

ART. IX – *Henry VII and Prerogativa Regis: The case of Mabel Dacre*

By SUSAN E. JAMES

HENRY VII came to the throne in 1485 at the end of nearly forty years of civil strife in England. War and execution had greatly reduced the number of the old aristocracy, but those who remained had grown accustomed to participating in the making and breaking of kings. This was a habit Henry was determined to curb. In addition to his desire to break the back of independent action by his nobles, the new king also had a financial crisis on his hands. He needed money but he was reluctant to resort to the expedient of forced loans that had been so resented under his predecessor, Richard III. From the first year of his reign, Henry hit upon a solution to both of his problems – *Prerogativa Regis*, or the prosecution of the royal prerogative right under feudal law.<sup>1</sup>

Henry's principal advisors in these matters were Sir Reginald Bray (d. 1503) and John Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1500), and in the latter part of his reign, Edmund Dudley and Richard Empson. These men were lawyers, and it was in close council with them that Henry realized the possibilities latent in the rights that medieval feudal law allowed him.<sup>2</sup> The rigorous pursuit of obligations and fines due to him by prerogative right would not only enrich his treasury, it would also intimidate over-mighty magnates. If an obligation was not forthcoming, the debtor would be forced to post a bond guaranteeing future payment. Such a procedure left the debtor open to legal prosecution. These bonds were extorted for enormous sums and were used on occasions by Henry to coerce, threaten and intimidate recalcitrant subjects. Incremental payment, the only practical method of payment for the debtor, on such financial obligations represented by the bonds, allowed Henry to refill the royal coffers. Although not all of Henry's subjects suffered from this rigorous prosecution of his feudal rights, many did.<sup>3</sup> Any man who held land by knight's service held it under the overlordship of the king. Henry's clever lawyers, whose very cleverness triggered a virulent hatred of them in the breasts of their victims, expanded the king's feudal claims to include a "long list of incorporeal things".<sup>4</sup> Additionally, other forms of holding land which had never before been formally included within the royal prerogative were now brought inside the crown's feudal fold. A good example of these involves the complicated legal expedients, "against all right",<sup>5</sup> used in the Hudleston case described below. The methods chosen to establish as well as to enforce these expanded feudal claims grew more from the king's present economic need than from actual past practice. Precedents and procedures for such claims were few or non-existent. Resentments were many.

It was in the end to prove impossible to justify or explain successfully all the aspects of an unpopular and paradoxical police that set itself to meet the expanding financial requirements of a modern state by means of a set of rules framed for his tenants in chief by a feudal suzerain. That stratagem was adopted simply because it lay ready at hand and the restiveness of Parliament made it expedient.<sup>6</sup>

One of the most lucrative aspects of royal prerogative was the right of wardship, a right which Henry took to the extreme limit of its definition. The death of a tenant-

in-chief, who left a minor as his heir, allowed the crown to assume control of that heir's estate until he or she reached their majority. Not only did the crown during this period control the income from the lands in ward, it also held two saleable commodities, the person of the heir and their marriage. The crown could sell either or both of these to the highest bidder or bestow them as gifts on a deserving supporter. With the person of the heir generally went control of sufficient of his or her lands to maintain them. Potentially a highly lucrative arrangement for the guardian, Henry VII's reign saw a brisk business in wardships. The broadening of the definition of royal wardship meant that the king could control during the heir's minority not only lands held of the crown but all of the lands held by knight's service of others. According to Henry's chief henchman, Edmund Dudley, the king's purpose was, "to have many persons in his danger at his pleasure . . .".<sup>7</sup> The more ruthlessly the king prosecuted his feudal right, the more devious and diverse were the methods his subjects came up with to thwart him. Enfeoffment to uses and joint tenancy were two such methods which Henry VII and later Henry VIII made every effort to curb.<sup>8</sup>

When the heir reached his majority and wanted to assume control of his lands, another financial stumbling block awaited him – suit for livery. This was a "perilous and dangerous suit"<sup>9</sup> which required great legal competence on the part of those acting for the heir. When the family estates spread over more than one county, a legal mistake in the suit for livery could force the heir to begin the process for possession all over again. Often it was more expedient to pay a large bribe to the crown for the privilege of special livery as long legal actions could prove even more costly than bribes.<sup>10</sup> Henry VII and his lawyer councillors thus greatly enlarged the scope of his royal prerogative and developed procedures for enforcing it that had the weight of the government behind them. The royal income expanded proportionally. For the individual, recovery of land or redress of grievances were time-consuming, expensive and difficult. For Mabel Dacre and her children, the penalties involved for non-compliance were to prove costly and in one instance, fatal.

Humphrey, Lord Dacre of Gilsland (about 16 miles north-east of Carlisle), had been an active Lancastrian in the early years of the Wars of the Roses. Dacre, however, was a shrewd opportunist and in June 1468, with Edward IV seemingly well entrenched on the throne, this northern lord switched sides. He cemented his new allegiance through connections gained by his earlier marriage with the sister of a prominent Yorkist. Dacre had married Mabel Parr, a daughter of Sir Thomas Parr of Kendal in Westmorland (d. 1461), shortly after her father's death.<sup>11</sup> Some five or six years later, he used his familial relationship with his wife's brothers, Edward IV's household comptroller and trusted supporter, Sir William Parr,<sup>12</sup> and John, Lord Hastings well-wisher, Sir John Parr,<sup>13</sup> to secure a pardon from the first Yorkist king and an entry into his service.<sup>14</sup> By the summer of 1471, Dacre had been appointed a member of Edward IV's royal council and remained loyal to the king until the latter's death. The former Lancastrian was rewarded for his change of loyalty by being chosen to succeed Sir William Parr as lieutenant of Carlisle Castle.<sup>15</sup> On the accession of Richard III in 1483, Dacre did even better. He received from Edward's brother an annuity of 100 marks and, upon Richard's departure from the north to take up his royal duties in the south, Dacre became the most powerful lord in the region.<sup>16</sup> Appointed lieutenant of the West Marches toward Scotland,<sup>17</sup> Dacre

avoided overt action against the future king, Henry, Earl of Richmond, by dying barely three months before the battle of Bosworth. Dacre died on 30 May 1485 and on 4 March 1486, his widow was granted, in an act which was no doubt regarded as one of great magnanimity by the new king, Henry VII, the guardianship of her own children – Thomas, the eighteen-year-old heir, his four younger brothers and three sisters<sup>18</sup>

Mabel Parr, Lady Dacre, was an ambitious but well-meaning woman, whose good intentions and political naiveté were to have damaging repercussions for her family. In a prayerbook which she gave as a gift to her nephew, Thomas Parr, she has written: “With sunny days all time, Thomas, [fortune] faire or fame will be yours. To my little Pare.” Under the inscription, Thomas, himself, has written: “Your loving nephew, Thomas Pare”.<sup>19</sup> During the years 1488-1494, Mabel Dacre’s affectionate nature, coupled with a not unnatural desire to marry her children well, led her into sympathies with two of her children’s love affairs and subsequent marriages that came into direct conflict with the king’s draconian prosecution of his royal prerogative. No quarter was given by the crown for the actions of a “foolish widow”, and the cautionary history of Mabel Dacre is important for the way in which it demonstrates the lengths to which the king and his lawyers were prepared to go to establish a legal claim on wardships and the marriage of wards and to prosecute apparent violations of those claims. As far as the crown was concerned, ignorance of the possibility of a feudal claim did not exculpate the perpetrator from a savage justice.

Mabel’s eldest son and heir to the Dacre estates, Thomas Dacre, born in 1467, grew into an impetuous and dashing young man. By the time he was twenty-one and had assumed his father’s title, he had shown a strong sense of the reckless audacity and personal courage that were to make him a hero at the battle of Flodden Field and get him into trouble in the boudoir. In the opinion of the commander under whom he served in the north, the Earl of Surrey: “There is no hardier or better knight, but often he neglects order”.<sup>20</sup> The Bishop of Carlisle commented that Dacre was known for “his good wit and good fortune”.<sup>21</sup> About ten miles from the Dacre manor of Kirkoswald, located in Cumberland north-east of Penrith, where Thomas Dacre spent a good deal of his time, lay the hamlet of Greystoke, part of the considerable holdings of Ralph, Lord Greystoke, who took his title from that area.<sup>22</sup>

Lord Greystoke’s son and heir, Sir Robert Greystoke, had married the daughter of Edmund Grey, Earl of Kent, and Edward IV’s lord treasurer. Lady Greystoke’s two brothers were the husbands of sisters of Edward IV’s queen. The Greystokes were thus not only an important family in the north, but were well-connected with the family of Henry VII’s own queen. Sir Robert’s only child and heir was his young daughter, Elizabeth (born 1471/2), and at Sir Robert’s death in 1483, the child Elizabeth became her grandfather’s heir as well. The fact that Lord Greystoke designated his granddaughter as his heir and not his younger son, Sir John, indicates that he may have had ambitious plans for her marriage.<sup>23</sup> Elizabeth Greystoke was barely twelve at her father’s death and sometime during the next four years, Thomas Dacre determined to marry her. He had by this time reached his majority and his indulgent mother seems to have had little control over him. Indeed, if the evidence of Henry VII’s wrath toward her a short time later is any indication, the romantic and ambitious Mabel may have encouraged her son’s suit to Elizabeth. Dacre was

well aware of Elizabeth's monetary value as a bride and wrote many years later about "the possibilities that fell unto myself by my marriage".<sup>24</sup> The fact that Elizabeth was an heiress would have made her an attractive match but there seems to have been more to Dacre's stubborn attachment than merely a desire to acquire her inheritance. Dacre appears also to have held a genuine affection for Elizabeth Greystoke and his efforts to win her hand from her equally stubborn but unsympathetic grandfather led to conflict that escalated to the point where Dacre was forced to post a £500 bond to keep the peace with his quarrelsome neighbour.<sup>25</sup> For his part, Greystoke did not consider Dacre a suitable candidate for his granddaughter and as long as he lived he kept them apart. Then on the Friday before Whitsunday 1487, when Elizabeth was sixteen, her grandfather died.<sup>26</sup>

That December, Henry VII granted the teen-aged Elizabeth Greystoke in wardship to the Earl of Oxford, who in turn placed her in Lord Clifford's household at Brougham Castle.<sup>27</sup> Brougham Castle, once part of the parcel of castles that had belonged to Thomas Dacre's uncle, Sir William Parr,<sup>28</sup> is just outside of Penrith, only some eight miles south of the Dacre manor of Kirkoswald. This proximity was a sore temptation to Dacre. Henry, Lord Clifford, was more interested in the study of astronomy and astrology than in the care of a sixteen-year-old girl, who was, after all, not his own ward anyway.<sup>29</sup> Sitting behind stone walls of "a lonely tower"<sup>30</sup> at Brougham Castle biding her time, there seems little doubt that Elizabeth Greystoke found the dashing and flatteringly persistent Thomas Dacre and "his good wit" an attractive alternative. Frustrated in his courtship by Elizabeth's new guardians, as he had been by her grandfather, but still determined to have her, Thomas Dacre, "without leave asking, but not without peril to his person, did take her, [and] married her . . ."<sup>31</sup> Dacre, probably by bribery, seems to have gained access to Brougham Castle and spirited the no doubt agreeable Elizabeth away.

The king's response to this flagrant violation of the right of wardship was to refuse to remit the £500 penal bond to which Dacre was still bound, in spite of the fact that the man with whom he had quarrelled, Lord Greystoke, was now dead.<sup>32</sup> This financial burden was a club held over the Dacres' heads for twenty years. It was not until the accession of Henry VIII in 1509 that they were finally let off the financial hook.<sup>33</sup> Yet this royal reaction to the Greystoke-Dacre elopement was relatively mild compared to that which erupted some six years later when Dacre's sister made what should have been an entirely prudent, unobjectionable match. All of the Dacres, particularly Mabel and her daughter, the errant bride, were made to feel the royal displeasure.

Elizabeth Dacre, like her brother before her, followed her heart into marriage with drastic consequences. She fell in love with young Richard Hudleston of Millom, Penrith and Blennerhasset.<sup>34</sup> Richard was the heir of his grandfather, Sir John Hudleston, who died in 1493.<sup>35</sup> The sixteen-year-old Richard believed that he held his grandfather's land from the successor to the late Marquess of Dorset and not from the king. Thus he appeared to be free from royal claims of wardship. His brother-in-law asserted angrily some years later that, "Hudleston was never a king's ward . . ."<sup>36</sup> In the summer of 1494 at the age of seventeen, Richard Hudleston married Mabel Dacre's daughter, Elizabeth, apparently not only with her mother's support but also with her active encouragement. It is significant that this marriage between two northern gentry families on the fringe of Henry VII's kingdom, of

ample but not extravagant holdings, should have come to the attention of the king. These were not great aristocratic families of vast wealth, but the king's reaction was just as ruthless, peremptory and harsh as it was in his campaign to bring the upper aristocracy under his exclusive control.

The royal lawyers came up with the ingenious claim that the Hudleston manor of Millom had been held by Sir John Hudleston, Richard's grandfather, of the manor of Egremont, owned in 1461 by John Radcliffe, styled Lord FitzWalter. Radcliffe had died fighting at Towton for Edward IV, the same king to whose daughter Henry VII was now married.<sup>37</sup> According to the lawyers, however, Edward was not at that particular moment the legal king of England. Henry VI held that honour. Since Radcliffe had died fighting for Edward and against his true and anointed lord, Henry VI, his estates by reason of this treason reverted to Henry VI and his heirs, to wit, the present ruler. It is difficult to say just how far this specious reasoning would have taken Henry VII, if he had chosen to push it into the realms of the great lordships of the kingdom. His own stepfather, Lord Stanley, had changed his coat more times than most people could count. However, by the logic of the crown's argument in this particular case, Edward IV's subsequent grant of the manor of Egremont to the Marquess of Dorset was invalid and the manor now belonged to Henry VI's legitimate successor, Henry VII.

Ignorance of this tortuous legal reasoning was no excuse, according to the crown, for the "ravishment" of a royal ward. According to the findings of the legal investigation following the Hudleston-Dacre nuptials, Richard Hudleston, under-age heir of Millom, was exactly that, a royal ward. As he had been a minor at the time of his marriage, responsibility for the heinous crime of violation of *prerogativa regis* was placed at the door of Mabel Dacre and her daughter. Royal justice was summarily executed. Mabel and three assignees, one of them her son, were bound before the abbot of Holme Cultram and the prior of Carlisle, the king's deputies, to pay an indemnity of £880, and Mabel alone was indemnified for an additional 500 marks.<sup>38</sup> She was then taken, together with Elizabeth, to remote and desolate Harbottle Castle in Northumberland and imprisoned. The conditions of their imprisonment seem to have been unduly harsh and their health was severely affected. Elizabeth was overcome with melancholy and remorse at watching her mother suffer. ". . . remembering her mother was so unrighteously [en]dangered and troubled for her causes, [Elizabeth] took such heaviness and sorrow that she died in the said castle, with other the said Dame Mabel's kin and servants".<sup>39</sup>

Thomas, Lord Dacre, and his brother-in-law, George, Lord Fitzhugh, husband of Katherine Dacre,<sup>40</sup> were forced to post recognizance or bond for 1,000 marks for his mother's involvement in the Hudleston marriage.<sup>41</sup> This sum was added to the £500 he still owed for his own impetuous nuptials. Such bonds and their unavoidable incremental payment were a crippling financial burden for someone of Dacre's rank and holdings and typical of the king's draconian pursuit of the widest latitude of interpretation of *prerogativa regis*. Dacre later made a list of the extortions (not to put too fine a point on it) which the king had exacted from his family over the matter of his and his sister's marriages: £500 for keeping peace with Lord Greystoke and "for his own and others' appearance in the Star Chamber, duly kept . . ."; a recognizance of 3,000 marks, "turned by Empson and Dudley into a debt payable at Michaelmas following against all right"; 1,000 marks, together with George, Lord Fitzhugh, "for

his mother Dame Mabel Dacre, accused of having ravished one Richard Hudleston, a ward of the late King, for which she was committed to prison and remained there three-quarters of a year. Of this 600 marks have been paid.” In addition, there was the £880 plus 500 marks for which Mabel had been bound in September 1494 as well as extraneous bonds “wrongfully made”, such as half of a 2000-mark bond forced on Dacre for the keeping of Harbottle Castle, his mother’s prison, and still in place even after Dacre had been discharged of the keeping of the castle, and another £200, which Dacre forfeited “by reason of the delay of the Council in accepting Sir George Manners in lieu of William Barons, deceased.”<sup>42</sup> None of these appear to have been equitable or just financial punishments and the Dacres can hardly be blamed for a deep sense of ill-usage by the crown, a resentment in which they were hardly alone.

After nearly a year of harsh incarceration and the loss of her young daughter, Mabel, Lady Dacre, was released from Harbottle Castle and allowed to return home. Her health had been greatly impaired and she wrote her will in 1503, naming her younger sons, Hugh and Humphrey Dacre, her son-in-law, George, Lord Fitzhugh, and her nephew, Thomas Parr, chief feoffees of her holdings in Cumbria.<sup>43</sup> The income from these lands was to be used to construct a chantry, to be known as “Mabelle’s Chaunterie”, in the church of St Mary’s, Carlisle. Thomas Parr was named executor of his aunt’s last bequest.<sup>44</sup> As for Richard Hudleston, the erstwhile bridegroom of the late Elizabeth Dacre, his first venture into matrimony was his last. He never remarried and died on 5 October 1503, at the age of twenty-seven, leaving two unmarried sisters as his heirs.<sup>45</sup>

## Notes and References

- <sup>1</sup> For three discussions of *prerogativa regis* from differing points of view, see W. C. Richardson, “Surveyor of the King’s Prerogative”, *EHR*, LVI (January 1941), 52-75; F. C. Dietz, *English Public Finance, 1485-1641*, I (University of Illinois Studies in Social Sciences, 1920), particularly 33-50; S. E. Thorne (ed.), *Robert Constable’s Prerogative Regis* (New Haven, 1949), v-xxxii.
- <sup>2</sup> Morton, Dudley and Empson were all trained lawyers. Also see, B. P. Wolffe, “Henry VII’s Land Revenues and Chamber Finance”, *EHR*, LXXIX (1964), 225-254.
- <sup>3</sup> Geoffrey Elton in his *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government I* (London, 1974), 45-99, has taken the position that Henry VII was not the rapacious monarch that legend would have him. His prosecution of his legal rights effectively helped to reconstruct a functioning government precisely because it was “vigorous, thorough and sometimes harsh”. This is quite probably true yet from the viewpoint of the Dacre family, Henry must be considered as somewhat “less than kind”.
- <sup>4</sup> S. E. Thorne (ed.), *op. cit.*, xiii.
- <sup>5</sup> PRO:SP Henry VIII, I, f. 71 and *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII* (hereafter *Letters and Papers*), I, i, #131.
- <sup>6</sup> S. E. Thorne (ed.), *op. cit.*, v-xx.
- <sup>7</sup> J. R. Lander, *Government and Community: England, 1450-1509* (London, 1980), 352-353.
- <sup>8</sup> Most notably in the 1536 Statute of Uses which had far-reaching effects.
- <sup>9</sup> S. E. Thorne (ed.), *op. cit.*, xviii-xix.
- <sup>10</sup> Thomas Dacre, Mabel Dacre’s son, was forced to this expedient in 1507 when he bought special livery of his wife’s lands. That this was nearly twenty years after his marriage indicates the difficulties he was encountering in gaining control of her inheritance. *Selections from the Household Books of the Lord William Howard* (Surtees Society, 68, 1878), 516.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 515-516. Humphrey and Mabel Dacre are buried at Lanercost Priory in an elegant tomb decorated with carvings of their coats-of-arms.
- <sup>12</sup> Susan E. James, “Sir William Parr of Kendal: Part I, 1434-1471”, *CW2*, xciii, 99-114, and Susan E.

- James, "Sir William Parr of Kendal: Part II, 1471-1483", *CW2*, xciv, 106-120.
- <sup>13</sup> Susan E. James, "Sir John Parr of Kendal, 1437- 1477", *CW2*, xcvi, 71-86.
- <sup>14</sup> *Rotuli Parliamentorum: the Rolls of Parliament*, 480 and VI, 43-45.
- <sup>15</sup> M. A. Hicks, "Dynastic Change and Northern Society: The Career of the 4th Earl of Northumberland, 1470-89", *Northern History*, XIV (1978), 85. Dacre replaced Parr as lieutenant of Carlisle Castle between April 1475 and 1478. PRO:E404/76/1/86 and *York Memorandum Book, Part II* (1388-1493) (Surtees Society, CXXV), 217.
- <sup>16</sup> *Calendar of Patent Rolls 1476-1485*, 388 (21 March 1484).
- <sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 485 (5 September 1484), and Charles Ross, *Richard III* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1981), 160.
- <sup>18</sup> G. E. C. Cokayne, *The Complete Peerage*, IV, 18-21.
- <sup>19</sup> CUL:Inc.4.J.1.2 (3570), pp. 77b-78a and p. 135a.
- <sup>20</sup> G. E. C. Cokayne, *op. cit.*, IV, 20 note c.
- <sup>21</sup> *loc. cit.*
- <sup>22</sup> The chief residence of Lord Greystoke was Hinderkelfe, on whose site Castle Howard now stands.
- <sup>23</sup> Sir John Greystoke eventually reclaimed a portion of his father's estate from the Dacres, *Letters and Papers*, 1, i, #381(15).
- <sup>24</sup> BL:Addit. MS 24,965 f. 200b (formerly f. 165).
- <sup>25</sup> PRO:SP Henry VIII, I, f. 71 and *Letters and Papers*, 1, i, #131.
- <sup>26</sup> *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem*, Second Series, Henry VII, Vol. III, #885 and #1010.
- <sup>27</sup> *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1485-1494*, 179 and 197.
- <sup>28</sup> *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1467-1477*, 423.
- <sup>29</sup> Known as 'the Shepherd Lord', because as the story has it, he was raised in the northern hills among shepherds to protect him from his father's enemies, Henry Clifford was restored to the lordship of Clifford under a royal pardon of 16 March 1472. An enigmatic eccentric, Clifford rarely appeared at court but apparently spent most of his time in Bardon Tower near Bolton Castle studying the stars. Born about 1454, he died on 23 April 1523.
- <sup>30</sup> Wordsworth's description of Brougham Castle at this period in "Song at the Feast of Brougham Castle". *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth* (London and New York, 1858), 155.
- <sup>31</sup> *Selections from the Household Books of the Lord William Howard* (Surtees Society, 68, 1875), 391; F. C. Dietz, *English Public Finance, 1485-1641*, I, 48.
- <sup>32</sup> In 1509 after the death of Henry VII, Dacre petitioned the privy council to remit a long list of debts to the crown, whose discharge he had "sundry times heretofore made suit to the king". These included the £500 bond. PRO:SP Henry VIII, I, f. 71 and *Letters and Papers*, 1, i, #131.
- <sup>33</sup> As no further mention of these debts occurs after 1509, it is safe to assume that the new king remitted them as he remitted so many of his father's imposed financial obligations.
- <sup>34</sup> Richard's grandfather, Sir John Hudleston of Millom in Cumberland was a tenant of Thomas Grey, Marquess of Dorset. Sir John's son and heir, Sir Richard Hudleston, had apparently married a bastard daughter of Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick. Warwick provided for his daughter, Margaret, by giving to her and to her husband the two Cumberland manors of Blennerhasset and Upmanby, as well as land in Penrith and Carlisle. This legacy, combined with the Hudleston holdings at Millom in Cumberland and other lands in the area, made Sir Richard Hudleston's only son, Richard, the younger, a better than average catch in the northern gentry marriage market.
- <sup>35</sup> *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, Second Series*, Henry VII, Vol. I, #969, 413-414.
- <sup>36</sup> PRO:SP Henry VIII, I, f. 71 and *Letters and Papers*, 1, i, #131.
- <sup>37</sup> For FitzWalter's death at Towton see Charles Ross, *Edward IV* (Cambridge, 1974), 36-37.
- <sup>38</sup> *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1500-1509*, #818.
- <sup>39</sup> PRO:SP Henry VIII, I, f. 71 and *Letters and Papers*, 1, i, #131.
- <sup>40</sup> George, Lord Fitzhugh, born 1486/7, married Katherine Dacre and died without heirs on 28 January 1513. His widow remarried, taking as her second husband Sir Thomas Neville of Mereworth (died 29 May 1542).
- <sup>41</sup> *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1500-1509*, #818 and PRO:SP Henry VIII, I, f. 71 and *Letters and Papers*, 1, i, #131.
- <sup>42</sup> PRO:SP Henry VIII, I, f. 71 and *Letters and Papers*, 1, i, #131.
- <sup>43</sup> *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1500-1509*, #455. On 16 January 1509, 400 marks and £80 of Mabel's debt, for which her son-in-law, George, Lord Fitzhugh, had stood surety, were relinquished by the crown to Mabel's cousin, Cuthbert Tunstall, future master of the rolls (1516), Bishop of London (1522),

keeper of the privy seal (1523) and Bishop of Durham (1529). *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1500-1509*, #955(xxvi).

<sup>44</sup> *Calendar of Close Rolls, 1500-1509*, #512. As his aunt's executor, Thomas Parr used Kirkoswald and Carlisle as residences until his own death on 11 November 1517. *Letters and Papers*, 1 i, #438.

<sup>45</sup> *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem*, Second Series, Henry VII, III, #66, p. 41 and #213, p. 137.