SOME REMARKS ON THE RENT-ROLL OF HUMPHREY, DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM.

26 & 27 HEN. VI., 1447, 1448.

READ AT THE OXFORD MEETING OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE, JUNE 19, 1850.

BY JAMES HEYWOOD MARKLAND, D.C.L, F.R.S., & S.A.

THE accompanying Roll, preserved amongst the Archives at Longleat, was obligingly placed by the Marquis of Bath in my hands for examination. It contains in fifty-six feet of parchment the Rent Roll of Humphrey, Duke of Buckingham, taken in the 26th and 27th years of the reign of Henry VI. (1447, 1448.)

A document of this kind must necessarily be far less interesting than a Household Book, or entries of expenses, but as this Roll shows us the Rental of one of our most powerful noblemen, four centuries ago, and conveys other information, a statement of its contents, with some few comments, may not be wholly valueless.

In the pages of English History, from the Conquest down to the reign of Henry VIII., the House of Stafford is conspicuous; their long unbroken descent, their splendid alliances, and their vast possessions, naturally imparted to them great power and influence, and placed them amongst the very foremost of English nobles. At the Conquest they possessed no fewer than eighty-one Lordships in Staffordshire alone, twenty-six in Warwickshire, and twenty in Leicestershire. By successive alliances with the heiresses of illustrious houses, these possessions swelled to the extent of the Rental before us, and they were again increased one-seventh in amount in the life-time of Henry, the second Duke.

The contemptuous reflection on Wolsey, which Shakspeare has put into the mouth of Edward, the third Duke,—styled by Johnson "one of the ancient unlettered martial nobility" —may be well understood, considering how different was the origin of these two distinguished persons:—

"A beggar's Book
Outworths a noble's blood."

At the same time, to this House how closely does the Psalmist's awful language apply!—

"Thou dost set them in slippery places; thou castest them down and destroyest them.
Oh! how suddenly do they consume, perish, and come to a fearful end."
Psalm lxxiii. 18, 19.

To the Staffords', "their birth and state" proved, as we shall see, "shadows not substantial things"—with them "the paths of glory" *literally* "led to the grave." In those days, as Southey remarks, "to die in peace at a good old age was indeed a rare fortune for men in high station." To fall in battle, or to receive the honours of political martyrdom, was the fate of too many members of our chief families. Two of this family were secretly murdered—three forfeited their lives on the scaffold—three fell in the field, not whilst defending their country against foreign enemies, but in the intestine factions of York and Lancaster. In three instances the father followed his expectant heir to the tomb.

This melancholy catalogue may be closed by the name of the accomplished Surrey, who, in his thirtieth year, shared the fate of his grandfather and great grandfather, the second and third Dukes of Buckingham, and whose untimely end must ever be a subject of regret amidst these walls. Had his life been spared, England might, perhaps, from his encouragement and example, have advanced earlier to that high rank in learning and in literature, which, through her Universities, she still so happily maintains.

One of the fatal events, to which I have referred, Froissart narrates in his own unrivalled manner. When Richard II. was on his route to Scotland, an archer of Sir Richard (Ralph ?) Stafford's, the son of Hugh, Earl of Stafford, pierced with his arrow an esquire of Sir John Holland's, the king's half-brother.

"Tidynges anone was brought to Sir Johan of Holande, that an archer of Sir Richarde Stafforde's had slayne a squyer of his, y^e^ man that he loued best in all the world.——Whan Sir Johan of Holande was well enfourmed of this aduenture, he was ryght sore displeased, & sayd, I shall neur eate nor drinke tyll it be reuenged, than he lepte on his horse, & toke certayne of his men with him, and departed fro his owne lodgyng, it was as than right late, & so rode into the fieldes.——And as he and his men rode up & downe amonge the hedges and busshes, in a straite waye he mett at aduenture, with Sir Richarde Stafforde, & because it was night,

he demanded who was there, I am quod he Richarde Stafforde; & I am Hollande quod the other, & I seke for the; one of thy seruauntes hath slayne my best beloued squyer; & therwith drew out his sworde, & strake Richarde Stafforde so that he slewe him, & fell downe deed, whiche was great pytie, so he passed forthe & knewe not well what he had done; but he sawe well one falle to the grounde.—Sir Richarde Stafforde's men were sore dismayed when they sawe their maister deed, than they cryed A Holande, Holande ye haue slayne the sonne of therle of Stafforde, this will be heuy tydynges to the father whane he knowethe therof. Some of Sir Johan of Holande's seruauantes herde well these wordes & sayde to their Master, Sir, ye haue slayne Sir Richarde Stafforde; well quod Sir Johan Hollande, what than? I had leauer have slayne him than a worse; the better haue I revenged the dethe of my squyer. Than Sir Johan of Holande went streyght to Saint Johan's of Beuerley & tooke the fraunchesse of the towne, and abode there styll, for he knew well there wolde be moche ado in the hooste for the dethe of that knight, and he wist not what the kynge would saye or do in the matter, so to eschue all parylles, he tooke sentuary in the towne of Saint Johan's of Beuerley.

"Tidynges anon came to the erle of Stafforde, how his sonne was slayne by yuell aduenture; thane the erle demaunded who had slayne him, & suche as were by him, when he was slayne, sayd, Sir, the kynges brother, Sir Johan of Holande dyd slee him; and shewed hym the cause why & howe it was. Ye maye well knowe that he loued entierly his sonne, & had no mō but hym, & was a fayre yonge knyght, & a couragyeous, was maruelously sore dyspleased, and sent incontynent for all his friends, to haue their counsayle, how he shulde vse hymselfe, in the reuengynge of his dethe; the moost wisest man of his counsayle sayd, Sir, to-morrowe in the mornynge, shewe all the matter to the kyng, & desyre hym to haue lawe and iustyce.—Thus they suaged somewhat his yre, & so passed that night; & y^{e} nexte mornynge Richarde Stafforde was buryed in the church of the vyllage therby, and at his buryeng were all those of his lynage, barons knyghts and squyers that were in that armye.—And the obsequy done the erle of Stafforde, & a threescore of his lynage mounted on their horses, & so came to the kynge, who was well enformed of that yeull aduenture; & so the erle found the kynge and his vncles toguyder, and a great nombre of knightes with them. Whan the erle came before the kyng he kneled downe, & all wepynge sayde with a soroufull harte, Sir, ye are kyng of Englande, & haue solemnly sworn to kepe Englade in all ryght, and to do justice; Sir, ye know how your brother, wout any tytell of reason, hath slayne my sonne and ayre. Sir, I requyre you do me right & iustyce, or els ye shall haue no worse enemy than I will be, and Sir, I wyll ye know the dethe of my sonne toucheth me so nere, that & it were nat for brekynge of this voyage that we be in, I shulde bring the hoste into suche trouble, that with honour it should be amended, and so couterueenged, that it shoulde be spoken of a hudred yeres hereafter in Englande: but as now I wyll cease tyll this voyage into Scotlande be done, for our ennemyes shall not reioyse of the trouble of the erle of Stafforde.—The kynge answered, knowe for trouthe, that I shall do you justyce & reason, as far forth as all my barones wyll iudge: I shall not fayle thereof for no brother that I haue than they of the erle's lynage said, Sir, ye have said well, we thank you therof.—Thus the lynage of Sir Richard Stafforde was appeased, and so helde on their journey into Scotlande, & all the iourney

the erle of Stafforde made no semblant of the dethe of his sonne, wherein all the barons reputed hym right sage." [1]

The alliance between the Staffords and the blood royal of England, which will be presently noticed, was a circumstance on which the family placed a due value; the royal arms formed the first quarter of their coat-armour. But this connexion, by placing them too prominently as rivals of the crown, led, in great measure, both the second and third Dukes to the scaffold.

There can be little question that these noblemen aimed at sovereign power, and Richard III. held the throne by far too questionable a title to tolerate the existence of so formidable a rival as Henry, the second Duke.

Humphrey, the sixth Earl of Stafford,—whose rental is before us—was the son of Edward, or Edmond, the fifth Earl of Stafford, slain at Shrewsbury in 1403, by Anne, daughter of Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, the youngest son of Edward III., and who himself bore for awhile the title of Buckingham, afterwards conferred upon his grandson.

In these two descents we may mark how rapidly a family may gain strength and power by its alliances. The Duke of Gloucester married Eleanor, the eldest daughter and co-heir of Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford, Essex. and Northampton, constable of England. The Duke's daughter, the before-named Lady Anne, became heiress to her brother Humphrey, who died of the plague, childless. She inherited also her mother's moiety of the large estates of the Bohuns, and in her will, doubtless conscious of her dignities, styles herself "Countess of Stafford, Buckingham, Hereford, and Northampton, and Lady of Brecknock."

We possess but little information as to the first Duke. In the 2nd of Henry VI. he did homage and had livery of his lands, as also of those which had descended to him by the death of his uncle, Hugh, Lord Bourchier, S.P. In the 9th of Henry VI. he attended the king at Paris, where in the following year Henry was crowned. Two years afterwards he was appointed Captain of the Town and Marches of Calais. In an indenture, (22nd Hen. VI.) 1443, he is styled "the Right Mighty Prince Humphrey, Earl of Buck-

[1] Froissart's Chronicles, translated by Lord Berners, vol. ii. p. 24.

ingham, Hereford, Stafford, Northampton, and Perch, Lord of Brecknock and of Holderness, and Captain of the Town of Calais."[2] In 1444, he was created Duke of Buckingham, and made Constable of Dover Castle.

He married the Lady Anne Neville, daughter of Ralph, Earl of Westmoreland, by whom he had issue Humphrey, Earl of Stafford, who was killed at St. Alban's in his father's life-time, 1455. The Duke's second son, Lord Henry Stafford, married Margaret Beaufort, so well known to us as the Countess of Richmond and Derby, the mother of Henry VII. The third, and youngest son, was John, Earl of Wiltshire. The Duke had also two daughters; the eldest, Anne, married Aubrey de Vere, eldest son and heir of John, Earl of Oxford. On this occasion Bishop Kennett tells us that the Duke received a customary aid from his feodatory tenants: a receipt given to one of them is as follows:—

"This Bille endentyd the 13 day of August (24 H. 6) bereth witnesse that Rob^{t}. Power feodary of my Lorde the Duke of Bockyngham hath reseyved of Edward Rede Squyere 25*s*. for a relif, and 5*s*. for a tenable eyde to the mariage of the heldyst daughter of my seyde lord for the fourth part of a knyght's fee in Adyngrave, in the shire of Buckingham."[3]

We thus see how a marriage portion could be raised at this period.

Among the Paston Letters there is one from the Duke to the Viscount Beaumont, who is addressed as his "right entirely beloved Brother," both these peers being Knights of the Garter.[4] The letter—which is said to be "perhaps the only original Letter extant of this great Peer"—is without date, but was written probably between 1444 and 1445. It presents a curious picture of his ways and means; for, notwithstanding his large possessions, it relates to an unsatisfied debt owing by him to the Viscount. He says,—

"I perceive by the tenor of your letter your good desire of a certain debt that I owe unto you. In good faith, Brother, it is so with me at this time that I have but easy stuff of money within me, for so much as the season of the year is not yet grown, so that I may not please your said good brotherhood, as God knoweth my will and intent were to do, and if I had it."

[2] Allen's History of Yorkshire, ii., 392.

[3] Kennett's Parochial Antiq., vol. ii. p. 372.

[4] Whose institution directs that the knights companions should be "fellows and brethren, united in all chances of fortune, copartners both in peace and war, assistant to one another in all serious and dangerous transactions, and through the whole course of their lives, faithful and friendly one towards another."

He sends by his son Stafford an obligation, partly satisfied,—

"The residue of which I pray you to receive, and that I may have an acquittance thereof, and to give credence unto my said son in such thing as he should say unto your good brotherhood on my behalf."[5]

The Duke dates his letter from the castle of Maxstoke, situated to the east of Coleshill, in Warwickshire. It was visited by Pennant in 1780, who speaks of the fine gateway, and the gates, covered with plates of iron by the Duke, with his arms impaling those of Nevil, and with the supporters, two antelopes, derived from his mother, "the burning nave or knot—the cognizance of his own ancestors." Pennant speaks also of a great vault ribbed with stone, of the old chapel and kitchen, and the noble old hall, and a great dining-room, with a most curious carved door and chimney, as then in use. Some portions of this building, I understand, still exist.

An ancestor of our noble president, Sir William Compton, was the favoured grantee of this estate when forfeited in the reign of Henry VIII.

One circumstance in the Duke's life must not be passed over, as being characteristic of this chivalrous age, and showing the jealousy with which honours were defended.

The nobleman, who may be regarded as the Duke's most powerful rival, was Henry Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, born 1424. From his father he inherited large estates, valued (12th Henry VI.) at 8606 *marks;* he was created Duke of Warwick in the same year (1444) that Buckingham gained that rank; and on this accession of title, while he was, in the scale of precedence, to follow the Duke of Norfolk, he was placed before Buckingham. This proof of royal favour gave great umbrage to the latter (who happened to be the Duke of Warwick's godfather), and in order to prevent contention and strife the matter of precedence betwixt these peers was thus settled by Parliament—

"That one of the said dukes shall have the pre-eminence for one whole year, and then the other have pre-eminence for the next year, and so alternately, as long as they shall live, and on their deaths, whichever shall first have livery of his lands to have the perpetual precedence."

[5] Paston Letters, by Ramsay (1840), vol. i. p. 9.

Well might the Lord Mayor, in Shakspeare's Henry VI. exclaim—

"That nobles should such Stomachs bear!"

Whether Buckingham's feelings were soothed by this middle course of proceeding or not may be doubted; but all jealousy was soon set at rest. Dugdale tells us that, on the death of Warwick, about two years after, without issue male, Buckingham obtained a special grant giving to himself and his heirs precedence above all dukes whatever, excepting such as were of the blood royal. Dugdale also states that—

"In consideration of his vast expences, in attending the King in those turbulent times, against his adversaries, then in arms, he obtained a grant (38 Hen. VI.) of all those fines which Walter Devereux, William Hastings, and Walter Hopton were to make to the King for their transgressions."[6]

Here was a fresh augmentation of wealth.

The Duke was slain in the battle of Northampton (28th July, 38 Hen. VI.), and was buried either there or in the monastery of Delapré. His will is given by Dugdale and by Nicolas. It contains some bequests for religious and charitable uses, and one provision deserves notice. In an age when the funeral solemnities of noblemen were performed with extraordinary splendour, and at a lavish expense, the Duke wisely directs, that his own should be solemnised "without any sumptuous costs or charge."

To revert to the roll. It contains the rental of estates in twenty-seven counties. The largest of these possessions appears to have been the castle, manor, and dominion of Brecknock, Huntingdon, and Talgarth, in Herefordshire, and the Marches of Wales, yielding 1183*l.* per annum. The estates in Holderness, producing the gross rental of 949*l.*, were also of immense extent, comprising the seigniory, liberty, and manor of Holderness, and lands or other property in twenty-eight parishes. These the Duke inherited through his mother.

The property in this county (Oxfordshire) was small (viz., 37*l.* 18*s.* 3½*d.* per annum), consisting only of the manor of Stratton Audley.

The gross rental is 6300*l.*, a sum then of vast amount. To show this the more accurately, I had bestowed some labour, in order to arrive, if possible, at the sum which it would represent in our own days. But to enter into the

[6] Dugdale's Baronage, p. 165.

details necessary, in order to lead us to a correct conclusion as to this point, would compel me to trespass upon your time far longer than would be acceptable.

Those who may feel interested in the subject may consult —1. Bishop Fleetwood's Chronicon Preciosum; 2. The History of England, by Dr. Henry; 3. The Tables, drawn up with so much care, by Rear-Admiral Rainier, in 1833,[7] and 4. Mr. Hallam's Work on the Middle Ages, where some very judicious observations on this subject will be found. Still our endeavours to adjust a multiplier for expressing the real value of a sum in the days of Henry VI. in terms of our present money, or its equivalent value, in commanding commodities in the present day, are attended with difficulties—1. From the difference of opinion which prevails amongst writers on the subject; 2. From the great variations in the price of wheat, taken as a criterion; and 3. In the shifting value of money. In order, therefore, to prove the magnitude of the Duke of Buckingham's income, I would endeavour to show how very much could be effected in different ways at that period with sums of far less amount.

It may be remarked that this income exceeded that of the powerful peer before alluded to, the Duke of Warwick, by some hundreds per annum, and we may compare it with the revenues of the greatest religious houses at the Dissolution.

Whilst thus engaged, we must never fail to bear in mind Johnson's judicious remark, that "custom, or the different needs of artificial life, make that revenue little at one time which is great at another. Men are rich and poor, not only in proportion to what they have, but what they want." Ascham's pension of 10*l.*, granted him by Henry VIII., reckoning the wants he could supply, and those from which he was exempt, Johnson (seventy years ago) computed at more than 100*l.* a year.

Although a great nobleman at this period had, as we shall presently see, many heavy calls upon his purse, yet people had few *imaginary* wants. Our habits, in this age of luxury, when contrasted with the severe simplicity of ancient times, must differ almost as widely, in some respects, as did those of the inhabitants of the Friendly Islands with the English, when the former were visited by Captain Cook.

[7] Obligingly lent by the Earl of Chichester, at the instance of my friend R. W. Blencowe, Esq.

True it is, that we find, in old inventories, vast quantities of plate the property of individuals—Sir John Fastolfe, for instance, one of the heroes of Agincourt, possessed not less than 13,400 ounces of silver in flagons and other massive articles, and the bed-rooms at Caister were furnished with luxuries which would then, perhaps, be regarded as effeminate ;[8] still, ordinarily, great simplicity prevailed. Carpets were used only as coverings for tables and sideboards ; sometimes for chairs. Hay and rushes served for floors. A few oaken benches and tables, raised on strong tressells, and a pair of andirons or dogs, generally formed the whole inventory of the best furnished apartment.

In the reign of Edward I., says Mr. Hallam—

"An income of 10*l.* or 20*l.* was reckoned a competent estate for a gentleman ; at least the lord of a single manor would seldom have enjoyed more. A knight who possessed 150*l.* per annum passed for extremely rich."[9]

His income was comparatively free from taxation, and its expenditure was lightened by the services of his villeins. Sir John Fortescue speaks of 5*l.* a year as "a fair living for a yeoman," a class whose importance he is not at all inclined to diminish.[1]

Dr. Henry, eighty years ago, observed : —

"It seems to be abundantly evident, that inferior clergymen, yeomen, respectable tradesmen, and others in the middle ranks of life, could have lived as plentifully, in the fifteenth century, on an income of 5*l.* a year, of the money of that age, as those of the same rank can live on ten times that nominal, or five times that real income, that is, on 50*l.* a year, at present.

"The precious metals of gold and silver," he continues, "have indeed greatly increased in Britain since those times ; but we must not therefore imagine, that we are so much richer than our ancestors ; because as these metals increased in quantity, they decreased in value and efficacy."[2]

To proceed with our illustrations. We have particulars of the pay of Edward the Third's army in the twentieth year of his reign. That of the Black Prince was 20*s.* per diem. The sum total is 12,720*l.*, for which, says Barrington,[3] an army and fleet of 31,294 men were to be paid and subsisted for sixteen months.

In the expedition made by John Duke of Norfolk (then

[8] Archæol. vol. xxi. p. 234.
[9] Hallam's Middle Ages, vol. iii. p. 451.
[1] Ibid.
[2] Henry's Hist. Eng., vol. x. p. 273.
[3] Observations on the Statutes, p. 267.

Lord Howard) to Scotland, as Lieutenant and Captain of Edward IV., in 1481, with 3000 landmen and mariners, for sixteen weeks, the payment to each man by the week is computed at xv^{d}. for his wages, and for his vitels xii^{d}. The sum total in "money wages and vitels for sixteen weeks being VM. V^{c}. li."[4] At this time it appears that an ox could be bought for 20*s.* and a load of hay for 5*s.* 4*d.*

In the reign of Henry VII., 120*l.* was held sufficient to found a fellowship.[5]

The whole revenues of the estate given by Margaret, Countess of Richmond, for the foundation of Saint John's College, Cambridge, amounted to 400*l.* per annum only, which was shamefully lessened by Henry VIII. On the fabric of that house were expended 4000*l.* to 5000*l.*, "a round sum in that age," as it is termed,—small as it will strike *us* for collegiate buildings of great extent. At this time 12*d.* per week was allowed in common to a fellow, and 7*d.* to a scholar.[6]

The largest sum ever paid in one year at the shrine of Thomas à Beckett, by as many as 100,000 pilgrims (1420), did not reach one-sixth part of the Duke's income, being only 954*l.* 6*s.* 3*d.*

In 1482, a grocer's shop in Cheapside, then, as now, a main artery of the Metropolis, "with a place above it," (perhaps a warehouse or store for goods), was let by Lord Howard for 4*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* per annum.[7] Lord Howard seems to have taken out the rent, in whole or in part, in groceries.

The vast estates of the Cliffords, in the time of the first Earl of Cumberland (temp. Henry VIII.), in the rich vales of Yorkshire, produced only 1719*l.* per annum.[8]

From marriage settlements we may also gather what were regarded as adequate allowances for members of illustrious families. Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, on his marriage with the Lady Anne, the youngest daughter of Edward IV., settled on the lady, "for sustentation and convenient diet in meat and drink," 20*s.* per week. Also a sum of 51*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.* was to be paid for the wages, diet, and clothing of the following persons—viz., two women, a woman-

[4] Howard Household Books, edited by J. P. Collier, Esq. Preface, p. iv., and p. 9.

[5] Bishop Fisher's Funeral Sermon on the Countess of Richmond and Derby. Preface, p. xlv.

[6] Sermon *ut supra*, preface, p. xlv.

[7] Howard Household Books, preface, p. xxv. and p. 351.

[8] Whitaker's Craven, p. 262.

child, a gentleman, a yeoman and three grooms; seven horses were to be kept at 47*s.* for each horse. The Queen was to find the lady in clothes, and to allow 120*l.* yearly for a certain period.[9]

The second wife of the Shepherd Lord Clifford, who was the daughter of Sir Henry Pudsay, of Bolton, married three times—1st, to Sir Thomas Talbot; 2ndly, Lord Clifford; 3rdly, Richard, third son of Thomas, Marquis of Dorset. Her first jointure, with the Knight, was 10 marks; this was very largely exceeded when she married the Baron, who settled upon her no less than 150*l.* per annum.

The mother of Henry, Lord Surrey (the Lady Elizabeth Stafford), the daughter of the last Duke of Buckingham, on her marriage with the before-named Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, received from her father a fortune of 2000 marks; the jointure settled upon her by her husband's father was 500 marks per annum.[1]

To the talents of this lady, Dr. Nott pays this high tribute of praise—"She was one of the most accomplished persons of the times; the friend of scholars, and the patron of literature."[2]

On the marriage of the Earl of Surrey, his father, the Duke of Norfolk, settled upon him lands yielding 300*l.* per annum. His lady, Lady Frances Vere, brought a fortune of 4000 marks, 200 to be paid on the day of marriage, and the remainder by half-yearly payments of 100 marks. The Duke was to be at the charge of Lord Surrey's clothes, Lord Oxford of those for the Lady Frances.[3]

But we shall probably form the most accurate idea how very much might be effected with a rental of 6000*l.* in the reign of Henry VI., by seeing how far any sum in round numbers (1000*l.* for instance) would go in housekeeping, both in those days and somewhat later.

Take the monastery of Glastonbury, well entitled, both from its splendour and its possessions, to stand foremost, as it does, in Dugdale's Monasticon. Its head had precedence of all the abbots in England until 1154, when that distinction was transferred to Saint Alban's. At the Dissolution, the revenues of this monastery were estimated at 3508*l.*; and what was its state and condition at that period? It was not only a religious house and an asylum for poverty, but it

[9] Nott's Surrey and Wyatt, vol. i. p. vi.
[1] Nott, *ut supra*, p. viii.
[2] Nott's Surrey, Preface, p. viii.
[3] Nott, *ut supra*, p. xxiii.

presented the pleasing picture of a well-disciplined court, where the sons of noblemen and gentlemen were educated. Whiting, the last abbot, whose cruel treatment—his murder we may call it—was equalled only by the bloody deeds of Judge Jefferies in the same part of England in a later age, had himself bred up nearly 300 young men of good birth in the short space of fifteen years, besides others of inferior degree, who were fitted for the Universities. He sometimes entertained 500 persons of rank at one time. On Wednesdays and Fridays all the poor in the neighbourhood were relieved, and when he went abroad he was attended by upwards of 100 persons. Yet this vast household, and this extensive hospitality, with the expenses attached to a great monastic establishment, the due performance of Divine service, the maintenance of buildings, and countless other outgoings, were sustained, as we see, for about 3508*l.* per annum.

To another monastery we will refer, as we have the accounts before us. About 1533 the sum expended at Whalley Abbey, in Lancashire, upon animal food alone was 143*l.* 18*s.* 2*d.*, which multiplied by ten would be equivalent to 1400*l.* of our money, and giving so many pounds of meat to each person (when animal food formed a much larger proportion of diet than at present) would have fed 162 persons daily at the Abbot's table.

Other large monasteries or religious houses were valued at the Dissolution, at the following sums:—

Westminster at 3977*l.* (Speed)—3471*l.* (Dugdale).
Saint Alban's at 2510*l.*
Tewkesbury at 1598*l.*
Sion, the best endowed Nunnery in the kingdom, at 1994*l.*[4]

The vast quantities of food which were furnished from the estates of noblemen and of religious houses, would, of course, materially reduce the cost of maintaining their immense establishments.

Let us next take a review of the expenses of the household of a powerful and wealthy nobleman. By the Northumberland Household Book, it appears that, in 1512 (65 years after the date of this rental), 1000*l.* was annually assigned for keeping the Earl's house. The number of the household was not less than 166 persons; the *weekly* sum to each

[4] Taylor's Index Monasticus, Diocese of Norwich, p. viii.

person being 2*s.* 3¼*d.*, or 6*l.* 0*s.* 5¾*d.* per annum. Bishop Percy computes this sum (taking wheat at 5*s.* 8*d.* per *quarter* in 1512, against 5*s.* per *bushel* in his own time) at 44*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.* for each individual, which, amounting to nearly 7000*l.* per annum, would express to us clearly the abundance and the liberality of the general scale of the Earl's housekeeping.

But large as were the sums actually paid at this period, in a vast establishment, for provisions—for mere eating and drinking—they formed but one item of expenditure.

As additional outgoings we may enumerate :—

1. The *wardrobe* of persons of rank, including the jewellery, furs, chains, velvets, cloth of gold and embroidery. So magnificent and expensive were these, that it has been said, many of the nobles "carried their castles, woods, and farms on their backs."[5] The velvet for a nobleman's robe in the 17 Hen. VIII. is estimated at 1*l.* 11*s.* 8*d.* the yard, the dress amounting to 26*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*, nearly 200*l.* of our money. Black satin at 8*s.* per yard.

The parson's livery at this time cost one mark—13*s.* 4*d.*

2. The wages paid and liveries furnished to a very numerous household.

3. The armoury, horses, and harness, and the carriages required for the removal of the contents of one castle to another. This was a singular feature in the manners of the times, the owners of castles removing from one to another, furnishing each, as it was from time to time required, for their reception.

4. The keeping in repair the castles and dwellings, and the restoration of churches and chapels.

5. Donations in money, or in money's worth, towards the building, rebuilding, or restoration of many of our cathedrals and churches. These were oftentimes granted with a liberality befitting the object. We must gladly advert to the spirit—the large and generous spirit of ancient days, when fortunes were cast into the offerings to God ; when one person would accomplish what, with some splendid exceptions, we now require a society, a town, or parish to undertake. In the twelfth century, on the rebuilding the abbey and church of Croyland, a knight laid one stone, and placed on it 20*l.* ; another knight 10 marks ; his wife and sister

[5] Henry's Hist. Eng., vol. ii. 135.

provided each a stone-cutter to work at their expense for two years; a neighbouring abbot 10*l.*; a baron, with his lady, their eldest son and daughter, placed the four next stones, offering on them the title-deeds of the advowsons of four neighbouring churches. The proceedings at that festival furnish an excellent example for us at the present day.[6] We may add, under this head, the tapestry and other furniture required in a chapel, the lights, altar-cloths, richly embroidered copes, gifts of plate and vestments, and other articles for the services of the church. Also the offerings made to images, and at shrines and tombs.

6. Expenses attending the chase and out-door amusements; payments to huntsmen, falconers, and watermen. "The *mystery* of woods, and the mystery of rivers," were necessary occupations for furnishing the tables, as well as daily sources of amusement.[7]

7. Rewards and costly presents, including the offerings at festivals before spoken of; the payments to silversmiths for *presents*, often appear in household books as disbursements of very large amount.

8. Payments to theatrical servants, "Associations of Players," as they were sometimes called, kept by the aristocracy, or for occasional performances.

Lastly, let us not omit private charities. From the Howard Household Books, printed by the Roxburghe Club, and ably edited by Mr. Payne Collier, already referred to, extending from 1481 to 1483, we find that the private charities of Lord Howard, the first Duke of Norfolk, and his family, were both general and extensive. Few pages, says Mr. Collier, occur in which alms are not recorded, apparently as a necessary part of the household expenditure.[8]

In a subsequent age this good practice continued. Anne, Countess of Pembroke, during her residence at each of her castles, every Monday morning caused 10*s.* to be distributed amongst 20 poor householders of the place, besides the daily alms which she gave at her gates to all that came.[9] A nobleman, as in the case of Lord Howard, often expended no trifling sums in the maintenance of youths at the Universities,

[6] Berington's Literary Hist. of the Middle Ages, p. 216.
[7] Ellis's Specimens of the Early English Poets, vol. i. p. 335.
[8] Household Books, *ut supra*, p. xxv.
[9] Southey's Colloquies, ii. 137.

sometimes paying the whole sum required, sometimes allowing the parents to pay a part of the cost of education, and contributing the rest himself. We may suppose that boys of promising abilities were selected, whose friends were little able to make any allowance or exhibition, and we must agree with Mr. Collier in regarding this as "most beneficial and enlightened liberality."[1]

There is an indorsement on this Roll, which must not be passed over; it is entitled *annuitates*, a list of payments annually made to eighty-four persons, amounting altogether to the sum of 585*l.* 9*s.* 1*d.* It commences with an allowance of 100*l.* to the Duchess Anne, which, if pin money, must have been a liberal allowance. This payment is followed by others to ten knights, varying from 40 marks to 20*l.* To twenty-seven esquires, 10*l.*, 10 marks, and 5*l.*

To Garter King at Arms, 40*s.*

To Buckingham the Pursuivant, 4*l.*

To 4 females, Elisabeth Drury and 3 others, annuities of 20*l.*, 5*l.*, and 5 marks.

To 4 trumpeters, and 15 other persons, annuities of 40*s.*, 5 marks, 4 marks, and 20*s.*

One entry may be noticed, "Thome Tyler, Tegulatori," as a plain proof of the origin of a surname from a trade or occupation.

Amongst the knights and esquires are members of several distinguished families; the larger proportion of them are of Cheshire blood, viz., Mainwaring, Warburton, Hanford, Egerton, Devonport, Venables, Grosvenour, and Donne (Done). This fact I have not been able to account for. The mere possession of Macclesfield Castle could not have led to so intimate a connexion between the Duke and the families of that county. The net revenue received from it is exceedingly small, only 4*l.* 6*s.*

From the border county of Staffordshire the revenue was large, and some few names of ancient families belonging to it are found in the list; Curzon and Basset, for example.

Many of these knights and esquires, if not all, may have been pages or members of the Duke's household.

In the expenses of Whalley Abbey there are gifts to Lord Stanley (6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*), and also to knights, esquires, and gentlemen. For what services, in days of tranquillity, these

[1] Household Books, *ut supra*, p. xxvi.

pensions to gentry could have been conferred, Whitaker remarks, it is not easy to conceive, unless for past services, or that they are given to them in the character of retainers, when those services should be required in a military or civil capacity.

Henry, Earl of Northumberland, in the reign of Henry VII., addressed a brief notice to Sir Randall Pygot, Sir William Stapleton, and five other knights and esquires, "to be ready upon *an ower warning*." These were the Earl's fee'd-men, receiving his wages. When the king made his progress in the north, the Earl met him a little beyond Robin Hood's Stone, with thirty-three knights of his fee'd-men, besides esquires and yeomen.[2]

No feature is more pleasing than the practice which then prevailed, of the English nobility and gentry placing their children as pages in the households of distinguished individuals. In the Lives of the Lindsays, Lord Lindsay has grouped the society at one of the Castles of his ancestors in the fifteenth century, as consisting of the Earl and his immediate family, guests, ladies attendant upon the wife and daughter, pages of noble or gentle birth—these last are described as gentleman-cadets (generally the younger branches of the family, who were attached to its head as servitors or feudal followers)—the Earl's own domestic officers, being gentlemen of quality, chaplains and secretary-chamberlain, marischall and armour-bearer.[3]

Ben Jonson, in his play, "The New Inn," has perhaps given us the best idea of this judicious regulation, when every house became an academy of honour, and tended to supply the existing want of Eton and Westminster, then, perhaps, almost entirely devoted to the education of ecclesiastics:

> "Call you that desperate, which, by a line
> Of institution, from our ancestors,
> Hath been derived down to us, and received
> In a succession, for the noblest way
> Of breeding up our youth, in letters, arms,
> Fair mien, discourses, civil exercise,
> And all the blazon of a Gentleman?
> Where can he learn to vault, to ride, to fence,
> To move his body gracefuller, to speak
> His language purer, or to tune his mind,
> Or manners, more to the harmony of nature,
> Than in these nurseries of nobility?"—BEN JONSON.
>
> *New Inn*, Act i., Scene 1.

[2] Plumpton Correspondence, p. 53. [3] Lives of the Lindsays, vol. i. p. 114.

If the disguised Lord Frampul, in this comedy, gives an accurate picture of Jonson's own days, it would seem that this institution had greatly degenerated, "that the age of Chivalry was gone," and that pages then occupied themselves in low and degrading pursuits.

I pass over any detailed statements regarding other members of this house; but we must shortly notice Henry, the second duke, "high-reaching Buckingham," or, as Richard is pleased to call him, "the petty rebel, dull-brain'd Buckingham."

A dialogue between the King and this dangerous subject, in Shakespeare's Richard III., has erroneously led to the belief that the moiety of the estates of the Earl of Hereford, claimed by Buckingham (who possessed the other part as the descendant of Anne Bohun), was withheld from him. Dugdale, on the contrary, gives us an abstract of the Bill founded on letters patent, "1st of Richard III., for livery of all those lands to the Duke, whereunto he pretended a right by descent from Humphrey de Bohun, sometime Earl of Hereford and Constable of England," together with a schedule of the castles and manors that was affixed to it, the annual value being 1084*l.* 1*s.* 9*d.*

In this bill Richard says, that "his beloved cosyn, Henry, Duke of Buckingham, is the rightful inheritor of such inheritances as were of the same earl."

Here therefore was a clear gift; Richard (says Holinshed) promised "golden hills and silver rivers" to Buckingham,[4] and he apparently fulfilled his promise, but the Duke, perhaps, never enjoyed these estates, as his life was forfeited in the following year.

It is to be observed that Shakespeare does not make the Duke ask for *lands*, but for the earldom of Hereford and the promised "*moveables*."

Now what is meant by this last word may be gathered from various authorities, especially from inventories. There is a most comprehensive list of jewels, apparel and *moveables*, late belonging to the Duke of Norfolk and his accomplished son, given by Mr. Nott from the originals in the Land Revenue Office, of which it is stated that the Protector Somerset, after the death of Henry VIII., retained for himself the lion's share.[5] These must have been of immense value,

[4] Lives of the Lindsays, vol. iii, 416.

[5] Nott's Surrey, vol. i., appendix cx.

and the Duke of Buckingham doubtless felt that though he obtained *honours*, *castles* and *manors*, yet if the *moveables* of the Earl of Hereford were kept back, he was still defrauded of his just rights.

Sad as was his fate, we cannot lament it, as this Duke was the accomplice of some of the blackest crimes committed by Richard III.; and though he was the chief instrument of that monarch's ambition, yet his son himself admits, in the language of Shakespeare, that his noble father, Henry of Buckingham, actually "first rais'd head against usurping Richard."

From one most serious charge I am anxious to vindicate this nobleman, as it must be admitted to rest on very doubtful authority. Carte tells us that the Duke hoped to have been admitted into Richard's presence at Salisbury, designing, *as his son afterwards said*, to have stabbed him with a knife, provided secretly for the purpose.[6] Carte quotes Lord Herbert as his authority. The latter refers to the articles exhibited against the last Duke of Buckingham, grounded on the evidence of his discarded steward or surveyor, Knevet. That base dependant asserted to Wolsey that the Duke would have played the part towards Henry VIII., which his father *intended* to have put in practice against Richard III. at Salisbury. The Scene in Shakespeare's Henry VIII., (Act I., Scene 2) with the dignified rebuke of Queen Katherine to Knevet, when accusing his late master, will immediately recur to my readers.

The whole charge, therefore, appears to rest upon the testimony of one who betrayed his master, and who only received the report second-hand, and Lord Herbert adds, "how far these particulars were proved, and in what sort, my authors deliver not."[7]

The reasons that prompted Duke Henry to take arms against his former friend and ally are not clearly stated. Richard and the Duke separated at Gloucester, More says, "in the most loving and trusty manner," and the Duke went to Brecknock "loaded with rich gifts and high behests." Sir James Macintosh is mistaken in his conjecture that no share in the spoils followed a share in the guilt; for though he obtained not all that he required, yet riches and honours, as

[6] Carte's Hist. Eng., vol ii. p. 814; vol. iii. p. 40.
[7] See Buck's Rich. III.; Kennett's Hist. Eng., vol. i. p. 530.

we have seen, were showered upon the head of Buckingham by Richard in no sparing measure.[8] Possibly Richard may have waded further into blood than the Duke expected; or, as a descendant of Edward III., Buckingham might have wished to hurl Richard from a throne stained with the blood of his brother's children. Friendship, if it ever existed between these two men, was turned to hate. As regarded Buckingham, discontent and envy ripened into conspiracy and rebellion. More says, "He was an high-minded man, and could ill bear the glory of another."[9] Shakespeare gives him, in his last hours, an accusing conscience—

"O let me think on Hastings,"

in whose destruction he had concurred.

The last days of the Duke's life will remind us of the many similar incidents which occurred to another peer of later days—the Duke of Monmouth. Both had been distinguished by the Royal favour in a more than common measure. Both were weak, vain, and ambitious men. In the rebellions they raised, they were received favourably by the people. Both assumed the title of king. Large rewards in money were in both cases offered for their apprehension;[1] but whether both were betrayed, is, as respects Monmouth, not very clear. The same privations and necessities were experienced by both, the once powerful Buckingham being, when captured, disguised as a countryman digging in a grove, and the Duke of Monmouth being found concealed in furze bushes. The Duke of Buckingham was hurried to the scaffold without the form of trial; the Duke of Monmouth suffered by virtue of his previous attainder, and without any formal trial by his brother peers.[2]

To carry on the parallel one step further—the two monarchs, against whom these peers had combined, were severally hurled from their thrones soon after their subjects had paid the penalty of their own misdeeds.

Lord Bagot has, in the 25th Vol. of the Archæologia, given an interesting record connected with Edward the third and last duke, in whom it may be remembered the post of Lord High Constable of England, for several ages hereditary in the family of the Bohuns, became extinct.

[8] Kennett's Hist. Eng., vol. ii. p. 41.
[9] Turner's Hist. Eng., vol. iii. p. 500.
[1] £1000 for Buckingham, Carte, ii, 814.
[2] Rapin, vol. iii. p. 749.

The Household Book in his lordship's possession extends over seven months of one year (27th Hen. VII.), and shows the Duke's expenditure in London, at Thornbury, and on journeys to and from London and Gloucestershire; everything is stated with wonderful exactness as to the price of every article of consumption for man and beast, and the quantities of each article consumed.

In this year (1507) was celebrated the Feast of the Epiphany at Thornbury Castle by a party of 459, of whom 134 were gentry. The religious services of the day were rendered more impressive by the presence of the Abbot of Kingswood, and the choir consisted of eighteen men and nine boys.[3]

The actual amount of the income of this nobleman, Lord Bagot informs me, he has never yet been able to discover throughout the Stafford MSS. This valuable collection, comprised in 13 folio volumes, is now safely deposited amongst his lordship's archives. The MSS. are of various ages and descriptions. Two cartularies contain copies of deeds, creations of nobility, and other matters of moment.

The eldest son of this last-named duke was Henry Stafford, who was restored in blood, but admitted only to the barony of Stafford in 1547. The great estates, says Camden, writing in 1607, which the Staffords had gained by their honourable marriages, are all fled and scattered, in lieu whereof they enjoy a happy security.

A small provision was granted to this baron out of these immense estates which had been forfeited. Afterwards a grant was made to him of Stafford Castle, but the whole property yielded only the small yearly sum of 317*l.* 13*s.* 1*d.* These were all the possessions which he and his wife had to live upon. He could not sing or say with the good Countess of Pembroke, in her mis-metred lines

> "From many noble Progenitors I hold
> Transmitted lands, castles, and honours which they swayed of old."

Wood speaks of him as a man of great "virtue, learning, and piety," who, in a calm and innocent retirement, endeavoured to avert his mind from his misfortunes by a close application to literature, and in assisting others who were busied in similar employments. At his suggestion, the well-

[3] Archæologia, vol. xxv. p. 323.

known metrical chronicle, "The Mirror for Magistrates," was undertaken, and, through his influence, it was licensed.[4]

Like the Shepherd Lord Clifford, he might have been the happiest of his race, and falling upon quiet times, was enabled, like him, to indulge the peaceful and thoughtful disposition which his early fortunes had produced.

In 1556, Lord Stafford appears to have compiled a catalogue of books remaining in Stafford Castle. In ten years afterwards a very different list of such books as remained was made out—a touching fact, as many of them had doubtless been parted with from necessity. Lord Bagot says, that about this time "the great house of Stafford was fast approaching its end, reduced from powerful princes to the most distressed and needy individuals." The peer whose father, as we have seen, had entertained four hundred and fifty-nine persons at his board, was obliged to part even with his silver spoons to procure actual subsistence. His grandson, Roger Stafford, Sir Harris Nicolas observes, was actually denied the dignity of baron, which he claimed on the death of Henry, the fifth baron, a bachelor, *on the ground of his poverty*, and as he had become the brother-in-law of a joiner, and the uncle of a shoemaker, it would have been a mockery to have encircled his brows with a coronet. Truly

"The bows of the mighty men were broken."

This nobleman, Henry, Baron Stafford, standing, as it were, amidst the ruins which the ambition of his ancestors had caused to be scattered around him, when "considering the days of old, and the years that were past," might yet be thankful that he enjoyed the "happy security" of which Camden speaks, and that, although deprived of the vast wealth, and of the almost unlimited power possessed by his forefathers, his humble and peaceful lot altogether exempted him from the fearful vicissitudes to which they had been subjected.

Had he, indeed, repined at his fate; had he sighed for what Johnson enumerates—

"The golden canopy, the glittering plate,
The regal palace, the luxurious board,
The liv'ried army, and the menial lord,"

[4] Athen. Oxon., I. 264.

the same great man and real poet might, if living, have thus addressed him, and, when we regard his circumstances and his place of residence, not inaptly—

> "Speak thou whose thoughts at humble peace repine,
> Shall Wolsey's wealth, with Wolsey's end be thine?
> Or liv'st thou now, with safer pride content,
> The wisest justice *on the banks of Trent?*
> For, why did Wolsey near the steeps of fate,
> On weak foundations raise th' enormous weight?
> Why but to sink beneath misfortune's blow,
> With louder ruin to the gulphs below?"
>
> *The Vanity of Human Wishes.*

It may be interesting to some readers to have a specimen of the Valor, or Rent-Roll; the following portion of it has therefore been selected, comprising the estates in Holderness, in the county of York, referred to at p. 265.

DOMINIUM DE HOLDERNES.

Preston,—Lelley et Dyke,—Spratley,—Estanwyk,—Burton Pidse,—Skeeling,—Bondbristwyk,—Kaynghám,—Outhorn,—Withornese,—Kilnese,—Esyngton,—Skeftling,—Barowe,—Skipse-maner,—Paulefiete,—Skipse-burgus,—Hedon,—Cleton,—Lanuath,—Moys,—Tainstall,—Dunceley,—Helpston,—Holdernes,—Kaynghám Mersk,—Littel Humbr,—Brustwick,—Berneston,—[1]

Somma Totalis valoris omnium dominiorum, maneriorum, terrarum et tenementorum dictorum infra dominium predictum, sicut supra continetur, 949*l.* 11*s.* 4½*d.* unde de—

	£	s.	d.
Redd' et firm'	548	15	11½
Exit' Husbond'	267	6	5¼
Annual' Casual.'	86	8	5
Perquis' Cur.'	47	0	7

Somma Total' deduction' predict' ibidem hoc anno, sicut supra continetur, 118*l.* 0*s.* 9½*d.* unde de—

	£	s.	d.
Redd' resolut'		13	10
Relaxac 'redd' cum decas redd' et firm'	24	16	8½
Feod,' vad' et stipend' ministrorum	9	14	6
Expen' senescalli cum necessariis	14	3	10
Reparacion' hoc anno	7	11	1
Cust' Husbond' cum stipend' Prepos' et Famulor' ejusdem, reparacion' dom,' maner,' Husbond,' cum emcione bladi et stauri	55	18	3½
Amerc,' et al' casual' posit' in respect'	3	8	8
Decima Herbag' solut.'	1	13	10½

Et valet ultra hoc anno.—831*l.* 10*s.* 7*d.*—Inde Deduct' in Feod' et vad' diversor'

[1] I am indebted to the kindness of Sir Charles Anderson, Bart., who, on comparison of this list with the names of places in Holderness, as given in Poulson's History, remarks that the existing names closely correspond with the above, with some slight variations, such as Sproutley, Elstanwick, Burstwick, &c. Moys is now written Meaux. Barrowe may be Barrow on Humber, in Lincolnshire. In a MS. at Burton Constable, in the possession of Sir Clifford Constable, Lord Paramount of Holderness, Sir Charles finds Bond, Burstwick, Lambthorpe, Hildeston, and Marisc, possibly identical with Lanwath, Helpston, and Mersk, in the list above given. Dunceley in that record may be Nun-keeling, and Cleton may be Carleton.

Officiar,' cum salario cappellani, et in expens' senesc,' Rec' et Aud' allocat' in compoto Receptoris ibidem, hujus anno, ut patet ibidem, 46*l.* 4*s.* 7½*d.*

Et valet ultra onera anual' hoc anno, 785*l.* 7*s.* 11½*d.* Inde Deduct' in annuitat' Johannis Constable, armigeri, 10*l.*, Roberti Danby 2*l.*, et Thome Berston 10 marc., eisdem per dominum concess,' ut patet per comp' Receptoris predictum, 15*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*

Et valet ultra hoc anno—769*l.* 19*s.* 3½*d.* Inde Deduct' in reparacion' ibidem hoc anno fact,' et in dicto compoto recept' allocat' (14*l.* 3*s.* 1*d.*) et respectuat' (15*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.*) cum expens' for' et necessariis (6*s.* 8*d.*) ut patet in eodem compoto. —32*l.* 12*s.* 1*d.*

Et valet ultra hoc anno clare—737*l.* 7*s.* 2½*d.* qui faciunt in marc' 1106 marc' —6½*d.*

ADDITIONAL PARTICULARS FOR THE BIOGRAPHY OF THREE OXFORDSHIRE WRITERS,

GEFFREY OF MONMOUTH, WALTER MAP, ARCHDEACON OF OXFORD, AND ALEXANDER DE SWERFORD.

COMMUNICATED TO THE HISTORICAL SECTION, AT THE MEETING OF THE INSTITUTE AT OXFORD,

BY SIR THOMAS PHILLIPPS, BART., F.R.S., F.S.A., &c.

MANY who, in past ages, made themselves conspicuous either by their actions or their writings, lay under great disadvantage, because their deeds before the invention of printing, were mentioned in few books, sometimes probably only in one, and therefore the knowledge of them was liable to be destroyed by a single accident.

Moreover, their exploits or works having been recorded in characters which have grown obsolete with the lapse of time, the knowledge of their reputation was confined to those only who were capable of reading those characters.

Therefore, all the events, which can throw additional light upon their history, should be collected together, and made accessible to the public by printing;—it becomes even a duty in those, who discover such facts, to make them known. With this persuasion, the following memorials of the lives of three celebrated writers connected with Oxfordshire, collected from the Godstow Cartulary, are presented to the Archaeological Institute.

Their names are, Geffrey Artur, generally called Geffrey of Monmouth, author of the "Historia Britonum:" Walter Map, author of "Lampoons against the Cistercians," a new monastic order which had sprung up a little before his time; and Alexander de Swerford, supposed to be the author of the work entitled "De Scaccario."

Geffrey Artur stands first in priority of time; partly