

ART. IX – *Richard Robinson, clerk, chantry priest of Brigham.*¹

By M. A. CLARK, M.A.

IN the sixteenth century, few chantry priests of Cumbria emerge from a decent obscurity. Some are known from the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of 1535; a few more are names in the chantry surveys of 1546-7, or the subsequent pension lists. No other has scattered his name around the records with the generosity of Richard Robinson and for this sudden illumination we must be grateful – even when it is the light of notoriety that shines.

He hits the headlines in no uncertain manner in a letter of Sir John Lamplugh to Thomas Cromwell, dated 15 October and assigned by the editors of the “*Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII*” to 1532.² Sir John, three times sheriff of Cumberland in the 1530’s, lieutenant of Cockermouth and one of the leading figures of West Cumberland, had done his best to solve a rather thorny problem. Royal letters of 27 September 1532, wrongly assigned to the following year,³ had ordered him to induct Richard Robinson into the chantry of Brigham from which he had been expelled by “riotous persons”, and though the King had written to the Earl of Northumberland, nothing had been done for the priest. Treading somewhat warily, Sir John replies at length. Having received the King’s letters on 9th October, he had gone to Brigham church on Thursday 10th between 8 and 9 a.m. to carry out his instructions. He had met the parish priest coming away from the church, unable to say matins there as the church was shut up. Sir John asked him to return with him, so that he could explain why he had come. At the church porch they had met another priest also unable to gain entry. Sir John had applied to the church wardens to let him in, but they said they had no idea where the key was, and stalled for time until Thomas Lamplugh of Dovenby came to hear of it. Thomas sent his servant to know why Sir John had come, who, when Sir John complained of the doors being locked so that he was unable to execute the King’s commands, said that he had orders from the Earl of Northumberland to refuse entry, and offered to send for his master. The two Lamplughs then confronted each other. Sir John tried to use his family authority on Thomas of Dovenby, but failed; Thomas had Northumberland’s backing (in a letter which he read out publicly) and refused to budge. Even when Sir John finally gained entry he found that Thomas and two servants had entered by the back door and had no intention of going. Sir John had then tried to bring in reinforcements; he had sent servants to Cockermouth to Gilbert Wharton, Sir Thomas Wharton’s deputy, asking him to bring pressure to bear on Thomas Lamplugh. Gilbert however thought discretion the better part of valour; having heard nothing from either King or Earl, he declined to interfere. Indeed the next morning he went home to Westmorland to be well out of it. Nothing daunted, Sir John had gone back to Brigham and tried again. Inside the church he found this time Robert Lamplugh, son of Thomas of Dovenby, with two servants, John Cuthbertson and one Wilson, plus the churchwardens and parishioners who had apparently turned up to watch the fun. Again Sir John had asked for the King’s command to be executed, but an attempt to open the chantry door led to a scuffle, and Sir John had had to separate the parties for

fear of murder being done, and then beat an ignominious retreat. Wilson and Cuthbertson had settled down to garrison the chantry against him, with food and a bed set up there, and no obvious intention of leaving in a hurry. So matters had stood over the weekend. On Monday, finding them still in occupation, Sir John had denounced their illegal presence as non-parishioners of Brigham, and with the assistance of four members of the parish had hauled them out of the church and taken possession.

Why, one wonders, all this trouble about a chantry priest? One may well suspect that the "riotous persons" complained of in the King's letters had some close connexion with the nearly-riotous persons who confronted Sir John Lamplugh. But why should an apparently insignificant chantry priest have aroused such opposition from the Dovenby Lamplughs, and the Earl of Northumberland – and how had Richard Robinson got official backing for his reinstatement?

The answer to the first question emerges a year later in a case transmitted on appeal from the court of the Archdeacon of Richmond to the consistory court at York in 1533, in which Richard Robinson was the appellant against an indictment for breach of foundation statutes of the chantry.⁴ The citation is not without its charm, down to the beautiful notarial sign drawn by its scribe at the finish. More importantly, it clearly states that Richard Robinson had been deprived of his chantry by the Archdeacon's vicar general at the express desire of Henry Percy Earl of Northumberland, patron of the chantry, and that William Lamplugh had been appointed in his place.

The case had come before the vicar general, Dr John Dakyn, in the course of his ordinary visitation at Cockermouth, and the text of Percy's letter to him at the appeal hearing is given in full in the citation.

To my lovyng frende Maister Doctor Dakyns vicar generall unto the archdeakyn of Richemount after my hartely recommendations. This shalbe to Signifie unto you, that where I perceyve ye accordyng to Justice at my sueyt at your last visitacion at Cokermouthe Cyted Sir Richard Robynson priest Incumbent of my chantry off Brigham to apere afore you at yorke the XIXth day of thys instant month of September to maike aunswer there for the breyche of the fundacion [of] my said chantry whych I intend god willyng in no wyse to suffer, my further desyer ys as ye Intend the avauncement of Justice ye will procede accordyng to the contynewe of the Said fundacion in writtyng and soo to amove and clearly expell the said Incumbent havynge no Juste and lawfull excuse as it may appere by the said fundacion from the said Chauntre and from all the profects theraunto belongyng accordyng to hys demeritys and perjurye, and further to gyf fyrm credence unto my trusty sarvante William Stapulton this beyrer myn attorney, whome I ordayne and auctoryse for me to exhibite and procure in your courte and to doo all suche thyngys as shall apperteigne In which your doynge ye shall nott only mynster unto me right acceptable plesure but also cause me to have your kyndenes in remembrance hereafter. wrytten at newcastell the XVth day of September your lovyng and assuryd freynd H. Northumbreland

If the tenor of the letter which Thomas Lamplugh had received was similar, one can hardly blame him for upholding the authority of the Earl at Newcastle against the King at London. Nor is it surprising that he should prefer the claims of one who was evidently a kinsman to those of a stranger, however well-connected. Sir John also needed to let Cromwell have all the facts to ensure his support against a potentially irate Earl whose orders were now countermanded.

It seems pretty clear that Richard Robinson was indeed in the wrong. The foundation statutes of 1329 are also adduced in evidence; they provide in detail for the chantrist's

occupation and evidently envisaged a quasi-monastic existence for which full-time residence would be essential. The canonical hours were to be observed; daily masses of various kinds were to be said. On Sunday a dominical mass was required. On Monday the priest was to celebrate in honour of the blessed angels and archangels; on Tuesday, St Thomas the Martyr. Wednesday, Thursday and Saturday were masses of the Blessed Virgin; Friday a requiem. On feast days a mass of the Holy Spirit might be substituted, provided a memorial was made of the founder and other beneficiaries. It was normal for foundation statutes thus to specify the masses of each day; the more common pattern was of the Trinity on Sundays, the Virgin on Saturdays, some aspect of the Passion on Fridays and Corpus Christi or the Holy Spirit on Thursdays. Nationally there was more variation in the masses of the first three days of the week, although All Angels on Monday, a Requiem on Tuesday and St Thomas on Wednesday were frequent allocations.⁵ In addition to these daily masses, the priest was "voluntarily" to assist the parson in his parish duties. This was probably intended not so much to prevent his becoming an additional curate as to protect the incumbent from loss of fees or tithes. In fact these statutes are less rigorous than some; no mention was made of observance of the night offices, and the timing of the daily masses was not specified.⁶ Even so, it was, in intent, no light task, and the endowment matched the responsibilities. The foundation statutes show the chantry to be richly furnished with chalice, vestments, books and the like. the priest's maintenance was provided for by a patent of 1329, licensing the founding parson of Brigham, Thomas de Burgh, to alienate a moiety of the manor of Brigham for the support of a priest to say masses in honour of the Virgin Mary, St Michael and St Thomas the Martyr for the souls of Edward II; the founder, his parents, kin and benefactors, Master John Walewayn, Walter de Twynham, and William de Kyrkeby.⁷ The *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of 1535 reckons the net income of the chantry from this benefaction to be £7. 6s. 8d. per annum – the most valuable Cumbrian chantry recorded.⁸

Full-time occupation at a reasonable standard of living – when £5 per annum could be reckoned an acceptable sixteenth century stipend – should have been available for a conscientious and unambitious priest. Richard Robinson evidently was neither. Notorious non-residence emerges, as the case proceeds, as the breach of foundation statutes complained of. This he makes no attempt to deny, but rather justifies on the ground of a dispensation to hold two benefices, one with cure of souls, one without. He appears to have regarded this as ample reason for non residence. He counter-accuses William Lamplugh as already holding one chantry and having no dispensation to hold a second. The whole of Robinson's nine-point appeal against the original verdict reflects this kind of legalistic and technical justification of his case. Spiritual justifications he offers none.

The appeal was heard at York in late September 1533, but a final decision was postponed until a further hearing at Blackfriars in December. No record of the verdict of this court survives with the ecclesiastical cause papers but unusually we can be sure that Richard Robinson won his case. It is his name that is given as the chantrist of St Michael's, Brigham in 1535.⁹ William Lamplugh was not entirely unprovided for. He had been a chaplain at Workington in 1525, and in 1556 is listed as receiving a pension of £6 from the dissolution of his Cockermouth castle chantry, which had also belonged to Northumberland.¹⁰

Richard Robinson's career proves unusual in more ways than this one. He must be the only Cumbrian chantrist whose career can be traced through the *Letters and Papers*

and the *Calendars of Patent Rolls*. To a great extent this is due to his having as strong connexions with the south-east as with his native Cumberland, and the details not only illustrate his notorious absence from the Brigham chantry but help to explain how he came to have royal letters in favour of his restoration.

The benefice for which he claimed a dispensation for plurality is possibly to be identified with Oldekirke in the Calais marches, then part of Canterbury diocese. Letters of presentation of 18 May 1525 give one Richard Robynson clerk as the successor to Thomas Baschurch, who had resigned the cure.¹¹ The identification might seem to be far-fetched, but by 1528 he was already acquiring a stake in other parts of Canterbury diocese, and here the identification is certain. A grant of 29 Henry VIII (1538) confirms him in five annuities previously paid by religious houses now dissolved; four are from Kent. Two grants of £12 and £10 had been made out of manors of the abbey of Faversham, Kent in 1528 and 1529; one of £14 from a manor of Byland (Yorks) in 1529; one of £12 from a manor of St Augustine's Canterbury in 1532; one of £6 from Boxley, Kent, in 1534.¹² With pensions totalling £54 accruing so easily it is not surprising that he should treat the few pounds from Brigham in such a cavalier manner. It was the only part he actually had to work for.

Robinson probably owed these annuities to influential patronage, whether Warham, Wolsey or Cromwell, who would have been the initiator of the "King's letters" which troubled Sir John Lamplugh. He is likely therefore to have been a university man. A Richard Robinson is recorded as proceeding B.A. at Cambridge in 1523,¹³ a date which ties in with the subsequent grants. Lack of detail makes a firm identification impossible, but it would go far to explain matters otherwise inexplicable.

Payment of the annuities continued to be made by the Court of Augmentations, established in 1536 to administer the revenues falling to the crown by the dissolution of the monasteries. Grants and sales of land, and the payment of pensions to the ex-religious, were part of its function. The Augmentations records of 1542 include the payment of annuities to Richard Robinson, clerk, out of Faversham, St Augustine's Canterbury, Boxley and Byland (by his fellow-Cumbrian Dr Leigh); in the following year the payment of five unspecified annuities is noted.¹⁴

That was to be the last payment, for the next year shows a dramatic change. In August 1544 Richard Robinson, clerk, became lord of a manor. After payment of £190 and resignation of pensions worth £54 per annum, and in consideration of the arrears of his pension from the previous Michaelmas, he was granted the manor of Loweswater; the service and rent of Egremont mill; grain and fulling mills at Loweswater (one at least in the hands of a kinsman, Matthew Robinson); the manor of Thackthwaite and various specified tenements; the King's lands at Brigham lately in the tenure of Thomas Wilson, chaplain, and now of John Wilson (these were former Percy lands, in the King's hands by virtue of the earl's bequest of them away from his family in the early 1530's); and the chantry of St Michael at Brigham now in the King's hands by surrender of Richard Robinson, clerk, chanter of the same.¹⁵ The income of Loweswater alone had been valued at £33. 2s. 8d. in 1538;¹⁶ Robinson paid far less than the normal 20 years purchase, and got a good bargain.

This grant confirms his otherwise unlikely identity with the annuitant of Kentish monasteries. It is also of incidental interest in clarifying the dedication of the chantry. The triple dedication of the foundation is referred to throughout the appeal proceedings

as the chantry of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Here however as in the *Valor* a decade earlier it is referred to as St Michael's. A multiple dedication seems to have evolved into a technical correctness at odds with popular devotion, and probably a similar explanation underlies the confusion over the dedication of the chantry at Bromfield.¹⁷

Of greater interest is this example of the surrender of a chantry, two years before their survey with a view to confiscation, and four years before the general dissolution of chantries took effect. Professor Dickens has noted similar cashings-in of chantries by the city of York to pre-empt crown seizure¹⁸ but this is the only known example in Cumbria. The 1546 survey shows no goods or lands remaining to the chantry as Robinson had already purchased them.¹⁹ Hints as to where the money might have come from are given in the last few years of his career.

By now he had one foot on the ladder towards acquiring status as a Cumbrian landowner. When others joined the scramble to purchase lands formerly belonging to the chantries, his position as a crown freeholder was a mark of distinction. Thus in December 1548, Thomas Brende, scrivener of London, acquired a mixed bag of chantries in Kent, Yorkshire, Shropshire, Essex, Lincolnshire and Cumberland. His local gains were the chantries of St Mary Magdalen Crosthwaite, and Mosergh; a rent exception of 5s. 1d. was made to Richard Robinson clerk and his heirs as to his manor of Loweswater.²⁰ In August 1549 he acquired a substantial addition to his own holdings. In that month a licence was granted to Lord Grey of Wilton and John Banaster, esquire, to grant to Richard Robinson, clerk, various lands in Brackenthwaite, late of the Earl of Northumberland; two little enclosures of Kirkstile and Milnehowe in Loweswater; pasture for 300 sheep on Loweswater moor, late of St Bees monastery and in the tenure of James Robinson; also Brickfield alias Gaysgarth in Brigham, near Buttermere.²¹

Lord Grey had only just acquired these lands himself: they had been granted to him *inter alia* on 19th July 1549 as a reward for his victory at Musselburgh.²² One is inclined to suspect that his name offered front cover for some property speculation. The suspicion is heightened in the case of a bulk purchaser like Thomas Brende who could not possibly have had a personal interest in his diverse purchases. It is confirmed by Richard Robinson's will of October 1549,²³ indicating that he had "the chauntrie of Crossethwayte and Mosar holden of the kings maiestie in socage" – part of Thomas Brende's December purchases – as well as his original chantry of Brigham. Indeed he had already disposed of one chantry. By an indenture of 20 August 1549 he had sold to Gilbert Wharton esquire of Kirkby Thore (that Gilbert who had declined to interfere in the Brigham affair fifteen years before) his chantry of "Howton" (probably Hutton-in-the-Forest.) which had not been purchased under his own name either. It thus seems very probable that certain London men of substance gave their names to purchases of chantry lands in which all manner of others might have interest, and for which they may well have advanced a part of the purchase money.

Richard Robinson's will is a most interesting document for many reasons. It is unique among 16th century chantrists wills in Cumbria for its probate at Canterbury, which has led to its survival where other pre-1560 Cumbrian wills have been lost. Without it we would lack the evidence for Richard Robinson's London property and connexions. His quantity of personal possessions both in Cumberland and London suggest a man of some comfort and wealth – as well they might do, on an income many another churchman might envy. Thus he bequeathes to six Cumbrians (three of them Robinsons), "All suche

1. stuf, Implements, stollles, chestes, cubbourds, linnen, wollen, bedstede, beddes, bedding, carpetts, coverletts and all my apparell, and all other thinges what soever theybe remayning within my Chamber at Saint James in the walle in London.” Other personal bequests include three rings, each set with a stone, to three Loweswater kinsmen – which is one ring more than the late bishop John Kite of Carlisle (*ob.* 1537) had bequeathed.²⁴

From the many kin mentioned in individual bequests, it is obvious that this clerk was of yeoman stock, which makes his choice of executors and supervisors of his will the more significant. John Robinson son of Matthew Robinson son of James Robinson deceased (a necessary distinction from other Johns and Jameses mentioned), heir to the bulk of the estates, is joined as executor by Thomas Stanley, “citizen and goldsmythe of London”. This scion of the leading house of north Lancashire is better known to posterity as assaymaster, and later Controller, of the Tower Mint.²⁵ Overseers include one esquire, one gentleman, and Richard Hutchenson, “auditor to our soveraigne lorde the king.” Witnesses to the will, apart from the inevitable Robinsons (one of whom signs as his bailiff) are all Londoners or citizens; three are goldsmiths and one, William Pierson, citizen and scrivener.

Much that was perplexing in Richard Robinson’s earlier career thus becomes plainer. He was obviously moving in more exalted circles than might have been expected. Perhaps first contacts came through the Robinson mentioned amongst the goldsmiths; this would account for the friendship with Stanley. Contact with an auditor to our sovereign lord the King cannot but have been useful to his financial dealings. Finally, when one scrivener witnesses a will, might not another, Thomas Brende, have proved useful when it came to the purchase of chantry lands?

Yet for all his London connexions it is Cumberland that his will mostly concerns. The opening bequests arrange in detail for charity to the poor of Loweswater and Mosergh, providing for oversight of the distribution of the weekly alms for the next ten years. The large numbers of personal bequests, with the exception of a few clergy, are almost all Robinson kin; names like “John Robynson my baylie”, “William Robynson of the park”, or “William Robynson of the pele” recur frequently. He evidently has all the concern for the importance of “surname”, or clan, that one would expect of a Border family like the Armstrongs or Grahams. It is obvious too that he hoped to have founded at Loweswater the nucleus of an enduring Robinson lordship. The last third of the will is concerned with the inheritance of the lands he had amassed. They were left in entirety to the John Robinson named as his executor, who turns out to be a minor entrusted by his kinsman to the custody and upbringing of Thomas Stanley. In default of heirs male of his line, another five successive inheritors are detailed, and finally:

for default of suche heires males the same to remayne to the right heyres of me, the said Richard Robynson, being of the name of Robynson and to their heires for ever.

Perhaps if Richard Robinson had lived long enough to consolidate his gains, this would indeed have happened. He was obviously still busily involved in land transactions within a few weeks of his death; his recent chantry acquisitions were of less than a year’s standing. From the first known reference to him and internal evidence of the will, it can be surmised that he was of no great age – about 50. Perhaps death came on the heels of the endemic plague in the capital. The evidence of the *Patent Rolls* is that this Richard

was as ill-served by a Stanley as his royal namesake had been seventy years earlier. Death robbed the Robinsons of the establishment of their name in Cumberland.

Thomas Stanley evidently had territorial ambitions of his own, and looked largely to Cumbria for them. In May 1547 he sued out a pardon as citizen and goldsmith, alias of Dale Garth, Cumberland;²⁶ in 1549 he acquired the chantry of Kirby Ireleth and its lands for £148. 10s.²⁷ Probate of Richard Robinson's will on 29 October 1549 gave him custody of the lands of the heir; in 1552 he gained two more. He first was granted the lands at Camerton of Anthony Curwen brother and heir of Oswald Curwen, and within months lands in Irton, Gosforth, Drigg, Haile, Bassenthwaite and elsewhere during the minority of Christopher Irton, brother and heir of Richard Irton with custody and marriage of the heir.²⁸ In July 1553 he added to these three a fourth in Kent.²⁹

Two entries of 1557 began to look ominous for the Robinson inheritance. On 25 November John Robinson has licence to enter on all his lands as kinsman and heir of Richard Robinson, clerk, deceased, who held of Edward VI in chief, and grant of issues since the time he attained the full age of 21.³⁰ But a couple of months earlier a licence had been granted to him to grant to Thomas Stanley all his lands in several tenures in Brackenthwaite; Kirkstile, Kirkcroft and Milnehowe in Loweswater; James Robinson's 300 sheep pasture on Loweswater moor; Brickfield in the tenure of Robert Hudson; and the rents from the mill at Egremont and from the lordship of Mosergh.³¹ It looks very much as though pressure was put upon the heir, just before he came of full age, to part with extensive areas of his inheritance.

Finally, Esau seems to have sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. In May 1562, a licence for £14. 12s. 6d. was issued for John Robinson of London, goldsmith, to alienate the manors of Loweswater and Thackthwaite, Gatesgarth and Buttermere Dubbs to Thomas Stanley.³² The custody and upbringing appointed by Richard Robinson had worked only too well. It was not unreasonable that the boy should follow his guardian into the same trade (and the Roger Robinson, goldsmith, who witnessed the will was probably another kinsman already pursuing it). In that respect Thomas Stanley can charitably be credited with having done his best for him. It had plainly never been the intention though that this should lead to the abandonment of his inheritance. Perhaps a young man brought up in London (he would have been about 12 at the time of his uncle's will) had carved a comfortable niche for himself and had no further interest in his native land. Perhaps he had been talked, or bribed, out of it. Thomas Stanley must have been well pleased with the bargain. One wonders what the disinherited Robinson tribe made of it.

Thus within a brief fifteen years any dreams of empire which Richard Robinson may have had were dissipated. His family might have found a foothold among the gentry of Cumbria; instead the little holding became a drop in the Stanley bucket, to be sold repeatedly before devolving in the eighteenth century upon Sir Gilfred Lawson.³³ Robinson had dealt in his time on equal terms with Leighs and Whartons; his successors were never to move in the same circles. Archbishop Grindal rising from a similar family background at St Bees is perhaps a parallel case. Despite his own eminence, the family remained tenant farmers at St Bees, with one member as the parish priest. Even a Dacre marriage did not raise the social status of the family at large.³⁴

Richard Robinson may also parallel Grindal in having learned, away from his native Cumberland, the outward form at least of Protestantism. In a career so full of the

unexpected this final fling should perhaps have been anticipated. Protestantism is certainly what the wording of the preamble to his will suggests. At a time when will formulae varied significantly and intentionally, he writes:

“first and principally I comend my soule to Almighty Jhesu my maker and redemer in whome and by the merites of whose blessed passion is all my hole trust of the remission and forgiveness of my synnes . . .”

This trust in the merits of Christ alone for salvation is in marked contrast to the Catholic form, which includes invocation of the Virgin and the whole company of heaven as intercessors, and also to the widespread noncommittal “I commend my soul to Almighty God, and my body . . .”. First occurring in the 1530’s, it becomes more prevalent under the staunchly protestant Edward VI. This example predates by four years the earliest of the strongly protestant wills of the Wilsons of Kendal, and is the earliest known occurrence from Cumberland.³⁵

It may of course signify no more than that the protestant form of bequest had become the norm in London and was followed as a fashion regardless of the beliefs of the testator. Two shreds of evidence might be adduced to support the protestant theory. One is Robinson’s purchase of the Brigham chantry four years before the general dissolution. This could just possibly be an ideological conversion to secular use of an ecclesiastical anomaly; a protestant denying the existence of Purgatory could hardly continue saying masses for the souls of the departed to release them from its pains. The other shred is the request in his will that his executors should cause the chalice, which he has in Cumberland, to be sold, and the money to be added to the yearly relief for the poor of Loweswater and Mosergh. This would be consonant with the prevailing theology of cashing in surplus church goods and applying them to charitable purposes. Both facts are of course entirely consonant with the cavalier attitude to his chantry and its obligations complained of by Henry Percy back in 1533. In fact the sale of a piece of church plate, granted to the chantry in perpetuity, would have been as clear a breach of the foundation statutes as his absenteeism.

Thus even in a career as well documented as Richard Robinson’s, questions remain unanswered. Was he indeed a Protestant? If so, what influence if any did he have on his native country? Or was he in contact with the more radical London groups? We know little of his whereabouts at various critical moments. Where was he for example during the Pilgrimage of Grace? When Sir Thomas Curwen reported on 21 January 1537 that from Plumbland to Muncaster was “all on flowghter”,³⁶ was Robinson encouraging the fray, lying low in case the lynching party denied Dr Leigh’s servant picked on him instead – or was he well out of the way in London?

Whatever the answers, Richard Robinson can safely be said to be exceptional. No other sixteenth century Cumbrian chantrist blazes like a meteor across such a multiplicity of records. His existence in the *Valor*, or the survey of 1546, is as near as he gets to the norm, and even there his entries are unusual. The long detailed letter from Sir John Lamplugh to Cromwell about his reinstatement; the unique appeal case to the consistory court at York; the amassing first of monastic annuities and later of Percy manors and chantry lands; those are wholly exceptional. Richard Robinson could never be mistaken for a typical chantry priest. He might however be regarded as a typical Cumbrian in his strong feeling for family; in his dogged pursuit of ambitions clerical or secular; in his

ability to turn up unexpectedly in spheres not usually associated with men from the distant counties. The light he sheds on one clerical career may not be particularly enlightened morally, but it is certainly illuminating.

Notes and References

- ¹ I am indebted to Dr D. N. J. MacCulloch for his criticism of this paper in draft form, and to the helpful comments of Mr A. R. Jabez-Smith.
- ² *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII* (henceforth *L.P.*), v, 1433.
- ³ *L.P.*, vi, 1533 and marginal note.
- ⁴ Borthwick Institute: Trans. C.P. 1533/2.
- ⁵ K. L. Wood-Legh, *Perpetual chantries in Britain* (Cambridge, 1965), 282.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, 272, 291.
- ⁷ *Calendar of Patent Rolls* (henceforth *C.P.R.*) 1327-30, 376-7.
- ⁸ *Valor Ecclesiasticus* (ed.) Caley and Hunter, Vol v, 267.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰ *CW2*, x, 143; *CW1*, xiii, 383.
- ¹¹ *L.P.*, iv, Part 1, 1377 (18).
- ¹² *L.P.*, xiii, Part 1, 888 (5).
- ¹³ Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Vol III, 473.
- ¹⁴ *L.P.*, xvii, 258, f16; *L.P.*, xviii, Part 2, 231.
- ¹⁵ *L.P.*, xx, Part 2, 266 (19).
- ¹⁶ J. M. W. Bean, *Estates of the Percy Family* (Oxford, 1958), 46.
- ¹⁷ *CW2*, lx, 84.
- ¹⁸ A. G. Dickens, *Reformation Studies* (1982), 47ff.
- ¹⁹ *CW2*, lx, 88.
- ²⁰ *C.P.R.*, 1548-1549, 73.
- ²¹ *C.P.R.*, 1549-1551, 57.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 69.
- ²³ P.R.O. Prob 11/32.
- ²⁴ P.R.O. Prob 11/27.
- ²⁵ *C.P.R.*, 1550-1553, 301, 320, etc.
- ²⁶ *C.P.R.*, 1548-1549, 153.
- ²⁷ *C.P.R.*, 1547-1548, 294.
- ²⁸ *C.P.R.*, 1550-1553, 161, 378.
- ²⁹ *C.P.R.*, 1553, 301.
- ³⁰ *C.P.R.*, 1557-1558, 322.
- ³¹ *C.P.R.*, *ibid.*, 333.
- ³² *C.P.R.*, 1560-1563, 419.
- ³³ Nicolson and Burn, *History of Westmorland and Cumberland*, Vol. II, 61.
- ³⁴ See e.g. B. L. Lansdown, MS 12, no. 34, printed in *Letters of Grindal* (Parker Society, 1843).
- ³⁵ Discussed in A. G. Dickens, *Lollards and Protestants in the diocese of York* (2nd ed. 1984), 215 ff; M. Zell, "The use of religious preambles", *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, L, 121 (1977); Surtees Society, Vol. 26 (1984), 77.
- ³⁶ *L.P.*, xii, Part 1, 185.

