

S009 L&DFLHS VCH Group Historical information extraction form (Publications)

Source		Bean, J M W, <i>The estates of the Percy family 1416 – 1537</i> , London, OUP, 1958			
Name(s) of contributor(s)		RA		Date of contribution	1 Feb 2012
1901 Parish	VCH cat (1-7)	Date range	Page(s)	Content	Notes
ALL	1,2,3	1415-1537	22-27, 46-7, 144-159	See page images attached	Bean's list of 'manors' are rather graveships than individual manors. The reference to Rogerscale should be to Rogersett, the old name for Newlands - dd

(ii) *Cumberland*

The Cumberland estates present a more difficult problem than those elsewhere, owing to the form in which the manorial accounts provide their information. In the case of estates in other areas, the accounts give full details of the various items of revenue. But those which have survived for Cumberland frequently summarize all the rents of a particular manor under the general heading *Rents and Farms* and further evidence is lacking. While the account of 1437-8, for instance, gives comparatively full details, that of 1453-4 in nearly every case gives only the total of rents and farms.

On the Cumberland estates most of the revenues were derived from tenancies at will. In Sussex, Northumberland, and Yorkshire the farms of demesne lands are entered as separate items in the accounts; but in Cumberland by the beginning of the fifteenth century the demesne lands had already been merged within the tenancies at will. No doubt the explanation for this phenomenon is largely geographical: the Cumberland estates must have been much less densely populated than those elsewhere, while the amount of arable demesne cannot have been large. The Survey of 1570 thus describes the Percy estates in Cumberland:¹ 'the country consists most in waste ground and is very cold, hard and barren for the winter . . . their greatest gain consisteth in breeding of cattle which are no charge to them in summer by reason they are pastured and fed upon the mountains and waste where they have sufficient pasture all the year unless great snows chance in the winter to cover the ground . . . because the greatest part of the country consisteth in waste and mountains they have but little tillage'.

Tables V and VI summarize the statistics available for the two manors for which we possess full details of the items of manorial revenue—Cockermouth and Wigton.

At Cockermouth rents reveal a slight rise from £7. 19s. 5d. in 1437-8 to £8. 4s. 2d. in 1453-4; but by 1478-9 they had dropped to a figure below that of 1437-8—£7. 2s. 4d. Moreover, it is possible to trace the development of one particular item included in these figures: the fulling-mill,

¹ Exch., KR, Misc. Bks. (E. 164), vol. 37, fol. 3.

charged at 13s. 4d. in 1437-8, had dropped to 7s. in the two later years. The issues of the park remained constant. But the corn-mill fell from £17 in 1437-8 to £13. 6s. 8d. in 1453-4—a decline of 21.5 per cent. The fishery, charged at £13. 6s. 8d. in the two earlier years, rendered £10. 6s. 8d. in 1478-9—a decline of 22.5 per cent. The total value of all rents and farms at Cockermouth declined by almost 10 per cent. in the forty-one years between 1437-8 and 1478-9.

At Wigton the rents of tenancies at will fell from £9. 12s. 5½d.¹ in 1437-8 to £8. 16s. 8d. in 1470-1. The water- and fulling-mills dropped from £10. 13s. 4d. in 1437-8 to £7 in 1453-4. Between the same dates another water-mill remained constant, though by 1470-1 its value had doubled. The exceptionally large size of the 'decayed rents' entry in 1437-8 in comparison with the two later years at first sight suggests that there was some measure of recovery between 1437-8 and 1453-4. However, an examination of the entry of 1437-8 shows that it is composed largely of an abnormal feature—a mill destroyed by the Scots which was charged at £9. 13s. 4d.: if this mill had rendered its normal value, the 'decayed rents' entry would have been only £1. 9s. 1d. Thus the 'decayed rents' entry of £4. 1s. 2½d. in 1453-4, which contains no reference to the mill, really represents a decline in comparison with that of 1437-8. But our figures show clearly that at Wigton by 1470-1 a pronounced recovery had occurred.

The above analysis reveals that at Cockermouth and Wigton after 1437-8 the process of decline mainly affected the mills, though the rents of tenants at will were slightly diminished. Table VII summarizes the statistics available for the other Percy manors in Cumberland. In examining its figures two points should be borne in mind. First, the totals of rents and farms are *net*, since the 'decayed rents' entries have been deducted from the totals given in the accounts. Second, a consequence of this, the figures contain in each case a small element of free rent. It is quite clear that the incidence of decline varied considerably from manor to manor. Indeed, the values of a few manors rose between

¹ This figure, which does not appear in Table VI, has been calculated on the basis of the details in the account.

1437-8 and 1478-9, that of Five Towns being the most conspicuous example. Most manors, however, revealed in some measure the effects of agrarian recession. The tendency for revenues to shrink was most marked at Great Broughton, where the rate of decline was roughly one-third in sixteen years. But here the explanation lies largely in the ruin of the coal-mine which in 1437-8 rendered £13. 6s. 8d. and in 1453-4 only £3. By 1478-9 this mine was completely derelict, though by then another was producing £4. In the case of two manors we are able to trace the decline in separate items of manorial revenue. At Caldbeck Upton the value of the mill fell from £6 in 1437-8 to £4. 13s. 4d. in 1453-4 and to £4. 3s. 4d. in 1478-9: at Caldbeck Underfell the farm of Woodhall dropped from £4. 13s. 4d. in 1437-8 to £4 in 1478-9. Table VII does not include the revenues derived from the forest of Westward, which declined considerably during our period. In 1453-4 the profits of the herbage of Westward were held by Sir Henry Fenwick, to whom they had been leased in 1444 for twenty years at an annual rent of £26: the actual profits must have been higher than this. But in 1478-9, when the Earl himself drew the profits directly, Westward rendered £16. 19s. 7d.

The marked variations in decline between manor and manor, and the fact that in certain manors between 1437-8 and 1478-9 there was either no noticeable decline or even some improvement, make it essential that we endeavour to investigate any evidence which throws light on manorial revenues before the earliest date for which we possess accounts—1437-8. The accounts of this year provide some figures relating to a previous period; but in each case the account, without specifying any date, simply states that the lands or tenements in question at some time past used to render a certain rent, higher than that which they now render.

Table VIII assembles all the information of this type that can be found. The figures therein do not imply that before 1437 decline was confined to these manors alone; no doubt their survival is due to the vagaries of individual accounting officials. The measure of the decline they reveal is extremely serious—in most cases ranging between roughly 50 and 25

per cent. But the difficulty remains—what period do they cover? The use of the same phraseology in a similar sense in later accounts for manors for which we possess the 1437-8 and 1453-4 figures suggests that the period was less than forty years. It is unfortunate that a more satisfactory solution cannot be found to this important problem. Nevertheless, this evidence remains highly suggestive in two important respects. First, the figures relate principally to the decline of rents received from the tenants at will and, therefore, include

TABLE V. *Cockermouth, 1437-79**

Items	1437-8		1453-4		1478-9	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Free rent	2	8 4	2	8 4	2	13 1½
Various rents and farms, incl. tenancies at will	7	19 5	8	4 2	7	2 4
Corn-mill with farm of toll and stallage	17	0 0	13	6 8	13	6 8
Fishery	13	6 8	13	6 8	10	6 8
Farm of herbage of park	13	6 8	13	6 8	13	6 8
New rent	1	8	..	2
Decayed rents	2	4 6	7	3
NET TOTAL	51	16 7	50	6 11	46	15 7½

* Based on Cockermouth C.M., 29/1, 4, and 5.

TABLE VI. *Wigton, 1437-79†*

Items	1437-8		1453-4		1470-1		1478-9	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Free rent	6	19 11	17	9 2½	6	4 2	6	4 2
Various rents and farms	10	9 1½	8	16 8	8	16 8	8	16 11
Corn and fulling-mills	10	13 4	7	0 0	8	6 8	8	6 8
Another corn-mill	1	6 8	1	6 8	2	13 4	2	0 0
Lands in lord's hands	1	9 4	1	9 4
Decayed rents	11	2 5	4	1 2½	15	6
NET TOTAL	19	15 11½	23	4 0	26	0 10	24	12 3

† Based on Cockermouth C.M., 29/1, 4, and 5; account of 1470-1 contained in Alnwick C.M., X. 11. 3.

the values of the original demesne lands. In this they differ from the figures assembled in Tables V-VII for Cockermouth, Wigton, and other manors, since in these it is the mills principally, and not the tenancies at will, which reveal

TABLE VII. *The Cumberland Estates, 1437-79*

Manor	1437-8		1453-4		1470-1		1478-9	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Dean	14	16 4	12	17 2	12	18 7
Whinfell	7	0 7	6	19 11	6	19 0
Five Towns	7	15 10	11	1 8	11	2 0
Papcastle	18	9 0	16	18 4	16	6 7
Birkby	5	19 0	6	0 0	5	19 0
Little Broughton	3	11 4	3	11 4	3	11 4
Great Broughton	34	13 2	23	15 0	24	8 6
Caldbeck Upton	19	1 8	17	18 7	17	10 0
Caldbeck Underfell	20	13 5	19	5 7	19	16 1
Uldale	21	8 11	20	10 4
Aspatria	19	5 11	17	0 9	16	11 5
Crosby	7	4 2½	6	15 10½	6	16 2
Whitehall	11	1 8	10	0 0	10	4 8
Loweswater	33	4 6	32	17 0	33	2 8
Thackthwaite	9	6 0½	9	9 4½	9	10 0
Setmurthy	15	8 8	14	18 10	15	8 7
Lorton	5	19 11	6	8 6	6	7 11
Brundholme	9	0 11	8	2 8	8	4 5
Coledale	8	12 0½	8	11 3½	6	14 6½	6	18 4½
Rogerscale	12	17 9½	13	3 5	12	15 3
Brackenthwaite	10	8 3½	10	2 6½	10	2 6	10	2 0
Mockerkin	7	6 4½	7	6 4½	7	6 8	7	6 8
Buttermere	18	1 10½	18	2 6½	17	11 10½
Braithwaite	17	17 4	18	0 8½	17	14 5½	17	10 8½
Aikhead	3	18 10	3	18 10	3	18 9
Kirkland	4	16 2½	4	16 10½
Rosewain	5	1 0	5	2 10
Woodside	6	7 0	6	7 0	6	7 2
Dundraw	1	4 1½	1	4 5½	1	4 5½
Kirkbride	3	6 8	3	7 6	3	7 6
Oulton	7	15 11	7	14 5	7	14 5
Waverton	5	14 9½	5	14 8½	6	2 0½
Egremont	14	17 5½	14	12 2½	14	15 10½
Wilton	1	6 8	1	6 8	1	7 2
Eskdale and Wasdale	21	5 8	20	19 10½	20	10 10½

decline. Second, the manors comprised in Table VIII include two—Mockerkin and Birkby—where rents remain comparatively stable after 1437-8.

The serious reality of the economic decline on the Cumberland estates cannot be denied. It is unfortunate that we possess no accounts earlier than 1437-8. But the evidence of the progress of the decline after this date, combined with valuable clues revealing its previous history, justifies us in

claiming that between the period of the second Earl's restoration in 1416 and c. 1470 the revenues of the Cumberland estates must have dropped by between a quarter and a third.

TABLE VIII. *Decline in Cumberland before 1437**

Manors	At a previous date		1437-8	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
<i>Mockerkin</i>				
Tenants at will	7	7 5	4	14 0
" " " in Scowrescales	1	13 4	1	9 7½
<i>Birkby</i>	7	0 0	5	19 0
<i>Loweswater</i>				
Herbage of Buckness	6	13 4	3	10 0
Tenants at will	18	11 8	13	11 5
Park at Balnes	9	13 4	8	0 0
<i>Caldbeck Upton</i>				
Demesne lands	2	11 6	1	19 2
Tenants at will	8	13 1	5	14 11
" " " in Rotten Row	6	14 2	5	5 3
<i>Caldbeck Underfell</i>				
Tenants at will:				
in East- and Ud-scales	5	13 1	4	7 4
in Branthwaite	9	4 6	6	7 10
in Haldleigh	1	8 4	1	0 10

* Based on Cockermouth C.M., 29/1, *passim*.

These conclusions raise the problem of the extent to which attempts were made to exploit the mineral resources of the Cumberland estates in this period. The accounts of 1437-8 reveal that, while licences to dig coal were granted at Dean and Loweswater, the coal-mine at Great Broughton was in this year leased for seven years at an annual rent of £13.6s.8d.¹ But in this year no further information exists relating to mineral resources. The account of 1453-4, however, shows that the whole issues of Lorton, Thackthwaite, Brundholme, Buttermere, Rogerscale, Brackenthwaite, and part of those of Braithwaite and Coledale, were paid to one Alexander Heighmore, who is described as Supervisor and Governor of the lord's mines in Cumberland.² The Receiver's account for

¹ Ibid. 29/1m. 5.

² Cockermouth C.M., 29/4.

TABLE XVII. *The Cumberland Estates, 1478-1538**

Manor	1478-9		1523-4		1537-8	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Cockermouth	46	15 7½	45	3 8	45	5 3½
Dean	12	18 7	13	9 1	13	8 1
Whinfell	6	19 0	7	1 2	7	1 7
Five Towns	11	2 0	11	2 7	11	2 7
Papcastle	16	6 7	17	2 5	17	2 5
Birkby	5	19 0	6	0 0	6	0 0
Little Broughton	3	11 4	3	14 8	3	14 8
Great Broughton	24	8 6	23	7 6	22	4 2
Caldbeck Upton	17	10 0	17	13 3	17	13 7
Caldbeck Underfell	19	16 1	20	8 2	20	0 0
Uldale	20	10 4	22	5 4½	22	5 4½
Aspatia	16	11 5	17	7 1	17	10 7
Crosby	6	16 2	6	16 2½	6	16 2½
Whitehall	10	4 8	11	18 0	11	18 0
Loweswater	33	2 8	33	3 2	33	2 8
Thackthwaite	9	10 0	9	10 4	9	7 0
Setmurthy	15	8 7	15	19 8	16	2 4
Lorton	6	7 11	7	0 0	7	0 0
Brundholme	8	4 5	11	3 1	10	16 5
Coledale	6	18 4½	7	17 4½	7	17 4½
Rogerscale	12	15 3	13	3 6	13	3 6
Brackenthwaite	10	2 0	10	12 6	10	10 6
Mockerkin	7	6 8	7	6 8	7	6 8
Buttermere	17	11 10½	18	6 8½	18	6 8½
Braithwaite	17	10 8½	19	13 11½	19	14 1½
Wigton	24	12 3	25	9 6	25	14 11
Kirkland	4	16 10½	5	0 1½	5	0 11½
Rosewain	5	2 10	5	7 4	5	7 8
Aikhead	3	18 9	3	19 0	3	19 0
Woodside	6	7 2	6	18 1	6	18 2
Dundraw	1	4 5½	1	4 5½	1	4 5½
Kirkbride	3	7 6	3	13 0	3	13 9
Oulton	7	14 5	7	14 11	7	14 11
Waverton	6	2 0½	6	13 4½	6	3 6½
Westward	16	19 7	29	16 11	29	18 11½
Egremont	14	15 10½	15	3 10½	15	3 10½
Wilton	1	7 2	1	7 2	1	7 2
Drigg and Carleton	2	8 1	2	8 2	2	3 2
Eskdale and Wasdale	20	10 10½	22	8 11½	22	8 11½

* Based on Cockermouth C.M., 29/5 and 13; and P.R.O., Min. Accts., Hen. VIII, 464.

scarcely any, change. At Tadcaster there was a decline in revenues, which may be attributed to the fall in the value of the mills: in 1471-2 the corn-mills rendered £20 and the

fulling-mills £6, but by 1516-17 the farms were £9 and £4 respectively—a total loss of £13.¹ It will be observed that, if this loss be taken into account and the rest of the rents and farms be separately examined, the latter had risen slightly. All the other manors entered in Table XVIII reveal increases in revenue, in some cases quite marked. The expansion of

TABLE XVIII. *The Yorkshire Estates, 1471-1525**

Manor	1471-2		1478-9		1524-5	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Healaugh	49	13 5½	51	6 1½
Spofforth	72	6 3½	77	14 7
Linton	13	13 10	13	13 10	17	4 0
Leathley	22	0 10	22	5 8
Kirk Leavington	24	5 0	24	10 4
Tadcaster	73	15 6	74	10 8	66	14 10
Topcliffe	90	7 6½	111	2 11½
Asenby	12	17 2	12	17 2
Gristhwaite	12	3 7	12	3 8½

Manor	1491-2		1524-5	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Catton	65	19 9½	72	16 6½
Pocklington	46	18 9	45	19 1½
Nafferton	86	6 11½	88	15 3
Hunmanby	38	12 9	41	19 9
Seamer	71	16 0	79	4 10½

* Based on Petworth H.M., D. 9. 7, 8, and 11 and the account for 1524-5 contained in Alnwick C.M., X. 11. 6(22). The survey of 1538 (P.R.O., Rentals and Surveys, Gen. Ser., Roll 959) and the accounts for 1539-40 (P.R.O., Min. Accts., Hen. VIII, 4283) have not been used to provide figures for this table, partly because some of the values had by then been reduced by the granting of beneficial leases, and partly because there are discrepancies between the figures supplied by these two sources.

rents and farms is most pronounced at Topcliffe, where the explanation is to be found in the growth of agistments of the parks. In 1478-9 £28 was derived from this source, but in 1516-17 £34. 2s. 9d. In 1522-3 and 1524-5 re-

¹ Petworth H.M., D. 9. 7/m. 9 and D. 9. 13/m. 1.

III

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE ESTATES

1527-37

THE period between the accession of the sixth Earl of Northumberland in 1527 and his death in 1537 witnessed the dissolution of the whole of his inheritance. The actual process of dissolution may be examined from three aspects: first, the Earl's lavish expenditure on favourites, which greatly diminished his financial resources; second, the transference of a large number of manors in the south of England to private persons; and, third, the transactions with the Crown, which thereby secured the rest of the Percy estates. In examining these problems, we are considerably aided by a large body of evidence, especially letters, mainly amongst the Public Records. In particular, the sixth Earl is the first Percy whose character is depicted by reliable contemporary evidence: we are thus able to discuss the extent to which his personal deficiencies affected his management of his affairs.

Contemporaries would seem to have been agreed that the sixth Earl of Northumberland was personally unfit to assume the responsibility of his inheritance. If we are to believe Wolsey's biographer Cavendish, who claimed to have been present at the scene, the Earl's own father upbraided him as 'a very unthrift waster' and declared that 'of thy natural inclination thou art disposed to be wasteful and prodigal, and to consume all that thy progenitors have with great travail gathered together and kept with honour': he even threatened to disinherit him.¹ It could be suggested that the writer composed this account after the Earl had indeed wasted his inheritance; but we know of no particular reason why his view of the Earl should be biased and, in any case, there is clear indication from other sources that the fifth Earl's strictures were not without foundation. Immediately after the death of the fifth Earl in 1527 Wolsey seems to

¹ Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey*, ed. Singer, pp. 126-7.

have considered that the heir lacked the mental capacity to manage his own affairs. Although the sixth Earl was about twenty-five years of age, he was not allowed to attend his father's funeral: Wolsey interfered in the management of the estates and even proposed to put the Earl under a governor.¹ These actions, it is true, are evidence of Wolsey's high-handed attitude towards the nobility; but they would not have occurred if there had been no grounds on which they could be justified.

In character the sixth Earl appears to have been weak and gullible. His personal deficiencies, aggravated by persistent ill health² and the break-up of his marriage,³ exposed him to the influence of favourites, on whom he showered exorbitant gifts of money, and land.⁴ The key to the dissolution of the estates is to be found in a remark made by Robert Southwell, one of the Royal Commissioners who surveyed the estates in 1537:⁵ 'Never have I seen a finer inheritance more blemished by the follies of the owner and untruth of his servants than those of the late Earl.'

Among the sixth Earl's favourites the Carnaby family have attracted the greatest notoriety, largely owing to the bitter accusations which the Earl's brother and heir, Sir Thomas Percy, brought against them in a petition made to Thomas Cromwell:⁶ 'if it might please the King and his most honourable council to remove from the company and service of the said Earl the said Sir Reynold Carnaby and his brethren who not only have made high division betwixt my said lord and his wife, his brethren and most high friends but also do daily entice him to give his lands and substance to them and their friends and do more and stir him daily to prodigality and mispending of his goods to his utter destruction and impoverishment and disinheriting of his

¹ Fonblanque, i. 378-9 and 381-5. Perhaps Wolsey's plan to assume the management of the Percy estates sprang from a desire to increase the territorial power of the Crown in the north of England. If this is so, it foreshadowed the policy towards the Percy estates pursued by the Crown in the 1530's.

² *Ibid.* i. 379, 385, 395, &c.

³ *Ibid.* i. 385, 401-2, and 456-7.

⁴ Details of many of these can be found in *Statutes of the Realm*, iii. 611-19 (27 Hen VIII, c. 47).

⁵ *L. & P. Hen. VIII*, xii (2), no. 548.

⁶ *Ibid.* viii, no. 1143(4).

blood'. There was, however, good reason for the bitterness of these complaints. A list of the offices which the members of the Carnaby family held for life of the Earl's grant need not be given here;¹ but the favourable leases which they obtained repay analysis. On 1 April 1530 Sir Reynold Carnaby received a ninety-nine year lease of the fishery of Ovingham at an annual rent of £3. 6s. 8d.: the Royal Commissioners of 1537 declared that in the times of both the sixth Earl and his father the fishery had rendered £60 a year, and sometimes £80.² On 13 December 1534 the whole manor of Corbridge was leased to Sir Reynold, his heirs, executors, and assigns for a term of ninety-nine years at an annual rent of £26: in fact, the total value of rents and farms there was £39 a year.³ The implications of the terms of these leases are obvious: not only did the Earl accept a rent far below the real value but he surrendered the opportunity to benefit from any increase in their value in a period when landed revenues were beginning to rise.

Nor were the Carnabys the only favourites to profit from the Earl's lavishness. On 18 October 1530 the Earl granted to Sir Thomas Wharton in tail male the Cumberland manors of Dean, Whinfell, Great and Little Broughton, Caldbeck Underfell, and Birkby, at an annual rent which was £40 less than the total of their rents and farms. Moreover, out of the rent he paid Sir Thomas received an annuity of £66. 13s. 4d. a year. Sir Thomas also obtained large grants in fee in Yorkshire, without rendering any rent—the manors of Healaugh and Catterton, valued in 1538 at £49. 16s. 5½d. and £15. 18s. 4d. respectively, and the manors of Leathley and Waltonhead, valued at a total of £49. 15s. 2d. The terms in which these grants are described show clearly that they were free gifts, not sales, of the lands in question. On 25 March 1535 the Earl's physician, Thomas Wendy, obtained a lease of the Yorkshire manors of Buckden and Starbottan at a rent of 6s. 8d. a year: their total annual value was £41. 4s. The

¹ A full list will be found in *N.C.H.* x. 397.

² In another document it is stated that the fishery yielded £110 a year in the time of the fifth Earl (*L. & P. Hen. VIII*, xii(2), no. 398). See also the discussion of the fishery on p. 44.

³ P.R.O., Min. Accts., Hen. VIII, 2809/m. 13d.

examples which have been selected¹ indicate the way in which the sixth Earl made grants of land either in fee or at a reduced rent. In addition, he granted many leases which, though at a normal rent, were for terms considerably longer than the usual twenty-one years.

This evidence clearly indicates the extent to which the sixth Earl of Northumberland dissipated a large part of his resources on his friends and favourites. The Royal Commissioners of 1538 declared that the Earl had granted 'extraordinary' fees in excess of those granted in the time of his father, to the remarkable total of £658. 5s.:² the total of all 'ordinary' and other fees granted by his father was £463. 18s. 10d. a year. Leases granted at a nominal, or considerably reduced, rent involved the Earl in a further loss of £267. 0s. 11d. a year. In addition, grants of land in fee, without rendering any rent, had been made to a total of £119. 3s. 3½d. a year.³ It should be emphasized that these figures relate to the estates in Northumberland, Cumberland, and Yorkshire alone. When the sixth Earl surrendered these estates to the Crown, at least one-third of their revenues were consumed by grants of lands and favourable leases to friends and favourites. These financial burdens were absolutely different from those which encumbered the estates in the fifteenth century: they were not the product of the need for political power, but merely free gifts, which secured no return. There was certainly no valid excuse for this worthless squandering of an inheritance.

This wasteful policy alone could have placed the sixth Earl in serious financial difficulties. But, mainly between 1529 and 1531, the Earl further diminished his net disposable income by completely liquidating a large portion of his inheritance. Outwardly, at least, his actions seem to have taken the form of sales of land on an enormous scale. He disposed of the manors of Torbrian and Slapton and Dart-

¹ P.R.O., Min. Accts., 464, 2809, and 4283; Rentals & Surveys, Gen. Ser., Roll 959.

² This figure does not include an annuity of £140 held by Sir William Percy and £413. 6s. 8d. held as her jointure by Catherine, dowager Countess of Northumberland, the sixth Earl's mother.

³ This figure does not include the manors of Kildale and Battersby, valued at £31 and granted in fee to Sir Thomas Percy.

mouth and its members in Devon;¹ Somerton Erleigh and Somerton Randolf,² Kingsdon,³ Staple,⁴ Week,⁵ Downhead and Stoke St. Michael,⁶ all in Somerset; Puncknowle, Toller Porcorum, Durweston, and Okeford Fitzpaine in Dorset;⁷ Crawley, Ifield, Twineham, Westmeston, Hangleton, East Aldrington, and other lands in Sussex; Shiremark in Charlwood in Surrey;⁸ Isleham in Cambridgeshire;⁹ Foston in Leicestershire;¹⁰ and all the estates in Kent.¹¹ The manors of Wilton Poynings in Norfolk and Cratfield and Wrentham Poynings in Suffolk¹² were granted to the Earl of Sussex, from whom in return the Earl of Northumberland received certain estates in Cumberland.¹³ Northumberland certainly had the worst of this bargain: if he died without male issue, these Cumberland estates were to revert to the Earl of Sussex, while their annual value was £59. 7s. 4d. less than that of the lands for which they had been exchanged.¹⁴ In 1534 the remainder of the estates in Somerset, Dorset, and Devon were granted to Henry, Marquess of Exeter: annuities charged thereon, totalling £186. 5s. 9½d., were to revert to the Earl and his heirs.¹⁵ In 1534 the Earl also disposed of Heyshott in Sussex.¹⁶ Two portions of house property were alienated—that in Southwark in Surrey in 1535¹⁷ and that in St. Martin's Le Grand in London.¹⁸

Can we discover the precise motives which induced the sixth Earl to indulge in this orgy of liquidation? Even if all these alienations could be regarded simply as sales, it would be impossible to calculate the total capital realized therefrom, since, although in each case the fine declares that the Earl received a certain sum, these figures are purely fictitious and do not represent an actual purchase price.¹⁹ To what extent

¹ Feet of Fines (2), 7/35/7 and 8.

² Ibid. 35/237/41.

³ Ibid. 35/237/32.

⁴ P.R.O., Ancient Deeds, B. 3223.

⁵ Feet of Fines (2), 36/238/27.

⁶ Ibid. 35/237/34.

⁷ Ibid. 9/46/26.

⁸ Ibid. 43/298/42 and 51/368/8.

⁹ Ibid. 4/19/41.

¹⁰ Ibid. 24/152/34.

¹¹ Ibid. 21/124/30.

¹² Ibid. 29/194/47 and 39/262/48.

¹³ Ibid. 5/28/12.

¹⁴ *L. & P. Hen. VIII*, xii(2), no. 398.

¹⁵ Feet of Fines (2), 51/370/27. Including the reversions of Haselbury Bryan, Lower Kentcombe, and Northam, which were still held for life by the Earl's aunt, the Countess of Arundel (see above, p. 125).

¹⁶ Feet of Fines (2), 43/300/8.

¹⁷ Ibid. 53/389B/24.

¹⁸ *Statutes of the Realm*, iii. 615. The 'chief mansion place' was expected from the grant.

¹⁹ See C. A. F. Meekings, *Surrey Feet of Fines, 1509-58*, Intro., pp. xxii-xxiii.

was the Earl forced to sell the estates through the pressure of debts, his own or inherited from his father? There is some evidence in favour of the view that indebtedness explains the alienations. Certain manors were purchased by two merchants with whom the Earl's father had dealings:¹ Thomas Kitson² bought Torbrian and Dartmouth in Devon, and Richard Gresham Isleham in Cambridgeshire and Foston in Leicestershire. Sir Thomas Neville secured the manors of Crawley, Ifield, Truly, Twineham, and Westmeston in Sussex and Shiremark in Charlwood in Surrey: in February 1534 the sixth Earl owed him a total of £570. 14s. 10d., of which at least £251. 17s. 10d. had been accumulated in his father's lifetime.³

On the other hand, there is good reason to suspect that the rest of the alienations were not sales in return for cash. The estates in Kent were acquired by the most notorious of the Earl's favourites, Sir Reynold Carnaby.⁴ Sir Thomas Johnson, who obtained large gifts of land in Yorkshire, received Somerton Erleigh and Somerton Randolf in Somerset, Puncknowle and Toller Porcorum in Dorset, and the property in Southwark. Two examples are especially instructive. On 29 July 1528 the Earl granted to another favourite—Sir Thomas Arundel, who was a boyhood friend—two annuities for life of £60 and £40, issuing from the Devon manors of Slapton and Torbrian:⁵ then, on the following 9 February, the Earl bound himself to grant him a good and lawful estate in the manor of Slapton,⁶ a grant which was duly executed in the following Michaelmas.⁷ Similarly, on 8 July 1531 the Earl granted to Henry Pole, Lord Montague, in tail male the manor of Staple Fitzpaine in Somerset: in

¹ Treasury of Receipt, Misc. Bks. (E. 36), vol. 226, pp. 115, 140, 200, and 282.

² The sixth Earl himself had dealings with Kitson (P.R.O., Min. Accts., Hen. VIII, 6306).

³ *L. & P. Hen. VIII*, vii, no. 215. According to a document of 1582 (Syon H.M., A. 1. 8(2) and 10) the Earl received the manor of Hackney in Middlesex, worth £30 a year, in exchange for the Sussex estates, worth £74. 11s. The Hackney manor was that later known as Brooke House. On these points I am much indebted to the forthcoming *L.C.C. Survey of London* volume on Brooke House.

⁴ *Statutes of the Realm*, iii. 612. Complicated conveyances of the Poynings portion to Sir William Sidney, and thence to Carnaby, were probably intended to secure the latter's title (Close Roll (C. 54), 407, no. 9).

⁵ P.R.O., Ancient Deeds, B. 9048.

⁶ Ibid. B. 8665.

⁷ Feet of Fines (2), 7/35/8.

return Pole surrendered an annuity of £40 for life which he had hitherto received from the issues of Petworth.¹ Thus Sir Thomas Arundel was granted a manor from which he drew a life-annuity, while Lord Montague ceded an annuity in return for the grant of a manor. The identities of some of the grantees and the transactions which preceded the alienations of two manors suggest that in the case of a large number of manors the purchase prices recorded in the fines are meaningless fictions: fines were employed to provide formal records of the transfers of the lands.

The sixth Earl's gullibility and lack of interest in the inheritance he had received from his ancestors are illustrated by his transactions in 1531 with Thomas Perrot, a Pembroke-shire squire. As early as 1466 the Perrot family had claimed to be the true heirs to the Brian inheritance.² Although their claim was then unsuccessful, they continued to put it forward.³ There is little doubt that this claim was without foundation: indeed, it is impossible to discover the line of descent on which it was based. Yet on 12 June 1531 the sixth Earl entered into an agreement whereby Thomas Perrot and his heirs received the lordships of Laugharne and Walwyns Castle: in return Perrot surrendered his claim to the Brian estates in Devon, Somerset, and Dorset and undertook to pay an annual rent of £80 to the Earl and his heirs.⁴ Though the Earl did not completely surrender his interest in Laugharne and Walwyns Castle, the rent he received was £47 below the annual value of their rents and farms.

¹ P.R.O., Ancient Deeds, B. 3223.

² In March 1466 Thomas Perrot released to William, Lord Herbert, and William Herbert all his rights to Laugharne and Walwyns Castle, which he claimed as kinsman and heir of Avice, late Countess of Wiltshire, on pain of forfeiting 1,000 marks to the Earl of Pembroke. The Herberts were acting as feoffees to the use of Henry, Earl of Northumberland (who, however, had not yet been restored to his title).

³ An inquisition *post mortem* states that Sir Owen Perrot, the father of Thomas, on 15 Sept. 1519 granted the two lordships to feoffees to his use (Exch., Inq. p.m., E. 150, 1215).

⁴ The agreement made provision for the execution of recoveries and assurances. But, though a recovery was made, Thomas Perrot died before the assurances could be performed, leaving an heir under age. The Percies seem to have taken legal advice about their claims to the Welsh estates in 1668: a counsel's opinion of this date is bound up with the bundle of deeds on which the above account is based (Alnwick C.M., X. II. 14(1)).

The Percy estates which remained after the alienations to private individuals had occurred were acquired by the Crown as a result of certain transactions between 1531 and 1537. The motives of the Crown in securing the remainder of the Percy inheritance must be viewed in the light of the policy which Henry VIII and Thomas Cromwell pursued towards the north of England in this period. The disturbed and lawless north was a special danger to the Crown during the state of emergency created by the break with Rome. A policy was followed which was intended to subdue the north and remove all threats to the authority of the Crown: the efforts of Henry VIII and Cromwell culminated, after the suppression of the Pilgrimage of Grace, in the re-creation and permanent establishment of the Council of the North in 1537.¹ The Crown's acquisition of the Percy estates forms an integral part of this policy. Since the Earl of Northumberland was the most powerful of the King's subjects in the north, the acquisition of his estates simultaneously increased the landed wealth of the Crown and removed the most dangerous potential rival to its power in the north.

The first stage in the development of this policy occurred when, on 7 July 1531, the Earl of Northumberland granted to the King the castle and honour of Cockermouth and all the Percy estates in Cumberland: in return, nineteen separate obligations, totalling £8,062. 9s. 6d., were delivered to the Earl and Anthony Bonvisi, an Italian merchant.² Thus the Percy estates in Cumberland seem to have been sold to free the Earl from an extremely heavy debt: that the estates were actually conveyed to the Crown is confirmed by the existence of the appropriate foot of fine.³ However, on the evidence of this transaction alone we cannot assert that the Crown or its advisers had already conceived the policy which was to lead to the acquisition of the whole Percy inheritance. In an indenture dated 16 July 1532 the Earl promised to allow the rest of his estates, excluding those in Wales and Lincoln-

¹ For the political and constitutional background see Reid, pp. 118-20.

² The text of this indenture is recited at length in the indenture of 3 Feb. 1535: it is not enrolled on the Close Roll.

³ Feet of Fines (2), 5/28/15.

shire,¹ to descend to 'one person of the name Percy and of the blood of the said Percy'.² The precise motives of the Crown in concluding this agreement are unknown. Its terms might indicate that the Crown at this stage did not intend to absorb the whole Percy inheritance. On the other hand, it is clear that the Crown wished to maintain the inheritance intact as it existed at the time of the indenture and wished to exercise some form of control over its future.

The second stage is marked by an indenture of agreement between the Crown and the Earl, dated 3 February 1535. The King returned to the Earl the Cumberland estates which had been bought in 1531, on the ground that the region adjoined the Scottish Border and the inhabitants were more naturally led by the Earl and his heirs than by any other leaders. The Earl, in return, sold to the King the lordships of Walwyns Castle and Laugharne in Wales,³ all the estates in Lincolnshire, the manor of Petworth and the remainder of the Poynings group of estates in Sussex, the manor of Hackney in Middlesex, and the annuities which the Earl enjoyed, in both fee and reversion, in the West Country estates granted to the Marquess of Exeter. The purchase price given by the Crown was threefold: first, the quashing of the original debt of £8,062. 9s. 6d., which was once more owing since the Cumberland estates had been returned to the Earl; second, the annulment of further debts totalling £2,317. 6s. 8d.; and, third, £4,000 paid in cash. In addition, the Crown purchased the Gloucestershire manors of Oxenhall and Oakley Grandison and Duncton and Sutton in Sussex for a total of £1,200. As a result, only the Cumberland, Northumberland, and Yorkshire estates now remained in the possession of the Earl, who promised that he would allow them to descend 'to one such person being of the kind and blood of the said Earl and bearing the name of Percy . . . without any bargain, sale . . . or other doing away of the same manors, lands and tenements . . . to any person or persons other than is before limited without the most royal assent or agreement

¹ The estates in Wales and Lincolnshire could be sold to redeem those in Cumberland.

² Syon H.M., D. I. 8a: this also is not enrolled. But the Earl bound himself to perform the agreement by entering into a recognizance of 20,000 marks (Close Roll (C. 54), 401/m. 31d). ³ i.e. the £80 rent interest therein (see above, p. 150).

of the King our said sovereign lord be first obtained or had.'¹ As in the case of the indenture of 16 July 1532, it is difficult to assess the Crown's motives precisely. On the one hand, the undertaking to allow what remained to descend to a member of the Percy family might seem to suggest that the Crown had not yet taken the decision to secure the whole of the Percy inheritance in the north. On the other hand, the prohibition of any further alienation without royal consent expresses openly the Crown's determination to control the devolution of the remaining portions of the Percy inheritance.

In the months that followed this agreement further pressure was brought to bear upon the Earl. In letters of 22 January and 2 February 1536, written to Thomas Cromwell, the Earl declared his intention to make the King his heir.² Probably this decision was due, at least in part, to his quarrel with his heir, his brother Sir Thomas Percy.³ An Act of Parliament which followed in effect reversed the terms of the indenture of 3 February 1535. All the estates then in the Earl's possession were entailed on the Earl and the lawful heirs of his body, with remainder in default of such issue to the King, his heirs and successors.⁴ The Earl was childless: his state of health, and his quarrel with his wife, from whom he was living apart, made it certain that he would have no lawful issue. Consequently, the Act of Parliament of 1536 ensured, on the Earl's death, the King's succession to the Percy estates in the north of England.

Henry VIII and Cromwell, however, remained unsatisfied: immediate possession of the estates now became their open objective. No doubt it was the new negotiations which produced a draft plan by which the Earl was to receive an

¹ Close Roll (C. 54), 430, dorse, nos. 11-17. The indenture of 3 Feb. 1535 is no. 17. See also *Statutes of the Realm*, iii. 591-5 (27 Hen. VIII, c. 38).

² Printed in Fonblanque, i. 469-71.

³ Sir Thomas claimed that the Earl had not performed fully the bequest of an annuity made in their father's will or his own undertaking to settle fees and offices on his brother. The undue influence exercised by the Carnabys was a further grievance on Sir Thomas's part (*L. & P. Hen. VIII*, viii, no. 1143 (4)).

⁴ *Statutes of the Realm*, iii. 619 (27 Hen. VIII, C. 47). The Earl's grant of his estates to the Crown on 31 Aug. 1536 must have been intended to assure the Crown's title, since he continued in possession (Close Roll (c. 54), 407, no. 65; P.R.O., Ancient Deeds, B.S. 421). Cf. *L. & P. Hen. VIII*, ix, no. 516.

annual pension of £1,000, together with £1,000 in hand for the payment of his debts.¹ At some stage the Earl himself requested lands to an annual value of £500 for life.² On 2 May 1537 he signified his consent to the King's immediate possession of all his estates.³ But within a few weeks—on 30 June 1537—the Earl died. Had he lived, he would have become a landless pensionary of the Crown.

The foregoing narrative throws an interesting light on the Crown's policy of subjugating the lawless north to its authority. The Crown's entry into the Cumberland estates in 1531 indicates a desire to acquire part, at least, of the Percy estates in the north six years before all the estates were finally secured. On the other hand, if a plan existed as early as 1531, it was not executed completely as it had been conceived. An important set-back occurred, when in 1535 the Crown handed back the Cumberland estates: the reasons given in the indenture of 3 February 1535 reveal the fear that the exclusion of the Earl would provoke disturbances in that part of the north, perhaps similar to those which actually occurred during the Pilgrimage of Grace. Instead, the King and Cromwell had to be content with the remaining Percy estates in the south—an acquisition which obviously did nothing to further the policy of extending royal power in the north. Moreover, in the indentures of 1532 and 1535 there is evidence that the Crown was ready to allow the northern estates to remain in the Percy family. On the whole, it seems clear that the policy of Henry VIII and Cromwell towards the Percy estates was more cautious, more opportunist, and more lengthy in execution than has hitherto been thought.

The motives which induced the sixth Earl to part with his inheritance must now be explored. It has been suggested that

¹ *L. & P. Hen. VIII*, viii, no. 363, wrongly calendared under 1535. It is unlikely that the negotiations began before the Pilgrimage of Grace was suppressed. At the beginning of the rebellion Sir Ingram Percy stated that 'the King shall be my lord's heir' (*ibid.* xii (1), no. 1090(25)).

² *Ibid.* vii, no. 1550 (2), which is wrongly assigned to 1534.

³ *Ibid.* xii, pt. 1, no. 1121. Letters of 30 May and 3 June 1537 also refer to this decision (*ibid.* xii, pt. 1, no. 1304 and pt. 2, no. 19). The Crown did not enter into possession until the Earl's death (P.R.O., *Min Accts.*, 464 and 2809). The survey which followed was, however, ordered the previous month (*L. & P. Hen. VIII*, xiii (2), no. 457, p. 179).

he inherited heavy debts from his father.¹ But inherited debts do not explain or justify his alienations of lands to private individuals, mainly in the period 1529–31. The sixth Earl himself, writing to his friend Sir Thomas Arundel in 1527, stated that the debts of both his father and himself totalled only 6,000 marks.² We do not know how much of this total had been accumulated by his father. But even the whole sum was equivalent to only one year's income from the estates: it is hard to see how it could not have been paid out of current revenue. Two scraps of evidence help to confirm the view that the burden of inherited debt was not overwhelming. First, two accounts of the Receiver in Somerset and Dorset for 1528–9 and 1530–1³ do not mention any debts of the fifth Earl: though both record considerable sums owed by the sixth Earl to London mercers, these are specifically described as his own, and not his late father's, debts. Second, only one individual debt owed by the fifth Earl is known to us—£66. 13s. 4d. due to the Crown for purchase of the wardships and marriages of the daughters of Sir Henry Thwaites:⁴ and this was due on 10 May 1527, only a few weeks before the fifth Earl's death. Moreover, our analysis of the alienations to private persons indicated that most of them can hardly be regarded as sales for cash.

Two explanations have been put forward to explain the sixth Earl's surrender of the remainder of his estates to the Crown.⁵ In the first place, it has been stated that Thomas Cromwell exploited the influence which Sir Reynold Carnaby exercised over the Earl; but the only evidence cited does not prove this contention.⁶ In the second place, it is

¹ Fonblanque, i. 379–80. The debts cited in support of this contention are those of the sixth Earl discussed above, pp. 152 and below, 156.

² Printed in Fonblanque, i. 381.

³ P.R.O., *Min. Accts.*, Hen. VIII, 6306; Court of Augmentations (E. 315), vol. 427, ff. 58–60.

⁴ *L. & P. Hen. VIII*, v, no. 395.

⁵ Dodds, i. 32–33; Reid, p. 119; *Estate Accounts of the Earls of Northumberland*, ed. James, pp. xiv–xv.

⁶ When the Earl's younger brother, Sir Ingram Percy, joined the Pilgrimage of Grace, he swore revenge on Sir Reynold Carnaby 'as the destruction of all our blood, for by his means the King shall be my lord's heir'. This is the only evidence that can be construed to mean that Cromwell used Carnaby. On the other hand, it could simply mean that Carnaby had encouraged the Earl in his wasteful habits and had estranged him from his family (*L. & P. Hen. VIII*, xii (1), no. 1090). Cf. the sugges-

suggested that the Earl was heavily in debt and that Thomas Cromwell took advantage of his financial difficulties by purchasing his debts and then using them to bring pressure to bear upon him. As far as we know, the Crown purchased from the Earl's creditors debts totalling just over £2,600. Of this total, £1,934 formed part of the purchase price for the estates purchased by the Crown in 1535. The remainder comprised two separate sums. A conditional bond in £200 in payment of £104. 5s. 4d. was purchased from Thomas Hennage on 12 July 1532;¹ while debts totalling £570. 14s. 10d. were bought from Sir Thomas Neville on 21 February 1534.² No evidence has survived to show how either of these sums might have been used to bring pressure to bear upon the Earl.

The problem of the sixth Earl's indebtedness and the extent to which it affected his negotiations with the Crown is best discussed in connexion with the Crown's purchases of February 1535. Part of the purchase price given by the Crown consisted of the quashing of debts totalling £10,379. 16s. 2d.³ This sum can be divided into three parts. First, £383. 6s. 8d. owed to the Crown for the sixth Earl's livery of his inheritance and for a wardship purchased by his father. Second, £1,934 purchased from the Earl's creditors by the Crown, including £1,604 owed by the Earl to Sir Thomas Seymour on a mortgage of Petworth and other Sussex manors. Third, a debt of £8,062. 9s. 6d. owed to the Crown and contracted by the Earl on behalf of an Italian merchant, Anthony Bonvisi. It was the custom of the Crown, when it advanced loans to Italian merchants in England, to demand that a peer of the realm should act as surety for them;⁴ and the Earl had acted in this capacity for Anthony Bonvisi. The latter's failure to meet his obligations provided the Crown with an admirable opportunity to bring pressure to bear upon the Earl. The debt was first employed in this way when the Crown secured the Cumberland estates in 1531, but, with the return of these to the Earl, the debt was resurrected.

Our analysis of the debts quashed in 1535 suggests two

tion of a correspondent that Cromwell should inform the Earl of Carnaby's intention to sell the lands in Kent (ibid. ix, no. 142).

¹ *L. & P. Hen. VIII*, v, no. 1169.

² *Ibid.* vii, no. 215.

³ A list of these debts (ibid. v, no. 395) wrongly gives £10,389. 16s. 2d. as the total.

⁴ Dietz, *English Government Finance, 1485-1558*, p. 85.

conclusions. Firstly, the debts specifically purchased by the Crown were not large in comparison with the total already owed to the Crown itself. Secondly, the contraction of by far the largest single debt—indeed, over four-fifths of the total—was the result of the Earl's folly and gullibility. Moreover, the quashing of debts formed only part of the purchase price: the Crown gave the Earl a total of £5,200 in cash. The fact that the Crown found it necessary to give the Earl so much in cash suggests either that there were no other debts in existence which it could buy up or that no serious effort had been made to buy up the Earl's debts. Indeed, we would expect the Earl, after receiving £5,200, to be free of heavy debt after February 1535.¹ Debts owed by the Earl did not play any part in the transactions of 1536-7 which eventually led to the cession of the rest of the Percy inheritance.² Ill health, childlessness, and loyalty to the Crown are the motives which appear in the Earl's letters.

The available evidence indicates that the inheritance to which the sixth Earl succeeded in 1527 could have been easily maintained intact under a wise and provident administration. Our analysis has shown clearly that all the Earl's difficulties were either avoidable or surmountable: by far the most serious debt he owed the Crown was due solely to his own folly. We must conclude that the causes of the sixth Earl's dissipation of his inheritance were not financial or economic but psychological in character. A more precise explanation is not possible, though it is probable that his quarrels with his wife and brothers and his childlessness did much to diminish his sense of responsibility to his family and to aggravate his dependence on favourites. Thus the dissolution of the Percy estates was not the product of an inevitable financial or economic process, but the personal responsibility of a weak and gullible character, the willing victim of greedy favourites and of the skilful diplomacy of a hostile Crown.

¹ The Public Records contain a list of the debts left by the Earl at his death (*L. & P. Hen. VIII*, iv, no. 3379, where it is wrongly assigned to the fifth Earl's death; Fonblanque, i, app. lvi, pp. 573-6, where it is dated correctly). The debts listed therein, totalling £1,761. 6s. 1½d., include all those given in another list, totalling £1,689. 5s. 5½d. (*L. & P. Hen. VIII*, xii (2), no. 172(2)). These debts were not purchased by the Crown but came into its hands on the Earl's death.

² In Sept. 1536 he received £1000 for coming to London to assure his lands to the King's use (ibid. xi, no. 516).

APPENDIX I

A LIST OF THE PERCY ESTATES AT
THE TIME OF THE ATTAINDERS OF
HENRY IV'S REIGN

THE following list of the Percy estates comprises those held by the first Earl of Northumberland, his son Hotspur, and his brother Thomas, Earl of Worcester, at the time of their respective attainders. It is based on the information supplied by the Patent Rolls,¹ the Escheators' Accounts,² and, in the case of the Northumberland and Yorkshire estates, by surveys made by Commissioners specially appointed for the purpose.³

Cumberland. The honour of Cockermouth, comprising the manors of Cockermouth, Dean, Whinfell, Five Towns, Papcastle, Birkby, Great Broughton, Little Broughton, Caldbeck Upton, Caldbeck Underfell, Uldale, Aspatria, Crosby, Whitehall, Loweswater, Thackthwaite, Setmurthy, Lorton, Brundholme, Coledale, Rogerscale, Brackenthwaite, Mockerkin, Buttermere, Braithwaite, Wigton, Kirkland, Rosewain, Aikhead, Woodside, Dundraw, Kirkbride, Oulton, Waverton, Allerdale, Wilton, Drigg and Carleton, Eskdale and Wasdale, and the forest of Westward.

A third of the barony and manor of Egremont.

A message in the city of Carlisle.

Northumberland. The barony of Alnwick, comprising the manors of Alnwick, Alnmouth, Alnham, Bilton, South Charlton, Chatton, Denwick, Lesbury, Long Houghton, Swinhoe, Tuggal, Lucker, Shilbottle, Rennington, Guzance, Rugley, and Fawdon.

The barony of Warkworth, comprising the manors of Warkworth, Acklington, Birling, and High Buston.

The manor of Newburn, with its members of Newburn, Butterlaw, Walbottle, and Whorlton.

The manor of Rothbury, with its members Newtown, Snitter, and Thropton. The borough of Corbridge.

¹ *C. Pat. R.*, 1401-5, pp. 175, 254, 259, 309-10, 395, 406-8, and 454-5; *ibid.* 1405-8, pp. 30, 40 and 68.

² Escheators' Accts., Enrolled, LTR (E. 357), 15/mm. 10, 32, and 86 and 16/mm. 41-42, 46, and 60.

³ Ancient Extents, Exch. (E. 142), 86/7. The commissioners were appointed in Dec. 1407 and Jan. 1408 (*C. Pat. R.*, 1405-8, pp. 307-8 and 416). *The Northumberland County History* (x. 109) is wrong when it states that the Northumberland returns are missing.

The barony of Langley, comprising the manors of Langley, Allerwash, Fourstones, Haydon, Warden, Wyden, Blenkinsop, and Fetherstone.

The Barony of Prudhoe, comprising the manors of Prudhoe, Birtley, Hedley, Ingoe, Ovingham, Barrasford, Horsley, Harlow, and Whelpington.

The manor of Thirston. The barony of Beanley.

The Talbot lands in Tyndale, comprising Kielder and Walwick Grange. Land in 'Famvun' by Cheviot.

A message in Newcastle on Tyne.

Hotspur held the manors of Byker, Ellingham, Newham, and Newstead, acquired from Sir Richard Arundel by means of a mortgage from which they were not redeemed.

Yorkshire. The manors of Leconfield, Scarborough, Arras, Wressle, Nafferton, Wansford, Waplington, Gembling, and Pocklington in the East Riding; Seamer, Topcliffe, Asenby, Gristhwaite, Kirk Levington, Throxenby, and Catton in the North Riding; Tadcaster, Healaugh, Spofforth, Leathley, and Linton in the West Riding.

Also lands in Craven, in Ribblesdale and Langstroth, including the manors of Cleatop, Giggleswick, Preston, Settle, Starbotton, and Buckden.

A message in the city of York.

Durham. Lands in Bishopton and Barmpton. 'Foucherhous' in Whickham.

Lincolnshire. The manors of Slothby, Claxby, Burwell, and Calceby.

Leicestershire. The manor of Foston.

Essex. The manor of Bradwell and its members.

Sussex. The manors of Petworth, Sutton, Duncton, and Heyshott.

London. Houses in Aldgate and Aldersgate, and two inns in St. Martin's Lane.

Thomas, Earl of Worcester held Wressle in Yorkshire, Claxby in Lincolnshire, and Foston in Leicestershire. Hotspur possessed the Talbot lands in Tyndale, Newburn, and the lands acquired from Sir Richard Arundel in Northumberland, Tadcaster, Asenby, Gristhwaite, and Throxenby in Yorkshire, and Bradwell in Essex. The rest of the estates listed above were held by the Earl of Northumberland.

The above list does not include the following:

(a) The manors held by the first Earl's grandson, Henry Percy of Athol. For details of these see above p. 76.

(b) The Jedburgh estates on the Border and the annuity of 500 marks from the customs of Berwick-on-Tweed, together with the keeping of the castle at Berwick, all held in fee simple.¹ However, in

¹ For the acquisition of these see above, p. 7.