

## I. Pedigree of Hannah Atherold/Atherall/Athereth

1. Before leaving England 'Colonel' William is supposed to have married a Hannah Atherold "in London" in 1638.<sup>11</sup> If so, it would have been impossible for 'Colonel' William to have been the son of William Ball of Lincoln's Inn. We know, by reference to the Bishops' Transcripts for Wokingham, All Saints and the 1639 *Inquisition Post Mortem*, that William Ball of Lincoln's Inn was born around 1601-03, probably 1601,<sup>12</sup> and that he married Alice Waltham in 1627.<sup>13</sup> Hence his eldest son, William, could have been no older than ten when he is supposed to have married Hannah Atherold.

Hayden states, without giving any source, that 'Colonel' William was born around 1615,<sup>14</sup> when his supposed father, William Ball of Lincoln's Inn, would have been no more than 14, and perhaps only 12. 'Colonel' William may well have been born around 1615 as Hayden says (or deduces) and married Hannah Atherold when he was aged 23 in 1638, but the lucky man could not have been the son of William Ball of Lincoln's Inn.

2. If the ancestry of Colonel William Ball of Millenbeck is less than clear, the pedigree of his wife, Hannah, is no less enigmatic.

Apart from Joseph Ball II's letter book and the Downman family Bible, the other most cited authority is the family pedigree set out in the letter written by Colonel James Ball Jr. of 'Bewdley' to his nephew, Colonel Burgess Ball, dated 11 September 1789.<sup>15</sup>

The genealogical information in the letter about Colonel William and his family is set out in Section G.7. As regards his wife, it says: "It appears from a memorandum of Joseph Ball Esq. [almost certainly Joseph Ball II], that he married in London the 2nd day of July, 1638, a Miss Hannah Atherall."

Hayden opines as follows as regards the ancestry of Hannah Atherold/Atherall/Athereth:<sup>16</sup>

"Mrs Hannah Ball was probably of the family of Atherold, in Burgh, Suffolk. Her name appears in the various Ball charts as *Atherall*. Joseph Ball, her grandson, wrote from London, 1745, to his cousin, Mrs. Ellen (Ball) Chichester, of Lancaster county, inquiring if his grandmother's name was not Hannah Athereth, instead of Atherall. Neither of these names appears in *Burke's Armory*. I have given it *Atherold*, *supra*, from having found among the Ball-Downman papers an ancient document spelling it Atherold, with this note by Joseph Ball, of London:

"*Party per pale Vert and Gules, a Lion passant*, by the name of Atherold of Burgh in Suffolk. Thomas Atherold of Burgh in Suffolk by Mary, Da.<sup>r</sup> of Vessy, had Thomas Atherold of Burgh, Barrister at Law, who by Mary, Da.<sup>r</sup> of John Harvey, had Nathani Atherold of Burgh, living in 1660 [*sic*]."

3. The foregoing raises a number of issues:

(a) It seems from Joseph Ball II's entreaties to his nephew, Joseph Chinn, in 1745-1747 to find out how his grandmother's maiden name was spelt in Colonel William's

'little book' (see Section C.4) that he originally believed that his grandmother's maiden name was 'Atherall' or 'Athereth'. Unfortunately, we do not know the outcome of his enquiries.

Given Joseph Ball II's remarkable memory of detail (see Section C.2), his recollection should be accorded due weight, although it is possible, of course, that he was mistaken.

(b) The Atherold pedigree contained in the 'note' attributed by Hayden to Joseph Ball II set out in paragraph 2 above is almost certainly copied from the pedigree recorded by Nathaniel Atherold in 1664 at the Visitation of Suffolk,<sup>17</sup> which Joseph Ball II would have been able to consult at the College of Arms.<sup>18</sup> The pedigree as it appears in the visitation book at the College of Arms is set out in Appendix XVI, paragraph 32(b).

(c) All three surnames are very rare. None is mentioned in Burke's *General Armory*, which lists some 60,000 armigerous families.<sup>19</sup> There were only eight Atherold/Aterold/Atherall wills proved in the Archdeaconry Court of Suffolk between 1444 and 1700,<sup>110</sup> while Boyd's Marriage Index lists a relative handful of 'Atherold' and 'Atherall' weddings and no 'Athereth' weddings at all.<sup>111</sup>

(d) One possible explanation is that Joseph Ball II assumed that Hannah (like Colonel William) would have been from an armigerous family, and finding no record of any family called 'Atherall' or 'Athereth' in any of the visitation books which he consulted at the College of Arms, decided that 'Atherall' or 'Athereth' was a variant (or misspelling) of 'Atherold'.

There is some support for this theory in the Hasketon parish registers, where 'Atherold' is consistently spelt as 'Atherall' between 1653 and 1660 (and as 'Atheroll' between 1624 and 1636).<sup>112</sup>

The extent of the significance of these variant spellings is unclear, however, as spelling was far from standardised and often inconsistent, while many parish clerks were less than literate.

(e) While it may be inferred that Colonel William's 'little book' says that he married Hannah "in London", it is not clear on what basis Hannah is reputed to come from Burgh in Suffolk. It is possible that the connection with Burgh derives merely from the copying of the Atherold entry in the Visitation of Suffolk 1664-68 after Joseph Ball II failed to find any references to 'Atherall' or 'Athereth' in the visitation books. Colonel James Ball Jr.'s letter does not suggest any place for Hannah's provenance.

(f) The Downman family Bible simply refers to Colonel William Ball marrying Hannah 'Atherold' (see Section D), but gives no other information. As discussed in Section G.23, it is quite likely that the source of the entry in the Downman family Bible (which appears to have been written between 1776 and 1783) is the papers left by Joseph Ball II, which came into the hands of his son-in-law, Rawleigh Downman, on his death in 1760.

(g) On the other hand, not only does Colonel James Ball Jr.'s letter in 1789 cite Joseph Ball II's memorandum indicating that 'Colonel' William married "a Miss

Hannah Atherall" in London in 1638, but his third son born in 1785 was christened 'Atherall' (see Section G.8). Hayden also notes that "Her name appears in the various Ball charts as *Atherall*".

(h) Hayden does not dwell on the issue, which is incidental to the Ball pedigree, saying that Hannah was "probably dau. of Thomas Atherold, of Burgh, in Suffolk".<sup>113</sup> Unfortunately, the "ancient document spelling it Atherold" amongst the Ball-Downman papers is not identified.<sup>114</sup> Like Joseph Ball II, Hayden focused on gentry families rather than parish records, thereby excluding families which were not armigerous.

4. The pedigrees of Suffolk gentry families were assiduously collected by a number of Suffolk antiquarians, including the Rev.d Philip Candler (died 1689),<sup>115</sup> David Elisha Davy (1769-1851),<sup>116</sup> the Rev.d George Bitton Jermyn (1789-1857)<sup>117</sup> and Joseph James Muskett (1835-1910).<sup>118</sup>

Candler seems the most authoritative, having the advantage of being much closer to events than later antiquarians. Davy appears to have made extensive use of parish records and his family trees routinely include dates. Muskett appears to have extensively consulted other primary sources, including family wills. None of the pedigrees refers to 'Atherall' or 'Athereth'.

5. It seems that there were at least four successive generations of Atherold living in Burgh in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries called Thomas:

Thomas Atherold I, who married Joan Carr in 1546;  
Thomas Atherold II (1549-1614), who married Mary Harbert (née Vesey);  
Thomas Atherold III (1590-1659), who married Mary Harvey;  
Thomas Atherold IV (1628-1665), who died without issue.

6. While a certain amount of the information in the antiquarian pedigrees is conflicting, and the line of descent is partly misrepresented in the family pedigree recorded by Nathaniel Atherold (1635-1665) in 1664 at the Visitation of Suffolk,<sup>119</sup> the inconsistencies can be resolved by reference to Candler's authoritative pedigree and the wills of Thomas II,<sup>120</sup> Thomas III<sup>121</sup> and Thomas IV<sup>122</sup> which survive.

There is an analysis of the information contained in the antiquarian sources and the primary sources in Appendix XVI and there are transcripts of the above family wills in Appendix XVII. Extracts from the Burgh and Hasketon parish registers are set out in Appendix XVIII.

7. The reputed father of Hannah Atherold is Thomas Atherold III, who was born in 1590 and died in 1659. He was admitted as a barrister at Gray's Inn in 1611, and became an 'ancient' (i.e. senior barrister) in 1632.<sup>123</sup>

Thomas Atherold III married Mary, the daughter of John Harvey of Eye in Suffolk. It is not known when or where Thomas III and Mary Harvey married, while Thomas Atherold II's will in 1614 makes no mention of Thomas III having a wife.

8. The Burgh registers record the baptism of three sons to Thomas Atherold III and Mary Harvey between 1628 and 1635, Thomas IV in 1628 (when Thomas III was 38), James in 1631 (died 1636) and Nathaniel in 1635.<sup>124</sup> This is consistent with Thomas Atherold III's will, which mentions an elder son called Thomas and a younger son called Nathaniel.

9. Hannah would have to have been born before (say) 1622 to marry in 1638, but as mentioned above the Burgh registers only record the baptism of three sons to Thomas Atherold III and Mary Harvey between 1628 and 1635. This suggests that Thomas III may have married late, and that there was a significant age gap between him and Mary, otherwise Mary could have been over 40 when she gave birth to Nathaniel in 1635.

10. As Thomas Atherold III was admitted to Gray's Inn in 1611, it cannot be excluded that he and Mary Harvey had issue baptised elsewhere than at Burgh (e.g. in London) before 1628.

Another possibility, of which there is no suggestion by the antiquarians, is that Mary Harvey was Thomas Atherold's second wife, and that Hannah was the offspring of his first marriage.

11. While Thomas Atherold III clearly maintained his family home at Burgh, he must also have had a London residence (or lodgings) in connection with his practice at the Bar. In his will, made in 1655, he is referred to as "of Grayes Inne" (rather than Burgh), indicating that he was still practising law (or else still retained lodgings at Gray's Inn).

12. To date no record of either the birth (e.g. baptism) or marriage to 'Colonel' William Ball of Hannah Atherold has been found. As it is reasonable to assume that Thomas Atherold III spent a lot of his time in London, at least during the law terms, it is quite possible that Hannah was christened there. Gray's Inn is adjacent to the north-west boundary of the City of London, and Thomas Atherold III's lodgings could just as well have been in 'Chambers' or in the City or one of the suburbs.

As regards the memorandum by Joseph Ball II that Hannah Atherall was married "in London" in 1638 (see paragraph 2 above), the reference to "in London" probably means the City of London.

13. In his will Thomas Atherold III bequeathed most of his property to his wife for the rest of her life, with a 'gift over' to his eldest son, Thomas IV, and his heirs, failing whom to his youngest son, Nathaniel, and his heirs, failing whom to his brother, John, and his male heirs, failing whom to be divided equally between his sisters, Anne Skinner and Elizabeth Dove, and the daughters of his brothers, Nathaniel (died 1653) and John (if any).

There is no reference in Thomas Atherold III's will to a daughter called Hannah. It would not be unusual for a daughter not to be mentioned as a primary beneficiary if she was long since married (17 years in Hannah's case), but it is perhaps curious that there is no mention of Hannah or her children in the 'gift over' which seems to be intended to extend to all immediate blood relatives, including females.

By all accounts, Hannah and her four children (aged 5 to 16) were still living in England in 1655 (see Section G.16(c)), and it might appear strange for Thomas III's only grandchildren to be excluded from the scope of a comprehensive contingent family bequest when nieces were included.

14. A possible explanation for the absence of any reference to Hannah in Thomas Atherold III's will is that they were estranged or else that Hannah was a member of a different line of the Atherold family (which could explain why there is no reference to her in any of the pedigrees of the Atherold family of Burgh compiled by the Suffolk antiquarians).

The parish registers and other primary sources provide evidence that there was probably more than one Atherold family living in Burgh and that there were also Atherold families at nearby Hasketon and Little Bealings, and doubtless elsewhere.<sup>125</sup> A list of potential alternative progenitors is set out in Appendix XVI, paragraph 45.

15. Despite the survival of extensive primary sources, the pedigree of Hannah Atherold gives rise to considerable uncertainty:

- there is doubt whether Hannah's maiden name was 'Atherold', 'Atherall' or 'Athereth', although there is some evidence that 'Atherall' may have been a variant of 'Atherold';

- to date no public record of either the birth or marriage of Hannah Atherold/Atherall/Athereth (or of the marriage of her reputed parents) has been found;

- there is doubt as to the veracity of the evidence linking Hannah to the Atherold family of Burgh in Suffolk and it is conceivable that the connection with Burgh derives merely from the copying of the Atherold entry in the Visitation of Suffolk 1664-68 on the hypothesis that Joseph Ball II had failed to find any references to 'Atherall' or 'Athereth' in the visitation books;

- there is a strong possibility that Hannah was a member of a different line of the Atherold family or else was not of the Atherold family at all.

The total absence of any reference to Hannah amongst the extensive surviving evidence inevitably leads to the conclusion that it is highly improbable that Hannah came from Burgh or was the daughter of Thomas Atherold III.