

ART. IX – *Hugh Sewell, Canon and Prebendary of Carlisle.*

By M.A. CLARK, M.A., Ph.D.

THE sixteenth century Borders were well-known for their colourful characters – men like Kinmont Willie on the Scottish side, or half the tribe of Dacre on the English. They are not noted for their holy zeal; the slightly tongue in cheek response to an outsider asking whether there were any Christians there, was, “Na, we’s a’ Elliots and Armstrangs”. It is not surprising if this cavalier attitude rubbed off on the ordinary townspeople of Carlisle. This applied as much to the men in holy orders as to the burghers in secular occupations, and an outstanding example of the wolf in monk’s clothing must be Hugh Sewell.

Hugh’s family tree is uncertain, though the name is well evidenced in the city. The Hugh Sewell who held demesne lands at Blackhall of Humphrey Dacre in 1476/7 is quite likely to have been his grandfather, but the consecutive links in the chain cannot definitely be proved. A Robert Sewell, merchant, was trading in Carlisle in 1490. He was the mayor of Carlisle in 1503, 1513 and 1518, and was one of the two aldermen recorded in 1517 as involved in the building and repairing of Carlisle Bridge. He died in 1520, when his name last occurs in an action for debt, his widow appearing soon after as administrator of her husband’s estate. A lawsuit from the 1520’s over a Carlisle mortgage involves another Robert Sewell, schoolmaster. References to the schoolmaster range from 1490 to 1542, suggesting kinship but not an immediate family link. Hugh might well be the son of the mayor, though the scattering of the name around the Carlisle trades forbids definite identification. A John Sewell, for example, was a merchant in 1526, as was a Lancelot Sewell in Mary’s reign. The Dormont book in 1561 shows a Sewell amongst the guild of weavers, and another a tanner; Randall Sewell, tanner and tenant of the Dean and Chapter, was styled ‘gentleman’ by 1585, probably on the strength of having been mayor. At the canniest reckoning, Hugh came from a numerous and businesslike family. If not perhaps in the same league as Aglionby or Blenerhasset – the Sewells were not armigerous before the eighteenth century, and lacked the gentry connections of many of their contemporaries – the family must be listed amongst the comfortable bourgeoisie. They hovered on the fringes of a society with gentle leanings, like Coldales and Shares, rubbing shoulders with a cadet branch of the Dentons in the earlier sixteenth century, and Daltons, Sharpes and Monks with their Dacre connections in Elizabeth’s reign.¹

Hugh is first heard of as a canon of the priory shortly after its dissolution in January 1540. As he is last heard of in 1590, it seems reasonable to assume that he was then a young man in his twenties; he is referred to as Master of Arts, suggesting that he must have spent most of the 1530’s at Oxford reading for his degree. In 1559 his degree is given as STB, and in 1561 he supplicated for his DD, on twelve years study, at Oriel College Oxford. His career, thus taken, reads as a typically academic one, remarkable only in that someone from Cumberland would have either time or inclination at that troubled period to undertake it.²

St Mary's Priory at Carlisle had been part of the fabric of the city since the time of the founding of the see. There was something of a fashion in founding houses of Augustinian canons at the time; Lanercost priory dates from the same era, as do Cartmel and Conishead in Furness, or Hexham, just across the Pennines. Local piety had given many churches into the priory's care, and by the sixteenth century were staffed by canons and diocesan worthies – Aspatria, Caldbeck, Dalston, Great Salkeld, Castle Sowerby, – and less popular livings like the impoverished Arthuret on the Borders or Addingham, up on East Fellside. Houses of canons had never lived under as strict a rule as the black or white monks and Carlisle never seems to have acquired a reputation for great piety. The canons were however great builders; most of the fourteenth century was spent in making good the destruction of the fire of 1292, and to the canons we owe the great East window of which the city remains justly proud. The tower and internal decoration were added in the fifteenth century, and as penitents were encouraged to visit it on the feast days of Mary, a fine statue of the Virgin was set up some time between 1451 and 1469 – all those works at times of continual trouble on the Borders, and later civil war in England. "Our Lady of Carlisle" was, by 1518, worth a visit by the widow of a York merchant, on pilgrimage for his soul.³

This was the kind of house young Hugh had joined; not one noted for its spirituality, but with a good business sense instead, and a role in promoting the tourist trade of Carlisle that was an echo in a minor key of Durham's. Were these adornments outward and visible signs still of inward and spiritual grace? Even that worldly prelate, Cardinal Wolsey, doubted it, and around 1520 carried out a reforming drive amongst the houses of the Order. The 1521 Visitation of Carlisle priory which he ordered during an episcopal interregnum was probably part of this work. This inspection, shortly before the time when Hugh must have joined the house, reveals little; authority to carry out the inspection was delegated and sub-delegated, until it ended in the hands of the vicar of Lazonby and the prior himself – not a recipe for searching inquiry. The priory seems to have passed muster almost on the nod. The nineteen inmates listed include the future sub-prior hanged after the Pilgrimage of Grace and two of the four prebendaries of the refoundation of the Cathedral in 1541.⁴

If Hugh had applied his family's businesslike mind to seeking clerical preferment, the threat of monastic dissolution in the 1530's must have come as a blow. The *Compendia Compertorum*, a list of the failings found by the monastic inspectors, Layton and Leigh, on their nationwide visitation, does not rate highly Carlisle's claim to sanctity.⁵ Seven inmates were accused of solitary vice, and three, including the prior, of incontinence with women. Accusing the head of the house seems to have been common form; worse was said of Holm Cultram, or Furness, and there was no report from Carlisle of young men wanting to leave religion, as at Shap, or of wholesale promiscuity, as at Cartmel or Conishead – reports which were in any case exaggerated. The visitors also listed the relics and 'objects of superstition' held by each house; Carlisle, like many another, had a supposed portion of the Cross, the sword of martyrdom of Thomas à Becket, and then, as frequently happened, something of aid to women in childbirth – in this case the girdle of St Bride. Nothing was said of the statue of the Virgin; was it hidden or maintained as Cathedral furnishings? The priory's income of over £482 exempted it from initial closure anyhow, but that did not prevent its being caught up in the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536 which followed on the heels of the first closures of the smaller houses in Copeland. Hugh

is never mentioned in this connection, and it is probable that by accident or design he was out of the way pursuing his university studies at the time. Prior Slee was so deeply involved that he disappears thereafter from the record; the sub-prior was definitely hanged; William Florens the precentor had accompanied the sub-prior in conducting the rebels' negotiations with Carlisle city, but survived to become a prebendary of the new foundation.⁶ When the great house of Furness surrendered to the King after the rebellion, it could only be a matter of time until the other large houses did the same. It has been suggested by a Catholic writer that the loss, in spiritual terms, may not have been too great; at around 1530, there were:

a larger number of houses. . . whose continued existence served no good purpose whatever. In this category would be found [all small houses and] in addition, almost all the houses of Augustinian canons.⁷

The canons of Carlisle were however the luckiest of the regular clergy in Cumbria; they found that although their house was to be closed, there was to be a new collegiate foundation of the cathedral, and unlike many others they were not to be left to fend for themselves. They appear to have hung around in a care-and-maintenance role until this refoundation took effect in May 1541, with the ex-prior, Lancelot Salkeld, as the new Dean, and four senior monks including the precentor William Florens as his prebendaries.⁸ One may question whether a new foundation with the same personnel as the old was likely to be of greater spiritual value than the old. All the indications are that a comfortable quasi-spiritual club continued much as it had always done, supporting one another in life and death, undertaking no duty, especially a reformed one, unless forced to by crown or mitre, and maintaining a role in the city's life by wont rather than virtue.⁹

The few months of the interregnum gave rise to a fascinating little incident, well-quoted but tantalisingly incomplete, in which Hugh Sewell for the first time comes to notice. It is related in two letters from the local JP's, in which they reported to Henry VIII, on 1 May 1540, that Hugh Sewell MA, a late brother of the monastery, had brought to them, as JP's, a book daily used in the services of the late monastery of Carlisle, with the service of Thomas à Becket and the name of the Pope unerased. The retaining of the names of the Pope and the patrons of the now abrogated saints' days went on being a general problem until Elizabeth's reign; Sewell was trying to bring himself to notice by the authorities, not for the last time, for his eagerness to support the new ways. He caused a fair amount of panic, both amongst the brethren and amongst the JP's who were obliged to act upon his allegations. On Sewell's advice they said, they had examined the succentor and one other ex-monk, and were sending their depositions and the book in question. Lancelot Salkeld, now 'guardian' of the monastery had tried to get the book back from Edward Aglionby, one of the JP's, and had offered sureties for it, but those worthy gentlemen decided it was too serious a matter to handle themselves: "we thought the matter too high for us to proceed in," said they, referring it to higher authority. Three days later (4 May 1540) their letter was amplified by another to Wharton. One of the deponents, Lancelot Robinson, said he would have erased the name of Thomas à Becket, but William Florens, precentor of the monastery, had taken the book from the younger man and given to to the clerk of the choir, bidding him keep it safe, for Florens would alter it himself. On 2 May however they discovered Florens had gone. An involved trail led via the captain of Carlisle, Thomas Wentworth, back to Lancelot Salkeld, and thence to Christopher Dacre, apparently for money. Florens had

been expected to return that day, but it later transpired that, having received both money and advice from Dacre, Florens had gone on to the parson of Melmerby, Roland Threlkeld, for a letter in his favour to Dr. Bellasis, and now appeared to be on his way to London. The JP's in something of a panic were sending Sewell to advise Lord Wharton, so that he in turn could pass word to Cromwell; they dared not conceal the matter, 'after the King's letter of last July'. Sewell was reported to have said that one John Austin, another brother of the monastery and future petty canon, had dismissed the whole as a storm in a teacup; when the book was taken, he commented, "Tush, it is but for a book, it will be despatched well enough for money." Sewell, the letter concluded, was 'the gardans on hand and steward of the hows'.¹⁰

As no more was heard of the matter, Austin was probably cynically right. The whole incident does however show up several of the *dramatis personae* in typical light: the JP's, afraid to give offence in a changing legislative world, hastily covering themselves against accusation; the young ex-monk with no great vocation but hanging around the convenient and familiar world; the moves behind the scenes of the monastic hierarchy who had made no attempt to conform to London's expectations. Sewell's role as informant, sailing ever close to the wind but always just clear of incrimination, is equally typical. Even if not one of the top four, Hugh Sewell was obviously much in favour with Prior Salkeld. If it is unfair to class him, as do older authors, as one of Cromwell's spies, he was certainly one of life's survivors. Like the good boy who tells tales when the headmaster walks in, he was always on the edge of the shady dealings but able to exonerate himself at need.

Young Hugh did well out of the new cathedral. From 1541–1573 he held the appropriated living of St Lawrence, Appleby; in August 1549 he succeeded Florens in the first prebend, by a grant which names him as the king's scholar and which was in the royal prerogative. He somehow managed to figure still as an annuitant of the house in Cardinal Pole's list, at 26s.8d; along with Alexander Whittington and Richard Benson, on 40s. and 100s. respectively. In 1560, he had as rector of Ousby, a dispensation for two benefices; in the same year he became rector of Caldbeck, one of the richest livings in Cumbria, with a long connection with the Cathedral. His name was to recur frequently in the early decades of the Cathedral's history.¹¹

King's scholar he may have been, but that did not automatically make Sewell in favour of any protestantising changes to the Chapter – notably the replacement of Dean Salkeld by Sir Thomas Smith early in Edward's reign. Sewell and another prebendary, Barnaby Kirkbride, who appears to have been a sharp and worldly character, seem to have done their best to stir up trouble for the new Dean. He was already disadvantaged by being a Southerner and a non-resident government servant. He was even apparently a layman – he is always referred to as 'Sir Thomas Smith, knight', as distinct from the courtesy 'Sir' accorded to non-graduate clergy, and granted his academic titles by his bishop.¹²

By 1555 matters had reached such a pitch that London had got to hear of it. In October 1555 Hugh Sewell and Barnaby Kirkbride, having been summoned by letter of the Privy Council, made their personal appearance in London and desired it to be recorded; in November, Councillors were delegated to examine a matter objected against the two, with power to commit them both to ward until the problem was resolved.¹³ Exactly what the problem was did not emerge at the time, but Smith, writing to Cecil in October 1560, was to remind him of what troublemakers they had been,

in Quene Maries tyme when I had not myche favor as ye knowe, and mater was so right agaynst me, and partlie as the compleyning of Barnaby Kirkbride and hym [Hugh Sewell], we were all called before the counsell. And when I was fownd innocent, there aperid such fowle matter agaynst them two for spoyling of the church and devidyng the goods thereof amonge them selves, and other wise misusyng of the revenues thereof, that they were comytted to the Flet.¹⁴

Smith's complaint suggests that the profiting of the Sewell family from leases of Cathedral property, which caused such a furore in 1564, owed much to a longterm mis-use of his position by the prebendary. Smith claimed that he tried to keep the issue of leases under control, which would have been resented by those in the habit of trading in them. Salkeld was restored to the Deanery on Mary's accession, which did nothing to check such abuse; if anything it seems that the whole chapter was conspiring to defraud the Cathedral. One wonders if the secularisation of monastic property encouraged a casual attitude to it, or whether the monks had always regarded it as their own personal possession, much as the Scottish monks at Melrose, for example, were wont to do.

Elizabeth's accession was followed promptly by Smith trying to get his Deanery back, which he only achieved on Salkeld's death at a ripe old age in 1560.¹⁵ Even after his eventual reinstatement, Smith was unhappy – with reason – about Kirkbride and Sewell: the first as a troublemaker, the second as one having the ear of the Earl of Worcester.¹⁶ Sewell's stay in the Fleet had evidently been shortlived; by the time of the Visitation of the Northern Province in 1559 he was once more a happy prebendary at Carlisle, in good odour with the powers that be, and one of those who managed to get a relatively good report from the ecclesiastical commissioners. When the other three prebendaries were found to be largely non-resident, and to be neglecting their responsibility for quarterly sermons, Hugh Sewell was found not resident enough – a common fault amongst those with a multiplicity of residences, but not conducive to good pastoral care. He escaped blame for lack of preaching: largely, one suspects, on the strength of producing the sermon for the commissioners' session of 7 October at Penrith. Although one of the petty canons was conveniently ill at the visitation, and subsequently deprived of his parish, the chapter as such passed examination without anything being found seriously amiss.¹⁷ Unlike 1521, no blame can be laid on the zeal of the Visitors; there was perhaps too much haste, almost inevitably, and one cannot but suspect that as in 1535, the wrong questions were asked; deeper probing into financial matters would certainly have shown plenty amiss.

All apparently went well until the problem over the state of the chapter finances blew up in 1564, when it emerged that the Cathedral was practically bankrupt, thanks to the disgraceful leases made, largely to the prebendaries' kin, with a complete lack of decanal supervision. In April 1563 the new Bishop, John Best, wrote to Cecil that

by the absence of the Deane of Carliell mr Doctor Smith, the churche goeth to decaye, ther woodes almost destroide, a greate parte of the lvyng undre color conveyd to there kynsmen themselves takyng the profetts and that for 3 or 4 score years. . . . no residence kept, no accompts, the prebendaries turnyng all to their awn gayne.¹⁸

The examination conducted before the bishop and the Marcher Warden the next year confirmed all his pessimistic generalisation. Those concerned were kept busy trying to shift the blame on to the shoulders of those who were safely dead, principally Salkeld and Kirkbride, whatever their own involvement may have been. This, when Sewell had been so deeply implicated with Kirkbride ten years before, should have proved difficult, but

he seems to have extricated himself with a show of honesty and a shifting of the blame to his deceased confederate. One particular problem had been the issuing of blank leases over the Chapter seal, to be filled in to the benefit of the recipients. Thus, Sewell confirmed that Salkeld had once brought such a lease into the chapter house, but did not know what became of it. Of course not. Both Sewell and the fourth prebendary, Richard Brandling, admitted to knowing of leases made simply to avoid taxation. Brandling seems to have been a colourless individual, who should have been playing a more active part. He held the keys to the chest containing the collegiate seal, but when Kirkbride and Sewell had broken into his room at night and removed it (presumably during his absence at his own living of Thursby), he seems to have done nothing about it. Both Sewell and Tallentire, the Chapter registrar, tried to blame Kirkbride, who had died two years earlier, for the subsequent fraudulent use of the seal; their own hands were not likely to have been clean. Sir Thomas Smith found himself dragged into the affair; his name reportedly authenticated at least one such lease. In his letter of 1554 included with the abstract, Smith had claimed that in his time (*temp. Ed. VI*) no leases should be sealed without the signatures of himself and most prebendaries in authentication; he only remembered granting one or two. If Tallentire's register is to be believed, his memory misled him; not many can be found thus fully authenticated, but plenty countersigned by Smith alone. His busyness, and lack of attention to the detail of Chapter organisation, had all but reduced the house to bankruptcy, and customary tenants, who in several cases had been ejected by the lessees, to penury.¹⁹

There is no doubt that Sewell and Kirkbride were deeply implicated, but no more was done about Sewell than in the 1550's. Perhaps he did indeed have the ear of Worcester – or perhaps as so often happens, a government report is simply not acted upon. Another letter of Best's in 1567 suggests that chapter finances had shown no improvement over the last three years; the church was still in distress by the heavy charges laid upon it, though "God be thanked the prebendaries that now be are good husbands" [of resources].²⁰ It was indeed going to be into the next century before the exceptionally long leases, which should have been for a maximum of twenty-one years, were extinct, and indeed the accepted norm remained a forty-year one.²¹

The Sewell family had done very well out of the connection. Sewells figure frequently as mid-century lessees of the cathedral; in 1550 Randall, Robert and Barnabas Sewell each were granted leases, Randall's being for fifty years, although the others were for the regular term; in 1551 Bernard Sewell shared a fifty-year lease of tithe hay with James Wallas; Robert had another the next year. John and Barnabas were still taking out leases for indeterminate terms as late as 1563. A multiple lease of 1546 of which Tallentire abandoned the copy, had presumably only just expired in the 1560's; although therefore of a more reasonable length, it links the names of Wallas (an alias of Brandling's), Kirkbride and Sewell in a way which indicates that the Privy Council had acted none too soon in calling Hugh Sewell and his fellows to account in 1555. There was nothing in this to make Sewell exceptional, except in the number of grants his family obtained; the kin of other members of the chapter all did well out of it.²²

Quite obviously the Carlisle chapter, whatever notoriety it earned, was not going to have a high reputation for spirituality, and one wonders what profit Hugh's extensive parishes had of his learning. Grindal, then Bishop of London, wrote of the Chapter in 1563,

All [Smith's] prebendaries (Sewell only excepted, who is discredited by reason of his inconstancy) are ignorant priests or old unlearned monks.²³

Hugh Sewell was well off, with his prebend, Caldbeck, Appleby and Ousby. The 1574 valuation of Caldbeck was the same as the *Valor's* £45. 13s. 6d.; Ousby was in the *Valor* £13. 13s.; St Lawrence Appleby £9. 5s. 1½d.²⁴ The four gave him a gentleman's income and leisure, had he wished, to pursue scholarly interests; of these we know nothing. The will which might have told us much – those of fellow prebendary Edward Mitchell, or contemporary Edward Knype, are exceptionally valuable – is missing, for reasons which become clear later. He is mentioned in the will of Thomas Priestman, yeoman of Caldbeck, but only as owing him 26s. 8d. and being left 20s. One is left with no evidence of his work as a priest, and suspicion that there might not have been much to leave any trace. It is his curates, William Robinson and Antony Wilson, who receive a mention for services rendered to parishioners.²⁵

From Sewell's parishes arises instead evidence of a brisk trade in advowsons, and Tallentire noted that two advowsons were to go to Hugh in 1561. Earlier, a 1540 deed copied in Best's diocesan register shows Lancelot Sewell, merchant, sharing the next turn's presentation at Thursby with a Benson and a Blennerhasset, so the family was already in the habit of it. Barnabas Sewell of Caldbeck, yeoman, presented Hugh's successor at Ousby; Ralph Sewell of Culgaith and John Sewell of Ousby, his successor at St. Lawrence Appleby. The distribution of Sewells around parishes where Hugh was incumbent cannot be accidental. There is also a suggestion of another working partnership, this time between Sewells and Fairfaxes. Hugh was Thomas Fairfax's proxy on his institution at Asby in 1573. Fairfax followed him at Caldbeck, and into a prebendal stall.²⁶ All in all, Hugh Sewell seems to have treated the church as a business out of which one made the maximum possible profit, for oneself and one's kin, and to have given little attention to spiritual matters.

Then, after an apparently unremarkable career as a non-resident and comfortable establishment figure, Hugh Sewell chose in his old age to drop the final bombshell which made all his earlier dealings pale into insignificance. Having retained prebend and livings until 1584, he departed this life, as far as the establishment would admit, in the normal way; the institution of his successor Fairfax in both Caldbeck and his stall is styled in Bishop Meye's register as "*per mortem naturalem magistri Hugonis Sewell*".²⁷

The Church of Rome believed otherwise. Perhaps after forty years of an eye to the main chance, *timor mortis* affected even Sewell. Apparently he threw it all in: the timeserving, the dealing with authority, the embellishing of his own family with the church's property. It is recorded without comment that he arrived at the English college at Rheims on 1 September 1584, and after a six-year gap, when a man of his education was probably engaged in teaching, was re-ordained at Soissons on 17 March 1590 and sent back to England in April, in company with one Alexander Rawlins. Rawlins is known to have worked in York and Durham, was captured on Christmas Day 1594 and executed the next year. By this time however, Rawlins' companion was not Sewell but another Cumbrian, one Thomas Warcop, who escaped and evaded recapture until 1597. Sewell must by 1590 have been well into his seventies, and probably died a natural death serving in the recusant *maquis*: a fitting end to an exceptional career. It has of course been argued that the seminary priest cannot be identical with the Carlisle prebendary, but on

no very solid foundation but that of his age – which would have been no greater than that of Dean Salkeld, or of Lancelot Threlkeld, sometime Provost of Kirkoswald. It is pleasing to think that eventually a man who had been in the church for what he could get out of it, found a deeper meaning to his profession of religion and made some amends for a worldly career.²⁸

What else does one make of such a man?: a creature of contrasts: the academic, the wheedler of authority, the featherer of the family nest, the surprising recusant. Perhaps the safest verdict on a remarkable product even of such a changeable age is that he was a true Borderer, with the sharp wits of his Carlisle guildsman family. After a lifetime spent adapting his considerable abilities to getting the most out of God and Caesar alike, he seems at last to have sought to render something in return – and that something as unpredictable and unpalatable to Caesar as could have been sought for. His fellow prebendary Barnaby Kirkbride expressed in his will of 1563 the hope that it might please God ‘that we may meet together in the blessed place with joie and felicitye’.²⁹ One can but hope that, for his apparently repentant fellow, his desire was realised.

Acknowledgement

I am indebted to Mr B.C. Jones for his expert knowledge of the ramifications of the Carlisle families, which he has kindly put at my disposal.

References

- ¹ For the elder Hugh, C.R.O. D/Lons/L MSS of Daniel Fleming, ms N; for the schoolmaster, CA/3/1/14, 42; for the mayor, C.R.O. CA/1 index, xiv; C.R.O. CA/3/1/24, 26, 29; W.R.O./Ry/HMC Misc. R. PRO C1/438/31; C.R.O. CA/2/17 26b; CA/3/1/29, 68; D&C III 34.
- ² *Letters and Papers* XV 617; PRO SP12/10; J Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses* III 1335.
- ³ C.M.L. Bouch, *Prelates and People of the Lake Counties* (Kendal, 1948), 6; D. Knowles, *The Monastic Orders in England* (2nd ed. Cambridge, 1966), 140; Nicholson and Burn, II 243; Bouch 72, 91, 110, 116–7, 124; R.B. Dobson, ‘15th century Cathedral Chapters’, in *Northern History* 19, 41.
- ⁴ D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England* (Cambridge, 1961), vol.III 159; Borthwick Institute, Reg 27, 135–136v.
- ⁵ *LP* X 364.
- ⁶ See M.A. Clark, *The Reformation in the Lake Counties*, (unpublished PhD thesis 1990), for a fuller discussion.
- ⁷ D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England* (Cambridge, 1961), vol.III, 465.
- ⁸ *LP* XVI 878/11, 15.
- ⁹ Clark, thesis, esp. 163–184.
- ¹⁰ *LP* XV 617, 633.
- ¹¹ *CPR* EdVI III 110. 1556 list in *CW1*, xiii, 380–383. P.R.O. SP12/76; *CPR* Eliz. 2 64
- ¹² For a discussion of Sir Thomas Smith’s career, see the biography by M. Dewar, *Sir Thomas Smith* (London, 1964), where she argues, I believe conclusively, the case for his not being in holy orders.
- ¹³ *Acts of the Privy Council* V 188, 192.
- ¹⁴ P.R.O. SP 12/14/27, printed in part in *CW2*, lxxxvii, 148, and *VCH Cumb.* II 65.
- ¹⁵ P.R.O. SP12/13/30; Salkeld was made deacon at York in 1507 [BI Reg. 5a 580v]; he must have been seventy at least.
- ¹⁶ P.R.O. SP12/14/27.
- ¹⁷ P.R.O. SP12/10.
- ¹⁸ BL Lans 6 f125.

¹⁹ P.R.O. SP12/40/100.

²⁰ P.R.O. SP12/43/58.

²¹ I owe this information on the 17th century to Mr. Jones.

²² C.R.O., D and C, Tallentire 34, 35, 10, 36, 18, 37.

²³ BL Lans. 6 f86.

²⁴ P.R.O. SP12/100; *Valor Ecclesiasticus* V 286, 290, 296.

²⁵ C.R.O./P.E. Mitchell 1566; Knype's will printed in *CW*2., xlv, 152ff; C.R.O./P.T. Priestman 1565, R. Peacock 1563, J. Scott 1563.

²⁶ C.R.O., D and C, Tallentire 82; D/R/C/1/3 12; Nicolson and Burn I 325, 507, II 437; C.R.O. DRC/1/3/137.

²⁷ C.R.O. DRC/1/3/137.

²⁸ Traditional view in N&B II 308; for his recusant career, D.A. Bellenger, *English and Welsh Priests 1558-1880* (Downside, 1984), 106; G. Anstruther, *The Seminary Priests I: Elizabethan* (Ware and Ushaw, 1968), 306, 285, 370. The contrary argument of E. Hinchcliffe, 'Hugh Sewell: the identity of seminary priest,' in *North West Catholic History* vol. 8 (1981), is not convincing.

²⁹ C.R.O./P.B. Kirkbride 1563.

