

TAG-23:32-39

THE WIFE OF THOMAS CHAMPION OF HEMPSTEAD, NEW YORK

By HERBERT F. SEVERSMITH, M.A., Washington, D. C.

IN THE AMERICAN GENEALOGIST, vol. XX, p. 44, the present writer stated that chronology rendered it most improbable that the senior Thomas Champion of Hempstead, New York, married a daughter of Francis Jecoeks of the same place. Subsequently in an article on the Jecoeks family in THE AMERICAN GENEALOGIST, vol. XXI, p. 216, Mr. H. Clifford Champion* states that "we must conclude that Thomas (Champion's) wife was Frances, daughter of Francis Jecoeks, Sr." Such opinion from a genealogist of long and seasoned experience merits respect, and it is only after detailed and considered study of the evidences available that we do not concur with such a conclusion. The disagreement arises admittedly from differing interpretations of incomplete evidences; for, were the latter sufficient, incompatible opinions could not arise. Nevertheless, the present writer adheres to the opinions expressed in the article written by him in THE AMERICAN GENEALOGIST as referred to. Possibly Mr. Champion's thesis may be correct; but at the same time his article carries an implication that the evidences are most strongly in the favor of his conclusion, which is by no means the case.

To assure that we are not mistaking the question at issue, the following is this writer's understanding of the premises, given or implied, in Mr. Champion's article:

1. That Francis Jecoeks senior, father of the children baptised in the parish church at Stratford-on-Avon, Warwickshire, was the one of that name recorded in Hempstead, New York 20 February, 1672/3 as the father-in-law of Thomas Champion.
2. That Francis Jecoeks junior is not to be identified as the father-in-law of any Thomas Champion, despite the fact that this Francis Jecoeks is otherwise not accounted for.
3. That Francis Jecoeks senior had a daughter named Frances (whose baptismal record is not yet found), who married Thomas Champion [Sr.].
4. That, as John Champion received the Champion property by primogeniture (*sic*), and further, as no Thomas Champion junior was ever so recorded, there was no such Thomas Champion junior who could have married a daughter of Francis Jecoeks, either the senior or junior of that name.

Before presenting our case, it is conceded that

5. It is not possible to determine from present available record, the exact age of the Francis Jecoeks who appears in New England about 1650.
6. No known record is found of Thomas Champion junior, wherein he is designated as such.

* We learn with regret that Mr. Champion passed away since this article was prepared. He was a thorough-going and painstaking genealogist.

The first consider relates to Francis footnote on page wherein it is show baptised 18 March Jecoeks (*et var.*) is baptised. There c (unless gross error as *filius* (son) in t baptised 20 March, appears on Long I 12 August, 1627. burials of children buried 27 June, 16 (when Francis jur record) who was b tised 22 August, 1 other burials of chi reported hitherto. tember, 1607, and t

The burials of ir of Christian names tism; they may h enough to be bapti time of burial.

These entries est

7. The interval bet mated birth of Simon entries of children of t

8. The infant (*infa* Jecoeks junior; and th refer to him. It was c as *filius* or *puer*: and it

As an infant of Francis Jecoeks ha further as from the Jecoeks is apparen can be maintained v (baptised in 1604/5 children. It is not Francis Jecoeks, fo

* To establish the limita Cassell's Latin Dictionary. B.A.: Page 731. infant. n. *infans*, infancy, n. *infant* Page 658. child, n. *filius*, *fil* Page 277. *infans*, -*santis*... Page 224. *filius*, -*ii*, m. son.

OF HEMPSTEAD,

ington, D. C.

p. 44, the present is most improbable that New York, married place. Subsequently AMERICAN GENEALOGY* states that "we was Frances, daughter of a genealogist of and it is only after records available that we disagreement arises of incomplete evidence incompatible opinions either adheres to the opinion in THE AMERICAN GENEALOGY. Champion's thesis clearly carries an implication in the favor of his

question at issue, the premises, given or

children baptised in the records; the one of that name baptised 1603 as the father-in-law

is recorded as the father-in-law of Francis Jecocks is

named Frances (whose name was Champion [Sr.]).

in property by primogeniture; a junior was ever so senior who could have been either senior or junior of that

name

available record, the records of England about 1650.

Francis Jecocks junior, wherein he is

this article was prepared.

The first consideration we shall take up is the chronology as it relates to Francis Jecocks senior. Attention is called to the footnote on page 44 of THE AMERICAN GENEALOGIST, vol. XX, wherein it is shown that a Francis Jecocks had a son Richard baptised 18 March, 1604. The next entry referring to a Francis Jecocks (*et var.*) is 4 January, 1617/18, when a son Francis was baptised. There can be no question as to the sex of the child (unless gross error is charged to printed record) as it is designated as *filius* (son) in the register. It is not contested that Thomas, baptised 20 March, 1619/20, was the one of that name who later appears on Long Island; this also is true for William, baptised 12 August, 1627. Mr. Champion contributes entries of three burials of children of Francis Jecocks senior: Simon, who was buried 27 June, 1618, and who was probably born before 1617 (when Francis junior was baptised); an infant (*infans* in the record) who was buried 27 July, 1632; and Hugo (Hugh, baptised 22 August, 1624), buried 6 May, 1634. There were two other burials of children of Francis Jecocks which have not been reported hitherto. Both called infants, one was buried 16 September, 1607, and the other 27 July, 1623.

The burials of infants in 1607, 1623 and 1632 without entries of Christian names indicate that these children died before baptism; they may have been stillborn. Hugh, who lived long enough to be baptised, was recorded by his given name at the time of burial.

These entries establish that

7. The interval between the burial of the infant in 1607 and the estimated birth of Simon Jecocks in 1615, shortens the interval between register entries of children of this generation to about eight years.

8. The infant (*infans*)* who was buried in 1623 is probably not Francis Jecocks junior; and the burial entry of 1632 is considered definitely not to refer to him. It was customary to designate a son who was beyond infancy as *filius* or *puer*: and if approaching manhood, as *juventis* or *adulescentulus*.

As an infant of Francis Jecocks was buried in 1607; as a Francis Jecocks had a child born before 1617 (say 1615), and further as from the intervals between baptisms only one Francis Jecocks is apparently of record from 1604 to 1632, a premise can be maintained with fair reasonableness that Richard Jecocks (baptised in 1604/5) was a brother or half-brother of the later children. It is not even necessary to postulate two wives for Francis Jecocks, for if he had his first child when his wife was

* To establish the limitations as to the interpretation of this word, we quote from Cassell's *Latin Dictionary*, revised by J. R. V. Marchant, M. A., and Joseph F. Charles, B.A.:

Page 731. infant, n. *infans, filiulus, filiola*.

infancy, n. *infantia*.

Page 658. child, n. *filius, filia, liberi* (= children).

Page 277. *infans, -fantis* . . . a little child . . . *infantia*: childhood (up to the age of seven).

Page 224. *filius, -li, m.* son.

about sixteen, she would be at the close of her child-bearing period twenty-eight years later. Let us now examine this situation to see what light it sheds on the age of the man who was father-in-law of Thomas Champion in 1672/3, since the assumption has been made by Mr. Champion that Francis Jecoeks senior was the father-in-law.

If Richard was the eldest child, and born in 1604 or 1605, we may estimate that his father was not born much later than 1585, although if a later date is insisted upon, we can only say that northern Englishmen are not usually so precocious. If Richard and the infant buried in 1607 are held to be children of another Francis altogether (and we do not deny the possibility), then Simon becomes the oldest probable known son, born say 1615. This would bring the estimated date of the birth of the senior Francis down not much later than ten years, say 1595.* *Per contra* it could be maintained, and we believe far more justifiably, that the senior Francis Jecoeks was born about 1580. If this was the father-in-law of Thomas Champion in 1672/3, he was then approximately ninety-two years of age; a very ripe old age indeed. Perhaps a shade too ripe, as we shall see.

We take up next the son Francis Jecoeks junior, baptised in 1617. In view of the thesis maintained by Mr. Champion, we must apparently assume that he disappears from record, and is not the Francis Jecoeks who appears in Hempstead, New York, or at any rate is to be otherwise disposed of in that nether-nether land of lost genealogical souls whose epitaph consists of the sad phrase, "no further record." It is necessary now to examine the chronology of certain of the earlier generations of the Jecoeks, Champion and Ellison families, to see if Francis Jecoeks junior might not have been, after all, father-in-law of the senior Thomas Champion.

Let us advert to chronology in the Ellison family of Hempstead, descended of one of the daughters of Thomas and Frances Champion. In his recently issued vol. one of *Colonial Families of Long Island, New York and Connecticut*, the present writer has set forth by evidences recited on pp. 197, 211, 212 and 215 the reasonable certainty that George Baldwin alias Benham was born in 1656. It is also true that his wife was born about 1660-1662. She was Mary Ellison, daughter of Thomas Ellison, and undoubtedly of his wife Martha Champion, a point upon which students of genealogy in the Hempstead locality have uniformly agreed. If Mary (Ellison) Baldwin was the oldest child of Thomas and Martha (Champion) Ellison, and it is probable, her parents were married about 1659/60. This permits us to estimate

a birth date of at
quently a birth dat
pion. At the same
the foregoing estim
born about 1635. T
Ellison was born i
that he was about s
Thomas Ellison ar
earlier date; the da
of fact, to aid a chr
thesis if at all possil
was born about 164
have been the daug
unless he was at ba
will be obvious, how
are disposing of; an
the junior Francis
of the senior Thoma
nection, that Mr. C
junior was the fathe

Therefore, to retu
born about 1620, w
was a daughter of t
against this is the la
existence of such a d
that there were oth
are found and who
baptismal record is n
to establish a positiv
conclusions are, of c

The next factor v
Champion's article (p

When the town c
16 January, 167
it undoubtedly r

In correspondence w
made further interpre

. . . you entirely
the land granted
with the land th

* Printed Records of the T
p. 93.

† Mr. Arthur S. Wardwell
second wife of the Thomas C
was a generation younger tha
Francis Jecoeks junior. In th
children of the first Thomas
suggestions used in the prepa

* Indeed, we could not deny that there were as many different parents named Francis Jecoeks as there were entries of baptisms to a man of this name. We assume, however, that the patent nature of this quibble requires no further discussion.

her child-bearing
amine this situa-
he man who was
ince the assump-
is Jecoeks senior

1604 or 1605, we
later than 1585,
an only say that
ious. If Richard
ildren of another
possibility), then
, born say 1615.
rth of the senior
say 1595.* *Per*
more justifiably.
1580. If this was
2/3, he was then
ery ripe old age
ee.

nior, baptised in
Mr. Champion, we
m record, and is
stead, New York,
hat nether-nether
onsists of the sad
now to examine
ons of the Jecoeks,
is Jecoeks junior
the senior Thomas

family of Hemp-
omas and Frances
Colonial Families
he present writer
211, 212 and 215
alias Benham was
born about 1660-
omas Ellison, and
point upon which
y have uniformly
e oldest child of
it is probable, her
nits us to estimate

† parents named Francis
. We assume, however,
ssion.

a birth date of about 1640 for Martha Champion, and conse-
quently a birth date of about 1615 for her father Thomas Cham-
pion. At the same time we have, fortunately, another check, for
the foregoing estimates would indicate that Thomas Ellison was
born about 1635. There is evidence to show that his brother John
Ellison was born in 1625 as on 27 September, 1686 he deposed
that he was about sixty-two years of age.* It may be that both
Thomas Ellison and his wife Martha were born at an even
earlier date; the dates we have stipulated were given, as a matter
of fact, to aid a chronology which would further Mr. Champion's
thesis if at all possible. However, if Martha (Champion) Ellison
was born about 1640, it does not permit her mother Frances to
have been the daughter of a Francis Jecoeks baptised in 1617,
unless he was at baptism a youth of about twelve or better.† It
will be obvious, however, that we are raising more issues than we
are disposing of; and we certainly believe it to be untenable that
the *junior* Francis Jecoeks was the grandfather of the children
of the *senior* Thomas Champion (it should be noted, in this con-
nection, that Mr. Champion does not say that Francis Jecoeks
junior was the father-in-law).

Therefore, to return again to the presumption that Frances,
born about 1620, wife of Thomas Champion, born about 1615,
was a daughter of the senior Francis Jecoeks. The first factor
against this is the lack of any baptismal record which proves the
existence of such a daughter. To reason from the foregoing (i. e.,
that there were other children for whom no baptismal records
are found and whose existence is proved) that the lack of a
baptismal record is not significant, would appear to be an attempt
to establish a positive conclusion from negative premises. Such
conclusions are, of course, subject to challenge.

The next factor which we take up is this statement in Mr.
Champion's article (page 215):

When the town of Hempstead granted Thomas Champion on
16 January, 1672/3 additional lands adjacent to his father,
it undoubtedly meant his father-in-law, Francis Jecoeks.

In correspondence with us during October 1944, Mr. Champion
made further interpretation in support of his case. He wrote that

... you entirely overlook the fact that the description of
the land granted by Francis (*sic*) Champion was identical
with the land that was granted by Francis Jecoeks to his

* Printed Records of the Towns of North and South Hempstead, New York, vol. II,
p. 93.

† Mr. Arthur S. Wardwell has pointed out that possibly Frances might have been the
second wife of the Thomas Champion whom we designate as senior. If so, and if she
was a generation younger than her husband, she may have been, after all, daughter of
Francis Jecoeks junior. In this event she could not have been the mother of the known
children of the first Thomas Champion. We express appreciation to Mr. Wardwell for
suggestions used in the preparation of this article.

son-in-law Thomas Champion, and that the adjoining owners of the land granted by the town to Thomas Champion, next to his father, were the same owners that were adjacent to the land Francis Jacocks granted to his son-in-law, thus supporting my statement that he was his father-in-law instead of his father. In these grants by the town it does not specify Thomas Champion, Jr. . . .

If we understand Mr. Campion correctly, these statements embrace the following meanings:

10. Francis Jacocks held land at the south side of property owned by John Carman, characterized by the latter as his "Toilsome."

11. When the town granted land to Thomas Champion next to his "father," 16 January, 1672/3, it was at the south side of John Carman's "Toilsome."

12. When Francis Jacocks sold the land he held at the south side of John Carman's "Toilsome" to his son-in-law Thomas Champion, 20 February, 1672/3, the record implied that the "father" mentioned in the grant by the town was Francis Jacocks, not Thomas Champion.

We quote from the printed *Town Records* to more fully illustrate the point:

Vol. I, p. 290.

(16 January, 1672/3)

. . . At the same townd meting was given to thomas Champin a pese of land Joyneing to his fathers feid at the south sid of John Carmans tilsom the Land Containing three or four akers.

Ibid., page 291:

Hempsted February :20: 1672-3 These presence Witnis that I Franse Jacocks of Hempsted upon Long Island in the North Riding of New Yourek-shere heave and do by these presence Give to my sone In-law Thomas Champin of Hempsted a pece of land lying on the south sid of John Carmans toylsum the Land containing two or three eakers more or less I the abovesaid frances Jeacocks have and do frely Give it to my sone in law thomas Champin.

Nathaniel Pearsall

Clarek

Mr. Campion's interpretation may be correct. However, if there were two Thomas Champions, father and son, there are other possible interpretations. There is nothing to show that the Thomas Champion whom we shall call senior (assuming that there was a son of the same name) ever had property on the south side of John Carman's Toilsome. There is nothing on the other hand to show that he didn't, and if he did, the word "father" in the town grant quoted above could be interpreted either way (as father or as father-in-law) and at this date it is difficult to understand how any definite conclusion can be drawn as to which is meant. Indeed, some implication is to be found that the town fathers were being quite accurate, for John Champion, son of Thomas Champion (designated herein as

senior) was
Thomas Chal

Ibid., page 28

. . . At the ser
Ether by John
half a dusen C

The two ent
consecutive,
structed as to
mentioned fir
given to us
Thomas juni
the town for
going, there
Champion ar
received a gr
It would see
trouble to c
specifically i
wherefore th
ambiguous, i
careless as he
nized that th
same time it
stances do no

However f
thesis the be
is the "fath
1672/3 recor
spectacle of
appearing at
about sevent
about 1663 (C
and who was
of age. He v
be proud to
senior, must
putative sons
to record. F
could record
was ever mov
us doubt also
eys Jacocks v
Jacocks—and
long-lost son
that these b
another in c

senior) was given land by the town at the same time that this Thomas Champion received it:

Ibid., page 289.

... At the same townd Meting was given to John Champin a home Lot Ether by John Jonsons or Els by Samuel Emorye and privileg to kepe half a dusen Cattell on the Commons in the Sumer

The two entries relating to John and Thomas Champion are consecutive, and the phraseology of the entries is not so constructed as to lead this writer to believe that the son (John²) was mentioned first and then the father (Thomas¹). The impression given to us is that Thomas Champion had two sons John and Thomas junior, and that they were receiving land grants from the town for their generation. In further support of the foregoing, there is the fact that John Johnson, husband of Hannah Champion and son-in-law of the senior Thomas Champion, also received a grant of land at the same time (16 January, 1672/3). It would seem reasonable also that the town grantors would not trouble to characterize the father and son relationship more specifically if the two men in question bore the same name, wherefore the reference to the father would certainly not be ambiguous, nor would the town clerk be, by implication, as careless as he is considered to have been. However, it is recognized that this viewpoint is purely a matter of opinion; at the same time it must be stressed forcibly that the foregoing circumstances do not prove that Thomas Champion junior did not exist.

However for the moment, let us again give Mr. Campion's thesis the benefit of the doubt, and assume that Francis Jecoeks is the "father" of the senior Thomas Champion in both the 1672/3 records quoted above. We are then confronted with the spectacle of a gentleman getting on in years, independently appearing at Stratford, Connecticut when he was very likely about seventy; who perambulated to Hempstead, New York about 1663 (he first appears in the calves' list for 23 May, 1663) and who was in 1672/3 reasonably approaching ninety-two years of age. He was a pretty tough old gentleman; in fact we would be proud to descend of him, if we only could! Francis, if the senior, must have settled all of his financial affairs with his putative sons Thomas and William in documents completely lost to record. For it is a fact that this Francis Jecoeks, although he could record a grant of land to a son-in-law, *in no case* of record was ever moved to do the same for his own sons; and this makes us doubt also that this was the senior Francis Jecoeks. If Francis Jecoeks were junior, and brother of Thomas and William Jecoeks—and note that this postulate would account for the long-lost son of that name—it would not be necessary to expect that these brothers would manifest their relationships to one another in documentary record. But if we set up that this

joining owners
Champion, next
e adjacent to
in-law, thus
father-in-law
town it does

se statements

erty owned by
on next to his
John Carman's

ie south side of
opion, 20 Febru-
ed in the grant

re fully illus-

mpin a pese of
Carman's tilson

that I Franse
of New Yourek-
in-law Thomas
th sid of John
rs more or less
my sons in law

arsall
Clarek

However, if
son, there are
show that the
assuming that
roperty on the
othing on the
lid, the word
be interpreted
this date it is
can be drawn
s to be found
ife, for John
ed herein as

Francis Jecocks is the junior, then he could not reasonably be the grandfather of the children of the first Thomas Champion.

We bring Frances Champion's own transactions in the *Hempstead Town Records* next under scrutiny. After Thomas Champion died, the widow sold property, which had been her husband's, to Jonathan Smith, 15 February, 1682/3. This was confirmed by John Champion (as the presumed surviving son of Thomas Champion), 2 January, 1687/8. The entry of sale is transcribed twice in the town records. This land, however, was not that given to Francis Jecocks at any time of record, and there is nothing to show that Frances Champion had such land by inheritance from Francis Jecocks. We have not found the implications in Mr. Champion's letter borne out by the circumstances. In no record that we have seen does Frances Champion ever manifest that she was related to any of the Jecocks family. In the published *Records of the Towns of North and South Hempstead*, vol. VIII, pp. 420 and 489, it is shown that Jonathan Smith, Rock, had land which had been laid out to the patent right of William Jecocks. The description of this land does not support any observation that it was land that Frances Champion had sold to Jonathan Smith. Other entries (*ibid.*, vol. VIII, 131, 137, 141, 142, 157, 160, 161, 186, 247, 423 and 491) show nothing different.

If there was a Thomas Champion junior, and if he died before his father, on the face of things that would leave the only surviving (and perhaps elder) son John to inherit the Champion property and to ratify deeds performed by his mother. The fact that John Champion would automatically inherit if Thomas Champion left no will does not prove that no son Thomas ever existed, and in turn does not permit the compelled conclusion that it was the senior Thomas Champion who was Jecocks' son-in-law. However, Thomas Champion did leave a will, now evidently lost. In vol. II of the printed *Records of North and South Hempstead, New York*, p. 78, it specifically refers to the grandchild Peter Totten, who recorded land on 8 April, 1685, which he had received according to the provisions of the last will and testament of his grandfather, Thomas Champion. Therefore the sequence of premises consisting of lines 2 to 12, page 216, vol. XXI of THE AMERICAN GENEALOGIST are invalidated on the basis of their own assumptions by the foregoing circumstances. We may not know, as Thomas Champion's will is lost, how his property was devised in his will.

The question must be asked, in view of the issues raised in the analysis of Mr. Champion's statements, what actual evidence is there against the present writer's case? A reconsideration of the article in THE AMERICAN GENEALOGIST by ourselves discloses no *non sequitur* of logic, so far as we can ascertain. It accounts for

Francis Jecocks' collocation of Francis Champion far begging assurance of construction. It added that there could be description of Francis Champion junior: a son Francis Champion City, 7 January. Els Kerbet (*ibid.*, vol. 7, p. 137). In connection, marriage of Jussell (*Marr State*).

We reiterate the children of any Francis Champion. The mention of the Champion most probably

THE ORIGIN

By G. A.

A considerable North American the great and sex, Topeliff in land. They were Earls of North their descend Smithson still of the ancient ing away of surrounded the American gene

The old peep family. They brother of Q Henry I and, the Pincerna Arundel. Co Bearded, Cou 1139). Joscel of Topeliff an

sonably be the
 champion.
 in the *Hemp-*
Thomas Cham-
ad been her
/3. This was
rviving son of
try of sale is
however, was
f record, and
had such land
not found the
y the circum-
ces Champion
ecocks family.
th and South
that Jonathan
the patent right
does not sup-
ces Champion
vol. VIII, 131,
show nothing

he died before
 the only sur-
 the Champion
 mother. The
 erit if Thomas
 Thomas ever
 led conclusion
 Jecoeks' son-
 will, now evi-
 rth and South
 to the grand-
 l, 1685, which
 last will and
 Therefore the
 page 216, vol.
 d on the basis
 nstances. We
 lost, how his

s raised in the
 al evidence is
 leration of the
 es discloses no
 t accounts for

Francis Jecoeks junior with his brothers; it permits of a satisfying collocation of associations between the Jecoeks and Champion families; and it does not raise the number of question-begging assumptions which are necessary if Mr. Champion's construction of this genealogy is to be maintained. It might be added that there are two entries of Champions which possibly could be descended of this denied connection of Thomas Champion junior: a Jonathan Champion and Frances his wife had a son *Francis* baptised in the Dutch Reformed church in New York City, 7 January, 1682, the sponsors being James Twysfort and Els Kerbet (*New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*, vol. 7, p. 137); and a Frances Champion, perhaps of this connection, married by a license dated 10 October, 1703 to John Jussell (*Marriage Licenses, New York, Office of the Secretary of State*).

We reiterate, in conclusion, the conviction that the mother of the children of the first Thomas Champion was not daughter of any Francis Jecoeks. Furthermore, we maintain our construction of the Champion-Jecoeks (Jacoeks) relationship to be the most probably correct interpretation of the available evidences.

THE ORIGIN OF THE PERCIES AND THE PERCY ARMS

By G. ANDREWS MORIARTY, A.M., LL.B., F.A.S.G., F.S.A.

A considerable number of the 17th century settlers of English North America and their descendants can trace their ancestry to the great and historic house of Percy, lords of Petworth in Sussex, Topeliff in Yorkshire and later of Alnwick in Northumberland. They eventually became the Lords Percy of Alnwick, then Earls of Northumberland and at last Dukes of that county, and their descendant of the somewhat prosaic paternal name of Smithson still enjoys the last-mentioned title and bears the arms of the ancient house. Accordingly, it would seem that the clearing away of some of the misapprehensions which have long surrounded the origin of the family should be of some interest to American genealogists.

The old peerage books and earlier writers knew all about the family. They told us that the family descended from Joscelin, brother of Queen Adeliza de Louvain, second wife of King Henry I and, through her second husband, William d'Aubigny, the Pincerna (m. ca. 1138), the ancestress of the later Earls of Arundel. Consequently, Joscelin was a son of Godfrey, the Bearded, Count of Louvain and Duke of Lower Lorraine (d. 1139). Joscelin married Agnes, daughter of William de Percy of Topeliff and sister and co-heiress of William de Percy, who