

THOMAS LORD MORLEY (d. 1416) AND THE MORLEYS OF HINGHAM

by Colin Richmond, B.A., D.Phil., F.R.Hist.S.

SUMMARY

The role of Thomas, Lord Morley (d. 1416) in the naval preparations for the relief of the siege of Harfleur is examined by means of a surviving account roll. His income from landed property is then calculated at about £400 p.a. on the basis of near-contemporary documents, notably the scattered but complex early- and mid-15th century estate accounts of his immediate successors in Norfolk, Hertfordshire and Essex, particularly of Isobel, Dowager Lady Morley (d. 1464), his grandson's widow.

Among the Stafford Papers at the Staffordshire Record Office is a damaged paper roll of the expenses of the Norfolk nobleman Thomas Lord Morley. It covers the important events in the last year of his life, his participation in the dramatically successful relief of Harfleur, and his death.

1416 was almost as remarkable a year as its predecessor. There is no need to recite again the English naval and diplomatic triumphs. That was done as early as 1417 by the author of the *Gesta Henrici Quinti*,¹ and exhaustively by James Wylie in Chapters XLIV and XLIX of *The Reign of Henry V*.² The account of the expenses of Thomas Lord Morley's preparations for naval action which included the raising of a £300 loan from John Hende, a London merchant, to pay for them,³ does, however, a little increase our knowledge of the naval activity preceding the English victory off Harfleur on 15 August. It also tells us a good deal about the fitting out of a ship for an expedition, and adds to what we know of Lord Morley's death at Calais on 24 September.

It reveals nothing of Lord Morley himself.⁴ He was over seventy in 1416, yet nevertheless on 6 July was appointed admiral of those vessels which had gathered at London and which were now to sail to and reassemble at Southampton.⁵ This was the prelude to the whole fleet's sailing across the channel and the result of months of naval preparation and naval activity; since the middle of March both had been furious.⁶ Lord Morley and his servants, as the first date mentioned in the account indicates, were busy at London from 21 March or thereabouts. Indentures for service (to begin at Southampton on 22 June) were sealed between the government and more than a hundred captains on 30 May.⁷ Lord Morley's indenture, if there ever was one, has not survived, but among the issues of money to retinue leaders recorded under 6 June he received £291.⁸ Over £400 had already been distributed by the government on sailors' wages at London, as well as £1600 for the same purpose at other ports; a further 1000 marks had been spent on their victuals.⁹

The first intended date of the operation's gathering at Southampton, the end of June, was deferred, perhaps because of the appearance in the Channel after the middle of the month of the Genoese carracks hired by the French, as well as owing to the usual administrative and logistical delays. Rescheduled to sail from the port at the end of June,¹⁰ the London vessels finally got away only after Morley's appointment on 6 July; they sailed round into the Channel with an increased complement of soldiers aboard, as the French and Genoese had raided the Isle of Wight and were threatening Southampton.¹¹ By then the expedition's sailing date for Harfleur had been reset for the end of July. The Duke of Bedford was appointed its commander on 22 July.¹² On 24 July 1000 marks was issued

by the Exchequer for the wages of sailors 'apud le Cambre',¹³ at the Camber off Winchelsea, where one part of the fleet was assembling; this 1000 marks (in gold), as Sir Walter Hungerford, appointed admiral under Bedford on 26 July,¹⁴ testified, was duly taken out of its bag (sealed with the king's signet) on 1 August at Winchelsea to pay the sailors.¹⁵ Bad weather and perhaps another Franco-Genoese descent¹⁶ prevented the Southampton contingent getting away until 10 August.¹⁷ The entire fleet rendezvoused off Beachy Head and then crossed to the Seine estuary where it arrived in the evening of 14 August.¹⁸ The battle was fought next day. Was Thomas Lord Morley there?

There is not watertight evidence of Lord Morley's being at the battle, the *Gesta* apart. The appointment of Hungerford on 26 July may have been in place of Morley, whose powers under the commission of 6 July were only to run until his arrival at Southampton.¹⁹ Thus, he was admiral of a regional fleet, composed of ships which had gathered at London, of ships from ports between London and Southampton, and of any vessels from northern ports met with as he conducted that fleet on its voyage from London to Southampton. Once there his service and his responsibility as a commander ceased. Was *that*, therefore, 'the voyage' of the account? From the extent of the preparations which the account reveals, hardly. Surely Lord Morley and his ship sailed off with the others to Harfleur in early August. Yet, as the account tells us, for some weeks, three probably, between 7 July and 23 August he was riding about Norfolk. He cannot, therefore, have done both, that is, have sailed with the London ships round to Southampton *and* have been with them still at the battle of Harfleur on 15 August. As the account states that he went from London to Southampton on 23 August it looks as if he had done the former (for which task, after all, he had been appointed), and then gone into Norfolk. He was either still there or in London when the news of the victory off Harfleur arrived.

The news of Bedford's victory reached Henry V, who was in Kent, on 21 August²⁰ just two days before (so our account tells us) Lord Morley left London for Southampton.²¹ Henry was at Canterbury with the Emperor Sigismund, who had been in England since 1 May and who was now returning to the continent. The treaty of friendship between the two sovereigns had been sealed at Canterbury on the day of the battle. Sigismund crossed from Dover to Calais on 25 August; Henry followed him from Sandwich on 4 September; their diplomacy, which here involved also the King of France and the Duke of Burgundy, continued until mid-October. By then, however, both King and Emperor had attended the funeral in St. Mary's Church at Calais of Thomas Lord Morley.²²

The account informs us of Thomas's movements in the last month of his life. Having left London for Southampton on 23 August, he was at Southampton until 11 September when he went to Winchelsea. On 15 September William Garneys, Morley's righthand man, probably his cofferer, certainly the accountant of these expenses, left him to go to London and thereafter to go to Norfolk; Thomas then crossed to Calais²³ and died on 24 September.²⁴ News of his master's illness quickly reached William Garneys who was probably at his home at Geldeston, which lay just across the county boundary from Beccles in Suffolk. William set off for Calais on 2 October. He was at Dunwich that night, at Ipswich the next, at Chelmsford the next, and at London on 5 October. He stayed there on business for a couple of days (having then surely learnt of his master's death) before crossing from Dover to Calais. Many of his remaining expenses concerned the return of Thomas's body to Norfolk for its burial in the Austin Friars at Norwich.²⁵ The body returned via Yarmouth; William Garneys via Sandwich.

We do not know when, as the account is torn away at this point; whatever followed is lost.

The account itself comes from a small collection of Morley documents in the Jerningham Papers (which themselves are to be found among the Stafford Papers) at the Staffordshire Record Office at Stafford.²⁶ The handful of other documents are estate accounts for a scatter of places over a scatter of fifteenth-century dates; Hingham and Buxton for 4-6 Henry VI, Aldeby for 5-6 Henry VI, Walkern (Herts) for 10-11 Henry VI, Foulsham for 35-36 Henry VI, the hundred of Eynesford for 39 Henry VI – 1 Edward IV. These, in conjunction with the fragmentary series of estate accounts for Hingham at the Norfolk Record Office at Norwich,²⁷ and the two stray accounts for Walkern and Great Halingbury (Essex) in the Hertfordshire Record Office at Hertford,²⁸ add a little more to our knowledge of Thomas Lord Morley.

For instance, they do not suggest that H. L. Gray's estimate of the landed income of the Lords Morley at £600 is an undervaluation; quite the reverse; they suggest that it is an inflation. In 1436 Isobel dowager Lady Morley's dower interest was assessed at £200, and the value of property in the control of the feoffees of Thomas, late Lord Morley (our Thomas not his grandson, Isobel's recently deceased husband) was put at £100. To these *actual* assessments Professor Gray added £300 as *his* estimate of the value of the lands of the heir, Robert Lord Morley, a minor whose wardship and marriage had been sold by the crown in February 1436 for 800 marks.²⁹

We begin with the dowager Lady Isobel. As might be anticipated of a daughter of Michael de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk, she was an important lady in East Anglia until her death in 1467. She had outlived her husband by thirty-two years, her only son by twenty-five years. She had never remarried. Her will is an outstanding example of the discerning piety of the age.³⁰ Her household was also a model of manners, at any rate for the Pastons.³¹ Between her and John Paston there was once a difference about a relief she claimed was owing her from Sparham; John resisted her claim. Margaret reported to John:

'Sche seyde sche had sett zw so many days to a-kord wyth here and ze had broke them that sche was ryth wery ther-of; and sche seyde sche was but a woman, sche must don be here cownseyl, and here cownseyle had avysed here, and so sche seyde sche wyld do'.³²

As John Heydon and William Jenny were two of her councillors,³³ John Paston was not likely to have got away with not paying what he owed.

The document, which informs us of Lady Isobel's income, is, however, neither at Stafford or Norwich but in the British Library.

It is an account of William Stather, *clericus denariis domine* (clerk of the lady's moneys), for 1463-4.³⁴ Isobel lived that year in the house of her son-in-law John Hastings esquire at Elsing or Gressenhall, and contributed £80 to the cost of her stay.³⁵ John had married her daughter Anne. Their son, Sir Hugh Hastings, who returned to the family's Yorkshire base, was an influential and powerful follower of Richard III.³⁶ Lady Isobel left him a plain standing cup of gilt in 1467. But there had been a Hastings-Morley connection before this one. Our Thomas Lord Morley had married, as his second wife, Anne, widow of Sir Hugh Hastings, and had supported Sir Hugh's son (*his* stepson), Sir Edward Hastings, in his unsuccessful suit against Reynold Lord Grey of Ruthin over the right to bear the arms of the Hastings family; what was at stake was the inheritance of the main branch of the Hastings family which had come to an end in 1389.³⁷

The account of 1463-4 also shows that Lady Isobel was on good terms with her de la Pole nephew, John Duke of Suffolk, who even came to see her; he was to be the supervisor of her will a few years later. However, our principal purpose is not with the discharge side of the account but with the charge where William Stather recorded the revenues of the properties Lady Isobel held (and had held for nearly thirty years) in dower.³⁸ From Aldeby she had £42, from Hockering £37, from Swanton Morley (or Swanton Worthing) £46, from Foulsham £19, from the hundred of Eynesford (including the military fee associated with it) £17; total (from these sources) £161.³⁹ The accounts at Stafford suggest that from Aldeby in 1463-4 Isobel did well, whereas from Foulsham she did poorly. In 1426-7 Aldeby was worth, on the roughest calculation from this single and complicated account, about £25 to its lord, then Thomas Lord Morley, the grandson of our Thomas Lord Morley.⁴⁰ Foulsham in 1456-7, on the other hand, was worth about £30 to Lady Isobel, and in fact nearly £29 was delivered to her and to her Receiver General, Robert Pynnes.⁴¹ So far as the hundred of Eynesford is concerned, an account of 1460-1461 at Stafford, as might perhaps be anticipated from its date, shows that the £17 Isobel received in 1463-4 was only a pound or two less than she would have expected: in 1460-61 the farm of the hundred was £18 and £18 was what was handed over to her, William Stather and Robert Pynnes, the Receiver General; besides that, there was the military fee accounted for by a bailiff; he handed on to Robert Pynnes a little less than £2.⁴² It seems clear, therefore, that in Lady Isobel's case the valuation of the tax assessors of 1436 was not too wide of the mark: £200 was about what her landed income may have been in that year. It seems to have been less a quarter of a century later: about £170 per annum. It also appears likely that she was one of those many late medieval widows who benefitted from what the late K. B. McFarlane called their husbands' 'pure affection or uxoriousness'.⁴³ She was holding more than a third part of the Morley estates, in fact half of them – five 'properties' all in Norfolk (Aldeby, Hockering, Swanton Morley, Foulsham and the hundred of Eynesford) out of a total of ten – the outstanding five being Great Halingbury, Walkern, and Hingham, Buxton and the hundred of Forehoe, Norfolk.⁴⁴ Moreover (and to anticipate), the revenue they produced was about half of the total landed income of the Morleys.⁴⁵ Her birth may also have had something to do with their generosity; she came from a greater family than they did, and although she was no heiress she was, to some degree, marrying beneath her. Swanton Morley was indeed her jointure, settled on her and her husband Sir Thomas, his grandson and heir, by our Thomas Lord Morley in 1403.⁴⁶ That it was a match Thomas wanted is evident from the fact that if Isobel were to die Sir Thomas was to marry her sister Elizabeth.⁴⁷ On the other hand, of course, the Earl of Suffolk was marrying off one of his many daughters to the heir of a respectable noble (and local) family. What sort of marriage portion did he have to give?

In that settlement of 1403 Thomas Lord Morley required his feoffees after his death to deliver all his other lands to Sir Thomas and Isobel, all, that is, save Hingham and Buxton and the hundred of Forehoe out of which 2000 marks were to be raised to pay his debts and fulfil his bequests. These, therefore, were the estates which were still under the feoffees' control in 1436 when their value was set at £100 by the tax assessors. Once more the assessors' valuation turns out to be tolerably accurate, for John Pelle, the Receiver General's account of Hingham, Buxton and the hundred of Forehoe for *two* years, 1425-7, at Stafford, lists his receipts from Hingham at £93 (£38 the first year, £55 the second), from Buxton at £101 (£65 the first year, £36 the second) and from the hundred of

Forehoe at £26.13.4d. (£13.6.8d. being received from its farmer in each of the two years).^{4 8}

The short series of Hingham accounts in the Norfolk Record Office enable us to decide which is the closest approximation to its usual annual value: £38 or £55. There is no such help for the even wider discrepancy at Buxton (£65 and £36); as, however, John Pelle recorded a payment of £20 to the dowager Lady Anne Morley for the year 1425-6 (she died in October 1426) out of Buxton for her dower, *pro dote sua*,^{4 9} we are entitled to assume its annual value was about £60. The Hingham discrepancy is also connected with the Lady Anne: she held a third of the manor in dower and thus John Pelle in 1425-6 received the revenues of only two-thirds, whereas in 1426-7 he received the revenues of the whole estate. We can be certain of this as at Norwich the Hingham account for the year 1426-7 survives and liveries to John Pelle of £55 are there duly recorded.^{5 0} Moreover, we can be sure that the account for 1426-7 is of the whole estate because there are a number of Hingham accounts between 1419 and 1426 of the third in the hands of the Lady Anne,^{5 1} one of 1420-21 of the other two-thirds,^{5 2} and two later accounts (of 1432-3 and 1452-3) of the whole property.^{5 3}

The dowager Lady Anne's third of Hingham was valued in a memorandum at the close of the 1402-21 account of the feoffee's two-thirds: *valet hoc anno claro* £29 precisely.^{5 4} Its value was also noted at the close of her own accounts of 1421-2, at £26.2.0.;^{5 5} of 1423-4, at £25.12.8.;^{5 6} and of 1425-6, at £25.0.1.^{5 7} Its value would appear to have been declining. During these early years of the 1420s Lady Anne actually received in liveries between £11 and £29, the unusually little £11 in the last year of her life, 1425-6.^{5 8} Arrears at £9 in 1419-20 had risen to £31 in 1425-6, but this may have been a 'natural' phenomenon in the last years of an old lady's life. At any rate, arrears on the account for the re-integrated estate in 1426-7 were recorded at less than £3;^{5 9} but that does not tell us whether the £31 had been written off or paid off. So much for Lady Anne's third, worth to her probably about £25 a year during the ten years that she enjoyed it between 1416 and 1426. It seems, in fact, to have been more than a third in value.

The account of 1420-21 for the other two-thirds, for instance, with a charge of £47, ordinary expenses and allowances of £15, and liveries of £32, suggests that *their* value was nearer £40 than the £50 they 'ought' to have been.^{6 0} The later accounts for the entire estate suggest this too.

That for 1426-7, when (as we have seen) liveries to the Receiver General were £55, and when the warrior Lord Thomas Morley visited in February (for a week) and in August, had a charge – excluding the arrears of £2 – of £94; expenses – including the 3d. a day wages for the warrener for two years – were heavy at £25, but more importantly the profits of courts in this year of a new lord were more than double what they were to be in the years of the two later surviving accounts, while profits of the manor were also more than twice as much as they were in those two other years in the 1430s and 1450s. Thus, the charge in 1426-7 was, I think we may say unusually, augmented.^{6 1}

In 1432-3 the charge less arrears was £73; arrears were £29. In 1452-3 the charge less arrears was £69; arrears were £7.^{6 2} Running expenses and various allowances came to £12 in 1432-3, and a visit of eleven days during Lent by Thomas Lord Morley, Isobel his wife, Sir Robert Clifton and Oliver Gros esquire cost another £4.^{6 3} In 1452-3 estate expenses and allowances came to only £8,

but Sir Andrew Ogard was paid £40 on the lord's warrant and he had further costs for riding from Rotherfield to London and from Hingham to 'Erdebury iuxta Coventry' in February 1454, the month in which the accounts were audited.⁶⁴ Liveries in 1432-3 were £48. In 1452-3 they were no more than £19,⁶⁵ but we have to bear in mind Sir Andrew Ogard's £40.

At approximately what figure, therefore, do these accounts of the whole estate – a mere three of them from three different decades – indicate that we should locate its annual value? At less than the £75 the £25 per annum Lady Anne's third of the 1420s points to, it seems. We are surely nearer the actual value of Hingham in the 1430s with an estimate of £60.

If our valuation of Hingham at £60, the same sum that we have set for Buxton, is anywhere near correct, then together with the hundred of Forehoe at £13.6.8., these estates (*if* they were the properties in the feoffee's control in 1436) were worth a little more than the £100 the tax assessors valued them at in that year. Yet not much more. Moreover, as the assessors tended to undervalue and we have tended to overvalue, the real worth of these lands to the Morleys was no doubt somewhere between the assessor's £100 and our £133.

We are left with Great Halingbury and Walkern. For Great Halingbury there are no accounts at Stafford. There is one for Walkern of 1431-2. It is a joint account of the farmer of the manor and the custodian of the park. The farm of the manor was £25; agistment in the park and sales of wood amounted to £12. The expense of getting that wood and maintaining the park fence came to just over £1; Thomas Lord Morley stayed a day and a night on his return to Norfolk from parliament at Westminster at Michaelmas 1431 at a cost of just under £1,⁶⁶ and the parker's fee and a reward for the custodian came to £4. Delivered to John Pelle the Receiver General were £29.⁶⁷

Another copy of this account of Walkern for 1431-2 has also survived; it is at the Hertfordshire Record Office: an unlucky and unlikely duplication.⁶⁸ The other Walkern account there is for two years, 1427-1429.⁶⁹ It reveals a similar situation, as we might anticipate from their proximity in time, to that shown by the 1431-2 account. The farm and the farmer were the same, wood sales and agistment were £9 in each of the two years; the lodge *extra motum infra parcum* was repaired under John Pelle's supervision at a cost of £1; the parker's fee and custodian's reward came to £4 per annum, and liveries were £26 each year. There was an additional expense: the annual fee of £3.6.8. (for his being retained on the lord's council) of the successful lawyer and civil servant John Hotoft of not too distant Knebworth – since 1423 treasurer of the Royal Household. Hotoft pastured his animals in Walkern Park in 1428-9, and had not paid the £2 he owed for doing so; perhaps it was a debt to be overlooked.⁷⁰

On the dorse of the Walkern accounts at Hertford are accounts of Great Halingbury for the two years 1427-1429,⁷¹ and for 1431-2.⁷² Here we have been luckier: in the course of 1428-9 Thomas Herman, the farmer, fled *extra patriam* and the subsequent valuation and sale of his crops and chattels tell us a little about an estate which otherwise is no more than a set of figures. Thomas's flight caused a stir. There was much riding to and fro. Thomas Fanham, the Halingbury parker, rode to Norfolk and to London to discuss matters with Thomas Lord Morley; the Halingbury parson rode with him into Norfolk; John Pelle, the Receiver General, had to make the journey the other way in order to put things straight, and at Michaelmas 1429 Lord Morley himself arrived, though this perhaps was not as a direct consequence of the defaulting Thomas Herman. He had left

manorial buildings in disrepair, yet, as Thomas Fanham spent less than thirty shillings in setting them to rights, this can hardly have been the cause of Thomas Herman's unexpected departure; unexpected too because his annual farm of £32 for the manor was no more than £6 in arrears. However, Lord Morley was put to the expense of litigation with John Carpenter, the chief executor of no less a Londoner than Richard Whittington, and with one Robert Mildenhall; they sued him after Thomas Herman's departure. For what one would like to know. Was it transactions with these two men which had led to his flight?

Behind him Thomas left 30 acres sown with wheat, 30 acres with barley, 19 acres with oats, and 15 acres with pease. These crops were sold for £21. His eight horses fetched £3.11.0., and his unstated number of cows were bought by the same man who had purchased the crops for £2.13.4. A boar, three swine, five piglets, twenty-six geese, and a plough were sold for fifteen shillings, and a 'qwerne' was bought by Peter Baron who would shortly take on the farm of the demesne, for three shillings. A plough harness and other farming equipment, valued at 2s.4d., remained unsold, and a quantity of pots and plans valued at four shillings, was retained for use in the lodge at Halingbury. Thomas Fanham, busy also at collecting rents, and John Pelle seem quickly and efficiently to have sorted out and set the estate in order; the dislocation caused by Thomas Herman's going was not great.

Within two years, in 1431-2, Halingbury was much as it had been in 1427-8. There was one change. Thomas Herman had leased the manor – collecting the tenants' rents and taking the profits of the court. In 1431-2 Thomas Fanham, parker in 1427-8 and parker still in 1431-2, collected those rents and accounted for the profits of the court, as well as continuing to supervise wood sales and agistment in the park, while Peter Baron leased the demesne farm, including presumably the hundred or so arable acres Thomas Herman had had under crop in 1428-9. This change appears to have brought about no alteration in the revenue Thomas Lord Morley drew from Halingbury. In 1427-8 Herman's farm had been £32; a tenement separately let to Thomas Fanham, wood sales and agistment in the park added another £4 to that. In 1431-2 Peter Baron's demesne lease was £11, rents – including those of pasture and meadow at £2 – were £25, the profits of the court were £3 and wood sales and agistment also came to £3. There were, of course, a few more expenses in 1431-2. In 1427-8 there had been only Thomas Fanham's fee of £3. In 1431-2 he seems in addition to have received a reward of £1. His other expenses in the park and at the court amounted to five shillings, and allowances on rent came to fourteen shillings, while Peter Baron was allowed £1 *pro vestura sua de liberata domini* (for his clothing of the lord's livery). Liveries in 1427-8 totalled £33; in 1431-2 they were £30.

We can sum up. Professor Gray was astray in estimating the income of the Lords Morley at £600 in 1436. The tax assessors were more accurate in their estimates. £200 for the dowager Isobel Lady Morley is more than the records available to us suggest she is likely to have received in any year down to her death in 1467, but as we almost certainly have less evidence than they had we dare not say they *overvalued* her landed estate.⁷³ £100 for the annual income of lands in feoffees' hands our one account of ten years previously for Hingham, Buxton and the hundred of Forehoe suggests is about right, though it may tend towards *underestimation*.⁷⁴ Of the two remaining Morley properties Walkern in distant Hertfordshire, but convenient for London, was worth around £32 a year clear, and Great Halingbury in Essex, around £35.⁷⁵ Thus, £400 a year not £600 would appear to be the likely clear landed income of our Thomas Lord Morley.⁷⁶

There is one further document at Stafford which seems to confirm this conclusion. It is an indenture, once attached to his 1425-27 account for Hingham and Buxton and dated 30 September 1426, whereby John Pelle, the Receiver General, attests his 'superplusage' for the accounting year 1425-6.⁷⁷ The 'superplusage' amounted to £363. It then states his 'superplusage' as Custodian of Lord Morley's household: £88. And it then sums them correctly at £451. Whatever the nature of his favourable balance as the household's accountant, whether or not, for example, he had from Lord Morley revenues other than landed ones, does not concern us: we are examining land revenues only, that is, those he accounted for as Receiver General. Thus, the figure of £363 which he described as 'superplusage' for 1425-6, whatever he precisely meant by that term, is surely some sort of guide to what at that time he was annually receiving from the Morley landed estate.

Or is it? Showing how complicated financial records are, and how easily self-deception may become part of the exercise of trying to use them, the last sentence of the indenture reads, *versus que quidem superplusage habet creditores ut patet in billa indenta huic annexa* (against which superplusage, however, he has creditors as appears in the indented bill annexed hereto). Luckily (and unusually) the schedule of John Pelle's creditors is still attached; its heading tells us that he stood indebted to them as both (or as either) Receiver General and Custodian of the Household. His debts were about £265.

John Hende's name is not on this list; we must suppose, therefore, that these are not *our* Lord Morley's creditors – whom anyway we know John Pelle was separately dealing with *via* the revenues of Hingham and Buxton⁷⁸ – and that, therefore, the range and degree of debt represented by this list are so to speak normal to the running of the financial affairs of a minor English nobleman of the first half of the fifteenth century. 'Debt' is after all entirely the wrong word. The sums on this list are merely those owed on 30 September 1426. If we subtract them (at £265) from John Pelle's total 'superplusage' (at £451) the result is a more-than-Macawberishly healthy one. There are, however, some names on the list which at least remind us of Thomas Lord Morley in 1416: Thomas Wright of London, 'peyntour', for instance, and the two saddlers of London, one of them 'ad capud pape in Lumbardstrete'. Other names are of men he certainly knew – Sir Thomas Erpingham and Richard Drew, for example, were feoffees of his⁷⁹ – or may have known – William Paston,⁸⁰ who was owed £27, more than anyone else on the list.

William Paston survives for us as much more than a mere name: Thomas Lord Morley does not. The account referred to at the beginning of this paper, while not telling us more about him, does at least serve to remind us that behind the handful of conventional details which survive for the men of his class and type there was an individual. By 1416, after a life spent in war and politics – for a man who had been taken by the Norfolk Commons in 1381 and who had supervised the execution of the Earl of Arundel in 1397 cannot be said to have avoided the latter – Thomas Lord Morley, for all we know, may have been a greater, even a wiser character than that other old Norfolk warrior whom we do know well, Sir John Fastolf.

May 1984

¹ Ed. Frank Taylor and John S. Roskell (Oxford Medieval Texts 1975).

² Cambridge, 1914-1929.

³ For John Hende, London draper, twice mayor, and alderman, see Sylvia L. Thrupp, *The Merchant Class of Medieval London* (Ann Arbor paperback, 1962), p. 349. He was perhaps an Essex connection of Thomas Lord Morley's, as their estates in that county were not far from each other. John Hende, as Morant says, was 'a very rich man'; he left £1000 in cash to his wife, £1500 in cash to each of his sons, both named John. He rebuilt St. Swithuns in Candlewick Street, London, the parson of which church appears in our account as active in helping secure Lord Morley's loan from him: see Philip Morant, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Essex* (1768), vol. two, p.155; John Stow, *A Survey of London* ed. C. L. Kingsford (1908, repr. 1971), vol. one, p.223; and footnote 48 below.

⁴ For whom see *The Complete Peerage* ix, pp.216-7.

⁵ *C.P.R. 1416-22*, p.36. He was granted letters of protection the following day: PRO C81/1130/27.

⁶ *C.P.R. 1413-16*, p.415, and for thereafter the summary account in R. A. Newhall, *The English Conquest of Normandy 1416-1424*, (Yale, 1924), pp.22-33.

⁷ PRO E101/48/10.

⁸ PRO E403/624.

⁹ PRO E403/624, under 27 May.

¹⁰ See *London Letter Book I*, ed. R. R. Sharpe, pp.152, 161-2; the king left London for Southampton on 26 June.

¹¹ Newhall, p.30; Wylie, p.351. The payment of a special reward to these men at arms and archers who had composed the guard on the London vessels was recorded under 18 July: PRO E403/624.

¹² *C.P.R. 1416-22*, p.38. He was commissioned to take the muster of the fleet on 25 July (*ibid.*, p.81). The king left Southampton for London on 26 July.

¹³ PRO E403/624.

¹⁴ *C.P.R. 1416-22*, p.39. However, from the one reference to him in our account, he was active before that date.

¹⁵ Sir N. H. Nicolas, *A History of the Royal Navy* (1847), vol. two, p.149, footnote h.

¹⁶ Wylie, p.357; Newhall, p.29, footnote 144.

¹⁷ This is the day on which the Exchequer considered Bedford's service at sea to have begun: PRO E403/624, under 3 September.

¹⁸ *Gesta*, p.145.

¹⁹ *C.P.R. 1416-22*, p.36, cf. the patent roll entry itself: PRO C66/399 m.22.

²⁰ *Gesta*, p. 151.

²¹ He had, I assume, heard the news of the victory and hurried off to welcome the returning English ships and the captured Genoese carracks, which sailed back to Southampton immediately after the battle: *Gesta*, p.149, footnote 3.

²² *Gesta*, p.163.

²³ At about the same time, as the *Gesta* speaks of his illness lasting ten days: *ibid.*

²⁴ His death and funeral service on 26 September coincided with the sighting off Calais of a Genoese carrack, its chase, and valiant though unsuccessful engagement by the Captain of Calais, Richard Beauchamp Earl of Warwick, described in chapter 24 of the *Gesta* and depicted in the *Pageant of the Birth, Life and Death of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, K.G. 1389-1459*, ed. H. A. L. Dillon and W. St. John Hope (1914). It was, therefore, a fitting time for the old soldier to have 'winged his way to heaven', as the *Gesta*, p.163 puts it.

²⁵ William Worcester, *Itineraries*, ed. J. Harvey (Oxford 1969), p.237. They celebrated his obit on 23 September but his *Inquisition Post Mortem* (PRO C138/21/49) has 24 September.

²⁶ The account (Staffordshire Record Office, D.641.3, Cossey 16, temp. no. 479) is a paper roll consisting of 11 surviving folios, each folio 15 inches in length and 6 inches wide, stitched head to foot. The first folio lacks 8 inches, the last 9 inches. It is written in a neat clerkly hand with only a handful of corrections and alterations, some in a different hand. There are a few slight marginal annotations of no importance, also in that second hand. For their generous help over a long period I am grateful to that model of an archivist, the Archivist at Stafford, Freddie Stitt and to his staff, particularly Dr. Margaret O'Sullivan; to Mary Harris, Carolyn Busfield, Dr. Robin Studd, and especially Dr. Peter Jackson.

²⁷ Nine in all between 1405-6 and 1452-3. They are among the Kimberley Estate Records: MAC/B Nos. 2-10.

²⁸ The call numbers of these two fifteenth-century accounts are simply 9378 and 9379. There are another four fourteenth-century account rolls for Walkern alone: 9325, 9345, 9357, 9380.

²⁹ H. L. Gray, 'Incomes from Land in England in 1436', *Eng. Hist. Rev.* XLIX (1934), p.617. The £600 was arrived at by Professor Gray taking Isobel Dowager Lady Morley's assessment of £200 as an actual third (p.613). He has been criticized for so proceeding by T. B. Pugh and C. H. Ross, 'The English Baronage and the Income Tax of 1436', *Bull. Inst. Hist. Res.* XXVI (1953), pp.22-3: "... the simple solution of reaching an arbitrary estimate of the dowager's income from that of the heir (or vice versa) will generally lead to miscalculations", and "It is equally unsafe to attempt (as professor Gray was inclined to do) a 'reconstruction' of the income of the whole barony when the dowager alone was rated for taxation,

during the minority of the heir." The authors seem to assume, however, and in the Roos example they go on to discuss, clearly show, that such 'reconstructions', like most of the actual assessments themselves (see also T. B. Pugh in *Fifteenth Century England 1399-1509*, ed. S. B. Chrimes *et al.* (Manchester, 1972), p. 97 *et. seq.*), are undervaluations of baronial income from land.

³⁰NRO, Norwich Consistory Court, register Jekkys, f. 50 *et seq.* It is excerpted in Blomefield, I, p.671. It deserves (and I hope will receive) consideration elsewhere.

For her importance see *CPR 1452-61*, p100: what 'sclaunderous language the same preest uttred of the kynges hous in his open predicacion at Norwich the xxvji yere . . . the lady Morley and the moste parte of the cite of Norwich couthe remembre, if they were required, as it is supposed.'

³¹*The Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Norman Davis, (1971-), I, p.257. Her household staff according to an account roll of 1463-4 (BL Add MS 34122A) comprised twelve, six men (including the Steward, William Stather) and six women. Two religious were also included under the heading of domestic fees: John Norwich, who received £4, and the Augustinian canon Richard Brandon, who received ten shillings. They earned their fees for singing for Lady Isobel and for the soul of Thomas her husband (d. 1435). Margaret Paston also had a religious, John Alderliche, in her household when she was widowed, as well as James Gloys, the chaplain, who no doubt ran Margaret's household as William Stather, priest, did Lady Isobel's: see the Paston inventory of c. 1470 in Davis, II p.363.

³²Davis, I, p.221 and cf. p.225. The estate was Sparham Hall in Sparham, held of Lord Morley (Blomefield, IV, p.414); it was in the hundred of Eynesford which Lord Morley held (see below); it had been the Mautbys'; Margaret continued her letter: 'And sche sayd sche wyst wele ther was wrytyng ther-of j-now, and sche hath wrytyng ther-of hw Syre Robert of Mawthby and Sir Jon and myn grawnsyre, and dyverse other of myn awnceterys, payd jt and seyde nevyre nay ther-to'.

³³They were in 1463-4; no doubt they had been for many years; the relief was at issue in 1448. In 1463-4 Heydon as Chief Steward had a fee of 5 marks, William Jenny a fee of 2 marks. Edmund Buckenham esquire had 6 marks as his fee, more than anyone save William Stather, the Steward of her household and her Receiver, who had 10 marks. Buckenham she made much use of in 1463-4, and to judge by her generous bequests to them these two men were her most trusted advisers and retainers. They were two of her four executors. John Heydon, who was not an executor was, however, to have £5 if he would give his assistance and good counsel that her executors 'be not wrongfully vexed'. For the household account of 1463-4 see the following note; for her will see note 30.

³⁴BL Add MS 34122A. She was ill in October 1463 and at Easter 1464; Master Thomas Reed came to attend to her on both occasions.

³⁵It might be noted that William Stather was chaplain of the college or chapel of St. Nicholas at Rougham in Gressenhall (Blomefield, V, p.1017). His unrevealing will of 1491 is at NRO, Norwich Consistory Court, register Typpes, f.44.

³⁶J. C. Wedgwood, *History of Parliament, 1439-1509, Biographies* (1936), pp.432-3; *Testamenta Eboracensia*, III (Surtees Society, v.45, 1864), pp.273-278: Sir Hugh Hastings' will of 1482 (cf. NRO, Gressenhall and Hastings family property collection, MR 321 and 322). John Hastings' will of 8 April 1477 is also at NRO in the same collection, MR 320, but is too damaged for consultation.

³⁷*C.C.R. 1405-9*, pp. 372, 393; Blomefield, I, p.677; R. Ian Jack, 'Entail and Descent: the Hastings Inheritance, 1370 to 1436', *BIHR XXXVIII* (1965), pp.1-19, especially pp.12-18.

³⁸*CCR 1435-41*, pp.19, 435. Isobel did not have dower in Hingham as our Thomas Lord Morley's widow Anne had had - Anne's dower had comprised a third of each of the Morley estates apart from Walkern and Halingbury which she had as her jointure (*CCR 1422-9*, pp.282-3, 288-90) - but she did receive from Robert Morley the yearly 26s.8d. farm of the fishery in Hingham Mere ('cum lez lakez apud Hengham'), called then as now Sea Mere ('Semer'). That fishery had not been included in Anne's third: *CPR 1416-22*, p.265.

Robert Morley was of the half-blood. The manor of Morley near Hingham had been settled on his branch of the family c. 1359. He died without male issue in 1484. In his will he stated that his wife Elizabeth was to enjoy the estate for her life, though he was worried that her occupation might be challenged; on her death in 1501 the manor reverted to the main stem of the family, then represented by the obscure William Parker and his wife Alice Lovel: Blomefield, I, p.708; Robert's will, NRO, Norwich Consistory Court, register A Caston, f.223, dated 20 August 1482, proved 16 December 1484; Elizabeth's will, NRO, Norwich Consistory Court, register Cage, f.183, dated 10 December 1500, proved 27 February 1501.

³⁹I have frequently rounded figures out to the nearest pound throughout this paper.

There were some other receipts. John Hastings had purchased from her a property in Norwich for £100; he had paid £50 in the three previous years and now paid off a further £10. She also received £20, part payment of £120 (of which she had already had £60 in three years) from a Lavenham man and the executors of Andrew Griggs, sometime Receiver General of Alice, dowager Duchess of Suffolk (Colin Richmond, *John Hopton* (1981), p.108, footnote 23). What had it been for? Wood sales from Aldeby fetched a further £3.

⁴⁰Staffs. R.O. D641/3/Cossey 16, old number 5. There was a demesne farm as well as a dairy farm; neither was important financially. The charge came to £48 (there were no arrears); outgoings, including allowances and decays at £10 and wages and fees at £6, came to £24. Liveries of money amounted to only £15. Our Thomas Lord Morley's widow Anne had held a third of Aldeby (*C.C.R. 1422-29*, pp. 288-90) but, as she died in October 1426, this account of 1426-7 *ought* to be of the whole estate rather than of

two-thirds of it. But with only a single account surviving there is no sure way of telling.

⁴¹ Staffs. R.O. D641/3/Cossey 16, old number 1. Revenues at Foulsham were all from rents and leases, including £5 for the mill, and from the court, worth £6 that year. Outgoings were correspondingly slight, the bailiff Thomas Gnatshall's fee of £2 being the heaviest of them.

⁴² Staffs. R.O. D641/3/ temp number 481. Castleward produced nearly £3 – there were no reliefs that year (cf. note 32 above); arrears stood at over £2. The bailiff John Palmer's fee was £1.

⁴³ *The Nobility of Later Medieval England* (1973), p.65. As between Isobel and her husband Thomas there may have been mutual affection. Married by 1403, when they were certainly still children, she never remarried after his death in 1435, and some thirty years later desired burial beside him in the magnificently original tomb she had constructed for them both in Hingham church: 'one of the most ambitious funeral compositions in England', N. Pevsner, *NW and S Norfolk*, p.51. In 1463-4 £3 was spent 'pro pictura tumbe domine apud Hengham': BL Add MS 34122A.

⁴⁴ They are set out in our Thomas Lord Morley's *Inquisition Post Mortem*: PRO C138/21/49, cf. William Dugdale, *The Baronage of England* (1675-6; 1977 reprint), p.26.

⁴⁵ See footnote 76 below.

⁴⁶ *CCR 1402-5*, pp.152-3; *CCR 1435-41*, pp.19, 435. Thomas's own wife Anne had as her jointure Walkern and Halingbury: *CCR 1413-19*, p. 330; *CCR 1422-29*, pp.282-3; *CPR 1422-29*, p.391.

The Phillipps MS recently acquired by the Norfolk Record Office (NRO Phi/65: I am grateful to Mr. Paul Rutledge for sending me a copy of this document) displays the de la Poles' concern that Isobel should be treated, so to speak, like a de la Pole. Dated 21 April 1417, it is an indenture between the Morley feoffees (headed by Sir Thomas Erpingham) and William de la Pole, the new Earl of Suffolk. It ensures, or seeks to ensure, by means of a hefty rent charge of £100 per annum to William de la Pole as the penalty for non-performance, that Isobel on her husband's death should be properly dowered. As we have just seen, she was.

⁴⁷ *CCR 1402-5*, p.153.

⁴⁸ Staffs. R.O. D641/3, temp. number 474. The Receiver General John Pelle's disbursements (totalling £80) consisted almost entirely of the repayment of moneys owed by our Thomas Lord Morley. These were chiefly small sums and some were being repaid by instalment; for example, Agnes Goldsmith of Norwich got 4 of the 8 marks owed her, Elizabeth Colman of Norwich had her 2 marks and William Walpole of Heveningham his ten shillings paid all at once. The exception, so far as size of sum was concerned, was the annual £40 being paid to the attorney of John Hende of London. This John Hende was undoubtedly one of the two sons of John Hende (d. 1418 and see footnote 3 above) and what was being repaid was the £300 Thomas Lord Morley had borrowed from their father in 1416.

⁴⁹ Staffs. R.O. D641/3 temp. number 474.

⁵⁰ NRO MAC/B7.

⁵¹ NRO MAC/B3 (1419-20); B5 (1421-2); B10 (1423-4); B6 (1425-6).

⁵² NRO MAC/B4.

⁵³ NRO MAC/B8; MAC/B9. There are two earlier Hingham accounts, the first for 2 February – 29 September 1358 (MAC/B1); the second, lacking the discharge, for 1405-6 (MAC/B2).

⁵⁴ NRO MAC/B4.

⁵⁵ NRO MAC/B5.

⁵⁶ NRO MAC/B10.

⁵⁷ NRO MAC/B6.

⁵⁸ In 1491-20; £21; 1421-2: £29; 1423-4: £25; 1425-6: £11.

⁵⁹ NRO MAC/B7.

⁶⁰ William Garneys esquire, one of Thomas Lord Morley's feoffees (*CCR 1422-29*, pp.288-9), was acting as the principal accountant for the estates in the feoffees' hands. At an audit of his accounts, lasting for two days and three nights, at Wymondham early in July 1421 the most distinguished person present was William Paston: NRO MAC/B4.

The story of William Garneys and the Garneys of Geldeston will have to wait until another occasion – as will that of William Paston and the Pastons. Margery, mother of Margaret Mautby who married William Paston's son John, married as her second husband William Garneys' son Ralph.

⁶¹ NRO MAC/B7.

⁶² The decreasing value of the manor to its lords over the first half of the fifteenth century can be detected in a comparison of the charges of the 1405-6 and 1452-3 accounts. The slump was greatest in the profits of the market, from £5 to £1, but the decline in the profits of the court was also steep, from £15 to £6; sales out of the manor fell from £4 to £1, while the rent of former demesne came down from £28 to £23. That these falls in income were real rather than accidental is shown by the intermediate evidence of the accounts of 1426-7 and 1432-3. They are what and where one would expect them to be: a decaying market, palsied 'feudal' revenues, a moribund manoralism.

⁶³ NRO MAC/B8.

⁶⁴ NRO MAC/B9. Who was the lord who warranted Sir Andrew's large payment of £40? Was it William Lord Lovel, whose second son William was to marry (or was already married to) the 10 year old Eleanor, only daughter and heiress of Thomas Lord Morley (d. 1442)? At Rotherfield in Oxfordshire was a house of the Greys and Deincourts now, by William's marriage to Alice heiress to those baronies, of the Lovels.

'Erdebury iuxta Coventry' was Arbury near Nuneaton. It was an estate of Ralph Butler, Lord Sudeley and there also was that family's favourite religious house of Augustinian Canons. However, Lord Lovel was a benefactor of the house too; or Alice, his wife, was; after Lovel's death she married, in 1463, Ralph Lord Sudeley; they were an elderly couple (R. Kretschmer, 'Ralph Butler, Lord Sudeley', Keele B.A. Dissertation 1973, pp.35-6, 45-6). What for, and who to see was Sir Andrew going to Arbury in February 1454? Ogard – naturalised Dane and English soldier – was a former associate of the Duke of York; by the time he sat in the parliament of 1453-4 as Knight of the Shire for Norfolk (the only occasion he was ever a member) he had become an important officer of Queen Margaret's household. At Westminster, February 1454 was a fraught time: in parliament the discussions concerning the protectorate of the Duke of York were proceeding as the demand of Queen Margaret for a regency was being discarded. The Lords were reluctant to engage in these negotiations (*History*, v.68 (1983), p.48 and refs. cited there).

Lovel (probably like Sudeley) was one of the many absentees; he was found to be ill and fined accordingly, even though he had been excused attendance at parliaments as recently as May 1453. He died in June 1455. Ogard had died the previous October. What was the relationship between them? Sir Andrew cannot have been riding to and fro in February 1454 merely on Morley estate business, can he?

⁶⁵To Robert Lethum, the lord's cofferer, £3 was delivered on 22 April 1453, and in February 1454 on Robert's behalf the lord's Receiver General William Bramston, received £16: NRO MAC/B9.

⁶⁶On another occasion two deer were sent up to him at Holborn while he was attending the King's council. These were stirring times for the politicians in the capital: Ralph A. Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, (1981), pp. 40-42.

⁶⁷Staffs. R.O. D641/3. temp. number 480. Arrears were a little over £2.

⁶⁸Herts R.O. 9379.

⁶⁹Herts R.O. 9378.

⁷⁰For him see J. S. Roskell, *The Commons in the Parliament of 1422* (1954), p.191. As he had been appointed keeper of Walkern and Halingbury parks with a yearly rent of 5 marks for life on 20 September 1427 (J. E. Cussans, *History of Hertfordshire*, v. II, Hundred of Broadwater (1877), pp.73-4), he was more than likely owed more than he owed. He appears receiving cloth in the account of expenses of 1416; no doubt he was by that date retained by our Thomas Lord Morley.

⁷¹Herts R.O. 9378.

⁷²Herts R.O. 9379.

⁷³To recapitulate our figures: Aldeby £25 – £42; Hockering £37; Swanton Morley £46; Foulsham £19 – £30; the hundred of Eynesford £18.

Having at the last minute come across an isolated account of Hockering among the Phillipps MSS at the Norfolk Record Office, my hesitation is confirmed as the appropriate attitude. The account is of 1413-1414 and is NRO Phi/486. Although it has been cut off towards the foot the broad financial outlines of the year are clearly revealed. Arrears stood at £22, receipts were £73. Outgoings came to £28, liveries of cash were £45. Still, the insignificant difference between £45 and £37 is probably the difference between 1414 and 1464.

⁷⁴To repeat: Hingham £60; Buxton £60; the hundred of Forehoe £13.6.8.

⁷⁵It is by now evident that Walkern and Great Halingbury were probably the only properties granted in wardship with the marriage of the young Robert Morley to Edmund Beaufort in February 1436: *CPR 1429-36*, p.510.

⁷⁶To set out all our figures in one place: Aldeby £42; Hockering £45; Swanton Morley £46; Foulsham £30; the hundred of Eynesford £18; Hingham £60; Buxton £60; the hundred of Forehoe £13; Walkern £32; Great Halingbury £35.

⁷⁷Staffs. R.O. D641/3 temp. number 475.

⁷⁸See footnote 48 above.

⁷⁹See, for example, *CCR 1422-9*. pp.288-9.

⁸⁰In December 1415 Thomas Morley – the son rather than the father – and William Paston were on a Norfolk commission: *CPR 1413-16*, p.411.