy catalogue of ailments and complaints, which often necessitated
that Sackville spent prolonged periods away from court. In his mid thirties, Sackville
had suffered from bladder stones, but in later life cold and ‘flu seem to have been his
most frequent ailments. In March 1600, Sackville wrote that ‘This cold having taken
over me and brought my body into some loosenes, I did hope that this night it would
have cleared, and then I meant to come to the Court this morning. But it continueth
upon me so as to go into the air might utterly overthrow me. His accounts of 1607-8
record numerous payments to apothecaries for medicines, and relate that the ‘physic’
that Sackville frequently received involved the letting of blood.
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Sackville had seen first-hand from the career of Burghley, his predecessor as Lord Treasurer, that complete retirement from court was impossible, and that the only respite that he could ever expect to enjoy would be a couple of days snatched between his appointments at court. As James Sutton has demonstrated, throughout the last decade of the 1590s, Lord Burghley and his son Robert orchestrated a programme of theatrical displays that promoted Burghley’s calls for a withdrawal from state affairs, none of which were realistic or ever realised. It was hoped that Theobalds Palace in Hertfordshire would be the house where Burghley could spend increased periods of time. As Sutton argues, Theobalds was ‘at once both sufficiently ludic and serious, simultaneously an immensely imaginative and playful locale and an official site of court business’.76 The location of the palace was also significant. Situated only twelve miles from Whitehall, Theobalds was an amenable distance from the city, an important consideration for an aging councillor. Again, it is possible to draw a parallel between Cecil’s architectural patronage and that undertaken by Sackville towards the end of his life. Although slightly further from London than Theobalds, Knole was easily amenable from London, for in June 1616 Lady Anne Clifford wrote that her journey from Dorset House to Knole had taken only four hours to complete.77

There is no evidence to suggest that Sackville made a similar attempt to extricate himself from court life. This is because, unlike Burghley, Sackville lacked an heir who was well positioned to take on his political mantle. In Robert Cecil, Burghley had a son who had been primed for the highest offices in government and who, by the final decade of the sixteenth century, was in a commanding position to take on the responsibilities of high office. The same cannot be said of Sackville’s son Robert, who, while being a capable individual, had yet to establish himself as a leading figure at Court. This was largely due to the fact that, for much of his life, he was chiefly preoccupied with government and family affairs in Sussex, serving as a knight of the
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shire of the county in 1584, and again in 1592, 1597, 1601, and 1604. This is not to suggest that Thomas Sackville in any way inhibited his son’s career; indeed, there is evidence to suggest that towards the end of his father’s life, attempts were made to integrate him further into life in London and at court. Sackville established Robert within his own household, renting the substantial property of Cecil House on the Strand for his son’s use at the rate of 8\text{li} 12\text{s} a year. This large house, with its riverside garden, tennis court and bowling alley, was arguably the finest riverside residence on the Strand, and Sackville’s acquisition of the property must be seen as a forthright attempt to establish his son in London. Likewise, Robert’s wish to set out a household in Kent can be seen as part of this broader effort to move closer to the city. The purchase and renovation of Knole, transformed for the requirements needed for entertaining both the King and his court was clearly made with his son’s political future in mind, even if he did not show the signs of promise that Thomas Sackville himself might have hoped.

It is possible, therefore, to identify a number of motivations for Thomas Sackville’s re-acquisition of Knole in 1604. Following his appointment as Lord Treasurer, Thomas Sackville had the confidence, both in terms of his resources and his influence, to undertake a programme of architectural patronage. He appears to have considered remodelling the family’s ancestral seat at Buckhurst, expanding the property to a scale similar to that of Longleat, but in a style closer to that of Burghley. These plans, as set out by the surveyor John Thorpe, were never realised, probably because they were simply too ambitious even for someone of Sackville’s resources. However, there was also another consideration, and this was the house’s location. Situated in Sussex, and only accessible by poorly maintained roads, Buckhurst was not easily amenable from the capital, and could not satisfy Sackville’s needs for the entertainment of the court, or provide a place to which he could himself retire.

As Sackville’s health worsened, this became a more pertinent issue. The house at West Horsley served its purpose well enough, and was frequently used by Sackville when ill, but because the house was only leased from his son-in-law there was less
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benefit in the long term for any major investment in the development of the fabric of the house. Furthermore, while the house was easily amenable from the palaces of Windsor, Richmond, Hampton Court, Nonsuch and Oatlands, it was some distance from the concentration of Sackville estates in northeast Sussex. This arrangement may have suited a councillor whose monarch’s progresses were increasingly limited by infirmity, but when James I acceded as king, playing host to the monarch changed dramatically. James I’s development of Eltham Palace shifted emphasis away from the series of Surrey palaces and towards Kent, and although the work at Eltham was soon abandoned for the more expansive project that was envisaged at Ampthill, at the time of Sackville’s acquisition of Knole there was still the attractive proposition of having a country seat within close proximity of the royal hunting lodge.

Like the Cecil palace at Theobalds, Knole would serve both as a house for accommodation of the court both on business and pleasure, and as a house suitable for Sackville’s own private recreation. Furthermore, it would firmly establish the Sackville family in Kent, as a foothold from which to develop their influence over the county. In this way, there were both immediate and longer-term benefits for investing in the estate at Knole. This combination of both the pragmatic and the dynastic considerations which shaped Thomas Sackville’s work at Knole will inform the following discussion of the transformation of the house at Knole, as Sackville converted the fifteenth century fabric into a country house that he and his family required.

The Acquisition of Knole, 1604

On the 23rd January 1604, Thomas Sackville purchased the lease of Knole for £4,000, buying Sampson Lennard out of the 51 years that remained on the lease that had originally been made between Thomas Rolf and Robert Dudley. Thirty years after he had abandoned Knole, Thomas Sackville returned to the house. What is surprising to learn from the Sackvilles’ accounts for 1604 is that there was relatively little activity at the house. From the 29th of January, Sackville began to pay the wages of the warrener
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and the bailiff at Knole. Pewter, brass and ironwork implements were brought to the house, as were covers, sheets, and blankets, along with other household stuffs taken from Dorset house. Salt stones were brought to the dove house at Knole and repairs were made to the paling. Likewise, small agricultural necessities were tended to, but there are no direct references to any building work at the house. There is the possibility that the sum of 65 li 9s for ‘Charges extraordinary at Knoll’ might relate to the commencement of some form of building activity, but this is a relatively small sum, and probably represented the stockpiling of materials in anticipation of the build.

Evidence suggests that Sackville may well have waited until he obtained the freehold of the property before starting building in earnest. If this cautious approach was habitual, the means by which Sackville set about obtaining the lease were entirely typical. Rather than petitioning the crown for a grant of the property, or even offering a sum for the freehold, Sackville contrived to seize the lease in a covert and convoluted manner. On the 5th of April 1605, the Crown (probably unknowingly) granted the lordship of Knole in Kent to Rowland White, Robert Sidney’s representative and agent, and other unnamed individuals for the sum of 220 li 6s 8d. Soon after, on the 8th June 1605, Rowland White was granted the reversion on the demesne lands at Otford for 40 years.

On the 10th of April 1605, Thomas Sackville conveyed the lease of Knole to three of his principal secretaries, Michael Heydon, John Suckling, and Edward Lyndsey. This was no doubt intended as a preventative measure, an attempt to complicate any future effort to wrestle the lease from Sackville or his heirs. The surreptitious nature of these deals and grants is further suggested by the survival of a small note, originally appended to the grant of the 10th of April 1605. The document, now removed from the grant, is catalogued amongst a series of miscellaneous papers in the Sackville archive.
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'This graunt was made by me to preserve the lease if at any time, any quearell might or shold be made to the fee simple, T Dorset, This graunt being inrolde in the chequer doth remain very secret & unknowen, & so it is fit it remain until by some necessary caus the same must be made knowen T D.'  

Two days later, on April the 12th, Rowland White and John Williams granted the lordship of Knole, with the mansion house and the park, to Thomas Sackville for the sum of £2,500. In his will, Sackville stated that this indenture was enrolled at the Court of Chancery, but no record of this grant appears to have survived.

This complex series of transactions, whereby Rowland White and John Williams purchased the freehold from the crown only to sell it to Sackville days later, must be seen as a premeditated plan, orchestrated by Sackville himself and made possible by the complicity of both his servants and other parties. There is no mention of the agreement with Sackville in any of White’s surviving correspondence, and it must be assumed that the deal was struck in private and in person between the two. This was not the first time that White had acquired leases on various properties, but it is the only example of when White acquired a property on behalf of another individual. There is a certain amount of irony in the fact that the day after these transactions had been made, Thomas Sackville thought it prudent to write to Robert Cecil, alerting him of the abuses in the exchequer office, warning him that grants were being passed without the King’s knowledge. Sackville was only able to push through this illegal transaction courtesy of his position as Lord Treasurer, and through his influence over key personnel in the exchequer and ambitious individuals such as Rowland White.
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The other figure in the transaction can be identified as the London Goldsmith and financier John Williams (fl. 1584-1627?), something that can be deduced from the fact that Williams’s signature at the foot of the indenture for Knole can be matched to his signature on a bill for Lionel Cranfield of March 1622/3. Operating from the sign of the Cross Keys on Cheapside, Williams served as the King’s Goldsmith, and was an associate of Sackville’s who provided him with both silver wares and ready money. It was quite usual for successful goldsmiths such as Williams to act as financiers for both the crown and private individuals, and Sackville appears to have used Williams, as a favoured associate, to help finance the £2,500 transaction which, even for someone of Sackville’s means, was a substantial amount.

So Thomas Sackville had the means, the contacts and the capital to bring such a complex plan into fruition. Quite why the matter had to be conducted with so much secrecy is impossible to say, but as suggested it is entirely typical of Sackville’s modus operandi. White’s involvement suggests that a deal may well have been struck with Robert Sidney, whereby Sidney allowed Sackville to rent the park and the Great Lodge at Otford in exchange for Sackville ceasing his attempts to claim Otford Palace. Whatever the case, by the 12th of April 1605, Sackville had finally obtained both the leasehold and the freehold of Knole and could begin his building project in earnest. His recent involvement in the plans for Ampthill and Eltham Palace had given him vital experience in the production of large-scale building projects – it had brought him into direct contact with the leading craftsmen of the day and had made him alive to the considerations that were required for the accommodation of the new King and his court, and Sackville would reap the benefits of both when he came to build at Knole.
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Chapter Four: Thomas Sackville’s building programme at Knole 1605-8

On the 2nd July 1614, a draft of a valuation of the manor of Knole was drawn up by the 3rd Earl of Dorset. The first item was the house itself, which was described as…

‘late re-edified w/ a barne, stable, dovehouse/ and other edifices, together w/ divers Courts, the/ gardens orchards and wilderness invironed w/ a/ stone wall, well planted w/ chose frute, and/ beawtified w/ ponds, and manie other pleasureable/ delights and devises are situate w/ in the Parke/ of knoll, the charge of new building of the said house/ and making planting and furnishing of the said/ ponds yards gardens orchards and wilderness about/ Seaven yeares past Thirty thosand pounds/ at the least yet exstant uppon Accounpts. All/ w/ are now in the Earle of dorsett's owne occupacon and are worth to bee sold’

This is the first written description of the house following the dramatic remodelling undertaken by Thomas Sackville and, despite its brevity, provides two important pieces of information which cannot otherwise be gleaned from the surviving sources. It confirms that work on the house had been finished by 1608 at the latest, and also relates that this work had cost at least £30,000 to complete. This chapter looks to identify precisely what this work involved, and how it was achieved in such a short space of time. It aims to provide the most comprehensive understanding of both the planning and the execution of the work, how it was organised and who was responsible for it.

1 CKS U269 T1 Bdl. A.
The evidence of previous ownership

The house that Thomas Sackville acquired in January 1604 had barely changed since he had been at Knole some thirty years previously. It was a house that was essentially that of Archbishop Thomas Bourchier (c. 1411-1486), the patron who had carried out various campaigns of building between 1456 – when he took hold of the lease – and 1486 when he died. This phase of building, as outlined by Oxford Archaeology (Phase 2A/B) (fig. 7), resulted in the creation of a multi-courtyard house based around four successive courtyard spaces. Given that Bourchier had to contend with a substantial existing structure, it is remarkable that he was able to create such a coherently planned house, which provided a series of spacious lodgings with excellent communication between the principal rooms of the house.²

Bourchier’s plan still defines the layout of the house as it stands today, and while there have been dramatic and far-reaching changes both internally and externally, the arrangement of the Archbishop’s house has been left largely unaltered. As it remains, the service area of the house was positioned in the northeast corner of the house, while the Chapel and a suite of more private rooms were situated in the southeast corner. Stone Court contained the great hall to the east, lodging apartments to the north and a further suite of prestigious lodgings clustered around the gatehouse of Bourchier Tower. The north range of this court still retains its fifteenth-century roof structure, with a series of finely moulded roof trusses which were originally visible from the first-floor lodging rooms. The position of three garderobe towers serving these rooms confirm that these were high-status lodgings, designed either for elite members of Bourchier’s household or prestigious visitors. Access to these rooms was provided by a timber framed gallery which ran around the interior face of Stone Court, originally in-filled with decorative brickwork, remnants of which can still be seen in the void between the north wall Cartoon Gallery [F141] and the Tapestry Passage [F143].

In this area of the house, where expansion was largely unimpeded by early phases of work, there was a clear attempt to facilitate access and movement, something that can most clearly be seen in galleries of communication that run between the high

² Oxford Archaeology attribute the creation of Green Court to Bourchier’s successors at the See of Canterbury, but there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Bourchier himself was responsible for its construction. See Alden Gregory, ‘Knole – The Archbishops’ Palace’, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis for the University of Sussex, 2010.
status suite of rooms of the Bourchier Tower [F155 and F64] and the Chapel. Although a substantial distance apart, these two significant areas of the house were linked through the passage that led down from the flight of stairs serving the Bourchier Room [F155] to what is now Parlour Passage [G152], through the Lead Stairs [G149] (which is the most likely site of Bourchier’s hall stair) and into the Great Hall [G121]. From the hall, Bourchier could pass through the doorway on the east wall, through the area which is now occupied by the Great Staircase [G123] and into a timber framed passageway, one that was no doubt akin to that which stands today [G126], before heading west and into the Chapel, either through the main entranceway [M01], or via the entrance to the undercroft from the Boot Room [G137].

Although subsequent changes to the south range of Stone Court make it difficult to reconstruct its original plan, it seems likely that the range contained a series of State Apartments overlooking the garden, something that is suggested by the fact that this range did not mirror the fifteenth-century lodging apartments on the adjacent side of Stone Court. The expansion of the house westwards through the creation of Green Court provided additional stabling and lodging, and with a greater degree of security provided by the Outer Wicket. This was a house designed for a large retinue and built for the accommodation of the King and his court. Set within a large deer park, Knole was also a house built with a mind towards courtly recreation, and while it is clear that the house served as a stopping-off point for the Archbishop en route between London and Canterbury, it was clearly used by Bourchier as a place of retirement from court life in London. As he approached death, Bourchier spent more and more time at the house. This being said, these ideas of leisure and retirement are not readily associated with the militaristic features that adorn surviving sections of Bourchier’s house. While crennellated rooflines were staple trappings of the elite, the machicolations and murder-holes of the Bourchier Tower (fig. 31) assert a martial authority not immediately reconcilable with Thomas Bourchier’s ecclesiastical offices. These markedly defensive features can be seen as symptomatic of the turbulence endured by Bourchier in the second half of the fifteenth century, and the constant threats to Bourchier’s position as a leading minister in both Lancastrian and Yorkist governments. The reasons as to why Thomas Sackville chose to retain so much of Bourchier’s great house will be discussed.

3 These features include the two masonry doorways to the Colonnade Room and the grand three-light window that serves the ground floor lobby to the second stair.
in detail later in this chapter, but a major consideration must have been the success of Bourchier’s plan, one that was left largely unaltered during the period 1486-1604.

There were, however, significant changes made to certain areas of the house by Thomas Bourchier’s successors at the See of Canterbury. These additions involved the remodelling of the Pheasant Court Building and an expansion of the house eastwards, creating a new suite of lodging ranges on the first floor of the east façade, accessed by the newly created Brown and Leicester Galleries. The new Pheasant Court Building, which was built up against the Duke’s Tower, completely replaced the previous structure on that site and provided high status chambers for the Archbishop. It was another area of the house that was left largely unaltered by Thomas Sackville, and today retains its close studded north façade and two fine bays that light both the French Library [G142] and the Pheasant Court Room [F133]. The two five-canted bays are of three tall, transomed lights facing the court, each with flanking single-lights on either side and two further lights of a similar design between them. Internally, the mullions and transoms display a sophisticated moulding profile of a type also used in the panelled and ribbed ceilings of the Pheasant Court Building, and are almost identical to those seen in the fenestration of the Brown and Leicester Galleries. Likewise, the baton ceilings of the Brown Gallery (f. 27) [F110] and Spangled Bedroom (f. 28) [F103] share this same moulding profile, something that suggests that all of this work should be associated with a single phase of building. Stylistically, this work finds close parallels in the work of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, something that would indicate that it was undertaken either during the tenure of Thomas Morton (1486-1500) or William Warham (1503-1532).

Thomas Bourchier’s successors to the See of Canterbury were Cardinal John Morton (Archbishop from 1486-1500), Henry Dean (1501-1503), William Warham (1503-1532), and Thomas Cranmer (1533-1553).


The existence of which is suggested by the survival of the ledge on the north wall of the Duke’s Tower, as discussed above. The fact that the previous range was removed entirely before the construction of the current building is suggested by the fact that the joists at first-floor level correspond to the construction of the oriel windows on the northern façade.


Thomas Wolsey’s work at Hampton court of 1515-27 would represent a more ornate manifestation of the geometric baton-type ceiling design. A similar ceiling from the gallery at the Manor House at Bermondsey, which shared the same coved form as the
Unfortunately, the surviving documentation for the period does not give any indication as which of the two archbishops was responsible for this work. Thomas Morton was arguably the most prolific builder in England in the late fifteenth century, and what remains of his work at Hatfield Palace gives a sense of the ambition of his architectural patronage. In 1493, a royal licence was given to Morton giving him power to impress stonemasons and bricklayers for a programme of building and repair on the manors of the Church of Canterbury in Kent, Surrey and Sussex, and it is possible that work at Knole may have been carried out following this warrant. In his *Perambulation of Kent* of 1576, the antiquarian William Lambarde alluded to additions at Knole in his section on the Archbishop’s palace at Otford, when he stated that both Morton and Warham had made additions to the fabric of Knole following Bourchier’s work, but it is difficult to know whether to treat Lambarde as a credible source. On the one hand, Lambarde was local to Sevenoaks, having moved from London to Kent following his marriage in 1570 to Jane, daughter of George Multon, who was Esquire and Justice of the Peace of nearby Ightham. Living within the Manor of St Clere in Ightham, Lambarde served as Commissioner for the Sewers in Kent from 1568 onwards, and surveyed the palace and park of Otford in April 1573, accompanied by his father-in-law and two members of the Office of Works, Thomas Flood and Lewis Stockett. As suggested in the previous chapter, there is the possibility that these same individuals were responsible for making the survey of Knole that was referred to in John Lennard’s letter of petition to Lord Burghley. Whatever the case, it would seem likely that Lambarde’s familiarity with Otford and Knole would have given him at least a basic understanding of their building histories. However, there are a number of reasons to doubt Lambarde’s reliability. The first is the fact that he makes a straightforward error when discussing Knole, stating that it was Archbishop Morton who purchased the manor from Lord Say and Sele, rather than Archbishop Bourchier. The second difficulty

Brown Gallery was lost when the place was destroyed but was recorded in Thomas Garner and Arthur Stratton, *The Domestic Architecture of England during the Tudor Period*, London, 1911, p. 198.


with Lambarde’s text is the fact that his account of Warham’s work at Otford is a thinly veiled post-Reformation attack on the supposed excesses of the pre-Reformation Archbishops. In Lambarde’s eyes, Otford was built as a ‘glorious monument of his [Warham’s] worldly wealth and misbegotten treasure’, despite the fact that ‘hee himselfe, Morton his immediate predecessor and Bourchier before him had not long before liberally builded at Knolle, a house little more than two miles from it’. Such a partisan stance makes it difficult to know quite whether Lambarde’s account should be believed.

Another reason why Lambarde’s authority appears suspect is the fact that he seems to rely heavily on printed texts for his information, something that contravenes the idea that Lambarde was drawing on personal knowledge of the area. Using Erasmus as his source, Lambarde described how Warham razed the existing structure of Otford to the ground, save the walls of the hall and a chapel, and completely rebuilt the house.\(^{13}\) Far larger than Knole, with a vast courtyard replete with galleries and lodgings, Otford was built on a scale that rivalled Hampton Court, the creation of Cardinal Wolsey – Warham’s counterpart at the See of York, and his political enemy.

Due to the lack of building accounts, it is not known when the work at Otford was begun, but the visit of Cardinal Campeggio, who was given ‘good and great cheer, and divers pleasures and goodly pastimes’ in the summer of 1518, suggests that work at the palace was largely complete by this point.\(^ {14}\) If Lambarde was correct in asserting that Warham completed his work at Knole prior to that at Otford, then this would suggest a date of between around 1503 to around 1515 for his work at Knole.

The next significant moment in Knole’s ownership history was Henry VIII’s acquisition of the property in 1538, when he forced Archbishop Cranmer to surrender both Knole and Otford to the Crown. In May of that year, £425 was expended on repairs at Knole, Otford, Petworth in Sussex and the More in Hertfordshire. These works were managed by James Needham, a master-carpenter at the Royal Works who was responsible for the supervision of a number of royal projects throughout the South East.\(^ {15}\) Because the records of building work at Knole and Otford during this period can

\(^{13}\) Lambarde, *Perambulation*, 1576, p. 378.
\(^ {15}\) BL ARUNDEL MS97, f. 22i, ‘Item payd to jamys Nedh’m by the kingis warr’nt dated xxvijjjo maij Anno xxx⁰ cont the p[t] of xxv⁰ to be by him employed towards the
only be traced through issued warrants, which provide little indication as to where or how these sums were being spent, it is almost impossible to know what was undertaken during this period of the house’s ownership. Matters are further confused by the fact that the warrants often treat the Manors of Otford and Knole as a single entity, something that makes it impossible to specify what was being spent at Knole. However, of the £2,221 expended during Richard Long’s stewardship for ‘works’, ‘buildings’ and ‘repairs’ at Otford and Knole, £998 was designated specifically for works at Otford, with the remainder split between Otford, Pantherst Park and Knole, something that gives the strong indication that the majority of new building was undertaken at Otford rather than Knole. This idea is given strength by the fact that a survey of Otford from 1548 mentions the ‘King’s Privye Chamber’, and the Queen’s Privy Chamber, and the ‘Newe Gallery’ which suggests that Henry VIII undertook a substantial programme of remodelling at Otford, creating the requisite suites for the royal household. Altogether, it would appear that Henry VIII modified Otford, but chose simply to maintain Knole, and any improvements that were made to Knole were concerned with developing the garden and estate for the King’s recreation and use.

Both Knole and Otford appear in planned itineraries for the summer ‘jests’ of 1541, and it would appear that the improvements to these properties were made with a mind towards visits during summer progresses. The following year, Henry VIII transferred 240 deer to the park at Otford from the royal parks of Greenwich, Eltham and Itchinghan, and appointed Sir Richard Long (c. 1494-1546) as Steward of the Manor of Knole, a man with a wealth of experience in the management of courtly recreation. Having served as an Esquire of the Stable, the Master of the Royal Buckhounds and as the steward of the royal parks of Eltham and Southwark, Long was

kings reparracons of the kings man’s of Otford, Knolle in kent petworth in Sussex & ij new chambers and a watched chamber at the manor in [p]te payment of the said warrant CCxxl

16 The correspondence is equally vague, and gives no detail as to the nature of the work. See NA E 351/21/2/f.4
17 See Colvin, HKW, Volume III, (Part I), London, 1975, p. 218. Between June 1541 and March 1542 alone, £872 was spent on building work at Otford. NA E 351/21/2
18 NA E 101/4974
19 ‘From Hampton Court to Asher, Oking, Guildford, Windsor, the More, Hatfield, Enfield, Hertford, Hunsdon, Enfield, Copathall, Havering, Wanestest, Greenwich, Eltham, Otford, Knoll, Pershurst, Otford, Beddington, Horsley, Oking, and Hampton Court.’ BL Add, MS, 9,835, f. 2
a man ideally suited to the management the two large parks and gardens at Knole and Otford. During Long’s tenure of the stewardship, which lasted up until his death in 1546, the majority of funds designated for Knole appear to have been spent on the maintenance and improvement of the gardens and parkland. The sum of £50 was spent for a ‘new bridge and standing pool in the park of Otford and Knolle’, and in July 1541 Sir Richard Rich, Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations, wrote to Edward North, the Treasurer of the Court, relating the King’s desire to ‘repair the buildings and clean the ponds and gardens of his manors of Otford and Knoll, together with the parks of Otford Knoll and Pan ters’. Further payments to Sir Richard Long in 1543 include provisions for ‘making the King’s garden at Knolle’, and along with these improvements to the garden, there also appear to have been developments to the park. The manorial survey, made for Thomas Sackville in around 1570, makes reference to areas of parkland at Knole that contained the butts and a bowling alley, a new type of recreational feature that was increasingly common in royal parks and palaces during the late 1530s and 1540s.

23 ibid. p. 472.
25 No detail is given due to the fact that the survey is almost solely concerned with the value of the woodland in the park. The reference relates to woodland ‘above the butts and the bollinge Alley’, CKS U269 E336/3. From about 1537 a host of bowling alleys had been added to the royal residences. At Ampthill the alley was defined by two turfed banks upon which seven wooden seats were set, and at each end there were boarded areas surrounded by railings. A similar structure was made at Grafton, Northamptonshire, where seats were designated for ‘the king’s grace to rest on’, and wooden rails ‘for gentlemen to lean on’, whilst at Woking the alley was boarded ‘for the bully to mak a jompe on.’ Much like the bowling alley, the inclusion of butts was a prerequisite of any Henrician visit, as was to be the case at Dartford, where butts had to be set up by candlelight in preparation of the King’s imminent arrival. Colvin, HKW, Volume IV, 1485-1660, (Part II), 1982, pp. 41, 93, 346, 71.
The Lennard Tenancy of Knole 1574-1604

There is no evidence that there was any major work undertaken by any of the owners of Knole between 1547 and 1574. On the 16th of November 1587, John Lennard wrote to Lord Burghley to petition the Lord Treasurer for abatement on his rent for Knole, in compensation for the expenses incurred by Lennard in repairing and maintaining the property when he had first arrived at the house in 1574. Lennard’s letter relates that Thomas Sackville received an abatement of £60 during his four years of the lease, and explained that when he first took possession of the lease in 1574, a survey was made of the various repairs that needed to be made to Knole and to a number of tenements associated with the manor. This survey, which was undertaken by ‘M’ Cyng & M’ fflyd s’veyo”, estimated the repairs at £204 5s 5d, but does not appear to have survived. Lennard also wrote that his reparations were made, ‘in stonewalynge y e house & gardeyne & other voluntary acts for y e which I ask for nothynge – yf yt had not been don yn tyme but a thousande pounds wolde not have don y’. In making his case, Lennard alluded to the decay of Otford Palace and the increasing sums that would be required to repair it, a further suggestion that it was the structure of Knole itself that had been under threat when he took over the lease in 1574.

However, it appears that John Lennard exaggerated the ruinous state of the house in 1574. In the previous year, Elizabeth I visited Knole during her summer progress, and stayed at the house between the 24th and 29th of July. As was common practice during progress, the Privy Council accompanied the Queen whenever possible, and at Knole, a house designed for such events, Lord Burghley, Lord Say and Sele, Sir Francis Knollys, Sir Francis Walsingham and Robert Dudley were all present. The accounts of the Office of Works record the relatively modest expenditure of £12 10d for

---

26 ESO D/DL/C43/1/6
27 ‘m t audyor allowed unto my lord/ Bukherst CCxlth for iiij years upon the sayd lease w’th ys lx” for ev’y yeare of hys iiij yeares’ ESO D/DL/C43/1/6. The only real record of Sackville’s occupancy between 1570-1574 comes in the form of a series of notes made on arrears on quit rents. See CKS U269 M156
28 ESO D/DL C43/1/6
29 APC Vol. VIII, 1571-1575, London, 1894, p. 133. The likelihood must be that the Leicester Gallery at Knole derives its name from this visit, and the same must be the case for the Bedroom on the first floor of the Duke’s Tower described as the ‘Queen’s Chamber’ in the sale inventory of 1645 CKS U269 O10/1. For an alternative interpretation of the sale inventory see Mark Girouard, Elizabethan Architecture, New Haven and London, 2009, n. 98, p. 470.
works at Knole for the Queen’s visit and itemised small-scale carpentry, glazing and unspecified smiths’ work, none of which suggests any major structural undertaking. The £12 spent did represent a larger sum than the £8 spent at the Archbishop’s Palace at Croydon that year, but there is no suggestion that the house was in a state of dereliction, and its state of repair was evidently far superior to that of nearby Otford, which had been preferred for the progress of 1559 over Knole, but was not chosen for the progress of 1573. At Knole, around 30 yards of glass was set up or repaired, and the inference is that what was undertaken by the craftsmen of the Office of Works was part of the routine work required for any royal visit, which mainly involved the provision of sleeping quarters for the courtiers and their servants.

There are a number of difficulties inherent in trying to gauge the work that the Lennards may have undertaken at Knole during their tenure. Typically, the main problem is the fragmentary nature of the evidence. For this period the only surviving household accounts date from the period 1585-1587. The bills and receipts for building work at Knole that survive from this period support John Lennard’s claims made in his petition to Burghley that he and his son had invested in the fabric of the building and the estate as a whole without actually transforming the house in any meaningful way. This is supported by the building archaeology at Knole, which shows no features that can be identified as Lennard additions, and the suggestion must be that if the Lennards did modernise or augment the house, these changes were entirely erased when Sackville came to remodel the house in 1604.

During the 1585-1587 period, the Lennards constructed a windmill at Panshurst and created a family chapel at Chevening Church from the existing Chantry Chapel to house their funerary monuments. The tomb of John Lennard and his wife Elizabeth Harman, whose death in 1585 no doubt instigated the tomb and the work on the chapel, is a fine example of Elizabethan tomb sculpture. The effigies are accurately rendered,

---

30 NA E351/3208
31 The house had been surveyed in April of that year and the estimated repairs would have cost £1,629 9s 10d, an astronomic figure in comparison to the £12 needed to bring Knole up to scratch. NA E178/1100 The Archbishop’s palace at Otford suffered continually from its location at the bottom of a valley, and the marshy land that it was built on did much to damage the building fabric. A survey of the house in 1597 described the ‘verie wett soyle upon spinges and vawtes of water’ and related that in winter the floors and walls became ‘very moyst and wett’ and in summer, ‘hoary and mustie’. NA E178/1165
33 ESO D/DL/E77
and must represent likenesses, while the tomb itself is classically inspired, adorned with Latin inscriptions and armorial bearings, a pertinent representation of Lennard’s aspirations (fig. 29). The contract for the chapel roof and the various partitions that delineated the former Chantry chapel as a private family space was made with William Chapman, a local carpenter of nearby Rethered. The roof itself is a coved structure embellished with baton ribs and small bosses that in form and decoration do not correspond with any surviving carpentry work at Knole.

A bill from the mason John Wryght relates that the garden wall at Knole was under construction in April 1585, and records other works that seem to have been part of a wider programme of maintenance and repair at the house. The bill notes the creation of a new gate, repairs to the limekiln, the burning of lime and the digging of both stone and lime. Two leaves of household accounts that date from September of the same year also contain payments to a number of craftsmen for work on the house. Although payments were made to the mason, the turner and the joiner, the majority of this work was for fenestration, which included painting the glazing bars for the ‘thoroughfare windows’. The fact that this evidence is so fragmentary, and totalled only 35 shillings and sixpence, makes it difficult to argue that the works of 1585 represent anything more than small scale internal repair and renovation.

It appears that the production of this glasswork was undertaken within the manor itself. There had been a glasshouse associated with the manor since the mid fifteenth century, situated near to Whitcliffe Wood. The production of glass at Knole seems to have followed the general pattern in the Wealden glass industry during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. After a period of decline, the industry enjoyed a resurgence following the influx of continental expertise. In 1567 the French merchant Jean Carré obtained a patent to manufacture window glass in the Weald, and brought over glassmakers from Lorraine and Normandy. This led to a substantial increase in both the quantity and quality of the production of English glass, the majority of which was

---

34 ESO D/DL/E77
35 ESO D/DL/E77
36 ESO D/DL/E60 These accounts mention the new gate for the garden, something that is mentioned in dated bills for 1585 ESO D/DL/E77
37 ESO D/DL/E60
38 NA SC6/1130/1 This document mentions ‘glasshouseland’ near Whitcliffe Wood 7-8 Edward IV – 1467-8. This reference was kindly provided by Alden Gregory.
produced in the Kent and Sussex Weald.\textsuperscript{39} Knole’s abundant supplies of coppicing wood and its sandy soil made it the ideal location for this industry. In various letters written between 1585 and 1587, Lennard’s steward Roger Puleston mentioned the names of the glassmakers ‘Valyan’\textsuperscript{40}, ‘Bousell’ and ‘Brussels’, which gives the strong indication that continental expertise was employed in the manufacture of the glass at Knole. The cordwood was felled within the manor, predominantly in Hook and Whitley Woods, and once the glass had been produced, it was stored at the house.\textsuperscript{41} There seems to have been some anxiety on Lennard’s behalf concerning security, as Roger Puleston related that ‘the Outer Court gate is locked every night at supper tyme and all the night after supper also; the Towne gate and all the gates in ye park are kepe locked both night and day’.\textsuperscript{42} The glass was brought into the house and ‘handsomely placed in the Chamber where your worship appointed as you shall see at your retorne’, although again Puleston felt obliged to reassure Lennard that ‘there are two locks on the dore to make all fast’.\textsuperscript{43}

Although Puleston’s comments about security suggest that the glass at Knole was not set in casements and therefore vulnerable to removal, the indication given is that it was intended for use in the house. There is the possibility that some of the heraldic glass that survives in two of the windows in the cartoon gallery (fig. 30) was manufactured for Lennard during this period. The small stained glass pieces depict the arms of a series of the most eminent judges and lawyers in the country, all of whom were John Lennard’s contemporaries and colleagues, although the appointment of Ralph Rokeby as Master of Requests in 1591 suggests that this series may well have been produced by Sampson Lennard just after his father’s death in 1590.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{40} The family ‘Le Vaillant’ was one of the leading families of the glasswork industry of Normandy. Pierre Vaillant was active at Buckholt in 1576.
\textsuperscript{41} ESO D/DL/E77 There are a number of payments for felling timber in Whitley wood within this unfoliated series.
\textsuperscript{43} Barrett-Lennard, ‘Glass-making at Knole’, 1905, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{44} When John Bridgman recorded the arms in 1797 they were in situ in the Cartoon Gallery at Knole. He records 12 badges, there are now only 10. He records Richard Cole ‘of the arches’ Ralph Rokeby, (d. 1595) Master of the Requests from 1591 and a member of Lincoln’s Inn, Roger Manwood (c. 1532-1592) Chief Baron of the Exchequer and aside from William Lovelace, the pre-eminent lawyer in Kent, Christopher Wray (1522-1592) also of Lincoln’s Inn, William Lewin (c. 1545-98) another Kentish figure and a leading ecclesiastical lawyer, ‘Julius’ who can be
After he left Knole in 1604, Sampson Lennard went on to spend the substantial sum of £1000 in remodelling the Dacre residence of Herstmonceux Castle in Sussex, but there is little evidence that such an expansive programme of building was undertaken at Knole.⁴⁵ This supposition is supported by the fact that there is very little in Knole’s surviving fabric that can be dated, either stylistically or scientifically, to the Lennard tenure. The solitary dendrochronology result for a timber with a last measured ring of 1576 and a sapwood boundary of 1592, located in the attic space of the east range, must represent a localised repair rather than any substantial campaign of building. Although there is the possibility that any Lennard additions or alterations were completely erased during the Sackville renovations of 1604-1608, all of the evidence seems to suggest that the Lennards did not undertake any major work on the house.

The Lennard Household

One of the key motivations for John Lennard in moving the family home from nearby Chevening to Knole appears to have been the need to accommodate an expanding family with increasingly elevated aspirations. His eldest son Sampson had married Margaret Fiennes, sister and heir to the 10th Lord Dacre, and his second son Samuel had married the daughter of the Lord Mayor of London, Sir Stephen Slanye. His eldest daughter Mary married Guilford Walshingham of Kent, his second daughter Elizabeth married Francis Eure (c.1564-1621), who would become Chief Justice of North Wales, and his third daughter Rachel married Edward Neville (c.1550-1622) of Birling, Kent, who would later become Lord Bergavenny. Anne married Marmaduke Darrell, and his youngest daughter Timothea married Walter Covert (c. 1549-1632) of Slaugham; altogether, an impressive set of matches that tied the Lennard family to a number of prominent families across the country.

---

By this point Sampson Lennard had also started his own family, and he would go on to produce four sons and six daughters. Unusually, covenants in the marriage settlement between Sampson Lennard’s daughter Elizabeth and Francis Barnham (1576-1646) stipulated that the couple should live at the Lennard residence [married 1597-8]. Barnham later described this in his memoirs, ‘Within lesse than two years after my marriage I came to live in my fathers, house, thought I had then by covenant one yeeres being more with my father in lawe, who thought he kept a very honorable house, and lived in all respects in soe brave a passion as might make the beinge there very delightfull’. This was also the case for the marriage of Sampson’s daughter Margaret to Sir Thomas Waller (d.1614), whose son William Waller (1598?-1668) was born at Knole. Similar arrangements were drawn up between Sir George More and Sampson Lennard when Frances Lennard married Robert More [12 May 1601], who came to live with the Lennards at Knole. Writing from Knole in 1602, Lennard wrote to Sir George More, informing him that a doctor had been to visit Robert in his illness, and reassured him that his son would make a full recovery, although the doctor did warn that ‘he is so sore taken wth them yt It is likely/ he wyll have many holes in his face’.

It can be seen that even by contemporary standards the Lennard family was sizeable, its numbers swelled by the various in-laws residing at Knole, and it is clear that Knole was acquired with a mind towards the accommodation of this far-reaching family with its aristocratic connections. While the Lennards appear not to have augmented the structure of the house, they do seem to have invested in its internal decoration. Lennard purchased a number of textiles and hangings from the sale of Archbishop Parker’s goods at Lambeth, which must have followed shortly after his death in 1575. These objects may well have adorned Knole when it had belonged to the Archbishopric. Lennard’s purchase was a substantial one, as he bought fifteen pieces of tapestry hanging, measuring 385 ells, a window cloth and a turkey carpet. Three of the hangings were taken from the hall at Lambeth, described in the sale inventory as ‘thre

49 A draft agreement, mainly concerning provisioning for stabling for the couple survives at SHC LM/348/291.
50 SHC LOSELEY MSS LM COR 4/9
51 ERO D/DL/E77
peces of hanginge of broade leaves’, while others were simply described as ‘Imagry Tapistry’.

There is every indication that the Lennards lived in some style at Knole and entertained those at the heart of court circles. In late December 1594, Sampson Lennard felt confident to invite Cecil’s principal secretary Michael Hicks to ‘cum wth your bedfello to/ Knoll wher you shall fynd the best welcom I can give/ you’. In 1596, Sir Walter Raleigh, his wife and his brother-in-law Sir Arthur Throgmorton were all at Knole, where according to Robert Sydney’s servant Rowland White, they were ‘very much made of and feasted’ by Sampson Lennard. White notes another occasion, April 27th 1597, when Robert Sidney’s wife and children stayed at Knole on their way to Penshurst, and those that accompanied them reported that they ‘very much commend the Intertainment my Lady Dacres gave unto my Lady and them’.

The extravagant hospitality that became commonplace at Knole was typical of Sampson Lennard’s profligacy. This did much to damage his estate, and in 1599 Lennard was forced to sell his lands to repay his considerable debts. This probably had a considerable bearing on his decision to sell the remainder of his lease to Thomas Sackville for the sum of £4,000 on 23rd January 1604. Another motivating factor for Lennard must have been his attempts to secure the Dacre title for himself. The matter seems to have reached an impasse during the later years of Elizabeth I’s reign, but in the heady days of James I’s accession there was renewed hope of a resolution. As the Lord Treasurer, and a leading figure in the Jacobean court, Thomas Sackville’s influence would have been instrumental in determining the outcome of the

---

53 BL Landsdown MS77/fol. 186
57 CKS U269 T1 Bdl. B
58 John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton 8 Dec 1598, The cases of both Henry Lennard for the title of Dacre and Edward Neville for the title of Lord Abergavenny were brought to the Court of the Earl Marshall, who at this point was Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex. NA SP12/269/7. In June 1598 Thomas Hesketh writing to Lord Burghley noted Sackville’s interest in the Dacre Estate, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. The Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, Vol. 8, 1899, p. 222.
complications surrounding the Dacre inheritance, and it can be no small coincidence that Sackville headed the commission that ruled in Lennard’s favour in this matter in December 1604.\(^5^9\)

So the house that Sackville took ownership of for the second time in 1604 had changed very little, if not at all, since the early part of the sixteenth century when Archbishop William Warham had had made his alterations and improvements to the house. At one point in the mid sixteenth century, the fabric of the house had been under threat, and there was an anxiety that redundant areas of the house might have been mined for valuable building materials. These fears were allayed when the Lennard family took possession of the house. They maintained the house and the estate for thirty years and used Knole as their principal residence in Kent. The substantial size of the Lennard family would have ensured that a sizeable proportion of the house was in use at all times, and kept in a good state of repair.

**Thomas Sackville’s building programme at Knole 1605-1608**

There is little evidence relating to how Thomas Sackville prepared or planned his work at Knole, so it is necessary to look quite broadly in order to gain any understanding of the measures that he took before he began to build. The fact that the acquisition of Leeds Castle was being given serious consideration by Sackville as late as 1603, and that plans for the expansion of Buckhurst might still have been a possibility, suggests that the decision to acquire Knole was made relatively quickly; a product of Sampson Lennard’s eagerness to resolve the difficulties surrounding his Dacre title and Thomas Sackville’s growing need for a new country house. Almost as soon as the lease agreement was signed with Lennard, various ‘necessaries of householde’ such as pewter and other kitchenware were brought down from London to Knole.\(^6^0\) Further household stuffs followed, and on 24\(^{th}\) March 1604, a cartload of coverlets and blankets were brought down to the house, something that suggests Sackville or his agents were making occasional stays at the house at this time.\(^6^1\) The only expenditure pertaining to Knole which is recorded in this volume of accounts, which are otherwise concerned with the administration of Sackville’s agricultural estates, relates either to the carriage

\(^6^0\) CKS U269 A2/1/60  
\(^6^1\) CKS U269 A2/1/86
of household stuffs from Dorset House to the house, or to routine management of the manor, such as clearing bracken and timber on the estate. No mention whatsoever is made for any provisioning for building work at the house, and it must be the case that during this first year at Knole, little or no start was made towards the transformation of the house.

This was probably for two reasons. The first was the fact that during 1604 Sackville did not own the freehold of the estate, and was probably waiting until he could be sure that he could obtain it before he began investing heavily in the fabric of the building. The second reason was most likely that the building project was of such ambition that it would have needed careful planning and organisation before any work could be initiated; accurate surveys would have to have been made, and detailed plans of the proposed changes would have had to have been drawn up. Craftsmen, labour and materials would all have had to have been organised well in advance of the commencement of building, with contracts and indentures agreed upon. This section will now go on to speculate as to how Thomas Sackville conceived his project and how he may have gone about procuring the requisite materials and expertise to convert the late-medieval great house into a home suitable for a Lord Treasurer and his family.

The fact that the accounts recording payments for building only survive from May 1607 onwards, at a time when work at Knole was nearing completion, means that there is an almost complete lack of documentary evidence during the period when work at Knole was being prepared and first begun. There is also an inherent danger in the interpretation of these sources and of overplaying the role of London craftsmen in the transformation of Knole, due to the fact that these accounts were written from Sackville’s London residence, and only list payments for task work to London-based craftsmen. Payments for the work that was conducted onsite at Knole only appear in the accounts in the form of large lump sums made over to an individual called Thomas Holmden, which provide no detail whatsoever as to the nature of the work. Sackville’s Receiver General, Edward Lyndsey, would have received ‘books of building’ from Holmden that would have contained detailed payments relating to the build, and would have provided the names of the craftsmen and labourers involved. These have all been lost, and with them a key avenue into understanding the transformation of the house.

---
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between 1605 and 1608. As a result, it is necessary to turn to the extant fabric of the house for clues as to both how and when various areas of the house were rebuilt.

Thankfully, recent dendrochronological investigation has been able to shed new light on the sequence of Thomas Sackville’s building at Knole. Although many of the surviving timbers at Knole lack the requisite sapwood for accurate dating, analysis was able to demonstrate that there were two distinct campaigns of felling for work at the house, the first in the winter of 1604/5 and the second of 1605/6. The date for the 1604/5 campaign was derived from a sample taken from the purlin between the second and third bay of the roof space over what is now the Orangery in Green Court [S01] and a timber retaining complete sapwood from the gallery above the Hall [S58].\(^63\) The date for the second campaign of felling was provided by samples taken from the principal rafters of the first three bays of the roof space known as the South Barracks [S54], providing a felling date of the winter of 1605/6.\(^64\) It was also during this second campaign that the massive timbers for the beams of the roof to the King’s Tower were hewn.\(^65\)

The first known felling date of winter 1604/5 sits well with the suggestion that there was no major building work undertaken during at least the first three quarters of Sackville’s first year of occupation. By the end of the year, Sackville felt confident enough to begin amassing his timber in preparation for the planned building campaign. It was common practice for patrons to begin the stockpiling of materials some way in advance of any construction work, and at Knole, a building principally of Kentish Ragstone and oak, it was an entirely necessary measure.\(^66\) Analysis of the oak timbers during the dendrochronological survey showed that the timbers of the roof structures built by Sackville at Knole were found to be closest in character to those used at nearby Cobham Hall, a house largely built in the latter years of the sixteenth century, something that strongly suggests that much of the wood was sourced locally.\(^67\) This corresponds with statements made by Thomas Sackville in his will, which stipulated that the woodlands belonging to Knole were to be set aside for the repair and maintenance of the house, and it seems certain that timber was felled on the estate and

---

\(^{64}\) ibid. p. 16.
\(^{65}\) ibid. p. 19.
\(^{67}\) Bridge, *The Tree-Ring Dating Knole*, 2010, p. 29.
used at the house.\textsuperscript{68} This was certainly the case during 1612, when a series of repairs and small-scale changes were made to the house and the estate following the return of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Dorset from his tour of Northern Europe. William Floate, a Sevenoaks carpenter, was paid for hewing a 'logg being iij tunne q’ter', and the sawyer John Munck, was paid for sawing the log into boards.\textsuperscript{69} This was done at a sawpit within the manor, dug and then filled back in after it had been used.\textsuperscript{70}

This being said, there were two samples from the dendrochronological research, one from the gallery over the hall [S58] and the other from the South Barracks [S54], that did not correspond to the locally sourced timbers, and were seen to match better with other sites located in the west of England, something that suggests that the timber stock of the woods at Knole may have proved insufficient for the planned building work.\textsuperscript{71} When planning the work for the royal residence at Ampthill, Sackville had charged William Portington, the King’s Master Carpenter, to consult Robert Treswell, the King’s Woodward south of the Trent, to assess the local timber stock, and estimate as to whether additional timber would have to be sourced from elsewhere, so it was obviously anticipated that even properties with large stores of local timber might fail to serve ambitious building projects.\textsuperscript{72}

Unsurprisingly, given the extent of his estates, Thomas Sackville had his own woodland, Thomas Trayton of Lewes (d. 1638), an affluent individual who had close ties to William Newton of Southover Grange.\textsuperscript{73} In November 1607, Sackville paid Trayton for providing an estimate for repairs at the Lord’s House in Lewes, and it is possible that Sackville also employed Trayton in a similar capacity at Knole, charging him with the provision of the requisite timber for the build.\textsuperscript{74} In 1607, Trayton had a surplus of 50\textsuperscript{i} 2\textsuperscript{sc} 9\textsuperscript{d} on his account, something that suggests that he may have been forced to acquire stocks from sources outside of Sackville’s own estates to meet the demand for building work at Knole.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{68} NA PROB 1/113 Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Dorset Quire Numbers 1-56, f. 24.\textsuperscript{69} CKS U269 A2/2
\textsuperscript{70} ‘Paid for makinge a Sawpitt to saw a logge at knoll and for filling it upp againe xvijd\textsuperscript{d}’ CKS U269 A2/2
\textsuperscript{71} Bridge, \textit{The Tree-Ring Dating Knole}, 2010, p. 12.
\textsuperscript{72} Colvin, \textit{HKW, Volume IV, (Part II)}, 1982, p. 45,
\textsuperscript{73} In 1624 Thomas Trayton Gentleman had the occupation of lands in South Malling, part of the Sackville holdings in Lewes. NA PROB 11/143 Bryde Quire Numbers 1-65.
\textsuperscript{74} CKS U269 A1/1
\textsuperscript{75} CKS U269 A1/1
Although building materials were often stocked in advance of construction, structural timber was often worked relatively soon after it was felled and used freshly hewn. Unseasoned oak had the benefit of being easier to work and was malleable enough to withstand small-scale structural movement.\textsuperscript{76} As the timbers dried, they hardened, cementing the joins and ensuring strength and stability. The oak used at Knole during Sackville’s build was worked when green, something that can be seen in the dramatic structural movement in the centre of the gallery over the hall [S 58], where the original placement of a cupola on the roof led to stress on the structure of the gallery, something that can be most clearly observed in the movement of the cornice (fig. 32) that runs the length of the gallery.\textsuperscript{77}

There can be little doubt therefore that the timbers in this area of the house were used within a very short period after they were hewn. Considering that the building season ran between March and October or November,\textsuperscript{78} it seems almost certain that building work at Knole did not begin in earnest until Spring 1605. This idea sits well with the fact that the earliest date that is inscribed into the rainwater heads installed by Thomas Sackville at Knole is 1605 (f. 32). The only reference in the 1607-1608 accounts that relates to work as early as 1605 comes in the form of a backdated payment of December 1607 to Richard Dungan, the King’s Master Plasterer. This entry into Sackville’s accounts records the final instalment of payment for two separate bills for work undertaken by Dungan between March 1605 and July 1607. Dungan’s bills came to the substantial sum of 410\textsuperscript{li} 14\textsuperscript{s} 6\textsuperscript{d}, and related to work undertaken both at Knole and at Thomas Sackville (the younger)’s house within the Dorset Court complex.\textsuperscript{79} Unfortunately, the accounts do not specify whether the work done in March 1605 was at Dorset Court or at Knole, so it impossible to treat this as concrete evidence that work had begun by this date.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{76} Airs, \textit{The Tudor and Jacobean Country House}, 1995, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{77} As early as 1649 a mason was paid for ‘mending a breack came from ye lanthorne through ye hall seeling.’ CKS U269 A41/2
\textsuperscript{79} CKS U269 A1/1/36
\textsuperscript{80} However, the 1607 accounts do make it clear that there had recently been a large amount of work done on Thomas Sackville’s (the younger) house at Dorset Court; carpentry work was being carried out during the summer of 1607, which is suggestive, though not conclusive, that the work at Thomas Sackville’s (the younger) house was conducted in 1607 and that Richard Dungan’s work of March 1605 was at Knole.
This date of spring 1605 also sits well with the timing of Sackville’s acquisition of the freehold from Rowland White and John Williams, and it is possible to imagine Sackville holding back on his plans until he felt entirely confident that this transaction would reach completion. As suggested in the previous chapter, Sackville had been in the market for a country house since at least 1600, and may have had long-held ambitions as to the development of Knole which date back to his first association with the house in the 1570s. However, it seems unlikely that any formal planning was conceived prior to the transaction with Lennard in January 1604, and it seems most likely that the plans to transform the house were conceived during the time following the January 1604 agreement and were completed, at least in their outline, by spring 1605.

The work that Thomas Sackville undertook at Knole would have required a huge amount of organisation, not only because of the sheer scale of the work, which saw the whole-scale transformation of large areas of the house, but principally because of the prodigious speed in which this work was completed. If spring 1605 is accepted as the start date for the work, and early 1608 taken as a date of completion – something that is set down in the 1614 valuation of the manor, and largely confirmed by the 1607-1608 accounts – then it can be seen that what was achieved at Knole was achieved in a remarkably short space of time, given the limitations of early seventeenth-century building practice. Within this three-year period, Sackville remodelled and re-roofed the entire west front, the Orangery range, the King’s Tower, the interior walls of Stone Court, the Hall, and sections of the East Front and Stable Court; a huge undertaking and one that would have needed careful planning. Some sense of the speed at which this work was conducted can be seen in the remodelling of Stone Court. The structure of the principal courtyard of the house had been completed (at the latest) by the end of 1605, when seven down pipes with lead hoppers, all inscribed with ‘T.D’ (for Thomas Dorset) and the date 1605, were set on the four walls of the court. This suggests that within the space of approximately ten months, Sackville and his builders had re-roofed the hall, created an attic gallery, inserted a classically inspired colonnade and terrace, and reconstructed three exterior walls. (fig. 34)

As suggested, the dates that are inscribed on the rainwater heads at Knole provide important evidence as to the sequence of the 1605-1608 building programme. There is nothing to suggest that these rainwater heads were erected retrospectively, and here the dates are seen to accurately represent the date when work on that area of the house was completed. As suggested, the first area of the house to be worked on was
Stone Court, where Sackville created a courtyard built along the lines of contemporary taste. As the most significant courtyard in the house, it is not difficult to see why Sackville chose to begin his work here. Judging by the felling dates for the timber in the south side of Stone Court, it appears that 1606 saw the reconstruction of the south façade of this area of the house and the construction of the King’s Tower. At the same time, the area around Water Court underwent various changes, as Sackville inserted a series of chimneypieces into the east range of the house and erected down pipes with the date 1606 within the courtyard. The dates on the rainwater heads also relate that in 1607 changes were made to the ranges of Green Court, where the south range of the court was thrown out westwards to align with the newly constructed King’s Tower.

By spring 1608, and after three years of building, Thomas Sackville had managed to complete what he had set out to achieve at Knole. In combination, the information provided by the Knole leadwork, the recent dendrochronology, and the evidence found in the building fabric, provides enough information to create a series of subsections with Oxford Archaeology’s proposed phasing.


Phase 4A/2 [1606-7] – Renovation of Water Court area. Reconstruction of King’s Tower and remodelling of the South range.

Phase 4A/3 [1607-April 1608] – Renovation of Green Court lodgings. Reconstruction of the south range of Green Court. Completion of internal decorative work. Renovation of Stable Court.

The suggestion here is that there were three distinct campaigns of building over the course of a project that lasted just over three years. Each campaign focused on the renovation of a specific area of the house, something that would explain the awkward junctures seen in various areas of the house, such as the intersection of S58 & S54, where the structural members of the roof do not marry, suggesting that they were built
in two separate phases. This is true, as it represents the fact that they were built a year apart. S58 was constructed in phase 4A/1 and S54 in phase 4A/2.

**The Exterior façades as a record of Sackville’s work**

On the west front of the house, Sackville’s shaped gables sit awkwardly on the earlier ragstone walls, a concerted but compromised attempt to regularise the façade. The most concerted effort to impose symmetry was made on the south face of the house, the most substantial and ambitious aspect of Thomas Sackville’s work at Knole. Unlike other areas of the house, where pre-existing structural walls were left unaltered or rebuilt on their original footings, here Sackville orchestrated whole-scale reordering of the plan, with a mind towards creating a coherent and balanced façade intended to be viewed from the garden. This façade would be markedly different in character from the western front to the house, and while the remodelled southern front was not intended as an alternative entrance to the house, it was clearly its most important façade. The composition itself was articulated around a centrally-placed loggia, flanked by projecting bays and large corner towers on either side. Minor alterations to the fenestration of G146, G149, G153 and F138 made in the nineteenth century detract slightly from the impact of what Sackville originally aimed to achieve, but the overall sense is still given.

The decision to invest most heavily in the development of this side of the house was, like so many of the decisions made during Sackville’s build, largely predetermined by the plan and layout of the preceding structure. The south side of the house, which enjoyed the longest hours of daylight and overlooked the gardens, had probably always contained the principal suite of State apartments. It was natural therefore for Sackville, a patron who would have anticipated frequent visits from the crown, to focus his efforts on the development of this area of the house. Although this work was extensive enough to remove most vestiges of the previous plan, it is clear that the design of the façade

---

81 Oxford Archaeology suggest that the south range of Stone Court was arranged in a similar fashion to that of the north range of Stone Court, although the position of the two stone doorways in the Colonnade Room somewhat contravenes this idea. See Oxford Archaeology, *Knole*, 2008, p. 26.
was governed by the fact that the Duke’s Tower (fig. 35), one of the oldest parts of the building, needed to be maintained.\(^{82}\)

The decision to incorporate the Duke’s Tower into the new design was probably based on two important considerations. The first was the fact that the south face of the Duke’s Tower is constructed upon a substantial mass of naturally lying rock buried into the ground, and any attempt to excavate this would have proved both a time-consuming and an expensive endeavour. The second consideration was the complex interrelation between the Duke’s Tower and the Chapel and Pheasant Court building, both of which are built up against the north wall of the Duke’s Tower. In short, the ramifications of its removal prohibited the extensive alteration of the Duke’s Tower, and the maintenance of this structure determined that the King’s Tower should be built to match it, with the perpendicular projection of the Boudoir [G153] and the block of the King’s Tower built to mirror the Poet’s Parlour/Great Chamber [G146/F138] and the Duke’s Tower.

As suggested, this arrangement created a centrepiece to the south front, one that was clearly thought-out and intended to be a coherent architectural statement. This imposition of an outward symmetry came at the cost of the coherence of the internal plan, which was occasionally compromised by the design of the façade. An example of this can be seen in the arrangement of the fenestration of the second floor room above the King’s Room [S56] whose canted bay, integral to the balance of the exterior, is actually off-centre to the room internally.\(^{83}\) There is also an awkward relationship between the principal stair and the mullion and transom window of the first floor, which is partly blocked by the landing of the cantilevered stair [F139-S61].

Although lacking the compact sophistication of the design for Hatfield House, there are inflections in this façade of Knole of the Hatfield plan, especially in the centrally-placed ground floor loggia with a gallery above and projecting ranges to either side. While this should not be seen as indicative of Simon Basil’s influence, it should be readily identifiable with the ambitions and preoccupations of the leading London-based

---

\(^{82}\) In its earliest manifestation it conformed to an entirely different set of floor levels, something that is suggested by the truncation of a now redundant newel stair in the north-west corner of the basement room L48. For a fuller discussion of the development of the Duke’s Tower during this early period see, Philip Dixon, *Knole: A Report on the Works of 2007-8*, Unpublished Archaeological Survey, 2008.

\(^{83}\) This is not immediately apparent when entering the room. However, the mortises incised into the central floor joists of the room relate the original configuration of the room.
artificers and builders whom Sackville would have consulted prior to his work at the house.

 Whoever he may have been, the individual responsible for the design of this façade and range must have had prior knowledge and accurate plans of the existing building, along with a strong concept of what could be achieved given the constraints of both time and the existing fabric. It has been suggested that Knole was built by ‘an old man in a hurry’, and there can be little doubt that by 1605 Thomas Sackville was a sick man, acutely aware of his own impending mortality. As previously discussed, the massive sums recorded in Sackville’s accounts and the generous amounts that he bequeathed in his will give a good indication of the vast extent of his wealth, so there can be little question that time, not money, was his chief constraint at Knole. The idea that the house was left incomplete or that Sackville’s plans were left unrealised at the time of his death must be seen as inaccurate, namely because all areas of the house underwent some degree of remodelling. Where pre-existing arrangements were maintained, interventions were made to modernise and update the overall appearance of both rooms and exteriors. This is apparent throughout the house, but is probably best represented in the renovation of the area of the Leicester Gallery, [F98] and Spangled Bedroom [F103] where both the early sixteenth-century fireplaces in them were given new, elaborately-carved surrounds which transformed the rooms in the most up-to-date style. Likewise, in the north range of Stone Court, where the medieval roof structure was left unaltered, a new set of masonry fireplaces was inserted into the earlier chimneystacks.

84 Girouard, Elizabethan Architecture, 2009, n. 98, p. 121.
Chapter Five: Designers and Craftsmen at Knole

The question is, therefore, to whom did Thomas Sackville turn during the planning process for Knole? As it has been seen, a man of Sackville’s means had a number of individuals in his regular employ who could manage modest building projects, and judging from the work at West Horsley, Sackville was able to undertake small-scale renovation without calling on outside help. However, Knole was simply too large a project to be managed by Sackville’s own staff.

It would be unwise to attempt to identify a single ‘architect’ in the modern sense at Knole. Not only was the concept of the architect only starting to be understood in the vernacular at this time, the evidence provided in the surviving documentation and the existing fabric of the house also suggests that Sackville’s work at Knole was the collective product of a number of individuals who were each given a certain amount of autonomy in the design process. As suggested, a project of Knole’s scale would have demanded that Sackville turned to a number of individuals to help him realise his ambitions. Some of these individuals, such as Sackville’s plumber William Halsey, were salaried members of his household staff, while others were independent specialists brought in to fulfil specific tasks. Due to the complete lack of any correspondence relating to the build or indeed the survival of any building contracts, it is impossible to identify all of these individuals with complete certainty. It is necessary therefore to look to comparable building projects from the period which are better documented to see how these projects were organised and planned. The most useful comparison in this instance is the architectural patronage of Robert Cecil who, as was seen in the previous chapter, employed a number of the same merchants and artisans as Sackville. Likewise, Rivkah Zim has suggested that Robert Cecil and Thomas Sackville’s relationship can be characterised as one of apprentice and mentor, and although she refers to this in terms of their political dealings, there is good reason to suggest that there were also parallels in the way in which the two patrons managed their architectural commissions. In the first decade of the seventeenth century, Robert Cecil was involved in a series of architectural projects at Hatfield, Salisbury House, Cranborne Manor and the New Exchange. Of these projects, only the rebuilding of Hatfield House rivalled the scale and ambition of Sackville’s work at Knole.

---

In his study of the building of Hatfield House between 1608-1612, Lawrence Stone was able to demonstrate how the complete house was the product of the ideas and ambitions of four key individuals. Although their roles occasionally overlapped, Stone characterised their positions as follows. Simon Basil, the Surveyor of the King’s Works, was the professional advisor brought in to help procure and manage both skilled labour and materials. The London carpenter Robert Lyminge was the principal designer, responsible for the structural work at the house while also managing the work onsite. Thomas Wilson, a salaried member of Cecil’s household and a principal secretary, was one of a number of Cecil’s staff that acted in the capacity of financial administrator whilst also playing an active role in decisions regarding the build. Lastly, there was Cecil himself, who was in constant correspondence with his team working on the various ideas and problems that the project posed and ultimately heading his team of artificers and advisors.

Although it would be dangerous to suggest that there was an identical division of responsibility at Knole, the set up at Hatfield was typical for its day, as can be seen in another contemporary example. The Charterhouse in London, conceived in 1612 and begun a year later, was managed and organised by the executors of Thomas Sutton’s will, and the excellent documentary evidence relating to the planning of the project sheds considerable light on the way in which large scale projects such as these were planned. It also serves as a pertinent comparison for Knole, namely because both building programmes sought to modernise and refurbish large medieval courtyard houses in the very latest style using the finest London craftsmen.

Prior to the work at the house, the overseers of Sir Thomas Sutton’s will set out a set of ‘Observacons & Instrucons to be followed in & about the building and fitting of the Hospitall house of King James founded in Charterhouse’. The first task was to appoint a ‘skilful Surveyor or Contriver of Buildings’ to survey the existing fabric and begin the planning process. After this had been established by the Governors of the Charterhouse, they would set about choosing a ‘Surveyor or Overseer’, as well as a Clerk and a Paymaster for the works. The Surveyor or Overseer would be responsible for sourcing the labour and the materials for the build. Finally the Governors stipulated that the Surveyor, Paymaster and Clerk of the works would each month deliver a
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complete book of building accounts which could be viewed and discussed with the governors.

During this planning process the governors sought the expertise of two established surveyor craftsmen, Ralph Symonds and Robert Stickles. Symonds and Stickles were both masons by training, but were both able to advise on projects and devise plans. In the event, the governors decided upon the carpenter Francis Carter (d. 1630) to act as their Surveyor of the Works, and Carter was paid for making a plot of the Charterhouse. Carter had served as a clerk of works to Henry, Prince of Wales before later becoming the Chief Clerk of the King’s Works. At the Charterhouse, Carter’s principal mason was Edmund Kinsman, who had served in a similar capacity for the 9th Earl of Northumberland at Syon House in 1603-5. The positions of Paymaster and Clerk were taken by individuals who were involved in the administration of Thomas Sutton’s will, and who had no immediate experience in the building world.

As can be seen, at the start of the seventeenth century, there was also an established method for planning large-scale building projects. Firstly, a skilled surveyor would accurately survey the existing building, and provide the patron or patrons with a prospective scheme for rebuilding the property. The surveyor John Thorpe is perhaps the most famous of this type of surveyor who was able to provide measured drawings of existing buildings and also devise plans for additions and improvements. Once a scheme had been agreed upon, the patron would look for a surveyor of the works who could oversee the works, procuring both materials and labour for the project. In effect, this individual was responsible for realising the project, and he was often a craftsman with the structural knowledge required to build, such as a carpenter or a mason. Then there was the paymaster and the clerk of the works, who were responsible for financing the project, and supervising the day-to-day running of the works. These individuals were often bureaucrats, rather than craftsmen, and acted in the patron’s place during his or her absence.

5 LMA ACC/1876/F/09/48
7 LMA ACC/1876/F/09/48
‘The Surveyor of Works’: Simon Basil at Hatfield and Salisbury House, and the possibility of his involvement at Knole

At Hatfield and Salisbury House, a key figure in planning and directing the building work was Simon Basil (d. 1615). Basil was first recorded as working under the Surveyor of the Royal Works, Robert Adams, in 1590. Although styled as an architect in the tomb monument that Basil erected to him in 1601, Adams was primarily a surveyor and a deviser of fortifications. The preponderance of forts, harbours, castles and ports listed in a catalogue of the maps and plans in his possession shortly after his death confirms this, and gives a good indication of Basil’s education as a surveyor and an architect. This bent towards militaristic architecture might help explain why Basil borrowed from a plan of a fortification in Philibert de L’Orme’s *Premier tome de l’architecture*, (Paris, 1568) for his design of Sherborne Castle in Dorset (1592-1600).

Shortly prior to his death in 1595, Robert Adams recommended Basil to Lord Burghley, stating that he was competent in the design of fortifications, and in 1597 Basil became Comptroller of the Works. In 1606 he succeeded Sir David Cunningham in the post of Surveyor of the Works, a position that he held up until his death in 1615. Like many of his other colleagues at the Office of Works, Basil lived within the parish of St. Martin in the Fields. He also turned his hand to property development, building new tenements in Westminster for the rental market, and in 1607, Basil and a number

---

12 NA SP 12/253/155
13 It is not entirely clear whether Basil was responsible for the original design of Sherborne or whether the plan at Hatfield House relates to the addition of the turret rooms in around 1600. See Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry*, 1999, p. 34 and Andor Gomme and Alison Maguire, *Design and Plan in the Country House, From Castle Donjons to Palladian Boxes*, New Haven and London, 2008, p. 60.
14 He also held the position of Overseer in Tower for life. *CSP James I, 1603-1610*, 1857, p. 312.
of his colleagues at the Royal Works, Thomas Baldwyn (Comptroller of the Works), Cornelius Cure, and William Portington, were involved in the purchase of a timber yard and a series of workhouses in Charing Cross which was almost certainly an investment for the Works Office itself.\textsuperscript{16}

However, Basil’s commitments to the Royal Works did not prohibit him from continuing to take on private commissions. In 1600, Robert Cecil employed Basil at his London residence on the Strand, Salisbury House, a project for which Basil produced a series of plans and elevations. During the early stages of building, Basil wrote regularly to Robert Cecil informing him on the progress at the house,\textsuperscript{17} and his plans and elevations for the project show him to be a competent surveyor and draftsman capable of rendering accurate drawings for craftsmen to follow. Although there is relatively little information about his career as a surveyor and a builder, his work on the projects for Ampthill and the theatre at Christchurch College Oxford attest to the fact that Basil engaged with Serlio’s architectural treatises, and used them as a basis from which to create his own designs.\textsuperscript{18} In this light, Manolo Guerci’s conclusion that Basil was ‘more an efficient clerk than a skilful designer’ seems slightly unkind, and it would appear that, prior to the advent of Inigo Jones’s influence, Basil was one of a handful of Works staff who were sought by Court patrons for their expertise in both devising and managing architectural projects.\textsuperscript{19}

Recently, Mark Girouard has suggested that Simon Basil was the most likely figure to have advised Thomas Sackville on the design and planning of the work at Knole.\textsuperscript{20} In suggesting this, Girouard has highlighted the fact that there were numerous Works personnel active at Knole, and has seen this as being indicative of Basil’s involvement. Indeed, the 1607-1608 accounts record the involvement of a host of Works staff including William Portington (Master Carpenter), Cornelius Cure (Master Mason), Richard Dungan (Master Plasterer), Thomas Mefflin (Chief Glazier) and Andrew Kerwin (Paymaster of the Works). However, Sackville did not necessarily need

\begin{itemize}
\item NA LR 1/51/f.141.
\item Will of Symon Basyll of Saint Martin in the Fields, Middlesex, 18 October 1615 NA PROB 11/126 Rudd Quire Numbers 67-188. The will was made on July 17 1615. It makes reference to his wife Elizabeth, his son Simon, and Thomas Baldwin Comptroller of the Works, who is described as a loving friend. George Weale, a Clerk of the Works was an overseer of the will.
\item Girouard, \textit{Elizabethan Architecture}, 2009, p. 27.
\end{itemize}
Basil in order to source these craftsmen for his own projects. As Lord Treasurer he was responsible for the financing and running of the Royal Works, and it was possible for him to call on Works staff for private commissions. For example, when Lady Elizabeth Russell came to repair one of her properties in the Blackfriars in London, she openly admitted that she was only able to procure key members of Works staff to view the property thanks to the influence of the Lord Treasurer.\[^{21}\]

In fact the only suggestion that Basil may have acted in any capacity at Knole is the fact that he and Sackville had collaborated during the construction of the indoor theatre in Christchurch, Oxford, and the planned rebuilding of Ampthill in Bedfordshire. Otherwise it is actually quite difficult to make an argument in favour of Basil’s involvement at Knole. He was very much Cecil’s man, and between 1605 and 1606 he was preoccupied with work at the almshouse at Theobalds and with work at the royal menagerie, which would have left him little time to supervise or manage Sackville’s work at Knole.\[^{22}\]

### A Stronger Case: The Role of John Thorpe

Another name that has long been associated with Thomas Sackville’s transformation of Knole is that of John Thorpe. Sidney Lee, describing Sackville’s work at Knole in the first edition of the *Dictionary of National Biography* wrote that, ‘[Sackville] at once set to work to rebuild part of the house from plans supplied at an earlier date by John Thorpe. Two hundred workmen were employed on it, and it was completed in 1605.’\[^{23}\] This statement clearly includes inaccuracies, and probably reflects some confusion about the plans that Thorpe made for Buckhurst, but nevertheless, it would be unwise to dismiss the possibility of Thorpe’s involvement out of hand. There was certainly a good deal of contact between Sackville and the surveyor around the time Knole was acquired. For example, Thorpe seems to have been

\[^{21}\] SHC 6729/6/98
\[^{23}\] Sidney Lee, ‘Sackville, Thomas, first Earl of Dorset and Baron Buckhurst (1536-1608)’, *DNB*, 1897.
responsible for providing designs for two of Sackville’s household servants; John Suckling, his principal secretary, and William Denman, his secretary at Court.

There is the belief that plans made by John Thorpe for a house in Acton, (London) were created for Suckling, who owned a house in East Acton until 1607, when the property passed to Sir Richard Sutton (d.1634). The plans for Acton depict a compact house, based around a single courtyard, suitable as a country residence outside the city for an aspiring secretary and government official. There is also another plan in the Thorpe collection inscribed ‘Mr Denmans howse’ which Summerson identified as belonging to William Denman, an individual who, with John Suckling, was granted the rectory of Falmer in Sussex in December 1607. This grant was in trust to Suckling and Denman on behalf of Thomas Sackville, and in 1610 the two conveyed the rectory to Richard Sackville, 3rd Earl of Dorset. In this conveyance, Denman was described as ‘late of London’, and it is possible to identify him as the same William Denman who served as Thomas Sackville’s secretary at Court, and may have been from the same family as the ‘Denman’ who was mentioned by Sackville in a letter concerning household matters of May 1575. In 1608, Denman held land just outside London in the parish of West Ham in Essex, which he rented from Thomas Sackville. Whether Thorpe’s plan for Denman, which shows a timber-framed house on a similar scale to the Acton design, was ever realised is not known, but Thorpe’s association with both Denman and Suckling gives the strong impression that the surveyor was well regarded by those within Sackville’s household.

24 The idea that this house should be associated with Suckling’s, rather than Sutton’s tenure is based on the fact that the corresponding elevation to this plan and two other plans associated with the Acton house show characteristics typical of Thorpe’s early style, which would suggest a date of approximately 1590-1600 rather than around 1610. John Summerson, ‘The Book of Architecture of John Thorpe’, Walpole Society, Vol. XL, 1966, pp. 75-76 & p. 102.
26 ESRO SAS/A80
27 CKS U269 A1/1, BL Add. 3308/10. It seems likely that William Denman may have been related to the ‘Denham’ who was buried at St Bride’s Church on May 10 1563 where Richard Sackville was the chief mourner. ‘The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, from A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563, Camden Society, London, 1848, p. 301.
28 Sackville had bought marshland in this area from Thomas Lake of West Ham, gentleman in February 1603/4. See ERO D/DU 141/2. Denman paid £35 for the half year’s rent of lands called Leymouth in Essex from Sackville, CKS U269 A1/1.
As discussed in the third chapter, John Thorpe had also produced a fine presentation drawing for the planned changes to Buckhurst. The two had also been involved in the plans for Eltham Palace in 1604, another instance where Sackville annotated plans that had been made by Thorpe. Sackville’s positive endorsement of Thorpe as ‘a very excellent surveyor’ in his letter to the Officers of the Works in 1605 also gives the strong impression that Thorpe’s plans for Buckhurst had impressed the Lord Treasurer, despite the fact that he had chosen not to implement them.29

It is also possible to locate John Thorpe in Kent at the time that Sackville would have needed an accurate survey of Knole. Within the records of the Exchequer there are a series of bound volumes that record payments to John Thorpe for surveying Crown lands on the King’s behalf.30 Although the houses that Thorpe surveyed during 1604 are not named, the fact that he produced a plan of Eltham Palace in connection with the works that were carried out in that year, puts him in close enough proximity to Knole to suggest that he may have surveyed the house for Sackville’s benefit. Furthermore, within Thorpe’s ‘Book of Architecture’ is a plan of part of the gatehouse at Otford, inscribed ‘Otford/Gate/Under’, which, although undated, provides further evidence that Thorpe was active in the immediate vicinity of Knole.31

In particular, one house attributed to Thorpe is relevant here. There are a number of similarities between Knole and Somerhill near Tonbridge in Kent, a large Jacobean mansion built for the 4th Earl of Clanricarde, begun in 1611, which shares with Knole the characteristic battlemented window bays, with a three light window serving the second floor gallery/attic space and decorative leaded rainwater heads.32 Altogether, a reasonable case can be made for John Thorpe’s involvement at Knole and one that, at the very least, is stronger than that which can be made for Simon Basil. The fundamental difficulty in ascribing the work at Knole to either Basil or Thorpe is the fact that both individuals worked within the established idiom of early-Jacobean building practice, and because relatively little is still known about their work, it is impossible to discern stylistic features particular to either Basil or Thorpe. As suggested, many features of Sackville’s work at Knole, such as the arrangement of the

30 NA E403/2724/79
canted bay and shaped gable, can be likened to those in John Thorpe’s ‘Book of Architecture’, and although Sackville may well have sought Thorpe’s expertise, either in surveying the property or in conceiving designs and plans for the house, his involvement can only be a matter of conjecture.

**Thomas Marshall, Auditor and Surveyor**

It also is worth highlighting the fact that Sackville had an auditor and surveyor within his own household. Thomas Marshall (d.1616) had been responsible for the 1597 ‘Buckhurst Terrier’, a detailed survey of Sackville estates around Ashdown Forest in Sussex. The Terrier records the names of the tenants and the rental values of each holding, and includes two land surveys, which give the impression that Marshall was a capable if not especially skilled draughtsman. He also served as the surveyor of the King’s possessions in Sussex and was briefly involved in a commission for the Royal Works. In February 1608/9 Marshall was employed by Robert Cecil to work alongside Simon Basil, Surveyor of the Royal Works, to help estimate the cost of repairing Hertford Castle, in Hertfordshire. Having undertaken this task, Marshall wished to show Cecil ‘what time and art have wrought’. Once Cecil had seen this survey, Marshall was confident that they would agree that only the gatehouse should remain, ‘which is in good repair, consisting of ten rooms, and a fit repose for a gentleman, elsewhere seated, in the summer time.’ In fact, Marshall suggested himself as a possible tenant for this crown property on account of the fact that it was amenable from London and ‘it near to do you all faithful service’. Despite these occasional commissions for surveys of crown lands, a career in this field did not ensue, and

33 Straker, ‘The Buckhurst Terrier’, *Sussex Record Society*, 1933. Nothing is known of Marshall’s family or upbringing, but it is possible that he was related in some way to the Thomas Marshall who served as a household auditor/steward to the Sidney family at Penshurst Place. See CKS U1475/A25/2
34 Annexed to the letter is a survey by Thomas Marshall of the Manor of Brasted in Sussex. See *CSP James I, 1603-1610*, London, 1857, p. 222. At the West Sussex Record Office there are three copies of a survey made by Marshall of the manor of How Court. See WSRO SAS-S229.
37 idem.
Marshall retained his position as auditor to the 3rd Earl of Dorset up until his death.\textsuperscript{38} His will names individuals such as Mathew Caldicott and Edward Legg as friends, and gives considerable thanks to the 3rd Earl of Dorset ‘whose honorable disposicion accompanied with mans rare perfections of nature first move mee soe highlie to honor and respect him’.\textsuperscript{39} As an affluent and successful member of the Sackville retinue, Marshall was granted the Manor of Chalvington in Sussex, and also held the Augustinian house of Michelham Priory. Sadly, there is no concrete evidence that Marshall produced surveys or estimates for Knole prior to or during Thomas Sackville’s transformation of the house in 1605-8, but it must remain a possibility given the type of work he undertook for both the crown and the Sackville family.

**The provision of materials (I) Andrew Kerwin**

A senior member of the Office of Works staff who may have aided Sackville in the planning of this project was Andrew Kerwin, a London mason who first appeared at the Works on task work in 1597 and who went on to serve as the Paymaster of the Works. He was probably the son of the eminent mason and tomb-maker William Kerwin (d. 1594), a Sworn Viewer of the City of London (1577) created City Mason on the death of Phillipe Paskyn in May 1580, and responsible in 1586 for creating statues of Elizabeth I and a number of historical figures on Ludgate.\textsuperscript{40} Succeeding William Kerwin as City Mason, Andrew undertook a commission for work at the city Guildhall in 1593\textsuperscript{41}, and worked periodically at the Royal Works until he formally received the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{39}] Marshall gave Richard Sackville 3rd Earl of Dorset one needlework purse of Crimson Silk wrought with gold. Anne Clifford also received a similar purse which she noted in her diary. Will of Thomas Marshall of Chalvington, Sussex NA PROB 11/128 Cope Quire Numbers 68-131; *The Memoir of 1603 and the Diary of 1616-1619*, 2007, p. 103.
\item [\textsuperscript{41}] Kerwin was charged with completing a pinnacle on the west end of the Guildhall for which he was paid £16. Caroline Barron, *The Medieval Guildhall of London*, London, 1974, p. 49.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
paymastership in 1604, a position that had been held under warrant from the Lord Treasurer and Chancellor of the Exchequer since 1599, and one that seems to have necessitated him surrendering his positions as City Viewer and City Mason.\textsuperscript{42}

Kerwin was buried at his parish Church of St. Martin in the Fields on 29\textsuperscript{th} March 1617.\textsuperscript{43} No will survives, but thankfully there is one that survives for his wife. In 1619, Margaret Kerwin, widow of St. Martin in the Fields, bequeathed the rents and profits of three tenements in St. Martin in the Fields to her brother-in-law William Swarland.\textsuperscript{44} As suggested previously, it was not uncommon for leading Works staff to build speculatively for the rental market, and the expansion of the area of St. Martin in the Fields owed a good deal to Works personnel. Simon Basil built a number of houses in the area around 1610, and there is the distinct possibility that Kerwin had had a hand in the construction of his own properties in Westminster. It is interesting to note that these houses were leased to other leading members of the Works. Two were let to Mathew Banks, (Master Carpenter at the Tower of London) and a craftsman closely associated with the Sackville family. The third house was shared by Banks and William Portington, the King’s Master Carpenter.\textsuperscript{45} Banks had served an apprenticeship of fourteen years under Portington, and the suggestion must be that the two were running some form of workshop from Kerwin’s property. At the turn of the seventeenth century, the parish of St. Martin in the Fields was dominated by high-ranking Works personnel, and as Julia Merrit has suggested, there was no other single group that enjoyed such a high profile within parish government during this period.\textsuperscript{46}

Margaret Kerwin’s will makes no mention of any children. There are references to ‘John Kerwyn son of John Kerwyn of Penshurst in Kent’ although there is no real indication as to how they were related to Margaret Kerwin. This Kentish branch of the family had descended from John Kerwin (d.1585/6) of Seal, the neighbouring town to Knole, who was a mason, and had gone on to enter into the service of the Sidneys at


\textsuperscript{43} ‘A Register of Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials in the Parish of St. Martin in the Fields, 1550-1619, Harleian Society, Registers Volume XXVII, p. 174.

\textsuperscript{44} Will of Margaret Kerwin, Widow of St. Martin in the Fields Westminster, NA PROB 11/133 Parker Quire Numbers 1-73.

\textsuperscript{45} Banks paid £5 5s for the first of his properties, and £3 10s for the other. Portington and Banks paid £6 for their joint lease.

Penshurst. During the programme of building work at Penshurst Place in 1600-1606, a Robert Kerwin acted in the capacity of foreman and overseer, supervising the works on Sidney’s behalf. During this time, he reported to Robert Sidney on a regular basis and also undertook practical jobs such as measuring and surveying.\textsuperscript{47} His letters to Sidney provide a rich resource for understanding the processes behind early seventeenth-century building practice, and give a good indication of the extent to which absentee patrons were able to manage their projects, even when abroad.\textsuperscript{48}

It is difficult to state with certainty how close Andrew Kerwin was to the Kentish branch of his family, but it is clear that he was a member of an extensive family of masons and builders based in the South East of England. He was also a relatively wealthy man; at her death, Margaret Kerwin was in a position to leave a whole series of household items including ‘three tapistire Cushions having the masons Armes wrought in them’ to an Ellen Bradingham, along with a further £50 to her niece, Sibyl Bennett.\textsuperscript{49} Kerwin’s close association with other Office of Works staff is suggested not only by the fact that he leased property to Portington and Banks but also by the fact that Henry Wicks, Kerwin’s successor in the paymastership, served as an overseer of his wife’s will.

What is clear from the surviving documentation is that during the building work that was undertaken between 1607 and 1608 at Knole, Thomas Sackville used Kerwin as a source for choice materials that could not otherwise be obtained from his own estates. Highly sought-after Purbeck marble, received in pre-cut paving stones or ‘mitchels’ and designated for the floors of various prestige areas of the house and garden (fig. 36), was bought from and delivered by Kerwin.\textsuperscript{50} Sackville also purchased Oxfordshire Stone from Kerwin which was used for mullion and transom windows and the shafts of the columns to the colonnade of Stone Court.\textsuperscript{51} Kerwin was also able to procure materials when they were in short demand. On 1\textsuperscript{st} September 1607, Kerwin was

\textsuperscript{47} CKS U1475 A62A
\textsuperscript{48} Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L’Isle and Dudley preserved at Penshurst Place, Kent, Volume Two, 1934, pp. 426, 437.
\textsuperscript{49} Will of Margaret Kerwin, Widow of St. Martin in the Fields Westminster, NA PROB 11/133 Parker Quire Numbers 1-73.
\textsuperscript{50} CKS U269 A1/2
\textsuperscript{51} This is discussed in Slide 1 of Cyril Haysoms’s tapes, transcripts of which are held at Scotney Castle. The suggestion is that all of the mullion and transom windows in Green Court were made from Oxfordshire stone, before being replaced in part in Portland in the eighteenth century and then Clipsham in the twentieth.
paid for 11 tonnes of Oxfordshire stone, 200 foot of Purbeck marble and 300 foot more of Purbeck marble which had been ‘borrowed of S' Will. Cornwallis’: something that suggests that Kerwin, as Paymaster of the Works, knew the whereabouts of available stocks of choice materials.\textsuperscript{52}

Another important factor as to why Sackville chose to use the Paymaster of the Works was the fact that Kerwin was a tenant of Sackville’s within the Dorset Court complex. In 1607 and 1608 Andrew Kerwin was recorded in the accounts as paying the quarterly rent of Hanging Sword Court in Fleet Street, an annexe of the lands associated with the former Salisbury Court conglomerate.\textsuperscript{53} There were numerous tenements within the court\textsuperscript{54} but it is clear from what survives of parish records that Kerwin was living in Westminster, and not in St. Bride’s, at this time. Judging by the fact that in 1621 the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Dorset was forced to employ the carpenter George Isaak and other ‘Sworne viewers of the Citie of London’ to view the ‘decaies and wants of reparacons’ in the ‘houses in the hanging sword court heretofore demised to Andrew Kerwin’ it seems possible that Kerwin had used the court as a workshop and masons’ yard up until his death in 1617.\textsuperscript{55}

Kerwin’s employment would appear to have been a further move on Thomas Sackville’s behalf to source materials quickly and efficiently, and while there is not enough evidence to suggest that Kerwin acted in the capacity of designer, he patently had experience in the financing and management of elite commissions such as the project for Knole, and would have been able to advise Thomas Sackville as to how to realise his ambitions for the build.

\textsuperscript{52} CKS U269 A1/1
\textsuperscript{53} CKS U269 A1/1 & CKS U269 A1/2
\textsuperscript{54} In 1618, shortly after Kerwyn’s death, these buildings were being let to two separate tenants, George Penny esquire and Alan Corance, both of whom were renting an unspecified number of tenements. ESRO ADA 45.
\textsuperscript{55} CKS U269 A1/6
The Provision of Materials (II) William Portington

Another senior member of the Office of Works named in Sackville’s accounts was William Portington, the King’s Master Carpenter. Portington enjoyed a long career in the Office of Works, and served as Master Carpenter from August 1579 to March 1629.\(^{56}\) It has often been assumed that Portington was responsible for much of the carpentry work at the house and also the sumptuously carved hall screen and the elaborate wainscoting in the Great Chamber at Knole.\(^{57}\) However, the payments to Portington in the accounts do not relate to either of these fixtures. On the 11\(^{th}\) August 1607, Portington was paid for 300 deal (pine) boards at just over a shilling each, which at Knole were used for flooring and the construction of doors.\(^{58}\) The second payment, dating to the 27\(^{th}\) of the same month, was for 100 wainscots (oak panelling) at 8.4 shillings each and 100 clapboards (a smaller size of wainscot) again at just over a shilling a piece.\(^{59}\) At the price of over 8 shillings each, the wainscots provided by Portington must have been carved or embellished in some other way. Prices of wainscot ranged considerably. In July 1605, Stephen Harrison of Lime Street, the joiner responsible for the architectural pageant ephemera for James I’s procession through London, provided 30 wainscots for the Earl of Northumberland’s work at Syon House at almost half the price.\(^{60}\) Nevertheless, it is unlikely that Portington was directly responsible for any of this work himself. This is something that is suggested in the accounts by the fact that the hundred wainscots were ‘bought and sent to knoll’, i.e. bought by Portington on Sackville’s behalf and then sent to Knole from London. Likewise at Hatfield, Portington provided Cecil with 80 loads of timber that had originally been bought for the Royal Works.\(^{61}\) Altogether, the idea that Portington sourced the wainscoting rather than fabricating it himself sits better with his activities during this period, which was a time when he was increasingly occupied with the management of planning of building work rather than actual construction. A good example of this was in 1605, when Portington was brought in by Sir Roger Aston to

\(^{58}\) CKS U269 A1/1
\(^{59}\) CKS U269 A1/1
\(^{60}\) SYON MS U1/13/1/9
\(^{61}\) HHA A160/1/141v.
inspect the work that had been carried out by Richard Bynding at his house at Cranford in Middlesex.\textsuperscript{62}

Today, in parts of the house where the roof structure has been exposed through the loss of the lath and plaster, it is possible to see the carpenters’ marks incised into the timbers, often positioned at the head of the principal rafter and the intersection between the rafter and the purlin. While much of this practical work was clearly done on site, and undertaken by local craftsmen, there must have been a principal carpenter responsible for planning who fulfilled the role of surveyor of the works as outlined above. At Syon, the 9\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Northumberland’s principal carpenter, John Dee, served as the chief craftsman during work at the house and was responsible for producing a working model for the staircase at the house. He had travelled to Theobalds and to Reading on the Earl’s behalf, presumably to take notes on the houses there.\textsuperscript{63} At both Hatfield and Salisbury House, Robert Lyminge (d. 1628) served as the principal carpenter and surveyor of the works, and liaised with Simon Basil concerning various decisions relating to the build. Judging from his work at Blickling Hall, Norfolk, where Lyminge provided the designs for the house and an arbour, Lyminge clearly had some proficiency in drawing.\textsuperscript{64}

There is the small possibility that William Portington fulfilled a similar role for Thomas Sackville at Knole, providing the expertise for the planning of the stairs, floor and roofs of the house. He frequently carried out large-scale carpentry work for the crown, such as the two new stairs in 1594-5,\textsuperscript{65} and the floor for a hall in 1599/1600,\textsuperscript{66} but what is clear is that by the turn of the seventeenth century, Portington was acting in a supervisory role during works at the royal houses, travelling across the country to oversee and advise upon the works at various royal properties.\textsuperscript{67}

\textsuperscript{62} BdIL MS. Eng.hist/c.480/f.267-8.
\textsuperscript{63} SYON MS U1/13/23
\textsuperscript{65} NA E351/3229
\textsuperscript{66} NA E351/3235
\textsuperscript{67} NA E351/3233
Mathew Banks, Carpenter

There is another individual who is more likely to have aided Sackville with the structural planning of Knole. This is the carpenter Mathew Banks. Relatively little is known about Banks,68 but from what can be ascertained he was a successful London-based craftsman who went on to serve as Master Carpenter at the Tower of London,69 and later collaborated with the eminent mason Edmund Kinsman in the rebuilding of St. Alban Wood Street in 1633.70 In 1607, Mathew Banks submitted ‘books’ or full sets of accounts to Sackville’s auditor for work at Dorset House and Cecil House, something that suggests that he was responsible for managing the works and directing workmen at both residences, acting in the capacity of surveyor of works.71 Here he was assisted by Isaiah Smith, a London carpenter who was made free of the Company of Carpenters by redemption in 1608.72

Unsurprisingly, all the carpenters who worked for Sackville at Dorset Court were London-based craftsmen. Henry Clibborne served his apprenticeship in the Company of Carpenters between 1592 and 1598, and by 1604 he was presenting his own apprentices.73 Griffith Morris, a craftsman who undertook work at both Dorset House and Thomas Sackville the younger’s house, was at that time an apprentice to Peter Street, the carpenter responsible for the construction of the Fortune Theatre in London.74 Aside from Banks, the most established of these carpenters was Anthony Lipsett, a London carpenter who was chosen by the city’s Livery Companies to assist in the creation of Londonderry in Ireland in 1614.75 In 1607 Sackville paid Lipsett sixty-

---

68 No will for Banks appears to have survived. In 1646, Anne, Henry and Mathew were described as orphans to Mathew Banks, citizen and carpenter LMA Court of Orphans, CLA 002/04/15
70 In the following year, he was paid £3 ‘for his drawing of plots measuring ye church & coming several tymes.’ Colvin, A Biographical Dictionary, 1995, p. 98 (n.1)
71 CKS U269 A1/1
73 ibid. pp. 8, 90, 224, 415, 481.
74 ibid. p. 227.
six pounds for setting up a stable and other buildings at the lower end of Hangingsword Court in St. Bride’s.\textsuperscript{76}

Lipsett was obviously an important craftsman for Sackville, but Banks was clearly the favoured carpenter. In March 1607/8, Banks was sent by the Lord Treasurer to ‘view the house & baine’ at Sackville’s manor of Temple Bruer in Lincolnshire, which suggests that even at this relatively early stage in his career he had the ability to appraise the costs and the logistics for building repairs.\textsuperscript{77} What is especially interesting is that in October 1614, Thomas Sackville’s widow, Cicely, sponsored Bank’s admission into the Carpenters’ Company, a gesture that was no doubt a reward for services rendered to the family.\textsuperscript{78} It should be stressed that there is no record in the Lyndsey accounts that situates Banks working at Knole between 1605-8. All the payments to him relate to work at the Dorset Court complex. However, in 1621 Mathew Banks was working on site at Knole when he collaborated with the Sevenoaks carpenter, William Foster, on the conversion of the Oat Granary over the Stable into an armoury.\textsuperscript{79}

Banks would go on to rise to the top of the hierarchy of the Carpenters’ Company, and in 1637 he donated a portrait of William Portington to the company.\textsuperscript{80} The inscription on the painting, hanging at the Carpenters’ Hall, relates that Banks had served Portington for fourteen years, an apprenticeship that would have provided him with not only the practical but also the logistical skills he would need to manage projects such as those at Dorset Court. The fact that Banks and Portington shared the lease on Andrew Kerwin’s property in Westminster indicates that the two were in professional partnership, and it is possible that Banks ran their workshop at a time when Portington was increasingly involved with the supervision of projects for the Royal Works. It seems entirely plausible to suggest that Portington recommended Banks to Sackville as a capable subordinate who could act in his stead. Altogether, the close

\textsuperscript{76} CKS U269 A1/1 Lipsett also worked at Thomas Sackville the younger’s house, but this appears to have been a far more modest commission as he was only paid three pounds for this work.
\textsuperscript{77} CKS U269 A1/1
\textsuperscript{78} Edward Basil Jupp, \textit{An Historical Account of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters of the City of London}, London, 1887, p. 162.
\textsuperscript{79} Originally the plan had been for Bankes and Foster to construct a new staircase at the house, but for whatever reason this fell through. CKS U69 A1/6
association that Mathew Bank's shared with the Sackville family, seen in Cicely Sackville’s sponsorship, and the 1st and 3rd Earls’ patronage, suggests that he may have played a significant role in the transformation of Knole.

**Thomas Holmden, Chief of Works at Knole**

What is interesting is that Thomas Sackville chose an individual outside of his immediate staff to manage his building work on site at Knole, rather than relying on a trusted secretary or retainer within his household staff. Between May 1607 and April 1608 a certain Thomas Holmden disbursed over £1,500 pounds on Sackville’s behalf at Knole, and the suggestion must be that he had been acting in a similar capacity since work had begun in 1605, managing the building work and organising the acquisition of labour and locally sourced building materials. Figure 38 shows Holmden’s expenditure in the months where the accounts have survived for 1607 and 1608. Although it is difficult to discern any clear pattern in the expenditure, it is apparent that after the substantial expenditure in December 1607, the payments for work subsided, something that suggests that after a final push in late 1607, work at the house was all but completed.

The accounts that Holmden would have passed on to Edward Lyndsey at Dorset House for building work at Knole would have taken the form of ‘books of building’, contemporary examples of which survive for the building work at Syon House between 1604-7, and Ashley Park between 1602-1607. Typically, these books detailed payments for labour, day work, task work, and materials for works both at the house and the garden. Had these books of building survived for Knole, it would be possible to follow the minutiae of how Thomas Sackville and his craftsmen went about transforming the property over the course of the three-year period. They would also have provided information as to the work that was undertaken by local craftsmen, something that is entirely non-existent in the 1607-8 accounts. As suggested, the inherent problem with the surviving documentary evidence for Knole is the fact that it only provides detailed payments for labour and materials that were sourced from London, something that has the potential to create a distorted picture of the build, diminishing the role that local craftsmen and materials played in the transformation of

---

81 For Syon see SYON MS U1/13 For Ashley Park see M Blackman, ‘Ashley Park Building Accounts, 1602-1607’, *Surrey Record Society*, 29, 1977.
the house. This section of the chapter seeks to highlight the significant role that local expertise and local materials played during the work of 1605-8 and also looks to identify the role that Thomas Holmden undertook for Thomas Sackville during the transformation of the house.

There can be little doubt that during the three years to 1608, large amounts of both stone and timber were worked on site while building work was in progress. This was certainly the case at Syon House, where the master mason Edmund Kinsman was paid for working both stone and marble at the house. At Knole there were abundant stocks of the hard sandy limestone known as Kentish ragstone within the manor itself, and there were also additional stocks of sandstone that could be mined at the Sackville estates at Buxted in Sussex. Despite the fact that ragstone was a difficult stone to work, it was used extensively throughout the house, not only for the masonry walls, but also for coping and window dressings. In fact, it appears to have been a reasonably popular material for stone fixtures in the early seventeenth century. In September 1601 Simon Basil wrote to Robert Cecil regarding window lights that had been sent from Kent, which he described as ‘clerestories’. These lights were almost certainly sent from Lady Sidney at Penshurst Place, who had promised Cecil ‘a choice of wrought stone as he found fit’. In Stone Court at Knole, Sackville’s masons wrought the ragstone into ashlar blocks, creating continuous courses of stonework, something that could only have been achieved by craftsmen who had a strong familiarity with the material, and suggesting that a number of local masons were employed at the house. The area was certainly well populated with masons. Along with the Kerwin family at nearby Penshurst, there were also masons local to Sevenoaks. The mason William

---

82 SYON MS U1/13.
83 Sevenoaks is surrounded on three sides by the Hythe Bed formation from which Kentish ragstone is hewn. See Bernard C Worssam and Tim Tatton-Brown, ‘Kentish Rag and other Kent Building Stones’, Archaeologia Cantiana, 1994, pp. 93-125. In the fifteenth century, John Carter of nearby Seal had a quarry that supplied stone for Knole and Eton College, and today it is still possible to see evidence of quarrying on Carter’s Hill in Seal. Areas towards the west of Knole park named ‘Petts’ are also suggestive that quarrying was conducted within the Manor of Knole itself. In 1611 stone was brought from Buxted in Sussex, and stone from these quarries was also employed during the creation of Hatfield House. See CKS U269 A2/2 and Hatfield House Archive Bills 29.
Lawrence of Sevenoaks was employed regularly at Knole during the 1630s for a variety of tasks at that property, which included repairs to the great hay barn, the middle courts, and pigeon house gate and the stews. Altogether there can be little doubt that, during the works of 1605-8, masons local to Knole were brought in to work on site at the house.\textsuperscript{87}

The record of these individuals and the work that they undertook has all been lost and the only vestige of their activities is in payments made to Thomas Holmden by Edward Lyndsey. Holmden himself is a difficult individual to identify; as suggested, he was not a member of Sackville’s staff, nor does he appear to have had any dealings with the family prior to 1605-8. The suggestion is here that he was the same Thomas Holmden who made his will in April 1639 and who owned a number of small landholdings dotted around Chislehurst, Kemsing and Edenbridge in Kent.\textsuperscript{88} His will makes no reference to any services rendered to the Sackville family, but perhaps tellingly Holmden left a ‘messuage tenem' and forme called Buckherst or Clarckes or by whastov\textsuperscript{er} name or names the same is or hath been called’, to his nephew and namesake Thomas Holmden. Only the Sackville family could have owned a property called Buckhurst in Northeast Kent in the mid seventeenth century, and the likelihood must be that this was a property associated with the Knole estate that had come into Holmden’s hands through his association with the family.

This idea is given strength by the fact that, during the works of 1605-8, Holmden received rents on Sackville’s behalf from lands surrounding the manor of Knole.\textsuperscript{89} Acting in the capacity of local receiver or bailiff, Holmden collected these rents and then used them to pay for the ongoing costs at Knole.\textsuperscript{90} In this way, the revenue generated by the manor was immediately reinvested in its development. This familiarity with the local area had its obvious benefits. During the works of 1611-1612, Thomas Holmden sourced a variety of building materials for the work at the house.

\textsuperscript{87} CKS U269 A41/1. The suggestion is here that William Novis and Daniel Stiddale, two masons active at Knole between 1611/1612, were also from the local vicinity. The accounts from this date usually specify if a craftsman was from London, and if not it must be assumed that they were local.

\textsuperscript{88} NA PROB 11/179 Harvey Quire Numbers 1-65.

\textsuperscript{89} CKS U269 A1/1 There is the small possibility that he might also be the ‘Thomas Homes’ recorded in the 1619 accounts of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Dorset as the receiver of the Manor of Sevenoaks. ESRO ADA 45.

\textsuperscript{90} In 1625, Edward Sackville 4\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Dorset appointed William Bloome of Sevenoaks, a mercer and a gentleman as bailiff of the manor of Sevenoaks, a post that a John Bloome had held since 1608.
provided 500 foot of oak boards,\textsuperscript{91} pales and sand to the workmen at the house, something that strongly suggests that he had access to local materials.\textsuperscript{92} At the time, Holmden was renting thirty acres of land in Pantherst Park from the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl, and he may well have been felling timber within the parkland for this purpose.\textsuperscript{93} Furthermore, stipulations in Holmden’s will for his wife to ‘keep all the houses buildings + fences in good repaire during her naturall life […] and so to fell timber but for necessary repairacons only’, strikes a cord with the idea that this Thomas Holmden was in the practice, or perhaps even in the business, of supplying materials designated for building work.\textsuperscript{94}

It is Thomas Sackville’s pragmatic approach to the project that appears to account for Holmden’s involvement at Knole, and something that suggests that wherever possible, labour and materials were sourced from the surrounding area. In November 1605, two Sevenoaks carpenters, who may have also been working on site at Knole, were fined for hunting rabbits on Sackville’s land.\textsuperscript{95} Likewise, during the small scale works at Knole in 1612, two other Sevenoaks carpenters, William Floate and William Foster, were made responsible for creating two of the gable ends on the south side of the house.\textsuperscript{96} Judging by the fact that Floate helped construct the gable, created a close stool for Lady Anne Clifford and also made two coffins for the kitchen staff, makes it clear that these were versatile craftsmen who could be employed on a variety of tasks around the house.\textsuperscript{97} It would appear, therefore, that Holmden’s appointment was made with a mind towards the expediency and pragmatism that seems to have characterised much of the work at the house during this phase of its development; something that strengthens the idea that, like the highly skilled craftsmanship and prestigious materials, the planning and design process had been conducted principally by Thomas Sackville, his secretaries and those specialists he brought in for their expertise and advice.

\textsuperscript{91} CKS U269 A2/2 ‘Paid to m Thomas holmden for v^c foote of Oaken boords and plancks at vijs the C bought to make Coopes for yo’ lo:ppps Cocks at knoll xxxv^v’.
\textsuperscript{92} CKS U269 A2/2 ‘Paid to m Thomas Holmden for Carrienge of timber boords pales sand to the Tylers and wood att knoll as by his bill may more plainle appeare iij’l xij’d’.
\textsuperscript{93} CKS U269 E66/2/8.
\textsuperscript{94} NA PROB 11/179 Harvey Quire Numbers 1-65.
\textsuperscript{95} CKS QM/SRc/1605/193.
\textsuperscript{96} CKS U269 A2/2.
\textsuperscript{97} CKS U269 A2/2.
Secretaries and Stewards

While the appointment of Holmden and the local craftsmen under his jurisdiction can be seen as part of a drive to complete the work quickly and efficiently, Thomas Sackville would also have needed his secretaries to manage the movement of the large sums required to finance the project. It is useful to point out, especially given the significant role that Thomas Wilson (d. 1629) played during the creation of Hatfield House, that Wilson was a close friend and correspondent of Thomas Sackville and other members of Sackville’s retinue prior to attachment to Cecil’s household. While travelling abroad in the late 1590s, Wilson served as an intelligencer to Sackville, and despite the serious nature of their correspondence, his letters were written with both eloquence and sophistication. However, in February 1600/1 Sackville wrote to Wilson thanking him for his ‘so mainy let[ters] so kindly & wisely written’ but asked him from hereon in to send his despatches to Cecil ‘for he will still impart them to me’, no doubt an attempt on Sackville’s behalf to try to alleviate himself of some of the burden of state business and a good example of Sackville’s advocation of Cecil as his political successor.98

Wilson stands out as a significant figure, as he went on to serve as a permanent member of Cecil’s household, and along with Cecil’s other senior secretaries, Richard Percival and Walter Cope, operated as a financial controller for building work at Hatfield House and Salisbury House.99 As suggested, Wilson also had a hand in the work at Salisbury House, where the library was decorated ‘in such sort as I [Wilson] thought fitt’.100 There is no indication that Wilson ever fulfilled a similar role for Sackville, and their surviving letters are actually surprisingly scant in their cultural content; they are principally concerned with Catholic plots to English security, and the whereabouts of various members of Sackville’s family abroad. However, Thomas Wilson was precisely the type of figure who could fulfil the role of financial controller of large scale building projects, and it is worth drawing attention to those of Sackville’s

98 NA SP 99/2/39
secretaries who might have aided him in the planning and execution of his building at
Knole.

By the mid-1590s, Thomas Sackville employed a large staff that helped manage
his ever-increasing workload and a large and peripatetic household. These secretaries
lived and worked within the Dorset Court complex, and were responsible for the
management of both Sackville’s private and State affairs. Drawn from the ranks of the
provincial gentry, nearly all of Sackville’s secretaries had spent time at the Inns of
Court, where they would have learnt the skills necessary to cope with the complex
litigation and bureaucracy that was part and parcel of their day-to-day duties. Although
each secretary often fulfilled a variety of functions within the household, Sackville’s
secretaries and household officers can be divided into two separate groups. The first
group were those who were intrinsically tied to the Sackville family either through
marriage or through prolonged service, moving up within the hierarchy of household
offices as their careers progressed. Edward Lyndsey, Receiver General to the family,
served three generations and all four Earls of Dorset prior to his death in 1630, and was
typical of this first type of individual.101 The son of Myles Lindsey of Dent in
Yorkshire, Edward Lyndsey was born in the parish of St. Sepulchre’s-without-Newgate
in London, and was in Sackville’s employ by at least 1601 when he was serving as a
steward.102 As an important figure in Sackville’s household, and one of the three
individuals on whom Sackville conferred the lease of Knole in April 1605, Lyndsey and
his family enjoyed their own house within Dorset Court, and were in many respects an
integral part of Sackville’s extended family.103 From the fact that he chose to be buried
in the Chancel of St. Bride’s Church, it is clear that Lyndsey had close ties to the parish,
and suggests that despite the fact that senior secretaries such as himself spent
considerable periods of time in Sussex, they considered Dorset Court their home. It is
perhaps unsurprising that Lyndsey’s friends were those within the Sackville orbit, and
included Serjeant Amherst, Sackville’s High Steward of his manors in Sussex, and the
King’s Goldsmith John Williams, the individual who had helped Sackville obtain the

101 Will of Edward Lyndsey, NA PROB 11/157 Scroope Quire Numbers 1-63.
102 John William Linzee, The Lindeseie and Limesi Families of Great Britain, including
the Probates at Somerset House, London, England, from 1300-1800, Vol. I, Boston,
Massachusetts, 1917, p. 113. The 1601 account book referenced as being in the private
MSS of William Shadwell of Ringmer in Charles E Clayton, ‘Hangleton and its
103 In 1619, Lyndsey rented both a house within Dorset Court (£10) and a tenement in
Dorset Alley (£4) ESRO ADA 45/87-88.
freehold of Knole. References to gilt cups, various jewels and plate in Lyndsey’s will give the indication that he was relatively affluent, and the books that he kept in his study in his house in Dorset Court suggest that he was a man of some sophistication. He was also a man of standing; he had his own coat of arms conferred to him in June 1608, and by the end of his life he was in possession of the Sackville Manor of Buxted in Sussex.

It was often the case that household stewards would supervise and manage building work in the absence of their patrons, and it is common to find records of building work within stewards’ accounts. For example, at the same time as work was drawing to a close at Knole, improvements at Buckhurst costing almost £800 were being made via Thomas Sackville’s Keeper of the Park at Buckhurst, Thomas Woodgate, who was a gentleman servant and minor landowner in Sussex. Likewise, at West Horsley in 1604, work had been supervised by Thomas Sackville’s Household Steward Michael Heydon (c.1550-1618), and the payments for this work had been recorded in detail within his book of household accounts. Another contemporaneous example can be found at Penshurst Place in Kent, where Sidney’s household steward Thomas Golding was responsible for the building work in his master’s absence during the works of 1604-5.

Michael Heydon had come from an established Hertfordshire family, and had studied at Trinity College Cambridge before joining Lincoln’s Inn in 1572. Described in February 1605 as holder of office with Sackville ‘long since’, Heydon fulfilled a number of other administrative roles relating to both the management of Sackville’s

---

104 Will of Edward Lyndsey, NA PROB 11/157 Scroope Quire Numbers 1-63
105 His coat of his arms was an eagle armed with a chief vair, the inclusion of the vair motif was no doubt a direct allusion to Lyndsey’s Sackville patronage. For Lyndsey’s family and a transcription of his will see, John William Linzee, The Lindezeie and Limesi Families of Great Britain, including the Probates at Somerset House, London, England, from 1300-1800, Vol. I, Printed Privately, Boston, Massachusetts, 1917, p. 149 and Arthur J Jewers, ‘Grants and Certificates of Arms’, The Genealogist, Vol. 21, 1905, p. 66. The documents consulted are BL Add. MS 12,225, BL Harl. MS. 6,140.
106 CKS U269 A2/1
108 Described in February 1605 as holder of office with Sackville ‘long since’, he appears regularly in the accounts of 1607 as household steward, and was responsible for the disbursement of Sackville’s household expenses. See Hasler, HOP, The House of Commons, 1558-1603, Vol. II, Members D-L, London, 1981, p. 283; CKS U269; A2/1; CKS U269 A1/1; CKS U269 A1/2
estates and government business. He was returned for Midhurst in the Parliament of 1601, a seat controlled by Thomas Sackville’s son-in-law Anthony Maria Browne, 2nd Viscount Montagu, who had also conveyed land in Surrey to Heydon. Although he appears to have left service in the family in around 1608, Heydon was clearly one of Thomas Sackville’s most trusted servants, responsible for the management of Sackville’s household. Payments to Heydon in the 1607-8 accounts record his expenditure for defraying the cost of running Sackville’s household, a figure that fluctuated between £200 and £300 between July 1607 and January 1608, during a time when Sackville kept house in London, at West Horsley and at Knole. In 1619, Richard Sackville, 3rd Earl of Dorset, was spending a similar amount on maintaining his household, something that would suggest that Heydon’s expenditure for the months leading up to January 1608 was used solely for household provisioning and did not include payments for the building work at Knole. Having said this, it is interesting that after January 1608, no household was kept at Horsley, something that suggests that by this point Knole had been made entirely habitable and had superseded Horsley as Sackville’s principal country seat. Yet despite the fact that Sackville was now only maintaining two households, his costs remained at £300 for the period 14 February to 12 March 1608, and actually jumped to £353 for the final month leading up to his death in April of that year.

It seems entirely possible that in the early months of 1608, when structural work at Knole had been completed and payments for building work had noticeably decreased, Heydon took responsibility for payments to craftsmen involved in the internal decoration of the house. The evidence is limited, but there is the strong possibility that in the final months of Thomas Sackville’s transformation of Knole, his household steward, Michael Heydon, served in the capacity of financial controller, in a role akin to that which Cecil’s secretaries undertook during the creation of Hatfield House.

---

111 CKS U269 A1/1
112 ESRO ADA 45/134
113 CKS U239 A1/1
The second type of secretary in Sackville’s household was the ‘career secretary’ who used Sackville’s patronage as a springboard to launch their careers in government. The most successful of these was Thomas Sackville’s principal secretary John Suckling, who went on to enjoy major government office as Receiver of Fines for Alienations (1604), Master of Requests (1620), Comptroller of the Household (1622), and Secretary of State (1622) to James I.\textsuperscript{114} The son of a wealthy Norwich merchant, Suckling had entered Gray’s Inn in 1590 and was active in Sackville’s household by at least 1600.\textsuperscript{115} John Suckling and Thomas Wilson were close friends and frequent correspondents.\textsuperscript{116} On the 10\textsuperscript{th} February 1601/2, Suckling wrote to Wilson at Pisa, responding to reports that a ship chartered by Robert Sackville and carrying heavy ordinance had sailed into prohibited waters. Suckling’s letter was insistent that Robert Sackville should not be held culpable for this mishap, and that the blame should rest solely on Captain Croston, who had signed indentures with Robert Sackville regarding where he could and could not sail.\textsuperscript{117} If anyone was to suggest anything otherwise, Suckling told Wilson not to hesitate to ‘\textit{di darle la Mesogna}’, a helpful remark that suggests that, like his reader, Sucking was proficient in Italian. The remainder of the letter is concerned with the whereabouts and wellbeing of Wilson’s wife, for whom Suckling appears to have been responsible in Wilson’s absence.

Another letter in the State Papers written by Suckling in 1601 to an unnamed ‘good countryman’, an individual who can almost certainly be identified as Thomas Wilson (Suckling refers to him in identical fashion in the letter mentioned above) gives some further clues as to the cultural rewards this friendship afforded. The letter concerned the customs duties on a trunk which contained a number of books that had been sent by Wilson to London from Italy. Wilson had asked Suckling to remove some of these books and to leave the remainder for Robert Cecil ‘to take his choice’.\textsuperscript{118} Suckling said he would send ‘Cornelius Tacitus and the Essays’ to Wilson in the hope

\textsuperscript{115} NA SP 96/1/51
\textsuperscript{116} NA SP 98/2/36 and NA SP 96/1/51 Thomas Wilson to Thomas Sackville, 23 August 1600, ‘My Lo: this last week I wrote twise unto yo’ servant M’ Suckling’.
\textsuperscript{117} NA SP98/2/36
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{CSP, 1601-1603 with Addenda 1547-1565}, London, 1870, p. 106.
that he might receive the ‘discourses’ in exchange, which he promised he would find
time to read.\textsuperscript{119}

It can be argued that, prior to Thomas Wilson’s attachment to Cecil, Thomas Sackville’s household was one of the few channels of communication that were open between England and the Continent. Thomas Sackville the younger was almost permanently abroad and was actively purchasing books from the continent, sponsored by his father in England. His principal secretary also received books from the continent through both his brother-in-law Lionel Cranfield and his friend Thomas Wilson.\textsuperscript{120} With close ties to both Sackville and Wilson, Suckling was clearly a man of learning with a keen interest in classical literature, something that casts some doubt on John Aubrey’s assertion that his son’s ‘wit came by the mother’, and sits well with the idea that even though Suckling was not as talented a writer as his son would prove to be, he was still accomplished in his own right. A sonnet that he wrote in Coryats Crudities of 1611, to which a number of the Mitre Tavern group contributed, may not demonstrate any great aptitude in poetry, but Suckling’s involvement with this group, one that included both John Donne and Inigo Jones, gives a good indication as to the cultural milieu in which Sackville’s principal secretaries participated.\textsuperscript{121}

Another member of the Mitre Tavern group which John Suckling frequented was the successful London merchant and future Lord Treasurer, Lionel Cranfield, whose sister Marta (d. 1613), Suckling had married.\textsuperscript{122} The close association that the city speculator and secretary shared is borne out in a series of letters remaining in the Cranfield papers, which give a good indication as to the agency and influence that Thomas Sackville’s senior secretaries could command within the city. These connections between John Suckling and Lionel Cranfield – between court and city – may account for the fact that the same craftsmen that worked for Lionel Cranfield at his residence at Wood Street in Cripplegate in the winter of 1604-1605, also worked for Thomas Sackville on his projects at Dorset Court and Knole. A surviving bill amongst Cranfield’s household accounts, made to the painter Daniel Robinson for various tasks

\textsuperscript{119} idem.
\textsuperscript{120} As was mentioned in the previous chapter, Thomas Sackville the younger was sent money whilst abroad from his father specifically for the purchase of books, and was also involved in procuring texts for the Bodleian Library in Oxford. See Chapter One. For an example of Suckling receiving books from shipments sent by Lionel Cranfield see CKS U269/1 CB 304.
\textsuperscript{122} idem.
such as hanging painted cloth, whitening, gilding and painting chimney-pieces, was endorsed by Paul Isaacson, the decorative painter who was responsible for decorating the long gallery at Knole.  

Within the same set of vouchers and receipts are two bills from the freemason John Walton, the first of which is a bill for 38s 6d for stone paving for the yard at Wood Street. The second is a much longer itemised bill for relaying of old stone and setting up of new stone in areas both inside and outside the same house. Much of this was for border stones and guttering, but there were payments for a new ‘mantell tree’ (an overmantel to a fireplace) in the gallery which cost £2 and also marble paving for the parlour and footways. In the Sackville accounts, John Walton’s name appears for work carried out between June and December 1607 at the new buildings built for Thomas Sackville (the younger) in Water Lane. The payment of £4 18s 2d was relatively modest, at least in comparison to Walton’s payment of £20 6s 11d for the work done at Wood Street, but nonetheless, Walton remains the only other mason aside from Andrew Kerwin that appears in the surviving Sackville accounts, and it is therefore worthwhile saying a little more about him.

The mason John Walton does not appear to have been involved in the production of monumental tomb sculpture, nor does he appear to have been a salaried member of the Office of the Works, and as a result, is one of the lesser known figures in the landscape of artisans and craftsmen operating in London at the turn of the seventeenth century. There is the strong possibility that he descended from the dynasty of London masons who had been active in the city since the fourteenth century. Although

123 Beneath the itemised bill is written ‘This work is to be Judged by a painter and what he sayeth it is worth daniell must have’. CKS U269/1 E2
124 CKS U269/1 E2
125 CKS U269 A1/1, BL Add.33084/10
126 John Harvey, *English Medieval Architects – A Biographical Dictionary Down to 1550*, Stroud, 1984, p. 313-314. Walton might also have been related to the Henry Walton, who was fined 8s 8d for faulty workmanship about the church in the Old Jewry, Douglas Knoop, *The Medieval Mason – An Economic History of English Stone Building in the Later Middle Ages and Early Modern Times*, Manchester, 1967, p. 201 and who was involved in the construction of the tower of St Mary Aldermary in 1626, see Howard Colvin, ‘The church of St Mary Aldermary and its rebuilding after the Great Fire of London, *Architectural History*, Vol. 24, 1981, pp. 24-145 at p. 25, n.12. There is the strong possibility that the John Walton who was presented as an apprentice to William Somers (again a leading family of masons in London at the time) between 1635-1636 was the son of the John Walton in question. Cliff Webb, *London Livery*
Walton’s bill for work at Wood Street was almost exclusively concerned with the provision and deployment of simply worked stone, payments in the Coopers’ Company accounts for 1590-1 to John Walton for making a carved escutcheon relate that he was proficient in creating sculptural wares. In January 1605/6, following the resignation of Andrew Kerwin, John Walton was elected as one of the four Sworn Viewers of the City, individuals who were chosen for their expertise in order to help the city’s aldermen arbitrate over disputes arising from both encroachments on property boundaries and badly-managed building practice.

As a Sworn Viewer of the City, Walton was one of the city’s leading masons, and as such he is a potential candidate as the creator of the numerous masonry fireplaces surviving at Knole, fixtures that were evidently the products of an established and prolific London workshop. These fireplaces will be discussed at greater length later in this chapter, but suffice it to say that it would have been through the channels formed by Sackville’s patronage network that both the materials and craftsmanship for Knole were procured. Thomas Sackville enjoyed privileged access to the senior officers of the King’s Works, but he also had established links to leading metropolitan craftsmen such as John Walton, and these links came thanks to a patronage network which was maintained by Sackville’s principal secretaries. Chief amongst them was John Suckling; an educated and able administrator with ties to the city’s cultural avant-garde, who appears to have commissioned John Thorpe to create a fine country house for him within the environs of London and procured building materials directly from his brother-in-law.

Of all Thomas Sackville’s secretaries, Suckling emerges as the most likely individual to have fulfilled a role similar to that which Thomas Wilson performed for Robert Cecil during the planning of both Salisbury House and Hatfield House. However, there were also individuals such as Michael Heydon and Thomas Marshall, both of whom had expertise that they could have brought to bear during the various stages of the Knole project. Marshall may not have had the training required to render

---

129 CKS U269/1 AP2
drawings accurate enough for craftsmen to follow, but he may have been called upon to assess the cost of materials and workmanship at the house. Likewise, Michael Heydon was a gentleman servant and not a member of the building trade, but this did not prohibit him from supervising the works at West Horsley place in 1604 and possibly at Knole also.
Chapter Six: The Role of Thomas Sackville

The internal fittings of Knole 1605-8 (I) – Fireplaces

Evidence supporting the idea that the building work and internal renovation at Knole were completed to a predetermined plan – that conceived of three systematic campaigns of building formulated by Thomas Sackville, his subordinates, and those individuals he brought in for their professional expertise – can be found in the location and design of the numerous masonry fireplaces which date from the 1605-1608 phase of building at Knole. There are over twenty of these fireplaces at the house, three of which can be confidently attributed to the workshop of Cornelius Cure, the King’s Master Mason. The remainder are typical of a style common to various houses throughout the Home Counties and that are associated with London workshops active between c.1575 and 1615.

In his study into sixteenth- and seventeenth-century gentry houses in England, Nicholas Cooper has identified two main types of these fireplaces prevalent in the South East. The first is a fireplace with a four-centred surround with segmental curve, and the haunch of the jamb often with a simple frieze embellished with a pattern of simple geometrical forms. Cooper cites the fireplace at Eastbury Manor House in Barking, Essex, as typical of this first type but as he suggests, there are numerous other examples such as those at Hall Place in Bexley, Kent, and also those at Wye College, Kent. The second type of the London fireplace has a straight head, as opposed to a four-centred opening, and an elaborate relief carving in the frieze of birds, flowers or fruits to the lintel, often with a device such as a shield of arms or a figure at its centre, a design which is typified by the fireplace formerly at Bromley-by-Bow and now housed at the Victoria and Albert Museum (fig. 39). At Knole, where the fireplaces from the 1605-1608 phase of building have survived in such numbers, it is possible to observe numerous examples of these two types of fireplaces, all which are made from Reigate stone. Although they vary in size, their friezes are normally around 60” wide and 7”

2 ibid. p. 175. Yet more examples can be found at the Porter’s House, All Saints Church in Essex, see Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Essex Vol. IV, 1923, p. 113.

I am extremely grateful to Adam White for sharing his ideas, and his research on this subject with me.
high, and the jambs are nearly always approximately 50” long. Some correspond closely to the types outlined by Cooper, but at Knole there is also a third type of carved fireplace which combines the four-centred opening with the high-relief carving in the lintel, examples of which can be seen in rooms G61, G131, F01, F05, F35, F35 and S56.³

In their recent survey of the house, Oxford Archaeology created a typology for the early seventeenth-century fireplaces at Knole, dividing these fireplaces into three distinct groups. However, it is possible to subdivide the series still further.⁴ Set out in the table in figure 40 is a brief summary of the defining characteristics of the eighteen fireplaces defined as types CH4 and CH5 by Oxford Archaeology, type CH5 being a slightly less sophisticated version of the CH4 type in their typology. In the adjacent table, the defining features of these fireplaces have been set out in order to show how it is possible to identify similarities between the most simple and the most elaborate fireplace. It also serves to show how the fireplaces can be grouped into pairs of two or three, each group sharing a series of features in common.⁵ As a result, it is possible to make seven subdivisions within the typology CH4, ranging from the simple geometric designs of G69 and F69 to the large and sophisticated compositions of G144 and F110.⁶

These fireplaces were clearly made to a predetermined scheme, and it is possible to demonstrate that they were made in batches that correspond to the proposed phasing outlined earlier in the chapter. The three CH4/5 fireplaces, which are characterised by their decoratively carved friezes and central cartouches, all share the same moulding profile on their jambs (fig. 40) and can all be found to the east side of Water Court, an area of the house remodelled in phase 4A/2. These fireplaces were also clearly made to order, because the quality of each fireplace corresponded with the status of the room for which it was intended. In Green Court, for example, an area of the house that retains a number of the CH4 fireplaces, there was a clear rationale applied to their deployment.

⁵ The only anomaly is CH/7 which has no immediate pair but is taken to be part of the series due to the fact that it shares certain features in common with the others in the series.
⁶ Here Oxford Archaeology’s CH4 and CH5 types have been combined and brought under the type CH4.
This area of the house was almost certainly given over to the accommodation of key household staff and prestigious visitors, and once stripped of later partitions it is possible to discern the layout of four individual apartments created for this purpose. Three of the four apartments contained four main rooms, spread over two floors and served by a central chimneystack. Timber staircases with winders in framed enclosures provided access to the first and second floors from the court. The sizeable chambers were served by a servants’ room and an adjacent privy, an arrangement that can still be seen in the layout of rooms G06-08, and which corresponds closely to the layout of the rooms designated as ‘A Noblemans lodging’ in the plan for Buckhurst House by John Thorpe.

However, there was clearly a hierarchy in the status of these four apartments, and it is unsurprising to learn that there is a distinction in the quality between the fireplaces in the apartment to the immediate south of the Outer Wicket [F14+F09] and those of the apartment to the extreme south of the west range of Green Court [F01+F05]. While the Outer Wicket apartment is served by type CH4/2 fireplaces, the southerly apartment contains two CH4/3 chimneypieces. This is a small distinction, but it does reflect the fact that the southerly apartment, with its garden views, south-facing prospect and access to an attic gallery-space [S01], was the more desirable of the two apartments. In a similar vein, the suite of lodgings over the stables in the north range of Green Court, no doubt designated for Sackville’s Groom of the Stable, contains a CH4/3 fireplace in room F53 which shares the same four-centred arch with decorative spandrels, trefoil stop and the shield and garland motif as the fireplace in F01.

Likewise, the best fireplaces in Stone Court aside from those in the state apartments were placed in the most spacious and prestigious rooms at either end of the west range of Stone Court, while the more simple type CH4/1 fireplaces were placed in the lodging chambers of the north side of the court. In fact, the two CH4/4 fireplaces, which are located in G61 and S56, are identical in their decoration save the design of their stops, which in the fireplace in the Room Above the King’s Room [S56] are decorated with a simple foliate motif, in comparison to those in the North Wing Sitting

---

7 In 1648, John Sackville, a family member from a satellite branch of the family and the individual responsible for the management of the household at this time, had his lodgings in Green Court, and the suggestion must be that he enjoyed the best apartment at the southwest of the court.
Room, which are plain. One other distinction, and something which is immediately apparent when the fireplaces are compared, is the difference in quality of the carving in the frieze between the two. It is quite clear that the craftsman responsible for carving the fireplace in G61 had considerably greater ability than the craftsman who rendered the frieze of the fireplace in S56. Not only are the fruits and ribbons in G61 more delicately carved, the overall composition is also better conceived, and noticeably sharper than its counterpart in S56.

There is a similar disparity in quality between fireplaces in F101 and F111, both of the CH4/5 type. All of these CH4/5-type fireplaces share the common feature of a strapwork cartouche and plain armorial badge. The provision for heraldic devices confirms that these were designated for a prestigious area of accommodation in the house. A remarkable feature of two out of the three CH4/5 fireplaces are the small volute-brackets which adorn the underside of the lintel at the intersection of the jamb, a feature that also appears on the fireplace of the nearby Brown Gallery [F110]. These are unusual features, but are not unique to the house, and can be seen in images of a fireplace of a similar date at Wolsey’s Cottage on Lower Teddington Road, London, which has a lintel carved with bird-monsters, dolphins, foliage and a cartouche bracketed in a similar fashion to those in the east range at Knole. These scrolled brackets were probably copied from a design by Du Cerceau for a chimneypiece from the *Second Livre d’Architecture* (1561), although in the Du Cerceau design the brackets are supported by caryatids.

These decorative brackets also appear on the set of masonry doorways at either end of the colonnade and the terrace above in Stone Court (fig. 41). These doorways are of a yellowish sandstone, with four-centred heads, and handsomely proportioned at 4ft 1” wide and 8ft high. The brackets are located on the inside face of both jambs of the doorway, exactly 6ft above floor level, and, like the volutes on the fireplaces, serve purely as decorative devices. One possible explanation as to why these peculiar features were included in the design could stem from a misreading of a design for a doorway in Book IV of Serlio’s Architectural treatise, where one of the consoles to the pediment is

---

8 As the table shows there is also a slight discrepancy in the dimensions of the two fireplaces.
depicted in profile on the right hand side at approximately three quarters of the way up the jamb. Perhaps the mason responsible for the Knole doorways saw this as a design feature and adopted it for his own means.

Whatever the case, these doorways were almost certainly produced by the same craftsmen that were responsible for the masonry fireplaces discussed above. The doorways share a common feature of their ‘pawn’ shaped stops with the fireplace in Lady Betty Germain’s Bedroom [F111]. Likewise, the two classically inspired entrances to the Hall (one of which is a blind opening) share the same ovolo moulding as the jambs of the doorways that flank them. The argument here is that all of these masonry fixtures were produced from the same workshop, and made by a series of craftsmen of differing abilities working from a series of house designs. Nicholas Cooper has suggested that, during the period, London masons were stockpiling items such as fireplaces. However, at Knole they appear to have been made to order, commissioned in batches for each of the three campaigns of building between 1605-1608. It was common practice to order fireplaces from London workshops during this period, and a good example of this can be found at Ashley Park in Surrey in 1604, where the Kettle family, who ran their masons’ yard from Aldersgate in London, supplied three fireplaces of varying quality for three specific rooms of differing status.\(^{10}\)

The compositions of the decorative friezes were almost certainly stock items within the mason’s workshop, something that is most clearly suggested by the fact that the same design appears on the fireplaces of both G61 and S56.\(^{11}\) The frieze of the Brown Gallery fireplace also shares the same design of benign dragonheads flanking a central figure with the chimneypiece in G144, but is more conventional in its overall composition than its counterpart in G144. Nicholas Cooper’s suggestion that these early seventeenth-century fireplaces lack strapwork motifs derived from continental sources is not entirely true, but for the most part the decorative friezes appear to have been created without direct quotation from pattern books or other printed sources.


The Cure Workshop and Knole

This was not the case, however, for the most elaborate of the entire series, the fireplace in the Poets’ Parlour [G146]. This fireplace raises the issue of the role of one of the leading sculptural workshops of the period at the house. It is a large composition with a double set of Ionic columns made of Purbeck Marble, set on a pedestal (fig. 42). Columns support the large and elaborately decorated lintel (fig. 43), the design of which was skilfully derived from a decorative border by de Vries from Clemens Perret’s, *Exercitatio Alphabetica...* of 1569 (fig. 44). The craftsman responsible also had the confidence and the skill to combine various features from de Vries’ strapwork border in order to create a new and original design, condensing the overall design and changing small details to suit his means. For example, the centrepiece to de Vries’ border was adapted to contain a heraldic shield, and the animal heads at either end of the border were swapped for grotesque heads, features which appear to have been a leitmotif of these craftsmen’s work, and which appear on the almost equally elaborate fireplace of G144.

The suggestion is here that these fireplaces may have been the products of the Cure workshop, which from around 1570-1620 was probably the most prolific London Workshop specialising in monumental tomb sculpture. The Cure workshop is not often associated with the production of these types of fireplaces, which in comparison to their tomb monuments are remarkably modest in the scale of their ambition. Nevertheless, the Works accounts do confirm that the Cures worked in Reigate stone, and the similarity of the Knole fireplaces to one held in store at Hampton Court helps strengthen the idea that these fireplaces were the product of craftsmen who were involved at the Royal Works.

The only payment relating to fireplaces in Lyndsey’s accounts of 1607-8 was made to the King’s Master Mason Cornelius Cure (d. 1608/9) on the 10th of December 1607.

---

13 This fireplace was originally located in the gallery over the hall [S58].
14 E351/3250.
‘Paid to Cornelius Cuer ffreemason in discharge of a bill for stones for a chimney piece in the wthdrawing chamber at Knoll the 20 of November 1607/xxvjli.\textsuperscript{15}

The fact the payment refers to materials as opposed to workmanship, should not prohibit attribution of this fireplace, nor indeed any other fireplace in the State Apartments to the Cure workshop. This was a semantic consideration which reflected the fact that the materials used were by far the most expensive aspect of such commissions, and were often itemised and paid for separately from the workmanship. Take, for example, the payment made to Cure six days later for the monument to Mary Queen of Scots…

‘Cornelius Cure 26\textsuperscript{th} November 1607, To Cornelius Cure, master mason of his Highness’s works, for 220 foot of touchstone, and 20 foot of Raunce stone, at the rate of 10s the foot, towards the framing, making and finishing of a tomb for Queen Mary, late Queen of Scotland, according to a plot thereof drawn, and articles indented, between the Right Honourable the Earl of Dorset, Lord Treasurer, the Earls of Northampton and Salisbury, and the said Cornelius Cure. By a Privy Seal dated the 19\textsuperscript{th} of April, 1606 £120 0 0’

As can be seen from this prestigious commission, Cornelius Cure was the most established and the most highly regarded mason in the country in the early years of the seventeenth century. Having been made free of the Marblers’ Company in 1574, and the Masons’ Company when the two companies were amalgamated in 1585, Cure went on to enjoy Lord Burghley’s patronage, and was responsible for creating the tomb monument for the Lord Treasurer.\textsuperscript{16} Drawings held in the Hatfield collection, relating to commissions either for the crown or for the Cecils, show Cure to have been a designer of some merit, capable of creating accurate presentation drawings for fireplaces, fountains, door-cases and church-monuments. Judging from the quality of a design for a modest building in the Hatfield collection, which provides both a scaled ground plan

\textsuperscript{15} CKS U269 A1/1
\textsuperscript{16} For the most recent and accurate biography of Cornelius Cure see Adam White ‘Biographical dictionary of London tomb sculptors, 1560-1660’, \textit{Walpole Society}, LXI, 1999, pp. 36-42.
and an elevation, Cure was also proficient in undertaking small-scale architectural
designs. By 1605, Cure’s son William had joined his father in the position of Master
Mason in the Office of Works and increasingly took on responsibility for the family
workshop.

The suggestion here is that it was either William or Cornelius Cure who was
also responsible for both the design and the construction of the classically inspired
loggia which forms the centrepiece of the south range (fig. 45 & 46). The loggia is of
seven arched openings, with eight sets of paired columns; those in the centre and at
either end of the colonnade are of rance veined with quartz, the remainder originally all
of touchstone, but renewed in an Irish stone during the restoration work of the second
half of the twentieth century. The arches themselves are of touch, while white statuary
marble was used for the capitals and bases of the columns and the spherical jewels set
within the spandrels. Although obscured by the insertion of the nineteenth-century
fenestration, the soffits of the arches display finely wrought low-relief incised panels
depicting floral motifs which are very close in character to those which adorn the touch
panels and lintels of the fireplaces in the Great Chamber [F138], the Withdrawing
Chamber [F140] and the Gallery [F141].

The three fireplaces in the State Apartments are of the highest standard, and are
arguably the finest set of their kind that survive in England. What is remarkable about
the design of these fireplaces is the fact they are noticeably free of armorial trappings
and heraldry, something that might come as a surprise from a patron who had recently
been created an Earl, and had a keen interest in ancestry. For, aside from the incised
coop of arms and garter belt on the lintel of the Great Chamber [F138], the three Cure
chimneypieces are entirely free of heraldic devices. This shift of emphasis, away from
ostentatious displays of heraldry towards a composition that showcases the qualities of
the prestigious materials, is especially apparent in the design of the Great Chamber
fireplace (fig. 47). At the centre of the overmantel is a large alabaster cartouche, similar
to those of Cornelius Floris and Vredeman de Vries which, in the context of early
Jacobean design practice, would normally be expected to display a large armorial
badge. Instead, there is a large plane of grey marble veined with quartz that was left

---

19 Cyril Haysom personal correspondence, 2008. I am also extremely grateful to Adam
White for allowing me to consult his notes on the Cure fixtures at Knole.
completely unembellished. The central panel on which the cartouche is set is made from alabaster but painted to imitate rance, (fig. 48) and is adorned with fruits, gourds and ribbons, close in character to those on the best Reigate fireplaces in the house. This panel is flanked by two alabaster pilasters (partly painted black to imitate touch) which are adorned with more of this decoration and trophies of musical instruments again borrowed and adapted from designs by de Vries (fig.49). Although profuse in design, the emphasis on the contrasting colours of the materials aims to accentuate their individual qualities, a theme constant across the three Cure fireplaces and loggia at Knole.

The central panel of the Withdrawing Chamber fireplace (fig. 51) [F140] is flanked by two pilasters of touch, decorated with the same incised work as the other Cure works, although here depicting floral decoration. The overall composition of the fireplace is based on a design by Jacques Androuet Du Cerceau taken from the Second Livre d’ Architecture (1561), inscribed ‘Senes a pueris virtute vinci turpe’ (fig. 52). As the inscription suggests, the engraving depicts a fireplace with a large oval in which three contemplative old men are placed. To either side of these figures there are putti, astride seated sphinxes, holding standards adorned with armorials. Anthony Wells-Cole, who identified this source for the design of the Withdrawing Chamber fireplace, suggested that this is a ‘precise quotation’ from Du Cerceau, ‘with only slight modifications to the proportions.’ However, the chimneypiece is actually a synthesis of two designs by Du Cerceau which also uses decorative motifs taken from De Vries. The Withdrawing Chamber fireplace substitutes the oval depicting the ‘senes’ for a circular jewel of grey marble, with a decorative surround similar in its detail to that of another Du Cerceau design [fig. 52].

Below, the Du Cerceau’s terms have been substituted for a pair of different terms which have their bodies encased and only their heads and feet protruding. What is remarkable about these two terms is the fact that these components are cast in bronze [fig.53]. There is no known contemporary example of bronze being used in England.

---


during this period, something that makes the Knole bronzes unique for their time. The suggestion is, therefore, that these bronzes must have been manufactured on the continent and shipped to London before being assembled on site. The same can be said of the white statuary marble and the rance, which was almost certainly sourced from abroad. Interestingly, there is an elaborate mason’s, or quarry, mark inscribed into the alabaster cornice of the pedestal to the right hand pilaster of this chimneypiece. An identical mark appears on top of the cornice that terminates the fire surround on the fireplace in the Cartoon Gallery, something that gives weight to the idea that all of these chimneypieces came from the same workshop.

Du Cerceau appears to have been a fashionable source for sculptors in London at the beginning of the seventeenth century. For example, Maximilian Coult used the same series of designs by Du Cerceau for his chimneypiece in the Winter Dining Room at Hatfield House, c. 1609-11. At Knole, the composition of the Cartoon Gallery chimneypiece (fig. 54) is also loosely based upon a third design by Du Cerceau (fig. 55) which depicts a lintel with a decorative motif of jewels, similar to that which adorns the Great Chamber chimney, supported by two large Ionic columns set upon a shared pedestal. Above these columns Du Cerceau placed two pairs of caryatids, features that are followed in the Cure fireplace. Here, the paired columns are of a white and purple Brescia marble, with alabaster capitals and bases. Again, a large sheet of grey marble veined with quartz serves as the centrepiece to the central panel, and is surrounded by festoons of fruits and gourds delicately carved in alabaster and attractively veined with iron ore.

The three fireplaces in the Great Chamber, the Withdrawing Room and the Gallery would have been the most expensive features that Thomas Sackville commissioned for his transformation of the house between 1605-1608. From what remains of Sackville’s original scheme of decoration, it is clear that he placed key emphasis on the prestige of his materials – something that contemporaries appear to

---

22 Adam White was kind enough to share his thoughts on these bronzes, highlighting the flaws in their casting, something that would indicate an early date, and also the remnants of gilding still visible on some parts of the statues.

23 Nigel Llewellyn notes that small pockets of rance had also been discovered in England, See Llewellyn, *Funeral Monuments*, 2000, p. 215.

24 For the most recent and comprehensive research into early seventeenth-century Masons’ Marks see Jennifer S Alexander and Kathryn A Morrison, ‘Apethorpe Hall and workshop of Thomas Thorpe, mason of King’s Cliffe: A Study in Masons’ Marks’, *Architectural History*, Vol, 50, 59-94.
have picked up on. Writing to her son-in-law the 3rd Earl of Dorset in February 1616, Margaret, Countess of Cumberland, suggested that her daughter Lady Anne Clifford loved the ‘Old stones of Brouhton Castle better than the marble pillars at Knole House in Kent’. In contrasting the ancient fabric of Broughton to the marble of Knole, the Countess was attempting to heighten her daughter’s affection for her northern estates, but it does make it clear that prestigious stone, whether real or imitated, was the defining aesthetic of Knole in the years that followed its transformation.

**The role of Thomas Sackville – the case of the Great Stair**

Sackville’s role in the design of Knole may be difficult to quantify, but there is evidence within the fabric of the house itself to suggest that, at least on occasion, he exerted strong control over the decisions being made. His position at the head of the Jacobean government required him to dedicate much of his time to State affairs in London and at Court, and from what can be deduced from his surviving correspondence, Sackville spent much of 1604 working from his London residence, Dorset House. As suggested previously, much of the planning of the work, including the procurement of skilled labour and materials would have been conducted from London. However, it is worth attempting to establish how frequently Thomas Sackville travelled down to Knole during the construction of his house. His correspondence does give clues as to his whereabouts, although Sackville often did not indicate the location from which he was writing. The majority of his letters are written from either Court or Dorset House. Only a couple of letters were written from Horsley, and none survive from Knole.

This being said, journeys to Horsley appear to have been made as often as time allowed. As mentioned before, a third of Sackville’s household expenditure was spent at Horsley, a house that seems to have served as a permanent residence for Sackville’s wife. Unsurprisingly, Sackville travelled to the house regularly, especially during the summer months. The fortunate survival of a number of Sackville’s letters from July to 1652 when she wrote ‘A Summary of the Records and a True Memorial of the Life of Me the Lady Anne Clifford’ writing that ‘the marble pillars of Knole in Kent and Wilton in Wiltshire where to me but the gay arbour of anguish’, The Memoir of 1603 and The Diary of 1616-1619, Ontario, Canada, 2007, p. 225.

26 BL Harley 703/123 and LPL Talbot Papers 3202/28.
September 1605 provide a rare snapshot of how often Sackville was able to retire to his country seat at Horsley, and provide clues as to how frequently he was able to view the transformation of his house at Knole (fig.56). On the 24th July 1605, Sackville was waiting on the arrival of letters from Cecil before he could leave for Horsley, but by the 26th July he was back at Dorset House, from where he wrote to his friend Sir Thomas Lake. On the 31st July, Sackville had returned to Horsley, where he entertained the Prince of Wales. By the 6th August, Sackville was back in London, no doubt looking towards the imminent visit of the Royal Household to Oxford, a visit for which Sackville, as Chancellor of the University, was personally responsible. Sackville had hoped to arrive at Oxford no earlier than the 25th August, but for whatever reason had been forced to travel up the night before. After staying at New College until the 29th, Sackville returned to London briefly before embarking on a week-long tour of his three country seats.

Writing to Cecil on the 4th September, Sackville informed his friend that, ‘I go now to Horseley, thence to Knol, where I was not only in the first beginning all the year. Thence for 3 or 4 days to Buchurst, where I was not these 7 years.’ The trip to Horsley was probably made in order for Sackville to recuperate after the exertions of Oxford, during which he ‘had neither time to eate nor slepe but to attend continually’ upon the King. From Horsley he planned to head to Knole. Given the fact that he planned to spend three or four days at Buckhurst, which he had not visited for seven years, Sackville could only have spent a couple of days at Knole. As his letter to Cecil relates, the last time that Sackville had visited the house had been at the start of the year, although the fact that he made a point of mentioning this makes it seem that he had travelled down more regularly in the previous year. It would appear therefore that Sackville was making periodic, if not regular, journeys down to Knole to inspect the

28 LPL Talbot Papers 3202/28.
29 BL Harley 703/135.
30 LPL Talbot Papers 3202/28.
32 idem.
33 Sackville was back in London by the 11th of September. Calendar of the Manuscripts of the most Honourable The Marquess of Salisbury, Part XVII, London, 1938, p. 419.
34 Calendar of the Manuscripts of the most Honourable The Marquess of Salisbury, Part XVII, 1938, p. 413.
35 LPL Talbot Papers 3202/28.
progress of the building. The visit at the start of the year, before that year’s building campaign began, was probably made to make sure everything was in place prior to the commencement of work, and the second visit, made around the 6th or the 7th August, would have been to inspect work at the height of that year’s building season. Despite the ongoing work, the house appears to have been made hospitable, for in 1604 a number of household provisions including pewter and bedding were sent down to Knole from London.36 This suggests that Sackville made visits to the house during 1604, and judging by his comments to Cecil in the letter quoted above, they may well have been more numerous than the two visits he managed in the following year. By July 1607, a permanent household had been established at Knole, and the suggestion is that, from this point, Sackville was able to make more visits down to the house, something that is suggested by the fact that in August 1607 a household officer, Thomas Reynell, was reimbursed for a number of small sums that had been given away by Thomas Sackville while he had been at Knole.37 It is significant that after January 1608, Sackville ceased maintaining a household at Horsley, and only kept house at London and Knole, which must suggest that the house was fully habitable and had superseded Horsley’s position as Sackville’s favoured country house.

The visits that Sackville made to the house during its transformation should be seen as consistent with Sackville’s offer to Officers of the King’s Works to travel and supervise the planned building at Ampthill, and helps suggest that Sackville was a lively and engaged patron, who took an active interest in the architectural projects in which he was involved. This is unsurprising given the vast sums that Sackville was expending on the project, but as the following section will aim to demonstrate, there is strong evidence to suggest that Thomas Sackville had a significant input into the creative decisions that governed the direction of his project at Knole.

As previously discussed, Thomas Sackville was in the practice of consulting and amending architectural plans, and it is all but inconceivable to think that he did not do the same when it came to his own architectural commissions. It is well known that Lord Burghley, Sackville’s predecessor as Lord Treasurer, produced his own architectural

36 CKS U269 A2/1
37 CKS U269 A1/1 ‘Paid to M’ Thomas Reynell in discharge of a bill for divers small somes delivered to yo’ lo: handes to give away at Horsley at knoll and at S’ William ffosters the some of ffoure poundes six pence iiiij‘ vj’.
plans, passing them on to skilled craftsmen for them to finish.\textsuperscript{38} Payments to Thomas Webster, who appears from the goods that were bought from him to have been either a stationer or an instrument maker, for ‘Compasses rulers & other things’ in the 1607-8 account book, confirm that Sackville owned the technical instruments that were needed for architectural planning and it is easy to envisage Sackville working in a similar way to that of Burghley.\textsuperscript{39}

Further evidence that Thomas Sackville played an active role in making the creative decisions that governed the transformation of Knole can be found within the house itself, and it is in the decorative cycle of the Painted Stair [G123 + F109] at Knole where Sackville’s presence is felt most acutely. The Great Stair at Knole (fig. 57) was probably constructed during phase 4A/2, (1606-7) after the completion of the Great Hall, as part of the work which saw the remodelling of Water Court and its associated lodging apartments. The stair itself is a timber framed open-well stair with two quarter-paces and three flights to a first floor landing, encased with turned balusters. An integral element to the plan of Sackville’s house, the staircase gave access to the first floor of the apartments on the east range of Water Court and connected the Great Hall to the Great Chamber, and as such formed an important part of the ceremonial route through to the State Apartments. As such a significant feature of the house, it was only fitting that Thomas Sackville sought to embellish the stair with a sumptuous and sophisticated decorative scheme of rich carving and elaborate painting. Within this space, Sackville’s craftsmen constructed an arcaded screen with semicircular arches of the Doric order at the ground floor, and of the Ionic and Corinthian on the second, the columns painted to imitate Purbeck Marble. These architectural elements were imitated on the three walls surrounding the staircase itself, as they played with the relationship between real and imagined space, combining architectural elements with \textit{trompe l’oeil} paintwork.

The painted decoration of the staircase has traditionally been attributed to Paul Isaacson, who in March 1607/8 was paid £100 towards the cost of painting the ‘Gallery at Knole’.\textsuperscript{40} This was according to a ‘reckoning’ or estimate that had been ordered by warrant by Thomas Sackville, which would have included various articles of agreement

\textsuperscript{38} Girouard, \textit{Elizabethan Architecture}, 2009, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{39} ‘Paid to Thomas Webster for Compasses rulers & other things provided for yo’ lo: as by the bill signed by yo’ lo:’ 4\textsuperscript{th} December 1607. Webster provided printed paper to be used in the Buttery, Pantry and Woodyard. Webster also mended a clock for Sackville which gives the indication that he may have been an instrument maker. CKS U269 A1/1
\textsuperscript{40} CKS U269 A1/1
relating to the materials and workmanship involved in its undertaking. Judging from the contents of a schedule of works at Hatfield House from 1611, which detailed that the ‘wainscot above the hangings in the great chamber to the west to be painted […] which he is about a plot for, if it please his Lordship to have them done’, decorative painters such as Isaacson drew up preparatory drawings before showing them to their patrons for approval.\(^{41}\)

Paul Isaacson was the son of William Isaacson of Sheffield, and the younger brother of Richard Isaacson, who was also a painter-stainer who served as Sheriff of London. He can be identified with the ‘Paul Jackson’ recorded in the Works’ accounts for 1594-5 for painting the screen at Greenwich Palace, and by 1605, Isaacson had established himself as a leading member of the Painter-Stainers’ Company.\(^{42}\) In that same year, Isaacson submitted a large bill to Robert Cecil for works that he had undertaken at the Palace of Theobalds between May and November of that year. The bill, endorsed by Simon Basil, came to £89 18 8, and detailed payment for a wide variety of tasks, from gilding overmantels of fireplaces to painting gates in the garden.\(^{43}\) Perhaps most significantly, the largest payment was for ‘all the workes upon the great stares’, which came to the sizeable sum of £43. No detail is given as to the nature of this work, but a similar bill of the Serjeant Painter John de Critz for work at Salisbury House in London of 1608 lists work done on the stairs for ‘Architectors’, ‘divers pieces with poetical fictions’ and ‘armes, badges, rails and ballasters, gilded with fine gold’, an ensemble that must have been remarkably close in character to the decoration of the Knole Stair.\(^{44}\)

The likelihood is that Thomas Sackville saw Isaacson’s decorative work at the stair at Theobalds Palace and sought to replicate it at Knole. Whatever the case, the decoration of the stair at Knole appears to sit within the context of a contemporary fashion in elite households for highly decorated processional staircases, with trompe l’oeil balusters, fictive architecture and figurative allegorical scenes. The attribution of

\(^{41}\) HHA Cecil Papers 142/122.
\(^{43}\) HHA, Bills 9. ‘The bill of Mr Isacksonn’. These series of bills, vouchers and receipts do not have folio numbers.
\(^{44}\) HHA, General Accounts 12/20.
this work to Isaacson is not as secure as tradition might suggest, but what is clear is that Isaacson was capable of producing this type of decorative work.\footnote{For example, Robert Sackville-West, \textit{Knole}, The National Trust, 2006; Cooper, \textit{Houses of the Gentry}, 1999, p. 38; Wells-Cole, \textit{Art and Decoration}, 1997, p. 211.}

It is worth highlighting the point that there would have been a number of other decorative painters working at Knole during the period 1605-8 who may have been responsible for the decoration of the stair. At Penshurst Place, Robert Sidney had employed the London-based painter Ralph Treswell to undertake his decorative painting. Ralph Treswell is most famous for his surveys of London properties and country estates (he produced a survey of Otford Park for Robert Sidney in 1604 and in July 1615 produced a survey of the Manor of Imberhorne for the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Dorset), but he was also a successful decorative painter, who between 1613 and 1614 was responsible for all of the decorative painting at the Charterhouse.\footnote{John Schofield, \textit{The London Surveys of Ralph Treswell}, London Topographical Society 135, London, 1987; CKS U1475 A62/A/70 [Bound Volume of Bills and Receipts Volume V]; For Imberhorne see ESRO AMS5909/11; For The Charterhouse LMA ACC/1876/F/09/48.} In July 1607, Robert Sidney’s household steward, Thomas Golding, described to his master how Treswell had restored the paintings in the house before ‘a vayne took him to cast a marble colour upon the pillars of my Lady’s Banqueting House for the doing whereof he sent for a couple of painters from Knowle and that likewise is performed. Now he saith he will presently discharge his workmen and send them away.’\footnote{Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L’Isle and Dudley preserved at Penshurst Place, Kent, Volume Three, 1936, p. 386. (CKS U1475 C36/12).} The impression that is given is that the painters from Knole were part of Treswell’s workshop, and the suggestion must be, therefore, that Treswell himself may have had some part to play in the decorative scheme at Knole.

Whoever he may have been, it is clear that this craftsman was in close communication with Thomas Sackville when devising the iconographic scheme. At the foot of the stair there are four panels, each depicting one of the Four Ages of Man, derived from engravings by Crispijn de Passe after Maarten de Vos, dating from 1596 (figs. 58-60).\footnote{The identification of the following print sources for the Great Stair at Knole relies entirely on the scholarship of Wells-Cole in \textit{Art and Decoration}, 1997, pp. 211-215.} Beneath these are panels of decorative strapwork, which appear to be of the artist’s own invention, although further up the stair there are cartouches which have been derived from Jacob Floris’s \textit{Velderhande cierlijcke Compertementen}… of 1564.
On the three walls that surround the flight of the stair are depictions of the Five Senses, taken from prints by Pieter de Jode. On the first floor landing (fig. 61) there are depictions of six virtues, the three on the south wall taken from Johannes Sadeler I after Maarten de Vos (1579), beneath which are grotesque panels that borrow from Duetecum after Cornelius Floris (1554). The final three virtues on the west wall of the landing are taken from prints by Crispijn de Passe, while the architectural elements appear to have been borrowed from Sebastiano Serlio’s depiction of an arcaded portico in Book Five of his Architectural treatises. In his discussion of the printed sources used in the decorative cycle of the Great Stair at Knole, Anthony Wells-Cole highlights the fact that while the subject prints were relatively new in 1608, the ornamental prints were over half a century old, and puts forward the idea that this discrepancy might reflect the fact that the newer prints belonged to Sackville himself, while the older decorative prints would have been part of the painter’s stock-in-trade. However tempting this suggestion is, the fact remains that continental print sources were often quickly assimilated into workshop portfolios following their publication. A good example of this can be seen in Thomas Trevelyon’s Miscellany of 1608, a huge visual compendium in which Trevelyon used a series of recently published sources from both London and the continent. It is difficult to imagine either Treswell or Isaacson, or indeed any other leading London artisan, passing up the opportunity to acquire prints like those by Marteen de Vos, providing as they did such a rich source of inspiration for their work.

This being said, wealthy patrons such as Thomas Sackville often had access to the printed sources that were used by Jacobean craftsmen. William Somerset, Earl of Worcester, owned a copy of Hugues Sambin’s La Diversité (Dijon, 1572), which he almost certainly acquired during his special embassy to France in 1572. The frontispiece of the book is signed by Worcester, and within the book itself there are a number of annotated marks on specific designs. It is clear that these annotations marked the designs which the patron wished to replicate in his own house, because the caryatid designs that were chosen were used in the decoration of Raglan Castle in Monmouthshire. Here was a clear example of a patron choosing specific designs from
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52 idem.
his own pattern book to be used in his own architectural project. As suggested in the first chapter, the ambassadorial trips that Sackville made to Paris and the Low Countries would have provided ample opportunity to acquire the latest architectural treatises and pattern books published on the continent. He held a strong interest in both classical forms and modern Italian culture, and was an acquisitive individual who understood and promoted the use of continental literature. He also worked alongside individuals such as Simon Basil and John Thorpe who were instrumental in bringing these works into England, as can be seen in the examples in Chapter Two of Christchurch Oxford and Ampthill.

Whatever the case, it is impossible to imagine that Thomas Sackville did not have access to architectural treatises and pattern books when he came to conceive the iconographic programme for the Great Stair at Knole. Those that he chose were the Four Ages of Man, by de Vos, depicting the development of man from amorous adolescence, to hard working youth, to successful middle age, and finally to sorrowful old age. The *momento mori* was a staple of humanistic meditation, but one that was pertinent for Sackville, not least because of his preoccupation with his health and his impending mortality. As was seen in the previous chapter, Sackville had been ailing for a number of years, and in June 1607 had been in such a precarious state that it was widely believed that he had actually died. ⁵³ Whether the scheme of the Great Stair was a response to this particular illness is impossible to say, but it certainly provides the context for its conception.

This vanitas sentiment had also been explored by Thomas Sackville during his time as a poet. In both ‘Sacvyles Olde Age’ [ll. 57-64] and ‘The Induction’ for *The Complaint of Buckingham*, Sackville conceived powerful and arresting descriptions of Old Age. In the ‘Induction’, Sackville developed Virgil’s description of Old Age from the *Aeneid*.

> ‘And next in order sad *Old Age* we foun:  
> His beard all hoar, his eyen hollow and bling,  
> With drooping cheer still poring on the ground,  
> As on the place where nature him assign’d  
> To rest, when that the sisters had untwin’d

His vital thread and ended with their knife
The fleeting course of fast declining life' [245-252]

So for Sackville, the inclusion of de Vos’s Four Ages of Man had a multi-layered meaning. Ostensibly, it reminded those who view these panels of the transience of life, and the inevitability of death, but it also made subtle biographical allusions to the trajectory of Sackville’s life and his poetry itself. The most obvious of these allusions was the reference to ‘Sacvyles Olde Age’, Sackville’s poetic meditation on the various stages that were believed to punctuate a man’s life. At the time that the poem was written, Sackville was in a period of transition, and acknowledged that he was leaving the ‘false delyghtes o vayne and wordly Ioyes’, bidding farewell ‘the glisterynge palacie and the goden halles/ vayne wrethed pompe dothe me nomore delyght’ [ll. 227-228]. This type of metaphor was used by Sackville in his verse preface to Hoby’s translation of Castiglione.

‘These royall kings, that reare up to the skye
Their Palaice tops, and decke them all with gold:
With rare and curious worke they feed the eye:
And shew what riches here great Princes hold.
A rarer work and richer far in worth,
Castilios hand presenteth here to the,
No proud ne golden Court doth he set furt-
But what in Court a Courtier ought to be.
The Prince he raiseth houge and mighie walles,
Castilio frames a wight of noble fame:
The kinge with gorgeous Tyssue classes his halles,
The Count with golden virtue deckes the same,
Whose passing skill *o Hobbies pen displaise
To Brittain folk, a work of worthy praise.’

Here Sackville suggested that sumptuous royal residences should be furnished with the virtue of the courtier, and that however rich and engrossing the aesthetic

experience of these palaces, it remains second in worth to the courtly behaviour described by Castiglione.\(^{55}\) By situating ideas of courtly behaviour within the context of ‘rare and curious woorkes that feed the eye’, Sackville drew a parallel between the effortless grace of the ideal courtier and the sumptuous decoration of the palace, both of which have counterfeiting properties and the potential to deceive. The staircase at Knole, therefore, with its profusion of illusionist paintwork, was the ideal location to pose these questions.

At the top of the stair, the inclusion of six virtues (Majesty, Wisdom, Justice, Patience, Kindness and Humility), provided a heavenly zone to which to aspire. As Nicholas Cooper has suggested, considered as a whole, the sets of paintings may be taken to show that ‘man learns throughout his life, by the proper exercise of his proper faculties, thus enabling him to contend victoriously with his vices and to achieve pure virtue at the end.’\(^{56}\) The scheme was both personal to Sackville in its allusions to his poetic career, and amenable to a wider audience through its didactic message, and could only have been conceived by Thomas Sackville himself. The question is, however, was Sackville’s close involvement in the iconographic scheme of the Great Stair an isolated moment of personal interest, or was it emblematic of a hands-on approach to all aspects of decision making at the house?

Focusing on some particular aspects helps bring us closer to an answer to this question. One example can be found in the east range of lodging apartments in Water Court. These were designed as high-status apartments and used by the family members in the years following Sackville’s transformation of the house.\(^{57}\) This area of the house had been added by Archbishop Warham in the early part of the sixteenth century, and was organised around the Brown [F110] and Leicester Galleries [F118]. A number of these rooms were equipped with new high-status chimneypieces, and those that retained their early sixteenth-century fireplaces were given elaborate carved overmantels and

\(^{57}\) In 1616, at a time when their marriage was in its most precarious state, Lady Anne Clifford noted in her diary that she slept in her own chamber and her husband in the Leicester Chamber. In 1617 Richard Sackville was forced to stay in the same room due to illness. *The Memoir of 1603 and The Diary of 1616-1619*, 2007, p. 83, p. 125.
new wainscot panelling. It was clearly the most important suite of rooms in the house besides the State Apartments, and was set aside for the highest ranking members of the household. Judging from the 1645 sale inventory, the two galleries were where the vast majority of the pictures were hung, with thirty paintings in the Leicester Gallery (fig. 62) and the Brown Gallery (fig. 27) hung with eighteen pictures.\(^{58}\) What is remarkable, given the extent of his changes elsewhere, is that Sackville and his craftsmen chose to maintain the early sixteenth-century baton-type ceilings in both the Brown Gallery and Spangled Bedroom. Although all of these rooms have undergone alterations at various points in their history, there is nothing to suggest that these two ceilings are not original and \textit{in situ}. This choice, to maintain antiquated features in the house, is difficult to reconcile with the character of the work that was being done elsewhere in the house, all of which was in the very latest London style. However, there had been a recent precedent for this at Westminster Palace during the work of 1599-1602, when there was a partial reconstruction of the east side of what was later called New Palace Yard. Very much like the east range of Water Court at Knole (fig. 63), the east side of New Palace Yard at Westminster belonged to an early sixteenth-century phase of building work. During the works of 1599-1602, a programme of building which would have been managed and perhaps even supervised by Thomas Sackville, the range was re-fronted, but some of the early sixteenth-century flat baton-type ceilings (almost identical to those that survive at Knole), were maintained. It is difficult to say precisely what bearing this had on Sackville’s approach to the early sixteenth-century ranges at Knole, but it does provide some form of immediate context. At the very least, there must have been a contemporary appreciation of these simple geometric designs which were admired, perhaps as part of the building’s history, and maintained accordingly.\(^{59}\) What is known is that Sackville had a deep-rooted interest in the past, and an understanding of the fact that history was a construct made by others, something that Sackville would have been conscious of when he chose to maintain these ceilings.

Sackville’s love of music was also expressed both in the design and the decoration of his house. At Buckhurst in 1618, there was an organ with a pair of virginals in the parlour, and at Knole there is both an organ (in the private chapel) and harpsichord that have been dated to the early seventeenth century. As was seen in the

\(^{58}\) CKS U269 O10/1
previous chapter, Sackville employed the Italian recorder player William Daman, and by the end of his life he maintained a band of twelve singers and instrumentalists, which included a consort of viols and violins.\textsuperscript{60} Amongst their number were the singer John Myners and the violinist Jonas Wrench, both of whom went on to play for Henry, Prince of Wales, while the violinist Horatio Lupo joined the King’s Musick in 1611.\textsuperscript{61} These musicians provided Sackville with much comfort and solace, something which he acknowledged in his will, writing that they ‘have often given me, after many longe labures and paynefull travels of the daye, much recreation and contentation with theire delightefull harmonie’.\textsuperscript{62} As Lynn Hulse has suggested, this love for music was found manifest in the provision of a musicians’ gallery behind the hall screen at Knole, and in the various iconographic details such as the inclusion of the ornamental trophies of viols and violins that adorn the chimneypiece in the Great Chamber (fig. 48).\textsuperscript{63}

The internal fittings of Knole 1605-8 (II) – Decorative Plasterwork

An important part of Thomas Sackville’s decorative programme at Knole was the series of ornately rendered plasterwork ceilings, orchestrated by Richard Dungan, the King’s Master Plasterer, from 1597 until his death in 1609.\textsuperscript{64} A leading figure in the London Plasterers’ Company, Dungan was the leading exponent of his craft. Throughout the first decade of the seventeenth century, Dungan undertook frequent


\textsuperscript{61} They included, Robert Baxter, Jonas Wrench, Bonadventure Ashby, Henry Webb, Baptist Larkin, William Ffrigozi, Horatio Lupo, Christopher Beawfort and Thomas White. At Christmas 1607-8 the musician Thomas Cordweel and his company of violins were paid £5 for playing at Sackville’s house. William Symmes was also described in the accounts as ‘late on of yor lo:ps Musicians’ in 1607/8. CKS U269 A1/1. For subsequent careers see, Lynn Hulse, ‘‘In Sweet Musicke did your soule delight’’, in ed. Karen Hearn and Lynn Hulse, \textit{Lady Anne Clifford}, 2009, p. 95.

\textsuperscript{62} NA PROB 11.205, Essex Quire Numbers 108-149

\textsuperscript{63} Lynn Hulse, ‘‘In Sweet Musicke did your soule delight’’, in \textit{Lady Anne Clifford}, 2009, p. 95.

taskwork for the Office of Works although it is interesting to note that he does not appear in the Works’ accounts in the audit year 1606-7, which gives the impression that the work at Knole consumed the vast majority of his time. As previously discussed, it appears that Dungan was active at Knole as early as 1605, when he would have been responsible for the Serlian plasterwork ceiling in the Great Hall with its arcaded frieze, as well as the plasterwork walls and ceiling of the gallery over the hall (fig. 32).

Plasterwork was an untidy and unpleasant aspect of decoration that had to be completed prior to the instalment of wainscoting or any other interior fittings. In 1611, progress on work at Hatfield house had been delayed due to the plasterers over-running on their schedule, the paymaster commenting that ‘the plasterers wilbe clearlye rid out of all the house within this foure or five dayes, who have bee the greatest cause of the house lying so foule’. Unlike joiners’ work, plastering, both decorative and plain, had to be carried out on site, and Dungan’s payments record the carriage of half a tonne of plaster of Paris to Knole. In the space of three years between 1605 and 1608, Richard Dungan and his workshop created some of the finest decorative plasterwork ceilings of the period. The design of the ceiling in the gallery over the hall is a complex geometric pattern that incorporates the Sackville heraldic leopard in its central panels. This motif appears again in the Withdrawing Room and the Great Chamber, but this time the ribs are enriched with a continuous foliate design which extends to splays at each corner of the design. These floral motifs also appear as a central feature to the design, and run continuously down the length of the Cartoon Gallery ceiling to spectacular effect (fig. 64).

On an immediate level, these plasterwork ceilings were the crowning glories of Sackville’s interiors, their intricate designs catching the light from various sources to marvellous effect. While these designs borrowed from a variety of printed sources, from Serlio to the more generic pattern books such as Walter Gedde’s *A Booke of Sundry Draughts*, (London, 1615), they appear to have been principally the creation of the master plasterer, although the moulds they used were sculpted by joiners on their
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65 NA E351/3235, NA E351/3239, NA E351/3240, NA E351/3241, NA E351/3243, NA E351/3235. I am extremely grateful to Claire Gapper for generously sharing her notes on both the plasterwork and Richard Dungan’s career.
66 HHA, Calendar State Papers Domestic James I, 68/88.
67 CKS U269 A1/1.
behalf. The stylised floral splays could be found in a number of embroiderers’ pattern books, and can be seen in various forms in Thomas Trevelyon’s *Miscellany* of 1608. Although stylized, the floral motifs were recognisably plants with which early seventeenth-century viewers would have been familiar. *La Clef des Champs* (London, 1586) by Jacques Moyne De Morgues, was a compendium of various flowers which he dedicated to Lady Mary Sidney, and possibly served as a source for Dungan and his workshop.

The literature of the day reflects the fact that flowers were heavily invested with association and meaning. In Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale* [Act Four Scene IV 70-135], Perdita distributes various flowers to her guests, which correspond to the age of each recipient. The idea that flowers represented the seasons, and by extension the passage of time and the four ages of man’s life, continued a theme that had been introduced in the iconographic scheme of the Great Stair. This suggests that visitors to the State Apartments at Knole were continually prompted to engage with their surroundings, and continue their meditation on the passage of time and the transience of life. On a more immediate level, the repeated depiction of flowers was a fitting decoration for a series of rooms that overlooked the garden. Today, nearly all of the vestiges of Thomas Sackville’s garden have been removed, lost to successive campaigns of replanting and reorganisation.

‘…manie other pleasureable delights’ – The Gardens at Knole

There is very little evidence that aids a reconstruction of the garden that Sackville created at Knole between 1605-8. As a place of both retirement and entertainment, Sackville’s garden would have been an important aspect of his transformation of the house. Much earlier in his life, Sackville had visited the gardens of the Tuileries and had admired the ‘plesaunt walkes, so beauti­ful’ of Amiens, which
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68 A good example of this can be found at the works of Syon in 1604-5, where Thomas Leythie was paid for ‘carving mouldes for ye fretters’ SYON MS U1/13/47.
69 *The Trevelyon Miscellany of 1608 – A Facsimile of Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.V.323*, Seattle and London, 2007. f. 230r is probably the best example of many.
71 *Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, Glasgow, 1994, p. 429. I am grateful to Claire Gapper for suggesting this idea to me.
suggests that he had an appreciation of ordered and beautified setting. The 1614 valuation of Knole describes the garden, ‘well planted with choise frute, and beawtified with ponds, and manie other pleasureable delights’. The impression therefore is that Sackville invested heavily in the development of his garden, and that he furnished it with the latest fashionable accoutrements which would have included features such as statuary, sundials and fountains. Unfortunately, aside from the payment for Purbeck marble for the walkways, the gardens at Knole are not mentioned in the accounts for 1607-8. However, Thomas Sackville did employ a gardener as a permanent member of his household. William Wellyn was paid frequently in the accounts for weeding and provisions in Sackville’s garden, although sadly these payments do not specify whether this was the garden at Dorset House or that of Knole. Nevertheless, the likelihood is that Wellyn was the individual that Thomas Sackville charged with creating his garden at Knole. The accounts of the 3rd Earl of Dorset record payments for garden seeds of ‘sundrie sorts’, barley and malt provided for the swans that roamed the orchard, and Osiers set up in the Wilderness in June 1612. As Paula Henderson has argued, the Tudor and Stuart house was designed in tandem with the garden, and the two were conceived as a cohesive entity, a unified architectural scheme of indoor and outdoor spaces. Knole was no exception. Liminal areas such as the open loggia beneath the gallery at Knole blurred the boundaries of where the house ended and the garden began, while the paved walkways of the garden continued this further. The South Range of Green Court, as seen in an engraving of c.1780 (fig. 65), was originally accessible from the garden through a double-arched entrance way, similar in design to the loggia of the Colonnade Room. In 1823, the range was converted into an Orangery and the internal arrangement gutted, which makes it very difficult to know what function this area of the house served in the early seventeenth century. Sackville’s builders created a two-
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73 CKS U269 T1 Bld. A.
75 CKS U269 A1/1.
76 CKS U269 A1/5 and CKS U269 A2/2.
78 For building accounts relating to the reconstruction of this range in 1823 see CKS U269/A316.
storey range, with a crenellated parapet and regular fenestration of paired lights with four-centred arches, as elsewhere in the house. However, what is interesting about this range is that it never appears to have been served by stacks, which suggests that it was never inhabited and served another function.\(^79\) In 1765, it was referred to as the ‘Greenhouse’ and used as a storage room for garden furniture, but by 1817 it was being used as a repository for lumber.\(^80\)

The suggestion here is that this range was originally designed as an open space, served by a centrally placed stair that led up to the gallery above. This gallery has suffered damage by fire, and now only a small section of the original plasterwork in the far west corner remains. However, this section has been adorned with leaves, branches and foliage, painted onto the plaster. This would suggest that this room was of some significance, and might have served as a ‘garden room’ and as an alterative indoor/outdoor space to the arched loggia beneath the gallery. This reinforces the idea that the remodelling of the garden was a significant aspect of Thomas Sackville’s transformation of the house and had a considerable bearing on the design of the ranges of the south façade.

There were three main aspects of the garden at Knole in the early seventeenth century which, in their basic form, can be discerned in Knyff and Kip’s bird’s-eye view of the house of 1697 and two subsequent views of the house by John Harris and the engravers Bladeslade and Kip (figs. 66 & 67). The formal gardens were placed immediately to the south of the house, while the Wilderness, as it is today, was situated to the south east of the garden. Heavily populated with trees and foliage, the Wilderness evoked the feeling of the wild within the confines of the garden wall. Lady Anne Clifford often walked in both the park and the garden, and went to the standing in the garden to read and pray.\(^81\) The standing would have been a substantial structure erected to view either the garden itself, or the deer chase to the south.\(^82\) There were also the orchards, which were stocked with apricots and other fruits, covered with canvas to


\(^81\) *The Memoir of 1603 and The Diary of 1616-1619*, 2007, pp. 77, 123.

\(^82\) Kristina Taylor suggests that there was a secondary standing place directly to the west of the house with a clear view of the deer chase. See Kristina Taylor, ‘The Development of the Park and Gardens at Knole’, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, Vol. CXXIII, 2003, pp. 153-184 at p. 169.
In addition, there were a number of stews and ponds at Knole, and in 1619 the 3rd Earl of Dorset created a new pond and four new stews in the garden which were stocked with carp brought from Sussex.

The internal fittings of Knole 1605-8 (III) Painting and Joinery

Another technique that Thomas Sackville deployed in his attempt to impose a cohesive architectural statement at Knole was the use of decorative painting. The elaborate iconographic scheme depicted on the Great Stair appears to have been the centrepiece of a similar decorative programme employed elsewhere in the house, most notably in the Second Painted Stair [G147/F129/S61/S62] which provides access from the garden loggia to the gallery over the hall. On the ground and first floors the decorative scheme of Thomas Sackville’s phase of building has either been obscured or destroyed by the subsequent renovations undertaken by Marc Anthony Hauduroy between 1723 and 1724. However, Hauduroy’s work only extends as far as the half landing between the first and second floors. From this point onwards the early seventeenth-century scheme can be seen, revealed from under a layer of grey paint. The decoration of the Second Painted Stair followed that of the Great Stair, with an illusionist balustrade imitating the turned balusters and cup and cover finials of the newel posts (fig. 68). It is tempting to assume that this decorative scheme was a feature of the staircases such as those of the North Wing Stair [G68/F74], Lead Stair [G149/F143], and the Chapel Stair [M101], which shared the same design as both the Painted and the Second Stair. If this were the case, then it would have furthered the conceit that Sackville had been successful in creating a classically inspired palace from the fabric of the medieval great house.

Another means by which Sackville’s craftsmen masked the house’s medieval fabric was to plaster the exterior walls of the house with a render, and then to draw in fictive mortar lines in order to give the illusion that the house had been built from cleanly hewn ashlar blocks, rather than courses of Kentish ragstone. Vestiges of this scheme can still be seen on the upper storey of the north side of the King’s Tower.

83 CKS U269 A3.
84 ESRO ADA45/134 and CKS U269 A3.
85 For Hauduroy’s bills for work in the Cartoon Gallery and other works at Knole see CKS U269 A232.
the early seventeenth century, it was common practice to provide a veneer to the exterior walls, especially one that had been constructed from low-status material. For example, in August 1601, Simon Basil wrote to Robert Cecil regarding an exterior wall of Cecil House that was to be rendered and painted to imitate brick coursing.86

Something that is easier to appreciate is how Thomas Sackville furnished many of the rooms of Knole. In many respects the internal transformation of the house was equally if not more important than both the cosmetic and the structural changes made to the house by Thomas Sackville. By dramatically remodelling the interiors of Knole, Sackville transformed the experience of the house, creating a series of fashionable interiors decorated in the very latest style that masked the medieval fabric of the building. Joined wares such as decorative wainscoting and elaborate decorative overmantels were inserted extensively around the house, and to magnificent effect in rooms such as the Great Chamber and the Gallery. The lavishness of the refurbishment of Knole can be seen as in keeping with the reputation Thomas Sackville enjoyed for entertaining in style. As was seen in the first chapter, when on diplomatic missions, Sackville had travelled with a large retinue which had impressed those he had met with. His largesse was known to his peers; in 1604, the Earl of Nottingham deemed Sackville better furnished of chairs than anyone else that he knew,87 while a year earlier the Venetian, Giovanni Carlo Scarmelli, described how leading members of the Privy Council such as Sackville lived ‘not like Ministers, but like […] Kings’.88

Much of the internal decoration of Thomas Sackville’s phase of renovation survives in the fabric of Knole today, predominantly within the suite of State Apartments that now make up the show rooms of the house. The spectacular hall screen was the frontispiece to the house’s internal furnishing, and was carved profusely in the most fashionable London style (fig. 69). The Sackville coat of arms, replete with garter belt and coronet, is repeated throughout the design of the screen, at its centre above the second cornice, and set incising the Baker family’s coat of arms of his wife Cicely on two flanking cartouches. The heraldic badges of the Sackville leopard and the Buckhurst ram adorn the pedestals that support the four pairs of terms either side of the

86 Calendar of the Manuscripts of the most Honourable The Marquess of Salisbury, Part XVII, London, 1938, p. 343.
88 Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, 1592-1603, London, 1897, p. 529.
doorways and which are repeated again on the first storey of the screen. Typically for an English design, the Serlian motif of spherical devices, which alternate with the bucrania in the frieze, are substituted for Tudor Roses. In both its composition and its handling the hall screen at Knole is remarkably close to that at Audley End in Essex (fig. 70). Both share the four pairs of large male and female terms that purport to support the superstructure. Likewise, there are other decorative details that appear elsewhere in the house. For example, the five sets of small paired sphinxes that support the heavily protruding cornice in the hall screen at Audley End appear in the carved frieze of the Great Chamber (fig. 71 & 72). Another motif that appears regularly in the joinery at both Audley End and Knole is the employment of the grotesque masks taken from Cornelius Floris’s set from *Poutraicte ingenieue de plusiers Façons de masques* (1550-1555). At Audley End, these masks figured frequently in the decorative scheme in the gallery before it was dismantled in the eighteenth century (fig. 74). These masked heads were clearly derived from the designs by Floris, as can be seen in the example illustrated in figure 73. At Knole, the masks also figure regularly in the carved overmantels such as that of the Leicester Gallery. Likewise, the simpler overmantel of the Pheasant Court Room [G142] (resituated and originally in the Venetian Ambassador’s Dressing Room F100, fig. 75) corresponds closely to one at Audley End (see fig. 76). The documentary evidence for Audley End is even slimmer than that for Knole, and none of the names of the craftsmen at the house are known, but there is every possibility that the same craftsmen were active at both houses.

As Anthony Wells-Cole has suggested, the main stylistic influence for the joiners responsible for these carved hall screens was Vredeman de Vries. Masks, from Cornelius Floris’s *Poutraicte ingenieue de plusiers Façons de masques*, 1550-1555 were also popular both at Audley End and at Knole. On the whole, however, these craftsmen worked largely independently from printed sources, and the compositions they produced appear to have been largely of their own creation. This also appears to have been the case for the joiner responsible for the elaborate wainscoting of the Great Chamber, who borrowed from both Serlio and de Vries for various details (figs. 77 & 78), but otherwise conceived the composition independently.
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89. This view is also shared by Mark Girouard, See Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture*, 2009, p. 348.
There is a strong stylistic continuity which is shared between the handling of the carved oak screen and the overmantels elsewhere in the house. For example, there is a similarity between the grotesque panels in the hall screen and the central cartouche in the Leicester Gallery overmantel, both of which employ the same motif of setting a Floris mask within an elaborate strapwork cartouche. The suggestion is, therefore, that the majority of the joinery and carving was carried out by a single workshop working under an established and capable master craftsman. The only joiners that are named in Edward Lyndsey’s accounts are Robert Keys, Henry Waller and George White.\textsuperscript{92} Of Keys very little is known. He appears twice in the accounts, and on both occasions he was paid for work at Dorset House. These payments were for modest sums and did not add up to more than sixty-three shillings. Aside from this payment, Keys does not seem to appear anywhere else, either in the Works’ accounts or in any other documented building programme, and it is very difficult to make any case for his participation at Knole. The career of Henry Waller, Joiner to the Privy Chamber, will be discussed in much greater detail, but suffice it to say that Waller was chiefly preoccupied in the construction of high status furniture for the royal court rather than larger structural pieces such as hall screens, chimneypieces and wainscoting. However, George White, who in February 1607/8 was paid £24 15s for 100 clapboards, 60 wainscots at 7s apiece, and their carriage from London to Knole, was one of the leading members of his Joiners’ Company, whose name appears regularly in the Joiners’ accounts and who served as one of the company’s feoffees in 1590 and 1614.\textsuperscript{93} It was leading members of the Joiners’ Company such as White who appear to have been responsible for the production of lavishly carved hall screens. For example, in 1624, Robert Linton, another leading member of the Joiners’ Company, was paid £40 by the benchers of Lincoln’s Inn to make the screen for their hall.\textsuperscript{94} Linton was a very similar figure to White; both

\textsuperscript{92} CKS U269 A1/1 & CKS U269 A1/2.
\textsuperscript{93} CKS U269 A1/1; GML MS 8060. White was also part of the delegation which met with the Carpenters’ Company elite to discuss the guild demarcation disputes of the early 1620s. In 1622-3 he was responsible for collecting rents on behalf of the company. See also Henry Laverock Phillips, \textit{Annals of the Worshipful Company of Joiners}, Printed Privately, 1915, p. 128.
served in the upper hierarchy of the Joiners’ Company, and were London-based craftsmen with their own workshops.\(^{95}\)

For elite commissions such as Knole, joined wares were usually fabricated in London and then transported and set up at the house by the craftsmen responsible for their construction. Like most other aspects of building work, designs and specifications were agreed in advance of construction with either the patron or one of his agents. In January, the principal joiner at Hatfield, Jenever, travelled to the house to discuss ceiling the rooms with wainscot and providing overmantels for the chimneypieces with Robert Lyminge, and planned to make preparatory drawings to show to both Thomas Wilson and Robert Cecil.\(^{96}\) The following year there were a dozen joiners at London working on the joinery for the gallery at Hatfield House alone.\(^{97}\)

Although much of the joiners’ work was conceived and carried out from London, sculptural carving appears to have also been carried out on site. An example of this can be seen in the work of the joiner John Gardiner at Syon House who, during the course of the work at the house, was paid both for prefabricated wainscots and for making chimneypieces on site at Syon.\(^{98}\) It is therefore sensible to suggest that London joiner George White may well have travelled down to Knole to set up his wainscots and may also have undertaken carving work on site. In the absence of conclusive evidence, White emerges as the leading candidate for the elaborate hall screen, wainscoting and chimneypieces which adorn nearly all of the show rooms at Knole.\(^{99}\)

\(^{95}\) There is the suggestion that the 48-year lease that Robert Linton took out with the London Tomb-maker Gerrit Christmas of a tenement on the east side of St. Martin’s Lane was with a mind towards establishing a workshop. See Edward Town, *Artisanal London – Community and Practice in the Metropolis*, Unpublished MA Thesis for the Royal College of Art, 2007, p. 106.


\(^{97}\) HHA Cecil Papers 142/122 & HHA Calendar of State Papers Domestic James I, 63/88.

\(^{98}\) SYON MS U1/13/36

\(^{99}\) Some of these overmantels such as that of the Leicester Gallery have been reconfigured at some point either in the nineteenth or early twentieth century. Other overmantels such as those in the Venetian Ambassador’s Dressing Room [F100] and Lord Sackville’s library [G159] would appear to be complete confections of stray pieces of carving. That in the French Library formerly belonged to the Venetian Ambassador’s Dressing Room before being moved c. 1900.
**Furnishings and Pictures at Knole 1605-1645**

The most important documentary sources for this aspect of the transformation of the house are the 1645 and 1646 inventories, which record the forced sale of the goods of the 4th Earl of Dorset. Despite the fact that the Parliamentary forces had first occupied the house in 1642 and established the headquarters for the Court of Sequestration for Kent at Knole in 1644, the house does not appear to have suffered heavily during this period. When the house was first seized, a company of horsemen broke forty locks, damaged furnishings in the gallery and the Lord’s Chamber and removed a large quantity of weaponry and armour, but otherwise the house was left untouched. In order to make Knole suitable for their needs, small changes were made to the house. Puritan sentiment demanded that the ‘railes’ in the Chapel were removed, and an office for the Commissioner was also set up in the house, but aside from this the Parliamentarians were conscientious, mending the locks and keys that they had damaged and repairing the brewhouse and the blacksmith’s furnace.

The first of the inventories was taken on the 30th September 1645, (CKS U269 O10/1) and was the larger of the two sales, whereby the contents of each room were divided into various lots, although on occasion the entire contents of a smaller room were sold together as a single lot. Here, the auctioneers walked around the house setting an assessment price for each lot, and the figs show the best guess as to which rooms they visited. The second auction on the 13th January 1645/6 (CKS U269 O10/2) records the sale of goods ‘late found’ at Knole, which were most probably hidden from the Parliamentary officers by the house staff prior to their arrival. These comprised of the most expensive soft furnishings, including the house’s tapestry hangings and the finest bed furniture. Here the contents were not sold in the rooms that they came from, and instead were inscribed with a lot number, although helpfully the entries for the most expensive lots mentioned to which room they had previously belonged. This inventory

---

100 CKS U269 E15 – ‘The hurte done at Knole House the 15th Day of August 1642 by the Company of Horsemen brought by Cornell Sandys’.
101 NA SP28/130
was reproduced in the *History of the Sackville family* by Charles Phillips, who put forward the romantic notion that many of the household goods were bought either by Richard Sackville (later the 5th Earl and then styled as Lord Buckhurst) or by agents acting on his behalf. Richard Sackville did indeed buy a handful of the pictures and furnishings, and appears to have held the right to purchase the lots at their appraised value. However, there is no record that he had agents acting on his behalf at the sale, and the majority of those present at the auction were members of the Parliamentary Committee for Kent, who would have been resident at Knole while it served as the Parliamentary headquarters for the county.  

There is the question as to what extent the 1645/6 inventories accurately represent the furnishing of the house at the time of Thomas Sackville’s death in 1608. The chance survival of a series of letters from 1624 onwards, concerning the movement of household furnishings between the Sackville residences at Knole, Buckhurst and Dorset House, gives a good indication of how often household furnishings moved between properties. However, some caution must be applied, as a number of these letters appear to date immediately after the death of the 3rd Earl of Dorset, at a time when the newly created 4th Earl was establishing himself at his newly acquired country seat. Changes were also made by the 3rd Earl of Dorset. Lady Anne Clifford’s diary records that around the end of May 1617, ‘my Lord made the steward alter most of the rooms in the house and to dress them up as fine as he could’. This being said, items of furniture described in the 1616-1619 diary do appear in the 1645/6 sales catalogues. For example, the ‘green cloth of bed where the Child was born’ (1614) was listed as lot number nineteen in the Parliamentary sale of 1646, something that suggests that there was little change in the furnishings over this period.

---

102 Richard Beal was a Committee member 1634-60. Captain William Boothby of Westerham was Deputy Lieutenant and County Treasurer. Captain Charles Bowles of Brasted was Officer of the Committee and receiver general of Kent. Godfrey Lambarde was also a Deputy Lieutenant and Sequestrator general for the County. Sir Richard Hardres was a Deputy Lieutenant as was James William of Ightham Court Lodge and Sir Anthony Wilding. Other committee members named in the auction are Peter Peale of Sandwich, John Philpott, Augustine Skenner, William Skenner. There was also Jonathon Tilecote, who was the messenger for the county committee.

103 U269 E1(60), CKS U269 E162/1, CKS U269 E1(85/1-6), CKS U269 E1(76), CKS U269/C4/2(60).

104 *The Memoir of 1603 and The Diary of 1616-1619*, 2007, p. 133.

105 This lot included five curtains, one tester head cloth and an inner valance all trimmed with bone lace and buttons and loops of embroidered silk and gold, along with a taffeta
Furthermore, the fact that all but one of the items that were inscribed with ownership marks showed the initials ‘T:D’ (Thomas Dorset) does suggest that the vast majority of the furnishings at the house had been acquired by Sackville. Patrons such as Sackville often furnished their newly finished houses with a complete set of new furnishings, and accounts confirm that shortly before his death, Sackville had commissioned a host of artisans to supply wares for Knole. Payments were made to Francis Bittridge, silkman for gold and silver fringing, while the successful upholsterer Robert Singleton was paid for a host of wares for Knole, including six tapestry hangings, which may have been the six that were hanging in ‘my Lordes chamb[er]’ at Knole in 1645.106 A bill submitted to Robert Cecil a year prior to Singleton’s death lists a number of wares, including pillows, chairs, mats and blankets, and demonstrates the variety of goods that successful upholsterers such as Singleton sold. It also highlights the fact that upholsterers were often responsible for equipping entire rooms with soft furnishings.107 In 1645 there were fifty-eight pieces of tapestry hangings at Knole, a number of which were described as ‘lawnskip’ hangings, and the only named set was the five-piece Story of Solomon in the ‘matted Chamber in the upper gallery’.108 Buckhurst, a smaller and less prestigious house than Knole, had a greater variety of hangings. Two chambers were hung with Dornix, others with tapestry and one with painted cloths.109

One of the craftsmen that Sackville employed to help furnish Knole was the joiner Henry Waller. As suggested, it was common practice for wealthy patrons such as Sackville to order large commissions of furniture prior to the completion of their architectural projects,110 and on the 10th November 1607, Waller was asked to provide counterpane, one cupboard cloth and two window cloths of green satin. CKS U269 O10/2. Alternatively they could have been the ‘Six peeces of hangeings for the Corner Chamber in the Lower Gallery’. CKS U269 O10/1. For payments see CKS U269 A1/1 and CKS U269 A1/2.


107 Probably a product of the Mortlake Factory c. 1625 which was producing tapestries of this subject from mid sixteenth-century Flemish Designs. Tom Campbell, The Art of Majesty – Tapestries at the Tudor Court, New Haven and London, 2007, p. 305. I am grateful to Helen Wyld for her thoughts on this matter.

108 ESRO 3828.

109 Lionel Cranfield’s renovation of Chelsea House between 1619-1623 is a good example of this. All of the furnishings for this project are recorded in a single bound volume in the Royal Wardrobe Accounts. See CKS U269/1 OW35.
various wares for Knole and Dorset House.\textsuperscript{111} As Joiner to the Privy Chamber from 1595 onwards, Waller was one of the most significant artisans in early seventeenth-century England, and probably the most important furniture maker at Court during James I’s reign.\textsuperscript{112} The frequent payments to Waller in the accounts of the Royal Wardrobe relate that he ran a workshop responsible for creating the most prestigious furnishing in the royal household, items similar to those in the Spangled Bedroom at Knole (fig. 79).\textsuperscript{113} The joined frameworks that Waller provided for the upholstered fabrics were never as costly as the materials that adorned them, but it would appear that Waller was responsible for applying these fabrics onto the frame of the furnishings using a series of gilt pins.

A complete set of these furnishings, replete with a canopied bedstead, great chairs, high stools and low stools, all upholstered with the same fabrics, would have had a strong visual impact on any visitor to the house. The hierarchical nature of these items, reinforced by their position within the room, would have been instrumental in directing the codified behaviour which was expected in the formal areas of the State Rooms. Henry Waller also specialised in fashionable items such as the walnut billiard table with a velvet top and the balls and sticks for which he was paid in the Wardrobe accounts in 1606.\textsuperscript{114} Later in 1613, Waller was paid for a host of joined furnishings for the wedding trousseau of Princess Elizabeth prior to her marriage to the Elector of Bohemia. The Royal Warrant for payment to Waller lists a series of items including chairs, necessary stools, a screen with a lion carved at the top, a folding walnut table, along with the timber and board to make cases to pack the furniture in for transit.\textsuperscript{115} At Knole in 1645 there were twelve walnut tables, and one billiard table covered with green cloth which there is every likelihood were made by Henry Waller for Thomas Sackville. Originally from Cartmel, Lancashire, Waller bequeathed five pounds in his will of 1621 to both the church and the school of the village where he was most

\textsuperscript{111} He was also paid for a moneybox for Thomas Sackville’s Comptroller, Thomas Bridges. CKS U269 A1/1.
\textsuperscript{112} He and a ‘James Waller’ (perhaps his father) had been jointly granted the post of Joiner to the Privy Chamber in around 1595, following the death of William Jasper.\textsuperscript{112} CSP Domestic Series, of the reign of Elizabeth, 1595-1597, London, 1869, p. 149.
\textsuperscript{113} NA LC 9/94/69, 71, 73 and74.
\textsuperscript{114} NA LC 9/94/74
\textsuperscript{115} ‘Warrant of King James the First to the Great Wardrobe for apparel, &c. for the Marriage of the Princess Elizabeth’ Archaeologia, Vol. 26, 1836 pp. 380- 394. [BL. MS. Add. 5750] The Wardrobe accounts for that year list what appears to be a special chair for the midwife. NA LC9/96/10v.
probably educated.\textsuperscript{116} Due to the fact that the Joiners’ Company accounts only survive from the year when Waller died,\textsuperscript{117} there is no record of his membership in the company, but a bequest of five pounds to the poorest members of the Company should be seen as proof of his participation in guild life.\textsuperscript{118} Whatever the case, he was one of the most eminent and successful joiners in London, and his will gives a good sense of the wealth that a practising craftsmen at the top of his profession could accrue. At his death, the workshop was manned by two ‘servants’ or journeymen, John Whitton and Thomas King, who were left all of Waller’s tools and all of his timber, boards and walnut – a choice commodity and one which Waller appears to have specialised in.\textsuperscript{119} Again, like so many successful craftsmen, Waller owned a number of residences in St. Martin in the Fields, a parish where he served as vestryman.

In his patronage of Henry Waller, Thomas Sackville was yet again sourcing the finest wares that money could buy. Along with the tapestry and furniture, Sackville also bought expensive gilt leather hangings, which were another important part of the decorative scheme at Knole. As a fashionable and attractive alternative to tapestry hangings, four of the best rooms at the house were hung in this fashion in 1645.\textsuperscript{120} By the eighteenth century, decorated leather hangings were being produced extensively in England, but in the early seventeenth century they were imported from Spain and the Low Countries.\textsuperscript{121} In the collection in the private apartments at Knole, there is a folding screen made of a confection of different materials, including what would appear to be sections of early seventeenth-century stamped gilt leather (fig. 80) which would have made up the border of the hangings in their original form. Situated at the centre of these panels is a section of painted canvas with an elaborate gilded cartouche, clearly derived

\textsuperscript{116} Will of Henry Waller Joiner of Saint Martin in the Fields Middlesex PROB 11/139 Savile Quire Numbers 1-62.
\textsuperscript{117} GML MS 8060.
\textsuperscript{118} PROB 11/139 Savile Quire Numbers 1-62.
\textsuperscript{119} PROB 11/139 Savile Quire Numbers 1-62.
\textsuperscript{120} CKS U269 O10/1. By 1682, at a time when the house was increasingly being decorated with fabric hangings such as calico, only one room, the ‘dining room’ was hung with gilt leather. CKS U269 T71/3 They were still there in 1687 CKS U269 E2/3 when the room was described as the ‘dining room below staires’. For other examples of houses hung with gilt leather see, ed. Lindsay Boynton, ‘The Hardwick Hall Inventories of 1601’, Furniture History, 1971.
\textsuperscript{121} Eloy Koldweij, ‘Gilt Leather Hangings in Chinoiserie and other styles: an English Speciality’ Furniture History, XXXVI, 2000, p. 61-101. In July 1609 Rowland Buckett was paid by Robert Cecil for mending gilt leather hangings but there is little evidence to suggest that he was responsible for actually creating them. HHA A/106/22v.
from a continental print source. It depicts a seated woman, surrounded by a variety of musical instruments and playing a lute. At the top of the strapwork surround is the word ‘Veroa’, which in modern Portuguese translates to the word ‘Summer’. This canvas panel appears, therefore, to have been a survival from what was originally a series of depictions of the four seasons, and would suggest that they had been made on the Iberian Peninsular. Thomas Sackville bought his gilt-leather hangings from a Dutch merchant, Robert de la Barre, who was born in the city of Mons, and who was an Antwerp merchant who had moved to London in around 1590. An associate of Lionel Cranfield and one of the wealthiest and most successful merchants in the city, De la Barre was a member of a syndicate including Sir Noel Caron and Philipo Jacobsen, who raised a loan of £8,000 on behalf of the crown in 1616.

In 1602, De la Barre found himself in considerable difficulties after he had tried to enter a ship’s lading of 1,600 quintals (160,000 kilos) of woad to the value of £1,600 under a false name (Vincent de la Barre) at the custom house of London, which, because they were ‘the proper goods of a subject of the King of Spain’ were deemed forfeited to Elizabeth I. It has to be likely, therefore, that Sackville’s leather hangings came into the country from Spain, brought in legally after peace had been signed by England and Spain in 1604. They were expensive items; Robert Cecil’s suite of gilt leather hangings ‘wth great large pictures in them’ cost £36, while Sackville’s twenty-two pieces cost £68 15s at £3 2s a piece, a large purchase no doubt made in order to furnish Knole. The earliest description of leather hangings at Knole comes in 1624, when ‘Five peeces of guilt Spanish leather hanginges the ground greene’ were removed

---

125 CKS U269 A1/1.
from the house and taken to Buckhurst, further evidence to suggest that Sackville’s hangings had been made in Spain.\textsuperscript{126}

There were also a host of other gilded items at the house. On the 23\textsuperscript{rd} May 1607 Sackville paid the gilder Thomas Capp the substantial sum of £49 4d for gilding stools and chairs.\textsuperscript{127} Almost nothing is known about Thomas Capp. Between 1561-8, a craftsman by the same name was involved in the production of banners and heraldry for city pageants in London, a staple form of employment for jobbing painters, but this may have been a relative.\textsuperscript{128} It is known that he was used by Robert Cecil, for in January 1609 he appears in the accounts for gilding chairs and stools and for ‘the greene velett hangings imbriodered for the Queen’ for which he was paid £11 6s 4d.\textsuperscript{129}

**Thomas Sackville’s Picture Collection**

Many of the pictures at Knole that date from the sixteenth and early seventeenth century arrived from Copthall in 1700-1 as part of the collection of Lionel Cranfield, 1\textsuperscript{st} Earl of Middlesex, which had come into the collection of the 6\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Dorset.\textsuperscript{130} There were three substantial campaigns of acquisition at Knole under the 1\textsuperscript{st} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} Dukes of Dorset in the eighteenth century and also under Charles Whitworth in the early nineteenth century. In comparison to his contemporary Robert Cecil, Thomas Sackville is not recognised as a great patron of portraiture, nor is he celebrated as a collector of art works.\textsuperscript{131} Nevertheless, Sackville did commission certain paintings. Like Cecil, he was a patron of John de Critz (c. 1551/2-1642) who created the standard portrait type of Sackville seen in the original at Knole, and replicated in copies such as those at the National Portrait Gallery and elsewhere. It was also used in the double portrait of Sackville and Suckling at Sissinghust and the group portrait of the Somerset House

---

\textsuperscript{126} CKS 269 E162/1.
\textsuperscript{127} CKS U269 A1/2
\textsuperscript{129} HHA A/106/58v.
\textsuperscript{130} A number of the portraits at Knole can be identified as those recorded at Copthall in an inventory of c.1625-1630, CKS U269/1 E16.
Conference of 1604 (fig. 81). Sackville also commissioned portraits of members of his family. In the private apartments at Knole there are portraits of his daughter Mary Neville and her husband Sir Henry Neville, which both date from 1590 and which must have formed part of a larger series of portraits of family members since lost or misattributed over time.

Sackville’s only documented commission was the payment of £3 to Martin van Bethlem (fl. 1595–1617), who, along with Henry Holdernes, was paid for ‘painting and guilding the patterne of a frame for a picture’ which appears in Edward Lyndsey’s accounts on the 4th February 1607/8. Precisely what this work actually entailed is quite difficult to grasp, but it was presumably an illusionist painted frame for a painting. Nothing is known about Henry Holdernes, and very little of Martin van Bethlem. A native of Emden in Holland, Van Bethlem was first recorded in England by 1595 and was denizened in 1607. He was obviously well regarded in court circles: in 1610 he was paid £4 by Robert Cecil to produce three pictures ‘in cullo’s’ for the chapel window at Hatfield House, and in 1608 was responsible for painting a portrait of Charles I as the Duke of York. From the slim evidence available, it would appear that the majority of Sackville’s picture collection comprised of portraits of family members, friends and dignitaries, although as was suggested previously, there was also a collection of Roman Emperors in the Sackville collection during the first quarter of the seventeenth century.

The Brown Gallery Portraits

The core collection of the set of portraits in the Brown Gallery at Knole (fig. 27), which date from the last quarter of the sixteenth century, is one of the most important survivals of its kind in England, and contains six portraits of members of the Howard family, five prelates of the Church of England, and various leading political figures from the Wars of Religion in France and the Netherlands. Having begun in

132 CKS U269 A1/1.
134 HHA A160/1/72.
136 I am grateful to Alastair Laing for sharing his thoughts on both this subject, and the wider collections of the paintings at Knole with me. Rosalys Coope has suggested that these portraits were bought as a collection by the 4th Earl of Dorset, but provides no source for this suggestion. See Susan Foister, ‘Edward Alleyn’s Collection of
the early- to mid-sixteenth century, the fashion for collecting portraits of famous figures both from England and elsewhere was, by 1600, common practice in the decoration of the houses of the elite. Amongst the correspondence of Thomas Wilson in the State Papers of c.1600 is a list of the ‘Names of the Pictures w’ch are in the D. of Florences Gallery’. The list runs for four pages and gives the strong impression that there was an interest in the portrait collections of other leading European States, and the Florentine model was obviously one deemed worthy of emulation.137

The high proportion of members of the Howard family in the set has led to the suggestion that the collection may have been first put together by Margaret Sackville (née Howard and wife to the 2nd Earl of Dorset) before being subsequently expanded by her husband following her death in 1591.138 This is an entirely plausible idea, but there is the possibility that this collection was created by Thomas Sackville; a suggestion that might better explain the number of political figures and especially French and Dutch dignitaries in the series. The frequent exchange of diplomatic gifts during missions such as Sackville’s to France and the Netherlands would have provided him with ample opportunities to acquire paintings of these foreign dignitaries, and it seems likely that the portraits such as the triple portrait of the Coligny brothers in the Hall at Knole were acquired in this manner.

Having been expanded in the eighteenth century, the set of portraits in the Brown Gallery at Knole was actually considerably smaller in its first conception. Writing in 1817, John Bridgman suggested that these portraits were originally placed at cornice level in the Cartoon Gallery, inbetween the caryatid figures and in the spaces now occupied by the flower paintings, before being removed when the cartoons were brought in from Copthall in 1700/1.139 There is the contemporaneous example of this type of picture hanging at Towneley Hall in Lancaster, where the paintings were skied in a similar manner and were inscribed with the sitter’s name beneath each portrait, and so it seems likely that Bridgman’s assertion was accurate.140 Underneath the later

137 NA 98/1/163.
gilding, it is possible to see traces of blue pigment, something that gives weight to the idea that these portraits were originally set up in the Cartoon Gallery, and helps explain why there were no pictures listed in that gallery during the forced sale of 1645.¹⁴¹

What is known is that there was a ‘picture gallery’ at Knole as early as 1611, and although it is not entirely clear whether this room was the Cartoon or the Brown Gallery, it must have been planned and furnished by Thomas Sackville.¹⁴² In 1645 there were 71 pictures at Knole, (18 in the Brown Gallery and 30 in the Leicester Gallery) and although a small part of this collection was dispersed at the 1645 sale, the majority of the paintings at the house were purchased and retained by the then Lord Buckhurst, Richard Sackville (later ⁵ᵗʰ Earl of Dorset).¹⁴³ The major loss to Thomas Sackville’s collections occurred in 1666 when Dorset House was destroyed in the Great Fire of London. As the place of government business, and as the house used to accommodate visiting ambassadors and foreign delegations, Dorset House would have contained the best part of Sackville’s collection. Some idea of this collection is provided in the account of Sir Edward Herbert of Cherbury (1582?-1648) of his visit to Dorset House in 1610. His autobiography recalled how the ³ᵈ Earl of Dorset brought him into the gallery there, ‘any showing many pictures, he at last brought me to a frame covered with green taffeta, and asked me who I thought was there, and therewithal presently drawing the curtain, showed me my own picture’.¹⁴⁴ When Herbert asked how the ³ᵈ Earl had acquired the painting, he was told that having heard of Herbert’s adventures and heroics on the continent, the ³ᵈ Earl had procured a copy of his portrait. This copy,

¹⁴² ‘Paid to Marke Barnes Joyner for setting upp the wainscot in the w⁴ʰ drawing Chamber to the galleriere at knoll, and in the Inner Chamber under the west end of the Picture Gallerie beinge done by an agreement made by yo' lo⁹⁰ vij' xiiij' iiiij". CKS U269 A2/2/18. The Joiner may well have been the joiner Mark Barnes living in St Botolph Aldgate in 1638. ‘Inhabitants of London in 1638’, The inhabitants of London in 1638, London, 1931, pp. 210-224. Between 1616-1618 Barnes worked on the silkworm farm house at Oatlands, where he wainscoted a room with ‘ovall and arched pannells, swelling myter and reveals, with a wrought freeze’. Colvin, HKW, Vol. IV, (Part Two), 1982, pp. 214-215.
¹⁴³ CKS U269 O10/1.
recorded by Herbert at Dorset House, has since been lost, but the original by William Larkin (c.1580-1619) is still at Charlecote Park in Warwickshire.\footnote{145}{ed. Karen Hearn, \textit{Dynasties – Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630}, New York, 1996, p. 196.}

It is likely that the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl commissioned Larkin himself to make this copy. Larkin was responsible for painting portraits of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl and his brother Edward Sackville (now at Kenwood House, London) (figures. 82 & 83) that were probably made to commemorate the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl’s spectacular appearance at the wedding celebrations of Elizabeth of Bohemia in 1613.\footnote{146}{Hearn, \textit{Dynasties}, 1996, p. 199.} In 1618 Anne Clifford’s diary records that the painter came to Knole to paint her portrait, and a portrait of her at Knole, attributed to Larkin, still hangs in the private apartments at the house (fig. 84).\footnote{147}{The Memoir of 1603 and \textit{The Diary of 1616-1619}, 2007, p. 155.} There are also portraits of both the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Dorset and Mary Sackville (née Curzon) (1585-1645) at Knole, as well as a portrait of Anne Seymour (née Sackville) (1586-1664) at Petworth, Sussex, all of which are attributed to Larkin and which can be associated with the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl’s patronage. What is especially interesting is that the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl owned a portrait of the artist; the 1618 inventory of Buckhurst records the ‘Picture of Mr Larkine the picture maker’.\footnote{148}{ESRO ACC 3828/8.} The suggestion here is that the portrait of an unidentified man in the Brown Gallery at Knole is that of Richard Sackville, 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl of Dorset, and that it was painted by William Larkin shortly prior to his death in 1619 (fig. 85).\footnote{149}{I am grateful to both Karen Hearn and Jeremy Wood for their thoughts on this subject.} This portrait previously hung as a pendant to the Larkin portrait of Lady Anne Clifford on the overmantel to the fireplace in Lady Betty Germain’s Sitting Room (See Pym Album c.1890).

Richard Sackville has often been regarded as the paradigm of Jacobean excess, and this exuberance has the tendency to overshadow his significance as a patron of the arts. Sackville shared his position as a Lieutenant of Sussex with Thomas Howard, 1\textsuperscript{st} Earl of Arundel, the most celebrated collector and patron of his day, and spent considerable amounts of time at Arundel House conducting county affairs from Howard’s riverside residence.\footnote{150}{BL Stowe 173; FRO Rhuall MS DH 732.} In December 1616, Anne Clifford notes a visit to
Arundel House to see the ‘all the pictures in the gallery and the statues in the lower rooms’.  

As well as Larkin, Richard Sackville also commissioned works from Isaac Oliver (c.1565-1617) (fig. 86) and Paul van Somer (1577/8-1621/2), the other leading court artists during the second decade of the seventeenth century. There is the possibility that the portrait of Margaret Sackville (b. 1614) (fig. 87), is that which is mentioned in Anne Clifford’s diary of 1619; an entry records that Van Somer travelled down to Knole to take Margaret’s likeness in 1619, and also relates that the artist made portraits of herself and her husband the 3rd Earl.  

These portraits are not known to have survived, but the payments for them do exist in what remains of the 3rd Earl’s accounts. On November 24th a warrant for £42 was made by the 3rd Earl to Van Somer for portraits of Anne Clifford, Margaret Sackville, ‘and others’, while in November 1621 a further ten pounds was paid to ‘Mr vanzomer picture drawer’.  

In 1618 there were thirty pictures at Buckhurst. There were two sets (one of eight and the other of nine) of the Church Fathers, and a picture of Christ with a say curtain. Another important aspect of the hangings at Buckhurst was the display of maps; those of London, Sussex, Germany, Ireland and also a map entitled ‘Survey of the Kingdom’. Alongside family portraits of Anne Clifford, and portraits of Robert Sackville, 2nd Earl of Dorset, (fig. 88) there was a strong contingent of members of the Seymour family. There was Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset (c.1500-1552) and his wife, Katherine Grey, as well as his son Edward Seymour, 1st Earl of Hertford (1561-1621), and his wife Honora Rogers. Their eldest son Edward (1587-1618) married Richard Sackville’s sister Anne, and it is her portrait by Larkin that hangs at Petworth. There was also the portrait of ‘Mr Singleton’, who can be identified as Robert Singleton (d. 1612), the Citizen and Skinner of London who supplied Thomas Sackville with various wares for the furnishing of Knole. What is interesting is that Mathias Caldicote is named in Singleton’s will of 1612, and was clearly a friend of the family.

---

151 The Memoir of 1603 and The Diary of 1616-1619, 2007, p.105  
153 CKS U269 A1/5 and CKS U269 A1/6. There is also the portrait of James I in the King’s Room which is a copy after the 1618 autograph by Van Somer in the Royal Collection.  
154 ESRO 3828.  
155 Alongside being the Warden of the Yeomanry for the Skinners’ Company of London, Singleton also appears to have been the Customer of Chester, John James Lambert, Records of the Skinners of London, London, 1933, p. 285
As can be seen, the 3rd Earl’s penchant for commissioning portraits of individuals with whom he associated or admired would appear to have been a trait that he had inherited from his grandfather, Thomas Sackville, whose portrait of himself and his secretary at Sissinghurst can be likened to the portraits of Larkin and Singleton in the 3rd Earl’s collection. If Herbert’s description of the gallery at Dorset House is anything to go by, Richard Sackville had inherited a large number of portraits from his grandfather, and had followed him in commissioning the most fashionable artists of the day.

Conclusions

Following this discussion in Chapters Three to Six, it becomes possible to sketch out a hypothetical list of those individuals who were involved in the transformation of Thomas Sackville’s house at Knole between 1605-1608. The surveyor John Thorpe emerges as perhaps the leading candidate for the role of ‘architect/surveyor’, although Sackville’s own surveyor Thomas Marshal also appears to have had the requisite skills to survey and assess building projects. There were also a host of other individuals such as William Portington, who may have advised Sackville on his build. The idea that William Portington’s role went beyond providing prefabricated wares for Sackville should be treated with a degree of caution and as suggested, it seems likely that Portington recommended Mathew Banks to Sackville to act as the chief carpenter at Knole. Of all the craftsmen involved at Knole, Banks appears to have had the closest ties to the Sackville family, and the sponsorship of his entry into the Carpenters’ Company in 1614 by Cicely Sackville might well be seen as belated recognition for his efforts on her husband’s architectural project at Knole. There was also Thomas Holmden, a local individual who was brought in by Sackville to supervise and manage the work on site. His local knowledge enabled Sackville to source local materials, craftsmen and labour efficiently and economically from the surrounding area. The likelihood is that Holmden was aided in this by one of Sackville’s household staff. Both Edward Lyndsey and Michael Heydon remain candidates for the role of financial controllers of the works, but if Sackville had one secretary who was especially suited to
such a role it was John Suckling, a cultured man of some ability who was clearly trusted by his master.

There were also those responsible for renovating the interiors of the house. Beautifully wrought plasterwork ceilings, sumptuously carved wainscoting and large marble fireplaces embellished the principal rooms of the house, creating a magnificent sensory impact. The decorative scheme was also given cohesion through the deployment of an elaborate painted scheme which used trompe l’oeil decoration, which helped transform the house from an archbishop’s great house into a palatial seat for one of the country’s most influential and powerful men. Added to this, the rooms in the house were adorned with the finest furniture, upholstered in the most exquisite fabrics, and made by the King’s own joiner. There were also tapestries and gilt leather hangings which hung on the walls of the house, bought from the leading upholsterers and merchants of the day. Alongside these items, there were numerous paintings of Sackville’s friends, peers and family members, placed in the picture gallery and elsewhere in the house. On both the exterior and the interior of Knole there were innumerable badges, heraldic devices and initials, incessantly reminding any visitor of Sackville’s immense wealth and power.

At the same time there were also demonstrations of Sackville’s intellectual pursuits. The iconographic scheme of Sackville’s Great Stair made allusions both to Sackville’s career as a poet and also to his role in introducing Italianate culture into the vernacular. There was also forthright expression of his love of music in the iconography of both the Great Stair and the Great Chamber Chimney Piece. Knole was a product of the largesse and the wealth that Sackville had accumulated through government office, but it was also a pragmatic and expedient transformation of an existing house, intended to serve as both a family home and as suitable accommodation for the King and his Court. While Sackville’s employment of the finest craftsmen can be seen as part of a continued interest in the latest fashions, his decision to retain so much of the fifteenth-century building can be seen as a reflection of his antiquarian leanings, and just possibly, a hidden Catholic faith. But the house will always remain something of an enigma, reticent and unwillingly to divulge its secrets – in many respects, a fitting monument to the man who transformed it.
Conclusion

On the 19th of April 1608, Thomas Sackville died suddenly at the council table at Whitehall.¹ His thoroughgoing transformation of Knole was only just complete, and Sackville could have had barely time to enjoy it. Less than a year later, on the 27th of February 1609, his son Robert also died at Dorset House, London. Coming in short succession, the deaths of the first two Earls of Dorset looked set to spell disaster for the Sackville dynasty. Robert Sackville’s death left his eldest son Richard at the head of the family. Having been groomed, although perhaps not entirely ready, to take on his father’s political mantle, Richard was only nineteen years old, and had recently left Oxford to join the Inner Temple. His numerous talents showed considerable promise but he was simply too young to launch himself into a political career and to sustain the influence his family had enjoyed during his grandfather’s time as Lord Treasurer.²

The newly created 3rd Earl of Dorset soon established a household at Knole, although he continued to use his father’s former residence at Bolebrook in Sussex.³ In April 1611, the 3rd Earl embarked upon his tour of Northern Europe that had been planned during his grandfather’s lifetime, visiting both France and the Netherlands, and returning to Knole on the 8th of April 1612.⁴ His fledgling career at court suffered a serious blow when Henry Prince of Wales died on the 6th of November 1612, the 3rd Earl writing, ‘oure resing sunn is set ere scarcely he had shone and that wth him all oure glory lies buried’.⁵ Here, his own words proved prophetic as he failed to establish himself as a leading courtier with either the King or the new heir apparent. His position as Lord Lieutenant of Sussex was shared with Charles Howard Lord Effingham and Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel, a role which necessitated that he split his time

---

² Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, 1892, p. 1298.
³ Richard Sackville to Mathew Caldicott, 11th of December 1609 (written from Knole). The current whereabouts of this document are not known. It was sold at Swan Auction House in New York on the 22nd of April 2010 along with another undated letter from the same sender to the same recipient. On the 1st of September 1609 Richard Sackville wrote to Robert Cecil from Bolebrook, NA SP 14/48/2.
⁵ BL Stowe 173/225.
between London, Sussex and Kent, and he was always on the periphery of political life of court.\textsuperscript{6}

The diary of his wife, Lady Anne Clifford, of 1616-1619 gives a good insight into how Knole was used in the years following Thomas Sackville's death. There was a steady flow of visitors to and from the house, including servants, family members and courtiers. The marital discord between the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl and his wife, caused by the disputes over her Clifford inheritance and what Anne described as her husband’s ‘prodigality in house-keeping’, ensured that Knole provided the backdrop for numerous altercations and occasional reconciliations between the two. For the most part Anne was left on her own and her diary relates the combination of boredom and depression that characterised her life at Knole. The 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl’s extravagant spending decimated the Sackville estate and his accounts make for similarly bleak reading. By 1615 he was at least £10,600 in debt and was paying crippling rates of interest on his loans.\textsuperscript{7} It is understandable therefore, that the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl considered selling Knole in 1614, a house which was simply too large to justify maintaining.\textsuperscript{8}

Knole has always been recognised as a palimpsest of a house and whilst a number of owners have left their mark on the building fabric, it is first and foremost Thomas Sackville’s house, a vast monument to his power and wealth in the years prior to his death. Many of the most significant interiors in the house date from this period, and are a testament to the skill and craft of the artisans responsible, many of whom have been identified during the course of this thesis. In Chapter Four it was argued that there were three successive campaigns of building at Knole, between the spring of 1605 and the beginning of 1608, when the campaign was largely complete. These changes saw a large-scale reordering of the south side of the house which was given a symmetrical façade and a seven-arched loggia which led into the garden. Above, there were the State Apartments: the Great Chamber or Dining Room, a Withdrawing Chamber, a Long Gallery and a Privy Chamber. These rooms were decorated in the most sumptuous fashion, by the leading craftsmen of the day. Large portions of the house, such as the north range of Stone Court, the east range of Water Court and the west range of Green Court were given over for accommodation.

\textsuperscript{6} There are three main sources for the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Earl’s movements throughout the second decade of the seventeenth century. FRO Rhual MSS DH 732; BL Stowe 173; Diary of 1616-1619, 2007.

\textsuperscript{7} CKS U269 A1/2/8-9.

\textsuperscript{8} CKS U269 T1/Bld. A.
Although Knole was clearly decorated using the most fashionable artisans and the most prestigious materials available, Thomas Sackville worked within the existing plan which he had inherited from the fifteenth-century archbishop, Thomas Bourchier. The overall courtyard structure was maintained and the Chapel and the Kitchen retained their original positions. Large medieval structures such as the Bourchier Tower and the Outer Wicket were also left largely unaltered, and were assimilated into Sackville’s new design. Part of Sackville’s success was in the fact that he created his home largely from what he had inherited of the original fabric, without having to resort to whole-scale demolition and rebuilding. In part this reflects the pressures of time, which Sackville felt ever more acutely as his health continued to worsen. It also reflects the fact that there was still a degree of continuity between the design, and to some extent the domestic needs, of the great house of an archbishop and that of an early seventeenth-century Lord Treasurer. The gatehouses of William Cecil’s Burghley and Thomas Sackville’s Knole convey the same ideals of martial authority and power, in the same way that the numerous lodging rooms of Theobalds and Knole expressed established notions of hospitality and largesse associated with both Elizabethan courtiers and pre-Reformation churchmen such as Thomas Bourchier. In this sense, Knole says as much about how notions of domestic building on this scale in England had stayed the same between 1450-1600 as it does about how much they had changed.

Sackville’s synthesis of old and new at Knole was a reflection of his tastes and interests. His deep interest in the historical past, and in particular the episcopacy, can be seen in the decision to maintain numerous features from the fifteenth-century house. Those antiquarian interests, discussed in chapters one and two, had provided the inspiration for his most effective dramatic works, and had continued to be a passion of his throughout his life, as he collated his own manuscript collection and exchanged documents with other individuals. At the same time, Knole reflects Sackville’s appreciation of what was new and what was fashionable. As has been demonstrated in this thesis, his London household was not only a haven for scholars but also a grand repository of choice commodities and luxury items – the 3rd Earl’s habits had been instilled in him at an early age. Sackville’s engagement with Italianate culture, which had prompted his participation in the translation of Castiglione, and also his travels abroad have been shown to have shaped the changes that he made to the fabric of Knole many years later. The classically inspired features of the colonnade, the loggia, and the decoration of the two painted stairs are the obvious examples here, but there are also
numerous classical details on the wainscoting, overmantels and fireplaces all over the house. These classical moments reflect both Sackville’s personal taste and the more general direction of early-Jacobean design and practice.

The balance between Sackville’s classical interests and his antiquarian learning in the transformation of Knole is hard to pin down. But what is without question is the fact that his ‘resolution’ of the house between the historic past, his own life experience and contemporary fashions in art and design truly ‘re-edified’ the structure, imbuing it with new meaning and a new identity. That resolution remains the abiding sense of what Knole is all about, notwithstanding early eighteenth- and late nineteenth-century adaptation; these are periods in Knole’s history that still require further research and are outside the scope of this thesis. Further archaeology on the standing building and its surroundings, conservation of the interiors and more extensive dendrochronology may in future nuance the 1605-08 phasing of the house, but will not challenge the essential value of Sackville’s legacy.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Name</th>
<th>Room No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frieze</th>
<th>Frieze Size</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Jamb Size</th>
<th>Moulding Profile</th>
<th>Stops</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Associated Phasing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Room of East Range Artics</td>
<td>S97</td>
<td>North End Attics East Range</td>
<td>Obscured</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Obscured</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Obscured</td>
<td>Obscured</td>
<td>Straight Lintel</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Room</td>
<td>G69</td>
<td>North Side Stone Court</td>
<td>Geometric design with circular devices</td>
<td>55 7/25&quot;</td>
<td>Unfinished</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
<td>MP 4/2</td>
<td>Elaborate Vase/Tower Motif</td>
<td>Straight Lintel</td>
<td>CH4/1</td>
<td>4A/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane's Room</td>
<td>F69</td>
<td>North Side Stone Court</td>
<td>Decorative work centrepiece obscured by addition of keystone</td>
<td>58 7/7&quot;</td>
<td>KEYSTONE</td>
<td>40&quot;</td>
<td>Obscured</td>
<td>Obscured</td>
<td>Straight Lintel</td>
<td>CH4/1</td>
<td>4A/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Room</td>
<td>F79</td>
<td>North Side Stone Court</td>
<td>Geometric design centrepiece obscured by addition of keystone</td>
<td>56 6.5&quot;</td>
<td>KEYSTONE</td>
<td>39.5&quot;</td>
<td>MP 4/2</td>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Straight Lintel</td>
<td>CH4/1</td>
<td>4A/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT Office 1</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>West Side Green Court</td>
<td>Geometric design</td>
<td>63 7.5&quot;</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>49&quot;</td>
<td>MP 4/1</td>
<td>Trefoil</td>
<td>Four-centred arch with decorative work in Spandrels</td>
<td>CH4/2</td>
<td>4A/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT Office 2</td>
<td>F09</td>
<td>West Side Green Court</td>
<td>Geometric design</td>
<td>63 6&quot;</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>48&quot;</td>
<td>MP 4/1</td>
<td>Trefoil</td>
<td>Four-centred arch with plain Spandrels</td>
<td>CH4/2</td>
<td>4A/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archway Flat</td>
<td>F35</td>
<td>West Side Green Court</td>
<td>Dragons/Floral Work</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>MP 4/2</td>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Four-centred arch with plain Spandrels</td>
<td>CH4/3</td>
<td>4A/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downer Flat Room 1</td>
<td>F01</td>
<td>West Side Green Court</td>
<td>Decorative work with shield surrounded by garland</td>
<td>62 8&quot;</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
<td>MP 4/1</td>
<td>Trefoil</td>
<td>Four-centred arch with decorative work in Spandrels</td>
<td>CH4/3</td>
<td>4A/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downer Flat Room 2</td>
<td>F05</td>
<td>West Side Green Court</td>
<td>Decorative work Dragons Carrouche and shield crest</td>
<td>62 6&quot;</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
<td>MP 4/1</td>
<td>Trefoil</td>
<td>Four-centred arch with plain Spandrels</td>
<td>CH4/3</td>
<td>4A/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Room</td>
<td>F53</td>
<td>North Side Green Court</td>
<td>Gourd and tassel motif with shield surrounded by garland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>MP 4/1</td>
<td>Trefoil</td>
<td>Four-centred arch with decorative work in Spandrels</td>
<td>CH4/3</td>
<td>4A/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wing Sitting Room</td>
<td>G61</td>
<td>West Side Stone Court</td>
<td>Decorative work with gourds and circular devices</td>
<td>68 7&quot;</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>49&quot;</td>
<td>MP 4/1</td>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Four-centred arch with decorative work in Spandrels</td>
<td>CH4/4</td>
<td>4A/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room over King's Room</td>
<td>S56</td>
<td>West Side Stone Court</td>
<td>Decorative work with gourds and circular devices</td>
<td>63 9&quot;</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>50&quot;</td>
<td>MP 4/1</td>
<td>Foliate</td>
<td>Four-centred arch with decorative work in Spandrels</td>
<td>CH4/4</td>
<td>4A/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Name</td>
<td>Room No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Frieze</td>
<td>Frieze Size</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Jambs</td>
<td>Moulding Profile</td>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Typology</td>
<td>Ass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower Room</td>
<td>G131</td>
<td>East Side</td>
<td>Decorative work</td>
<td>60” 7”</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>MP 4/2</td>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Four-centred arch</td>
<td>CH4/5</td>
<td>4A/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men’s Court</td>
<td>Cartouche and Circle for Crest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with plain Spandrels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangled Bedroom</td>
<td>F101</td>
<td>East Range</td>
<td>Decorative work</td>
<td>57” 9”</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>43”</td>
<td>MP 4/2</td>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Straight Lintel</td>
<td>CH4/5</td>
<td>4A/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dragons Cartouche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Oval for Crest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Betty Germain’s</td>
<td>F111</td>
<td>East Range</td>
<td>Decorative work</td>
<td>65” 9”</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>47”</td>
<td>MP 4/2</td>
<td>Pawn</td>
<td>Straight Lintel</td>
<td>CH4/5</td>
<td>4A/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with Strapwork Cartouche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dragons &amp; Figures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Strapwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with Sackville Arms, Earl’s Coronet &amp; Garter Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Gallery</td>
<td>F110</td>
<td>East Range</td>
<td>Dragons &amp; Figures</td>
<td>66” 10”</td>
<td>Obscured</td>
<td>52”</td>
<td>MP 4/3</td>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Straight Lintel</td>
<td>CH4/6</td>
<td>4A/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Strapwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Sackville’s</td>
<td>G144</td>
<td>Duke’s Tower –</td>
<td>Dragons &amp; Figures</td>
<td>63” 10”</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>54”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Straight Lintel</td>
<td>CH4/6</td>
<td>4A/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting Room</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formerly Gallery</td>
<td>over Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strapwork adorned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with swags, peacocks, dogs and elaborate strapwork cartouche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poets’ Parlour</td>
<td>G146</td>
<td>Pheasant Court</td>
<td>Decorative work</td>
<td>79” 12”</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>56”</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Straight Lintel</td>
<td>CH4/7</td>
<td>4A/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 41: Early seventeenth-century door, Knole (photo: author)
Fig 42: Fireplace, Poet’s Parlour, Knole, c.1605-8 (photo: author)

Fig 43: Detail of carved lintel to fireplace, Poet’s Parlour, Knole, c.1605-8 (photo: author)

Fig 44: Hans Vredeman de Vries, cartouche design for Clemens Perret’s Exercitatio Alphabetica... of 1569. Copyright Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam
Fig 45: attrib. to the workshop of Cornelius Cure, Exterior of Loggia, South Façade, Knole (photo: author)

Fig 46: attrib. to the workshop of Cornelius Cure, Interior of Colonnade Room, Private Apartments, Knole (photo: author)
Fig 47: attrib. to the workshop of Cornelius Cure, Great Chamber fireplace, Knole. National Trust Picture Library

Fig 48: attrib. to the workshop of Cornelius Cure, Detail, Great Chamber fireplace, Knole. National Trust Picture Library
Fig 49: Hans Vredeman de Vries, Design for Trophies. Copyright Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

Fig 50: Androuet Du Cerceau, Design for a chimney piece, Second Livre d’Architecture, 1561. Copyright University of Tours, France.

Fig 51: attrib. to the workshop of Cornelius Cure, Chimney piece, Withdrawing Room, Knole. National Trust Picture Library
Fig 52: Androuet Du Cerceau, Design for a chimneypiece, *Second Livre d'Architecture*, 1561. Copyright University of Tours, France.

Fig 53: Detail of Gilt Bronze Terms, Withdrawing Room, Knole (photo: author)
Fig 54: attrib. to the workshop of Cornelius Cure, Cartoon Gallery Fireplace, Knole (photo: author)

Fig 55: Androuet Du Cerceau, Design for a chimneypiece, *Second Livre d’Architecture*, 1561. Copyright University of Tours, France.
## 1605 ITINERARY of THOMAS SACKVILLE, 1st EARL of DORSET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>FOLIO</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>RECIPIENT(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA SP 46/67/184</td>
<td></td>
<td>26-Jan</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Fanshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA SP 46/67/188</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Feb</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Fanshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of State Papers Domestic</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-Feb</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To the Officers of Customs of the Port of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I, HMSO, London 1857</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-Feb</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To the Officers of Customs of the Port of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA SP 46/67/198</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-Mar</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Fanshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL Harley 703</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6-Mar</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To the Justices of the Peace in Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA SP 46/67/203</td>
<td></td>
<td>22-Mar</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Fanshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 46/67/205</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-Apr</td>
<td>At Court Greenwich</td>
<td>To Fanshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of State Papers Domestic</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-Apr</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To the Officers of Customs of the Port of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I, HMSO, London 1857</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-Apr</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Fanshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 46/67/207</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-Apr</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Sir Thomas Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of State Papers Domestic</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-Apr</td>
<td>At Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I, HMSO, London 1857</td>
<td></td>
<td>14-Jun</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Michael Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL Landsdowne 89</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15-Jun</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Michael Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL Landsdowne 89</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17-Jun</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Cuthbert Ogle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 46/67/226</td>
<td></td>
<td>22-Jun</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Cuthbert Ogle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 46/67/232</td>
<td></td>
<td>26-Jun</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Cuthbert Ogle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td>TALBOT PAPERS</td>
<td>1-Aug</td>
<td>Horsley</td>
<td>To Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL Harley 703</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6-Aug</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Sir Walter Covert and Sir Nicholas Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas, Progresses</td>
<td>p. 538</td>
<td>24-Aug</td>
<td>New College Oxford</td>
<td>Lodged at New College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of James I, Vol. I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td>TALBOT PAPERS</td>
<td>25-Aug</td>
<td>New College Oxford</td>
<td>To Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas, Progresses</td>
<td>p. 539</td>
<td>25-Aug</td>
<td>Court at Woodstock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of James I, Vol. I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Palace</td>
<td>TALBOT PAPERS</td>
<td>30-Aug</td>
<td>New College Oxford</td>
<td>To Talbot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HMC, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the most Honourable The Marquess of Salisbury, Historical Manuscripts Commission, Part XVII, London, HMSO, 1938**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>RECIPIENT(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP 46/67/247</td>
<td>6-Oct</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Auditor Kinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 46/67/252</td>
<td>17-Oct</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Fanshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of State Papers Domestic</td>
<td>18-Oct</td>
<td>Dorset House</td>
<td>To Sir Thomas Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James I, HMSO, London 1857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig 56: Itinerary of Thomas Sackville, 1605 (author)*
Fig 57: The Great Stair, Knole. National Trust Picture Library
Fig 58: Crispijn van de Passe after Marteen de Vos, Adolescensia Amor, 1596. Copyright British Museum

Fig 59: Crispijn van de Passe after Marteen de Vos, Iuventus Labori, 1596. Copyright British Museum
Fig 60: Crispijn van de Passe after Marteen de Vos, *Senectus Dolori*, 1596. Copyright British Museum

Fig 61: The Great Stair, Knole. National Trust Picture Library
Fig 62: Leicester Gallery, Knole. National Trust Picture Library

Fig 63: The East Façade, Knole (photo: author)
Fig 64: Plaster Work Ceiling by Richard Dungan, Cartoon Gallery, Knole c.1607 (photo: author)
Fig 65: Unknown engraver and artist, South Range of Knole, c.1780.

Fig 66: John Harris and Thomas Bladslade, The West Prospect of Knole, for John Harris’s *History of Kent* 1716. National Trust

Fig 67: John Harris and Jan Kip, The South Prospect of Knole, for John Harris’s *History of Kent* 1716. National Trust
Fig 68: The Second Painted Stair at Knole. Hauduroy’s scheme can just be seen in the background toward the right. (photo: author)

Fig 69: The Great Hall at Knole with the carved hall screen, possibly by the London Joiner George White, c. 1605. National Trust Picture Library
Fig 70: The Great Hall at Audley End, c.1605. Copyright English Heritage

Fig 71: Detail of the Carved Frieze in the Great Chamber, Knole. National Trust Picture Library

Fig 72: Detail of the Carved Frieze in the Great Chamber, Knole. National Trust Picture Library
Fig 73: Carved Mask, formerly in the gallery at Audley End, now on display at the Saffron Walden Museum, Essex. Copyright Saffron Walden Museum

Fig 74: Design for Grotesque masks taken from Cornelius Floris’s set of masks from *Poutraicture ingenieue de plusiers Façons de masques* (1550-1555). Copyright Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

Fig 75: The Venetian Ambassador’s Dressing Room, Knole, from the ‘Pym Album’ of c.1890. National Trust
Fig 76: Carved Overmantel, Audley End, c.1610. Copyright English Heritage


Fig 78: Carved Capital from the Great Chamber at Knole (photo: author)
Fig 79: Furniture for the Spangled Bedroom at Knole, possibly made by the joiner Henry Waller, c.1615. National Trust Picture Library

Fig 80: Early seventeenth-century Gilt Stamped Leather Hanging, later incorporated into the Screen in the Private Apartments, Knole (photo: author)


Fig 86: Isaac Oliver, Richard Sackville 3rd Earl of Dorset, c.1616. Victoria and Albert Museum, London

Fig 87: Paul van Somer?, Margaret Sackville, Knole. National Trust Picture Library

Fig 88: British School, Robert Sackville 2nd Earl of Dorset, Knole. National Trust Library
Fig 90a: Room names, Oxford Archaeology, Phased typology of Knole, 2007. National Trust
Fig 90b: Room names, Oxford Archaeology, Phased typology of Knole, 2007. National Trust
Fig 90c: Room names, Oxford Archaeology, Phased typology of Knole, 2007. National Trust
Fig 89a: Plans of Knole based on the Inventory of 1645 and 1646 (author)
Fig 89b: Plans of Knole based on the Inventory of 1645 and 1646 (author)
Fig 89c: Plans of Knole based on the Inventory of 1645 and 1646 (author)
## INVENTORY OF THE GOODS OF KNOLE 30TH SEPTEMBER 1645 AND 13TH OF JANUARY 1646.

**CKS O10/1 & CKS O10/2. (AUTHOR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRISALL</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TO WHOME SOLD</th>
<th>SOLD FOR</th>
<th>BUYER</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Right hono[ra]ble Edward Earle of Dorsett Inventory of his goodes taken the 30th of September[e] r An[n]o 1645 Vera Copie p[er] le Cotte de Sutton at Hone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Great Hall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>One Draweing table</td>
<td>Rochester Mr. Philpott</td>
<td>1:04:00</td>
<td>Philpott</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One Shovell boord table three Formes and a Cover for the table</td>
<td>Rochester Mr. Philpott</td>
<td>1:09:00</td>
<td>Philpott</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:08:04</td>
<td>One table uppon tressles two Formes and one paire of Cast Andirons</td>
<td>Westrum Collonell Boothby</td>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00:00</td>
<td>Nine pictures of the Story of Malta</td>
<td>Lord Buckhurst</td>
<td>3:00:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In th[e] Parlor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05:00</td>
<td>Five piecees of Orris hangeings</td>
<td>London Mr. Stone</td>
<td>19:00:00</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:11:00</td>
<td>Two walnuttree foulding tables</td>
<td>Seavenoke John Thornton</td>
<td>1:07:00</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:07:04</td>
<td>One Cort Cupbord one round table upon a turned Frame</td>
<td>Knockholt Mr. Barber</td>
<td>0:17:00</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Kent, Knockholt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14:00</td>
<td>One high cheyer two backstooles &amp; two Lowe Stoolees &amp; 12 high Stoolees of Turkey woork</td>
<td>Tunbrige Robert Ware</td>
<td>3:18:00</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Kent, Tunbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One pair of brass Andirons fire Shovell &amp; tongs 1 pair of Small Creep[e]r's &amp; 1 fire Forke</td>
<td>London Tho: Blake</td>
<td>1:18:00</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:01:00</td>
<td>Five greene Curtaines of woodmeale 4 redd 3 old back cheyers 1 ould Stoole 1 ould Cushion &amp; a great cheyer of valare</td>
<td>London Humfrey Seale</td>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In Th[e] Roome within the Parlor going to the Garden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?]:10:00</td>
<td>One long Walnuttree table 1 ould Wooden Chest &amp; one Joyned Stoole</td>
<td>Seavenoke John Thornton</td>
<td>1:04:00</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In th[e] w[ith] Draweing chamb[e]r adjoining to the Parlor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:13:04</td>
<td>The Roome hanged w[i]th Guilt Leather</td>
<td>Rochester Mr. Philpott</td>
<td>3:09:00</td>
<td>Philpott</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:13:06</td>
<td>One Court. Cubbard one Small Walnuttree table 1 other Small table &amp; a frame. One wicker Screen 1 high cheyer Covered W[i]th Velvett 2 backstooles of green Velvett &amp; one high Stoole</td>
<td>London, Tho: Blake</td>
<td>3:00:00</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:14:00</td>
<td>One round table w[i]th falls &amp; a little Cabonett</td>
<td>Maidstone Mr. Godfrey</td>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td>Godfrey</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:06</td>
<td>One elboue cheyer 2 Stoolees embroydred w[i]th Silver twist 1 per of Creep[e]r's &amp; two long Cushons</td>
<td>London Tho: Blake</td>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In th[e] Chamb[e]r w[ith]in that</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>flower peers of Orris hangeings</td>
<td>East Kentt S[ir]. Rich: Hardres</td>
<td>10:10:00</td>
<td>Hardes</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05:00</td>
<td>One Standeing bedsted 7 backstools of purple Sarge embroydred 2 lowe Stoolees Suitable 1 Carpet of purple cloth</td>
<td>Kentt Penshurst Sir John Rivers</td>
<td>8:00:00</td>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>Penshurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00:00</td>
<td>Three windowe Curtaines of greene Sarcenet Lyned w[i]th bayes</td>
<td>London Mr. Stone</td>
<td>3:18:00</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>One per of brass Andirons, 1 paire, of tongs &amp; 1 paire of Iron Creep[e]r's</td>
<td>London Humfrey Seale</td>
<td>1:08:00</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In An Inner Chamb[e]r there</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>One Lyvery bedstead 2 ould fustion Mattresses dornix 1 Canopie w[i][th] Curtains 2 old Stooles 2 blankets 1 red Rugg; one Clostoole &amp; a pewter pann 1 little field table &amp; a bedstoole &amp; Pann</td>
<td>London Tho: Shelmerden</td>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>Shelmerden</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Under the Great Chamb[e]r Stayers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:07:06</td>
<td>One round [sic] square table 4 Anticke pictures 1 glass Lanthorne 1 Square table Upon the Stayers Head</td>
<td>Maidstone Goodwife Marshall</td>
<td>0:17:00</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Greate Dynge Roome</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:01:04</td>
<td>One foulding table upon blacke pillars 2 square walnutree tables 3 printed leather Carpets 1 Couch; 18 backstooles of Turkey woorke 7 windowe Curtaines of Greene Say 1 fire Shovell &amp; a per of bellowes</td>
<td>Lord Buckhurst</td>
<td>13:01:04</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the w[i]th Draweing cham[e]r</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>The Roome hanged w[i]th Guilt Leather</td>
<td>Westrum Collonell Boothby</td>
<td>6:12:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10:00</td>
<td>One large Canopie of Crimson Damaske wth a Deepe fringe w[i][th] large embroidered lace 4 Curtaines Suitable: 1 Guilt Couch; bedstead: 4 Pillows of Damaske glaced Knobbes Suitable to them 2 large cheyers: 6 high back stoools 4 lowe Stools all Damaske 1 Damaske Cover for the Couch 2 Quilts some p[ar]te of the Fringe Silver &amp; Some Copper the bases Suitable</td>
<td>London Mr. Knott</td>
<td>22:00:00</td>
<td>Nott</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In th[e] Queenes Chamb[er]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>One Standeinge bedstead 4 Guilt Knobs 3 Curtaine Rodds 1 Walnuttree table upon a Frame 1 Court Cupbord Suteble</td>
<td>Westrum Coll: Boothby</td>
<td>1:11:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0[2?]:10:00</td>
<td>Two high Stooles 1 cheyer 2 lowe stooles of Greene Cloath of gold Coll[ou]r w[i][th] Covers of Green bayes</td>
<td>London Ro: Stone Mr Fullerton Mary Barwicke and Mary Smith</td>
<td>4:10:00</td>
<td>Stone, Fullerton, Barwick, Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:09:00</td>
<td>One per of brass tonges brass fire Shovell &amp; a ould Iron Creeper. Two Deale boord tables upon tressles 1 wicker Cheyer &amp; 2 Window Curtaines of Greene Bayes very ould</td>
<td>Maidstone Mr Somersale</td>
<td>1:03:00</td>
<td>Somersall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In th[e] Servants Lodgeing w[ith]in y[t]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:08:00</td>
<td>A little pece of ould Dornix 1 bedsted Cord &amp; Matt 1 little table a Clostoole &amp; pann</td>
<td>Tunbrige Robt Ware</td>
<td>1:02:00</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In th[e] Chappell Chamb[e]r</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00:00</td>
<td>Five peeces of Orris hangeinge</td>
<td>London Mr. Stone</td>
<td>8:13:00</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:09:00</td>
<td>One bedstead Curtaines &amp; Canopie of greene Dornix two Fustian Mattresses &amp; one Canvas one, 1 Fustian bolster 3 Sarcenet Curtaines of Severall Coulers lyned w[i][th] blewe Say 1 table 1 Court Cupbord 1 paire of bellowes &amp; 2 lowe stooles of Rich embroidered Stuffe</td>
<td>London Robt. Ware</td>
<td>6:00:00</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>The picture of prince Henrye</td>
<td>London Mr. Beckwith</td>
<td>1:13:00</td>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>To Whome Sold</td>
<td>Sold For</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>In the Chapell Closett: One high cheyer 1 long Cushion 2 lowe Stoools w[i]th Cloath of Silver laced w[i]th Silver &amp; Gould Lace w[i]th Copper Fringe three Covers w[i]th greene Cotton.</td>
<td>Westrum Coll: Boothby</td>
<td>3:18:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>In the Chapell Closett: One long Cushion 2 high Stoools 4 lowe stoools of Crimson yellowe the lace Silke w[i]th Copper Fringe the Stoools being covered w[i]th red Bayes &amp; the Cushions w[i]th greene bayes.</td>
<td>Westrum Coll: Boothby</td>
<td>1:18:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:14:00</td>
<td>In the Chapell Closett: One long Cushion panned W[i]th the Cover greene bayes 2 ould long Cushions &amp; 7 small valure Cushions.</td>
<td>London Mr. Fullerton</td>
<td>1:05:00</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:02:00</td>
<td>In the Ladies Closett: One little enlayed tobula.</td>
<td>neare Maydstone Cap[t]. Slynner</td>
<td>00:05:0?6</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>In the Purple bed chamb[e]r: One guilt standing bedstead 4 guilt knobs w[i]th feather &amp; silver Fringe 1 round bolster 1 pair of blancket 1 Elbowe cheyer &amp; 2 Stoools With Silke &amp; Silver Fringe Covered w[i]th greene bayes 3 Curtain Rodds.</td>
<td>London Mrs. Smith</td>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>In the Purple bed chamb[e]r: One table of Walnuttree 1 Court Cubbord 1 large lookeing Glass w[i]th a Frame One Counterpaine of blew Damaske w[i]th Coper lace lyned w[i]th bayes, 2 saracenett Curtains lyned w[i]th bayes 1 brass fire Shovell et tongs 1 pair of bellows &amp; Iron Creep[er]s 1 Closestoole &amp; pann.</td>
<td>about Gravesend Mr. Blunden</td>
<td>3:05:00</td>
<td>Blunden</td>
<td>Gravesend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:02:00</td>
<td>In An Inner chamb[e]r: One halfe headed bedstead 2 Fustion Mattresses 1 featherbed &amp; bolster 1 little table 1 Joyned Stoole 1 pair of Iron Doggs 1 little Screene &amp; 1 per of Tongs</td>
<td>Seavenoke Rich: Cackett</td>
<td>5:06:00</td>
<td>Cackett</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:06:00</td>
<td>In A Roome between the Purple bed chamb[e]r &amp; the Damaske bed chamb[e]r: The Roome hanged w[i]th a Guilt Leather &amp; a Court Cupbord.</td>
<td>London Mr. Stone</td>
<td>6:00:00</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:05:00</td>
<td>In the Damaske Bed chamb[e]r: One Standing bed stead 3 Curtain Rodds 2 Fustion Mattresses &amp; 1 of Canvas &amp; a Fustion bolster.</td>
<td>Rochester Mr. Philpott</td>
<td>5:00:00</td>
<td>Philpott</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10:00</td>
<td>In the Damaske Bed chamb[e]r: One Couch bedsted 2 ould Mattresses 4 long Damaske Cushions 18 Cups of Damaske for the bed &amp; for the Couch w[i]th Silver lace, 2 elbowe cheyers 2 backstoole 4 10we Stooles of Dour Coulored Damaske laced w[i]th Silver bone lace 2 Standards to set Candle-stickes upon &amp; 1 Creadle.</td>
<td>London Mr. Norris</td>
<td>17:00:00</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:04:00</td>
<td>Two tables whereof one Spanishe</td>
<td>Black Friers Jonathan Tylecotto</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Tilecot</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>One brass fire Shovell &amp; tongs 1 wicker Screene 1 per of bellowes 1 per of Iron Creep[ers]</td>
<td>about Gravesend Mr. Blunden</td>
<td>0:16:00</td>
<td>Blunden</td>
<td>Gravesend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>flower windowe Curtaines of white Saracen lyned w[i]th yellowe Bayes</td>
<td>London Humfry Seale</td>
<td>4:06:00</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>One guilt bedstead w[i]th my Lords Armes att the head</td>
<td>Lord Buckhurst</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td>&amp; Canopie w[i]th 3 Silke Curtaine y Canopie wrth Silke &amp; Silver Fringe 1 high Cheyer &amp; 2 Stooles Sutable to the Canopie</td>
<td>London Mrs. Smith</td>
<td>2:18:00</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>Two small Turkey Carpets 2 ould Say Curtaine in the Close Stoole howse two Small peece of hangeings</td>
<td>London Mr. Stone</td>
<td>4:14:00</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:11:00</td>
<td>A brass pann a fire Shovell &amp; tongs of Iron 1 Close stoole &amp; pann &amp; a Court Cupbord</td>
<td>Farly Capt. Skyner</td>
<td>1:06:00</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Farleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In Leicester Gallery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10:00</td>
<td>A Rich guilt Couch bedstead 1 flock bed a case for the bedd 2 pillowes of greene Veluett &amp; 2 Stooles all of the Same w[i]th Silke &amp; Siluer lace the pillows Cases greene bayes &amp; a Buckrom Cover</td>
<td>Westrum Coll: Boothby</td>
<td>11:11:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One Billiard boord Covered w[i]th greene Cloath 4 billiard Stickes 1 porch 1 pinn &amp; 2 balles of ivory</td>
<td>Westrum Coll: Boothby</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:05:00</td>
<td>One Round table w[i]th falls upon a frame &amp; one Draweing table</td>
<td>Penshurst Sr John Rivers</td>
<td>3:00:00</td>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>Penshurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16:00</td>
<td>Twelve high backstooles of yellowe Stuffe: laced &amp; the frames painted w[i]th Some yellowe covers</td>
<td>London Humfry Seale &amp; John Tritton</td>
<td>3:18:00</td>
<td>Seal Tritton</td>
<td>London, Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One cheyer 2 high stooles w[i]th Silke &amp; Siluer Fringe the Frames being painted w[i]th gould</td>
<td>Maydstone Mr. Somersale</td>
<td>2:16:00</td>
<td>Somersall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>Two elbowe chyeres 2 high stooles &amp; 2 lowe stooles all Covers exept on the frames being, guilt w[i]th Crimso[n] &amp; gould w[i]th Silke &amp; silver Fringe 3 long Cushions Sutable</td>
<td>London Tho: Blake</td>
<td>8:00:00</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>One elbowe cheyer 2 high stooles 2 long Chusions: the Frames being Crimson gould w[i]th Cloath of Tissin &amp; Covers of bayes the woorke raysed in Branches</td>
<td>London Mrs. Smith</td>
<td>6:12:00</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>One elbowe cheyre 2 lowe stooles &amp; a footts stoods of gould Coulon &amp; white; 3 long Cushions of the Same w[i]th Silke long &amp; silver Fringe Some Branched being Rayed</td>
<td>London Mr. Beckwith</td>
<td>7:18:00</td>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10:00</td>
<td>Two elbowe chyeres 2 high stooles 2 lowe stooles there Frames beinge gould &amp; watchet w[i]th silke &amp; silver Fringe 3 Cushiones Sutable</td>
<td>London Tho: Blake</td>
<td>7:12:00</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:10:00</td>
<td>Thirty pictures in the same Roome &amp; 2 in the passag Coming in 7 of them w[i]th Curtaine</td>
<td>Westrum Lord Buckhurst Coll: Boothby &amp; Mr. Beckwith</td>
<td>39:01:00</td>
<td>Sackville, Beckwith, Boothby</td>
<td>Knole Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In An Inner Roome there</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedstead 1 feather bedd &amp; bolster 1 pillows 1 table with Drawers 1 paire of Andirons with brass tops 1 paire of tongs &amp; bellowes &amp; 2 windowe Curtaine</td>
<td>John Tritton</td>
<td>4:02:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Leyecter Chamb[e]r</td>
<td>3:00:00</td>
<td>The rooms hanged w[i]th guilt Leather</td>
<td>10:10:00</td>
<td>Godfrey</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:10:00</td>
<td>One guilt high Standeinge bedstead 1 oould woodmeale Cover for the Tester 3 greens Sarcenett Curtaines lyed w[i]th bayes &amp; a Taffety Curtains for the windowes</td>
<td>10:03:00</td>
<td>Philpott</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00:00</td>
<td>One great elbowe Cheyer 2 high Stooles &amp; 2 lowe Stooles 1 long Cushion gould Colored laced with Silke Silver related Covered w[i]th redd bayes</td>
<td>11:11:00</td>
<td>Frembly</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>One walnutt tree table 1 Court Cupbord 1 Closestoole &amp; 1 pann 1 paires of Iron tongs 1 Iron fire Shoovel</td>
<td>1:16:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Servants cham[e]r</td>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedsted Cord &amp; Matt 1 oould dornix Canopie head 1 small table &amp; a Cover for a Brushings table 1 Cushioned Stooole</td>
<td>0:17:00</td>
<td>Howesby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:16:00</td>
<td>In the Passage where the Emperors head hangs 18 pictures</td>
<td>1:16:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the w[i]th Draweing cham[e]r to the Rich Gallery</td>
<td>8:00:00</td>
<td>Two elbowe cheyers 4 high Stooles &amp; 4 lowe stooles of Cloath of Silver w[i]th Flowers cheyre Covers red bayes C round Ovell table upon a font guilded with silver 1 per of fire Shoovel &amp; tongs w[i]th brasse &amp; 16 pictures</td>
<td>8:00:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Rich Gallery</td>
<td>32:00:00</td>
<td>A Rich Canopie of watchett Velvett &amp; the Curtaines of Watchett Damaske one great cheyer 2 high stooles &amp; a feote Stooole 1 Case for a long Cushion The tester Vallance being embroydred with gould &amp; silver &amp; cheyers &amp; Stooles embroydred with silver &amp; gold, the Curtaines laced w[i]th gould Lace Some of them Cased w[i]th yellowe bayes 6 elbowe cheyers &amp; 6 high backstooles of blewe watchett Velvett embroydred with gold &amp; silver there Covers blewe bayes</td>
<td>68:00:00</td>
<td>Brockett</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[17]0:00:00</td>
<td>Sixe elbowe cheyers &amp; 6 backstooles of Crimson sattin embroydred with twisted silver &amp; gold Fringe there Cases red bayes</td>
<td>27:00:00</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:09:00</td>
<td>One small Walnuttree Draweing table 1 Iron Creep[ers] 1 p[er] of Doggs: 1 windowe Curtaine of Taffety very ould &amp; one Curtaine Rodd</td>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Gallery over the Hall</td>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>Sixteen Valare Stooles very ould 4 lowe Stooles of Needle woorke &amp; a backstooele of green velvet</td>
<td>2:06:00</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17:05:00</td>
<td>One couch cheyer w[i]th tester &amp; hed Clooth 1 Canopie 2 per of Vallance 1 headcloth 2 Curtaines 5 Cupps &amp; the head Cloth &amp; the outer Vallance being of velvett the tester &amp; the Inner Vallance &amp; the Curtaines of Damaske 1 Spanish Cheyer w[i]th Elbowes 2 lowe Stooles 4 backstooles 6 high Stooles 2 long Cushions 2 Shorter Cushions The cheyers stooles &amp; Cushions beino, of velvett laced w[i]th Silke &amp; Silve lace &amp; Silke &amp; silver fringe there Covers being blewe bayes, 1 small round tabule guilt</td>
<td>36:00:00</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:14:00</td>
<td>One flockebed 3 flocke bolsters &amp; an ould Matteress</td>
<td>Knockholt Mr. Barbor</td>
<td>1:13:00</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Knockholt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>One featherbed &amp; bolster marked with R: D:</td>
<td>Westrum Coll: Boothby</td>
<td>4:16:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:08:00</td>
<td>One featherbed &amp; bolster marked with T: D:</td>
<td>Seavenoke John Thornton</td>
<td>3:03:00</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:18:00</td>
<td>One featherbed &amp; bolster</td>
<td>London John Trit[on]</td>
<td>2:08:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td>One bolster &amp; 3 long pillowes</td>
<td>London Ambrose Martin</td>
<td>1:14:00</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>in the Bed Waldrupe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>21 frames of cheyers 1 quilted bedsted &amp; 2 halfe headed bedsteds 3</td>
<td>Rochester Mr. Philpott</td>
<td>4:19:00</td>
<td>Philpott</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curtaine rods &amp; Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:04:00</td>
<td>One small Spanishe table and another enlayd table with Drawers</td>
<td>Mr. Turville</td>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td>Turville</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>in the Roome w[i]thin the Bed Waldruppe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>One Canopie head of Dornix &amp; 4 Curtaines</td>
<td>Knockhold Mr. Barbor</td>
<td>0:18:00</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Knockholt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Eight ould greene Carpetts</td>
<td>Town Sutton Mr Mowle</td>
<td>10:10:00</td>
<td>Mole</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>Sixe per of oud Blanketts</td>
<td>London Mr Turville</td>
<td>2:02:00</td>
<td>Turville</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>Two piece of Vardey &amp; 3 woolen Coverlets</td>
<td>Knockholt Mr Barbor</td>
<td>2:02:00</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Knockholt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>Two yellowe Damaske windows Cloathes with Silks &amp; silver Fringe &amp;</td>
<td>Rochester Mr Philpott</td>
<td>1:12:00</td>
<td>Philpott</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 of Sticht Taffetty Greene with Coper lace &amp; Fringe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:14:00</td>
<td>Three ould white Quiltes</td>
<td>Rochester Mr Philpott</td>
<td>1:14:00</td>
<td>Philpott</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>Five ould Cushiones of greene Velvett and one greene Case</td>
<td>Branchley John Morgan</td>
<td>1:11:00</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Branchley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:16:00</td>
<td>Two per of blancketts 1 blewe Rugge</td>
<td>Westrum Tho: Smith</td>
<td>2:02:00</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:02:00</td>
<td>Two per of Newe blancketts &amp; 1 oud blancket</td>
<td>Coll: Boothbys man Mr Godfrye</td>
<td>2:05:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:16:00</td>
<td>A blewe bayes being Cases for a bed and Couch</td>
<td>Maydstone Mr Godfrye</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>Godfrey</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:14:00</td>
<td>Two Windowe Cloathes of Wachtett Damaske w[i]th Silks &amp; silver Fringe 1 of Cheyney Damaske with Copper Fringe</td>
<td>about Ashford Mr Tritton</td>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>Seaven red Damaske windows Cloathes the Topps being Copper &amp; the lower silks and silver</td>
<td>Banton neare Ashford Ralf Fremlby</td>
<td>2:16:00</td>
<td>Frembly</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14:00</td>
<td>One Canopie head layd w[i]th gold lace all over upon greene Taffety</td>
<td>London Mrs. Barwick</td>
<td>1:16:00</td>
<td>Barwick</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Fower small greene Carpetts</td>
<td>Gravesend Mr Blunden</td>
<td>1:16:00</td>
<td>Blunden</td>
<td>Gravesend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:18:00</td>
<td>A Remnant of greene Say a blacks Damaske headcloth 3 odd long Cushions Covered w[i]th velvett of severall Coulors one side of one of them Cloth of Silver</td>
<td>about Ashford Mr Tritton</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00:00</td>
<td>Fower little Turkey Carpets &amp; 1 greate Turkey Carpet Mixed with greene</td>
<td>Canterbury Sir Richard Hardres</td>
<td>15:00:00</td>
<td>Hardres</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:06:00</td>
<td>One long Turkey wrought Carpett &amp; fower ould Shorter</td>
<td>Maydstone Mr Somersale</td>
<td>6:00:00</td>
<td>Somersall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00:00</td>
<td>One Screene w[i]th 4 fowlds of greene Cloath 1 Greene Cloath Carpett.</td>
<td>Kent Mr Blunden</td>
<td>5:10:00</td>
<td>Blunden</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>Two square Trunckes bord with Iron</td>
<td>Lord Buckhurst</td>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>A Childes Cheyer and a small Cushion of Crimson velvett Covers of red Bayes</td>
<td>Lord Buckhurst</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>Eight Feathers</td>
<td>Kent Mr Blunden</td>
<td>0:07:00</td>
<td>Blunden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:07:00</td>
<td>Seaven ould Domix Curtains and Six Small Remnants of Dornix</td>
<td>Thomas Howesy</td>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>Howesy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:08:00</td>
<td>Five ould green Curtains Some Say and Some other</td>
<td>neare Ashford John Tritton</td>
<td>1:02:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:18:00</td>
<td>Fower ould bayes Curtains with Some Taffetty to them one red Cloath lined w[i]th Canvas garded w[i]th yellowe Cott[n]</td>
<td>neare Ashford John Tritton</td>
<td>2:02:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:01:00</td>
<td>Fower Lookeing Glasses where of some of them are broke</td>
<td>Canterbury Sr Richard Hardres</td>
<td>3:10:00</td>
<td>Hardres</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In the Standing Waldrupp**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRISALL</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TO WHOME SOLD</th>
<th>SOLD FOR</th>
<th>BUYER</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:07:00</td>
<td>(in a Roome by that) 4 ould stoole panns &amp; a Chamber port of Pewter fire Shovell tongs &amp; bellows</td>
<td>Maydstone Goodwife Marshall</td>
<td>0:16:06</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Fower picture frames &amp; a Case for a glasse lined with bayes</td>
<td>Westram, Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>0:18:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:04:00</td>
<td>In the stayers head by the backe Doore of the waldrup Two short Cuphords and a Wicker Cheyer</td>
<td>Goodwife Plumley</td>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>Plumley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:09:00</td>
<td>Two Close stoole w[i]th panns &amp; one Case .</td>
<td>Ashford John Tritton</td>
<td>1:02:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>Two presses</td>
<td>Mr. Blunden</td>
<td>1:07:00</td>
<td>Blunden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>One great Globe one Screen &amp; a p of bellowes</td>
<td>Tunbrige Mr. Sheffield &amp; Blackfriers Jonathan Tulecott</td>
<td>2:16:00</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Tonbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:02:00</td>
<td>Two ould Stoole 1 leather &amp; another green a small Remnant of Greene Cotton</td>
<td>Seavenoke John Thornton</td>
<td>0:09:00</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A parcell of Matts</td>
<td>Farley Capt. Skynner</td>
<td>3:03:00</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Farleigh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my Lords chamb[e]r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10:00</td>
<td>Sixe peeces of Tapestry hangeings .</td>
<td>London Mr Webbe</td>
<td>16:00.00</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00:00</td>
<td>One guilt French bedstead w[i]th Tester &amp; head Cloath &amp; Duble Valiance of Crimson, velvets embrodryed with Silver &amp; gold &amp; Silke &amp; gold Fringe Fiv[e]e Cr[im]on Taffety Curtains lined with greene Sarsenet laced with Silver &amp; gold Lace 2 elbowe cheyers 2 high Stoole[s] 2 very Cases for 2 long Cushions of Satin embrodryed w[i]th gold &amp; silver &amp; silke Fringe</td>
<td>Rochester Mr Philpott</td>
<td>36:00.00</td>
<td>Philpott</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Two windowe Curtains of red Cloath ve[ry] ould</td>
<td>Town Sutton Mr Mowle</td>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>Mole</td>
<td>Sutton Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:11:00</td>
<td>One small Walnuttree table a Court Cupbord &amp; a Close- stole &amp; pann</td>
<td>Seavenoke John</td>
<td>0:01:04</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>One small per of brass Andirons one Iron fire Shovell &amp; tongs a per of bellowes a Little Screen</td>
<td>Westrum, Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>1:18:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:18:00</td>
<td>A Fustian Mattress &amp; a Canvas Mattress a Small Turkey Carpet &amp; a small greene Cloath Carpet</td>
<td>Gravend Mr Blunden</td>
<td>2:16:00</td>
<td>Blunden</td>
<td>Gravesend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In A Closet[e]t by the chamb[e]r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:18:00</td>
<td>One Deske upon a Screene a little lowe table in a servants Lodgeing there 1 halfe headed bedstead 1 little table &amp; 2 Joyned Stool[s]</td>
<td>Branchley John Morgan</td>
<td>0:18:00</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Brenchley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Matted chamb[e]r towards the Gallery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00:00</td>
<td>Seaven peeces of tapestry hangeings</td>
<td>London Mrs Miller</td>
<td>18:00.00</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One large picture</td>
<td>Westram, Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15:00</td>
<td>One standeing bedsted tester &amp; head Cloath &amp; Duble valance, of Taffe Taffety 1 elbowe cheyer 2 high stoole[s] of the same</td>
<td>Mr. Blunden</td>
<td>0:05:05</td>
<td>Blunden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:05:00</td>
<td>One feather bed &amp; bolster 1 plaine greene Rugg &amp; 2 blancket[s]</td>
<td>Westram, Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>6:12:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:06:00</td>
<td>Two small Turkey Carpets 1 small table 1 Court Cupbord 2 windowe Curtaines of woodmeale lined with bayes .</td>
<td>Towne Sutton John Mowle</td>
<td>3:12:00</td>
<td>Mole</td>
<td>Sutton Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:16:00</td>
<td>One per of small brass Andirons fire shovell &amp; tongs of Iron 1 pair of bellowes 1 Closetoole &amp; pann &amp; 1 chamb[e]r pott</td>
<td>Tonbrige Mr Sheffield</td>
<td>1:18:00</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the outer chamb[e]r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:03:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedsted &amp; 1 tressle table 1 Joyned Stool[e]</td>
<td>Thomas Knight</td>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>One round Canopie head w[i]th 2 greene Taffety Curtaines laced Silver lace 1 backstoole &amp; 2 high Stool es of greene Velvett</td>
<td>London Thomas Blake</td>
<td>3:10:00</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>One feather bed &amp; bolster two blancket[s] a warder Coverlett vergould</td>
<td>Thomas Knight</td>
<td>4:12:00</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Corner chamb[e]r in the Lower Gallery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:05:00</td>
<td>One half[ed] head[ed] bed[stead] 1 Canopie of Taffety 2 Curtaines of the Same 1 feather bead bolster &amp; pillow 2 blancket[s], &amp; a ould Coverlett</td>
<td>London Robert Ware</td>
<td>4:14:00</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:06:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedstead 1 feather bed &amp; bolster 2 blankets &amp; 1 Coverringe</td>
<td>Win. Dirtnall</td>
<td>2:04:00</td>
<td>Dirtnall</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:05:00</td>
<td>Fower field stoole 1 elboe cheyer 2 high Stooles w[i]th Silke &amp; gold Fringe the lace of the Stooles being Copper &amp; 2 lowe Stoole of greene velocities</td>
<td>London or Ashford Mrs. Barwicke</td>
<td>2:18:00</td>
<td>Barwick</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:05:00</td>
<td>Two square tables a fouling table and 1 Joyned Stoole.</td>
<td>John Tritton</td>
<td>1:12:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Three windowe Curtaines 1 Close stoole and Pann 1 Iron fore shovell &amp; tongs</td>
<td>[Ditto] [included in above]</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>Two great Standard Trunks bound with[i]th Iron</td>
<td>Westrum Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:09:00</td>
<td>Two square tables 1 Joyned Stool1, Close Stooke and pann 2 Creep[ers] &amp; a fire Shovell</td>
<td>Maydstone Mrs. Marshall</td>
<td>1:01:00</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00:00</td>
<td>Five peeces of Tapestry hangeings</td>
<td>Canterbery Sir Richard Hardres</td>
<td>14:00:00</td>
<td>Hardres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00:00</td>
<td>One guilt bedsted 4 Curtaines of greene &amp; yellowe Damaske. Tester head Cloath &amp; Dubble valiance w[i]th Silke &amp; silver Fringe &amp; lace of Tufft Taffety 10 elboe Cheyer 2 high Stooles &amp; 2 love Stooles &amp; 1 long Cushion all laced Fringed w[i]th gould &amp; silke Covers of Greene bayes for the Cushions &amp; the Stooles</td>
<td>Westrum Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>27:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10:00</td>
<td>One guilt bedsted 4 Curtaines of greene &amp; yellowe Damaske. Tester head Cloath &amp; Dubble valiance w[i]th Silke &amp; silver Fringe &amp; lace of Tufft Taffety 10 elboe Cheyer 2 high Stooles &amp; 2 love Stooles &amp; 1 long Cushion all laced Fringed w[i]th gould &amp; silke Covers of Greene bayes for the Cushions &amp; the Stooles</td>
<td>Westrum Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>27:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:16:00</td>
<td>Two small Turkey Wrought Carpets</td>
<td>Robt. Ware</td>
<td>1:14:00</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>Three large Dornix windowe Curtaines &amp; 2 Say Curtaines</td>
<td>Mr. Blunden</td>
<td>1:08:00</td>
<td>Blunden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>A small per of Brass Andirons Dogs fire Shovell &amp; tongs 1 per of bellowes</td>
<td>John Tritton</td>
<td>1:09:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:08:00</td>
<td>One small Court Cupbord 1 table a Close Stoole &amp; pann &amp; a Cham[ber] pott</td>
<td>Westrum Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>0:18:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedsted 1 feather bed &amp; bolster two blanckets &amp; a oulde Coveringe 2 oulde Stooles &amp; a little table</td>
<td>Maydstone Ambrose Martyn</td>
<td>3:18:00</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:02:00</td>
<td>One Dornix Canopie 2 Dornix Curtaines 2 halfe headed bedsted 1 featherbed &amp; bolster 1 per of Blanckets &amp; a greene Rugg 1 little Spanishe Table 4 Moles 2 Cushioned &amp; 2 Joyned 1 table upon Tressels fire Shovell et tongs</td>
<td>Maydstone Mrs. Marshall</td>
<td>4:16:00</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10:00</td>
<td>Fower pieces of Tapestry hangeings</td>
<td>London Mr. Beckwith</td>
<td>9:09:00</td>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:16:00</td>
<td>One bedstead &amp; Canopie of a blewe Turffted Silke stuffe 2 Curtaines of the same 1 feather bed &amp; bolster 1 pillowe 1 per of blanckets, 10 blewe Rugg 1 blewe Casey high cheyer &amp; 2 Stooles</td>
<td>Lord Buckhurst</td>
<td>3:16:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>In the Same chamb[e]r</td>
<td>Two small Turkey Carpetts</td>
<td>Lord Buckhurst</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:17:00</td>
<td>One table a Court Cupbord 1 leather Stoole &amp; a Chamber pott 1 per of Andirons with 2 brasses fire Shovell Tongs et bellowes w[i]th out Brasses</td>
<td>Ambrose Martyn</td>
<td>1:05:00</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:03:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedstead 2 Joyned Stooles a small wicker Cheyer</td>
<td>Thomas Wheeler</td>
<td>0:07:00</td>
<td>Weller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedstead a Dornix Canopie with 2 Curtaines of the Same 1 feather bed &amp; bolster 2 ould Blanckettes 2 Coverlets a Cushioned Stoole &amp; 1 other Stoole 1 little table upon fower legs</td>
<td>London John Blacker</td>
<td>3:18:00</td>
<td>Blacker</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:02:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedstead</td>
<td>Nich[o]las Knight</td>
<td>0:04:00</td>
<td>Knight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedstead Dornix Curtaines &amp; Canopie 1 feather bed bolster &amp; pillowe 1 greene Rugg &amp; 2 blancketts</td>
<td>Lord Buckhurst</td>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One elbowe cheyer 1 lowe back stoole 2 lowe stooles of Sage Couler embroydred with Twist &amp; laced with Silver lace</td>
<td>John Tritton</td>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>One windowe Curtaine</td>
<td>London Mr Norris</td>
<td>0:14:06</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00:00</td>
<td>Nine pieces of Tapestry hangeinges</td>
<td>London Mr Stone</td>
<td>11:00:00</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:04:00</td>
<td>One little Square table 1 ould Covered Stoole torne 1 per of Iron Creep[er]s fire Showell et tongs 2 per of Bellowes &amp; a windowe Curtaine</td>
<td>John Blacker</td>
<td>0:09:00</td>
<td>Blacker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>A Canopie head 2 Curtaines of Dornix 1 table upon feet 1 Joyned Stoole 1 Close stoole &amp;, pann &amp; a ould Trunk</td>
<td>Maydstone Mrs Marshall</td>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedsted 1 Canopie &amp; Dornix Curtaines</td>
<td>Banton Ralfe Frembly</td>
<td>5:00:00</td>
<td>Frembly</td>
<td>Banton, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>Tower pieces of Tapestry hangeings</td>
<td>Tunbrige Mr Sheffield</td>
<td>5:15:00</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Tonbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td>One table 1 Court Cupbord 1 elbowe cheyer Sage Coulered or Olyve velvett 16 Joyned Stoole a fire shovell &amp; small Andirons wr brass knobs tongs &amp; bellowes &amp; 2 ould Dornix Curtaines</td>
<td>John Tritton</td>
<td>1:06:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedstead Dornix Curtaines &amp; Canopie 1 featherbed &amp; bolster 2 ould blanckets &amp; a ould Coverlets</td>
<td>Kennington John Tritton</td>
<td>4:04:00</td>
<td>Tritton</td>
<td>Kennington, Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>A Close stoole &amp; pann 2 chamb[e]r ports 1 Joyned Stoole &amp; fire pann</td>
<td>Farly Capt. Skynner</td>
<td>1:06:00</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Farleigh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In the outer chamber to the Matted chamber in the Outer Gallery**

| 0:16:00  | A Sloop bedstead wt  5 Curtaines Valiance tester & Head Cloath of Greene Carsey | London Mr. Knott | 1:10:00 | Nott | London |
| 4:00:00  | Five small piececs of Tapestry hangings | London Mr. Webb | 4:14:00 | Webb | London |
| 0:08:00  | One elbowe cheyer, one ould stoole a Backstoole, a long Foote Stoole, with Copper Finte of Watcher damaske one Little table, a payer of Iron Doggs, one payer of tongs, one Joyned Stoole | John Tritton | 0:18:00 | Tritton | Kennington, Ashford |

**In the inner roome to the Matted chamber**

| 0:02:06  | One Spanishe table | Sussex Mr. Woodhouse | 0:10:00 | Woodhouse | Sussex |

**In the chamber by that**

| 0:06:00  | One halfe-headed Bedstead, one Court - cupboard, two ould tome Stooles, one table & one Joyned Stoole | Banton Mr Frembly | 0:14:00 | Frembly | Ashford |

**In the Middle chamber in the Upper Gallery**

| 3:10:00  | One Beadsteadle painted Curtaines of Dornix lyned with woolen Stuffe one Dornex Tester, three Curtaine Rodds, one featherbed, bolster, one pillowe, one white Rugg, & two ould Blankets | Banton Mr Frembly | 4:18:00 | Frembly | Ashford |
| 0:02:00  | One elbowe cheyer, two high Stooles, two lowe Stooles, a footestoole of flowered Stuffe & Crimson white Fringe | Maydstone Mr Godfrey | 2:00:00 | Godfrey | Maidstone |

**In the Same chamber**

| 3:10:00  | flower piececs of Tapestry Hangeinges | London Mr. Stone | 6:15:00 | Stone | London |
| 0:07:00  | Two small Turkey wroughte Carpets | Maydstone Mrs. Marshall | 1:10:00 | Marshall | Maidstone |
| 0:02:00  | One table & a Court Cupboard, one payer of Bellowes one fyer shovell. & tongs | Rochester Mr. Philpot | 0:10:00 | Philpott | Rochester |

**In the chamber within that**

| 0:06:00  | One halfe headed Beadstead two close Stooles & panns | Sutton John Mowle | 0:13:00 | Mole | Sutton Valence |

**In the Chamber by that**

| 1:10:00  | One halfe headed Bedstead Dornix Canopie & Curtaines & one ould greene Stoole | Mr Sheffield | 0:17:00 | Sheffield | Tonbridge |
| 0:12:00  | One halfe headed Bedstead | Mr. Barbor | 0:04:00 | | |

**In the chamber next it**

<p>| 0:10:00  | One Elbowe cheyer, one Backstoole two high Stooles all of greene cloath one close Stoole Case fire shovell Bellowes one Creep[er] 1 Table | John Tritton | 1:03:00 | Tritton | Kennington, Ashford |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRISALL</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TO WHOME SOLD</th>
<th>SOLD FOR</th>
<th>BUYER</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Chamber over the Pantrye</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed Bedstead one Canopye of East Enges Silke Stuffe</td>
<td>Sir Rich: Hadres</td>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>Hardres</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:07:00</td>
<td>Three Dornixe curtaynes one Elbowe cheyer two high Stooles where of one of them is Leather two tables freshovell &amp; Creep[er]s</td>
<td>Tunbrige Mr. Sheffield</td>
<td>0:16:00</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Tonbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Screene Chamb[e]r</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed Bedstead one Canopie head of Dornix one feather bed &amp; Boulster two pillowed one Elbowe cheyer &amp; one Curtaine of woodmeale</td>
<td>Banton Mr. Frembly</td>
<td>3:00:00</td>
<td>Frembly</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Clarces chamb[e]r</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed Bedsted Dornix Canopie two Curtaines one Backstoole of ould greene velvet three ould Cushioned Stooles three Joyned Stooles one Table one Court Cupbord one greene Curtaine, tongs &amp; one Creep[er]</td>
<td>Maydstone Mrs. Marshall</td>
<td>1:02:00</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Spicery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:03:00</td>
<td>Three Jackes: five Beere glasses 7 wine glasses, 2 Ewers, 10 payer of Scales. Brass Wheights 1 Cocknet glasse one white Drinkckg pott one wicker Cradle &amp; three Baskets</td>
<td>Maydstone Capt. Skynner &amp; Mr. Godfrey</td>
<td>0:08:00</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Godfrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the chamb[e]r over the Clarces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Two halfe headed Bedsteads, one ould featherbedd &amp; Bolster</td>
<td>Richard Lamb[?]</td>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>Lamb[?]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Kitchin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:03:00</td>
<td>Two small copperes, three great Brass Panns whereof one is Broken one ould Brass pott</td>
<td>Mr. Blunden Mrs. Smith, and Mrs. Marshall</td>
<td>6:17:00</td>
<td>Blunden, Smith, Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One payer of Iron Rackes</td>
<td>Lord Buckhurst</td>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>One Iron Range to set Dishes upon two Gridirons a Fryeing Pann &amp; 3 Iron Dripping Panns</td>
<td>Seaventeene Richard Cackett</td>
<td>1:02:00</td>
<td>Cackett</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Wet Larder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td>Fewer great Leaden weights, 3 smaller weights &amp; one Iron Beame and Scales</td>
<td>Banton Ralfe Frembly</td>
<td>1:16:00</td>
<td>Frembly</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Dry Larder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>Seaventeene Spitts, one Copper Kettle, two Brass posts, one Brass Skillets, one Custard Ladle, two Beefe Hookes, one Iron Beame without Scales one Skymmer one Joyned Stoole</td>
<td>London Mr. Beckwith.</td>
<td>5:10:00</td>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Inner Larder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>Eightene Douzen of Sweet meats glasses 2 Doz. of white Stone Dishes and one Truncke</td>
<td>Fayrly Captaine Skynner</td>
<td>2:18:00</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td>Farleih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Cookes chamb[e]r</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One halfe headed bedstead, one featherbed bolster, two pairs of ould Blankets, two ould Coverlids &amp; a little Table</td>
<td>Ralfe Frembly</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>Frembly</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Scullery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>Two stoole panns, 3 chamberpotts one ould Iron Daping Pann</td>
<td>London Humfreys Scale</td>
<td>0:02:06</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>In the Brewhouse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Breweing vessels with ap[ur]t[an]ence thereunto Belongeing</td>
<td>Left to the House</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:07:00</td>
<td>One small Brass Bell &amp; 7 Broken Candlestickes</td>
<td>Mrs. Smith</td>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the Clockhouse</strong></td>
<td><strong>Left to the House</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knole</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mr. Smith</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mr. Smith</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>One Turkey Carpett 3 yards and a quarter longe and 2 yards broad apprised att marked with the Figure of 1</td>
<td>Maydstone Mr. James Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>3:03:00</td>
<td>Wilks (James)</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00:00</td>
<td>One large Turkey Worke Carpett 6 yards longe &amp; 2 yards &amp; a quarter broad, sad ground w[i]th white boarder marked w[i]th the Figure of 2 apprised att</td>
<td>Maydstone Mr. James Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>15:00:00</td>
<td>Wilks (James)</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00:00</td>
<td>One Persian Velvatt Carpett in culleres 5 yards &amp; a halfe longe and three yards broads lined with Cheyney satinn, marked with the Figure 3</td>
<td>Maydstone Sr John Rivers Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>12:12:00</td>
<td>Rivers (Wilks)</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:00:00</td>
<td>One Persian Carpett 7 yards longe &amp; halfe ell broad marked with the Figure 4</td>
<td>Westram Collonell Boothby</td>
<td>37:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:00:00</td>
<td>One Persian Carpett 7 yards longe &amp; halfe ell broad marked with the Figure 5</td>
<td>S[i]r John Rivers Maydstone Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>17:00:00</td>
<td>Rivers (Wilks)</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:13:00</td>
<td>One small Persian carpett 2 yards &amp; a quarter longe &amp; one yard &amp; halfe broad marked with the Figure 6</td>
<td>Mr Jo: Sanders Earnest ijjs 6d</td>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>One small[er] Muskets Carpett one yard and three quarters and a halfe longe a yard quarter &amp; halfe quarter broad</td>
<td>Mrs Mary Beale earnest ijjs vjd</td>
<td>1:09:00</td>
<td>Beale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>One Turkey Carpet 4 yards longe 2 yards &amp; a quarter broad w[i]th figure 8</td>
<td>Maydstone Mr Wilkes</td>
<td>2:18:00</td>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:13:06</td>
<td>Six peeces of hangeings for the Corner Chamber in the Lower Gallery conteyninge 169 Flemish Ells marked with the figure 9 apprised at 1s 6d per Ell</td>
<td>Mrs Fell [Collonell Boothby crossed out]</td>
<td>17:12:00</td>
<td>Fell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00:00</td>
<td>Five peeces of Hanginges for the marted Chamber in the upper gallery conteininge 138 Ells of the story of Solomon marked with the fuggle 10 apprised att</td>
<td>Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>30:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>139:09:00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:10:00</td>
<td>Five curtaines and vallance of greene cloath of gould, trimmed w[i]th An opie bone lace with buttons &amp; loups of silke and gould all embroydred, one tester head cloth and inner vallance trimmed suitale one Counter pane of greene Toofaty trimmed suitale to the inside of the bed one cupboard cloath and 2 windowe cloths of greene sattin with gould and silke fringe and gould and silke lace marked w[i]th the Figure 19 apprayed att</td>
<td>London Mr. Nott Earnest x li[bri]</td>
<td>72:00:00</td>
<td>Nott</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00:00</td>
<td>One greene veluatt Carpet imbroydred with gould and silver &amp; gould and silke fringe marked w[i]th figure 20</td>
<td>Collonel Boothby</td>
<td>6:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:00:00</td>
<td>A Furniture for a sparrow bed a tester head cloath and duble vallance of cloth of gould 25 yallowe Damaske curtaines a cupboard Cloath of yallowe damasks a Cowter pane of wrought w[i]th panes in the middle tourkey Quilt the Valance and Tester trimmed with silver lace and silver and silke Fringe marked w[i]th the Fugure 21</td>
<td>London Mr. Nott Earnest v li[bri]</td>
<td>41:00:00</td>
<td>Nott</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:00:00</td>
<td>Five curtaines and vallance of Cloath of gould with purple ground trimmed w[i]th gould and silke lace and buttons &amp; loups w[i]th a gould and silke Fringe, to the Valance Tester head cloath and inner valance of Toufaty with a gould coild fringe a counterpane of Sattin imbroydred with Twist lined with bays A purple veluatt carpett imbroydred with gould and silver a purple satin cupboard cloath trimmed with copper lace and Fringe &amp; a windowe Cloath suitale marked with the Fugure 22 apprais att</td>
<td>Mr. Stone Earnest xxs [ Mrs Marshall crossed out]</td>
<td>72:00:00</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>One fleild tester head cloath and vallance of white sattin imbroydred with Crimson twist 5 Curtaines of Crimson &amp; white sarsnett 1 little Inge mantle marked with the Fugure 23 appraised att</td>
<td>Collonell Bothby</td>
<td>4:04:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00:00</td>
<td>One Counterpane for a bedd of Crimson Cheyney sattin quilted allover with blacke silke and silver twist with an edginge Fringe suitale marked with the Fugure 24 appraised att</td>
<td>Mr. Fullerton earnest xs</td>
<td>4:12:00</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>199:16:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:00:00</td>
<td>Five peeces of Lawnskip hangings conteininge 135 ells belonginge to the Chambere with[in] the Parlor marked with the fugare 11 appraised att</td>
<td>Collonell Boothby</td>
<td>38:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:10:00</td>
<td>Fower peeces of Launskip hanginges five Ells deeps conteineinge 110 ells belonginge to the Purple bedd chamber marked w[i]th the Fugure 12 appraised att</td>
<td>Seavenoke Mr. Whiting Earnest xs.</td>
<td>33:00:00</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td>One feather bedd marked with the Figure 13 appraised att</td>
<td>Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>2:02:00</td>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:04:00</td>
<td>Foure paier of Fustion Blankettes 5 breedhs in a blanket marked with the Figure 14 at 16s the paier pasede att [crossed out]</td>
<td>Nicho: Tauton Earnest xs [crossed out]</td>
<td>06:00:00 [crossed out]</td>
<td>Tauton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:08:00</td>
<td>Two paier of Fustine Blanketts 4 breedhs in a blanket marked with the Fugure 15 appraised att att [sic] fourteens shillinge, the paier</td>
<td>London Mr. Stone Earnest vs</td>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:06:00</td>
<td>Five paier of down pillows marked w[i]th the Fugure 16 att 13s the paier appraised att</td>
<td>Capt. Bowles 3 paire of pillowes Mr Wilkes</td>
<td>4:01:00</td>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:16:00</td>
<td>Two paier of downe pillowes marked with T: D. and the furgure 17 at 8s the paier appraised att</td>
<td>Mr. Whiteinge Earnest ijs.</td>
<td>1:02:00</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75:00:00</td>
<td>The furniture for A bedd of damasks wachett and white 5 curtanes dubb vallance tester &amp; head peeve Cases for 2 pipers and Cownterpane, 2 little Carpets of the same all aimed with silver bone lace and silke &amp; silver fringe underneath the furniture for a canopy suitable to the bedd beinge fouer curtanes duble vallance tester &amp; head cloath and bases &amp; cover for the boath 2 windowe cloaths all suitable to the bedd trimed with silver bone lace &amp; silver &amp; silke fringe underneath marked with the fugur 18 appraised att</td>
<td>London Mrs. Peake Earnest x li[bri]</td>
<td>98:00:00</td>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 184:00:00 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APRISALL</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TO WHOME SOLD</th>
<th>SOLD FOR</th>
<th>BUYER</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04:00:00</td>
<td>One Crimson Cownter pane of Cheyne damasks imbroydred ronadaboute &amp; in the midle with Diver sides of cullers and cullerd silke of Cheyne gould edged aboute with a fouer edgings fringe beinge lined with greens tafaty marked with the Figure 25 appraised att [crossed out]</td>
<td>Robert Haye Earnest xs [crossed out]</td>
<td>04:04:00 [crossed out]</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00:00</td>
<td>One Carpett and windowe Cloath of Crimson Twft tafaty the Carpett beinge laid round with a gould lace and gould fringe lined with Fustin the windowe Cloath laced and fringed with Copper marked with the Fugure 26 appraised att</td>
<td>Mr Nott Earnest xs.</td>
<td>4:02:00</td>
<td>Nott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00:00</td>
<td>One large Cownterpane of Crimson Tafaty Quilted all over with gould twist &amp; fringed aboute with a gould fringe 1 lined with redd bays marked with the Fugure 27 appraised att</td>
<td>Mr. Beckwith Earnest xvs</td>
<td>5:15:00</td>
<td>Beckwith</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>One white Cover for a bedd quilted marked w[i]th the Fugure 28 appraised att</td>
<td>Capt. Bowles Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>1:18:00</td>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00:00</td>
<td>One East india Cownterpaine marked with the Fugures 29 appraised att</td>
<td>Collonell Bothby</td>
<td>7:12:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00:00</td>
<td>One long window needle works [windowe crossed out] Cushon marked with the Fugure 30 appr</td>
<td>Collonel Bothby</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00:00</td>
<td>One green velvatt Carpett embroydred all over with silver with diverse cullered sattin lined with green Sarsnett indented round about marked with fugures 31</td>
<td>Mr. Blake Earnest xvs</td>
<td>7:05:00</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:00:00</td>
<td>One Fielde Caparoson of Tawney sattin beinge 16peeces imbroydred alover with silver Marked with the Fugures 32</td>
<td>London Mr. Brockett Earnest iiiij li[bri]</td>
<td>38:00:00</td>
<td>Brockett</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:15:10</td>
<td>The Pewter of all sorts weighinge 600 and a halfe &amp; 11 pounds at 10d per lib[ri]</td>
<td>London Mrs. Allington at js earnest iiiij li[bri]</td>
<td>36:19:00</td>
<td>Allington</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Of Brass 30 pounds being 5 Candle sticks &amp; 4 Skoneses at 4d. per lib[ri]</td>
<td>Mrs Marshall vd per lb. Earnest vs</td>
<td>00:13 :01½</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>Two Warming pans at</td>
<td>Seavenoke Richard Randall Earnest js</td>
<td>0:11:00</td>
<td>Randall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>108:19:01½</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10:00</td>
<td>One feather Bedd &amp; bolster weighinge 21 stone w[i] th T: D:</td>
<td>Collonel Bothby</td>
<td>8:01:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; Bolster weighinge 18 stone w[i] th T:D: marked w[i][i]th 15</td>
<td>Ashford Mr. Barrett Earnest xa.</td>
<td>5:00:00</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; bolster weighinge 18 stone Marked :Y:</td>
<td>Sr Anthony Wilding Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>6:00:00</td>
<td>Weldon</td>
<td>Wilkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:03:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; bolster weighinge 14 stone marked w[i][i]th T: D: &amp; 21 .</td>
<td>Mr. Whiteinge Earnest iii5.</td>
<td>4:04:00</td>
<td>Whiting</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; bolster weighinge 14 stone w[i] th T: D: &amp;c: 5 .</td>
<td>Mrs. Marshall Earnest iii</td>
<td>4:04:00</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:03:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; bolster weighinge 14 stone marked w[i][i]th T: D: &amp;: 1:</td>
<td>Richard Earith Earnest x .</td>
<td>4:10:00</td>
<td>Earith</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:04:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; Bolster weighinge 18 stone w[i] th T: D: &amp;: X: [crossed out]</td>
<td>The Lady Sackville [crossed out]</td>
<td>05:15:00</td>
<td>Sackville</td>
<td>Knole?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; bolster weighinge 14 stone marked w[i][i]th T: D: &amp;c: 22:</td>
<td>Christofer Fell Earnest x .</td>
<td>4:16:00</td>
<td>Fell</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; bolster weighinge 14 stone marked w[i][i]th J: S: &amp; T: D:</td>
<td>Sr Anthony Wilding Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>5:05:00</td>
<td>Weldon</td>
<td>Wilks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:03:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; Bolster marked : X :</td>
<td>Blackfriers Jonathan Tylecott</td>
<td>4:04:00</td>
<td>Tilecot</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02:10:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; bolster weighinge 14 stone marked w[i][i]th T: D: &amp;: 9 :</td>
<td>Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>4:08:00</td>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:03:00</td>
<td>One Feather Bedd &amp; bolster w[i][i]thout any marke</td>
<td>Chartt Mr. Fell Earnest X1.</td>
<td>4:14:00</td>
<td>Fell</td>
<td>Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>Fower Down Pillowes</td>
<td>Mr. Stone [Wilkes crossed out]</td>
<td>1:01:00</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Ashford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:01:00</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>62:02:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRISALL</td>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>TO WHOME SOLD</td>
<td>SOLD FOR</td>
<td>BUYER</td>
<td>ORIGIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>Two paire of large Brasse Andirons at xxs the paire</td>
<td>Collonel Bothby</td>
<td>4:04:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:08:00</td>
<td>Eight paire of Brasse andirons of one sorte att xvi s the paire [part lot]</td>
<td>Coll Bothby 2.: paire</td>
<td>2:04:00</td>
<td>Boothby</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[included in above]</td>
<td>Eight paire of Brasse andirons of one sorte att xvi s the paire [part lot]</td>
<td>Jo: Fullerton 2 paire Earnest vs</td>
<td>2:10:00</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[included in above]</td>
<td>Eight paire of Brasse andirons of one sorte att xvi s the paire [part lot]</td>
<td>Jo: Fullerton 2 paire Earnest vs</td>
<td>2:14:00</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[included in above]</td>
<td>Eight paire of Brasse andirons of one sorte att xvi s the paire [part lot]</td>
<td>Mr. Blake 2: paire earnest V</td>
<td>2:12:00</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:04:00</td>
<td>Two paire of Brasse Andirons of a lesser sorte att xij the paire</td>
<td>Mr. Blake earnest iiiij .</td>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td>Blake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:02:06</td>
<td>Two old Woodmall Curtaines</td>
<td>Mr. Wilkes</td>
<td>0:02:06</td>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:14:00</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>16:01:06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:14:00</td>
<td>THO. TAYLOR JOHN WILKES [SIGNATURES]</td>
<td>SUM TOTT OF THE SALE</td>
<td>710:07:7½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>