

## Roger Dudley's Father Proved to be Captain Henry Dudley

By H. Allen Curtis

The maternal ancestry of Thomas Dudley, the first Deputy Governor and several times Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, is noble, regal, and well documented.<sup>1</sup> For over one hundred and forty years able and talented genealogists have been trying to discover Thomas Dudley's paternal lineage.<sup>2</sup> However, it has never been completely proven. All through the years that researchers have been trying to determine Thomas Dudley's paternal ancestry, the stumbling block has been in discovering the true identity of his father, Roger Dudley's parents. It is evident that with so many having researched the Dudleys for so many years that no DIRECT evidence of Roger Dudley's parentage exists today. That means that what is needed to discover and prove Thomas Dudley's paternal line is INDIRECT proof of Roger Dudley's parentage. In mathematics, an exact science, indirect proof is often found preferable to direct proof. Use of indirect proof in genealogy, an inexact science, is valid and should be used when needed.

Two distinguished modern day genealogists, David Faris<sup>3</sup> and Douglas Richardson,<sup>4</sup> are agreed that towards proving Thomas Dudley paternal ancestry, there are three main clues. The first of these is "that the will of Gov. Thomas Dudley included a seal of the baronial Sutton-Dudley arms differenced with a crescent (i.e. indicating descent from a second son of a Sutton-Dudley baron)." Clearly, for the coat of arms on Thomas Dudley's seal to be a valid clue, Governor Dudley must have been entitled to use it.

Under the hypothesis that Thomas Dudley was, indeed, entitled to the use the coat of arms, it will be investigated here to see where the clue leads. First of all the coat of arms is that used by the Sutton-Dudleys. The present day accepted and well documented Sutton-Dudley line from the first generation using the coat of arms to and including the generation adopting the Dudley name in brief is as follows<sup>5</sup>:

1. Sir Richard de Sutton, b. ca. 1266, d. aft. 1346, m. Isabel Patrick, b. ca. 1260, d. by 1318.
2. John de Sutton I, d. aft. 1337, m. Margaret de Somery, b. 1290, d. 1384.
3. John de Sutton II, d. 1359, m. Isabel de Cherleton, d. 1396.
4. John de Sutton III, b 1338, d. 1369/70, m. 25 Dec 1357 Katherine de Stafford (child bride), b. ca. 1347/8, d. by 25 Dec 1361.
5. John de Sutton IV, b. 6 Dec 1361, d. 1395/6, m. Joan.
6. John Sutton V, b. Feb 1380, d. 28 Aug 1406, m. bef. 10 Dec 1401, Constance Blount, d. 23 Sep 1432.

---

<sup>1</sup> Frederick Lewis Weis, *Ancestral Roots of Certain American Colonists Who Came to America before 1700* (Baltimore, Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1999, Seventh Edition), 51-54.

<sup>2</sup> George Adlard, *The Sutton-Dudleys of England and the Dudleys of Massachusetts in New England* (New York, printed for the Author, 1862).

<sup>3</sup> David Faris, *Plantagenet Ancestry of Seventeenth Century Colonists* (NEHGS, 1999, Second Edition), 125

<sup>4</sup> Douglas Richardson, *Plantagenet Ancestry: A Study in Colonial and Medieval Families* (Baltimore, Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc.), 280.

<sup>5</sup> Weis, *Ancestral Roots* [Note 1], at 78 (Line 81) and David Faris, *Plantagenet Ancestry* [note 3], at 122, 123.

7. John Dudley, b. 25 Dec 1400, d. 30 Sep 1487, m. aft. 14 Mar 1420/1, Elizabeth Berkeley, d. shortly bef. 8 Dec 1478.

Considering the time from generation 7 in the Sutton-Dudley line and Roger Dudley's approximate date of birth (1550)<sup>6</sup> there must have been three to four generations spanning that time.

To be consistent with the second son crescent requirements of Governor Thomas Dudley's coat of arms, the men of generations 8, 9, 10, and 11 must be comprised of either three first sons and one second son with Roger Dudley being the first son of generation 11 or else four first sons with Roger Dudley being the second son of generation 11. There are exactly five such cases to investigate. One and only one will contain the correct generations between John Dudley of generation 7 and Roger Dudley. In the investigation of any case, if it becomes evident that there might be only three generations spanning the time to Roger Dudley that possibility will also be investigated. In the first four cases studied it will be shown that those generations could not be the correct ones separating John Dudley of generation 7 and Roger Dudley. Then by inference, it follows that the generations of the fifth case must necessarily be the correct ones.

Case A<sup>7</sup>:

- 8. Edmund Dudley (first son)
- 9. Edward Dudley (first son)
- 10. John Dudley (first son)
- 11. Edward Dudley (first son)

The 11<sup>th</sup> generation Edward's first wife died in 1566 without male issue. His second wife had two sons both of whom were born too late for Roger Dudley to have been the second son. Therefore, the case for which there were only three generations must be investigated. The second son of John Dudley of the generation 10 was well known to be Henry Dudley.<sup>8</sup> This means that Roger Dudley cannot have been the second son and that neither the three or four generations were the correct ones.

Case B<sup>9</sup>:

- 8. John Dudley (second son)
- 9. Edmund Dudley (first son)
- 10. John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland (first son)
- 11. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester (first and only son with male issue)

Robert Dudley's first son was Robert born in 1572 just three years before Roger Dudley was married on 8 June 1675.<sup>10</sup> Hence, Roger Dudley could not have been the first son of Robert of generation 11 or for that matter the first son of John Dudley of generation 10 because Robert Dudley was his first and only son.

---

<sup>6</sup> [note 3] at 125 and [note 4] at 280.

<sup>7</sup> Adlard, *The Sutton-Dudleys* [note 2], Pedigree of the Sutton-Dudleys (Chart A, second page), one of five charts preceding page 17.

<sup>8</sup> [note 3] at 125 and [note 4] at 280.

<sup>9</sup> [note 2], Pedigree of the Dudleys, Duke of Northumberland, Earls of Warwick and Leicester (Chart B), one of five charts preceding page 17.

<sup>10</sup> [note 3], at 125 and [note 4] at 280.

Case C<sup>11</sup>:

8. Edmund Dudley (first son)
9. Thomas Dudley of Yeanwith (second son who had male issue)
10. Richard Dudley (first son)
11. Edmund Dudley (first son)

Edmund Dudley of generation 8 had two sons by his first wife, Joyce Tiptoft, but his second son John of Aston le Wells had no male issue; John's daughter Margaret was his heir.<sup>12</sup> Edmund Dudley of generation 11 was succeeded by Thomas, his first son with a male heir. Since Edmund's *successor* was not Roger Dudley, the generations of case C can reasonably be eliminated as the correct ones to Roger Dudley.

Case D<sup>13</sup>:

8. Edmund Dudley (first son)
9. Edward Dudley (first son)
10. Geoffrey Dudley of Russell's Hall (second son to have male issue)
11. Thomas Dudley (first son)

Thomas Dudley of generation 11 was married to Dorothy Lascelles in about 1562.<sup>14</sup> Also, Thomas' first son Jeffrey (not Roger) was born in about 1563.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, Roger could not have been Geoffrey's first son because Thomas was. Thus, cases A through D have been eliminated as a part of Roger Dudley's ancestry.

Case E<sup>16</sup>:

8. Edmund Dudley (first son)
9. Edward Dudley (first son)
10. John Dudley (first son)
11. Henry Dudley (second son)

Of the five cases A through E, one and only one can consist of the ancestors of Roger Dudley. Since the first four cases have been eliminated, it follows by inference that case E must be the one which consists of Roger Dudley's ancestors.

Hence, it has been proven here that if Thomas Dudley was entitled to his coat of arms, then its crescent mark represented Henry Dudley and that Henry Dudley was Roger Dudley's father. To complete the indirect proof, it must be shown that Thomas Dudley was entitled to his coat of arms.

Many an early settler found a need to use a seal on documents and adopted a coat of arms associated with his name without knowing whether or not he was entitled to it based on his ancestry. The New England Historic Genealogical Society (NEHGS) established the Committee on Heraldry to address this problem of whether or not a settler was using a correct coat of arms. The Committee registered coats of arms of settlers

---

<sup>11</sup> [note 2], Chart A (second page) and Pedigree of the Dudleys of Yeanwith, Cumberland (Chart C), one of five charts preceding page 17.

<sup>12</sup> [note 3], at 368 and [note 4] at 754.

<sup>13</sup> [note 2], Chart A (second page).

<sup>14</sup> Dean Dudley, *Supplement to the History of the Dudley Family*, (Wakefield, MA, privately printed 1898), Chart of pages 33,34.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> [note 3], at 123-125

whose titles were proven by sufficient evidence. They would not register “coats assumed in this country without either a grant or an inherited right.”<sup>17</sup> If the Committee was satisfied that the settler brought his coat of arms on a seal or any other form from England the Committee considered that was a good *prima facie* case that the settler was entitled to the coat of arms. Otherwise, complete proof was required.<sup>18</sup> The first Roll of Arms registered appeared in April of 1928 and contained seventy-two coats.<sup>19</sup> The second roll contained ninety registered coats of arms among which was that of Thomas Dudley.<sup>20</sup>

It was not revealed by what basis each coat of arms was accepted for registration. One reason for the registering Thomas Dudley’s coat of arms might well have been that he was not one of those who felt a need for coat of arms seal to use on his documents since he only used it on his will. The second reason was probably that the coat of arms was for the 16<sup>th</sup> century and not the 17<sup>th</sup> century. This requires a bit of explanation. The Sutton-Dudley coat of arms consisted of a green lion rampant (standing erect with one foot on the ground and facing left) on a field of gold. Originally, the lion had a double tail, but in the sixteenth century the heralds, due to a dispute, caused the lion to be displayed with a single tail. The heralds restored the double tail in the seventeenth century.<sup>21</sup> If Thomas Dudley had adopted his coat of arms in America, it would have had the double tailed lion. Hence, it is likely that the seal was originally that of Thomas Dudley’s father for use in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

Anne Bradstreet’s biographer, Elizabeth Wade White, acquired evidence from an English authority that Thomas Dudley was fully entitled to the Sutton-Dudley coat of arms: In a letter dated 9 February 1953, Captain de La Lanne-Mirrlees, then Rouge Dragon pursuivant, of the College of Arms agreed that Thomas Dudley was entitled to the use of the Sutton-Dudley coat of arms, and that his seal provides “reasonable, though inferential proof” of Thomas Dudley’s paternal lineage.<sup>22</sup> Inferential proof is a form of indirect proof.

From its inception to the present day the NEHGS Committee on Heraldry has been the most respected authority on American heraldry. Other than proof that Thomas Dudley was not entitled to his coat of arms, there is no reasonable justification to ignore or dismiss either their findings and judgments or those of England’s highest authority on heraldry, the College of Arms. Therefore, in accordance with the two best possible authorities, Thomas Dudley was entitled to use his coat of arms seal. This completes the indirect proof that Henry Dudley was Roger Dudley’s father and establishes Thomas Dudley’s paternal line as follows:

---

<sup>17</sup> *NEHGR*, Robert Dickson Weston, Chairman of the Committee on Heraldry, “A Second Roll of Arms Registered by the Committee on Heraldry of the New England Historic Genealogical Society”, vol. 86, 258-259.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, at 259.

<sup>19</sup> *NEHGR*, G. Andrews Moriarty, Jr. of the Committee on Heraldry, “A Roll of Arms Registered by the Committee on Heraldry of the New England Historic Genealogical Society”, vol. 82, 146.

<sup>20</sup> *NEHGR*, [note 17], at 273.

<sup>21</sup> Dean Dudley, *Supplement to the History of the Dudley Family*, [note 14], 6 ( a footnote).

<sup>22</sup> Elizabeth Wade White, *Anne Bradstreet, The Tenth Muse*, (New York, Oxford University Press, 1971), 13.

1. Sir Richard de Sutton, b. ca. 1266, d. aft. 1346, m. Isabel Patrick, b. ca. 1260, d. by 1318.
2. John de Sutton I, d. aft. 1337, m. Margaret de Somery, b. 1290, d. 1384.
3. John de Sutton II, d. 1359, m. Isabel de Cherleton, d. 1396.
4. John de Sutton III, b. 1338, d. 1369/70, m. 25 Dec 1357 Katherine de Stafford (child bride), b. ca. 1347/8, d. by 25 Dec 1361.
5. John de Sutton IV, b. 6 Dec 1361, d. 1395/6, m. Joan.
6. John Sutton V, b. Feb 1380, d. 28 Aug 1406, m. bef. 10 Dec 1401, Constance Blount, d. 23 Sep 1432.
7. John Dudley, b. 25 Dec 1400, d. 30 Sep 1487, m. aft. 14 Mar 1420/1, Elizabeth Berkeley, d. shortly bef. 8 Dec 1478.
8. Edmund Dudley (or Sutton), m. Joyce Tiptoft, d. between 1483 and 1487.<sup>23</sup>
9. Edward Dudley, b. abt. 1459, m. Cecily Willoughby, d. 31 Jan. 1531/2 at age abt. 72.<sup>24</sup>
10. John Dudley, b. abt. 1495, m. Cecily Grey, buried at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on 18 Sep. 1553.<sup>25</sup>
11. Capt. Henry Dudley, b. abt. 1517, m. Miss Ashton, d. between 1568 and 1570.<sup>26</sup>
12. Capt. Roger Dudley, b. abt. 1550, m. Susanna Thorne 8 June 1575, d. bef. October 1588.<sup>27</sup>
13. Gov. Thomas Dudley, baptised 12 Oct. 1576, m. Dorothy Yorke on 25 Apr. 1603, d. 25 Apr. 1653.<sup>28</sup>

The statement of David Faris and Richardson about the importance of Thomas Dudley's coat of arms in determining Governor's Dudley paternal ancestry has been shown to be true and insightful.

Formerly, there was no documentary proof that Thomas Dudley was a descendant of Henry Dudley. Now, there is. Thomas Dudley's will is that document with the crescent of the coat of arms seal showing the descent of Thomas Dudley from Captain Henry Dudley.

### Some Closing Comments

It has been suggested that one of the Suttons of generations 1 through 6 might have had a second son who was Thomas Dudley's ancestor. To study this possibility, generation 6 will be considered. It is known that John Sutton and Constant Blount had three sons, the first son, John, along with Thomas and Humphry. For Thomas or Humphry to have been the ancestor of Gov. Thomas Dudley, he must be the first of a line of four or five first sons to the time of Roger Dudley. No such line is known to exist after more than 150 years of researching the Sutton-Duttons by a goodly number of expert genealogists. Longer lines from a second son of any of the first five generations have also not been discovered. Thus, based on the present state of knowledge, it is

---

<sup>23</sup> [note 3], at 123,124.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* at 124.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.* at 125

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* at 125,126.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

inconceivable that the suggested possibility is true. However, it is noteworthy that Isabel de Cherleton of generation 3 married a second husband by the name of Richard Dudley.<sup>29</sup> His line came within three generations of reaching the time of Roger Dudley.<sup>30</sup> Of course, he was not a Sutton-Dudley. His coat of arms featured three lions' heads.<sup>31</sup>

It is worth mentioning that according to the present state of Sutton-Dudley knowledge, each first and second son of the cases A through E is correctly identified. For instance, Thomas Dudley of case C was identified as the second son in 1848<sup>32</sup> and the identification after all these years has not been shown to be false.

---

<sup>29</sup> [note 14],10; [note 2], Chart A (first page)

<sup>30</sup> [note 14],10.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid

<sup>32</sup> Dean Dudley, *The Dudley Genealogies and Family Records*, (Boston, published by the author, 1848), 10.

# Rebuttal to Criticisms of Roger Dudley's Father Proved to be Captain Henry Dudley

**By H. Allen Curtis**

At the website <http://www.gatago.com/soc/genealogy/medieval/4281263.html> are found some criticisms of my article, "Roger Dudley's Father Proved to be Captain Henry Dudley". Below is my rebuttal to those criticisms.

## Nat Taylor's Criticism

As for taking the approval of the NEHGS Committee on Heraldry as prima facie evidence for the genealogical validity of Gov. Dudley's use of arms, I would be rather more cautious.

Be that as it may, I remain convinced that Marshall's hypothesis (the same one as reflected here) is probably correct, but it lacks proof.

## My Rebuttal

Mr. Taylor was critical of standards of the NEHGS Committee on Heraldry and dismissed their evidence but ignored the evidence of the greater authority, The College of Arms: Captain de La Lanne-Mirrlees, then Rouge Dragon pursuivant, of the College of Arms who agreed that Thomas Dudley was entitled to the use of the Sutton-Dudley coat of arms, and that his seal provides "reasonable, though inferential proof" of Thomas Dudley's paternal lineage. The captain's reference to an inferential proof was the inspiration for my proof by elimination which verified the captain's words.

## Joseph Cook's Criticism

Mr. Cook agreed with Mr. Taylor about the NEHGR Committee on Heraldry but was otherwise favorable to my article. Thus, my rebuttal to Mr. Taylor applies here also.

## Todd A. Farmerie's Criticism

Mr. Farmerie's criticism though much more detailed was essentially the same as the previous two. Among his details, he said, "It is taken on faith that a crescent on a shield is indicative of descent from a second son at one and only one point in the pedigree. This is an oversimplification of the practice of differencing."

## My Rebuttal

Mr. Farmerie also ignored the evidence of the College of Arms. In this case the over-simplification applied and could be used to provide reasonable inferential proof. Mr. Farmerie correctly stated, "The NEHGS Heraldry Committee was primarily interested in whether the immigrant adopted arms in America, or carried some armigerous tradition with him from England." The reason for this interest was that many of the immigrants adopted coats of arms for personal gain. However, Thomas Dudley used his seal only once (on his will) and thus did not use it for personal gain. Thomas Dudley was known for his honesty and would not have used his seal if he were not entitled to do so.

## John Brandon's Criticism

Mr. Brandon had no explicit criticism, but suggested the direction he would take in the search for documentary evidence of Thomas Dudley's paternal ancestry. My rebuttal is not needed.

## Douglas Richardson - no criticism

Mr. Richardson merely replied to Mr. Brandon. This initiated a Richardson and Brandon correspondence which included no criticism of my article. Nat Taylor joined that correspondence. All criticism had ceased.